

Uneasy Bedfellows: Amateurism and Coaching Traditions in Twentieth Century British Sport

Tegan Laura Carpenter

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the Manchester Metropolitan University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

July 2012

If you do well in sport and you train, 'good show', but if you do well in sport and you don't train, 'bloody good show'.

Geoffrey Dyson, 1970

Dedication

This thesis is proudly dedicated to my parents, Lynne and John, my two brothers, Dan and Will and my best friend, Steve - Thank you for always believing in me.

Acknowledgments

This thesis would not have been possible without the continued support of family, friends and colleagues. While I am unable to acknowledge you all individually - I will be forever indebted to you.

To my supervisor, Dr Dave Day - I consider myself incredibly lucky to have had such an attentive and committed mentor. Someone who transformed the trudge of a PhD into an enjoyable journey, and because of this, I would not hesitate accepting the opportunity again (even after knowing the level of commitment required!). Thank you for never losing faith in me and for your constant support and patience along the way.

I would also like to thank Dr Neil Carter and Professor Martin Hewitt for their comments and advice. Special thanks to Sam for being the best office buddy and allowing me to vent whenever necessary! To Margaret and the interviewees of this study – thank you for your input and donating your time.

Finally I would like to extend my thanks to my immediate family. My parents for their continued support and the sacrifices (mostly financial!) that they have made over the years to ensure I achieved my ultimate goal, without them, I'm certain I wouldn't have reached this point. To my brothers - Dan, for your continued support and the reading of endless drafts which I have thrown your way during my academic career, and Will, for keeping me young at heart and never letting me lose sight of the important things in life. Steve, not only for the endless cups of tea and coffee (!) but also for the unfaltering optimism and encouragement you have offered me over the past three years.

Uneasy Bedfellows: Amateurism and Coaching Traditions in Twentieth Century British Sport

Abstract

Amateurism acted as the guiding principle for the many sporting clubs and governing bodies that were created and developed by the late Victorian middle-classes. While some forms of coaching and training were tolerated, many organisations, such as the Amateur Rowing Association, expressed a preference for amateur honorary coaches rather than professionals. Through the use of archival material, oral history interviews, and ongoing case studies in athletics and swimming, this thesis traces the trajectory of the less than harmonious relationship between amateurism and professional coaching in Britain throughout the twentieth century. In the pre and interwar period, a number of proposals for coaching schemes emerged, especially after poor Olympic performances, but continuing resistance within the amateur establishment meant that these initiatives were uncoordinated and experienced short life-spans. Even in the post-war period, characterised by an increasing number of centralised coaching schemes and the appointment of national coaches, amateur officials sought to maintain strict control over their appointments. A reluctance to accept advice from professional coaches, coupled with a struggling economy and a government determined to remain distant from sport, contributed to a further decline in international sporting performance. British athletes had long proved unable to compete with the Americans and the emergence of another sporting superpower at the 1952 Olympics, the Soviet Union, finally prompted a number of responses, including the 1960 Wolfenden Report. The government subsequently took a more active role in sport, resulting in an inevitable shift towards greater specialisation as centralised funding became inextricably linked with targets and results. Although this encouraged a more widespread utilisation of professional coaches and improved the integration of sports science, the ethos of amateurism proved far-reaching, even at elite levels. The evidence suggests that, while it is no longer considered a guiding principle, its legacy continues to impact on the working lives of many British coaches.

Keywords:

Amateurism; Coaching; Training; Swimming; Athletics; Geoffrey Dyson; Sports Science.

Uneasy Bedfellows: Amateurism and Coaching Traditions in Twentieth Century British Sport

Introduction

- 1-2 Overview
- 3-7 Themes
- 7-16 Amateurism
- 17 Outline

Chapter One: London and Stockholm – British Olympic Performances and Ad-Hoc Coaching Developments

- 18-21 The Evolution of the Olympics
- 21-24 Creation of the British Olympic Association
Early Olympic Games- British Perception
- 24-31 1908 London Games and Aftermath
- 31-37 1912 Stockholm Games and its Influence

Chapter Two: Interwar Sport and the Formation of Early Coaching and Training Schemes

- 38-43 Interwar Period
- 43-44 Interwar Athletics Coaching Scheme
- 44-46 1936 Berlin Games
Coaching Schemes – Post-1937
- 47-51 Athletics
- 51-57 Swimming

Chapter Three: British Sporting Decline and Post-War Coaching Developments

- 58-66 Post-War Context
Post-1945 Coaching Scheme Developments
- 66-70 Athletics
- 70-76 Swimming

Chapter Four: 1948 London Games and 'The Father' of British Coaching

- 77-84 1948 London Games
Post-Olympic Games Coaching Developments
- 84-86 Athletics
- 86-93 Geoff Dyson: 'The Father' of British Coaching
- 93-96 Swimming

Chapter Five: 'Shamateurism' and Sports Science: An Exploration of the Soviet Sporting Model

- Soviet Sport Organisation*
- 98-102 Pre-WWII
- 102-107 Post-WWII
- 107-108 The Soviet Union and the Olympic Games
- 108-112 Western reactions to Soviet Success

- 112-117 Components of Soviet Success
117-120 Key Factors

Chapter Six: Soviet Influence on British Sport

- 121-125 Helsinki and Melbourne from a British Perspective
Post-Melbourne Coaching Scheme Developments
125-133 Swimming
133-140 Athletics
140-142 Britain in the World of Sport
142-153 The Wolfenden Report and its Impact

Chapter Seven: Government Intervention and the NGBs Battle for Autonomy

- 154-156 1965 Advisory Sports Council
156-161 How Coaching Was Valued
161-170 1972 Executive Sports Council and Modern Developments

Chapter Eight: Emergence of Sports Science and Medicine in British Sport

- 171-172 Early Forms of Sport Science
172-173 Relationship between Early Sports Science and Coaches
174-177 Interwar Developments
177-182 Development of Sports Medicine
182-189 1965 Altitude Research and British Sport

Chapter Nine: Institutionalisation of Sports Science in the British Post-War Period

- Use of Science in Swimming and Athletics in Post-War Britain*
190-197 Science, Coaches and Swimming at Loughborough
197-200 The Amateur Athletic Association and the Incorporation of Science
200-203 Formalisation of Sports Science in Britain
204-207 Resistance to Sports Science
207-209 Improved and Future Integration of Sports Science

Conclusion

- 210-214 Concluding Comments
214 Limitations and Future Research
214-217 Amateur Legacy

Appendix A: Short Biographies of Oral History Interviewees

- 218-219

Bibliography

- 220-236

Abbreviations

AAA	Amateur Athletic Association
AAC	Athletes' Advisory Club
ASA	Amateur Swimming Association
ASC	Advisory Sports Council
BAAB	British Amateur Athletic Board
BANC	British Association of National Coaches
BASES	British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences
BASM	British Association of Sport and Medicine
BASS	British Association of Sport Science
BOA	British Olympic Association
BOC	British Olympic Council
CCPR	Central Council of Physical Recreation
CCPRT	Central Council of Recreative Physical Training
ESC	Executive Sports Council
FIMS	Fédération Internationale de Médecine du Sport
GB	Great Britain
IAAF	International Association of Athletics Federation
IAC	International Athletes Club
IOC	International Olympic Committee
ISF	International Sporting Federation
KAR	King's African Rifles
LTAD	Long Term Athlete Development
MMU	Manchester Metropolitan University
NCF	National Coaching Foundation
NFC	National Fitness Council
NGB	National Governing Body
NOC	National Olympic Committee
NSMI	National Sports Medicine Institute
NTO	National Technical Officer
OUAC	Oxford University Athletic Club
REF	Research Excellence Framework
SDC	Sports Development Council
SSEP	Sports Science Education Programme
SSSP	Sports Science Support Programme
USA	United States of America

Introduction

At the 2008 Summer Olympic Games in Beijing, the British team successfully achieved a total of forty-seven medals, of which nineteen were gold. However, previous British performances at the Olympics have not always been so successful. Despite competing in every Games since its inception in 1896 this was the highest medal tally ever achieved, apart from that of the 1908 London Games. This result was not a lucky coincidence; it was achieved through a carefully planned and well-resourced professional system which integrated several different aspects of athlete development. Sports science and medicine, intensive training centres, full-time professional coaches and greater funding availability for athletes all created an environment which allowed full time training and preparation using the best facilities. However, this shift towards a more specialised system of British sport could be considered a fairly recent development, which might explain why Britain, unlike some other countries, has previously struggled to achieve results on the international scene.

This thesis examines the trajectory of amateurism and how this influenced the development of coaching and training techniques in British swimming and athletics during the twentieth century. Specific focus has been placed on the Olympic Games and how poor British performances may have encouraged a greater incorporation of coaching through the adoption of nationalised schemes. While a limited amount of coaching was generally tolerated, there always appeared to be a preference for amateur or honorary coaches rather than the utilisation of professionals because of the strict adherence to amateurism and volunteerism. Even in those sports where some professionals were appointed, amateur administrators remained wary of their intentions and as such, sought to control them by imposing a master-servant relationship, thus ensuring that professional coaches never gained authority within the National Governing Bodies (NGB). Particularly in the post-war period, the number of professional coaches in certain NGBs rose dramatically, but whereas other countries would have utilised these coaches to train and improve the standard of their elite athletes, the primary duties of the British coaches was to educate a contingent of honorary coaches and trainers so that they could then pass on their knowledge to amateur participants. There was a residual underlying disquiet regarding professional coaches and this appeared to stem from a belief that they were in some way not suitable for amateur sport. The fact that they wished to receive payment for the improvement of athletes did not sit well with many of the amateur officials. In some ways, this mind-set was to be expected especially when consideration is given to the principles on which many of the NGBs had been forged. Richard Holt, Tony Mason, John Lowerson and Martin Polley all suggest that British sport grew and developed under the auspices of amateurism and as such, it was inevitable that these principles would underpin the approaches taken by the emerging sporting bodies.¹ However, as this

¹ Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Richard Holt and Tony Mason, *Sport in Britain, 1945-2000* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000); Tony Mason, ed., *Sport in Britain: A Social History* (Cambridge:

research progressed it became increasingly apparent that the impact of the amateur ethos went much deeper than has been previously suggested. Its unfaltering life-span and influence appeared to gain further impetus as various aspects of sports science began to impact in the latter half of the twentieth century. This appeared to create a renewed uncertainty regarding issues of professionalism in British sport and led to resistance towards the incorporation of scientific methods, reflecting the controlling influence that amateurism continued to have over British sport. Utilising a range of primary and secondary sources it is the intention of this thesis to demonstrate how amateurism has influenced coaching developments and to argue, that despite the fact that amateurism is no longer considered the guiding principle, its legacy can still be seen in certain aspects of British sport.

Even though there is a plethora of literature available on individual aspects of this research, for example, work by Peter Lovesey, Martin Polley, Thierry Terret, Christopher Love, Ian Keil and Don Wix has focused on the development of British athletics and swimming and while the progression and development of sports science and medicine in British sport has been examined by Vanessa Heggie, for the most part such work is more generalised and does not specially focus on the interaction of these different areas under the notion of amateurism.² In addition, despite the analysis of coaching traditions in both swimming and athletics receiving more attention in recent years, particularly through the work of Dave Day and Neil Carter, published material with a specific focus on British coaching remains limited.³ This research was designed to address this oversight by collecting and combining oral history testimonies and detailed archival evidence in order to develop a thematic and contextualised account of the progression of amateurism and its relationships with coaching and training techniques in twentieth-century Britain. The placing of this material within the wider context of British culture and sport helps to produce a unique perspective on a previously under researched area.

Cambridge University Press, 1989); John Lowerson, *Sport and the English Middle Classes, 1870-1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995); Martin Polley, *Moving the Goalposts: A History of Sport and Society in Britain since 1945* (Oxon: Routledge, 1998).

² Peter Lovesey, *The Official Centenary History of the Amateur Athletic Association* (Enfield: Guinness Superlatives, 1979); Martin Polley, "The Amateur Rules": Amateurism and Professionalism in Post-War British Athletics', *Contemporary British History* 14, no. 2 (2000): 81-114; Thierry Terret, 'Professional Swimming in England before the Rise of Amateurism, 1837-75', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 12, no. 1 (1995): 18-32; Ian Keil and Don Wix, *In the Swim: The Amateur Swimming Association from 1869 to 1994* (Loughborough: Swimming Times, 1996); Christopher Love, 'Social Class and the Swimming World: Amateurs and Professionals', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no. 5 (2007): 603-19; Vanessa Heggie, *A History of British Sports Medicine* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).

³ Dave Day, 'From Barclay to Brickett: Coaching Practices and Coaching Lives in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century England' (PhD diss., DeMontfort University, 2008); Dave Day, 'Craft Coaching and the "Discerning Eye" of the Coach', *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching* 6, no. 1 (2011): 179-96; Neil Carter, 'From Knox to Dyson: Coaching, Amateurism and British Athletics, 1912-1947', *Sport in History* 30, no. 1 (2010): 55-81; Dave Day, Neil Carter and Tegan Carpenter, 'The Olympics, Amateurism and Britain's Coaching Heritage', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* | First article (2012): 1-14.

Themes

To achieve these aims, this thesis is centred on a number of different themes including the Olympic Games, coaching, oral history and amateurism and these will be explored in depth in the following section.

Olympic Games

The Olympic Games were chosen as a means to monitor the progression, the impact of the nascent coaching schemes and demonstrate how poor performances by British athletes potentially offered further impetus for continued improvement. By selecting the Olympics for analysis it was also possible to discuss the development of British sport and coaching techniques within an international framework. This also allowed for a comparison between British and foreign training methods and an analysis of their influence on the British sporting system. Throughout the thesis it will be noted that specific focus has been placed on certain Olympic Games rather than analysing each one in chronological order. The reasoning for this emerged from the ongoing analysis and a realisation that while a discussion of each individual Games may have been possible, it seemed unnecessary to include them if they added no extra value to the overall thesis. Consequently, the Games that have been selected and included throughout the thesis are the ones that were deemed most appropriate in terms of British coaching developments and advances.

Although the World Championships offered an alternative avenue for investigation, the Olympic Games were considered particularly appropriate for this work, because not only are they a more established event (the World Championships for swimming and athletics did not begin until 1973 and 1983, respectively), but the ranking of nations is more visible, and they also occur on a four yearly basis, unlike the World Championships which occur every two. Monitoring the impact of coaching schemes on a four year basis ensured that the developments had sufficient time to become established and demonstrate some progress. Also, it needs to be considered, particularly from the perspective of the athlete, that the Olympic Games are normally perceived as the highlight of their athletic career and that greater emphasis is placed on preparing for them. As Dave Collins, a sport psychologist and Director of British Athletics from 2005-2008, emphasised when interviewed by the author in 'the vast majority of sports that I have ever worked in, an Olympic medal is the pinnacle, that's the business.'⁴

Coaching - Athletics and Swimming

Two sports, athletics and swimming, were selected for comprehensive analysis predominately because of their ongoing popularity and their prominent presence at the Games since the birth of the modern Olympic movement in 1896. Athletics in particular has always been considered a major event of the Olympics. For

⁴ Dave Collins, interview by author, February 17, 2011, Crewe, Cheshire.

example, in 1908, some countries, the United States of America (USA) in particular, measured their overall success at the Games based solely on the outcome of the athletics events. In addition, by restricting the research to only two sports it was possible to provide a much more detailed analysis than would have been possible if a broader spectrum had been attempted.

These two sports were also considered the most appropriate because their relevant NGBs, the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) and the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA), have consistently incorporated some degree of coaching and training during the course of the twentieth century. Although somewhat reluctantly at times, both athletics and swimming engaged with various incarnations of centralised coaching schemes and therefore it was possible to trace their activities and involvement by accessing official documents from a number of different sources. Information regarding the progress and development of these coaching schemes is intertwined within short case studies throughout the thesis in an attempt to show their evolution in relation to the context of British society and sport. It will be recognised that these case studies are predominately focused on the working class men who were appointed within the NGBs coaching positions. While there are isolated cases of women working within this environment, as is demonstrated within this thesis, it was essentially a male endeavour. Women may have been appointed in teaching roles that were not directly connected to the NGBs but as the focus of this research was specifically on individuals that were associated with the coaching schemes and were appointed as a result of centralised grant money, it was deemed inappropriate to include them.

Throughout the thesis intricate details regarding the discussions and communications between the NGBs and the particular grant awarding bodies are presented because the ways in which the debates unfold, signify the very 'amateur' nature of the administration of British sport. The evidence presented demonstrates, that although money and support was available for the NGBs to progress, particularly with regards to coaching, because they remained guarded about their autonomy and the level of control they had over their professional coaches, they often did not fully embrace these opportunities and in some instances rejected them completely. Archival material was gathered from both the ASA and AAA, and while this offered in-depth detail about the internal workings of the organisations it was not possible to gain the entire perspective from association documents because as Martin Polley highlights, 'an organisation's minutes and reports are created within that organisation...and they will embody its traditions, concerns, ideologies and internal politics.'⁵ Consequently, because of their traditional positions on coaching and amateurism, which were closely aligned to the principle of volunteerism, professional coaches were often viewed with uncertainty by administrators and so information and issues relating to them was often disregarded. Therefore, although association documents have proved useful, they have been primarily

⁵ Martin Polley, *Sports History: A Practical Guide* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 102.

used as a means of triangulation. Other archival material from the likes of the British Olympic Association, National Fitness Council, Ministry of Education and British Association of Sports and Medicine offered interpretation from different perspectives, which also allowed for a greater collaboration and synthesis of material. Furthermore, the use of newspapers, seminal texts, private family collections and oral history interviews has ensured a cross-examination of information across a number of different sources thus attempting to establish historical accuracy, although this is in itself something of a contestable statement. In general, this thesis lends itself towards what Alun Munslow refers to as, a reconstructionist or empirical perspective, but it also recognises that such work always involves a degree of interpretation.⁶ Douglas Booth suggests that both reconstructionism and constructionism are 'evidence-based, objectivist-inspired models in which historians aspire to build accurate, independent and truthful reconstructions of the past'⁷ and it is anticipated that the mixed method approach taken in this work will help to provide a 'narrative truth.'⁸

Oral History

Oral history, 'one of the best ways of getting truly original source material', was used as one means to gather evidence for this study.⁹ It is an umbrella term used to describe various research methods in which memories and personal commentaries of historical significance are collected through the use of recorded interviews.¹⁰ There are four basic types of oral histories and these include life histories, topical histories, thematic studies and artefact specific research.¹¹ As this research was specifically focused on the experiences of both coaches and sports science staff in a specific period of time, the use of topical oral histories was deemed the most appropriate because it focuses on 'what, when, how, why, or with what consequence something happened', or in other words, it uses a specific event or circumstance as the basis for historical documentation.¹² This research focused on the experiences of individuals who were working in a similar scenario but as they were fulfilling different roles at various times it would have been impossible to have found a single individual with all the information required. By conducting a number of interviews with a variety of relevant individuals it was possible to collect alternative accounts and then piece together what they knew and experienced to present a collective analysis.¹³ In order to achieve this it was necessary to

⁶ Alun Munslow, *Deconstructing History*, 2nd ed. (Oxon: Routledge, 1996), 20-7; Alun Munslow, *Narrative and History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 10-5.

⁷ Douglas Booth, *The Field: Truth and Fiction in Sports History* (Oxon: Routledge, 2005), 10.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 13-5; Munslow, *Deconstructing History*, 12.

⁹ Polley, *Sports History*, 129.

¹⁰ Donald A. Ritchie, *Doing Oral History: A Practical Guide* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 19.

¹¹ Texas Historical Commission, *Fundamentals of Oral History: Texas Preservation Guidelines* (Texas: Texas Historical Commission, 2004), 2.

¹² Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin, *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*, 2nd ed. (California: Sage Publications Inc, 2005), 11.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 6.

actively seek appropriate individuals who each had relevant experiences and knowledge of the periods and environments being researched. Therefore, all the interviewees in this study were selected because of their previous or current involvement with coaching and/or sports science in British sport. The nine interviews conducted included a former Director of Coaching for UK athletics, a Technical Director of Scottish swimming, two athletics National Coaches, one National Technical Officer (NTO), two professional swimming coaches and two individuals who have worked in British sports science. Attempts were made to select persons who had been employed in the positions at different periods of times to ensure that an array of perspectives and interpretations were collected. Short biographies of all the included interviewees are listed in Appendix A.

All interviews were conducted in accordance with the Oral History Association Principles and Standards which encourage 'those who produce and use oral history to recognise certain principles, rights and obligations for the creation of source material that is authentic, useful and reliable.'¹⁴ The interviews were semi-structured and the questions were altered according to who was being interviewed. For example, the national coaches were subjected to a different set of questions to the sports science researchers. By asking the interviewee 'only about information he or she knows best' Herbert and Irene Rubin suggest that this ensures the interview evidence gathered is of rich detail.¹⁵ Before the interviews were conducted, interviewees' consent, which included an agreement to publish their name in connection with the interview material, was obtained. Participants were not obligated to continue in the research and had the opportunity to withdraw at any point. Any information which the interviewees highlighted either at the time or after the interview that they did not want to be published was omitted from the final transcription. The recordings and transcripts will remain in the author's care until they can be placed into a digital archive where they can be accessed by a much larger audience, with the full permission of the interviewees.

Katherine Borland suggests that 'oral personal narratives occur naturally within a conversational context' but it is the job of the oral historian to,

Identify chunks of artful talk within this flow of conversation, give them physical existence (most often through writing), and embed them in a new context of expressive or at least communicative activity (usually the scholarly article aimed towards an audience of professional peers). Thus we construct a second level narrative based upon, but at the same time, reshaping the first.¹⁶

¹⁴ Oral History Association, 'Principles and Standards of the Oral History Association', <http://www.oralhistory.org/do-oral-history/principles-and-practices/oral-history-evaluation-guidelines-revised-in-2000/#1.3> (accessed April 26, 2012).

¹⁵ Rubin and Rubin, *Qualitative Interviewing*, 227.

¹⁶ Katherine Borland, "That's Not What I Said": Interpretive Conflict in Oral Narrative Research', in *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*, ed. Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai (New York: Routledge, 1991), 63.

As such, there are many different ways to interpret oral history material but the one deemed most appropriate for this particular research is what Lynn Abrams refers to as 'evidential.' This 'encompasses the application of oral history for evidence gathering, the use of oral testimony as data, providing information to support an argument and illustrative material for publication.' Quotes, which have been selected for their 'typicality', have been chosen from the testimonies and are presented throughout the thesis as short 'pithy' extracts.¹⁷ This model of interpretation has been adopted by many other researchers such as Elizabeth Roberts, Paul Thompson, Stephen Humphries and Jerry White.¹⁸ The interweaving of quotation with narrative and documentary evidence allows for the creation of 'fresh historical interpretations' and a 'multi-dimensional picture of the past.'¹⁹

Amateurism

Amateurism did not rest merely on a technical definition of whether or not an athlete was paid, rather the concept incorporated a range of ideals and beliefs that had a broad social significance reaching far beyond the sports field.²⁰

The ethos of Amateurism is the running theme throughout this thesis and as such an effort has been made, where possible, to consistently relate information to its principles. Its influence can be clearly seen in nearly all aspects of British sport, particularly in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Although its presence became ever more diluted in the latter stages of the twentieth century this thesis will attempt to demonstrate that despite this, its impact and legacy has been far reaching particularly with regards to coaching provision. In order to understand amateurism and how it became such a valued and established part of British sport it is necessary to fully appreciate its initial formation and development, so the following section provides a brief overview of the evolution of amateurism in British sport.

The English word 'amateur' can trace its origins back to the Latin, *Amatorem* which means 'one who loves or is fond of; who has a taste for anything.'²¹ Emerging in France at the end of the seventeenth century, where it was often used in connection with connoisseurs of fine art, it was around 1780 the word came into regular use in Britain and it gradually began to be used in connection with sport with which it

¹⁷ Lynn Abrams, *Oral History Theory* (Oxon: Routledge, 2010), 15.

¹⁸ Elizabeth Roberts, *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working Class Women 1890-1940* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1994); Paul Thompson, *The Edwardians* (London: Routledge, 1992); Stephen Humphries, *Hooligans or Rebels? An Oral History of Working Class Childhood and Youth, 1889-1939* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995); Jerry White, *Rothschild Buildings* (London: Pimlico, 2003); Lynn Abrams, *The Orphan Country: Children of Scotland's Broken Homes, 1845 to the Present Day* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1998).

¹⁹ Stephen Humphries, *The Handbook of Oral History: Recording Life Histories* (London: Inter-Action Imprint, 1984), 52.

²⁰ Norman Baker, 'The Amateur Ideal in a Society of Equality: Change and Continuity in Post-Second World War British Sport, 1945-48', *International Journal of the History of Sport* 12, no. 1 (1995): 101.

²¹ Eugene Glader, *Amateurism and Athletics* (New York: Leisure Press, 1978), 96.

subsequently became irrevocably linked.²² However, contemporary definitions appear to differ somewhat. The Oxford English dictionary defines an amateur as 'a person who engages in a pursuit, especially in sport, on an unpaid basis' or 'a person who is contemptibly inept at a particular activity.'²³ The word appears to have undergone a period of transition; an amateur was once morally superior to the professional because they rejected specialisation and payment and participated in sport for the love of the game and had a respect for fair play and moderation. Since the professional thus contravened the true spirit of sport, the amateur became glorified.²⁴ However, a variety of reasons, perhaps the most influential of which was the dilution of the professional ban at the Olympics, which gradually gained momentum after 1974, ensured that the meaning of amateurism continued to evolve. This resulted in the definition most commonly associated with being an amateur in the twenty-first century which is being of mediocre standard. Neil Carter argues that this shift in definition is nothing new, suggesting 'there have been many different and complex interpretations of amateurism. In effect, amateurism was a state of mind, its rhetoric ever changing to justify itself.'²⁵ These differing interpretations may have emerged because, as Richard Holt suggests, amateurism was 'a complex phenomenon with complex causes.'²⁶ As a result, establishing a consensus about what constituted an amateur performer has been a task that sporting administrators have struggled with over the years and one that resulted in each NGB using the terms 'amateur' and 'professional' to mean just what they chose them to mean. For example, in 1956, in association football and women's hockey and netball, an amateur could receive a fee or honorarium for coaching, but in lawn tennis and athletics this was not permissible. While the AAA declared that being a professional in one sport constituted a loss of amateur status in others, the Lawn Tennis Association had no such regulation.²⁷ The following sections will explore how this disparity over the exact nature of amateurism may have stemmed partly from the uncertainty which surrounded its emergence and early formalisation in British sport.

²² Lincoln Allison, *Amateurism in Sport: An Analysis and a Defence* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2001), 3; Peter A. French, *Ethics and College Sports: Ethics, Sports, and the University* (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2004), 11; University of Birmingham Physical Education Department, *Britain in the World of Sport: An Examination of the Factors Involved in Participation in Competitive International Sport* (Birmingham: The Physical Education Association, 1956), 17.

²³ Oxford Online Dictionary, s.v. 'amateur', <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/amateur?region=us> (accessed October 31, 2011).

²⁴ Harold Abrahams, 'Sport, Professionalism and the Olympics' (Speech to the Ethical Society, Conway Hall, London), March 27, 1977, File HA Box 2, Amateur Athletic Association Collection, University of Birmingham Special Collections Archives, Birmingham (hereafter cited as AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives); Stanley Eitzen, 'The Sociology of Amateur Sport: An Overview', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 24, no. 2 (1989): 96.

²⁵ Neil Carter, 'From Knox to Dyson: Coaching, Amateurism and British Athletics, 1912-1947', *Sport in History* 30, no. 1 (2010): 60.

²⁶ Richard Holt, 'The Amateur Body and the Middle-Class Man: Work, Health and Style in Victorian Britain', *Sport in History* 26, no. 3 (2006): 353.

²⁷ University of Birmingham, *Britain in World Sport*, 15.

'Sportisation'

The second half of the nineteenth century saw continuing industrialisation and urbanisation transform the way in which sport in Britain was played and managed. Richard Holt, Wray Vamplew and Mike Huggins have all made connections between modernisation and an increase in spare time, something which prior to industrialisation and shorter working weeks was fairly unfamiliar.²⁸ However, it was the way in which this spare time was utilised that ultimately caused a formalisation of sport in Britain. This period of 'sportisation' was also aided by an increase in disposable income, improved transport links and the influx of individuals from rural to urban areas which consequently altered the amount of space and time available for leisure. Sport became moulded around such factors and this eventually encouraged the development of sporting rules, the creation of voluntary sporting organisations and perhaps one of the most influential features of this period, the materialisation of class distinction and social exclusion in sport.²⁹ However, whilst it is clear that industrialisation had a major impact on the development and progress of modern sport, Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning argue there is a 'widespread tendency to explain almost everything that occurred in the 19th century as a result of the Industrial Revolution' and as such its influence needs to be kept in perspective. Elias and Dunning, therefore, suggest that both 'industrialisation and sportisation were symptomatic of a deeper-lying transformation of European societies which demanded of their individual member's greater regularity and differentiation of conduct.'³⁰ Consequently, it could be suggested that while increasing opportunities and social change may have been influential in the formalisation of sport, it may have been the natural progression of society that created a demand for a new approach to sport which saw a shift away from popular violent pastimes towards more rationalised activity.³¹

Emerging Middle Classes and Sport

It was once a common belief that the middle classes were forged out of the industrial revolution during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.³² However, more recently it has been suggested, particularly by Dror Wahrman, that because there was no clearly defined period of 'revolution' and that the social change experienced in different industries was 'gradual and protracted' it is not possible to attribute

²⁸ Holt, *Sport and the British*, 74; Wray Vamplew, *Professional Sport in Britain, 1875-1914: Pay Up and Play the Game* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 53; Mike Huggins, 'Second-Class Citizens? English Middle-Class Culture and Sport, 1850-1910: Reconsideration', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 17, no. 1 (2000): 5.

²⁹ Huggins, 'Second-Class Citizens?', 5.

³⁰ Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning, *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilising Process* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 151.

³¹ Robert James Lake, 'Social Exclusion in British Tennis: A History of Privilege and Prejudice' (PhD diss., Brunel University, 2008): 104.

³² Peter Earle, *The Making of the English Middle Class: Business, Society and Family Life in London 1660-1730* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 336.

the emergence of the middle class to the industrial revolution.³³ In fact, the transformation of British social culture was a long process, something which had already become firmly established well before the period of industrialisation.³⁴ However, although the middle classes were noted as existing as far back as the seventeenth century, because they had not yet had the opportunity to make themselves as a 'distinctive presence' on the historical stage, it was increasingly difficult for researchers to acknowledge their early existence.³⁵ Nonetheless, increasing industrialisation, which encouraged a shift in the occupational hierarchy, was conducive to establishing middle class identity and by the mid-Victorian period the middle class had a 'clear social-economic basis in business and the professions' and, as a result, they gradually gained 'social weight and definition.'³⁶

The rise of the English middle classes to positions of power in industry and commercialism resulted in a demand for recognition of their contribution to the nation's ever expanding authority and wealth.³⁷ Although only 1,500,000 families, equalling only 5.5 per cent of the total population, were considered to be 'middle-class' in 1870, 'their social position and influence were extremely high in proportion to their numbers.'³⁸ As a result of this new found power and control, the middle-classes had the ability to exert influence over various aspects of Victorian life, one of these being that of sport and the emerging concept of amateurism.³⁹ The rules of many sports in Britain, including those related to amateurism, were developed in the 1880s, and although other classes may have played their sport according to the amateur ethos, it was the professional middle class that developed the principles and refined them into a sporting philosophy, which aimed to keep sport 'pure' by excluding corruption and money.⁴⁰ Although both the upper and lower classes had previously received money from sport in the 'traditional sports' era either through playing or wagering, the period of 'modern sport', coupled with the emergence of the 'Gentleman Amateur' ethos, saw a rise in middle class concerns. If individuals were willing to accept payment for winning then there was the potential that money could be accepted to lose.⁴¹ As a result, the original rules of these newly emerging governing bodies were designed with the participant in mind. Although, the individuals who developed these rules were generally from the higher ranks of society, who had both time and money at their disposal, and therefore, the rulings they developed were designed for individuals in similar social

³³ Dror Wahrman, *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c. 1780-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1995), 2-3.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 3-4.

³⁵ Edward Palmer Thompson, 'Patrician Society, Plebeian Culture', *Journal of Social History* 7, no 4 (1974): 382-405; Edward Palmer Thompson, 'Eighteenth-Century English Society: Class Struggle without Class?', *Social History*, no. 3 (1978): 133-65; Wahrman, *Imagining the Middle Class*, 4.

³⁶ Simon Gunn, 'Class Identity and the Urban: The Middle Class in England, c. 1790-1950', *Urban History* 31, no. 1 (2004): 35.

³⁷ John R. Mallea, 'The Victorian Sporting Legacy', *McGill Journal of Education* 10, no. 2 (1975): 188.

³⁸ Huggins, 'Second-Class Citizens?', 2.

³⁹ Stephen G. Jones, *Sport, Politics and the Working Class* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 34.

⁴⁰ Day, 'From Barclay to Brickett', 23.

⁴¹ Holt, *Sport and the British*, 12; Kyle Phillpots, 'The Professionalisation of Rugby' (PhD diss., University of Warwick, 2000): 28.

circumstances. There was also a strong allegiance to volunteerism amongst these individuals as it was believed that this would ensure that the sports were managed with the interest of the games being paramount.⁴² However, this close affiliation to 'philanthropic voluntary action' also had a much deeper meaning, whereby it offered a 'significant source of social welfare' during the late nineteenth century. The development and involvement in 'charity' schemes which could aid the poor became popular during this time, and because such activities were reserved for those who had the ability to donate both time and money, it was generally an exclusive pastime for the upper and wealthy middle classes.⁴³ Consequently, by immersing themselves in philanthropic activities and demonstrating a strong loyalty to the amateur ethos, which stressed enjoyment and fair play over the work ethic, the upper middle classes were afforded the opportunity to fulfil their aspirations of 'social upward mobility' and create a distinction between themselves and the lower middle and working class masses.⁴⁴ As Patrick Joyce and Martin Pugh have both highlighted, the Victorian middle class was never a distinct social entity but more a cluster of diverse groupings which were stratified according to their economic, political, social and religious standings. As such, those who achieved this higher middle class position were keen to offset themselves against those whom they perceived to be inferior.⁴⁵

Social Hegemony

The maintenance of a firm code of amateurism by sports administrators served a pragmatic as well as a moral purpose. Whether developed instinctively or as a deliberate policy, the more exactly the tenets of amateurism were enforced, the less likely it was that those who lacked independent wealth could afford to compete at a national or international level as amateurs.⁴⁶

The amateur ideal was explicit in terms of how sport should be played in that it should be done purely for recreation and enjoyment and be entirely unrelated to an individual's occupation. Since earning money from sport would violate the cherished values of amateur sport, a 'true' amateur needed an independent source of wealth thereby enabling the refined sportsman to exclude the lower-class masses from their sport.⁴⁷ In 1895, American Caspar Whitney questioned 'why there should be so much constant strife to bring together in sport the two divergent elements of society that never by any chance meet elsewhere on even terms.' He was not against the 'labouring classes' having the opportunity to participate in sport 'in

⁴² Norman Baker, 'Whose Hegemony? The Origins of the Amateur Ethos in Nineteenth Century English Society', *Sport in History* 24, no.1 (2004): 2.

⁴³ Mark Walsh, Paul Stephens, and Stephen Moore, *Social Policy and Welfare* (Cheltenham: Stanley Thorne, 2000), 37.

⁴⁴ French, *Ethics and College Sports*, 12.

⁴⁵ Patrick Joyce, *Democratic Subjects: The Self and the Social in Nineteenth Century England* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1994), 163-164; Martin Pugh, *Sport and Society: A Social and Political History of Britain since 1870* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012), 99.

⁴⁶ Baker, 'Amateur Ideal', 102.

⁴⁷ Eitzen, 'Sociology of Amateur Sport', 97.

whatsoever manner best suits their inclinations', but did not understand why they should be given the opportunity to play under rules which were designed for the more privileged classes.⁴⁸ Sports participation, as with many other aspects of life, was therefore dictated by social class. The ideals of amateurism were not founded with the intention of instilling some form of 'sacred morality' in individuals but essentially provided the upper and middle classes with a means of preventing undesirable individuals from participating in their sport. For example, in rowing, an individual would not be considered an amateur if he had 'ever taught, pursued or assisted in the pursuit of excellence of athletic exercises of any kind as a means of livelihood; nor have ever been employed in or about boats in manual labour, not be a mechanic, labourer or artisan.'⁴⁹ It was believed that individuals whose work involved manual labour would have a physiological advantage over the gentlemen amateurs and, based upon such grounds, they were considered professionals.

However, while certain individuals 'might aspire to meet its standards, amateurism was an essentially aristocratic concept' and as a result had various different facets to its meaning.⁵⁰ Simply being an amateur did not offer someone the privilege to control and organise sport because that was reserved for gentlemen. While there was a time when being a gentleman was depicted by birth or wealth alone, the rise of the middle classes caused the social-class demarcation to become blurred and education was now also considered a significant factor. The growing numbers of city merchants and industrialists now had the opportunity to distance themselves from lower middle class groups by ensuring their sons achieved a higher level of education.⁵¹ Gentlemen amateurs emerged as a distinct group of middle and upper class individuals who placed emphasis on the 'spirit of the game' and believed that wages and wagering in sport 'destroyed the frame-work of healthy competition.'⁵² Although they played many sports that the working classes also enjoyed, such as athletics, cricket and rowing, a gentleman amateur had a social and class distinction which could be used to distinguish them from what they perceived to be socially inferior individuals.⁵³ Fair play was a central notion of amateurism and an unwillingness to take an unfair advantage over another opponent was paramount to being a gentleman. Charles Burgess Fry, who represented England at football, athletics and cricket - an all-round typical gentleman amateur - commented on the issue of fair play and he suggested that it was 'a standing insult' to sport that rules were

⁴⁸ Caspar Whitney, *A Sporting Pilgrimage: Riding to Hounds, Golf, Rowing, Football, Club and University Athletics. Studies in English Sport, Past and Present* (New York: Harper, 1895), 164-7.

⁴⁹ Abrahams, 'Sport, Professionalism and Olympics', File HA Box 2, AAA Collection: HA, Birmingham Archives.

⁵⁰ Baker, 'Amateur Ideal', 102.

⁵¹ Holt, *Sport and the British*, 113.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 99; Simon B. Eassom, 'From the Bank to the Baron: A 200 Year History of Amateurism Embedded in the Olympic Ideal' (Paper Presented at the Second International Symposium for Olympic research, Ontario, Canada, October, 1994).

⁵³ Holt, *Sport and the British*, 99; University of Birmingham, *Britain World of Sport*, 17.

required to prevent players from attempting to 'trip, hack and push into opponents', because from his perspective, competitors should not even have considered resorting to such unfair tactics.⁵⁴

The exemplary late nineteenth-century amateur had the ability to excel at several sports without any apparent effort.⁵⁵ Individuals such as George Smith and Leslie Balfour Melville who were successful across a multitude of sports, including horse racing, rugby union and athletics, were considered true gentlemen amateurs. Amateur ideals stressed 'play for play's sake', although winning was acceptable provided that it was not achieved by cheating and that it was kept in perspective.⁵⁶ This 'moral perspective' included a judicious use of training, since a gentleman should not have to work hard to achieve and therefore, to train too hard, to take a specific diet or to be overly concerned with winning were just 'not cricket.'⁵⁷ By doing ones best a man could remain secure in the belief that he had participated in sport in the right manner, and if that resulted in defeat then that was entirely acceptable because sport was predominately played for intrinsic gain.⁵⁸

Amateurism and Coaching

Despite a widespread acknowledgement that placing too much emphasis on coaching and training an individual could in some way violate the rules of amateurism, there were some sports that accepted the use of coaches and trainers, which highlights 'the fluid nature of interpretations of amateurism in this period.'⁵⁹ As the terms "coach" and "coaching" have both evolved since their initial conception, in order to avoid confusion it seems necessary at this point to highlight how these terms are to be interpreted throughout this thesis. Coach refers to the individual who is responsible for directing the training of their athletes and coaching is the actual act of preparing an athlete for competition.⁶⁰ This preparation encompasses a number of different tasks, including the orchestration and implementation of carefully developed training plans, the acclimatisation of athletes for a competition environment, and the offering of technical and tactical advice throughout a performance.⁶¹ While any individual has the opportunity to be a coach, being considered a long-term successful coach requires more than just managing athletes who win competitions.

⁵⁴ Derek Birley, *Land of Sport and Glory: Sport and British Society, 1887-1910* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 36.

⁵⁵ Holt, *Sport and the British*, 100.

⁵⁶ Martin Polley, 'The Amateur Ideal and British Sports Diplomacy, 1900-1945', *Sport in History* 26, no. 3 (2006): 454; Allison, *Amateurism in Sport*, 22.

⁵⁷ Vanessa Heggie, 'Only the British Appear to be Making a Fuss: The Science of Success and the Myth of Amateurism at the Mexico Olympiad, 1968', *Sport in History* 28, no. 2 (2008): 230.

⁵⁸ Holt, *Sport and the British*, 97.

⁵⁹ Dave Day, 'Massaging the Amateur Ethos: British Professional Trainers at the 1912 Olympic Games', *Sport in History* 32, no. 2 (2012): 1.

⁶⁰ Rainer Martens, *Successful Coaching: Fourth Edition* (Champaign: Human Kinetics, 2012), ix; Murray George Phillips, *From Sidelines to Centre Field: A History of Sports Coaching in Australia* (University of New South Wales: University of New South Wales Press Ltd, 2000), xiii.

⁶¹ Phillips, *Sideline to Centre Field*, xiii.

Effective coaches have a clear understanding of the technical and tactical aspects of their sport and they have the ability to successfully transfer this knowledge to all their athletes.⁶² Many of the coaches discussed throughout this thesis appeared to have an innate intuition about how to improve their athletes and this has been commonly interpreted as a 'coaching eye'. Evidence suggests that many believed it was this skill that ensured they were at the forefront of their profession.

Returning to the issue of coaching acceptance, university rowing generally acknowledged that some amount of coaching was required if they were to row with elegance and style but, unlike other sports, they preferred to use amateur rather than professional coaches.⁶³ However, as Rob Light highlights, 'few, if any, modern sports have a stronger tradition of coaching than cricket.'⁶⁴ The structure of cricket during the late nineteenth century ensured that professional players were at the forefront of the technical developments in the sport and it soon became established that in order for amateurs to display grace while batting and bowling they would need to receive 'expert tuition' from the professionals who quickly assumed a coaching role.⁶⁵ However, amateurs and their representative authorities still marginalised professionals because they generally came from the lower social orders.⁶⁶ This was essentially why many sports did not welcome coaching from professionals, because not only would it involve a reversal of class status, but upper-class individuals did not want to risk acquiring 'plebeian' characteristics.⁶⁷ Also, there was a belief that if lower-class professionals were offered too much power, they might attempt to exert some sort of control over the administration of amateur sport. Those sports which did accept some amount of coaching controlled the situation by imposing a master-servant relationship on their working professionals.⁶⁸ Administrators prevented professional coaches and teachers from holding office within their sporting organisations to ensure that they never achieved any control over the direction of their sports.⁶⁹ Professionals, or 'paid servants', were also frequently reminded of their inferior position within the club environment and treated as such.⁷⁰ In both tennis and cricket clubs, professionals were kept separate from amateur members; they were allocated different changing rooms and catering facilities to ensure the professionals could not mix

⁶² Martens, *Successful Coaching*, ix.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁶⁴ Rob Light, 'A "Strange...Absurd...and Somewhat Injurious Influence"? Cricket, Professional Coaching in the Public Schools and the "Gentleman Amateur" Ethos', *Sport in History* 30, no. 1 (2010): 10.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 10-12.

⁶⁶ Robert J. Lake, 'Stigmatised, Marginalised, Celebrated: Developments in Lawn Tennis Coaching, 1870-1939', *Sport in History* 30, no. 1 (2010): 85.

⁶⁷ Day, 'Massaging the Amateur Ethos', 7; Peter Mewett, 'Sports Training, Science and Class among British Amateur Athletes in the Mid to Late Nineteenth Century' (Paper Presented at the TASA Conference, University of Western Australia and Murdoch University, December 4-7, 2006), 2.

⁶⁸ Dave Day, 'Walter Brickett. A Respectable Professor', in *Recording Leisure Lives: Sports, Games and Pastimes in 20th Century Britain*, ed. Bob Snape and Helen Pussard (Brighton: Leisure Studies Association, 2010), 194.

⁶⁹ Dave Day, 'A Man Cannot See His Own Faults': British Professional Trainers and the 1912 Olympics' (Paper Presented at the Sport and Leisure History Seminar, London, February 6, 2012), 8.

⁷⁰ Lake, 'Stigmatised, Marginalised, Celebrated', 94.

socially with other members.⁷¹ In fact, it was not until 1952 that the first professional was appointed to captain England at cricket.⁷²

Exporting Amateurism

As British sport became ever entwined with the notions of amateurism it was only natural that when the sports and games played in Britain were exported to the colonies that the amateur ethos would be exported with them. Initially, the British sporting system had a profound influence on sport in the USA, and by the mid-nineteenth century, Americans participated in many of the same types of sporting activities as the 'leisure classes' in England.⁷³ Although the Americans had the tendency to approach sport less formally than their British counterparts, it was still regarded in the same spirit and many early baseball clubs were formed and organised around the British amateur model.⁷⁴ However, it soon became apparent that the 'upper class amateur ideal of participation...was destined to be a failure in a society whose ideology of freedom of opportunity provided for all to seek excellence through effort and ability.'⁷⁵ The British university sporting model, whereby sport was controlled and administered through amateur student-run bodies, was therefore not considered applicable to American colleges.⁷⁶ Instead a 'meritocratic approach' developed in intercollegiate sport, one which relied on talent rather than 'ascribed status as seen in England's elitist universities.'⁷⁷ The popularity and prestige which soon became associated with college sport caused an escalating level of competitiveness. While the appointment of full time professional coaches went some way to raising standards, they could only achieve so much and there was an increasing need for particularly efficient skilled athletes. Consequently, many individuals who would never have given consideration to attend university or college were persuaded to sign up to courses by the offer of payment for their athletic services.⁷⁸ However, not everybody agreed with such a system and in 1904 it was suggested that if colleges were sending teams of professionals to compete against each other then, 'it becomes a question of who can hire the strongest team, and the whole thing is reduced to an absurdity.'⁷⁹ Others agreed, arguing that 'the man who makes some athletic pursuit his main business, instead of turning to it as a

⁷¹ Stephen Wagg, "'Time Gentlemen Please": The Decline of Amateur Captaincy in English County Cricket', *Contemporary British History* 14, no. 2 (2008): 32; *Ibid.*, 95.

⁷² Dominic Malcolm, "'It's Not Cricket": Colonial Legacies and Contemporary Inequalities', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 14, no. 3 (2001): 263.

⁷³ Allen Sack and Ellen Staurowsky, *College Athletes for Hire: The Evolution and Legacy of the NCAA's Amateur Myth* (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1998), 17.

⁷⁴ Steven J. Overman, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Sport: How Calvinism and Capitalism Shaped America's Games* (Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2011), 267.

⁷⁵ Ronald A. Smith, *Pay for Play: A History of Big-Time College Athletic Reform* (Illinois, University of Illinois Press, 2011), 99.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁷⁸ Sack and Staurowsky, *College Athletes for Hire*, 22.

⁷⁹ William P. Few, 'The Place of Athletics in Education', in *The Sewanee Review Quarterly*, ed. John Bell Henneman (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1904), 335.

health-giving pastime, ceases to be a particularly useful citizen.⁸⁰ But, as college sport was now considered a lucrative form of commercial entertainment, it was inevitable that such practices would continue. Whereas Britain had resisted the infiltration of money and professionalism into many aspects of sport, the cultural differences which existed between the two countries were too large to ensure that America would follow the same path. It was pointed out by an American commentator that while the British confined their contests to the 'gentleman class, that is, to the well-to-do class, who are not subject to temptations in regard to money...we don't want any such restrictions. It is impossible here.'⁸¹ As a result, the 'elitist and separatist' English system of amateurism that Caspar Whitney had longed for at the turn of the century was considered an 'outdated non-egalitarian concept', and this ensured it never gained much support in the American college sport system.⁸²

America was not the only country which appeared to have difficulty accepting and incorporating the strict British amateur ethos. This ongoing disparity with regards to the principles of amateurism prompted Ernest Charles Buley, an Australian journalist, to express his distaste at the British class system's imposition on sport:

Now this is not the first time I have been allowed to express my views...on the injustice of amateur definitions in this country...my correspondents then told me I was all wrong, and advised me to go back to Australia if I did not like the way in which sport was conducted here...I have spoken to many thousands of soldiers, and have gathered their almost unanimous impression that this is a country where there is one law for the rich and another for the poor. Trying to trace that impression to its source, I found that in most instances they had derived it from the methods in which sport...is conducted here.⁸³

He objected to the Amateur Rowing Association's ruling on amateurism which suggested that 'any man who works with his hands is ipso facto, a professional and a "menial"' arguing that 'what man, whose honest valuable work is branded as "menial" by one of the written laws of sport, can believe that in sport all men are esteemed equal?'⁸⁴ It seems, therefore, despite being initially embraced by other countries, that amateurism was gradually redefined to accommodate alternative principles with regards to sport. Ultimately, 'the ideal of the uncompensated athlete succumbed to cultural biases and to economic reality' as the intense training and commitment required to be successful in top level sport accelerated a shift away from amateur sport. However, there was no other country in the world where the traditional concepts of amateurism had such an obvious and unfaltering life-span as it did in Britain.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ Theodore Roosevelt, 'Professionalism in Sports', *The North American Review* 151, no. 405 (1890): 190.

⁸¹ Edwin Hall, 'Athletic Professionalism and its Remedies', *The North American Review* 13, no. 10 (1905): 767.

⁸² Smith, *Pay for Play*, 67, 99.

⁸³ E. C. Buley, Sport Snobbery: More of it since the War', *Northern Advocate*, January 31, 1920, 4.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ Overman, *Protestant Ethic*, 270; Sack and Staurowsky, *College Athletes for Hire*, 12.

Outline

This thesis traces the development of British coaching, training techniques and amateurism chronologically through the twentieth century; in order to successfully do this it has been necessary to create nine distinct chapters. Chapters one and two specifically focus on British sporting developments in the pre and interwar period and concentrates on how the poor performances in 1912 and 1936 provided an impetus for an improving coaching environment. These early coaching developments were deemed particularly appropriate for this research as these provide the first example of a national coach being appointed directly by a NGB. From here, the direction of this thesis shifts towards British coaching progress in the post-war era, which is covered in depth in chapters three and four. Specific focus is given to certain aspects of post-war society, such as the aftermath of war and the 1948 London Olympic Games, because these factors were considered particularly influential in ensuring the longevity of amateur hegemony in British sport. The focus of chapter five differs slightly, in that the emphasis is on an alternative to the British sporting model – the Soviet Union. Detailed background information associated with the formation and development of the Soviet sporting system is provided in order to create an understanding of the differing ways in which sport in the East developed and how this was interpreted by those in the West. Subsequent chapters centre on two specific areas which emerged through the research and were considered particularly influential in ensuring Soviet success - government intervention and sports science. These aspects are considered from a British perspective and emphasis has been placed on Soviet influence, because while previous research has focused on the impact and incorporation of American methods on the British setup, the Soviet impact has been under-researched. The thesis ends by drawing together the evidence in order to present an argument which suggests the possibility of a continuing amateur legacy in British sport.

Chapter One: London and Stockholm – British Olympic Performances and Ad-Hoc Coaching Developments

During the Edwardian period, there were growing anxieties in Britain regarding the decline of industrial supremacy. It was at this point that the Olympic Games began to emerge as a platform for both sporting and diplomatic rivalries. However, British performances at both the 1908 and 1912 Olympics signalled that British sporting methods and coaching, which were restricted by amateur hegemony, were now no longer adequate to challenge the emerging powers of both the United States and Germany. This chapter explores these processes in detail and places the development of British coaching within the wider context of sport and culture. The section begins by demonstrating how and why the formation of the Olympic Games was heavily influenced by the principles of amateurism and establishes how the early involvement of the British in the Olympic movement epitomised the state of sport in Britain. Events such as the loss of British global power, the 1908 Games, and poor performances by British athletes in 1912, are all considered in depth and emphasis is placed on how these may have provided impetus for an improved standard of coaching and training. Lastly, the chapter establishes how World War I and other external factors prevented these early ad-hoc coaching developments from becoming an established aspect of British sport.

The Evolution of the Olympics

The Olympic Games have developed into a commodity of great significance, being widely considered as the world's most visible sporting competition. The Games have continued to evolve and adapt despite political events which, in more recent years, have had a tendency to define them. They have developed into something more than sport by becoming a 'profound and deeply embedded component of our global culture.'¹ Coubertin had hoped the Games would be an opportunity to blend sport with culture and education, a philosophy which he coined as 'Olympism', and it appears that there were a variety of influences which ultimately encouraged him to revive the Olympic Movement.² Bruce Kidd has suggested that Coubertin was particularly concerned with the rapid industrialisation and urbanisation in his country which had resulted in 'class conflict, poverty, disease and despair.'³ Like many others, he believed that the resolution to this problem rested in educational reform and this prompted him to visit educational institutions in England, Germany, America and Canada in order to gain some insight. He was inspired by the early intercollegiate competitions in America and Canada and intrigued by the British attitudes towards sport and physical education, which were encapsulated in the British public schools curriculum. This English 'element' was to play a significant role in 'laying the philosophical foundations of a revival' because

¹ Jeffrey O. Segrave and Don Chu, 'Introduction- The Modern Olympic Games: A Contemporary Sociocultural Analysis', *Quest* 48 (1996): 3.

² Pierre de Coubertin, *Olympism: Selected Writings*, ed. Norbert Muller (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), 44.

³ Bruce Kidd, 'Taking the Rhetoric Seriously: Proposals for Olympic Education', *Quest* 48, no.1 (1996): 83.

Coubertin saw the potential that competitive sport harboured with regards to inspiring and invigorating individuals.⁴

During one of his visits to Britain, his attention was drawn to Dr Penny Brookes' Much Wenlock Games which had been established in 1850. Although they were initially 'little more than a well organised sports day', by the time Coubertin visited in 1890 the evolution of the Games was obvious.⁵ He was particularly impressed with the highly structured competitions and elaborate medal presentations of the Games and reporting on his visit, he noted that 'the Olympic Games, which modern Greece has been unable to restore, are being revived today is due not to a Hellene, but to Dr. W. P. Brookes. He is the one that began them forty years ago.'⁶ As a result, David Young has suggested that Brookes, and not Coubertin, should be credited with the revival of the modern Olympics, although it is apparent that Brookes had been unable to gain the international support he desired.⁷ Where Brookes had tried and failed, Coubertin was able to successfully revive the Olympic Games under modern conditions, initiatives which began with his 1892 lecture in Sorbonne.⁸ He hoped that the revival of the Olympics would 'bring athleticism to a high state of perfection and that they would provide the opportunity to infuse new elements of ambition to the lives of the rising generation and offer a new respect for life.'⁹ Although this declaration was not met with great enthusiasm, he gradually began to gain international support and in 1894, again in Sorbonne, he created the International Olympic Committee (IOC), which remains the administrative body for the Olympic Games.¹⁰

For a long time, the amateur principles of sport were considered a significant asset to the Games; the Olympic Movement moulded the definitions of amateurism and claimed them as their own. When the IOC was established it adopted a core set of amateur values, not only to be respected by competitors but to be adhered to without question, although from its creation in 1894 through to 1986 abiding by the amateur ruling remained the biggest challenge faced by the Olympic Movement.¹¹ However, although the Olympic movement was defined by the amateur ethos, at the time of its inception, Coubertin himself had little allegiance to the concept of amateurism, although he was aware that many others, particularly his British contemporaries, had a strong belief in its principles and he recognised that he would need to indulge these individuals so that he could gain their support.¹² In his memoirs he wrote,

⁴ Ibid.; Martin Polley, *The British Olympics: Britain's Olympic Heritage 1612-2012* (London: English Heritage, 2011), 9.

⁵ Polley, *British Olympics*, 38.

⁶ Coubertin, *Olympism*, 281.

⁷ David Young, *The Modern Olympics: A Struggle for Revival* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996), 12.

⁸ Coubertin, *Olympism*, 287-97.

⁹ Ibid., 311.

¹⁰ Ibid., 313-20; Polley, *British Olympics*, 95.

¹¹ Stephen Wassong, 'Clean Sport: A Twofold Challenge in the Contemporary History of the Modern Olympic Games', in *Pathways, Critiques and Discourse in Olympic Research*, ed. Robert K. Barney et al. (London: UWO Press, 2008), 85.

¹² Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games: Second Edition* (Champaign: The University of Illinois Press, 2002), 13.

Here it was again – the same old question...Personally I was not particularly concerned. Today I can admit it; the question never really bothered me. It had served as a screen to convene the congress designed to revive the Olympic Games. Realising the importance attached to it in sport circles, I always showed the necessary enthusiasm, but it was an enthusiasm without real conviction.¹³

Coubertin's core belief was that sport should be used to 'produce a moral, not a social elite' and in 1910, in an attempt to establish perceptions of amateur definitions and classifications, he persuaded his committee to issue a questionnaire to all the sporting federations and associations that had some connection to the Olympics.¹⁴ Coubertin described the answers as 'widely contradictory' because there was no agreement, either in or between sports, and the responses were 'mere statements; no reasons. Pure fantasy; nothing concrete, nothing really well thought out.' This highlighted the discrepancies that existed between definitions of amateurism and Coubertin suggested that from that moment he 'lost even the little interest' that he 'had in the question of amateurism.'¹⁵ Avery Brundage, IOC president from 1952-72, the man who defined amateur politics within the IOC arguably more than any other and who 'saw himself as the protector of Coubertin's Olympic ideas', later defended amateurism in a way that Coubertin himself may not have approved of.¹⁶ Nevertheless, the modern Olympic Games were reinstated during a period when amateurism was held in high esteem, and as such, it was conducive to the success of the Games and Olympism that amateurism was incorporated into the movement. Sensibly, Coubertin was willing to offer support to amateurism as a guiding principle of the Olympic Movement and at the 1894 conference in Sorbonne, which acted as the prologue to the modern Olympic Games, it was agreed that eligibility to participate in Olympic competition would be restricted to:

Any person who has never taken part in a public race open to all comers and run for a money prize, or for money forming a part of the sum taken at the gates, or with professionals for a prize, or for money collected by public transcriptions, or who has never been at any period of his life a professor or salaried master of physical exercises.¹⁷

It subsequently became apparent that such a decree would not only be difficult to uphold but also that it was open to individual interpretation. In 1905, Coubertin reinforced that amateur sport was not simply a set of rules, but an opinion, suggesting 'it is very difficult to give a precise definition of who is an amateur

¹³ Coubertin, *Olympism*, 653-4.

¹⁴ John J. MacAloon, *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games* (Oxon: Routledge, 2008), 189-190; *Ibid.*, 639-40.

¹⁵ Coubertin, *Olympism*, 656-7.

¹⁶ Wassong, 'Clean Sport', 86.

¹⁷ 'The International Athletic Congress', *The Times*, June 20, 1894, 5.

athlete and who isn't; the problem is still far from being solved.¹⁸ Despite this uncertainty, amateurism continued to exert its influence over the Olympic Movement for many years. This was in part due to the contemporary ideologues, such as Brundage, who saw value in amateur sport not only as a concept through which to keep the Olympic Movement pure and free from corruption, but also as a personal philosophy. He believed that while amateur sport was 'delicate and fragile', its values were intangible and the delight that one felt as a result of physical expression would deepen one's experience through self-satisfaction and accomplishment.¹⁹

Over the years, there have been many cases of athletes violating this much vaunted amateur code. Jim Thorpe achieved two gold medals at Stockholm in 1912, although evidence later emerged that he had played with a professional baseball team and the Amateur Athletic Union subsequently stripped him of his records and medals. Thorpe had broken the rules, accepted money for sport, and above all else, had not acted as a gentleman should.²⁰ Paavo Nurmi was a Finnish runner who achieved nine Olympic gold medals at the 1920, 1924 and 1928 Games but he was suspended in 1932 and eventually banned by the International Amateur Athletics Federation on grounds of alleged professionalism for having accepted expenses over and above those to which as an amateur he was entitled.²¹

Creation of the British Olympic Association

As British sporting principles had been so influential in the revival of the Games, it was inevitable that Britain would play an active role in the formation of the IOC. Of the initial thirteen members, there were two nations, France and Britain, who had more than one representative.²² However, despite this early involvement, Britain did not form a National Olympic Committee until 1905.

One individual who set in motion the development of the British Olympic Association (BOA) perhaps more than any other was Reverend Robert Stuart de Courcy Laffan. An unlikely friendship which formed between Laffan and Coubertin was particularly significant for the development of British sport because it ensured the 'rationalisation of British involvement in the Olympic Games.'²³ Laffan was the headmaster at Cheltenham College, which had historical connections with both Muscular Christianity and rational

¹⁸ Pierre de Coubertin, Speech delivered at the Olympic Congress in Brussels, 1905, quoted in Barbara Krawczyk, 'The Social Origin and Ambivalent Character of the Ideology of Amateur Sport', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 12, no. 3 (1977): 37.

¹⁹ Avery Brundage, *The Speeches of President Avery Brundage, 1952-1968* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1969), 68.

²⁰ 'The Thorpe Case Shifts to New York', *The New York Times*, January 27, 1913; Andrew Strenk, 'Amateurism: Myth and Reality', in *Olympism*, ed. Jeffrey Segrave and Donald Chu (Champaign: Human Kinetics Publishers, 1981), 62.

²¹ 'The Nurmi Problem', *Guardian*, July 28, 1932, 3; 'Paavo Nurmi is Forever Banned as an Amateur', *Leniston Daily Sun*, August 28, 1934, 6.

²² Polley, *British Olympics*, 96.

²³ Steve Bailey, 'Noble Ally and Olympic Disciple: The Reverend Robert S. de Courcy Laffan, Coubertin's "Man" in England', *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies* 6 (1997): 56.

recreation, when he had his first introduction to the Olympic Movement at the IOC's first working session at the La Harve Congress in 1897. Sent as a representative of the Headmasters of English Public Schools, Laffan presented a speech in 'French of the greatest purity' in which he depicted the potential 'moral value of sport.'²⁴ His presentation seemingly had a significant effect on the audience, most notably De Coubertin, who was convinced that 'a new collaborator with the most invaluable qualities had fallen from the skies to help us.' Laffan explained to Coubertin that he had felt a calling to the Olympic Movement which he was required to serve with 'all his power.'²⁵ Coubertin, impressed by his vision and tenacity, co-opted Laffan onto the IOC and he would later be an important conduit in the development of the BOA. Laffan was clearly aware of the level of work required in administering the National Olympic Committee. He later noted, 'I came to the Olympic Movement prepared to scoff and I remained to admire - and to work.'²⁶ His involvement continued for thirty years, during which time he spread both a knowledge and enthusiasm for the Olympic Movement around Britain.

The first visit of the IOC to London in 1904 began a series of events which resulted in the founding of a BOA in order to bring Britain into the heart of the Olympic Movement. The BOA was formed at a meeting at the House of Commons in May 1905, when Mr W. H. Grenfell (later Lord Desborough) was elected as chairman of the association and Laffan as honorary secretary.²⁷ A small council which consisted of the chief founders of the BOA, including Theodore Andrea Cook, was also appointed, and this council was instructed to draft rules for the governance of the association and to invite the leading National Governing Bodies (NGB) to each send one representative to the council.²⁸ This would ensure that 'full information as to the views of experts in every branch of sport' would be at the disposal of the council.²⁹ The BOA was subsequently officially authorised as the representative body of IOC in Great Britain.

An exploration of the social background of the men involved in the initial formation of the BOA emphasises how British sport was administered and run at that point in time. A group of wealthy and bourgeois sportsman of the correct social standing organised and controlled the direction of sport, so the appointment of Lord Desborough as chairman was hardly a surprise. Renowned as a politician and sportsman he held many positions of power in areas of public service, it being noted at one point that he was serving on 115 committees simultaneously, although it was his athletic prowess and influence within sporting organisations that made him the ideal candidate for the BOA. He had represented Harrow at

²⁴ Pierre de Coubertin, *Olympic Memoires: The Olympic Congress at Le Harve (1897)*, *Olympic Review* 107-8 (1976): 548.

²⁵ Coubertin, *Olympism*, 371-2.

²⁶ Rev. Robert Laffan, Speech delivered at Banquet to Olympic Competitors and Officials, October 31, 1908, 17, British Olympic Association Archives, quoted in Bailey, 'Noble Ally', 56.

²⁷ Theodore Andrea Cook, *The Olympic Games* (London: British Olympic Council, 1908), 145.

²⁸ British Olympic Association, Committee Minutes, December 2, 1906, 3, File BOA/M/1/1, British Olympic Association Collection, University of East London Archives, Docklands Campus (hereafter cited as BOA Collection, UEL Archives).

²⁹ Cook, *Olympic Games*, 145-6.

cricket and Oxford in fencing, athletics and rowing and he had participated in the University Boat Race in 1878 and 1888. Desborough was also known for his more adventurous sporting endeavours. He swam across the base of Niagara Falls on two separate occasions, rowed the English Channel, stroked the London-Oxford stretch of the Thames in twenty-two consecutive hours and ascended the Matterhorn via three different routes. He held many positions of influence within sporting bodies at various times during his career including president of the Life Saving Society, president and chairman of the Bath Club and president of the Marylebone Cricket Club and Lawn Tennis Association.³⁰ While Theodore Andrea Cook may not have held as many prestigious positions as Desborough, he came from a similar upper class and public school background. As a journalist for the *Daily Telegraph* and editor-in-chief of *The Field*, he was well known in sporting circles. While at Oxford, he founded the university fencing club and went on to act as vice president of the Amateur Fencing Association in 1923 until his death in 1928. In 1903, in Paris, he acted as a non-playing captain (common practice at this time) to the first British fencing team to compete abroad.³¹ Laffan, Desborough and Cook epitomised the aristocratic and upper-middle class individuals who were attracted to the BOA; men who retained a profound admiration for the values of amateurism.³² Because the BOA was defined by its 'patriotic and amateur ideals', there was a clear consensus about the value and position of sport in society, and as such this may have influenced the administration and direction of the BOA.³³

Once a leader in athletic endeavours, Britain was now suffering frequent international defeats and Matthew Llewellyn has emphasised that the sporting success of the nation's past 'was relative, not absolute.' Britain's achievements were due primarily due to the fact that it was the birth-place of many sports and the 'first nation to enter the field', but as other countries began to gain experience in these games and shaped them by their own interpretations of amateurism, they quickly began to supersede Britain.³⁴ The BOA saw its formation as an opportunity to demonstrate to the rest of the world that British sport was not in decline and to reemphasise the values of amateurism. Britain would achieve sporting success while adopting an amateur approach, even if that meant occasionally being beaten by lesser nations who were more 'business-like' in their approach to sport. These traditions and beliefs continued to have a profound influence on the BOA for many years. There was also a strong sense of autonomy that ran

³⁰ Ian F W. Beckett, 'Grenfell, William Henry, Baron Desborough (1855-1945)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online Edition, January 2011, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33566> (accessed October 25, 2011); Holt, *Sport and the British*, 111-2.

³¹ Ian Buchanan, 'Cook, Sir Theodore Andrea (1867-1928)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online Edition, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/55483> (accessed October 25, 2011).

³² Matthew P. Llewellyn, 'Prologue: An Indifferent Beginning', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 28, no. 5 (2011): 639.

³³ Martin Polley, 'No Business of Ours?: The Foreign Office and the Olympic Games, 1896-1914', *International Journal of the History of Sport* 13, no. 2 (1996): 98.

³⁴ Llewellyn, 'Prologue: An Indifferent Beginning', 640.

though the organisation, a common trait amongst British sporting bodies, and the BOA 'cherished and defended its independence, and rejected all political interference in its affairs.'³⁵

Early Olympic Games - British Perceptions

1908 London Games and Aftermath

Some years ago the late Rev. de Courcy Laffan, as fine a sportsman as he was a preacher, told me that, at certain Olympic Games, he was standing alongside a famous Swedish coach when the javelin throwing was being decided, and the latter remarked to him that the British performance was a crime against nature. "You have the finest raw material in the world," he said, "and you persistently neglect to develop it."³⁶

Beginning in the late eighteenth century and gaining impetus during the nineteenth, the far-reaching period of industrialisation had provided Britain with a stable economic, social and political base which allowed it to dominate trade around the world and create capital. However, a series of events, such as the end of the Victorian period, marked by the death of Queen Victoria in 1901, and the Boer War, had set in motion a process which caused Britain to lose some of its economic and industrial supremacy. The Second Boer War, which spanned from 1899 to 1902, had not only resulted in a significant drain on resources, but had also had an impact on how Britain was perceived by the rest of the world. The British Army experienced great difficulties against what they perceived to be group of inferior farmers who had little resemblance to any conventional army. This had exposed a number of deficiencies in many crucial areas such as military organisation and national fitness, two aspects in particular which were necessary for Britain to be considered a world leader.³⁷ However, it was the burning of Boer farms and the establishment of concentration camps by the British army, in which many Boer women and children died, that altered public opinion. To many, including British citizens, this accentuated the belief that Britain was incapable of efficiently dealing with the issues of war.³⁸ However, it was the obvious shift in industrial supremacy that undoubtedly highlighted to the rest of the world that Britain was in decline. Up until 1890, Britain was the leading producer of both steel and iron, but by 1910, it was unable to rival the production of America and it was a similar scenario in the newly emerging chemical and electrical industries in which America and Germany had established themselves as the world leaders. Britain had lost its monopoly over industrial progress and was now no longer considered the principal nation. That accolade now belonged to America,

³⁵ British Olympic Association, *The British Olympic Association and the Olympic Games* (London, British Olympic Association), 11, quoted in Polley, 'No Business of Ours?', 97.

³⁶ Gerald F. Ellison, 'English Athletics: A Training Centre Needed', *The Times*, August 27, 1927, 6.

³⁷ John H. Holler, *The Boer Lessons that Changed and Prepared the British Army for WW1* (Pennsylvania: US Army War College, 1999), 2.

³⁸ Paula Krebs, "'The Last Gentlemen's Wars': Women in the Boer War Concentration Camp Controversy", *History Workshop Journal* 33, no. 1 (1992): 44; Kenneth Morgan, 'The Boer War and the Media (1899-1902)', *Twentieth Century British History* 13, no. 1 (2002): 12-4.

where significant amounts of natural resources had ensured the USA would become a commanding force on the worldwide economic stage.³⁹ Considering Britain had been the industry leader for such a long period, it was increasingly difficult for British citizens to accept she had fallen from power, and this loss was emphasised further as Germany became an international powerhouse. This, coupled with the fact that Kaiser Wilhelm II had wired his support to the Boer's during the war and followed an anti-British foreign policy, had solidified an emerging rivalry between the two nations.⁴⁰ The power struggle between these three nations had ensured that any sporting competitions would act 'as a means of demonstrating...overall cultural superiority and promoting nationalism' and it was inevitable, therefore, that this intense rivalry would present itself at the 1908 Games.⁴¹

The 1908 Olympics had originally been awarded to Rome, but a lack of preparation and the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in 1906 resulted in the Italian government and Organising Committee agreeing that it would no longer be financially viable to act as host, so the IOC invited London to hold the Games. The BOA took it upon themselves to gauge the level of interest and support they were likely to receive from the NGBs and, following favourable replies from the majority, the decision was taken in November 1906 to stage the Games.⁴² The biggest issue that the organising committee faced was the construction of fully functional facilities, but fortunately, the Franco-British exhibition due to be held in the summer of 1908 was already in its planning stages and the Olympics had a history of connections with World Fairs. However, there was a risk attached to forging such a partnership because the 1900 Paris and 1904 St Louis Games, which allied themselves to World Fairs, had both been considered failures. Coubertin said of the 1904 Games, 'we have made a hash of our work, it's a miracle that the Olympic Movement survived that celebration.'⁴³ Nevertheless, Desborough made an agreement with entrepreneur Imre Kiralfy and his committee for the Franco-British exhibition that they would 'construct at their own cost all of the racing tracks and building necessary for carrying out the Olympic Games.'⁴⁴ As an additional sign of good faith, £2000 was advanced to the BOA to cover current working expenses and British NGBs were further satisfied when Kiralfy agreed to award them indemnity if the gate admissions were divided three to one between the exhibition and the BOA.⁴⁵

Considering the climate in which the 1908 Games were expected to function, whereby each country was attempting to demonstrate its national vigour and athletic superiority, it is not surprising that the Games

³⁹ Paul Warwick, 'Did Britain Change? An Inquiry into the Causes of National Decline', *Journal of Contemporary History* 20, no. 1 (1985): 101.

⁴⁰ Morgan, 'The Boer War', 13.

⁴¹ George Matthews, 'The Controversial Olympic Games of 1908 as Viewed by the *New York Times* and the *Times* of London', *Journal of Sport History* 7, no. 2 (1980): 40.

⁴² Cook, *Olympic Games*, 152-3.

⁴³ Matt Rogan and Martin Rogan, *Britain and the Olympic Games: Past, Present, Legacy* (Leicester: Matador, 2011), 24.

⁴⁴ Cook, *Olympic Games*, 158.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*; £2000 in 1906 would be the equivalent of £191,400 in 2012. Information gathered from <http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-1633409/Historic-inflation-calculator-value-money-changed-1900.html>

witnessed a fierce rivalry between Britain and America which quickly degenerated into bitter confrontations between the two countries.⁴⁶ From a British perspective, the Games were considered a success, since not only had the organisers managed to coordinate the Games in a short period of time, their athletes had also topped the medal tables with 141, which outstripped the American total by a hundred. However, there was a suggestion from some that Britain had only succeeded because they were the host nation. During this time, the home country not only provided all the officials, but also framed the event programme and as such, London organisers included all the 'sports which we hold in high estimation, and at which we are therefore specially proficient.'⁴⁷ As a result, despite Britain dominating in the majority of events, the American media claimed victory based solely on the track and field results. *The New York Times* declared that American athletes were, 'as usual, well in the lead. They won 75...points in the contests at Athens two years ago, against Great Britain's 41.'⁴⁸ The American team were not satisfied with the system of scoring and officiating, which they considered unjust because the total points would be calculated from all the events in the programme. Since American athletes were not present in the majority of events, the American press wanted an alternative system. It was claimed the 'English system of marking Olympic victories would make England sure winners' and American administrators wanted track and field to be considered as a separate entity with its own 'Championship Trophy.' James Sullivan, head of the American Olympic Committee, stated that 'we came here, as we went to Paris and Athens, with a field team, and are making a fight in the field events, caring nothing for the other sports. We asked that the championship trophy be put up for the field sports separately, but this request was not acceded to.'⁴⁹ Disputes continued and by the closing of the athletics events on the 25 July (the official closing ceremony did not occur until 31 October), relationships were strained. *The Times* observed that, 'The Games have not been all plain sailing. The perfect harmony which everyone wished for has been marred by certain regrettable disputes and protests and objections to the judges' rulings.'⁵⁰

Although Britain believed it had organised a successful Games, a number of factors may have overshadowed some of their shortcomings. There was a sense that because Britain had saved the Games when Italy could no longer act as host, and then organised the Games in only two years, that any deficiencies should be overlooked. In the eyes of British amateur administrators, the Games had been a success both in terms of organisation and Britain's perceived dominance in events. However, their significant advantage in having 'home' officials (this caused so much controversy that it was declared that all future Games would have to include officials of different nationalities) and having designed a programme

⁴⁶ Matthews, 'Controversial Olympic Games', 40.

⁴⁷ British Olympic Council, *Aims and Objects of the Olympic Games Fund* (London: British Olympic Association, 1913), 3.

⁴⁸ 'The Modern Olympic Games', *The New York Times*, July 15, 1908, 7.

⁴⁹ 'Athletes Aroused over Points Scoring', *The New York Times*, July 17, 1908, 11.

⁵⁰ 'The Olympic Games: The Last Day', *The Times*, July 27, 1908, 10.

which was unlikely to ever be repeated, had potentially concealed quite how badly British athletes had performed. There was some acknowledgement of Britain's struggling performance, in that it was recognised that American athletes far outranked British athletes in terms of speed and strength, but there was still this belief in Britain that as the originators of modern sport, this heritage would carry them through to victory in subsequent games.

Business-like methods may sometimes have results which, from our British and possibly insular point of view, have a tendency to spoil the game. After giving all due honour to the magnificent performances of the Americans, we may say that we have contrived to exhibit a very respectable degree of excellence, and so we shall not go far wrong, in the cause of true sport, if we stick to our antiquated methods.⁵¹

Consequently, there was little assessment of the training and preparation (or lack of) of British athletes, something which would undoubtedly surface when Britain participated in Games away from home. However, it also needs to be considered that improving sport was perhaps not the first priority for many. Not only was sport controlled by a voluntary tradition, which ensured that established figures continued to view sport as separate and autonomous from the more important aspects of government, but Britain had also entered a period of instability following the sudden death of Edward VIII in May 1910.⁵² There was widespread industrial unrest which included a series of national strikes, most notably the miners' strike in South Wales in 1910 and the Liverpool dockers in 1911 during which Winston Churchill, then Home Secretary, ordered in the Army to control the escalating violence.⁵³ Rising disputes amongst workers were not the only factor which challenged the edifice of British civilisation since the workers' strikes ran concurrently with the civil disobedience of the Suffragette Movement, the uncertainty surrounding the issue of Irish Home Rule and the growing realisation that Germany, with its rapid naval expansion, was now both a military and economic threat.⁵⁴ It is not surprising then, that despite growing evidence of Britain's diminishing athletic supremacy, preparations for Stockholm did not begin until late 1911.

Although preparations had been slow, there were two initiatives that emerged which potentially furthered British coaching in athletics. Perhaps these were prompted by the slow developments of the NGBs and by comments made in the *Manchester Guardian* which suggested that failures of British athletes were not the result of a lack of training knowledge and material but because 'scientific training and coaching' was required. Consequently, a group of enthusiasts formed an Athletes' Advisory Club (AAC) which it was hoped would, 'induce old athletes of experience to act as amateur advisers and coaches to

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Kevin Jeffreys, *Sport and Politics in Modern Britain: The Road to 2012* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 3.

⁵³ Derek Birley, *Playing the Games: Sport and British Society, 1910-1945* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 20.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 19; Eric Taplin, 'The Labour General Transport Strike, 1911', *North West Labour History* 36 (2012): 4.

young athletes.⁵⁵ Although it is unclear exactly which individuals were members of the club it was apparently dominated by a number of Oxbridge graduates, men who not only had the enthusiasm to try and improve sport, but also the financial security which enabled them to donate both time and money. One individual, who had attended a meeting of the AAC, observed that every influential member of the committee 'was a university man' and argued that the opportunities available for 'non University men' within the club were limited. Although the AAC was attempting to improve the international performance of British athletes, it was obvious that various members of the committee still believed in the amateur traditions of sport. At one meeting it had been observed that a member of the committee had suggested that 'a gentleman athlete could only hope to be properly coached by a man who was also a gentleman' and this strict adherence to amateurism was described by one reporter as 'snobbery'.⁵⁶ The committee were acutely aware that as a result of lack of funding within British sport, it was not possible for many athletic clubs to appoint professional coaches, and so it was envisaged that amateur trainers and advisers from the AAC could be used to supplement any future coaching developments put in place by the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA).⁵⁷ However, it does also have to be considered that, although these 'gentleman' certainly had intentions of trying to improve British standards, by offering their services they would also ensure that the sport continued to be controlled by amateurs. Since not every athlete would have been considered a 'gentleman athlete' there was still very much a sense of exclusivity surrounding the sport, something which the AAC seemed keen to maintain.

The other notable coaching development was a coaching scheme proposal which had been sent from the *Sportsman* to the AAA. The paper had offered to work in conjunction with the AAA by offering much needed finance. British sport had been founded on a voluntary tradition and it was not until the latter part of the twentieth century that NGBs began to receive financial support from indirect government sources. Prior to this, NGBs relied heavily on donations and subscription fees in order to function, thus the offer of money from the *Sportsman* was welcomed. The 'Sportsman's Scheme', as it became known, proposed to appoint Walter George as chief advisor for the Olympic training scheme but this was rejected by the AAA who asked the *Sportsman* to reconsider their nominee and accept the AAA's recommendation of Alec Nelson.⁵⁸ It is not entirely clear why the AAA did not wish to appoint George, although it can be assumed that as George had never shown any prior interest in coaching he was not considered experienced enough to fulfil

⁵⁵ 'The Sporting World: Athletics', *Otago Standard and Wallace Country Chronicle*, June 16, 1914, 7; A. B. George, 'An Athletes' Advisory Club', *Manchester Guardian*, December 23, 1911, 14.

⁵⁶ 'British Athletics: Training and Snobbery', *Grey River Argus*, October 23, 1912, 7.

⁵⁷ A. B. George, 'An Athletes' Advisory Club', *Manchester Guardian*, December 23, 1911, 14; 'Olympic Lessons: Scheme to Restore British Prestige', *Straits Times*, August 28, 1912, 2.

⁵⁸ Amateur Athletic Association, Olympic Committee Minutes, November 25, 1911, January 13, 1912, File 1/2/4/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

such a role.⁵⁹ As George was to be an integral part of the 'Sportsman's Scheme', negotiations stalled and the *Sportsman* withdrew its offer of support. Nevertheless, the proposal may have provided the impetus needed to improve the coaching of British Olympic athletes because it emerged that the Southern Association had begun to develop their own alternative coaching scheme which could also be extended to the North and the Midlands.⁶⁰

As the AAA no longer had the financial support of the *Sportsman*, they had to source income from other means and as such, an appeal was placed in the *Daily Mail* in which they requested donations from all affiliated clubs and also appealed to the board of trustees to release £250.⁶¹ Despite all the fundraising efforts, the response was poor, and the amount raised was not deemed enough to secure the services of Alec Nelson, who had requested £150 per annum for four years to fulfil the position of chief athletic advisor. The alternative was to appoint Frederick. W. Parker, who agreed to an honorarium fee of £50. It was apparent, however, that the AAA did not want to lose the expertise of Nelson altogether and they endeavoured to secure his services at a fee not exceeding £50 'for two months from the 1 June in order to take charge of the selected representatives and accompany them to Stockholm.'⁶² Parker began his duties immediately, and began visiting training centres around the country so he could offer training and preparation advice to all the athletes who had been chosen to participate in the Olympic trials.⁶³ Parker had already sent a letter to all the trial hopefuls in order to establish what advice they required in order to progress with their training and the responses he received highlighted just how beneficial a centralised and structured coaching scheme could be. He commented in his report that the 'list of points on which they wished for advice practically necessitated an essay on the "A.B.C" of training, dieting, arm action and breathing', and in a rather ironic turn of events, he had sent the applicants a copy of Walter George's book *Training*. (Interestingly, the '100-Up' exercise which George developed, and had referred to in the text, was rediscovered in 2011 by a *New York Times* journalist, which caused widespread interest in the running world. His training principles were deemed so applicable to modern running conditions that his methods were re-published in a book in 2011).⁶⁴ George, the very man the AAA had refused to appoint was now apparently indispensable, because he was considered 'the only means of answering their many queries.'⁶⁵

⁵⁹ Carter, 'From Knox to Dyson', 62.

⁶⁰ Amateur Athletic Association, Olympic Committee Minutes, November 25, 1911, File 1/2/4/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁶¹ Amateur Athletic Association, Olympic Committee Minutes, January 13, June 11, 1912, File 1/2/4/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁶² Amateur Athletic Association, Olympic Committee Minutes, March 9, January 13, 1912, File 1/2/4/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁶³ 'Training the Olympic Athletes', *Daily Mirror*, January 20, 1912, 14.

⁶⁴ Walter George, *Training* (London: Universal Press Agency, 1902); Christopher McDougall, 'The Once and Future Way to Run', *The New York Times*, November 2, 2011; Ellis Morgan, *W G George's '100-UP' Exercise: Rediscovered* (Derby: Dormouse Press, 2011).

⁶⁵ Amateur Athletic Association, Olympic Committee Minutes, March 9, 1912, File 1/2/4/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

Upon Parker's recommendation, the AAA also agreed to appoint a number of 'subsidiary trainers' who were to be paid £5 each to provide assistance at the centres during training, although the total sum allocated for this was only £100, so once again, coaching progress was limited by the lack of funding available. Of these trainers, W. W. Cross and W. J. Parish were selected to accompany the team alongside Parker and Nelson. The selection of Cross and Parish did not occur because they had a greater level of coaching expertise compared to the other trainers, quite the opposite in fact. It was predominately due to the amount of (or lack of) payment they were willing to accept to fulfil such role. Cross was willing to accept £5 and Parish had offered his services for free, which when considering Nelson was to be paid up to £100 to attend the Games, was a financial saving the AAA were required to make. There was clearly some trepidation amongst the AAA regarding the coaching knowledge of the four chosen trainers and their ability to coach the athletes appropriately because a decision was taken to insure the trainers 'against accidents of all the athletes.'⁶⁶

Despite favourable support for the coaching schemes leading up to the Games, and comments that the athletes who had been under the guidance of Parker had improved noticeably in training, the scheme did not ensure the success of British athletes at Stockholm.⁶⁷ However, it could be suggested that it was not the mediocre level of the scheme that resulted in a poor showing at the Games, but the amount of time in which the new developments were expected to make an impact. Years of amateur tradition and lack of structured coaching and training could not be reversed from a coaching scheme initiated only months before it was required to come to fruition and produce success. As Sidney Abrahams explained,

With this appointment of a coach our troubles are not over; in fact, they have only just begun. It seems to have been thought in many circles there is something magical in the very words "coach" and "trainer" that it was only necessary to appoint one of the very numerous and perfectly competent professional experts...it does not seem to have struck such optimists that a successful coach must be developed like a successful athlete, and even more so, for the born coach in the strictest sense can hardly be said to exist.⁶⁸

It was also apparent that the coaching and training environment in which Parker and associates were expected to make improvements was not particularly favourable to producing successful athletes. Parker noted that athletes 'appeared to have no regular system of training', many had 'never been able to train on a track' and there was a 'lack of implements' available for field events.⁶⁹ It was becoming clear, that if success was to be achieved by British athletes, not only were consistent coaching improvements required,

⁶⁶ Amateur Athletic Association, Olympic Committee Minutes, June 11, 1912, File 1/2/4/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁶⁷ 'Athletics in the North', *Daily Mirror*, May 15, 1912, 14.

⁶⁸ 'British Athletes: Can They Regain Supremacy', *Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser*, May 27, 1912, 10.

⁶⁹ Amateur Athletic Association, Olympic Committee Minutes, March 9, 1912, File 1/2/4/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

but also a change of attitude was needed. If British athletes were to improve on the international stage, then some of the debilitating manifestations of amateurism would need to be dismantled.

1912 Stockholm Games and its Influence

The 1912 Stockholm Games saw for the first time participants from all five continents competing. This ensured a particularly strong competition, something which up until this point, Britain had not had to contend with. The Games were an organisational success for Sweden, and Brundage later recalled that 'the efficiency and almost mathematical precision in which the events were handled and the formal correctness of the arrangements made a great impression on me.'⁷⁰ Not only did they take the organisation seriously, the Swedish Olympic Committee also made methodical arrangements for the training and the preparation of Swedish athletes. Unlike the Olympic Report of 1908, which had dedicated an entire section to amateurism and its definitions, the 1912 report devoted eighteen pages to the 'training of Swedish athletes for the Olympic Games.'⁷¹ Adverts for trainers were placed in English and American journals, and after receiving many replies, Ernie Hjertberg, a Swede by birth who had been living and coaching athletics in America for forty years, was appointed as athletics trainer.⁷² British coaches had been engaged to work with Swedish teams in swimming, tennis, rowing and football, and as a result the training and coaching budget for these sports exceeded many others.⁷³ Training of the Swedish athletes began in 1910, some two years prior to that of the British athletes. The athletes followed a carefully designed training plan developed by Hjertberg and the professional trainers, which included break periods for the athletes to recover and opportunities for the athletes to participate in international competition prior the Olympics.⁷⁴ This investment paid dividends when Sweden achieved sixty-five medals compared to the sixty-two won by America. However, the Games were anything but a success for Britain, who only managed to gain forty-one medals, placing them third in the medal table. It was patently obvious that the British approach, which relied heavily on its amateur traditions and superficial training methods, had been far outranked by the specialised, well-equipped methods now in place in other countries. The nation, which Roberta Park suggests, 'taught the world to play', subsequently regarded the failure at Stockholm as a 'tale of national

⁷⁰ Avery Brundage, quoted in Allen Guttman, *The Games Must Go on: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 25.

⁷¹ British Olympic Council, *The Fourth Olympiad: Official Report* (London: British Olympic Association, 1908), 761-79; Swedish Olympic Committee, *The Olympic Games of Stockholm 1912: Official Report* (Stockholm: Wahlstrom and Widstrand, 1912), 286-303.

⁷² Swedish Olympic Committee, *Stockholm 1912: Official Report*, 287.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 46-8.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 289.

disaster', and this caused a torrent of criticism from both the British public and the British press.⁷⁵ *The Times* argued that,

Our representation at Stockholm was deplorable, not because we do not possess abundance of first-class material, but because the arrangements made for our share in the Games, the training and the preparation for our athletes, and the care taken of them at Stockholm were almost pathetically farcical.⁷⁶

Similar comments were made by athletics coach and writer Frederick Annesley Michael (F. A. M.) Webster, who expressed a 'feeling of shame that we should fall so low as to be beaten by even the lesser European nations, who for generations past have been our pupils in all sporting pastimes.'⁷⁷ Other press reports accentuated the harm that international sporting failure could do to Britain, since 'whether we took that result very seriously ourselves or not, it was widely advertised in other countries as evidence of England's "decadence".' It was clear that similar feelings were widespread, and that a decision needed to be made; either Britain was to take Olympic competition seriously or it ought to withdraw from the Olympic Movement altogether.⁷⁸ However, some men took a more pragmatic approach. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle suggested that in order for British athletes to be successful at the Olympic Games, 'liberal funds' were needed to offer some form of coaching and preparation to British athletes. He went on to suggest that if the public would not provide the funds 'then they can blame no one but themselves for our failures.'⁷⁹ Reflecting on this initiative, Tom McNab suggests that Conan Doyle was supportive of the idea of coaching, and that he had called for an introduction in Britain after seeing what America and France had achieved with the use of coaches. However, McNab believes that he may have faced opposition because it was too 'contrary to everything they thought for years beforehand.'⁸⁰ His proposal to raise funds to train and prepare athletes received much criticism. Rowing coach R. C. Lehmann suggested that 'the scheme...means specialisation, and I cannot help saying that, in my opinion, sport would be ruined.' He commented that achieving success at the Olympics would require making 'professional slaves' of the men who took part and that Britain would be much better off with 'the old idea of games for games' sake.'⁸¹ Similar disapproval was expressed by Hugh Legge, who observed that those individuals who were not interested in who won at the Olympics generally had a concern 'for the interest of amateur sport, and they are by no means convinced that these

⁷⁵ Roberta J. Park, 'Cells or Soaring?: Historical Reflections on "Visions" of the Body, Athletics, and Modern Olympism', *International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no. 12 (2007): 1708; Duke of Westminster, letter to the editor, *The Times*, August 27, 1913, 3.

⁷⁶ 'Where Britain Failed at Stockholm', *The Times*, July 27, 1912, 10.

⁷⁷ University of Birmingham, *Britain in World Sport*, 9.

⁷⁸ 'Britain and the Olympic Games', *The Times*, August 18, 1913, 7.

⁷⁹ Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, 'The Olympic Games: Sir A. Conan Doyle's Suggestions', *The Times*, July 30, 1912, 6.

⁸⁰ Tom McNab, interview by author, May 6, 2011, St Albans, London.

⁸¹ R. C. Lehmann, *The Times*, July 21, 1912, quoted in British Olympic Council, *Aims and Objects*, 11-12.

interests will be served if the proposals which are now being set forth are carried out.⁸² On the other hand some commentators supported allocating funds to train British athletes. Arguing that Britain would travel to Berlin regardless of the levels of support, one individual observed that, 'it only remains to settle whether the British contingent is to consist of a keen but inglorious mob, or of a properly selected, properly trained team which will, it is to be hoped, do credit to the country.'⁸³

Prompted by the poor results at Stockholm, and the calls of many for an improvement in British sport, the AAC called a meeting soon after the Games in order to address 'England's failures' and develop a 'scheme to restore British prestige.' Some believed that importing a trainer from America who could implement 'American methods was absolutely necessary', but others argued that English methods of training were just as comprehensive and 'provided men were willing to submit to them', they would achieve similar success to that of the Americans. The overall sentiments of the meeting were, that in order for British sport to develop, large sums of money were required; Laffan commented that a minimum of £30,000 would be needed for athletics alone in order to prepare a team for the Games in 1916. However, aware that the sporting public rarely donated the financial support required, it was hoped that 'a rich philanthropist would take up the Olympic Games as a hobby.'⁸⁴ Although these suggestions appeared somewhat revolutionary, it seems that British sport remained focused on volunteerism and philanthropy. Wealthy individuals with disposable income and time were still required to organise and control sport in order to ensure its development.

Perhaps one of the most influential publications surrounding the debate concerning how to improve British sporting performances was the 1913 British Olympic Council (BOC) *Aims and Objects of the Olympic Games Fund*. This signalled a more specialised approach, since it provided an in-depth and comprehensive report of the way in which British sport should progress.⁸⁵ The production of this type of report was fairly novel, and since it was published at a time when the amateur debate surrounding international sport was particularly current, it could be considered as being somewhat ground-breaking. By presenting their own evidence and supporting it with newspaper reports, the BOC drew comparisons between Britain and other countries, particularly the United States. It highlighted Britain's lack of organisation with regards to Olympic preparation, suggesting that the United Kingdom's failure to improve in 'chief stadium events...is only the inevitable result of slackness which grows only more slack when all the rest of the world is becoming much keener and taking the Games more and more seriously.' The report fully supported extra funding, and called for a complete reform of British sport. The contributors suggested

⁸² Hugh Legge, *The Times*, August 10, 1912, quoted in British Olympic Council, *Aims and Objects*, 12.

⁸³ G R L. Anderson, *The Times*, August 14, 1912, quoted in British Olympic Council, *Aims and Objects*, 13.

⁸⁴ 'Olympic Lessons: Scheme to Restore British Prestige', *Straits Times*, August 28, 1912, 2; 'The Sporting World', *Otautau Standard and Wallace County Chronicle*, July 1, 1913, 2.

⁸⁵ British Olympic Council, *Aims and Objects*, 1-44.

that as time progressed and 'there was no sign of any serious awakening to the danger that awaited us at Stockholm...the need of some drastic reform became more and more imperative.'⁸⁶ The report provided both sides of the argument for the development of a 'Special Committee' and the creation of an Olympic appeal for £100,000 to send a well prepared team to Berlin, and it closed with the observation that:

Those who, for a dislike of the whole notion of the Olympic Games and an attachment to the old Arcadian village-green era of British sport, choose to indulge in more or less diffused and impractical criticisms of the Committee's plans make very hard work for those who...are bent on seeing it carried to a successful conclusion.⁸⁷

Both of these initiatives could be considered somewhat unusual for a time when amateurism appeared to be so highly valued in Britain. This potentially signifies that although amateur hegemony remained, it did not possess the same level of control it once had, and that perhaps amateurism was to undergo a process of evolution, which again highlights the fluidity of its principles. Although not all recommendations of these initiatives were fully supported, it is apparent that the men involved in both the AAC and the 'Aims and Objects' scheme wanted to encourage the adoption of a more rigorous approach within British sport.

Encouraged by the debates, the BOC took it upon themselves to develop a 'Special Committee' in March 1913. This consisted of both members and non-members of the BOC in an attempt to bring 'them into closer touch with the public.' Both Cook and Doyle were inaugurated into the committee, as were Mr Foster and a Mr Bosanquet, who were both 'all-round sportsman' and, therefore, represented 'the best amateur traditions.'⁸⁸ The primary duties of the committee were to control the financial arrangements associated with the British preparation for Berlin. During the stages of preliminary planning, each NGB was requested to submit an 'ideal scheme' which would ensure the best possible representation in their chosen sport in 1916.⁸⁹ It was not intended that the principal outcomes of the schemes would be to produce a 'team of gladiators' but it hoped to encourage a widespread improvement in 'national hygiene and physical development', so any schemes submitted were required to reflect this.⁹⁰ From the responses received, it was established that a 'scheme of awards' should be initiated so that the discovery of suitable athletic talent could be encouraged by providing the 'man in the street' with the benefit of 'expert coaching.'⁹¹ However, in order to attain a 'badge' an individual was required to compete in five out of the offered nine

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 5, 8.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 29-30.

⁸⁸ 'Great Britain and the Olympic Games', *The Times*, March 14, 1913, 8.

⁸⁹ 'Olympic Games Fund: The Attitude of the Special Committee', *The Times*, September 5, 1913, 11.

⁹⁰ 'Great Britain and the Olympic Games', *The Times*, March 14, 1913, 8; 'Olympic Games Fund: The Attitude of the Special Committee', *The Times*, September 5, 1913, 11.

⁹¹ 'The Appeal', *The Times*, August 18, 1913, 6; 'Olympic Games Fund: The Attitude of the Special Committee', *The Times*, September 5, 1913, 11.

events, which spanned across a number of different sports.⁹² Perhaps this clause was included because the schemes were required to adhere to the 'strictest amateur principles' and these proposals would encourage the cultivation of the much admired 'all-round sportsman'.⁹³ Each NGB was required to draw up standards and provide instruction and training in their sport, so the AAA proposed the development of multiple training centres throughout the country and the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) endeavoured to appoint 'professional instructors' for twenty-five weeks during the summer at an estimated cost of £1000.⁹⁴ This widespread preparation would require substantial financial backing and the Special Committee launched a public appeal for £100,000.⁹⁵ However, despite repeated pleas in the media, the 'public response to the appeal for funds underlined the nation's apathy', and by September 1913, only £7,000 had been donated.⁹⁶ There was a feeling in some quarters, that the amount Britain was trying to raise appeared excessive, but in an attempt to 'save' the appeal, *The Times* pointed out that Germany would be spending much more and that in 1912 the United States had spent 'between £30,000 and £40,000 just on taking its men to Stockholm'.⁹⁷ Highlighting how much more Britain's 'rivals' had invested in their sport appears to have been an attempt to play on British insecurities, but the public remained unmoved, and in January 1914 a decision was taken to close the appeal after only managing to achieve £11,000.⁹⁸

Even though the appeal had failed, as a sign of good faith to the individuals who had donated money, a decision was taken to allocate the gathered funds to various sports. The actual sum at the disposal of the committee was calculated to be £5,393, of which, £3,850 was allocated for training purposes. The AAA were awarded £3,000 and the ASA and National Cyclists Union received £600 and £250 respectively.⁹⁹ In January 1914, the AAA appointed the first full-time national athletics coach, Walter Knox, a Scottish-Canadian professional Highland Games all-rounder and the Canadian Olympic coach at the 1912 Games, and he was given a salary of £400 per year and travelling expenses worth £150.¹⁰⁰ Nine supplementary trainers were also appointed to work under the direction of Knox at an annual cost of £700; four coaches were located between Scotland and Ireland, two in the North and two in the South of England, while the

⁹² 'The British Olympic Council: New Scheme of Awards', *The Times*, July 23, 1913, 14.

⁹³ 'The Appeal', *The Times*, August 18, 1913, 6.

⁹⁴ 'The Olympic Games: Amateur Swimming Association's Scheme', *The Times*, September 27, 1913, 10; 'Amateur Swimming Association', *The Times*, September 2, 1913, 11; Day, 'Massaging the Amateur Ethos', 17.

⁹⁵ 'Great Britain and the Olympic Games: Appeal for National Subscriptions', *The Times*, August 18, 1913, 6.

⁹⁶ Matthew P. Llewellyn, 'A Nation Divided: Great Britain and the Pursuit of Excellence, 1912-1914', *Journal of Sport History* 35, no. 1 (2008): 86.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 82; 'Britain and the Olympic Games: Review of the Situation', *The Times*, September 22, 1913, 29.

⁹⁸ 'The Olympic Games: Retirement of the Special Committee', *The Times*, January 16, 1914, 50.

⁹⁹ 'Olympic Games Fund: Failure of the Special Appeal', *The Times*, January 16, 1914, 9.

¹⁰⁰ Sports Council, *Coaching Matters: A Review of Coaching and Coach Education in the United Kingdom* (London: Sports Council, 1991), 10; £400 in 1914 would be the equivalent of £36,308 in 2012. Information gathered from <http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-1633409/Historic-inflation-calculator-value-money-changed-1900.html>

Midlands were allocated one trainer.¹⁰¹ Due to the outbreak of the First World War in July 1914 and the subsequent cancellation of the Berlin Games, Knox did not hold the position of chief national coach for any notable period of time; in fact some mini-biographies and reports which have been published on him do not even acknowledge his time as chief national coach in Britain.¹⁰²

Aftermath

The war, coupled with the general indifference of the majority of the British public towards supporting Olympic athletes, meant that the practical suggestions and promising advances which had been put in place by the likes of those involved with the BOC *Aims and Objects* and the AAA, with its creation of a national coaching post, failed to be developed further after the end of the war in 1918.¹⁰³ There are a number of possible reasons for this, and they predominately relate to those who were in positions of power in British sport prior to the outbreak of the war, and a desire to return to “normal” after the war. Although the individuals associated with the BOC report had made attempts to alter the state of British sport, the barriers of amateurism remained strong; altering years of traditions would require a change in mind set, and due to a culmination of factors, this was something that these pioneers had been unable to achieve successfully prior to the war. The individuals associated with these coaching initiatives were invariably Oxbridge graduates and current students who had enlisted in the Officer Training Corps, and there is evidence to suggest that that in the Great War, mortality varied significantly by class, with those of higher social class much more likely to lose their lives than those of lower ranks.¹⁰⁴ The deaths of thousands of educated and wealthy individuals, who potentially would have become the nation’s leaders, and who later became known as the ‘Lost Generation’, resulted in a loss of some of these early sporting visionaries.¹⁰⁵ Once the conflict had ended, these individuals were replaced with those who did not share their views about the direction of sport, and as a result, British sport returned to improvised and impromptu organisation. McNab suggests that, ‘the people weren’t around, it’s often...two or three people who trigger it off and get support and once those guys have gone it’s as if it’s never been...the idea of doing what they were doing, that had gone.’¹⁰⁶ An alternative explanation relates to what Mike Huggins and Jack Williams refer to as, ‘conservatism in sport.’ The experiences and loss of war may have caused many individuals to view the pre-war era as a

¹⁰¹ ‘The Olympic Games: Retirement of the Special Committee’, *The Times*, January 16, 1914, 50.

¹⁰² Canada’s Sports Hall of Fame note that he was meant to travel to the Berlin 1916 Olympics in the form of a coach but insinuate that it would have been with the Canadian team, <http://www.sportshall.ca/honoured-members/27778/walter-knox/> (accessed September 6, 2011); Orilla Hall of Fame Committee, *Orilla Hall of Fame* (Orilla: City of Orilla Hall of Fame Committee, 2008), 6.

¹⁰³ Carter, ‘From Knox to Dyson’, 66.

¹⁰⁴ Grace Horseman, *Growing up between 1900 & 1920* (Devon: Cottage Publishing, 1996), vi; Jay Winter, “‘Lost Generation’ of the First World War”, *Population Studies* 31, no. 3 (1977): 449.

¹⁰⁵ Winter, “‘Lost Generation’”, 449; Reginald Pound, *The Lost Generation* (London: Constable, 1964); Pugh, *State and Society*, 175-7.

¹⁰⁶ McNab, interview.

time of security and reason, and this may explain the nostalgic desire of some to return to a world before the war.¹⁰⁷ Although some ad-hoc coaching developments were being initiated prior to the war in the hope of stimulating change in British sport, for the most part, many individuals would have been unaware of these schemes, so for the majority, it was natural to desire a return to the traditional values of sport in which amateurism continued to provide a philosophical direction.

In summary, elite sporting preparation in the pre-war period essentially relied on ad-hoc arrangements which were rooted in heritage and tradition. Even though some sporting pioneers were attempting to integrate new coaching methods and schemes, because British sport continued to be controlled by amateurism, they failed to gain support from the British public. Until some of the traditional barriers were broken down there would continue to be a resistance towards coaching in British sport. The following chapter traces the development of the centralised coaching schemes in the interwar period and suggests how the continued prevailing influence of amateurism prevented the schemes from having significant impact on British performances at the Olympic Games.

¹⁰⁷ Mike Huggins and Jack Williams, *Sport and the English, 1918-1939* (Oxon: Routledge, 2006), 75.

Chapter Two: Interwar Sport and the Formation of Early Coaching and Training Schemes

Despite the fact that the pre and inter-war periods saw a marked increase in coaching utilisation and availability, particularly with regards to Olympic competition, British sport continued to align itself to the principles of volunteerism and amateurism, so professional coaching struggled to find acceptance. Although poor performances in 1936 once again encouraged the adoption of additional coaching, this chapter emphasises, that because these methods signalled a shift towards the American system and greater specialisation, British administrators remained wary of its integration. In addition, by investigating the ad-hoc approach taken to coaching schemes in the interwar period it is possible to show how their indirect connection to government came about because of anxieties associated with the military and sporting threat of Germany. Finally, the chapter demonstrates that, although the integration of these coaching schemes appeared to indicate an acceptance of greater professionalisation and specialisation in British sport, the main purpose of these schemes was to create a contingent of honorary coaches rather than to improve the standard of Olympic athletes. This amateur approach to the schemes appeared to satisfy the National Governing Bodies (NGB) because it would ensure that any appointed professional coaches would remain under their tight control and jurisdiction.

Interwar Period

By the end of the war in November 1918, Britain had suffered a significant loss of life since 745,000 of the country's men, most of whom were under 45, had been killed.¹ This loss was multiplied further when a worldwide Spanish Influenza Pandemic broke out in June 1918. Although it is not possible to know the exact number of British deaths, because wartime censors deliberately underreported its effect, it has been estimated that approximately 200,000 people died.² These factors, coupled with a large amount of debt as a result of the war effort and the discharge of four million men from the armed serves, led many to believe that Britain would enter a period of economic depression and high unemployment. However, Britain actually experienced an immediate post-war boom. Businesses thrived as they tried to fill the vacuum of the war years and the returning soldiers were quickly absorbed into industry. The awarding of demobilisation bonuses, which encouraged individuals to purchase items which they had postponed during the war, also ensured that that the British economy remained stable. For a short period following the war, Britain appeared to be the 'land fit for heroes' that Prime Minister Lloyd George had promised, but that was soon

¹ Arthur Marwick, *Britain in the Century of Total War: War Peace and Social Change 1900-1967* (Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd, 1968), 62.

² Spencer C. Tucker, *The European Powers in the First World War: An Encyclopedia* (Oxon: Routledge, 1999), 360; George C. Kohn, *Encyclopedia of Plague and Pestilence: From Ancient Time to Present* (New York: Facts on File Inc, 2008), 46.

to change.³ There was an early indication that Britain could be heading for a period of instability when, although unemployment remained low, the number of strikes throughout the country increased dramatically. Niall Johnson suggests that, because the 'political and social order' in Britain was undergoing a period of change in which Lloyd George's administration shifted from a laissez-faire to a more interventionist approach, particularly regarding the life of British citizens, it was inevitable that the transition would involve some difficulties.⁴ By the end of the 1920s, a culmination of over-production and rising costs, which had been attributed to high wage levels, caused a 'slump' or economic decline. Employers made attempts to convince the trade-unions to accept partial wage cuts, but when they refused, there was no alternative but to reduce the size of the workforce.⁵ Between 1920 and 1921, industrial output had fallen by 10 per cent, and this decline was particularly apparent in the export-orientated trades such as cotton, coal, iron and steel, causing large regional disparities in the levels of unemployment.⁶ Once the economic recession had hit almost all of the basic industries, the unemployment rate accelerated inexorably, and in the three months between March and June 1921, unemployment rose 17.8 per cent to 2,171,000.⁷

However, high levels of unemployment, reductions in the average working week and improved transport links all prompted an increase in the popularity of sport.⁸ As John Hargreaves highlights, 'spectator sports expanded...this was the golden age of football and cricket attendances, professional football had ceased to be so strongly associated with the North and spread Southwards in popularity; County Cricket became a truly more popular game.'⁹ Average football attendances for the first division had risen from 23,000 in the 1913-4 season, to over 30,000 by 1938-9, and attendance at cricket test matches during the interwar period was considerably higher than anything recorded previously.¹⁰ For example, at the Lord's test match against Australia in 1930, 115,000 people had watched over the four days, with an average daily attendance of 29,000.¹¹ Although this may have had a beneficial impact on how the British Olympic team were perceived and supported by the public, for those who cherished amateur hegemony it was particularly alarming, because as Norman Baker highlights, 'spectatorship was far removed from

³ Henry Pelling, *Modern Britain: 1886-1955* (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1960), 142; Anthony Mason, 'The Government and the General Strike', *International Review of Social History* 14, no. 1 (1969): 2.

⁴ Niall Johnson, *Britain and the 1918-1919 Influenza Pandemic: A Dark Epilogue* (Oxon: Routledge, 2006), 2.

⁵ Pelling, *Modern Britain*, 143.

⁶ Jones, *Sport, Politics and Class*, 43; Roger Lloyd-Jones and Myrddin John Lewis, *British Industrial Capitalism since the Industrial Revolution* (London: UCL Press, 1998), 131.

⁷ William D. Rubinstein, *Twentieth-Century Britain: A Political History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 110.

⁸ Jones, *Sport, Politics and Class*, 44.

⁹ John Hargreaves, *Sport, Power and Culture: A Social and Historical Analysis of Popular Sports in Britain* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1986), 86.

¹⁰ Jones, *Sport, Politics and Class*, 45; Mike Huggins, *Horse Racing and the British: 1919-1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 1.

¹¹ Jack Williams, *Cricket and England: A Cultural and Social History of the Inter-War Years* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999), 59.

participatory experience and the appeal was thus more simply entertainment' and this potentially marked the 'end of sport for sports' sake.'¹²

Sport had also been strongly connected to the war effort, and many sporting organisations did what they could to support by encouraging a large number of professional and highly talented amateur athletes to enlist. It was noted that no prominent sports player declared themselves a conscientious objector, and as a result Britain lost a large contingent of its promising sportsmen.¹³ Following the end of the war, there was a suggestion, that while Britain would still be capable of competing at the 1920 Antwerp Olympics, the athletes who remained would not be prepared enough to participate. Despite this, there was an acknowledgment that the 'Olympic movement should...lead to the better coordination of sport within our own country by bringing into closer touch and cooperation the governing bodies of the various branches of sport.' However, there was a concern amongst some, that because nothing had changed in British sport since 1912, rather than having a successful Games in 1920, there would be a repeat of the 'debacle at Stockholm.'¹⁴ A number of factors suggested that Britain would not actually compete in Antwerp, but an accidental acceptance of the invitation by the Foreign Office resulted in Britain having to attend.¹⁵ Once the decision was taken, rushed attempts at the preparation of the British team got underway. Some believed that adopting American methods would ensure British success, because by now the United States had been firmly established as both a sporting and industry leader. Mark Dyreson argues that 'American culture was the primary motor of America power' and that 'culture produced industrial might.' Nations that looked to emulate the United States needed to do more than simply copy their production techniques, they also needed to reproduce their culture.¹⁶ However, the late entry of America into WWI had not been well received by the British, and this resentment continued to build in the interwar period, not least because of the Paris Peace talks in 1919, which witnessed disagreement over war debts and the refusal of America to join the British led League of Nations.¹⁷ This general resentment towards America was further heightened with the Wall Street Crash of 1929. Many British citizens, therefore, had no desire to look to America for guidance, especially in sport, where it was well-known that 'American methods' consisted of a programme of intensive training, in which 'picked athletes', often children, were 'encouraged, watched, guided.' As a result of this 'encouragement no other country in the world has anything approaching them' for they

¹² Norman Baker, 'A More Even Playing Field? Sport During and After the War', in *Millions Like Us: British Culture in the Second World War*, ed. Nick Hayes and Jeff Hill (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999), 126-27.

¹³ Huggins and Williams, *Sport and the English*, 4.

¹⁴ 'The Olympic Games Again: British Prospects Good', *Observer*, April 13, 1919, 19.

¹⁵ Martin Polley, 'Olympic Diplomacy: The British Government and the Projected 1940 Olympic Games', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 9, no. 2 (2002): 171.

¹⁶ Mark Dyreson, 'Selling American Civilization: The Olympic Games of 1920 and American Culture', *Olympika* 8 (1999): 1-2.

¹⁷ Alan P. Dobson, *Anglo-American Relations in the Twentieth Century: Of Friendship, Conflict and the Rise and Decline of Superpowers* (London: Routledge, 1995), 43.

outclassed everyone in athletics and athletic effectiveness.¹⁸ A belief that these methods could potentially be contravening the amateur values enshrined within the Olympic Movement, ensured that Britain remained distant from American training techniques and continued to rely on their heritage and tradition as a truly 'amateur' sporting nation.¹⁹ However, the realisation that Britain could not possibly contend with the 'professional' methods of the American athletes resulted in, once again, little support for the British team. Theodore Andrea Cook was so frustrated by the lack of response, he suggested that although other countries clearly saw benefit from the Olympic Games and would undoubtedly continue to support them, he hoped they would 'never misunderstand our motives if we finally declined to enter English teams until English public opinion and the present framework of international Olympic arrangements are each very different from what they are today.'²⁰

Although Cook may have been trying to provide some sort of impetus for an increase in financial support for the team, the growing instability throughout the country, highlighted particularly by the eventual General Strike in 1926, appears to have been a factor in a continued lack of public support.²¹ It was not until 1927, when Gerald F. Ellison, a retired army lieutenant, who had been encouraged by the success of an Australian training centre, called for a similar venture to be adopted in British athletics. Through observations of army athletic meetings he had established that the athletes who had the opportunity to work with a professional coach performed significantly better than those that did not. As a result, Ellison claimed that developing a training centre, which could also work with boys aged 14-18 and 'put them on the right track from the start', would ensure increased success in British sporting endeavours.²² This type of preparation would require a more 'professional' approach to be adopted, something which, thanks to the increasing popularity of horse racing, greyhound racing and speedway in the interwar period, was gradually becoming more integrated into British sport. Although these sports had always had a professional connection because of their close relationship with gambling, professionalism had also begun to permeate other sports which had historically always had a close affiliation with the amateur ethos. Coupled with this professionalisation was an increasing desire to win, which was exposed by the controversial 'bodyline' tour of Australia in 1932-3.²³ However, this adoption of more specialised methods of training and competing was not universally welcomed and caused much debate, particularly within those organisations that guarded both their autonomy and amateur hegemony. The Amateur Rowing Association suggested that the intensive training which would be required to send a fully prepared team to the Olympics was 'entirely

¹⁸ Frederick W. Rubien, 'Why American Athletes lead', *The New York Times*, April 23, 1916, 1-2.

¹⁹ 'Americans and Their Sports: Dangers of too Much Specialisation', *The Times*, August 10, 1913, 10.

²⁰ Theodore A. Cook, 'The Olympic Games: The Case For Withdrawal', *The Times*, August 23, 1920, 8.

²¹ Mason, 'Government and General Strike', 1-21.

²² Gerald F. Ellison, 'English Athletics: A Training Centre Needed', *The Times*, August 2, 1927, 6.

²³ Stephen G. Jones, 'State Intervention in Sport and Leisure in Britain between the Wars', *Journal of Contemporary History* 22, no. 1 (1987): 170.

contrary to the true spirit of amateur sport' and that 'the exaggerated importance which is attributed to success in such contests endangers rather than stimulates the friendly relationships which ought to exist between rival competitors.'²⁴ The British Olympic Association (BOA) were equally concerned with preventing professionalism from permeating Olympic sport when they objected strongly to the proposal for 'broken-time' payments which would have allowed payment to amateur athletes while they were representing Britain.²⁵ At the International Olympic Congress in Berlin in May 1930 it was decided that the BOA delegates would oppose any efforts to allow amateurs to receive payment for loss of salary.²⁶

The uncertainty surrounding the amateur versus professional debate was potentially a reflection of the changing pattern of class structure that had begun to emerge in Britain following the end of the war. As the issue of amateurism had always had a close affiliation with class, particularly in its association with 'gentleman amateurs', it is unsurprising, therefore, that as class distinction became increasingly blurred, so too did the definitions of amateur and professional. A decline in British aristocracy was increasingly evident because not only had their numbers diminished as a result of the war, they also had to contend with death duties on their inherited wealth. Land reforms, which had been put in place by the Liberals, and the requisitions of stately homes for military and hospital use during the war had presented further challenges.²⁷ The middle-classes were also affected financially, which is reflected by the decline in servant-keeping in the interwar period, and as Arthur Marwick highlights, this helped 'weaken the barriers between the middle and lower classes.'²⁸ Other significant factors in reducing the differences between classes included the 1918 Representation of the People Act, which not only gave women over thirty the right to vote but also offered the entitlement to men over twenty-one, something which had previously been reserved only for home-owning men. The abolition of the workhouse in 1929 and the fact that upper-class officers and lower-class soldiers had fought together during the war, ensured that class distinctions, particularly amongst men, were weakened.²⁹ Nevertheless, despite the diminishing divisions between classes, disparity in education remained. Free elementary schools were provided for the working-classes, in which it was not uncommon to have sixty or more children in one class, but by the time the child reached fourteen their education was deemed to be complete. Fee-paying schools, reserved for those with the available disposable income, offered students greater opportunities, but even then there were differences which were dictated primarily by wealth. The elite sent their children to preparatory and public schools, whereas the middle-classes had to be content with small private and secondary schools. Higher education

²⁴ 'The Olympic Games: Are They Bad for Sport?', *Observer*, August 7, 1921, 15.

²⁵ 'Athletics: Broken Time Payment', *The Scotsman*, November 14, 1927, 5.

²⁶ 'Athletics: The Olympic Council', *The Scotsman*, December 5, 1929, 15.

²⁷ Mike Huggins, 'Sport and the Upper Classes: Introduction', *Sport in History* 28, no. 3 (2008): 357.

²⁸ Marwick, *Century of Total War*, 170.

²⁹ Horseman, *Growing up*, 104-5.

was predominately reserved for those who had emerged from a public school background, men who continued to assume the role of the 'gentleman amateur.'³⁰ As a result, despite the dilution of class barriers, these continuing educational differences meant that amateur hegemony remained firmly entrenched within British sport, particularly in those sporting organisations which had a long association with its ethos.

However, the tentative arrangements for coaching and training improvement which had materialised prior to the war, did begin to resurface. Although a nationalised coaching scheme was yet to emerge, individual sports were beginning to establish their own coaching and training systems, but because these NGBs remained firmly under the direction of amateur administrators, these men continued to exert significant control over the way in which these developments unfolded.

Interwar Athletics Coaching Scheme: 1933-1936

Although there was still resistance, it was apparent that if improvements were to be achieved in British athletics then some form of intervention was required. In 1933, individuals associated with the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA), most notably Harold Abrahams and E. A. Montague, developed the idea of creating an 'annual school of athletics science.'³¹ Influenced by F. A. M Webster, who had continually drawn attention to the lack of proficiency in field events amongst British athletes, which he suggested was due to a 'lack of competent coaches', the AAA decided that a body of amateur coaches was required.³² As a result, the AAA, in connection with Loughborough College, developed the Loughborough Summer School in 1934. Webster and Montague were appointed as organisers, and a decision was taken to make a two week school available to both 'active athletes and would-be coaches.' Around 160 athletes were in attendance at the first course, including a young Geoffrey Dyson who would become Britain's first national athletics coach in 1947.³³ Armas Valste, a Finnish athlete who had taken up coaching and later went on to coach the 1936 Finland Olympic team, was secured as head coach for the initial course. Valste agreed to attend without any payment apart from minimal travelling expenses.³⁴ It became an accepted policy of the Summer School to invite foreign coaches to lead the course and other notable individuals included, Franz Stampfl (Austria), Pierre Lewden (France), Johannes Viljoen (South Africa) and Jaako Mikkola (Finland). Each year foreign coaches would teach techniques to schoolmasters, directors of physical training and athletes in an attempt to develop a body of amateur coaches who could 'diffuse expert knowledge

³⁰ Marwick, *Century of Total War*, 179.

³¹ 'Loughborough's Great Contribution to the Sport', *Guardian*, September 18, 1956, 9.

³² 'Successful Experiment at Loughborough', *Guardian*, September 6, 1934, 9; Lovesey, *Official Centenary*, 120.

³³ 'Successful Experiment at Loughborough', *Guardian*, September 6, 1934, 9; 'Athletics: A Course of Tuition', *The Times*, April 11, 1934, 5; 'Loughborough's Great Contribution to the Sport', *Guardian*, September 18, 1956, 9.

³⁴ 'Successful Experiment at Loughborough', *Guardian*, September 6, 1934, 9.

throughout the country.³⁵ Given that many of the individuals who were heavily involved in the Summer School, most notably Harold Abrahams, held deep rooted beliefs about coaching and amateurism, it might appear somewhat surprising that the use of coaches, particularly foreign coaches, was so well supported. However, although foreign coaches were being used, they were not receiving any sort of payment other than expenses and as such they could be construed as amateurs. In addition, it was noted that the coaches were to remain under the direct control of amateur administrators for the duration of the course and this continuation of the traditional master-servant relationship ensured that none of these men posed any threat to the AAA's authority.

In 1936, Webster founded and headed up the School of Athletics, Games and Physical Education at Loughborough, and in 1937, as a result of their previous encounter at the first Summer School in 1934, Webster appointed Dyson as his assistant.³⁶ Despite the perceived success of the Summer School during its initial years, the AAA were aware that immediate athletic results were not to be expected and it was accepted that it would be at least another five years before the full benefits of the programme would show itself in international competition.³⁷

1936 Berlin Games

During the 1930s, there was a growing realisation, particularly by governments overseas, that sport could be used as tool to not only demonstrate the national prestige and superiority of a country, but also as a means to forge relationships with other nations. In 1931, the French government donated £240,000 to the French national sports development scheme, which was 'probably the biggest windfall sport had ever received from government.' A large proportion of this money was assigned to improving the 'provision of sports grounds all around the country' and undoubtedly went some way to ensuring the continued success of international athletes such as middle-distance runner Jules Ladoumegue and swimmer Jean Taris.³⁸ Peter Beck has demonstrated that, during the interwar period, the British Foreign Office also saw sport, particularly football, as a diplomatic tool.³⁹ During a match with Germany in 1938, English players were strongly encouraged, indirectly by the Foreign Office via the Football Association, to give the Nazi salute, something which Stephen Jones suggests was a political decision designed to promote healthy relations between the two countries.⁴⁰ However, the most salient example of a government intervention in international sport relates to the highly politicised Berlin Olympics in 1936. The Games had been awarded

³⁵ 'Loughborough's Great Contribution to the Sport', *Guardian*, September 18, 1956, 9; 'Lord Burgley Visits College Summer School', *Daily Mail*, August 11, 1938; *Ibid*.

³⁶ 'Death of FAM Webster', *The Times*, April 13, 1949, 2.

³⁷ 'Successful Experiment at Loughborough', *Guardian*, September 6, 1934, 9.

³⁸ 'State's Blessing on Sport: French Government Propose to Vote £240.000', *The Scotsman*, November 5, 1931, 9.

³⁹ Peter Beck, *Scoring for Britain, International Football and International Politics* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999), 5-6.

⁴⁰ Jones, 'State Intervention in Sport', 171.

to Germany in 1931, two years before the Nazi party had come into power, but Hitler soon saw the opportunity to utilise the Olympics for National Socialist propaganda. Staging the Games provided Germany with a means to demonstrate to other nations that they were willing to co-operate and interact, not only in sport, but also in other aspects of everyday life. This was achieved by putting in place initiatives that would improve training and coaching facilities and ensure that Germany was victorious.⁴¹ Germany subsequently headed the medal table with thirty-three gold medals, closely followed by the United States, who secured twenty-four, but Britain was much less successful, achieving only five gold medals. Although Britain had been greatly affected by the Great Depression of the 1930s, which saw unemployment levels reach 21.3 per cent in 1931 and led to protests marches such as the National Hunger Marches in 1932 and the Jarrow Crusade in 1936, the economic and social impacts were considered less debilitating than the experiences of the United States and Germany.⁴² The overall Olympic result was interpreted negatively and levels of criticism were high.

The *Daily Express* observed that 'with bad luck and in some cases very disappointing performances, our athletes have been left as far behind as a donkey's tail'⁴³ while the *Observer* suggested that Britain had been 'outstripped' by Germany, America, France, Italy and Japan and even lesser nations such as Finland, Sweden and Hungary.⁴⁴ These countries had 'licked us hollow, what was worse, they made us look ridiculous.' British training and coaching methods were questioned by those who believed that British performances were 'lamentable, not because our luck was out, but because the majority of our representatives were not good enough.'⁴⁵ Athletes needed to train harder for longer periods of time and to a level which would allow them to cope with the strenuous nature of Olympic events.⁴⁶ Echoes of previous post-Games comments resurfaced, with the *Daily Express* urging Britain to keep out of the Olympics if men 'cannot train for them properly, and view them with the necessary seriousness.'⁴⁷ Despite criticism, the British team was defended by some, and true to British tradition, excuses covered every facet of performance while avoiding criticising the sporting system. Athletes from many other countries arrived six to eight weeks before the Games, but the British only arrived four days before the start.⁴⁸ Their accommodation, which was fifteen miles from the town centre, was also credited for their poor showing although this conveniently ignored the fact that other nations had been housed a similar distance from the

⁴¹ Andreas Luh, 'On the Way to a National Socialist Sports System: From Liberal Sports in Clubs and Associations to Directed Sports in National Socialist Organisations', *European Journal of Sport Science* 3, no. 3 (2003): 5-7; Jones, 'State Intervention in Sport', 165.

⁴² Ingvar Svennilson, *Growth and Stagnation in the European Economy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), 31.

⁴³ Peter Wilson, 'Black Flash Shatters More Olympic Records', *Daily Express*, August 5, 1936, 26.

⁴⁴ 'Sport and Nations', *Observer*, August 16, 1936, 12.

⁴⁵ Trevor Wignall 'Ashamed at Exhibition at Berlin', *Daily Express*, August 14, 1936, 13.

⁴⁶ 'Sport and Nations', *Observer*, August 16, 1936, 12; Trevor Wignall, 'Will Not Take Old Excuses', *Daily Express*, August 12, 1936, 1.

⁴⁷ Trevor Wignall, 'Ashamed at Exhibition at Berlin', *Daily Express*, August 14, 1936, 13.

⁴⁸ 'We Fail in Games-But We Can Be Proud', *Daily Mirror*, August 14, 1936, 3.

stadium.⁴⁹ The major factor however, was that other nations employed different interpretations of the amateur definition.⁵⁰ It was suggested that 'our own particular amalgam of work and play expressed a better philosophy of life than those other codes which have reaped superior honours at Berlin.'⁵¹ While amateur values may have restricted the success of British athletes, there appeared to have been a certain satisfaction that they had not infringed any amateur rules and performed as a 'gentleman' should. This was more than could be said for many other nations, whose athletes 'enjoyed government subsidies' which had encouraged them to 'train longer and more intensely.' It was suggested that because foreign athletes were being 'kept by their governments', even prior to entering the Games, they already had an advantage over British competitors. Questions were also raised about how British athletes were expected to successfully compete against these nations, when not only did they have to treat the Games as their summer holidays and take unpaid leave, they also had minimal experience, a lack of support and mediocre training.⁵² Any hope that multiple poor Olympic performances might influence the structure of British sport was, however, clearly misplaced when Sir Noel Curtis Bennett (GB representative for the IOC) stated that,

Sport should not become mixed with government...Olympic Games are now apt to be regarded as having some political significance and I think it is a pity that the running of a race should be considered a test of a country's importance.⁵³

While the BOA report for 1936 concluded that devoting more time to specialist training and coaching would improve performance in the future it was questioned whether this would actually 'demonstrate anything of national importance.'⁵⁴ British sporting administration and organisation would continue to be rooted in its tradition and heritage, with its reliance on volunteerism and monetary donations.⁵⁵ Remaining true to the belief that the 'dear ol [sic] game is the thing that matters, and that results...are not of our concern', would probably not continue to ensure success as it once had, but it would undoubtedly guarantee that British sport would remain amateur and 'dignified.'⁵⁶

Coaching Schemes – Post-1937

Following the Berlin Games, some individuals began to question why the German athletes had been so successful. Many attributed this to the 'Strength through Joy' movement which had been initiated by the

⁴⁹ Trevor Wignall, 'Will Not Take Old Excuses', *Daily Express*, August 12, 1936, 1.

⁵⁰ 'We Have More Reasons to Be Proud Than Ashamed', *Daily Express*, August 14, 1936, 3.

⁵¹ 'Sport and Nations', *Observer*, August 16, 1936, 12.

⁵² 'We Fail in Games-But We Can Be Proud', *Daily Mirror*, August 14, 1936, 3.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ Harold M. Abrahams, *British Olympic Association: The Official Report of the XIth Olympiad Berlin 1936* (London: British Olympic Association, 1937), 54.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 37-46.

⁵⁶ Trevor Wignall, 'Ashamed at Exhibition at Berlin', *Daily Express*, August 14, 1936, 13.

Nazi party in an attempt to improve the overall fitness of the German nation.⁵⁷ But regardless of the root cause of German success, the Games had highlighted more than ever before, the impact that a poor level of national fitness was having in Britain. Fears were raised not only regarding athletes, but also for the quality of British soldiers if another war was to break out.⁵⁸ Consequently, in 1937, the Physical Training and Recreation Act was established primarily in an attempt to improve and maintain the physical state of British citizens, although this Act was also to have an indirect impact on the level and quality of British coaching. The National Fitness Council (NFC) was established to organise and fulfil the requirements of the Act and to allocate financial assistance to organisations in order for them to educate and train teachers and physical training leaders, so that they could then disseminate their new found knowledge to others.⁵⁹ In order to achieve a grant allocation, sporting organisations were invited to submit an application to the NFC for consideration.

Athletics

Prompted by the poor performances in Berlin and the possibility of a grant from the newly formed NFC, the AAA saw an opportunity to address the standard of coaching in Britain.⁶⁰ Soon after the formation of the NFC in March 1937, the AAA submitted their proposals to Lord Aberdare, the Chair of the NFC, in an attempt to secure funding. It was repeatedly highlighted that 'exercise for the multitude, rather than competition for the specialist' was the underpinning rationale for their proposal. If the AAA were provided with the means to develop a 'National Training College', they guaranteed that 'qualified instructors' would be placed throughout the country so that they could 'disseminate' good coaching and technical knowledge.⁶¹ This 'national scheme of instruction would be of great benefit', not only to athletes, but also to those who have a desire for recreation because, 'any game is more enjoyable when played properly.'⁶² Despite this demonstration of interest from the AAA, the organisational ability of the NFC appears to have been somewhat 'amateur' itself because they failed to respond to the AAA until October 1937, some five months after the initial application. When the NFC finally did make contact they requested that a fully prepared proposal of the national scheme be delivered to them within a week. However, the AAA Committee, not a group who welcomed direction from others, responded accordingly, demanding that

⁵⁷ Jones, 'State Intervention in Sport', 165.

⁵⁸ Carter, 'From Knox to Dyson', 72.

⁵⁹ Board of Education, Physical Training and Recreation Act, 1937, 1 Edw. 8 & 1 Geo. 6, Ch. 46.

⁶⁰ Carter, 'From Knox to Dyson', 73.

⁶¹ Amateur Athletic Association, Memorandum to National Fitness Council, May 10, 1937, File ED 113/54, National Fitness Council Collection: Amateur Athletic Association 1937-39, National Archives, Kew (cited hereafter as NFC Collection: AAA, NA).

⁶² Amateur Athletic Association, Memorandum to National Fitness Council, May 10, 1937, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection, NA.

'more consideration' be paid to them in the future and arguing that it was 'hardly reasonable to expect a comprehensive national scheme to be produced at two days' notice.'⁶³

The AAA, working to their own time scale, began to conduct research in order to assess the quality of coaching in Britain and develop plans for the scheme. A large number of questionnaires were distributed to clubs across the country and from the replies it was established that there were only seventeen paid coaches operating in England and Wales at the time, equating to only one available coach for every 200 athletes who were interested in personal coaching. More promising for the AAA was that over 3,000 individuals declared a desire to learn how to coach on a voluntary basis, if the resources were made available. However, the responses stressed just how serious the coaching situation in Britain had become. Although the AAA were taking steps to establish how to improve coaching and training facilities it was obvious that amateur hegemony still ruled sport in Britain. It was repeatedly highlighted by clubs around the country that 'there are no grounds available. In city after city there is no running track and there are no facilities for field events.' One response noted that in a city which had over a quarter of a million inhabitants there were no running tracks available for use. When it was questioned why large park areas could not be used to accommodate sporting endeavours, it was stated that 'the chairman of the parks committee refuses to permit these sports to be held in any parks controlled by the corporation as he believes that they foster gambling.'⁶⁴ There was still this underlying amateur fear in Britain that money could be used to corrupt sport and in some cases, the situation had degenerated into a scenario whereby the best way to ensure that sport remained 'pure' was by not allowing it to take place. The responses received were 'sufficient testimony to the demand for coaching' in Britain, and as such, the AAA submitted an official application to the NFC on 8 June 1938 requesting grant-aid for the employment of three full time paid coaches and an organiser 'for the purpose of teaching running and field events' and to 'train other people likely to become coaches.'⁶⁵

On the 21 July 1938, the NFC awarded a grant to the AAA to enable them to 'appoint a full time organiser to stimulate interest in physical training and recreation.'⁶⁶ However, the AAA's application for a grant to enable them to appoint three full time coaches remained 'under consideration' by the NFC. It would appear the idea of full-time coaches did not align itself to the NFC's principles since, 'at first sight we were a little doubtful about the proposal, as it is scarcely one of the purposes of the Act to train budding Olympic champions!'⁶⁷ The NFC were apparently just as conscious, if not more so than the NGBs, that the first

⁶³ Captain L F. Ellison to D G A. Lowe, October 22, 1937, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁶⁴ Amateur Athletic Association, Physical Fitness Committee Minutes Memorandum, March 4, 1938, File 1/2/9/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁶⁵ Amateur Athletic Association, Physical Fitness Committee Minutes Memorandum, March 4, 1938, File 1/2/9/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; E J. Holt to Captain L F. Ellis, June 8, 1938, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁶⁶ R. Howlett to E J. Holt, July 21, 1938, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁶⁷ Ibid.; H B. Usher to D B. Davidson, July 19, 1938, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

priority for British coaching was not to coach elite athletes. The main emphasis of the NFC was volunteerism, a central tenet of amateurism. Deliberation continued over the grant to appoint three coaches and the AAA began to take action to appoint an organiser for the scheme by placing an advert in the *Daily Telegraph*. After receiving multiple applications, six individuals were selected for interview, and C. F. R. Hilton was subsequently appointed at the agreed sum of £450 per annum.⁶⁸ Hilton was twenty-nine years of age and had considerable experience in the 'organisation of all types of recreational work' having previously been involved in the Physical Education department at Loughborough College.⁶⁹ His references included one from J. W. Bridgeman, head of the Loughborough Summer School, who acknowledged that Hilton was 'a man of good speech and attractive personality', although 'from an education point of view, Hilton lacks profound or deep knowledge of physical training or athletics.' Bridgeman suggested that because such experience 'are of secondary importance to you, I can recommend him well.'⁷⁰ Apparently Hilton was well-known and popular amongst both the AAA and NFC Committees, so while he may not have been the most qualified candidate, he was probably selected because of his previous relationships with both associations. The AAA, in particular, would have wanted to select someone sympathetic to their approach and there appeared to be no threat from Hilton. He was amenable to accepting the traditional master-servant relationship required by the NGB and would go about his duties without questioning the committee.

After much deliberation by the NFC they were finally satisfied that the scheme aligned itself to their ideals and a grant for 75 per cent of the salaries of three coaches was agreed. However, this was on the basis that they would visit local clubs and schools and 'pass on enough of their own knowledge to some among those they teach to enable these in their turn to instruct their fellow members on an amateur basis.'⁷¹ However, the association were not satisfied with the offer, and initiated negotiations to secure a larger grant, arguing that the newly appointed coaches could not only be employed to train honorary coaches, but could also be used at the Loughborough Summer School.⁷² This would suggest that, despite outwardly accepting the use of coaches from abroad at the Loughborough Summer School, there remained an underlying uneasiness about the employment of foreign coaches to train British athletes, and the AAA saw the allocation of the NFC grant as an opportunity to remedy the situation. However, the NFC refused to allocate more money and the initial offer was, somewhat begrudgingly, accepted by the AAA. Although it

⁶⁸ Amateur Athletic Association, Physical Fitness Committee Minutes, July 28, August 13, 1938, File 1/2/9/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; £450 in 1938 would be the equivalent of £24,088.50 in 2012. Information gathered from <http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-1633409/Historic-inflation-calculator-value-money-changed-1900.html>

⁶⁹ Amateur Athletic Association, Qualifications of Mr C F R. Hilton, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁷⁰ F J. Davis to E J. Holt, August 22, 1938, File 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA; J W. Bridgeman to E J. Holt, August 8, 1938, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁷¹ H B. Usher to D B Davidson, July 19, 1938, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁷² Amateur Athletic Association, Physical Fitness Committee Minutes, August 13, 1938, File 1/2/9/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

soon declared that it did not have the funds available to appoint three coaches at £450 per head, even though it would only be required to cover 25 per cent of each of the salaries. The solution was to appoint three coaches, but at a reduced salary of £300 per annum, ensuring that the association would only be liable to pay a maximum of £225 for each coach. Advertisements were placed in the *Daily Telegraph*, *Manchester Guardian* and *Birmingham Daily Post* to ensure that coaching opportunities were widely circulated.⁷³ Although these initiatives heralded the prospect of a AAA coaching scheme finally being initiated in Britain, it was declared in February 1939, that the AAA had made such a substantial loss in 1938 that they could no longer afford to appoint coaches in the Midlands and the North. If these districts still wished to appoint coaches they would have to finance it themselves. In the South, however, a position could be filled immediately. Hilton, the scheme organiser, suggested that instead of appointing professional coaches, they could use students of the Loughborough Summer School as voluntary coaches. Each coach would serve four clubs and the AAA would pay them a maximum of £2 per week to cover expenses.⁷⁴

Despite efforts to move away from the traditional approach to British coaching it seems that amateurism still exerted a considerable influence. By using a lack of money as an excuse for why professional coaches could not be appointed, the AAA, for the most part, would continue to function as it always had, relying on, and having a preference for, amateur honorary coaches. The exception was the appointment of a single professional coach to work in the South. After receiving few applications for the post it was decided that Franz Stampfl, an Austrian by birth, would be appointed. Stampfl who was twenty-nine years old had himself been a successful athlete until 1934, when he decided to take up coaching. He had been involved in the Loughborough Summer School and taken various coaching positions throughout the country where he had given 'complete satisfaction.'⁷⁵ The quality of his coaching attributes were well known within the AAA and made him an ideal candidate for the position. However, the appointment of a foreign coach was not supported by everybody for it highlighted the deficiencies which existed in the quality of British coaches. Henry Pelham, who was a member of the NFC Committee, stated 'I do not much like the idea of the appointment of an Austrian refugee to a post the salary of which will be mainly found from Government funds' and went further to suggest that he would 'very much prefer the appointment of an Englishman.'⁷⁶ Fearful of the matter being raised in Parliament, Captain Lionel Ellis contacted two former Olympic athletes and now MPs, Lord Burghley and Phillip Noel-Baker, to solicit their views on 'the

⁷³ Amateur Athletic Association, Physical Fitness Committee Minutes, October 4, 1938, File 1/2/9/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁷⁴ Amateur Athletic Association, Physical Fitness Committee Minutes, February 2, 1939, File 1/2/9/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁷⁵ E. J. Holt to Captain L. F. Ellis, May 2, 1939, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁷⁶ Amateur Athletic Association, Physical Fitness Committee Minutes, March 25, 1939, File 1/2/9/1, AAA Collections, Birmingham Archives; E. H. Pelham to Lord Burghley, May 3, 1939, File 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA; E. H. Pelham to E. J. Holt, May 5, 1939, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

appointment of a foreigner' to such a position.⁷⁷ Both Baker and Burghley agreed that Stampfl was 'more likely to be satisfactory' than any British coach, stressing that the only alternative would be Alec Nelson, who was currently employed at Cambridge, but would soon be seventy and had not even applied for the role.⁷⁸ Although the NFC were 'surprised to find that we have no British coach really capable', after much persuasion from the AAA Committee and various other sources, they agreed to allow the appointment of Stampfl.⁷⁹ The uneasiness surrounding Stampfl's appointment soon became irrelevant when the Home Office became involved. In the build-up to the war they had been placed on high alert and the 'Security People' had a 'serious objection to Mr. Stampfl being employed by the Amateur Athletic Association as their principal coach', not only because he would potentially be required to visit 'Service Depots', but also because they had doubts regarding his credentials as a coach.⁸⁰ At the outbreak of the war in 1940, Stampfl was interned as an enemy alien and sent to Australia on board the 'Dunera'. The ship was torpedoed by a German U-boat, but Stampfl survived and he returned to Britain after the end of the war in 1946.⁸¹ Similar to the fate suffered by previous attempts to establish a national coaching contingent, the outbreak of the war caused an abrupt end to the scheme.⁸² However, unlike the programme which involved Knox in 1914, it would not be another thirty-three years before another full time professional coach was appointed, because soon after the war had ended immediate attempts were made by both the AAA and the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) to re-establish coaching schemes.⁸³

Swimming

Sir Henry Pelham of the NFC wrote to Alderman Harold Fern (ASA honorary secretary, 1921-70 and President of FINA, 1936-48) on 21 October 1937, indicating that grant aid for 'games and athletic bodies' would soon be available to enable them to 'appoint a whole-time organiser to go about the country gingering things up.' Pelham asked if the ASA 'have in mind putting in an application of this sort', and if this was the case could he be informed quickly so that it could be raised at the next meeting of the sub-committee.⁸⁴ It is not clear why Pelham had written to the ASA directly, particularly when there is no evidence to suggest that this was done for other sports. Perhaps the ASA was offered this 'luxury' of an early indication that the grants would be available because Fern was an active member of the NFC

⁷⁷ Captain L F. Ellis to Phillip Noel Baker, May 12, 1939, File 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA; Philip Noel Baker to Captain L F. Ellis, May 15, 1939, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA; Captain L F. Ellis, Memorandum, May 16, 1939, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁷⁸ Philip Noel Baker to Captain L F. Ellis, May 15, 1939, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁷⁹ National Fitness Council, Memorandum, May 22, 1939, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁸⁰ National Fitness Council, Memorandum, June 16, 1939, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁸¹ Belgrave Harriers, 'Advisor to the Four Minute Mile', *The Belgravian* 2, no. 5 (2007): 25.

⁸² H B. Jenkins to E J. Holt, September 2, 1939, File ED 113/54, NFC Collection: AAA, NA.

⁸³ Lovesey, *Official Centenary*, 120.

⁸⁴ E H. Pelham to A H E. Fern, October 21, 1937, File ED 113/57, National Fitness Council Collection: Amateur Swimming Association 1937-40, National Archives, Kew (hereafter cited as NFC Collection: ASA, NA).

Advisory Council and had a number of contacts within the NFC. Fern responded quickly, some four days later, indicating that 'for some time past I have been working on a scheme for submission to the Grants Committee' and he began formalising plans so that an official application could be submitted.⁸⁵ Similar in scope to the AAA proposals, the aim was to 'create swimmers, not would-be champions' and, therefore, when an individual had become a 'competent swimmer, he or she would no longer be eligible for instruction.' However, it was hoped that once an individual had been taught how to swim they would join the local clubs, but this needed to be kept in perspective because this was 'not the purpose of the scheme.'⁸⁶ The ASA believed that the 'appointment of a whole-time paid organiser would be of great assistance in spreading cult of swimming', so much so that they suggested two organisers should be appointed, one for the North and one for the South.⁸⁷ Although the ASA valued the amateur tradition, and did their utmost to uphold its values, it was clear that this ethos, coupled with a lack of finance, had significantly impacted on the scale of work they had been able to accomplish. Fern also emphasised how 'over-worked' the officials of the ASA were because they all donated their time freely and carried out their duties on an entirely 'honorary basis.'⁸⁸

The NFC agreed that providing financial support would potentially improve the running efficiency of the ASA but they declared that they would be unable to authorise grant-aid for two organisers because they had to 'adhere to the practice which they had followed in other cases', so they would only offer a grant of £450 a year to fund the appointment of one organiser.⁸⁹ Fern responded unfavourably to this rejection arguing that during the discussions prior to the grant allocation, there was no suggestion that it would not be awarded. In fact, it had been unanimously agreed by the committee that 'the work contemplated was much too heavy for one organiser, and that two was the minimum to warrant the ASA embarking on the scheme with any expectation of success.' The ASA, but particularly Fern, interpreted the rejection as a lack of 'sufficient confidence in the ASA Committee's knowledge and experience.' As a result, the ASA 'regrettably' decided to reject the offer for one organiser and declared that there was 'no point in troubling the Board further on the matter', because it would appear that neither party was willing to compromise.⁹⁰ The NFC appeared irritated by the ASA's stance, stating that 'there was never any lack of confidence in the ASA' and that they were merely following procedure because, until a scheme had proved worthy, it would not be justified to provide further grant-aid for a second organiser. They also added, in a somewhat

⁸⁵ A H E. Fern to E H. Pelham, October 25, 1937, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁸⁶ A H E. Fern to NFC, June 14, 1937, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁸⁷ A H E. Fern to E H. Pelham, October 27, 1937, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ National Fitness Council, Grants Committee Minutes, November 11, 1937, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁹⁰ A H E. Fern to E H. Pelham, November 20, 1937, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

disgruntled tone, that 'other bodies have found it possible to start with one officer' and that, to date, the ASA was the 'only organisation so far to reject...help.'⁹¹

At the next meeting of the NFC Grants Committee in December 1937, Fern took the opportunity to once again raise his 'protest' against the committee's refusal to fund two organisers. Although he stated that he was 'not seeking to re-open the matter', it was clear he was trying to provoke a reaction from the committee when he highlighted that 'the Association only sought to help forward the work which the National Fitness Council was formed to undertake, and I thought that some advance might be made by the appointment of two organisers.'⁹² Fern tried to build a case for his argument by suggesting that the sport of swimming was potentially of greater value than others and, therefore, financial support should be more forthcoming. He emphasised that 'all the officials work in an honorary capacity and there is no paid staff as in the case of a good many other governing bodies of sport.' It was clear he viewed swimming as a superior activity, because although he was 'all in favour of helping other sports', he suggested that as the 'circumstances' and 'opportunities' were different in these other governing bodies, unlike swimming, they were not as well placed to gain immediate results. The NFC Committee had previously claimed that the grant allocation was refused, because 'hitherto no voluntary organisation had been given financial assistance for more than one organiser.' As a result of this, Fern wished to register his protests 'against such a rule of thumb attitude.'⁹³ The committee responded by highlighting that the NFC 'attach the greatest importance to the development of swimming along with other sports and are very sorry to think that we are not to co-operate to the fullest extent with the Amateur Swimming Association.' Although they agreed that some amount of 'elasticity' was desirable when considering applications from various governing bodies, they were not willing to compromise on the decision they had already made but would be willing to 'consider the matter again at a later stage.'⁹⁴

Encouraged by this, the ASA decided to submit a further application in March 1938, to enable them to establish training centres and classes for candidates for the ASA certificate which would be open to amateurs and professionals alike.⁹⁵ In order to fulfil the proposal and ensure its efficient running it was claimed, once again, that there was a need to appoint two organisers. Following much discussion and indecision, the committee eventually agreed to allocate funds towards two appointments.⁹⁶ The NFC was willing to contribute 'up to £450 a year each in the case of a man or £350 for a woman' as well as £150 a year towards travelling expenses. Conditions were also attached to the intended appointments, whereby

⁹¹ E H. Pelham to A H E. Fern, November 24, 1937, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁹² A H E. Fern to Lord Aberdare, December 13, 1937, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Lord Aberdare to A H E. Fern, December 20, 1937, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁹⁵ National Fitness Council, Amateur Swimming Association Application for Grant-Aid (No. G. 38. 13), March 26, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁹⁶ National Fitness Council, Grants Committee Minutes, March 30, April 4, April 8, 1938, File 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA; R. Howlett to A H E. Fern, May 5, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

the NFC Committee were only willing to offer a grant up until the end of March 1939 (less than a year), and the selected organisers would be required to submit reports to the NFC, describing in detail the work they had carried out so that the committee could monitor their activities.⁹⁷ A sum of £300 per annum had also been made towards the ASA's headquarter administrative expenses but the committee declared that such a grant was 'contingent on the appointment of the two proposed organisers.'⁹⁸ Fern was less than satisfied, stating that not only would the appointment of two organisers 'take some time to arrange', but also that the 'administration expenses of the Association have increased considerably because of the activities of the National Fitness Council', something Fern was having to cover personally.⁹⁹ The NFC responded by explaining that because the Grant Committee had recently changed their policy, thereby allowing the ASA funding for two organisers, it was necessary to attach conditions to the grants for headquarters expenses.¹⁰⁰ The grants were 'intended to cover the increased work which the newly appointed organiser would create if he were doing his job properly' and, therefore, 'one half of the...grant would begin with each of the two organisers.' However, it was suggested that if the ASA 'did not feel satisfied with the conditions attached' they should submit a case in writing so that it could be re-considered.¹⁰¹ Fern took it upon himself to complain, and this time the NFC was willing to compromise on the matter, stating that the 'special situation of the ASA renders it desirable to make some concession.'¹⁰² It was agreed that two-thirds of the administrative grant would commence from 1 May 1938, and the remaining one-third would be payable upon the appointment of the two organisers.¹⁰³

The ASA began advertising for organisers and in June 1938 the NFC were informed that Miss Molly Laxton Lloyd had been appointed for the North of England and Miss Elaine Frances Burton for the South.¹⁰⁴ The appointment of women in such a position could be considered unusual, not only for the time period, but also because no women had been appointed in a coaching or organising position by any other governing body to date. It was emphasised by the ASA that 'people of the right type and quality are obviously not attracted by an appointment for such a limited period', which suggests that women may have been selected because not only would it cost the ASA less money than if they were to appoint men (£350 per annum compared to £450) but also because the length of appointment was so short.¹⁰⁵ Burton was thirty-four years old and held a diploma in teaching; although she possessed 'time certificates of the ASA', there is no mention in her application that she held any swim coaching or teaching certificates. It was also

⁹⁷ R. Howlett to A H E. Fern, May 5, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁹⁸ A H E. Fern to R. Howlett, May 6, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

⁹⁹ Ibid.; R. Howlett to Mr. Pearson, May 7, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹⁰⁰ National Fitness Council, Grants Committee Minutes, May 7, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² National Fitness Council, Grants Committee Minutes, May 11, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹⁰³ NFC to A H E. Fern, May 19, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹⁰⁴ A H E. Fern to R. Howlett, June 11, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

noted that she was unemployed at the time of application because she wanted to utilise her time efficiently and did not want to accept 'minor posts.' As a child she had been successful in athletics, achieving the title of 'world sprint champion', and later went on to become an honorary coach for Leeds City teams.¹⁰⁶ There is no suggestion that she had much experience in swimming, from either a coaching or administrative perspective, but it can be assumed that the ASA believed her skills would be transferable from one sport to another. Laxton on the other hand, could be considered somewhat more qualified for the position; she was thirty-five years old and held a Physical Training Diploma and Advanced Teacher's Certificate for the ASA.¹⁰⁷ The ASA Teacher's Certificate had emerged in 1919 as part of a reform to the Professional Certificate, which had been first introduced in 1899 when there had been difficulty in securing enough amateurs to take up teaching roles, causing the ASA to concede that 'professional teachers were necessary for the widespread propagation of swimming.'¹⁰⁸ This introduction of a teaching certificate could be interpreted as a shift towards a greater acceptance of professionalism, particularly when it is considered that very few other sports developed such schemes, but closer analysis suggests that its creation was less to do with progress and more the result of the ASA's desire to remain in control. By introducing certification, professional teachers and coaches could be regulated under the ASA's jurisdiction ensuring that they would not confront the authority of amateur administrators and thereby maintain the preferred master-servant relationship.¹⁰⁹

The first report which Burton sent to the NFC Committee highlighted a 'crying need...for leaders' noting that, although the 'enthusiasm is there', individuals' contributions were restricted for financial reasons.¹¹⁰ Burton and the ASA proposed that six courses should be developed around the country, so that those interested in voluntary service could 'improve their own swimming, learn the art of imparting it to others and thus enable the clubs who have not the means to provide their own coach to have equal advantages with others better off than themselves.' Individuals 'would contribute to the cost according to their ability, but nobody would be debarred', and it was hoped that the remaining costs would be covered by a grant from the NFC Grants Committee. It was intended that the course would last for six months and each candidate would attend one night per week. On completion of the course it was envisaged that each candidate would have gained the ASA Teachers Certificate and the Bronze Medallion and Intermediate Certificate from the Royal Life Saving Society.¹¹¹ The time and effort required to achieve teaching and coaching qualifications in swimming was considerably greater than in other sports, and this continued to be

¹⁰⁶ Elaine Frances Burton, 'Application for Appointment as Organiser', May 21, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹⁰⁷ Mollie Lloyd Laxton, 'Application for Appointment as Organiser', May 25, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹⁰⁸ Keil and Wix, *In the Swim*, 25; Day, 'Brickett: Respectable Professor', 195; Day, 'See His Own Faults', 8.

¹⁰⁹ Day, 'Brickett: Respectable Professor', 195.

¹¹⁰ Elaine F. Burton, Amateur Swimming Association Application for Grant-Aid (G.38.45), File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*

a factor as these courses progressed and developed. For example, the ASA Coaches' Certificate, established in 1955 had a consistently low pass rate. In 1957, out of the nineteen candidates who took part, only six completed the course successfully, while in 1959, of the nineteen candidates, nine were successful.¹¹² The NFC Grants Committee could see the benefit of running teaching and coaching courses and agreed to provide a grant of £300 to enable the ASA to organise the proposed six courses.¹¹³

The NFC Grants Committee were so satisfied with the work of both Burton and Lloyd that, after three months of service, they agreed to extend the grant for their salaries until March 1940.¹¹⁴ Also, they proposed to Fern that they would be willing to offer a 75 per cent grant towards the employment of a full-time coach so that a contingent of honorary coaches could be produced. It was envisaged that this programme would be organised and run along similar lines to those seen in other sports, in particular the AAA.¹¹⁵ However, far from welcoming the offer, Fern remained cautious, suggesting that the ASA would not be able to raise the remaining 25 per cent of the salary and the required travelling expenses, because they 'were already finding it difficult' to cover the cost of the two organisers. Fern highlighted that 'by employing two women organisers, we are spending less in salaries than was authorised had men organisers been engaged', and even then they still found it difficult to provide the required finance.¹¹⁶ It was concluded, that with regards to the appointment of a full time professional coach, the ASA 'had no funds available for such a purpose- desirable as it is.'¹¹⁷ The development of the ASA had apparently, once again, been limited by lack of funds, as was the case with so many of the amateur national sporting bodies during this period. However, these problems were ultimately inconsequential because on the outbreak of the war in 1939, the country was placed in a state of 'National Emergency' and all the grants offered under the Physical Training and Recreation Act were terminated.¹¹⁸ Much progress had been made with regards to producing teachers and potential coaches in swimming, but this now ceased. Opportunities for similar ventures would once again become available after the end of WWII, but unlike the AAA, the ASA was somewhat slower in its uptake, and it was not until 1959 that the ASA accepted a Ministry of Education Grant to appoint Bert Kinnear as its first full time National Technical Officer.

Regardless of the continuing decline of British sporting performances in the interwar period, partly because British athletes were now no longer able to contend with the coaching and training techniques being utilised in other countries, British sporting administrators still felt they had little to learn from foreign

¹¹² Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1957, 6, Amateur Swimming Association Headquarters, SportsPark Loughborough University (hereafter cited as ASA Headquarters); Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1959, 7, ASA Headquarters.

¹¹³ NFC to A H E. Fern, September 10, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹¹⁴ NFC to A H E. Fern, November 23, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹¹⁵ E H. Pelham to A H E. Fern, December 9, 1938, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹¹⁶ A H E. Fern to E H. Pelham, December 12, 1938, File ED 113/57 NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹¹⁷ A H E. Fern to Captain R. Stephens, January 19, 1939, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

¹¹⁸ NFC to A H E. Fern, September 2, 1939, File ED 113/57, NFC Collection: ASA, NA.

coaches and athletes. Even though athletics were willing to accept some input from foreigners, their advice appeared to have little impact on British sport and administrators, who continued to organise sport in the way they had become accustomed to, along amateur lines. These factors, coupled with the state of British society following WWI and the general indifference of the British public regarding the issues of sport, did not create an environment which was conducive to the development and formalisation of British coaching. The following chapter will trace the progress of British coaching in the immediate post-war period and examine how and why professional coaches continued to struggle to find acceptance within British sport.

Chapter Three: British Sporting Decline and Post-War Coaching Developments

Despite the significant social changes that marked British society in the immediate post-war period, evidence suggests that much of British sport returned to its pre-war values. This chapter explores how this return to pre-war practices and values, which was characterised by the retention of control by amateur administrators, was reflected in the intended purpose of the revitalised coaching schemes. Firstly, this chapter analyses the relationship between society and sport and reveals how post-war sporting performances appeared to mirror the widespread decline in society and demonstrates how this may have encouraged the uptake of coaching schemes. The adoption of the coaching schemes are also explored and while this uptake appeared to indicate that the National Governing Bodies (NGB) seemed willing to accept a small amount of fluidity regarding the amateur definition on coaching, they ensured that they remained in control by continuing to exert the master-servant relationship over their coaches. Although coaching schemes had become more widespread, this section demonstrates how, similar to previous coaching developments which had an indirect connection to government, the emphasis of these new coaching initiatives remained with the production of a contingent of honorary coaches, rather than exceptional athletes. Finally, this chapter examines how the refusal of the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) to not only apply for grant-aid, but reject it when it was offered, potentially indicates that this NGB did not want to lose its authority or autonomy by relinquishing some of its control to an external organisation.

Post-War Context

During the war the government began to have a much greater role in the everyday lives of the British public. In 1940, rationing was introduced as part of the war effort, and although it was not initially welcomed, it was gradually acknowledged that such measures had been introduced to safeguard people's welfare, regardless of their social status. This increase in government involvement in individual's lives was believed to have a positive impact, and as a result, there was a growing opinion that many did not want a see a return to the pre-war order. People began demanding some form of reassurance about post-war society and a guarantee that the sacrifices and hardships that the majority had endured, would be 'rewarded with a more just and egalitarian society' once the conflict was over.¹ In other words, the majority of working class people wanted to see 'an end to the tradition of "privileged" and "leisured" classes.'² Thus, after the government commissioned a report in 1941, which would address some of the most prominent issues in society, there was a widespread assumption that the government were fully committed to post-war reform. However, the wartime government consisted of an all party coalition and the primary drive

¹ James Chapman, 'British Cinema and "The People's War"', in *Millions Like us?*, 58-9.

² Geoffrey G. Field, *Blood, Sweat, and Toil: Remaking the British Working Class, 1939-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 371.

behind the creation of a committee on Social Insurance and Allied Services, which would develop into the Beveridge Report, had come from Labour.³ The Conservative, Winston Churchill, believed that too much emphasis on social policy and reconstruction issues would only encourage the redirection of efforts away from the war effort and he was keen to delay the official publication until after the war.⁴ On the other hand, William Beveridge who had headed up the committee, believed that regardless of how controversial the recommendations were, and how they might be received by some, they needed to be in the public domain. As a result, in December 1942, the Beveridge Report was published with a solitary signature, Beveridge's, after the remaining civil servants of the committee, for fear of repercussions, had removed their names from the final report.⁵ The principal points of the publication called for an extension and expansion of the current social services and a minimum subsistence for all, which was to include full employment, family allowances and a national health service.⁶ The report seemingly appealed to the public desire for an improved post-war society because within the first year alone it had sold over 600,000 copies.⁷ Eric Chamberlain suggests that if the Beveridge Report had been published before the war then it would probably have been dismissed as just another academic publication but the wartime conditions, which had created a desire for social revolution, ensured that it 'set the agenda for social reconstruction for the next decade.'⁸

Despite public and press response, to what was now being referred to as a 'plan', being positive and supportive, the government reaction was one of indifference. Although the wartime coalition presented a united front it was frequently interpreted that the 'lukewarm attitude' expressed towards the Beveridge Report was the result of the Conservative majority. It was widely believed that under Conservative rule, the changes required to ensure that post-war society was markedly different would never be implemented. Labour seized the opportunity to present themselves as the party who were 'most likely to fulfil the public's demand for post-war social reform.' The strategy was to enhance their already strong working class appeal by 'metaphorically linking arms with those who had fought the "people's war".' Such an approach appeared successful when, on 26 July 1945, Labour achieved a 126-seat majority in the first general election after the war.⁹

In the immediate post-war period, Britain underwent a 'political revolution' which, amongst other things, saw a change in political authority and the introduction of a welfare system. However, the much sought 'social revolution', which it was hoped would alter the British class system by blurring the barriers,

³ Marwick, *Century of Total War*, 291; Robert Mackay, *The Test of War: Inside Britain 1939-1945* (London: Taylor and Francis Group, 1999), 59.

⁴ Mackay, *Test of War*, 58.

⁵ Marwick, *Century of Total War*, 306.

⁶ Mackay, *Test of War*, 60.

⁷ Thomas William Heyck, *A History of the Peoples of the British Isles: From 1870 to the Present* (London: Routledge, 2002), 205.

⁸ Eric Russell Chamberlain, *Life in Britain* (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd, 1972), 183; Heyck, *History of the Peoples*, 205.

⁹ Juliet Gardiner, *Wartime Britain 1939-1945* (London: Headline Book Publishing, 2004), 501, 579, 580-1.

was not so forthcoming.¹⁰ Robert Mackay suggests that 'while the war had highlighted some of society's defects and given an impulse to social reform, victory seemed to imply that, for all its faults, the social...order was basically sound' and consequently any impetus for change had been lost.¹¹ In addition, prompted by the lack of suitable housing in the post-war period that stretched far into the 1950s, and the continuation of rationing, which had actually become more stringent after the war and did not fully cease until 1954, there was an increasing desire to return to normal in everyday life.¹² 'Normality' for most would involve at least a partial transition to pre-war life, because although this time had become increasingly difficult, it was what the majority had become accustomed to. Post-war British sport, therefore, emerged as a reflection of a society in which 'continuities were prized and came generally to prevail over any significant impulse for fundamental change.'¹³ Perhaps it was inevitable that sport would align itself to such principles in this way, because as Martin Polley highlights, 'sport is not passive: it co-exists with its society.'¹⁴ This, coupled with a government that continued to distance itself from sport for fear of threatening the much cherished voluntary tradition, ensured that sport in Britain reverted back to its pre-war arrangement whereby 'the amateur ethos continued to exercise significant influence over the practice and administration of English sport.'¹⁵

This somewhat rapid return to the pre-war values of sport had been expected by some. Not only had wartime developments helped solidify the ideals of amateurism, they had also offered an early indication that any post-war shift from amateurism would be resisted. Throughout the war, a number of restrictions had been placed on both spectating and participation in sport. Sporting grounds had been requisitioned for the war effort, sporting equipment gradually began to deteriorate and there was also a shortage of personnel for public transport, which when coupled with the blackout regulations, significantly reduced the opportunity for public activity.¹⁶ There was also a growing debate, particularly amongst government officials, as to whether sport was actually negatively impacting on the war effort. Whilst it was acknowledged that participation in sport positively contributed to morale and fitness levels amongst both civilians and military personnel, there was a belief that spectator sports were directing attention away from critical areas.¹⁷ Such debates were in fact nothing new, similar sentiments had been raised during WW1 when it was agreed that professional football 'kept the man who played from the trenches, it kept the man

¹⁰ Baker, 'The Amateur Ideal', 99-100.

¹¹ Mackay, *Test of War*, 16.

¹² Gardiner, *Wartime Britain*, 587.

¹³ Baker, 'The Amateur Ideal', 100.

¹⁴ Polley, *Moving the Goalposts*, 6.

¹⁵ Baker, 'The Amateur Ideal', 101; Holt and Mason, *Sport in Britain*, 19; Baker, 'Whose Hegemony?', 14.

¹⁶ Baker, 'More Even Playing Field?', 129-30.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 130.

who watched from the factory.¹⁸ Nobody added more weight to this argument during WWII than Sir Stafford Cripps, who exclaimed that 'dog racing and boxing displays...are completely out of accord with the true spirit of determination of the people...no longer [should they] be allowed to offend the solid and serious intention of the country to achieve victory.'¹⁹ Consequently, unlike the previous war where some professional spectator sports, such as football, had continued to function for some time during the conflict, tight limitations were imposed by the government to ensure spectatorship was significantly reduced.²⁰

Although these restrictions were predominately directed towards spectator sports, in reality, despite the widespread acknowledgement of the benefits of sports participation, playing sport was somewhat confined to the armed services. These limitations may have helped solidify and ensure the longevity of amateurism. Critics of gambling in sport suggested that the reduction in the availability of professional sports during the war 'added strength to their already well-established campaigns.' This weakening of the bonds between gambling and sport may have slowed the process of professionalisation in British sport, ensuring that traditional 'amateur' values remained dominant.²¹ In addition, military sport, particularly the army, was governed by a set of 'amateur' rules which had been established by the Army Sports Control Board in 1918. These rules suggested, amongst other things, that games should be played 'for the game's sake' and that an individual should always play 'for his side and not for himself.' The list of eight published guidelines, which were strictly enforced by army officers, would ensure that all soldiers were 'good sportsmen.'²² It was noted in one press report that a number of 'Olympic Probables' for the 1948 Games had been introduced to their chosen event while serving in the forces during the war, so it could be assumed that many British athletes in the immediate post-war Games had been indoctrinated with an unquestioning respect for amateurism, something which may also have had an impact on their level of performance.²³

Towards the end of the war, some sports had begun to appoint committees to plan for post-war developments. Although these initiatives appear to indicate that certain sports were willing to incorporate change, for the most part the majority of the more radical suggestions were opposed by influential administrators. Considering that a large proportion of administrators remained largely unchanged from the interwar period, it appeared inevitable that suggestions which indicated a possible shift towards a more professional approach would be rejected. For example, in 1943, the football 'War Emergency Committee' presented plans to the Football Association Council which suggested that the 'game for game's sake'

¹⁸ Marwick, *Century of Total War*, 68-9.

¹⁹ 'Grave War Aspects Not Last Straw: Stafford Cripps First Speech as Leader', *Advertiser*, February 27, 1942, 7.

²⁰ Pierre Lanfranchi and Matthew Taylor, 'Professional Football in World War Two Britain', in *War Culture*, ed. Pat Kirkham and David Thoms (London: Lawrence and Wishart Limited, 1995), 188.

²¹ Baker, 'More Even Playing Field?', 132.

²² Tony Mason and Eliza Riedi, *Sport and the Military: The British Armed Forces 1880-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 119.

²³ Baker, 'More Even Playing Field?', 134.

attitude which had been adopted during the war should be encouraged once the conflict was over to ensure that the nature of football was kept in 'perspective.' While this proposal was welcomed by the Council, other suggestions which 'departed radically from past practices', such as the formation of a Sunday football association, were not well received, somewhat surprisingly given the relationship that football always had with professionalism.²⁴ Similarly, the plans for cricket, which were published in an interim report in 1945, proposed the formation of a knockout cup, which it was stressed, had been the result of increasing public demand. However, the 'ultra conservative elders of the game' strongly resisted its implementation which ensured that such a competition, in the form of the Gillette Cup, did not emerge until 1963. These examples of resistance to rule changes highlight that for all the planning and proposed developments, the 'old school' elite still remained very much in control of sport.²⁵

This return to the traditional means of sport organisation and administration, which was guided by amateur hegemony, ensured that gradually diminishing international performances, which had become commonplace before the outbreak of the war, stretched far into the immediate post-war period. The prominence of British sport continued to decline rapidly, particularly between the periods of 1948-53. British tennis players were convincingly defeated at Wimbledon, boxers lost their world titles to opponents from abroad, the English cricket team were beaten by Australia, New Zealand and the West Indies, and the football team were defeated by the United States in their first appearance at the World Cup in 1950, a defeat compounded further with the loss of its unbeaten home record to Hungary in 1953.²⁶ Many critics began to emerge in a multitude of sports, none more so than in rowing where Britain, considered the birthplace of the sport, was now being beaten by 'lesser' nations. This lack of achievement and loss of prestige within Europe was being made even more humiliating due to the fact that successful scullers, who had been acting as honorary coaches in Britain, were now being appointed as full-time coaches abroad. Eric Phelps, for example, a rowing coach who at the time was coaching Britain's best amateur rower, 'had been forced to accept a post in Argentina where excellent terms were offered for the very work he wanted to do here, and was never invited to undertake.'²⁷ Poor results of British athletes on the international sporting circuit were something the nation was seemingly becoming accustomed to, partly as a consequence of the coverage given to their meagre performances within the British press. Papers such as the traditionalist *The Times* and the conservative *Daily Express* passed judgement on the sporting performances of the era, perhaps in an attempt to stimulate improvements to the British sport system.²⁸ For

²⁴ Ibid., 135-7.

²⁵ Ibid., 137-8.

²⁶ University of Birmingham, *Britain in World Sport*, 7.

²⁷ Hylton Cleaver, 'Rowing', in *The Sports Book 2: Britain's Prospects in the Olympic Games and in Sport Generally*, ed. James Rivers (London: MacDonald and Co Ltd, 1948), 97-8.

²⁸ Norman Baker, 'Sport and National Prestige: The Case of Britain 1945-48', *Sporting Traditions* 12, no. 2 (1996): 82.

example, in 1947, it was suggested that 'British boxing has never been so severely crushed' and that its prestige and quality had 'descended into the ground floor.' The only consolation that could be taken from such a situation was that America was faring just as badly.²⁹ American defeat in sporting endeavours was particularly welcomed in Britain, because the resentment towards America noted during the interwar period had become further entrenched in the post-war period. Beginning in 1942, many American service personnel were stationed in Britain, a process which eventually saw nearly 3,000,000 American GI's residing throughout the country.³⁰ They were highly paid, receiving £3 8s 9d a week compared to a British soldier's 14s, and they filled the void left by the missing British men.³¹ Wartime conditions were already conducive for many married women to 'drift' but the high concentrations of US service men made this more possible, and the return of British soldiers after the conflict was over resulted in a marked increase in the number of divorce petitions. Whereas only 9,970 had been filed in 1938, by 1945 this number had risen to 24,857, of which, 70 per cent claimed adultery as grounds for divorce.³² Additionally, many GI's had taken brides whilst in Britain, and once the war ended endeavoured to take them home to America, but because not everyone approved of these relationships, numerous young women left the country without informing their families. From a British perspective, not only had the Americans been the highest paid soldiers in the world, which they made no attempt to conceal, they had also made family life increasingly difficult for many, particularly following their departure, which when coupled with post war conditions and low morale, contributed to a growing dislike for America in general.

Although there were some isolated examples of sporting defeats experienced by the United States, American athletes continued to fare much better than Britain, which only led to further criticism in the press. With regards to tennis it was argued that it 'is more poverty stricken than ever before. The complete annihilation of our Davis Cup team in Paris last summer was humiliating.'³³ Wimbledon, the much cherished home-grown competition, had now descended into a 'foreign-dominated championship' and it was realised that the 'Perry days are but beautiful memories for British tennis and that Wimbledon titles have been added to the long list of extravaganza for exports only.'³⁴ It was clear that the very public defeats being suffered by British international sportsmen were less than satisfying for the British sporting public,

²⁹ Frank Butler, 'Baksi Turns Down £25,000 Fight', *Daily Express*, April 17, 1947, 6; Frank Butler, 'British Boxing Takes Another Blow', *Daily Express*, June 4, 1947, 6.

³⁰ Mackay, *Test of War*, 136.

³¹ War Department Washington, *Instructions for American Servicemen in Britain 1942* (Washington DC: War Department, 1942; Bodleian Library: University of Oxford, 2004), 6. Citations are to the University of Oxford edition.

³² Mackay, *Test of War*, 170; Gardiner, *Wartime Britain*, 84.

³³ John Macadam, 'Britain's Failures Make Us Tired', *Daily Express*, February 6, 1947, 6.

³⁴ Frank Rostorn, 'Wimbledon Goes Wild As Empire Pair Win', *Daily Express*, June 26, 1947, 6; Frank Butler, 'We Don't Like It, Mr Bromwich', *Daily Express*, June 18, 1947, 4.

who were apparently beginning to get 'a little tired of seeing their representatives laid in the dust more times than they are not.'³⁵

In many ways poor sporting results were merely a reflection of what was occurring in society in general. As a result of the war, Britain had suffered a significant drain on resources and was verging on bankruptcy with debts exceeding £3,000 million.³⁶ Shortages were apparent in nearly all aspects of life, which were exacerbated by Prime Minister Clement Attlee's secret £100 million investment in British atomic bomb development.³⁷ Stephen Lee suggests, that Britain wanted to emerge as a nuclear power because 'she acknowledged her decline on the world scene', something which, since the establishment of the Soviet Union and the United States as new world super powers, had become ever more apparent.³⁸ Loss of productivity and industrial decline, both the result of the residual impacts of the war, were made more evident by the severe winter of 1947. Fuel shortages became widespread and this not only had an impact on export-earning capacity, but also caused a wave of unemployment, which at its peak had reached 800,000.³⁹ Although the introduction of a welfare system had signified positive progress, shortly after the introduction of the National Health Service in 1948 it was clear that Britain was not equipped to cope with the escalating costs of welfare and a number of cutbacks were quickly introduced.⁴⁰ However, it was the fall of the Empire which signified, perhaps more than anything else, that Britain had entered a period of significant decline. Following the war, it had become clear that Britain would be unable to retain its position of authority, so the government initiated a process of decolonisation, which saw Britain grant independence to all its major colonies, beginning with India in 1947.⁴¹

Whilst it was recognised that British economic and imperial decline would have inevitably impacted on sporting performances, there appeared to be a tendency to attribute all sporting failures to the war and its aftermath, to the extent that other factors failed to be acknowledged.⁴² Such an attitude disguised significant deficiencies in the British sport system, particularly those caused by the intransigence of amateurism, such as coaching and quality of training. It was also a common belief that Britain had suffered the greatest impact as a result of the war. However, the reality was that other countries, particularly France, had actually suffered a much more considerable drain on resources and yet were still achieving success in sport and beating Britain in the process. Even so, British sporting administrators still felt that they had little

³⁵ John Macadam, 'Britain's Failures Make Us Tired', *Daily Express*, February 6, 1947, 6.

³⁶ Arthur Marwick, *British Society since 1945: The Penguin Social History of Britain* (London: Penguin Books, 1990), 14.

³⁷ John Saville, 'C. R. Attlee: An Assessment', *Socialist Register* 20 (1983): 163.

³⁸ Stephen J. Lee, *Aspects of British Political History, 1914-1995* (London: Routledge, 1996), 13.

³⁹ Marwick, *British Society since 1945*, 15; Maurice W. Kirby, *The Decline of British Economic Power since 1870* (Oxon: Routledge, 2006), 100.

⁴⁰ Bernard Harris, *The Origins of the British Welfare State: Social Welfare in England and Wales 1800-1945* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 100.

⁴¹ Pugh, *State and Society*, 314-5.

⁴² Baker, 'Sport and National Prestige', 86.

to learn from individuals overseas and the suggestion to import foreign coaches was quickly rejected. Leading athletics coach, F. A. M. Webster, commented in *The Times*,

The suggestion has now been made that we must employ foreign coaches. But why? We have the material and the men to handle it. No department of national life stands alone, and we shall lose more in prestige than we might possibly gain in performance by going hat in hand to some foreign country for a so-called expert.⁴³

As Norman Baker notes, there was still this belief that as the originators of modern sports, the British were the 'teachers not the students.' Britain would remain true to the virtues of amateurism, especially playing by the rules, even when there was increasing evidence that other nations, particularly America, were taking sport seriously.⁴⁴ The British interpretation of this rigorous approach was that it would inevitably lead to athletes being willing to cheat to achieve success while their own approach would lead to athletes being respected for retaining respect for the amateur ethos. One press report, commenting on the British defeat by the Americans' at the Walker Cup in 1947, suggested that it was 'very sad' but Britain could remain safe in the knowledge that they had played the game in the intended way, unlike the Americans.⁴⁵

Although the traditionalists had a desire to remain true to the virtues of amateurism, it was becoming clear that a proportion of the British public wanted an improvement in sporting performance and so changes needed to be made. The *Daily Express* argued that Britain 'must stop playing games' if they wanted to attain anything like their former standards of performance. Simply turning up to golf courses and sporting grounds and 'playing at it' was no longer enough to guarantee success. The British professional golfer, in particular, had a tendency to 'arrive by car, look into his shop, look over the names of those members who may want a game, and, if there is nobody good enough for him, he steps into his car and drives off again.' Although there had been a time in which this casual approach had been sufficient to ensure victory, all these athletes were doing was 'deluding themselves that they can compete internationally.'⁴⁶ It was now apparent that if individuals wished to succeed in the demanding world of sport, then not only would they require regular training and some form of coaching, but they also needed a 'keenness' and 'impudent confidence', something it was argued, that was 'entirely lacking amongst the Englishman.'⁴⁷ James Rivers concluded,

⁴³ F A M. Webster 'The Olympic Games', *The Times*, July 1, 1946, 5.

⁴⁴ Baker, 'Sport and National Prestige', 86.

⁴⁵ 'U.S Regain the Walker Cup', *The Times*, May 19, 1947, 2.

⁴⁶ John Macadam, 'We Must Stop Playing Games', *Daily Express*, November 10, 1947, 4.

⁴⁷ 'Fourth Test Match Prospects', *The Times*, January 30, 1947, 2.

For years Britain ruled the world at many sports. In more recent history there have been countless examples of the pupils outplaying the masters. Our stock attitude to this development has been one of complacency; our favourite phrase: "The game's the thing." So the first requisite of our plan must be a radical change of attitude, the inculcation of a new national idea that if a game is worth playing it is worth playing well... We have a glorious past, but let us not make the mistake of dwelling in it, and so ignoring the great task which lies ahead.⁴⁸

Echoes of post-1912 Stockholm debates could be heard when it was suggested, if British sport could not adapt to the modern requirements of competing and make the best possible showing then it was time to 'get-out' of international sport altogether.⁴⁹ Perhaps prompted by these calls to improve the quality of British athletes, and encouraged by their previous attempts to develop coaching schemes, two sports in particular, athletics and swimming, began to make preparations to develop and improve the quality of coaching available to British athletes.

Post-1945 Coaching Scheme Developments

Athletics

In April 1946, discussions began within a number of Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) Committees regarding the possibility of creating a suitable national coaching scheme for British athletics. Encouraged by this, Lt Col Roland Harper, with the help of the newly formed Coaching Committee, began to develop ideas for a potential scheme, which included a suggestion for the appointment of a professional coach, and this was circulated to members of the AAA in September 1946.⁵⁰ The 'Development Committee', of which Harold Abrahams was chairman, was satisfied with the proposals and made suggestions 'regarding the appointment of a professional coach.'⁵¹ They recommended that Major Geoffrey Dyson be 'tentatively approached' regarding the position and that he be offered a two year contract at a salary of £700 for the first year which would then rise to £750 in the second. If he was not available it was suggested that the AAA should look to approach Austrian coach Hoke, and failing him, look to re-appoint Franz Stampfl. However, Dyson was satisfied with the terms of employment and consequently, in February 1947, with the aid of a £522 donation from the *News of the World* (not a Ministry of Education grant, which is the common

⁴⁸ Geoffrey Cousins, 'Golf', in *Sports Book 2: Britain's Prospects*, 188.

⁴⁹ John Macadam, 'We Must Stop Playing Games', *Daily Express*, November 10, 1947, 4.

⁵⁰ Amateur Athletic Association, Development Committee Minutes, April 27, July 27, 1946, File 1/2/10, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁵¹ Amateur Athletic Association, Development Committee Minutes, October 12, 1946, File 1/2/10, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

misconception) they were able to provisionally appoint Dyson for two years.⁵² The AAA were happy with their appointment, and it would appear their judgement of his qualities as a coach were correct considering that he would later be repeatedly credited with the success of the coaching scheme and for, 'laying its foundations.'⁵³ However, initial satisfaction over their appointment would soon alter as conflict began to emerge between Dyson and AAA officials, primarily over the implications of amateurism.

Dyson's duties included, taking charge of the AAA coaching courses, co-ordinating the work of the AAA honorary coaches for the whole of Britain, and acting as chief coach at the yearly Loughborough Summer School.⁵⁴ It should be noted that, although it was not stipulated that the duties of the national coach included the coaching of elite athletes, it was clear, initially at least, that this was to be one focus of his work since it had been a prerequisite of the donation from the *News of the World*. The AAA were only able to consider appointing a coach because of the significant contribution from the *News of the World* (who organised both the British Games in 1946 and various other athletics meetings). But this financial backing had been 'specifically given for the purpose of employing a coach or coaches to help towards development for the Olympic Games 1948.'⁵⁵ In a somewhat uncharacteristic disclosure, the amateur officials of the AAA commented:

We realise that it is impossible to accomplish much in the way of producing first class athletes in such a short space of time for 1948, but a start has been made along these lines, not so much with the idea of producing world beaters, although we are keen to hold our own from a prestige angle.⁵⁶

It is apparent, that although amateurism was still highly valued within the AAA, the loss of prestige as a result of repeated defeats, particularly by American athletes, had begun to leave its impression. They would not directly contravene the ethos of amateurism, but they might be willing to compromise on certain areas. Perhaps this signalled one of the many shifts in the definition of amateurism which is highlighted in the opening of this thesis, whereby 'amateurism was a state of mind, its rhetoric ever changing to justify itself.'⁵⁷ As part of this new approach to coaching, the appointed professional coach could be 'loaned to Oxford and Cambridge' at a charge of £10 per week to train individual athletes. The use of professional

⁵² Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, January 27, 1949, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; E J. Holt to Colonel Parker, March 5, 1947, File ED 169/30, Ministry of Education and Department of Education and Science Collection: Amateur Athletic Association-Coaching 1947-55, National Archives, Kew (hereafter cited as MoE Collection: AAA, NA); Amateur Athletic Association, National Coaches General Policy, 1, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA; £522 in 1947 would be the equivalent of £16,061.94 in 2012. Information gathered from <http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-1633409/Historic-inflation-calculator-value-money-changed-1900.html>

⁵³ Lovesey, *Official Centenary*, 122.

⁵⁴ Amateur Athletic Association, Development Committee Minutes, October 12, December 7, 1946, File 1/2/10, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁵⁵ E J. Holt to Colonel Parker, March 5, 1947, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ Carter, 'From Knox to Dyson', 60.

coaches to train athletes at Oxford and Cambridge was actually nothing new, since both Alec Nelson and Bill Thomas had been heavily involved in coaching duties during the 1920s and 1930s.⁵⁸ It seems, therefore, that although the AAA may have compromised on some of their principles regarding amateurism, the developments which occurred as result were not particularly advanced, even in Britain.

As time progressed, it was becoming increasingly evident that not only was the workload which had been delegated to Dyson far too demanding for just one individual but they were also struggling to pay his salary and so the AAA began to explore other options to expand their coaching scheme.⁵⁹ Fortunately for the AAA, prior to the end of the war there had been significant, albeit inadvertent advances, most notably the 1944 Education Act, a by-product of the Beveridge Report, which had led to the development of the Ministry of Education, that would offer them the opportunity to gain the support they required.⁶⁰ The newly formed Ministry took control of the 1937-9 NFC Grants Committee, and part of their remit was to provide financial support to sporting associations so that a national coaching scheme could be developed. Despite the availability of grants to enable the AAA to appoint further coaches, the AAA initially decided that the need for equipment was of greater importance, and so their first bid to the Ministry consisted of a request for £3,000 for javelins, discus, hurdles and other implements.⁶¹ This reinforces the low esteem afforded to coaching in Britain at the time, because although there were a number of honorary coaches already in place, the number of professional coaches was limited. But despite this, the acquisition of equipment was being prioritised above employing more coaches. As Britain's failure in international sport had been repeatedly attributed to poor facilities and lack of equipment (rather than the restrictions of amateurism) it would appear that as soon as the money was available to remedy this, the AAA took the opportunity. But without a solid coaching foundation and the correct organisational structures, it was unlikely that simply supplying equipment to clubs and athletes would improve the quality of British athletics, but this was the typical 'side-ways' looking approach often taken by the AAA.⁶²

The second application was sent to the Ministry in August 1947 in hope of obtaining a grant for 80 per cent of the cost of the salary of three national coaches. When the grant was awarded, it provided the coaching scheme with the opportunity for 'wider significance and much greater possibilities of expansion.'⁶³ However, both the grant, and the opportunity to work in co-ordination with the Ministry, came with conditions. The Ministry had to approve the AAA's coaching appointments and the majority of the coaches' time would be 'devoted to the training of teachers, organisers and club coaches', or as Peter Lovesey

⁵⁸ Oxford University Athletic Club, Committee Meeting, October 16, 1928, Oxford University Athletic Club Archives, Oxford (hereafter cited as OUAC Archives).

⁵⁹ E H L. Clynes to Ministry of Education, August 25, 1947, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁶⁰ Department of Education, Education Act, 1944, 7 & 8 Geo. 6, c. 31, section 53, 43.

⁶¹ AAA to Ministry of Education, July 3, 1947, File ED 169/29, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁶² 'Olympic Games', *The Times*, August 13, 1952, 5.

⁶³ Amateur Athletic Association, National Coaches General Policy, 1, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

describes it, 'coaching the *coaches*' and teaching the teachers.⁶⁴ As the Ministry also requested six-weekly reports of the work undertaken by the national coaches, it was clear they were being closely monitored. The AAA were not in a particularly good financial position, and so decided to use the grant of one of the salaries to pay a proportion of Dyson's wages, which meant that his role would now be required to meet the Ministry's stipulations. Thus, the original intention of Dyson's employment, which was to prepare the 1948 Olympic squad, now became obsolete because the Ministry's coaching scheme was not established to 'polish up a few stars', but rather to disseminate a good knowledge of coaching and athletics around Britain.⁶⁵ When Dyson subsequently trained Maureen Gardner to a silver medal in the 80m hurdles at the 1948 Games, he did so on a voluntary basis. With the remainder of the grant money, Tony Chapman and Dennis Watts were appointed in September 1947 and 1948 respectively, although Chapman resigned in 1949 'to take up a similar appointment in another country at a better salary.'⁶⁶ Despite the coaching scheme still being in its formative years, coaches were already beginning to feel undervalued, and disputes between coaches and administrators over their value, status and monetary worth would soon become a common characteristic of the coaching scheme.

Encouraged by their successful grant applications, the AAA requested further financial support for additional coaches, and in late 1948 they appointed Allan Malcolm and Jim Alford.⁶⁷ However, despite British sport gradually beginning to build an affinity with coaching, for some it was proving a difficult adjustment. For years it had been acceptable to be a 'good loser' and the 'important thing is taking part and not winning', so the use of a coach had been considered unnecessary.⁶⁸ Now coaches, albeit only a small number, were being appointed on a national scale, some readjustment would be required. However, the traditions of amateurism remained powerful and for some the shift from such an ethos would prove too difficult. Prior to the appointment of Jim Alford, who eventually took up his post for the Welsh AAA, some individuals questioned the need for a coach, even though the money had already been allocated. Mr Ray Thomas of the Welsh AAA 'expressed the doubt of his association as to whether there would be sufficient work to occupy a coach for all the weeks of the year.'⁶⁹

A few of the coaches, like Dyson and Chapman, had been selected because they had previously been connected to the AAA through various coaching circles, but the remainder of the coaches were appointed via job advertisements. It was clear that coaching and training knowledge amongst British individuals was

⁶⁴ Ibid., 4; Lovesey, *Official Centenary*, 122.

⁶⁵ F W. Collins, 'Training of Athletes', *The Times*, August 20, 1948, 5.

⁶⁶ E H L. Clynes to F G. Ward, February 11, 1949, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁶⁷ Amateur Athletic Association, General Committee Minutes, October 20, 1948, File 1/2/2, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, November 13, 1948, 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, January 1, January 27, April 21, 1949, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁶⁸ John Disley, 'Reflections on Soviet Sport', *Physical Recreation*, no. 1 (1956): 71.

⁶⁹ Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, August 26, 1948, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

limited, because when discussing applicants for the role of national coach, the AAA commented that 'none of them possessed outstanding qualifications for the post.'⁷⁰ However, a lack of expertise was to be expected since Britain, unlike other nations, did not yet have a system of wide-spread coaching. In order to be a successful coach, an expert technical knowledge is required which demands a professional approach and a willingness to commit a substantial amount of time and finance. The environment created during a time when sport was controlled by a 'committee of part-time officials' was not conducive to the development of coaching proficiency, so it is unsurprising that coaches such as Watts, Malcolm and Alford did not initially possess a comprehensive knowledge of successful coaching techniques.⁷¹

Although the original intention of Dyson's coaching role had been to train Olympic athletes, now that his salary was partially controlled by the Ministry, this was not his primary responsibility. Nevertheless, it was clear that some individuals could see the potential advantages of utilising the national coaches to train active athletes, and it was suggested that a small proportion of their time should be devoted to this. However, far from promoting the development of a system which could benefit both coach and athlete, the honorary secretary of the AAA promptly dismissed the suggestion, arguing that their roles needed to be kept in perspective and 'that the employment is to be mainly to teach coaches and teachers.'⁷² Fear of reprisals from the Ministry was regularly used as a reason for not supporting the use of the national coaches to train elite athletes, but the AAA never appeared to question the Ministry regarding such a matter so it seems that they were quite content with such an arrangement. For amateur officials, this ensured that the work of the national coaches would remain "amateur" but without giving the appearance that they were insisting on this approach. However, the success of Gardener at the 1948 Olympics, who had been given voluntary training by Dyson, influenced this school of thinking. Following the 1948 Games, there appears to have been a greater degree of flexibility regarding the coaching of promising athletes, but this was only to be allowed on the proviso that the coach's role was to be kept in perspective.

Swimming

In November 1946, the ASA appealed to the Ministry for financial support, not so they could appoint professional coaches, but so they could 'develop courses of instruction in swimming for youth leaders and organisers' in order to expand the ASA Teachers Certificate. In addition, because the ASA was in such a 'parlous state financially' following the war, it was hoped financial support would be forthcoming for the

⁷⁰ Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, December 20, 1947, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁷¹ Lovesey, *Official Centenary*, 122.

⁷² Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, March 9, 1948, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

'provision of clerical assistance.'⁷³ Although the Ministry sympathised with the ASA's situation, they were unable to provide this kind of monetary assistance because the capacity in which they could support was 'essentially in the direction of coaching personnel.'⁷⁴ However the ASA Committee, in particular Alderman Fern, were not satisfied with this response, and Fern stated that he was 'seriously thinking of giving up the work connected with the ASA Teacher Certificate' because he did not feel 'warranted' to spend so much of his own money on such a cause. He hoped he would not have to 'give up a life of work' but the Ministry was making it difficult to see any other option.⁷⁵ This type of outburst by Fern was nothing new, as can be seen from his previous behaviour in 1937 involving the NFC Committee. However this time, unlike the last, the Ministry were not willing to compromise. Although as a form of compensation they were willing to offer the ASA, as they had with every other sport, 80 per cent of the salaries for three to four coaches. Considering the ASA had not requested this and the Ministry had not been willing to support their previous proposal, it is unsurprising the ASA were not particularly receptive to the offer. They claimed they were not 'in a position financially to take advantage of it' because unlike other amateur organisations, they were unable to raise their own income from events and 'meets' as there was not a pool in the country that was suitable.⁷⁶ They thanked the Ministry for their offer but decided to reject it, urging them to re-consider the matter in the future.⁷⁷ Considering the ASA did not submit another request for grant aid for coaching until almost ten years later when they were looking to appoint Bert Kinnear, it seems the Ministry were not prepared to compromise on the type of support they were willing to give.

Although the ASA had not requested financial assistance from the Ministry for the employment of coaches they were still aware that some amount of coaching and training was required if British swimmers were to represent the ASA in a positive light. Prior to their grant rejection from the Ministry, the ASA had initiated a national appeal which was placed in the *Swimming Times* in order to raise monies to enable the British swimmers to make 'an adequate contribution' to the 1948 London Games. It was claimed that 'six years of war and no income have left the Association very impoverished' and the only way they could produce a 'worthy team' was through donations and fundraising from swimming clubs around the country.⁷⁸ Similar to the rationale behind Dyson's early employment, the national appeal had been initiated so that British swimmers would be fully prepared for the impending Games. However, the training of Olympic athletes was to be kept in perspective. Although it was accepted that athletes must prepare for the Games, the scheme would remain true to the amateur ethos and it was imperative that this 'training must not take

⁷³ A H E. Fern to Colonel Parker, November 23, 1946, File ED 169/70, Ministry of Education and Department of Education and Science Collection: Amateur Swimming Association 1946-63, National Archives, Kew (hereafter as MoE Collection: ASA, NA).

⁷⁴ Ministry of Education to A H E. Fern, November 29, 1947, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁷⁵ A H E. Fern to Colonel Parker, September 15, 1948, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁷⁶ A H E. Fern to Colonel Parker, October 15, 1947, File 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA; R B. Martin to G W. Hedley, December 13, 1947, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁷⁷ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1947-Committee Minutes, March 8, 1947, 17, ASA Headquarters.

⁷⁸ 'National Appeal', *Swimming Times*, June, 1946, 5.

precedence over the training of school children.⁷⁹ In 1946, at the first ASA meeting since 1939, it was declared that £2,000 had already been raised through the national appeal, but if a 'comprehensive training scheme' was to be inaugurated then a further £4,000 was required.⁸⁰ The appeal continued and a decision was taken to appoint Harry Koskie as 'Chief Swimming Advisor' (note how he was not referred to as a 'coach') to make periodical visits to each district for the purpose of 'seeing trainees in action', and to discuss training with various coaches. Preparations also involved providing training facilities in 1947 and 1948 at 'Summer Camps', which would eventually become the 'Advanced Swimming and Coaching Course' at Loughborough College.⁸¹ However, unlike the AAA, the ASA had raised enough funds to pay Koskie's salary themselves and, therefore, they did not require further assistance from the Ministry. Although this meant that only one 'advisor' could be appointed, because Koskie was not controlled by the conditions of the Ministry grant, the ASA were able to continue to use Koskie's coaching abilities as they had initially intended, and that was to coach potential Olympic athletes. As a result, resources began to be funnelled towards the preparation of British Olympic swimmers in order to make the best showing possible, and shortly after his appointment, Koskie addressed the Olympic hopefuls. Koskie's coaching and training knowledge was significant and it was clear he had an understanding of the dangers of overtraining, even if it was not referred to as such. He suggested that competitors 'in their own and the nation's interest' should refrain from participating in exhibition swims because the involvement of 'long and tiring journeys and loss of sleep' could inadvertently impact on the swimmers' physical state. He went further to suggest that 'swimmers who wish to attain the highest honours should be prepared to accept reasonable guidance.'⁸² These statements appear somewhat ambiguous, it is not clear whether it was said to reassure athletes they would receive the support they required, or to prepare athletes to accept some amount of coaching. For each athlete who wanted some form of coaching there was probably another who was wary of allowing a coach to 'tamper' with their training. Nevertheless, it was obvious that with the assistance of Harry Koskie, the ASA were beginning to address the coaching and training issues within British swimming.

The 'First Special Course' was held at Loughborough College for two weeks in August 1947. Forty-seven swimmers and seven coaches who had been recommended by Koskie were invited to attend by the ASA. Max Madders, once an international swimmer and now a lecturer in Physical Education at Birmingham University, had been persuaded to contribute to the course by organising sessions and talks on the benefits of physical and relaxation exercises.⁸³ Although the intentions of the course were good, and

⁷⁹ *Evening Sentinel*, March 11, 1946, 4.

⁸⁰ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1946-'ASA National Appeal', 5, ASA Headquarters.

⁸¹ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1946-'Interim Report of English Members of the Olympic Games (1948) Management Committee', 18, ASA Headquarters.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1947-'First Special Training Course Loughborough College, August 2-16, 1947', 35, ASA Headquarters.

this was the first course of its kind in British swimming, because the course was held at Loughborough, pool time was extremely limited and on average each swimmer would only be in the water for approximately two hours a day.⁸⁴ However, it would appear that water fitness was not the primary objective from Koskie's perspective; he had recognised the benefits of creating a good rapport between the Olympic hopefuls which could then be successfully utilised during the Games. Methods of building team spirit were to constitute a 'special feature' of the course, something which Koskie confessed he was 'fanatical' about. The programme received good publicity thanks to the initiative of Koskie in inviting the BBC to attend and this certainly raised the profile of British swimming, which was undoubtedly Koskie's intention. In his final observations, Koskie commented on the potential benefits of the whole Olympic team training together for one month prior to the Games, but he went on to explain 'as we are all amateur, I realise this cannot be considered but it also does not prevent one from wishing it was possible to complete the job.' It was obvious to Koskie, the amateur ruling had a restrictive impact on the quality and possible achievements of British swimming. Whether because of his frustrations or because of a desire to direct his attention elsewhere, Koskie, while stating that without question a Loughborough school should be held every year as it 'could not fail to raise the standard of British swimming', requested that he 'not be invited to be responsible.'⁸⁵

The second Loughborough Summer School was held in March 1948, and made up the final part of Koskie's two year plan to prepare Olympic hopefuls for the London Games. This course compared with the previous one, aligned itself more closely with some scientific principles (Loughborough is discussed in detail in chapter nine). Dr Richard Bolton, from Birmingham University, examined every swimmer on the course and monitored them for the duration. Max Madders was again in attendance, this time offering physiotherapy to the swimmers. There appeared to be great deal of variation in the amount of science that was incorporated in the first two Loughborough Summer Schools. However, compared to the sports science and training occurring in other nations at the time, it could be considered fairly basic, and rather than being used to improve performance, it was primarily used to monitor responses to exercise. To guarantee the programme did not appear too professional and to ensure it remained in keeping with amateur principles, all the individuals who donated their services had done so in an honorary capacity.⁸⁶ One benefit to arise from the course was the opportunity for the ASA to select swimmers for the 1948 Olympic team, including Bert Kinnear (who would go onto be the first National Technical Officer for the ASA). It is safe to assume that he had been in attendance at the first two Summer Schools and this is reminiscent of Dyson's experience since both men attended Loughborough as athletes and then went on to

⁸⁴ Ibid., 36.

⁸⁵ Ibid. 35, 38.

⁸⁶ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1948-'Olympic Games (1948) Preparation 2nd Special Training Course Loughborough College, March 26-April 4, 1948', 29-31, ASA Headquarters.

ensure the further development of the course. Both were probably influenced by their encounters and experiences at Loughborough, Dyson by Webster and Kinnear by Koskie.

Koskie had been appointed as chief swimming advisor in 1946 on the premise that he would gather and condition a group of swimmers to represent Britain at the 1948 Games and 'lay foundations for the future' which would include preparations for Helsinki in 1952.⁸⁷ As Koskie possessed a comprehensive technical swimming knowledge, it might be assumed that part of that role would include selecting the best potential swimmers for the 1948 Olympic squad. However, although the ASA were willing to take his recommendations into consideration, the final decision on who was selected was their responsibility and 'the Committee reserve the right to make such additions or alterations to the list as circumstances demand.'⁸⁸ This is a clear example of the ASA's determination to remain in control of their professional coach. Although they would allow an advisor to 'assist' them, crucial decisions would be managed by them, even though the committee themselves would almost certainly have lacked the expertise of a man like Koskie when making these judgements.

This desire of the administrators to maintain control was common at this time, and comparisons of such instances can be drawn across the sports between both Koskie and Dyson. In 1958 during an interview, Dyson commented that it should become a requirement for the British team coach to be in attendance during team selection because throughout his eleven years of duty this had only occurred on a single occasion. He went further to explain, that apart from one exception at the 1952 Games, the team coach 'had little to say in determining relay running orders' and Dyson saw this as 'most unsatisfactory.' He suggested that the desire of the amateur officials and administrators to remain in control, and the resistance they displayed towards professional coaches, was due to a belief, that if the 'influence of professional coaching increases it will dominate athletics to the detriment of the sport.' However, Dyson claimed that this was an error, and that 'professional coaching seeks no more power than is needed to serve our international athletes efficiently.'⁸⁹ It was obvious that amateur administrators would continue to rule their sport and employ mechanisms to prevent powerful professional coaches from gaining control. Evidence from elsewhere suggests that the hostile environments experienced by Koskie and Dyson were not isolated cases. In 1949, the Oxford University Athletic Club (OUAC) had established the 'need for a full time professional coach' and, based on the advice of the AAA Coaching Committee, they employed John Jeffrey.⁹⁰ He was twenty-two and had qualified at Loughborough College, where he had undoubtedly interacted with, and been influenced by Dyson. Essentially, he was a product of Dyson's teaching and

⁸⁷ Harry Koskie, 'Points to be Pondered No. 19', 1948, ASA Headquarters.

⁸⁸ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1947-Olympic Games (1948) Management Committee Minutes, November 15, 1947, 43, ASA Headquarters.

⁸⁹ John Weatley, 'Experience Tells', *Athletics Weekly*, July, 1958, 2.

⁹⁰ Oxford University Athletic Club, 'Coaching Problems 1949-1950', OUAC Archives.

coaching, and this was inevitably going to be an issue for the OUAC, especially considering how badly Dyson had been received by them in the summer of 1947. (This will be covered in depth in the following chapter). It was noted that after Jeffrey had completed two terms, the 'standard of performances at the top of the OUAC had probably never been much higher.' But the committee were less than satisfied with Jeffrey because his coaching methods were not considered 'the Oxford approach', and 'if given a free hand', he would endeavour to organise training along American lines. There was a fear that if this situation was allowed to continue, and Jeffrey was allowed to become established within the club, that he would be able to manipulate 'officials of the club who are younger and less experienced than him.' To avoid Jeffrey gaining too much influence and to ensure that he realised 'the coach is the advisor to the club and not the controlling brain behind its organisation' restrictions were put in place. With regard to team selection, the president retained 'complete discretion in selecting teams' but could, on occasions, seek consultation from the coach. Jeffrey was not allowed to be a member of the OUAC Committee or attend any Annual General Meetings and he was not to be included in any of the team photos or 'listed amongst the officials of the club.' The lengths to which the OUAC Committee were willing to go to ensure that a coach did not assume any real authority within the club, accentuate how amateurism continued to be valued within the club. This scenario resonated with Dyson's comments about the influence of professional coaching and its relationship to power. There was evidently an underlying fear within the OUAC, that a strong-willed (professional) coach would somehow have the ability to overpower a weak committee and then alter the direction of Oxford athletics, something which they had fought so hard to build and maintain. Despite improving the performance of many OUAC athletes, Jeffrey was viewed as a threat to both the committee and their sporting values and, as a result, he was dealt with accordingly. It is therefore unsurprising that Jeffrey did not stay at the OUAC for long. In 1953 he resigned which was a satisfactory outcome for the OUAC because he had on 'many occasions taken offence' to their decisions and as such was 'not the ideal type of coach' for the club.⁹¹ The committee did recognise however, that 'while lacking the personal understanding of the great coach' he had brought with him a scientific approach which had undoubtedly made the OUAC 'less of a slapdash, haphazard affair.'⁹² Although they were not comfortable with an 'American type' coach like Jeffrey, perhaps the barriers towards specialisation in the sport were gradually being lowered.

In the immediate post-war period, there was a continued assumption that 'amateurism was a more morally superior basis for sport' and so it continued to exert significant influence over certain aspects of British sport, including that of coaching.⁹³ Consequently, the poor sporting results of British athletes in the

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Oxford University Athletic Club, 'The Coach', 1953, OUAC Archives.

⁹³ Baker, 'Whose Hegemony?', 14.

interwar period declined further following the war as other nations began to integrate more sophisticated methods of coaching and training. Initially at least, sport did not rank highly on the government's post-war agenda, but developments put in place before the end of the war would offer some support for British coaching development.⁹⁴ However, the reluctance of the NGBs to relinquish too much of their control to an external body prevented their coaching schemes from developing fully. The following chapter analyses the influence of the coaching schemes on performances achieved at the 1948 Olympics and how the results achieved by one athlete and coach encouraged greater flexibility with regards to coaching.

⁹⁴ Holt and Mason, *Sport in Britain*, 21.

Chapter Four: The 1948 London Games and 'The Father' of British Coaching

The aftermath of war was not conducive to the staging of an Olympic Games and the impact of this austerity surfaced before and during the 1948 Olympics. As a result, a greater emphasis was placed on the successful organisation, rather than the performance of British athletes. This chapter explores the social climate of the London 1948 Olympics, and highlights how attempts were being made to encourage the greater integration of coaching and medicine into British sport. The chapter begins by demonstrating, that although developments at the 1948 Games had the potential to further the relationship between medicine and sport, sports science and medicine still struggled to become established aspects of British sport. The ongoing difficulties experienced by coaches are explored by considering the performances of Maureen Gardener and her coach Geoff Dyson. Although their collaboration encouraged greater provision for the coaching of individual athletes, it failed to radically change the primary aims of the coaching schemes which continued to emphasise the coaching of coaches. Lastly, the chapter examines how the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) coaching schemes continued to develop differently to that of the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA), and while this allowed coach's greater freedom with regards to coaching athletes, administrators remained cautious of giving their coaches too much control.

1948 London Games

Following the many sporting defeats suffered by British competitors after the war, there was a desire to demonstrate that the nation still possessed some credibility in the sporting world and that the lingering amateur tradition had not adversely affected athletic performance, although in reality it undoubtedly had. One of the ways it was hoped to do this was through the staging of the 1948 Olympic Games. The British press and public also hoped that the newly formed national coaching schemes would demonstrate their potential, and help British athletes achieve success. Although not all the national coaches had been directly involved with British elite athletes, there was an underlying optimism amongst many, that because they had travelled the country and educated a large contingent of honorary coaches, these men would then be able to transfer their knowledge to British competitors.

As both the previous scheduled Olympic events, the 1940 Tokyo and 1944 London Games, had been cancelled because of World War II, there was keenness, particularly within the IOC, to restore the Olympic Games as soon as it was feasibly possible.¹ Discussions regarding the 1948 Games had begun in August 1945 at meeting in London between Sigfrid Edström of Sweden, Lord Aberdare of London and Avery Brundage of the USA.² Four American cities, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Minneapolis and Philadelphia made

¹ Peter Beck, 'The British Government and the Olympic Movement: The 1948 London Olympics', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25, no.5 (2008): 617.

² 'Olympic Games Discussions', *Manchester Guardian*, August 21, 1945, 2.

strong claims to stage the Games and received support from Brundage, who believed that, 'London, half destroyed by bombs, will have a lot more important things to do than stage an athletics meeting.'³ Despite a solid case being presented for an American host, particularly Los Angeles, the committee eventually opted for London, concluding that not only had London been awarded the cancelled 1944 Games but also that it would be far too costly for countries to travel to the USA given the tough economic climate which was being faced as a result of the war.⁴ The awarding of the Games to London that closely after the end of the war was seen by some as a 'gift'; London had been crippled as a result of the bombings and it was hoped that the Olympics would go some way to restoring Britain to its former glory.⁵ Norman Baker suggests, that regardless of the circumstances under which London was selected as host, in order to ensure a successful staging of the Games, an 'appearance of normalcy' was required, and this further encouraged a rapid return to the pre-war values of sport.⁶

From the moment it was revealed that London would host the Games, there was wide-spread concern that the impact of the war would affect the staging of the Games. It was generally accepted that it would be a much more modest affair than that seen in Berlin some twelve years earlier, and this was welcomed by many because this would ensure that the connection between political propaganda and the Olympics would be severed, in the short term at least. In addition, it would seem that the British were keen to offset the damage of post-war decline and to resurrect a supposedly glorious sporting past, which due to war and its ramifications, had suffered dramatically.⁷ A correspondent to *The Times* suggested that although British sport had experienced a period of decline in recent years, the Games could provide the perfect opportunity to demonstrate 'on equal terms' that British athletes could hold their own 'in amateur sport with all comers.'⁸ The *Daily Express* commented further that the Olympic Games could be 'decisive not only in the morale of rebuilding of the work weary Britain, but in selling the British idea to the world.'⁹ However, the large amount of reconstruction required following the war, the monetary crisis and the on-going food rationing did not provide the best environment for staging a mega-event such as the Olympics, and as a result, excitement levels amongst the British public were low.¹⁰ There were also fears amongst some that, far from providing an opportunity to display a return to athletic supremacy, the event would actually demonstrate to other countries quite how disastrous the sporting situation in Britain had become. Frank Butler of the *Daily*

³ Avery Brundage, quoted in Janie Hampton, *The Austerity Olympics: When the Games Came to London in 1948* (London: Aurum Press, 2008), 22.

⁴ 'Olympic Games for London', *The Times*, February 15, 1946; Beck, 'The British Government', 617.

⁵ Hampton, *Austerity Olympics*, 22.

⁶ Baker, 'The Amateur Ideal', 100.

⁷ Norman Baker, 'Olympics or Tests: The Disposition of the British Sporting Public, 1948', *Sporting Traditions* 11, no. 1 (1994): 59; 'The Setting of the Games', *The Times*, May 8, 1948, 5.

⁸ Cecil W. Cooke, 'The Olympic Games', *The Times*, June 10, 1946, 5.

⁹ John Macadam, 'Sport Can Sell British Idea', *Daily Express*, May 31, 1948, 4.

¹⁰ Thierry Terret, 'Introduction: Post War Games', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 27, no.6 (2010): 1001.

Express warned that 'something must be done or else the gloomy procession of British defeats since the end of the War will reach the humiliating climax of the Olympics being staged in London without a single British victory.'¹¹ When it became apparent that the number of acceptances to attend the London Olympic Games had reached an all-time high it was comforting that, 'if we do have the lowest winning figure on record we shall at least have the highest entry, which is something.' It was also anticipated that Britain would not suffer the lowest spot on the medal table, not because their athletes would discover some new found sporting success, but purely because Jamaica and Trinidad had accepted invitations to attend the Games.¹²

There was a feeling that a commitment to a 'luxury' such as the Olympic Games was a waste of money, especially when resources were so desperately needed elsewhere.¹³ Although sections of the press continued to express reservations about the staging of the Games, most notably those of Lord Beaverbrook of the *Evening Standard*, who continually called for a withdrawal from organising the Games, for the most part public opinion and the press remained divided on the issue.¹⁴ A poll published by the *Daily Express* reported that supporters for holding the Games had a small majority.¹⁵ It appears that media outlets had not always reflected public opinion accurately, and that regardless of having to contend with a degree of adversity, many citizens could see the potential benefits of the Games; not only in boosting morale but in pulling Britain together to work towards something that could aid recovery following the war.¹⁶ Despite the pessimistic press coverage, and fears from around the world that Britain could not cope with organising the event, on Thursday 29 July 1948, the XIVth Olympiad, subsequently dubbed the 'Austerity Games', got underway.¹⁷

Provisions had been made prior to the Games to ensure that the medical services would be anything but austere. The Organising Committee had agreed that free comprehensive medical support should be available to all officials and athletes, and they were so confident in their ability to provide such a service that they even discouraged other countries from bringing their own doctors.¹⁸ Arthur Porritt (who would go on to be one of the founding members of the British Association of Sport and Medicine in 1952) was appointed as director of the Olympic Medical Services and placed in charge of the medical sub-committee

¹¹ Frank Butler, 'Our Olympic Men Have No Tracks', *Daily Express*, May 23, 1947, 6.

¹² John Macadam, 'Britain Loses Guest Stars', *Daily Express*, October 30, 1947, 4.

¹³ Hampton, *Austerity Olympics*, 23.

¹⁴ 'Transfer of Olympics Opposed by Organising Group', *The New York Times*, September 5, 1947; 'The Setting of the Games', *The Times*, May 8, 1948, 5; Baker, 'Sport and National Prestige', 90.

¹⁵ 'Let's Have the Games- Most Say', *Daily Express*, February 24, 1947, 4.

¹⁶ John Macadam, 'Sport Can Sell British Idea', *Daily Express*, May 31, 1948, 4.

¹⁷ John Macadam, 'Olympics Day', *Daily Express*, July 29, 1948, 2.

¹⁸ British Olympic Committee, *The Official Report of the Organising Committee for the XIV Olympiad* (London: Organising Committee for the XIV Olympiad, 1948), 180; Roger Bannister, in *The Development of Sports Medicine in Twentieth-Century Britain: The Transcript of a Witness Seminar Held by the Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL, London, on 29 June 2007*, ed. Lois A. Reynolds and E. M. Tansey (London: Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL, 2009), 44.

which included a number of notable individuals, including Professor Archibald Vivian Hill and Sir Adolphe Abrahams. The committee had been allocated £1000 and set out to provide a variety of medical services at all sports arenas and at the athlete accommodation. It was intended that this provision would include medical officers, nurses, physiotherapists, x-ray facilities, bacteriological examinations, and an 'Olympic hospital' outside the Wembley Arena.¹⁹ The intention was that any injured athlete at the Games would be able to receive the medical attention they required without travelling any great distance. On evaluation of the scheme at the completion of the Games, the Organising Committee commented that 'in general the medical services worked smoothly and, although...ample cover was provided at all points, at no time was any real strain thrown on the organisation.'²⁰ However, previously unpublished responses to medical questionnaires, sent out in 2001 by Dr Malcolm Bottomley to surviving pre-war and immediate post-war athletes, do not appear to fully support this positive appraisal of medical provision at the Games. The intention of the questionnaires was to establish how the athletes were affected by injury and what sort of medical support was available. One athlete commented that she had never met any of the team doctors and she was not aware of any medical provision being made available at the Games. The only medical contact she had had throughout her athletic career was with her own doctor in order to get a certificate to prove she was female. Another athlete remarked he was not conscious that doctors were available for treatment, but explained that if he had any serious medical problems he would ask his mother for advice as she had taught him how to 'live a normal clean life' consisting of no smoking, no drinking and plenty of rest.²¹ Of the thirty responses received, the general consensus was that athletes had been unaware of medical support at the Olympics and that if treatment was received either at the Games, or throughout their athletic careers, it was via personal contacts. Roger Bannister referred to the 'old-nineteenth-century masseur, or rubber' being commonplace in athletics before the war, and this seems to have also applied in 1948 since a number of these respondents mentioned an individual called Micky Mays.²² One respondent commented that he was 'untrained' but still attached to the team and noted that, he 'treated all the famous athletes of my time in a tiny room in a council house.'²³

Once the Games had begun it became apparent that visiting nations, in particular the United States, were surprised by the severity of post-war austerity. Clifford Bourland, American 4x400m gold medallist, recalled that 'they still had rationing for everything including meals. You could only have one meal in a restaurant. I remember that distinctly because I was hungry and I had to go to a second restaurant to get

¹⁹ British Olympic Committee, *Official Report XIV Olympiad*, 181.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 185.

²¹ Confidential Enquiry Conducted by Malcolm Bottomley, 'A Modern History of Sports Medicine: Athlete Questionnaire', September, 2001.

²² Bannister, in *Development of Sports Medicine*, 44.

²³ Malcolm Bottomley, 'Sports Medicine: Athlete Questionnaire'.

enough to eat.²⁴ Despite Britain's efforts to provide all the essentials under the difficult organisational circumstances it would appear that some American coaches had to improvise with what was available. Melvin Patton who went on to win gold in the 200m and 4x100m relay for the United States, explained that while travelling on the Underground in and out of London, athletes were made to stand. The American coaches believed that this may have been detrimental to performance and so they chartered buses to create a shuttle service between the arena and the housing at Uxbridge.²⁵ Although criticism of the Games was to be expected considering the climate in which they were required to function, negative comments from the Americans were not well received. The resentment from the war remained, but it was also the way in which the American team had approached the Games that caused a particular issue with many in Britain. While visiting teams had been encouraged to bring their own food in order to reduce the burden on Britain, the actions of the Americans were seen as unnecessary. They imported over 15,000 chocolate bars and 5,000 steaks, and they arranged daily flights from Los Angeles to RAF Uxbridge to provide enriched white flour and fresh fruit, most of which had not been seen in Britain since 1939.²⁶ These initiatives were resented in Britain, where American complaints were construed as an attempt to demonstrate American superiority by emphasising how much Britain was struggling in the post-war period.

However, criticisms regarding the Games were not isolated to the American team. The British swim team, who had initiated comprehensive training and coaching in order to prepare for the Games, argued that the accommodation and training facilities available had prevented these developments achieving their potential. In his post-Games analysis, Koskie commented, that although he appreciated that the Olympic Games Organising Committee were 'faced with the problems' of post-war austerity he believed that the preparation and availability of resources were 'in some respects, unsatisfactory.'²⁷ Even though he accepted that it was 'customary to segregate' the sexes when housing Olympic competitors he 'greatly deplored' a separation of seventeen miles, an arrangement which he suggested had reversed the team spirit that he had fought so hard to build.²⁸ The distance between the two groups prevented them training together in the final stages before the Games, and as a result, it had become the responsibility of the female chaperones to prepare the women's team. In addition, despite the male swimmers being able to train with Koskie, they faced great difficulty in organising training swims. An arrangement had been made with Uxbridge Pool, but because this facility was privately owned, the result of favourable weather during

²⁴ Clifford Bourland, interview by Margaret Costa, December, 1999, The Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles Collection, www.la84foundation.org/6oic/OralHistory/OHbourland3.pdf (accessed June 26, 2012).

²⁵ Melvin Patton, interview by Margaret Costa, December, 1999, The Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles Collection, www.la84foundation.org/6oic/OralHistory/OHpatton.pdf (accessed June 26, 2012).

²⁶ Hampton, *Austerity Olympics*, 75-6.

²⁷ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1948-'Report of the Olympic Games (1948) Management Committee', 28, ASA Headquarters.

²⁸ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1948-'Olympic Games 1948 Hon. Team Manager's Report', 31-2, ASA Headquarters.

the Games was that the pool refused to close their doors to the public and the pool was 'swamped with bathers.'²⁹ Clearly, although British swimming had made an attempt to improve coaching and training provision for its athletes, these developments had been hindered by the post-war climate. Koskie commented that, 'after all the hard work of preparing for the Olympic Games, it will readily be understood just how we all felt about the final set-up.'³⁰ He suggested that these arrangements had taken the 'edge' off the whole team, which was reflected in the results achieved. Although many British swimmers had managed to reach finals, the best placing achieved was a bronze medal. Koskie was far from complacent about these results and his forward thinking attitude allowed him to 'profit from the experience' and 'plan for the future.'³¹ He suggested that arrangements should be made immediately by each District to occasionally bring together their 'best' and 'most promising' young swimmers to train under one chief coach.³² It is interesting to note that such a system is now commonplace across the country, whereby swimmers from local clubs gather together, usually on a weekly basis to train in a squad under a selected coach. Koskie also made recommendations about 'spotting' promising young swimmers, and again, this is now regularly used, although, some sixty years on, it is being argued that talent identification programmes in the UK are still not successfully organised. Bill Furniss comments that the system is 'still pretty poor...they're not as clinical and as ruthless as we like to pretend.'³³ Given that these programmes are still unable to be successfully implemented, even in an environment where money and resources are readily available, Koskie's visions for sport and swimming really were advanced for their time. There is evidence then, that Koskie had the technical knowledge that would allow British swimming to progress, but this would only occur with a shift towards a more formalised and specialised system of sport.

Despite complaints from British and American athletes and coaching staff alike, the general British perception was that the 1948 London Games had been a success, at least from an organisational perspective. This success was not reflected in the number of medals won, however, because as Norman Baker states, the London Games 'had been, athletically, a disappointing Olympics for the British.'³⁴ Emphasis had been placed on the successful organisation of the Games before they had even got underway, and perhaps in an attempt to overshadow the expected poor performances of the British athletes, it was commented,

²⁹ Ibid., 32.

³⁰ Ibid.; Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1948-'Report of the Olympic Games (1948) Management Committee', 28, ASA Headquarters.

³¹ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1948-'Olympic Games 1948 Hon. Team Manager's Report', 33, ASA Headquarters; Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report-'Report of the Olympic Games (1948) Management Committee', 28, ASA Headquarters.

³² Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1948-'Report of the Olympic Games (1948) Management Committee', 28, ASA Headquarters.

³³ Ibid; Bill Furniss, interview by author, March 29, 2011, Nottingham.

³⁴ Baker, 'Sport and National Prestige', 91.

Even if all goes badly for the British competitors and we do not provide a single winner, it will not be by such failure that we shall be in danger of losing what is so often called international prestige in sport. Our success in these Games will be judged primarily by our organisation.³⁵

As the Games were drawing to a close, many press reports appeared to agree with this sentiment. Amateur Britain had not achieved in athletic terms, but as the Games were not about the 'winning but the taking part', positives could be taken from the fact that, they had for the second time, successfully managed to organise the event in a limited amount of time and under difficult circumstances.³⁶ The *Daily Express* praised the efforts of everyone involved stating that 'the great gamble has paid off...a critical world and a half sceptical England can safely say that the first British Games for 40 years is a triumph of performance and organisation.'³⁷ The International Olympic Committee went further to suggest that to undertake such a 'herculean task' given the circumstances, was a 'tremendous undertaking' and that Britain could be proud of what they had achieved, for it had been a truly successful games in terms of organisation.³⁸ Nevertheless, it could not be ignored quite how badly Britain had done in the medal tables, although in traditional British style, excuses were once again made for the poor performances. In the press, failure in the medal tables was repeatedly attributed to poor diet and lack of facilities. The *Daily Express* seemingly pre-empted the poor result of 1948 and argued that 'ever since the war the sporting boys and gals of this hungry island have been hit for six.'³⁹ Far from taking the opportunity to question coaching and training methods, it was argued that the reason British athletes had not achieved was not because they were mediocre but because other nations were improving rapidly. The *Sporting Mirror* commented that 'the world has moved on a stage since Britain taught the rest of the nations a great deal in sport. The pupils have caught up their masters.' However, it was argued that the Olympics were not just about focusing on the winners but appreciating 'the standard achieved by all the competitors.'⁴⁰

There also appeared to be an acceptance in Britain that because the Games had been held so soon after the war, there was never any expectation that British athletes would have regained 'former standards of performance.'⁴¹ On the other hand, there was a belief that advances made in coaching and training prior to the end of the war should have resulted in more medals than twenty-three, of which only three were gold. The potential benefit of increased coaching were highlighted, when it was noted that 'the one athlete who obtained whole time professional coaching broke a world record' and far from suggesting that British

³⁵ 'The Olympic Games: A Test of British Organisation', *Guardian*, March 29, 1948, 4.

³⁶ Coubertin, *Olympism*, 587.

³⁷ Frank Rostron, 'Half-Time: The Gloomy Ones were Wrong' *Daily Express*, August 6, 1948, 2.

³⁸ British Olympic Committee, *Official Report XIV Olympiad*, 106-7.

³⁹ Frank Butler, 'U.S Food Will Stop Olympic "Alibis"', *Daily Express*, January 2, 1948, 4.

⁴⁰ 'Olympic Retrospect', *The Times*, August 18, 1948, 5; 'Our Olympic Section: Away With Your Gloom', *Sporting Mirror*, May 7, 1948, 12.

⁴¹ University of Birmingham, *Britain in World Sport*, 7.

coaches did not have the technical knowledge to produce medallists, it was argued that 'our coaches are as well-equipped in the details of their craft as any foreign land.'⁴² It was becoming increasingly clear, if Britain was to keep pace with countries where professional coaching was commonplace, then some sort of initiative was required. As a result, similar to the responses seen after the poor results at Stockholm, the AAA vowed that 'in the future, some personal instruction will be given.' It was suggested that this would result in a 'much better showing' at the 1952 Games, but it was recognised that these developments would probably not achieve their full potential until 1956.⁴³ There always appeared to be an assumption that any coaching developments would eventually prove their worth on the Olympic stage, but because they were not directly focused on improving athletes, it is unsurprising that this was never the case.

Post-Olympic Games Coaching Developments

Athletics

During, and shortly after the 1948 Games, there was a realisation by the AAA that the one athlete, Maureen Dyson nee Gardener, who had received intensive training, had also achieved success.⁴⁴ It was obvious that Dyson's prediction had been correct when he commented that 'her competitive temperament is excellent. We need to have no fears of her "going to pieces" in the Games.'⁴⁵ Despite Gardener failing to achieve gold in the 80 metre hurdles, she had managed to equal the world record after only one season of hurdling by following a thorough and methodological coaching programme developed by Dyson. During the build up to the Games, Gardener had been training on average four times a week, and although this does not sound particularly strenuous compared to modern training practices, this would have been considered a relatively heavy schedule in 1948. Each training session included a warm-up and cool-down and would work towards a specific aim by minimising faults. Dyson provided Gardener with a set of 'Golden Rules' that he would instil every session, one of which read: 'If there is any question of leaving work out for the day's training, leave out the work you LIKE. Discipline yourself in this way - tackle the not-so-pleasant task - and you will reap your reward the next day.' He had also encouraged her to keep a daily training diary so that he could monitor not only her physical state, but how she was coping mentally.⁴⁶

It was clear to members of the AAA Committee, that the level of personal coaching attention provided to Gardener had made her more successful than if she had trained alone, and that there were many similar athletes 'not receiving the assistance from a coach who is qualified to coach them up to international

⁴² F W. Collins, 'Training of Athletes', *The Times*, August 20, 1948, 5.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Judith Rawlins (nee Dyson), in discussion with author, August 11, 2011.

⁴⁵ Geoffrey Dyson, Maureen's Training Programme-Situation at the End of 1947, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

standard.⁴⁷ In November 1948, a scheme entitled 'Coaching Active Athletes for International Competition' was proposed, and this was initiated in January 1949.⁴⁸ The purpose of the scheme was to 'provide coaching or advice for athletes who show promise of reaching international standard', and although there was some initial hesitation from both members of the AAA and the Ministry, it was tentatively approved, provided that it could be ensured that no more than one-third of the national coach's workload would be devoted to coaching athletes.⁴⁹ Provisions were made so that each national coach could work with up to eight athletes of 'particular promise, and may coach them over a period of many months or years.'⁵⁰ The remaining athletes (it was established that saturation point of the scheme would be 150 athletes) would be placed with honorary senior coaches and other honorary coaches recommended by the AAA. The AAA Committee wished to make it clear that 'no athlete shall be compelled to join the scheme: he may continue with no coach' and, although they had made allowances to provide support to exceptional athletes, it was obvious that the AAA's main focus remained on the development of a contingent of 'amateur' honorary coaches.⁵¹ They may have been willing to compromise and allow the coaching of athletes, because from their perspective, it was still essentially amateur and the coaches would remain under their control. The programme relied heavily on volunteerism, which had always been a strong pillar of amateurism, and although the national coaches were involved, they would receive no extra money for their work with elite athletes, so they too would be doing it on a voluntary basis. Although initially the scheme only catered for applications from athletes who had placed first, second or third in 'National or Area, Senior or Junior Championships', as it expanded and grew in popularity the AAA were able to consider applications from the top six finishers.⁵² By 1954, the 'Active Athletes' programme had successfully provided assistance to over 250 athletes and a review of the 'long term efficacy of the scheme proved that it remained effective in about 75% of cases.'⁵³

However, although the Ministry had authorised the national coaches to work with athletes, they continued to carefully monitor the programme, and as the scheme expanded, the Ministry began to regard it with a degree of suspicion because they felt the main purpose of their grant aid was 'being overlooked.' Although they could see the benefit of the national coaches working with elite athletes, they regarded 'this side of the work as incidental to the main function of the coaches.' The Ministry were 'a little concerned that

⁴⁷ Amateur Athletic Association, 'Coaching Bulletin', May, 1949, 23, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁴⁸ Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, November 13, 1948, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; Amateur Athletic Association, 'Coaching Bulletin', May, 1949, 24, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁴⁹ Ministry of Education, Minute Sheet bo5a/46, March 5, 1955, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁵⁰ Amateur Athletic Association, 'National Coaches General Policy', 6, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁵¹ Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, November 13, 1948, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁵² Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, January 1, 1954, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁵³ *Ibid.*; Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, August 19, 1956, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

employment in other fields may possibly interfere with their full use in being available for the work which they are primarily appointed.⁵⁴ The AAA assured them that the coaching of athletes consisted of no more than one-third of the national coach's work and the reports sent to the Ministry confirmed this. Somewhat reluctantly, the Ministry allowed the scheme to continue, but now the AAA were aware of how the Ministry regarded such a programme, it may have made them more cautious about developing the scheme further.

Dyson played a significant role in the success of Gardener at the 1948 Olympics and it was because of this performance that administrators even gave consideration to allow the national coaches to work with individual athletes. Tom McNab suggests that Dyson had to battle with the administrators in order to gain access to athletes and it was because of him that this became an established, albeit small aspect of the national coaching role.⁵⁵ Dyson was the leading coach during this period and continued to influence the sport until his resignation in 1961. The following section presents a short biography of his life, because while it is accepted that the trajectory of British coaching traditions and amateurism cannot be summarised by analysing one individual, as Dyson has more recently been labelled as the 'father of modern British athletics coaching' an exploration of his life course is deemed appropriate at this stage.⁵⁶

Geoff Dyson 'The Father' of British Coaching

'You have heard a lot about playing for the game's sake, that winning does not matter but my advice to you is to PLAY TO WIN with every fibre of your being.'⁵⁷

Major Geoffrey Harry George Dyson was born on 22 June 1914 in Camberwell, London and raised in Croydon where he attended Croydon British School. It was here that his passion for sport developed and he regularly represented his school at football, cricket and hurdling. Despite his eagerness at school, his home life was far from settled; he had never forged good relationships with his parents and the only person he felt he could rely on was his grandfather. In 1930 at age of fifteen, his life was to become even more difficult as a growing resentment over his mother's affairs and the death of his grandfather (about which he was not told until after the funeral) culminated in him running away from home. Dyson commented, 'things were pretty tough for a while, I sold newspapers, did odd jobs and sometimes slept on the Embankment...It wasn't much fun in the early thirties.'⁵⁸ On 2 March 1931, Dyson falsified his age and enlisted with the Somerset Light Infantry, and perhaps in an attempt to compensate for his lack of education, he undertook extra classes in English, mathematics, geography and map-reading, in which he achieved first-class

⁵⁴ Ministry of Education, Minute Sheet bo5a/46, March 5, 1955, File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁵⁵ McNab, interview.

⁵⁶ Ron Marshall, 'Geoff Dyson', *Glasgow Herald*, February 6, 1981, 23.

⁵⁷ Frank Ross, 'Play to Win', *Daily Graphic*, March 14, 1949.

⁵⁸ Neil Allen, 'Once He Slept on London's Embankment', *World Sports*, Spring 1965, 9, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

honours. He later became a teacher in regimental schools.⁵⁹ In 1933, he had gone to the army stores and requested the use of a high hurdle which he then trained with every day until he achieved his army colours in 1936. Dyson commented that 'choosing a technical event like hurdling and having no coach made me begin to examine the how and why of athletics.'⁶⁰ His success in coaching himself impressed F. A. M. Webster, so much so that when he visited Colchester Garrison where Dyson was stationed in 1934, he had asked his Commanding Officer if he could use Dyson at the first Loughborough Summer School. At the school, Dyson was immersed in athletics and he experienced coaching from some of the most prominent foreign coaches of the time, including Valste, Hoff and Mikkola. He also met many of the British trainers and administrators, and this was probably one of his first meetings with Harold Abrahams. As a result of such encounters, his athletic and coaching ability continued to improve, and in 1937, he recorded 14.9 seconds in the high hurdles, faster than the current Army record but not considered official because he had not achieved it at an Army Championships.

In 1936, while Webster was in the process of establishing the School of Athletics, Games and Physical Education at Loughborough College, Dyson was being transferred to the Army reserves. Webster seized the opportunity to appoint a talented individual who had the potential to become a successful coach and invited Dyson to join staff at Loughborough as chief instructor for athletics. In 1938, after nearly seven years of service in the army, Dyson left to take up the position at Loughborough, and he later commented that he did not miss Army life because he was 'too much of an individualist to enjoy service life fully.'⁶¹ Webster was very satisfied with his appointment and described Dyson as an 'excellent lecturer' and 'very good demonstrator' in both running and field events. Considering the poor standard of British athletics in field events, Dyson's expertise was welcomed, and he later referred to his initial Loughborough appointment as his 'golden days', a time when he 'learnt so much about the coach's art.'⁶² Such an environment also allowed Dyson's own hurdling talent to develop and in 1937, at the AAA Championships, he had come a close second to Don Finlay who had achieved silver at the 1936 Olympics and would go on to win the 1939 European Championships in Berlin. Dyson had the potential to represent Britain at the planned 1940 Olympic Games but on the eve of the AAA Indoor Championships at Wembley, where it was hoped he would achieve his qualifying time, AAA administrators, including Abrahams, had decided that Dyson could no longer be considered an amateur because he had been a lecturer in athletics at Loughborough; from that point on, Dyson the athlete, disassociated himself from the sport and never

⁵⁹ British Army, 'Regular Army: Certificate of Service' 108, Private Collection-Dyson Family; British Army, 'Army Certificate of Education: First Class', October 11, 1933, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁶⁰ Neil Allen, 'Once He Slept on London's Embankment', *World Sports*, Spring 1965, 9, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁶¹ British Army, 'Certificate of Transfer to the Army Reserve', January 7, 1938, Private Collection-Dyson Family; F A M. Webster, 'The Man Who Knows It All', *The Amateur Athlete*, July, 1947, 15, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁶² F A M. Webster, 'The Man Who Knows It All', *The Amateur Athlete*, July, 1947, 15, Private Collection-Dyson Family; Tony Ward, Echoes of Infamy, *Running Magazine*, April, 1987, File HA Box 3, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

hurdled again. There seems little doubt that this incident underpinned subsequent confrontations between Dyson and AAA administrators regarding the professional status and value of British athletes and coaches.

Dyson had been working at Loughborough for eighteen months when Germany made its first aggressive move on the continent, and as he was still on the army reserves list, he was recalled to serve in the war in 1939.⁶³ Webster suggested that the Second World War was the 'making of' Dyson as it allowed him to develop and mature, and he quickly gained a reputation for 'brilliant organisation combined with hard discipline.'⁶⁴ Initially he was deployed in the Garrison at Gibraltar, but soon returned with the rank of Sergeant. Encouraged by the speed of his own progress he applied for a full position in the regular army and was first posted to the Durham Light Infantry and then to the King's African Rifles (KAR).⁶⁵ He was transferred to one of the KAR battle schools in Nakuru, Kenya, where he took up the position of instructor and he gradually progressed to Major in charge of Physical Training. It was Dyson's duty to train and develop men to make them physically and mentally prepared for battle, and he achieved this by establishing a physical training and athletics centre in all the places he served in, Nakuru, Germany, Italy and Austria.⁶⁶ Developing these centres allowed Dyson to continue coaching athletics as part of the generic PT that soldiers were subjected to, and such an experience no doubt went some way to refining and developing his coaching ability which he was then able to transfer to British athletics when he returned in 1945.

On his arrival back to Britain he returned to his post at Loughborough where he began to apply some basic principles of engineering and mechanics (both areas being of keen interest to Dyson) to the movements and actions of athletics. In 1957, Chris Brasher commented that Dyson soon became restless with his Loughborough post because 'he could see the limitations of his job' and he made plans to emigrate to New Zealand.⁶⁷ However, the Coaching Committee of the AAA were in the process of appointing their first national coach and as Dyson was the only Englishman on the list of possibles, he was offered the job and began his duties in February 1947.⁶⁸ Harold Abrahams had supported the appointment of a British coach and was satisfied with the selection of Dyson, because after all they 'certainly did not want an American type demagogic coach.'⁶⁹ However as Tony Ward indicates, while unknown to them at the time, 'this was exactly what they were getting.'⁷⁰ Dyson's first six weeks were spent at Oxford University in an

⁶³ British Army, 'Certificate of Transfer or Re-Transfer to the Army Reserve, Discharge or Disembodiment', August 27, 1939, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁶⁴ F A M. Webster, 'The Man Who Knows It All', *The Amateur Athlete*, July, 1947, 15, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁶⁵ The War Office to Major G H G. Dyson, January 15, 1947, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁶⁶ F A M. Webster, 'The Man Who Knows It All', *The Amateur Athlete*, July, 1947, 15, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁶⁷ Christopher Brasher, 'Dyson of Athletics', *Observer*, November 3, 1957, 23.

⁶⁸ M C. Noakes, 'Report of the Work of the Coaching Sub-Committee since its Appointment', File ED 169/30, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

⁶⁹ Tony Ward, *Echoes of Infamy*, *Running Magazine*, April, 1987, File HA Box 3, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

attempt to improve the standard of University athletics, but his 'ebullient almost aggressive personality came into shattering collision with the traditional Oxford lackadaisical approach to physical exercise.'⁷¹ Tom McNab recalls that during Dyson's first visit to Oxford, one of the lecturers had approached him and warned him 'not to speak to the athletes unless they speak to you first.'⁷² One positive to come out of his Oxford visit, would be the discovery of Maureen Gardner. She had originally trained as a ballet dancer and would commute from Oxford to the Espinosa Ballet School in London on a daily basis, but when she was sixteen she contracted bronchial pneumonia and was no longer able to dance. Whilst recovering from her illness, her father had suggested she take up running in attempt to regain some of her strength. She joined the Oxford Ladies Athletic Club and with the help of Walter Morris, the Oxford Illfey Road grounds-man, soon became an accomplished sprinter. While Dyson was in Oxford he had noticed her training and could see that her potential was in hurdling, not sprinting. He suggested that she should change her event and although she was initially reluctant, soon took up the 80 metre hurdles. Within three months she was national champion and within eighteen she had equalled the World Record and achieved a silver medal at the 1948 Olympics.⁷³ Dyson and Gardener developed a close relationship and soon after the end of the 1948 Games they were married. They went on to have two children, Timothy and Judith, and remained together until Maureen's early death at the age of 45 in 1974.⁷⁴

Dyson had a talent for spotting the potential in athletes and commented that he had two preferences when doing so, 'first, to start them from scratch (it's easier!) and second, to tackle events which the British have previously neglected.'⁷⁵ The majority of his team of 'all-stars' as they became known, which included John Disley, Maureen Gardner, John Savidge, Geoff Elliott and Shirley Cawley, had all been discovered in a similar way to that of Gardner.⁷⁶ Disley, for example, was a promising middle distance runner when Dyson had encountered him at Loughborough in 1947, but Dyson could see that his potential was in the steeplechase and suggested that this is where Disley should be directing his training. Disley took the advice, began to re-focus his training, and at the 1948 Olympics, Dyson offered him his coaching services. Within four years, he had achieved a bronze medal in the steeplechase at the Helsinki Games. Savidge was a similar example of Dyson's ability to spot athletic potential. They had met when Dyson was conducting a course for the Navy in 1949, during which, Dyson had commented that Savidge would sit in the front row of his lectures and 'would stretch out his long legs and get in my way. After one or two near trip-ups I asked him to stand up and up he rose for all of 6ft 7ins.'⁷⁷ Together they raised the profile of

⁷¹ Christopher Brasher, 'Dyson of Athletics', *Observer*, November 3, 1957, 23.

⁷² McNab, interview.

⁷³ 'Ballet Girl for the Olympics', *Picture Post*, May 1, 1948, 22; 'Dyson's Team of Stars', *Picture Post*, August 12, 1950, 27.

⁷⁴ Judith Rawlins (nee Dyson), in discussion with author, August 11, 2011.

⁷⁵ 'Sport Needs Unity', Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁷⁶ 'Dyson's Team of Stars', *Picture Post*, August 12, 1950, 27.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*; 'Sport Needs Unity', Private Collection-Dyson Family.

British shot putt when Savidge achieved 55ft 2ins, making him the first British man to achieve over 50ft. Without Dyson's ability to identify their potential, many of these athletes may not have achieved the feats they did. Dyson commented that, 'even when you have international colours for sprinting you may still be in the wrong event!' and it was his 'coaching eye', which he stated was the ability to differentiate between a 'fundamental movement, a mere idiosyncrasy and a fault', that made him such a developed and accomplished coach.⁷⁸

As well as his 'coach's eye', Dyson's ability as a coach stemmed from his belief that to be successful it required not only a coordinated effort from the coach and the athlete, but also the incorporation of science and alternative methods. Dyson had a constant desire to increase his coaching knowledge, but he was conscious that because Britain was the 'last of the great sporting countries to turn to coaching', in order to improve it would be necessary for him to observe the techniques and methods being used in other nations.⁷⁹ In 1949, Dyson submitted a request to visit Sweden so that he could improve his own knowledge and expertise in the events which the Swedes were considered leading experts. Although the AAA agreed they could see the potential benefit of such a venture, they did not consider they had the 'funds for this purpose at present' and suggested Dyson approach the Ministry in an effort to secure some financial backing. However, the Ministry also claimed that they were unable to provide a grant for such a visit and, as a result, Dyson took it upon himself to write to Swedish governing bodies in an attempt to gain assistance. He successfully secured backing from the Anglo-Swedish Society in London and other Swedish authorities and he was able to visit Sweden during February and March in 1950. The general consensus was that 'great benefit had been brought to the coaching scheme from his visit.'⁸⁰ Without Dyson's initiative, and his realisation that in order to improve personally as a coach he would require guidance from others, then such ventures would never have been instigated, because although they did not prevent such schemes, the AAA were not willing to provide material support.

Encouraged by his interest in foreign methods of coaching, Dyson gradually refined his own knowledge in human movement and engineering and this developed into a vital aspect of his coaching work. He incorporated the use of slow motion 'loop' films in which the movements of an athlete could be projected onto a screen and analysed. He also encouraged his athletes to purchase 'peepscopes' so that they could take Dyson's analysis away with them and study it individually. He believed that once an athlete had the ability to identify their own mistakes using a film, they were more likely to successfully alter the

⁷⁸ Geoffrey Dyson, 'Development of Coaching', *Straits Times*, September 21, 1950.

⁷⁹ Geoffrey Dyson, 'Forty Years on: Some Thoughts on Coaching and Development' (Paper Presented at the International Olympic Academy Nineteenth Session, Olympia, July 6-19, 1979), 210.

⁸⁰ Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, May 6, November 12, 1949, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; Amateur Athletic Association, Report of the Coaching Committee Agenda Item 8, November 12, 1949, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

action. Dyson would also plot the films frame by frame onto a graph so that he could establish the athlete's acceleration and deceleration or the angle of release in shot putt.⁸¹ Another key aspect of his coaching was the use of a wooden model which his athletes affectionately renamed 'His Nibs'.⁸² With the model he was able to demonstrate to the athletes in real time, the correct position they needed to adopt during a particular movement and this ensured that he was successfully able to eradicate errors as soon as they occurred. Dyson believed that 'one can analyse the technique of an athlete with almost mathematical precision' and he began working in collaboration with various universities, in particular Loughborough and Leeds, in order to gain greater understanding and knowledge about motion muscle control and its relationship to respiration. The universities not only assisted him with research but they also monitored American techniques which they would then report to Dyson.⁸³ This dialogue between coaches and universities in Britain is now commonplace, but during the 1950s when Dyson was carrying out such studies, the use of a university to improve athletes would not have been particularly widespread. Sport in America has always been inextricably linked with the universities, and as such, has long had the opportunity to incorporate various methods which otherwise may not have been available. However, prior to the appointment of Dyson as chief coach, the use of such techniques were fairly uncommon, if not non-existent in British athletics. The incorporation of scientific 'foreign' methods was exactly what amateur officials were trying to prevent because this signalled not only a shift towards greater specialisation, but also a potential threat to their level of authority. Professionalisation and the use of science in sport were always going to create difficulties in the AAA and, because it was Dyson who was initiating such actions, it was inevitable that the amateur officials would begin to resent their national coach.

By 1961, the disagreements between Dyson and the administration had reached such levels that he felt compelled to resign from his position. It was suggested that there was 'still too many officials at the top who are jealous of his influence and the authority which his great knowledge gives him' and, until these barriers were broken down, individuals with a coaching vision similar to Dyson would never be welcomed in British sport.⁸⁴ Dyson later commented, 'I don't think that...I made much impression on the British as far as coaching was concerned', but Canada quickly saw the availability of Dyson as an opportunity to further their own standard of performance in international sport.⁸⁵ Following his resignation from the AAA, he was soon offered a five year contract as the Director of the Royal Canadian Legion Sports Training Plan and it

⁸¹ 'Joint Effort', Private Collection-Dyson Family

⁸² 'Robot for Record Breakers', Private Collection-Dyson Family; Geoffrey Dyson, 'The Use of Coaching Films', *Straits Times*, September 25, 1950.

⁸³ 'Robot for Record Breakers', Private Collection-Dyson Family; Geoffrey Dyson, 'The Use of Coaching Films', *Straits Times*, September 25, 1950.

⁸⁴ Christopher Brasher, 'Hail and Farewell', Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁸⁵ Geoffrey Dyson, interview by Tom McNab, 1970.

was expected that 'the Canadians will benefit from one of the greatest crimes of British sport.'⁸⁶ News of Dyson's resignation and relocation to Canada was not well received by either the British press or athletes and it was argued that 'Britain's loss is Canada's gain - apparently they place far greater importance on athletics coaching in Canada than we do.'⁸⁷ It was commonly believed that Dyson had been forced from his position of national coach because AAA officials did not appreciate his coaching knowledge and had been unwilling to compromise. One press report commented, 'Perhaps when Dyson returns to Britain in five years time we might be ready to use his talents properly. But somehow I doubt it.'⁸⁸

Before Dyson and his family left for Canada, a presentation was organised by individuals who accepted, that although Dyson's abilities had not been utilised in the most efficient way, he had undoubtedly made a difference to British sport. However, at this farewell event it was noted that only one AAA official, Pat Sage, was in attendance, which is a clear indication of the low esteem in which Dyson was held by contemporary athletic amateur officials.⁸⁹ Tom McNab, who had been appointed as an AAA national coach shortly after Dyson resigned, explained that, in association with his farewell event, a monetary collection had been organised in order to thank Dyson for his work. Far from receiving significant support from all the clubs and athletes he had assisted over the years, only twelve out of 2000 clubs made some sort of donation to the fund. Although it was frequently reported that the athletic community were unhappy about the circumstances of Dyson's resignation, when it actually came to expressing appreciation for his services very few were actually willing to contribute. McNab suggests that Dyson's resignation, and the subsequent lack of support for him did not provide a great advert for being a national coach. It potentially 'tarnished' how people viewed the role, so much so that there was very little competition for the coaching roles, primarily because,

People didn't want to be involved in it. People advised against it, said you don't want to do that, look at what happened to the other guys that were in it, look what happened to Dyson. If they get rid of people like Dyson, what do you think is going to happen to people like you?⁹⁰

As a result, the role did not attract particularly skilled people with much experience in coaching and many of the individuals who were subsequently appointed had to learn 'on the job' how to be a successful national coach.⁹¹

Dyson worked in Canada from 1962-70, at which point he and his family returned to England. Dyson took up a teaching post at Winchester College and Maureen returned to ballet and opened a dancing

⁸⁶ Christopher Brasher, 'Hail and Farewell', Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁸⁷ 'Exports', *Athletics Weekly*, April 25, 1964, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁸⁸ Christopher Brasher, 'Hail and Farewell', Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ McNab, interview.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

school. However, she soon fell ill and passed away in 1974. Timothy Dyson, Geoff's son, suggested that his father was never the same after Maureen died and never re-connected with his life or his coaching role back in England, retiring soon after Maureen's death.⁹² In 1980 he was awarded an OBE, although it has been suggested that he only accepted it after receiving confirmation that he had not been recommended for the honour by anyone associated with the AAA or the British Amateur Athletic Board (BAAB).⁹³ Dyson suffered a heart attack and died in 1981. Because he 'couldn't adapt himself to officialdom' he had never received the recognition he deserved while he was alive and even after his death, although he had been acknowledged for the work he did during his lifetime to further British sport, he remained a relative unknown.⁹⁴ In fact, his entry into the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography did not appear until 2012.⁹⁵ Even though he was inducted into the England Athletics Hall of Fame in 2008, and his book, which has only recently gone out of print, continues to be sold around the world, to the majority of the British public who do not work within athletic circles, the name Geoff Dyson is meaningless.

Swimming

In reviewing the Olympic Games, Koskie commented that 'with all things considered the team put up a very good performance.' Although it was accepted 'that world beaters cannot be developed in a few months' there was strong desire to improve significantly on a single bronze medal before the Helsinki Games in 1952. Koskie developed a list of 'suggestions for the future', which he hoped would ensure that the steady development which had occurred in British swimming would continue.⁹⁶ He recommended that good relationships between leading swimmers and bath managers should be encouraged, commenting, 'I consider an enthusiastic bath manager to be our best friend' because 'he can do more than anybody else in assisting the development of champion swimmers.'⁹⁷ This may seem fairly odd to modern audiences, but because many swimmers in the mid-twentieth century would not have had their own regular coach, the amount of time swimmers were able to spend in the water would have had an impact on their development, whether that be positive from increased use or negative because of pool restrictions. Hamilton Smith commented on the situation from the experiences he encountered as a swimmer and explained 'there was no coach, I coached from a book...I was coaching myself.' He described how when he was in his first year of college he had the key to Paisley Baths in Scotland and he used to 'get the 6 o'clock bus down, open the

⁹² Timothy Dyson, telephone discussion with author, July 29, 2011.

⁹³ Tony Ward, *Echoes of Infamy*, *Running Magazine*, April, 1987, File HA Box 3, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; The BAAB emerged in 1937 as the international representative body for athletics in the United Kingdom.

⁹⁴ 'Britain may try to Lure Dyson Back Home', Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁹⁵ Tony Mason. 'Dyson, Geoffrey Harry George (1914-1981)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online Edition, May 2012, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/100477/?back=,104312> (accessed May 31, 2012).

⁹⁶ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1948-Olympic Games 1948 Hon. Team Manager's Report', 33, ASA Headquarters.

⁹⁷ Harry Koskie, 'Suggestions for the Future', October, 1948, ASA Headquarters.

baths...went in did my training, on my own, nobody else in the building.⁹⁸ This was an example of the close co-operation between the swimmer and bath manager that Koskie spoke of and, as Smith noted, if he had not been granted the use of the baths in this way there was no way he would have had the time to complete the training required to remain at the level he did. With regards to Koskie's 'suggestions for the future', from a coaching perspective not only did he recommend that Loughborough Summer school become a fixed annual event under the direction of Max Madders but he also suggested that a 'top-class American coach' be asked to visit Britain. Koskie had noted how successful the American swim team had been at the 1948 Olympics and argued that if Britain was to attain similar levels of performance then they would need to learn from, and adopt, some of these principles. It was hoped that if this was arranged, the American coach would be able to attend the Loughborough Summer School to supervise the training of each swimmer and offer advice to coaches, as well as travelling the country to present lectures 'on the principles of training and stroke technique' and provide training sessions.⁹⁹

Encouraged by Koskie's recommendations, Carl Wootton of the Hove Schiverers Swimming Club organised the visit of Coach Matt Mann and the Michigan State University team in August 1951.¹⁰⁰ Although the ASA Committee fully supported this arrangement they had made no plans to organise such a visit themselves and without the initiative of Wootton and others, this venture, which undoubtedly went some way to stimulating British swimming, may never have occurred. Considering amateurism was so highly valued amongst organisations such as the ASA it might appear somewhat surprising that they would allow the infiltration of these specialised 'foreign' methods of coaching and training. However, from their perspective, it was still an amateur venture, since not only was Mann British, having originated from Yorkshire, but he was also not receiving any form of payment for his services and he had even agreed to pay his own airfare.¹⁰¹ The ASA were not paying anything for these 'professional' services, which seemingly satisfied their ongoing amateur principles of volunteerism. Mann, who was the Michigan State University head coach and appointed American Olympic coach for the 1952 Games, visited Britain with his Michigan squad from 25 August-17 September 1951, and travelled the country to provide demonstrations and instructions to young swimmers.¹⁰² One of the swimmers who had attended these demonstrations was Hamilton Smith and he described his experience,

We got there and we were put into groups and there was about a million of us...you just swam across the width and he was on the end and one of his swimmers was down the pool for each

⁹⁸ Hamilton Smith, interview by author, July 27, 2011, Edinburgh, Scotland.

⁹⁹ Harry Koskie, 'Suggestions for the Future', October, 1948, ASA Headquarters.

¹⁰⁰ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1951-Committee Minutes, March 3, 1951, 10, ASA Headquarters.

¹⁰¹ Peter Wilson, 'Swim Tourists', *Daily Express*, April 26, 1951, 6; Carl Wootton, letter to the editor, *The Times*, February 15, 1952, 7.

¹⁰² Carl Wootton, letter to the editor, *The Times*, February 15, 1952, 7; Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1951-Committee Minutes, April 6-7, 1951, 12, ASA Headquarters.

group and I was in the shallow end for some reason and I started swimming breaststroke and this guy, I remember his name, he was Burwell Jones, and I'm 12/13 and he is watching, or Bumpy Jones he was called...he looked at me and he said 'hey coach,' he called Matt Mann over and he said, 'what do you think of this', and Matt Mann looked at me and he said 'ooh' he says 'son' I can remember it like it was yesterday, 'You should swim fly!' and I thought, really, oh well, and that made me think and I started swimming butterfly and I became the first Scottish butterfly champion and I was Scottish butterfly champion for five years. All because that man, that great coach, looked at me and he said 'you should swim fly!' and I can hear it like it was yesterday, and that's what started me swimming butterfly and I became Scottish champion and won medals at the British championships.¹⁰³

As in the case of Dyson, it seems that Mann also possessed an expert coaching intuition or a 'coach's eye', and this undoubtedly contributed to the success of his coaching career.

Towards the end of Mann's visit to Britain it was agreed that he would run a 'Swimming Clinic' in Hove for Olympic 'potentials' and a number of coaches, so they could take be familiarised with American coaching methods.¹⁰⁴ Each district had the opportunity to nominate two swimmers and two coaches who they believed would benefit. The ASA Committee clearly saw this as an opportunity to potentially raise the standard of the 1952 British Olympic swim team and agreed to cover the cost of the 'Swim Clinic', but they were saved from honouring this commitment when the *News Chronicle* agreed to pay all the expenses. The consensus of everyone involved was that time spent with Mann and his swimming squad had been both 'successful and 'instructive', but despite the ASA taking this somewhat revolutionary approach to coaching, there were those who believed it was too little too late to have any impact on the swimming results of the 1952 Games.¹⁰⁵ Unlike other countries, Britain had 'not got down to selecting a team to get into training - or even get accustomed to playing as a team', and although it was agreed swimmers would 'benefit immensely' from American coaching methods, considering the state of British swimming, it 'needs all the boost it can get.'¹⁰⁶ While such an arrangement may have hinted a shift away from the amateur tradition, commentators of the period recognised its ongoing hold over the organisation of British swimming with one journalist questioning 'Why, oh why, do we always leave everything to the last moment.'¹⁰⁷

While British sport was gradually becoming more accommodating to coaching, the NGBs remained wary of the intentions of professional coaches, and in order to remain in control of their sports, they continuously placed restrictions on the activities of the national coaches. However, even though the national coaches had to function within limitations, they were gradually being granted permission to work directly with athletes - something which suggested a gradual loosening of amateur constraints. This emphasises the fluid nature of amateurism as it had once again been shifted to allow a greater amount of

¹⁰³ Smith, interview.

¹⁰⁴ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1951-Committee Minutes, April 6-7, 1951, 17, 24, ASA Headquarters.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ Peter Wilson, 'Swim Tourists', *Daily Express*, April 26, 1951, 6.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

coaching. However, even though British sport and coaching were slowly beginning to integrate alternative methods it is apparent that other countries continued to utilise ever more specialised techniques. In particular, the American approach to coaching and training far outstripped anything available in Britain and had all but guaranteed prolonged American domination at the Olympic Games. However, a new sporting power, the Soviet Union, was beginning to present a significant challenge to the USA. The following chapter traces the development of the Soviet sporting system and identifies the key factors which ensured that the Soviet Union superseded the United States as the leading sporting nation. It also analyses how Soviet sport was perceived by other nations, and what influence their success had on amateurism and sporting policies around the world.

Chapter Five: 'Shamateurism' and Sports Science: An Exploration of the Soviet Sporting Model

The British approach to sport had never been the only exemplar for the international sporting community. The highly successful American model, which welcomed professional coaches and intensive training techniques, had gradually progressed and developed since the pre-war period. However, in the aftermath of WWII, a new sporting model was beginning to emerge in the Soviet Union. Whilst it is acknowledged that the American approach to sport was particularly efficient, this model has been extensively researched, and so the focus of this chapter is on Soviet sporting policies.¹ The Soviet Union adopted sport as means to demonstrate the superiority of the communist way of life. In order to successfully achieve this they re-directed vast resources from the government and developed a comprehensive sport system which included, amongst other factors, a sophisticated use of sports science techniques and methods to ensure optimal training and development for their athletes and an appreciation for the expertise of the coach. This approach had encouraged sport in the post-war period to 'became a high-profile battlefield upon which representatives from both sides of the "Iron Curtain" competed...for primacy.'² The aim of this part of the thesis is to examine the formation and development of the Soviet sporting system and identify the components of the system which ensured that they were able to achieve Olympic success, and also addressed how this success was subsequently interpreted in the West. In exploring the Soviet model, this section reveals how the Soviet Union used the Olympics as a means to demonstrate superiority and demonstrates how this directly contravened the International Olympic Committee (IOC) rules of amateurism. But more importantly in the context of this work, it also highlights how the success of the Soviets encouraged other countries to adopt a much more specialised sporting model.

Soviet sport

It is an open secret in the Soviet Union that the nation's top sports figures are "shamateurs". Highly competent experts who devote full time to their sport and get paid for it with a heady mix of money, cars, apartments and travel.³

¹ See Allen Guttman, *A Whole New Ball Game: An Interpretation of American Sports* (North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988); Steven W. Pope, 'Amateurism and American Sports Culture: The Invention of an Athletic Tradition in the United States, 1870-1900', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 13, no. 3 (1996): 290-309; Elliot J. Gorn and Warren Goldstein, *A Brief History of American Sports* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2004); Thomas Hunt, 'Countering the Soviet Threat in the Olympic Medals Races: The Amateur Sports Act of 1978 and American Athletics Policy Reform', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no. 6 (2007): 796-818; Roberta J. Park, 'Setting the Scene - Bridging the Gap between Knowledge and Practice: When Americans Really Built Programmes to Foster Healthy Lifestyles, 1918-1940', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25, no. 11 (2008): 1427-52; Joseph M. Turrini, *The End of Amateurism in American Track and Field* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2010).

² Peter Beck, 'Britain and the Cold War's "Cultural Olympics": Responding to the Political Drive of Soviet Sport, 1945-58', *Contemporary British History* 19, no. 2 (2005): 170.

³ 'Amateurism: Soviet Facade Not Likely to Change', *Palm Beach Post*, February 18, 1972, 60.

Sport Organisation – Pre-WWII

Prior to the Revolution in 1917, sport, for the most part, was relatively unknown to the majority of Russians because it was primarily reserved for the wealthy or the military and many workers were not entitled to join sports clubs.⁴ Despite this, Tsarist Russia had been one of the founding members of the modern Olympic Movement, although Russian athletes did not compete in the Games until 1908. After a reasonably successful Games in London, in which five Russian contestants achieved gold and two silver, placing them fourteenth overall, the government saw the opportunity to achieve prestige through sporting success and established a Russian Olympic Committee. The newly formed committee provided financial support to send a larger team to Stockholm, which was to consist of 169 athletes covering all events on the Olympic programme, but on the day the team were due to sail to Stockholm, many of the athletes failed to arrive, and as a result, a very compromised and much smaller team was sent to the Games. The team only managed to achieve one silver and three bronze, results which were perceived as anything but a success; the poor performances in Stockholm had exposed Russia as a 'backward country in the sphere of sport.'⁵ The failure of its athletes diminished Russian prestige, and in an attempt to remedy the situation and improve the state of physical wellbeing amongst individuals, the Tsarist government developed a state organisation to manage sport, known as the Office of the General Supervisor for the Physical Development of People in Russia.⁶ The outbreak of World War I in 1914 and the need for a large number of physically fit soldiers further emphasised the need for physical training. These two key aspects, nationalism and militarism, which had been prominent in early Russian competitive sport, would provide the key foundation stones for the Soviet sport system.⁷

Russia organised their own 'Olympiads' in 1913 and 1914, and it had become obvious that with proper training and organisation, Russian athletes had the ability to demonstrate superior athletic performances on the international stage although it would be another forty years before Russian athletes, representing the USSR, participated in the Olympic Games again.⁸ Following the Russian Revolution in 1917 there was an increasing resistance towards 'bourgeois' and elitist sports competitions, particularly the Olympic Games, which it was believed were designed to 'deflect workers from the class struggle and to train them for new

⁴ George Sinfield, *A Nation of Champions: All about Soviet Sport* (London: Russia Today Society, 1941), 4; 'Russians Enter Olympic Games', *Manchester Guardian*, December 28, 1951, 8.

⁵ Komsomolskaya Pravda, Why Soviet Sportsman Win, March 31, 1950, 5, File FO 371/86796, Foreign Office Collection, National Archives, Kew (hereafter cited as FO Collection, NA); 'Russian Enter Olympic Games: Records Demanded', *Manchester Guardian*, December 28, 1951, 8.

⁶ James Riordan, *Sport in Soviet Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 31-2.

⁷ Jenifer Parks 'Red Sport, Red Tape: The Olympic Games, The Soviet Sports Bureaucracy, and The Cold War, 1952-1980' (PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 2009), 21.

⁸ Norman Shneigman, *The Soviet Road to Olympus: Theory and Practice of Soviet Physical Culture and Sport* (Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978), 19.

Imperialist wars.⁹ The Russian Revolution is a collective term used to describe a series of revolutions which ultimately led to the formation of the Soviet Union in 1922. During the 1920s, as a result of an increasing resistance to the West in general, the Soviet Union tried to prevent the infiltration of Western interpretations of sport by declining, on ideological grounds, to affiliate with 'bourgeois' sporting competitions.¹⁰ Instead, focus was placed on an alternative system of sport, 'based on a distinctly proletarian brand of sport and physical culture' which shunned individualism and competition.¹¹ Physical culture was developed as a means to promote healthy living and increase hygiene education, and these factors were encompassed within the field of physical education which became a dominant ideology in the early 1920s. There was a belief within the Communist party that physical education could play a vital role in influencing younger citizens and, in turn, reduce anti-social and anti-Soviet behaviour. As these principles of sport and physical education had been based on Lenin's own ideals, following his death in 1924, Soviet sport lost its direction and underwent a period of instability.¹² Attempts to establish a system of mass participation in sport, which was 'class based, collectivist and mass orientated' now failed to compete with the capitalist bourgeois centred sports culture, and as a result, opposition towards elitist sport gradually diminished in the late 1920s and early 1930s.¹³

As James Riordan noted, if the 1920s 'may be described as having been dominated by *physical culture*, the 1930s were to be a decade of competitive *sport*.'¹⁴ During this time, it became rapidly more widespread and fed into and supported Stalin's industrial drive. Competitive sport also acted as a means to raise the widespread standard of health in order to ensure there was suitable preparation for military action.¹⁵ Various actions taken during the 1930s shaped and developed Soviet sport into the system that became familiar during its period of international sporting success from the early 1950s until the late 1980s. In April 1930, physical education and sport were placed under greater government control when an All-Union Council of Physical Culture was established and charged with the responsibility of sport in the Soviet Union. The structural framework of the new organisation resembled that of a regular government department and essentially it would act as a ministry of sport.¹⁶ As part of this, all well-established local sport clubs were transferred to local workplaces and voluntary trade-union sport societies were developed.

⁹ James Riordan 'The Rise and Fall of the Soviet Olympic Champions', *Olympika* 11, (1993): 25.

¹⁰ James Riordan, 'Sport Which Came in from the Cold...for Health and Efficiency', *Guardian*, March 4, 1980, 23; Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 'Sport in the Soviet Union- Background Brief', June, 1980, 2, File FO 973/97, FO Collection, NA.

¹¹ Barbara Keys, *Globalising Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1930s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 159.

¹² Nikolaus Katzer, 'Soviet Physical Culture and Sport: A European Legacy', in *Sport and the Transformation of Modern Europe: States, Media and Markets*, ed. Alan Tomlinson, Christopher Young, and Richard Holt (Oxon: Routledge, 2011), 20; Shneigman, *Soviet Road to Olympus*, 23; Riordan, *Sport in Soviet Society*, 60-7.

¹³ Keys, *Globalising Sport*, 159.

¹⁴ Riordan, *Sport in Soviet Society*, 122.

¹⁵ Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 'Sport in the Soviet Union- Background Brief', June, 1980, 2, File FO 973/97, FO Collection, NA.

¹⁶ Baraukh Hazan, *Olympic Sports and Propaganda Games: Moscow 1980* (New Brunswick: Transaction Inc, 1982), 22.

These newly founded sport 'collectives' began to spread around the country and were primarily formed to help discover and train proficient athletes; the Soviet Union's professionalised sport system was beginning to emerge and was gradually building momentum. Physical education now had a dual purpose. Not only was it helping to produce healthy workers to fuel an expanding industrial base, it was now also acting as a means by which talented athletes could be selected to participate in top trade-union teams. In order to allow these teams, or 'sport societies', to develop district and regional competitions were established in popular sports such as soccer, basketball and ice hockey.¹⁷ Another significant development was the creation and integration of a uniform ranking system known as the 'Ready for Labour and Defence' (GTO) programme. This was established by the *Komsomol* (Communist Youth Organisation) with an aim to 'improve the general level of physical fitness and to create a basis for raising the level of athletic standards.'¹⁸ In order to manage the increasing levels of sporting activity occurring throughout country an expansion of sporting facilities was required. It is suggested that during the periods of 1931-40, the construction of sporting facilities almost quadrupled, and by 1939, census records indicated that there was approximately 649 stadia, 8,000 playing fields, 20 cycle tracks, and 342 swimming baths.¹⁹

Previous hostility towards Western sport was officially reversed in 1934, when the objective to 'catch up and overtake bourgeois records' was launched. However, unlike Western, particularly British sport, which continued to strictly adhere to amateurism, the Soviet Union viewed amateur principles with a degree of indifference and failed to fully embrace its ethos. The initial aim of Soviet sport was to surpass half all world records within three years but it soon became apparent that the enormity of such a task would make it virtually impossible to achieve. Instead, the new mantra was to 'bring worldwide glory to Soviet sport' by achieving as many top finishes as possible in international competitions. Paralleling this was the introduction of a second tier to the GTO badge, which came with the coveted title of 'Master' of sport. It was hoped that these new developments would entice more Soviet citizens to participate in sport so that international successes could be secured.²⁰ In order to ensure the achievement of its athletes, the Soviet authorities began to monitor the progress of Western sport. By establishing a foreign department within the Physical Culture Council it was possible to examine foreign training methods by intercepting and translating training manuals, journals and newspapers. Despite this shift towards an acceptance of Western sporting methods and competitions in the years before the war, the Soviet Union failed to indicate any desire to join the Olympic Movement and International Sporting Federations (ISF). This possibly stemmed from a fear of losing the tight control maintained over sports teams because if the Soviet Union had made attempts to join

¹⁷ Riordan, *Sport in Soviet Society*, 126-7.

¹⁸ Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 'Sport in the Soviet Union- Background Brief', June, 1980, 2, File FO 973/97, FO Collection, NA.

¹⁹ Sinfield, *A Nation of Champions*, 7.

²⁰ Keys, *Globalising Sport*, 165.

ISFs they would have been obligated to compete against all member countries, whereas by remaining absent they were in a position to choose their opponents.²¹ In addition, the Soviet government only wanted its athletes to compete in sports which they were guaranteed to excel at, and by joining federations such as the IOC and participating in the Olympic Games there would have been an expectation for them to send as many athletes as possible, covering a wide range of sports.

With so much emphasis now being placed on sport, winning and achieving records, it is unsurprising that rigorous sport programmes had begun to penetrate Soviet sport. In order to produce a large contingent of talented athletes they were being placed in programmes of intensive training and were rewarded accordingly if they achieved the desired results. As the rewards and prestige of winning competitions increased so too did the assistance provided to athletes, who were increasingly being taken out of the workplace and placed in full time training facilities. In an attempt to embrace some of the attributes of Western amateur sport the Moscow Committee on Physical Culture of Sports Affairs condemned such practices in January 1937 but the illegal assistance provided to athletes continued to be a widespread problem. In 1939, it was reinforced that 'half-trained sportsman should not receive extra money for fictional "work", they should not receive subsidies and all manner of gifts for success in competition' believing that such practice was 'bourgeois', and should not be allowed to 'creep into Soviet Sport.'²² Despite many such warnings and the condemnation of these practices, assistance to athletes persisted and it gradually became commonplace amongst sporting societies. This may have occurred, because unlike Britain, the amateur ethos was not rooted within the fabric of Soviet sport. Although this type of practice was never fully removed from Soviet sport, immediately prior to the outbreak of WWII many of these focused systems and methods were curtailed in an attempt to direct resources to prepare for military conflict. Soviet involvement in the war began in June 1941, and it was at this point that the direction of the entire Soviet sports movement shifted. Having been geared towards excellence in elite sport at the outbreak of the war, now all sport societies, government sport departments and physical education in schools switched towards the development of military attainment and preparedness. Although Soviet athletes continued to participate in some sporting competitions throughout the war, this was mostly done to boost morale. The Soviet Union's main objectives were now aligned toward their military capability, and any thought of a Soviet debut in the Olympic Games would be postponed until a time when they would have the resources available for such preparation.²³

Even though the foundations of what developed into the 'Big Red Sports Machine' can be traced back to the 1930s, at this time the Soviet Union did not yet have the wide ranging success in sport to have

²¹ Ibid., 172.

²² Riordan, *Sport in Soviet Society*, 133.

²³ Ibid., 153-5.

considered them a major power in the sporting world. Although many resources had been devoted to sport during the 1930s, it was still not regarded as a primary objective. It was not until the period of the Cold War that it emerged as a key state priority. Despite facility availability expanding during the 1930s, they still remained in short supply, and any available sporting equipment was often of poor quality. Such factors, coupled with a lack of funding and low standards of living and hygiene, had a detrimental impact on the quality of sporting performances that Soviet athletes could achieve. However, the performance of the Soviet Union in WWII had reinforced to Soviet authorities that functionalising sport and placing physical education and physical training on a military basis had been 'absolutely right', and as a result, following the end of the war in September 1945, more money and resources were directed towards sport.²⁴ Victory in the war had also restored pride in the Soviet people, because it acknowledged, that for all its hardship, the period of industrialisation had been absolutely necessary, and this was now reflected in the status of the Soviet Union on the global stage. Sport was now to take a more prominent role within society as it was now seen as a peaceful means through which the Soviet Union could demonstrate their superiority and continue to further their potential.²⁵

Sport Organisation - Post-WWII

Massive government aid, based on recognition of the value of sport as a political and ideological weapon, has contributed to the successes of Soviet sportsmen.²⁶

During the Second World War, Soviet military power was so strong that it had successfully penetrated Central and Eastern Europe and resulted in the creation of ten aligned Soviet states. As the rest of Europe were debilitated because of the war, this had provided the Soviet Union with the opportunity to dominate, and as a result the balance of power, both in Europe and globally, was altered.²⁷ The Soviets had a new target; they were determined 'to catch up and overtake the most advanced industrial powers', particularly America who had long been considered the most powerful political and military force in the world.²⁸ This threat to American power ensured that after WWII had ended, these two nations who had once been allies, would embark on a battle of their own, generally referred to as the 'Cold War'. Far from being a direct militaristic encounter, the Cold War was an opportunity for each of these superpowers to gain allegiance

²⁴ Ibid., 159; Keys, *Globalising Sport*, 179.

²⁵ Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 'Sport in the Soviet Union- Background Brief', June, 1980, 2, File FO 973/97, FO Collection, NA.

²⁶ Ibid., 1.

²⁷ James Riordan, 'Rewriting Soviet Sports History', *Journal of Sports History* 20, no. 3 (1993): 248.

²⁸ Riordan, *Sport in Soviet Society*, 161-2.

from other nations via psychological conflict and propaganda.²⁹ As a widely supported policy of 'peaceful co-existence' had been launched soon after the war, there was a realisation that success in international sport could offer a means to exert influence without fear of military repercussions, and so the sporting arena developed into a commodity of great significance.³⁰ Lincoln Allison and Terry Monnington suggest that the Soviet drive to win international competitions was also a 'hearts and minds' campaign which could be used to convince those outside of its boundaries of the qualities of the 'Soviet way of life.'³¹ It functioned as a demonstration of the power and success of the Soviet Union, particularly when it is considered that apart from the space programme, sport provided the only opportunity to demonstrate superiority over the world's most advanced capitalist nations.³² It was, therefore, inevitable that sport would become an integral part of the Soviet quest for global prestige. International sport and athletes had become intertwined with both Soviet and American political philosophies, whereby they were now being used to sell their country's ideologies to the world. From a British perspective, it was particularly alarming; the general feeling of uneasiness which existed in the country as a result of poor performances was now accompanied by a fear that more was at stake than a mere win on the playing field. National prestige was now inextricably linked with success in sport and international competition had far-reaching political and educational implications.³³

In order to ensure sporting success, the Soviet government established that the administration of sport required improvement, so they undertook a period of reconstruction. It had been determined that a more productive form of athlete incentive was required if they were going to secure top results, something which Riordan refers to as, 'material interestedness.'³⁴ In October 1945, the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR developed a financial reward scheme to award monetary prizes to individuals who achieved athletic performance targets. Whereas such financial rewards had previously been considered illegal in the Soviet Union, they were now widely accepted within the new Soviet sport system. The use of bonuses and increased salaries for athletes, which were awarded according to their sport ranking, began to encourage the emergence of an exceptional breed of elite athletes.³⁵ The improvement and progress of these athletes was ensured with the development of sports schools, which had also enlisted the services of highly qualified coaches.³⁶ Establishing training facilities and offering financial incentives to athletes contravened the IOC and many other ISF rules on amateurism. However, and somewhat surprisingly, the Soviets had

²⁹ Toby Rider, 'An Unwitting Target: The IOC, Exiled Athletes, and US Government Covert Operations, 1950-1960', *International Olympic Committee Research Project* (2010): 3.

³⁰ James Riordan, 'The Role of Sport in Soviet Foreign Policy', *Soviet Studies* 26, no. 3 (1974): 571; Robert Edelman, *Serious Fun: A History of Spectator Sports in the U.S.S.R* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 125.

³¹ Lincoln Allison and Terry Monnington, 'Sport, Prestige and International Relations', in *The Global Politics of Sport*, ed. Lincoln Allison (Oxon: Routledge, 2005), 116.

³² Riordan, 'Rise and Fall', 31.

³³ University of Birmingham, *Britain in World Sport*, 7.

³⁴ Rob Beamish and Ian Ritchie, *Fastest, Highest, Strongest: A Critique of High Performance Sport* (Oxon: Routledge, 2008), 18.

³⁵ Riordan, *Sport in Soviet Society*, 162.

³⁶ Alfred Erich Senn, *Power, Politics and the Olympic Games* (Champaign: Human Kinetics, 1999), 85.

shown little desire to seek inclusion within the IOC. Even after they had received an invitation from Sigfrid Edström to join the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) in an attempt to incorporate them into the Olympic family, they still regarded it with indifference; the Soviets were determined to keep other nations guessing about their Olympic and sporting intentions.³⁷

By late 1946, the Soviet Union had begun to participate in many global sporting competitions and was starting to develop plans to expand its involvement in international sport. The speed in achieving this was unquestionable. At the end of 1946, the Soviet Union was represented in only two international athletics bodies, but during the period 1946-55 that number increased to twenty-seven.³⁸ This demonstrates their power of mobilisation; although they had not been heavily involved in international sport for almost two decades, and had lost countless individuals during the war, they still had the ability and the resources to ensure they could be incorporated rapidly into the international arena. Even so, the Soviet authorities had remained apathetic regarding the issues of amateurism and Olympic participation, until they arrived at the European Championships in August 1946. The Soviets were not members of the IAAF, and therefore under the regulations were not eligible to participate, but Lord Burghley, who was acting as head of the IAAF, granted them permission to compete. A similar instance occurred at the International Weightlifting Championships in October 1946 in which they were granted entry despite not being affiliated to the appropriate sporting body.³⁹ The American Avery Brundage, recently elected as the first IOC vice-president, commented,

My own guess is that the real object of the Russians is to humiliate the West...Every time they force a Federation to break its own rules in order to let them compete, Russian prestige is increased and Western prestige is decreased. The trouble at the moment...is that about half the countries don't want to annoy Russia, and any country which is anxious to obtain a World Championship or World Congress is reluctant to annoy the Eastern Bloc.⁴⁰

Each time Soviet athletes were granted the right to compete, even though they were not eligible, the Soviet sport system was provided with increasing authority, although in reality their system was never considered entirely legitimate due to suspicions over the payment of athletes and their state controlled sports schools.⁴¹

There was a growing realisation, that in order to exert the greatest impact, the Soviets would need to compete in the world's most widely recognised sporting contest, the Olympic Games. To achieve this they

³⁷ Beamish and Ritchie, *Fastest, Highest, Strongest*, 18.

³⁸ Richard Espy, *The Politics of the Olympic Games* (London: University of California Press, 1979), 26; John Washburn, 'Sport as a Soviet Tool', *Foreign Affairs* 34, no. 3 (1956): 490.

³⁹ Senn, *Power, Politics and Olympic*, 87.

⁴⁰ Brundage to Edström, January 21, 1947, Brundage Papers Box 42, University of Illinois Collection, Champaign-Urbana, quoted in Espy, *Politics of Olympic Games*, 28.

⁴¹ Beamish and Ritchie, *Fastest, Highest, Strongest*, 19.

would need to join the relevant sporting federations, and by January 1947 they had made their intentions clear when they applied to join the International Wrestling Federation and the IAAF. However, Soviet authorities attached several conditions to their application. They declared that Russian had to be introduced as an official language of the Federations, the executive board would need to include a Soviet representative and they also requested the ejection of 'fascist' Franco-Spain. Brundage, for one, was enraged by such 'unprecedented' demands and commented that their conditions exceeded 'the requirements of common courtesy and no other country has ever been so favoured.' He warned Edström that any application made by the Soviets to ISFs 'must not be given any special consideration', emphasising that their athletes would not be admitted to international and Olympic competition without positive confirmation that they were amateurs.⁴² Although the Soviet sporting authorities had previously manipulated other sporting federations to let them compete without fully adhering to regulations, this would no longer be possible. If they wished to compete legitimately in international sporting competitions, including the Olympic Games, they would now have to meet all the rules and policies regarding participation, or at least give the impression that they were complying, particularly with those relating to amateurism.⁴³ Consequently, in January 1947, the Soviet government reversed its earlier decree 'on remuneration of sporting attainments', stating that Soviet athletes would no longer be entitled to monetary rewards for sporting success with prizes in future consisting purely of medals and badges. They also appeared to address the issue of occupational status, declaring that the title of 'professional entertainer' was no longer a legitimate profession and that athletes would in future be classified as a 'student, serviceman or physical education instructor.'⁴⁴ Regardless of this declaration, it would soon become apparent that these 'students' and 'soldiers' were in fact state-sponsored professionals, but because at the time, the Soviet Union gave the impression that they had now met all the requirements of membership, they were admitted to the IAAF in December 1947.⁴⁵

The Soviet Union did not participate in 1948 Games because they had failed to initiate provisions to develop a National Olympic Committee (NOC) and under the Olympic Charter this was a prerequisite to participation in Olympic competition.⁴⁶ However, Soviet authorities sent a delegation to London in order to monitor Western athletes, and soon after the completion of the Games, the Soviet government declared that if they had participated they would have placed second overall, only marginally behind the United States.⁴⁷ Inspired by this analysis, and a realisation that by beating Western countries the Soviet authorities

⁴² Robert Creamer, 'Of Greeks-and Russians', *Sports Illustrated*, February 6, 1956, 30-2; Senn, *Power, Politics and Olympic*, 87.

⁴³ Riordan, 'Rewriting Soviet Sports History', 248.

⁴⁴ Riordan, *Sport in Soviet Society*, 163.

⁴⁵ Robert Edelman, 'The Professionalisation of Soviet Sport: The Case of the Soccer Union', *Journal of Sport History* 17, no. 1 (1990): 45.

⁴⁶ Espy, *Politics of Olympic Games*, 27.

⁴⁷ Keys, *Globalising Sport*, 178.

could advertise the perceived benefits of socialism to the rest of the world, the Communist Party Central Committee published policy targets in December 1948, stating that their overall goal was to 'win supremacy in the major sports within the next few years.'⁴⁸ Success in attaining this objective would provide 'irrefutable proof of the superiority of socialist culture over the decaying culture of the capitalist states.'⁴⁹ After altering their sporting policies in order to adhere with the Olympic Charter, it was inevitable that the Soviet Union would soon attempt to join the IOC although Olympic officials were apprehensive about admitting them. Brundage was adamant that while Soviet athletes now gave the outward appearance of being amateur, they were still aligning themselves to professional principles; he commented 'from the Western point of view we must question ourselves if the Russian athletes can be considered amateurs. We must face the fact that many of them are professional.'⁵⁰

Despite trying to deny Soviet entrance into the Olympic Games on the grounds that they were in some way violating the amateur doctrine, it would appear that much of the resistance was politically driven. There was much uncertainty surrounding the Soviet Union at this time, with many countries fearful of their intentions, and this generated a desire to prevent them from competing to ensure that they did not gain further credibility by achieving international sporting success. There was an underlying fear that if the Soviet Union were allowed to compete in the Olympic Games, not only would it bolster their power in the global sense, it would also increase their sense of authority amongst its own citizens. Granting them entry to the Games would demonstrate the leverage that they possessed over other nations and would both solidify government authority and further increase support for the regime. However, others believed that if the committee allowed Russia to join the movement and ensured they adhered to the Olympic principles, then in turn her 'Satellite States' would do the same, and as a result this would boost the overall authority of the Olympic Movement. There was also an underlying fear amongst some that they could not realistically prevent the Soviet Union from joining the IOC because they were now one of the most powerful nations in the world. In 1951, as expected, the Soviet Union submitted a bid to enter the Games, and despite reservations, the Soviets were accepted into the Olympic Movement with a vote of thirty-one in favour and only three against. This action actually contravened the founding principles of the Olympic Movement because, as Lincoln Allison suggests, due to the very nature of the Soviet Union there was one condition of Olympic competition that they would never be able to meet. NOCs are required to be autonomous and independent of the state, but within the Soviet Union, this would have 'contradicted the fundamental

⁴⁸ James Riordan, 'The USSR', in *Sport under Communism: The USSR, Czechoslovakia, the G.D.R, Cuba*, ed. James Riordan (London: C. Hurst, 1978), 30.

⁴⁹ James Riordan, 'The Impact of Communism on Sport', in *The International Politics of Sport in the 20th Century*, ed. James Riordan and Arnd Kruger (London: E and FN Spon, 1999), 57.

⁵⁰ Espy, *Politics of Olympic Games*, 35.

doctrine' of the government. By accepting the Soviets, the IOC had chosen 'its universalist aspirations over a fundamental principle' and from this point onwards the Games would be significantly different.⁵¹

The Soviet Union and the Olympic Games

At the XVth Summer Olympics in Helsinki, the Soviet Union made its debut. Two emerging superpowers, the USA and USSR, would now confront each other for the first time in international sport, and as a result, 'the cold, calculated pursuit of victory emerged as a dominating principle.'⁵² The extensive preparation of Soviet athletes soon became apparent. Soviet sporting authorities had ensured that not only would Soviet athletes compete in every event except field hockey, but they had also put measures in place to guarantee success.⁵³ Where Soviet athletes had previously only excelled in a limited number of sports, the structure of the new system and increased resources would be conducive to ensuring favourable results in a multitude of events. However, despite the Soviet athletes achieving an early lead in the medal table, the American team successfully recaptured top place towards the closing of the Games. Even though they had not attained the most gold medals, what the Soviet athletes had achieved was considered significant. Despite lacking previous experience against high-level competitors, they had managed to win more silver and bronze medals than the American team. What damaged American pride and prestige most was that according to the official scoring system, the 'Olympic Bulletin', the Soviet Union and the United States were considered tied for points.⁵⁴ As a result of the Soviet entry into the Games, and the inevitable intense rivalry between the United States and the USSR, a strong sense of nationalism was present at Helsinki. Bob Mathias, the American decathlon champion, described the atmosphere amongst the American team:

There were many more pressures on American athletes because of the Russians than in 1948. They were in a sense the real enemy. You just loved to beat 'em. You just had to beat 'em. It wasn't like beating some friendly country like Australia. This feeling was strong down through the entire team.⁵⁵

This rivalry would become commonplace in future Games. Whereas American athletes had dominated for so long, primarily because of their large pool of talented athletes, the indifference of the Soviet Union towards sport and the concerns of the majority of Europe over recovery from two world wars, the emergence of the Soviet Union and their use of sport as a means to demonstrate the superiority of the communist way of life would eventually result in a shift of athletic success away from America.⁵⁶

⁵¹ Ibid., 35; Lincoln Allison, 'The Olympic Movement and the End of the Cold War', *World Affairs* 157, no. 2 (1994): 92.

⁵² Beamish and Ritchie, *Fastest, Highest, Strongest*, 19-20.

⁵³ Riordan, 'The Role of Sport', 588.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Bob Mathias, quoted in Espy, *Politics of Olympic Games*, 38.

⁵⁶ Hunt, 'Countering the Soviet Threat', 797.

The Melbourne Olympic Games in 1956 were particularly notable for a number of reasons. Political events which occurred prior to the Olympics resulted in the staging of two separate boycotts; Spain, Netherlands and Switzerland initiated a boycott as a result of the Soviet invasion of Hungary and Egypt while Lebanon and Iraq boycotted because of the Suez Canal conflict. They were also the Games that allowed the Soviets to demonstrate the outcome of an intense four-year drive to win at the Olympics. Following Stalin's death in 1953, the new Soviet leadership under Nikita Khrushchev improved and further developed the established sporting policies by filtering more money and resources into the state-run system, which in turn ensured the widespread cultivation of elite 'amateur' athletes. This increased coordination of the sporting system guaranteed that the prowess of its athletes was increased, which further boosted Soviet prestige.⁵⁷ The investment was deemed a success when Soviet athletes achieved ninety-eight medals, which compared favourably with America's seventy-four. This 40 per cent increase on their previous gold medal tally not only demonstrates the power of the Soviets to mobilise and direct resources to achieve success, but also how amateurism was potentially limiting Western levels of performance. Since the Soviet athletes' training and preparation regimes were not constrained by the Olympic rules of amateurism, as was the case in the West, particularly in Britain, they were able to produce athletes who were essentially training full-time. It seems, that although established schemes were going some way to ensuring the success of Soviet athletes, the perceived impact of such systems may have been exaggerated because amateurism was limiting the results which Western athletes were able to achieve. What is clear is that Olympic success undoubtedly provided a boost to Soviet prestige and built pride amongst Soviet citizens. Lincoln Allison interviewed Georgians in 1991, in which they reported that, although they now deeply regretted it, at the time 'the sight of three Soviet athletes, complete with flag and anthem, standing triumphantly on the Olympic podium did make them feel proud to be associated with the 'Soviet Motherland.'⁵⁸

Western Reactions to Soviet Success

The planned and strategic integration of sport into the political and social foundation of the Soviet state, and 'a focus on elite, not mass, sport' which was 'supported by a systematic process of talent identification...scientific coaching; shamateurism; and reliance upon performance-enhancing drugs' ensured that the Soviet Union continued to dominate the Olympics.⁵⁹ Up until its dissolution in 1991, the Soviet Union "won" every summer Olympic Games they entered, with the sole exception of 1968. They are also considered one of the most versatile nations in Olympic history, competing in all winter and summer

⁵⁷ Barbara Keys, 'The Soviet Union, Global Culture, and the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games' (Paper Presented at the Conference of Globalization of Sport in Historical Context, University of California, San Diego, March 2005), 5.

⁵⁸ Allison and Monnington, 'Sport, Prestige and Relations', 117.

⁵⁹ Beck, 'Britain and "Cultural Olympics"', 175.

sports, and winning medals in twenty-one of the twenty-three sports represented at the 1988 Games.⁶⁰ The Soviet Union's Olympic campaign culminated in a total of 1010 medals, of which 395 were gold, 319 silver and 296 bronze. However, even at the height of Soviet dominance, the attitude from the West, particularly America, was one of disdain rather admiration. Western press reports and opinions consistently trumpeted the capitalist system of sport and often condemned the Soviet Union and their methods.

The American publication *Sports Illustrated*, repeatedly published negative portrayals of the Soviet system and used specific language and descriptors to ensure that both the Soviet Union and communism were always placed in an unfavourable light.⁶¹ Detailed interpretations of the Soviet strategies used to achieve sporting supremacy were repeatedly scrutinised and analysed, often presenting the system as 'machine-like' and inhuman. It was commented 'that every Russian athlete of international promise has been taken out of his job and given intense, year-round training which few in the West can equal and which, of course, is state-paid.'⁶² American press reports consistently argued that the Soviets defeated American athletes not because they were athletically superior but because of their unsporting practices. It was claimed that the Soviet sport system was violating the true meaning of sport because their athletes expressed no enjoyment when they were competing. One example of American reaction to the Soviets emerged in 1956,

Their athletes are deadly serious...they seldom did anything but concentrate on the work at hand. Noticeably missing was the thrill and satisfaction of a fine performance. When Mikhail Krivonosov smashed the world hammer-throw record, he merely sat down on a bench and pulled a cap over his eyes. He had been given a job to do and he did it - that was all.⁶³

Sports Illustrated argued it was unreasonable to expect American athletes to compete successfully against the 'machines' of the Eastern Bloc, particularly when there was evidence that the Soviet authorities were 'buying their athletes, working them full time and making a mockery of the Olympic ideal.'⁶⁴ Perhaps one of the most critical comments on Soviet sport came from US Senator John Marshall, who described the Soviet athlete as a 'paid propaganda agent of the USSR, one more slave in the hideous chain gang of brainwashed individuals slavishly advancing the Communist cause.'⁶⁵ During this time of course, American citizens were being treated to the spectre of the supposed dangers of communism through the publicity being given to 'McCarthyism', which had resulted in many anti-communist purges. During the early stages of the Cold War, in 1950 Senator Joseph McCarthy had accused the State Department of being 'infested

⁶⁰ James Riordan 'Rise and Fall', 31.

⁶¹ John Massaro, 'Press Box Propaganda? The War and *Sports Illustrated*, 1956', *The Journal of American Culture* 26, no. 3 (2003): 363.

⁶² Andre Laguerre, 'Russia Takes Over', *Sports Illustrated*, February 6, 1956, 17.

⁶³ Don Carnham, 'Russia Will Win the 1956 Olympics', *Sports Illustrated*, October 25, 1954, 12.

⁶⁴ Charles A. Bucher, 'Are We Losing The Olympic Ideal', *Sports Illustrated*, August 2, 1955,

⁶⁵ Keys, 'Soviet Union, Global Culture', 2.

with communists' and he began to gain support from the American public and anti-communist organisations. This marked the start of a decade of investigations, or 'witch hunts', in order to uncover 'Communist infiltration in American life.' Although McCarthyism eventually lost momentum and is now more commonly associated with 'unscrupulously accusing people of disloyalty without evidence', at the time, these factors, coupled with American defeat by Soviet athletes, continued to fuel the widespread anti-communist hysteria and resulted in ever more strident criticism of the Soviet Union.⁶⁶

The majority of the accusations directed towards the Soviet sport system centred around the notion that the Communist state were exploiting sport in order to demonstrate the superiority of their way of life. However, as Jim Nendel highlights, this was somewhat odd considering there had previously been many claims made against the United States, particularly during the twentieth century, that they too had manipulated the use of the Olympic Games in order to 'promote the supremacy of the American way of life to other nations.'⁶⁷ By using the Games in this way they had been repeatedly accused of violating the amateur tradition of sport by British officials. It was rather ironic therefore, that when the Soviet Union began to manipulate the Games and the amateur regulations for their benefit, the United States claimed that this was unfair practice. Comparisons can be drawn here between the American reaction to Soviet success and British responses to American victories, particularly those at the London and Stockholm Games in 1908 and 1912 respectively. In both instances there were suggestions that losses at the Olympic Games would impact on prestige, and that an improvement in results would only be achieved if substantially more money and resources were directed into training and preparation. Although the Olympic Games had been founded on the principles of fair play and sportsmanship and were supposedly devoid of political involvement, it is obvious from the widespread association between athletic failure and national decadence that political ideologies and beliefs have always had a close relationship with the Olympic movement.

From a British perspective, the criticisms published in the press regarding Soviet sport revolved primarily around traditional notions of amateurism. Although Soviet authorities claimed that professionalism did not exist in their country, British press reports claimed that 'by Western standards of amateurism this is open to dispute.'⁶⁸ Soviet athletes were beating the British because they were employing the use of 'shamateurs' and British amateur athletes were ill-equipped to keep pace. There were repeated debates in the press regarding 'shamateurs', and because countries like Russia and Poland were not being prevented

⁶⁶ Sam Roberts, 'A Decade of Fear: How 'McCarthyism' turned American against American in the Decades after World War II', *The New York Times Upfront*, March 15, 2010.

⁶⁷ Jim Nendel, 'The Cold War: Emerging from the Ice at the 1956 Cortina D' Ampezzo Winter Olympic Games', in *The Global Nexus Engaged: Past, Present, Future Interdisciplinary Olympic Studies: Sixth International Symposium for Olympic Research*, ed. Kevin B. Wamsley, Robert K. Barney, and S G. Martyn (Ontario: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 2002), 200.

⁶⁸ Colin Groom, 'Are the Russians Good Sports?', *Sydney Morning Herald*, February 2, 1952, 7.

from entering such athletes, there was a call from some in the West to allow the entry of professional British athletes into the Olympics so that Britain could compete on a level playing field.⁶⁹ Despite an apparent disinterest of Soviet sport in the press, possibly because the Soviet Union were so convincingly beating the British that any attempt to compare or even suggest that Britain could challenge the Soviet Union would have been futile, Soviet sporting activity was placed under careful scrutiny through some official channels. In April 1950, a report had been sent from the British Embassy in Moscow to the Research sector of the Foreign Office which included a publication that had appeared in *Komsomolskaya Pravda* entitled, 'Why Soviet Sportsmen Win.' This raised concerns amongst British officials because it highlighted the 'motives behind the importance attached to the supremacy in sport in the Soviet Union' and it was clear 'they would not rest' until they were 'supreme in all branches of sport.'⁷⁰ Contained within the report were disquieting comments relating to the manipulation of children, and how they were being moulded to recognise the significance of sport within the Soviet Union. The 'Soviet youth, educated by the Party, is hardening its character and will, and becoming insistent and stubborn because it sees before itself an honourable aim.' When this strategy paid dividends, and the children developed into successful elite athletes, they would be accorded great respect and admiration, because they were now considered 'worthy of their Motherland' for 'defending the honour of an advanced state and the honour of their people.' Soviet officials remained aware of the potential threat from Western athletes, but this was not given too much consideration because 'the bourgeois system of physical education is in a state of moral decay. And its ruin, together with the ruin of bourgeois culture as a whole, is inevitable.'⁷¹

Another report from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in 1980, raised fears surrounding the allocation of the Olympic Games to Moscow. The Soviet Government was manipulating the awarding of the Games and using it to their benefit to demonstrate to their citizens the power and authority of Communist states. The 1980 'Handbook for Party Activists' had been intercepted and contained within was a thirteen page section devoted to the Olympics which emphasised the political importance the Soviet leadership attached to staging the Games. It was declared that 'the decision to award the honour of holding the Olympic Games to the capital of the first socialist state in the world is convincing proof of the general acknowledgement of the historical importance and correct foreign policy of our country.' British officials commented that political involvement would violate the rules of the Olympic Charter and that some form of sanction should be placed upon the Soviet Union to prevent such use of the Games. However, once the

⁶⁹ James Mossop, 'Shamateurs Should be Kicked Out', *Sunday Express*, 25 July, 1978, 24.

⁷⁰ British Embassy-Moscow to Northern Department-Foreign Office, April 6, 1950, File FO 371/86796, FO Collection, NA.

⁷¹ Komsomolskaya Pravda, 'Why Soviet Sportsman Win', March 31, 1950, 6, File FO 371/86796, FO Collection, NA.

Games had been awarded to Moscow there were very few options to prevent them from using the Olympics to boost their political prestige.⁷²

Components of Soviet Success

The emergence of the likes of the Soviet Union, which used sport to demonstrate the superiority of the communist way of life, created an increased emphasis on winning and breaking records, and a shift in the role of international sport. The Soviet Union sporting system was a centrally controlled programme in which the government devoted ever more resources via a sophisticated and comprehensive sports system in order to guarantee success. Although drug taking and blood doping amongst athletes in countries such as the Soviet Union was endemic during the Cold War, it would be tenuous to suggest that their success rested solely on the use of performance enhancing substances. As Rob Beamish and Ian Richie highlight, the Soviet Union were never alone in their use of substances and unethical training methods and the manipulation of performance enhancing ergogenic aids was merely a small part of a much larger sophisticated system. They suggest that three main factors contributed to their success; the systematic and scientifically guided selection of children for a particular sport; the placing of these young athletes in fully equipped facilities with methodical and structured training programmes, which were guided by networks of qualified scientists associated with research in human performance; and finally, the concentration of effort and resources to selected sports.⁷³ However, this list is not exhaustive because another major contributor to Soviet success was the focus it placed on its female athletes. For example, at the Montreal Games in 1976, Soviet women comprised 35 per cent of the entire Soviet team and contributed thirty-six of the total 125 medal tally. In comparison, the American and British teams' female athletes consisted of only 26 and 20 per cent respectively. It is also interesting to note that during the seventeen track and field meets between the USA and USSR during the periods of 1958 to 1981, in which the Soviets amassed a higher points total on thirteen occasions, Soviet men only won five times but the Soviet women only lost on one occasion, winning all the other sixteen meets. Without the presence of Soviet women, the USSR team would have lost the majority of events.⁷⁴

The success of female athletes in the Soviet Union and other Eastern Bloc countries was achieved by directed research into the female body and recognition of its potential for performance enhancement. This allowed for the development of training schedules which would actively complement the female metabolic

⁷² Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 'Sport in the Soviet Union - Background Brief', June, 1980, 1, File FO 973/97, FO Collection, NA.

⁷³ Beamish and Ritchie, *Fastest, Highest, Strongest*, 100.

⁷⁴ James Riordan, 'Sports Medicine in the Soviet Union and German Democratic Republic', *Social Science and Medicine* 25, no. 1 (1987): 25; James Riordan 'Some Comparisons of Women's Sport in East and West', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 20, no. 1-2 (1985): 123.

potential.⁷⁵ One sports official from the Eastern Bloc commented that 'we give our men no preference in training. While other nations can produce men's teams as good if not better than ours, they lose to us overall because they are not tapping the potential of their women.'⁷⁶ Although the American media initially made attempts to minimise the importance of women's events, the emergence of successful Soviet women resulted in a realisation that if America was to re-gain control in international sport they too would need to direct greater focus and resources towards to development of female athletes. It was the emergence of the Soviet Union at the 1952 Olympics that altered the way in which women's sport came to be approached around the world.⁷⁷

There were also technical sports science techniques being implemented in the Eastern Bloc countries during the Cold War, and they were for the most part, designed and developed by Soviet researchers. Michael Kalinski and Christopher Dunbar suggest that due to the inaccessibility of journals, lack of familiarity with the language and secrecy surrounding such work ensured that this research was scarcely known by those in the West. Particularly in the Soviet Union, the free dissemination of scientific ideas and research was suppressed in the early 1950s as a direct result of the actions of the Joint Sessions of the Academy of Science and the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR.⁷⁸ This, coupled with the pressures exerted as a result of the Cold War, meant that any communication between the Soviet Union and Western scientists virtually disappeared. From this point onwards, what was occurring in the Soviet sport system became a mystery and caused much speculation regarding the reasons for their success. Hamilton Smith commented that 'nobody knew what the hell the Soviets were doing', and that he and Tom McNab often disagreed about the mechanics of the system. Although both men believed they must have been using some form of performance enhancing substance, Smith was convinced that the Soviets were working harder than anyone else and he points out that 'you can't take drugs and go faster, the drug enables you to train harder.'⁷⁹

Many individuals began to question the Soviet sport system and how they could produce athletes that were so superior to the rest of the world, and this uncertainty resulted in growing unease over the Soviet system. In an attempt to gain some evidence, Michael Speak and Victoria Ambler visited the Soviet Union in 1975 to observe the sporting and physical education programmes in use. They noted that the State would select gifted sporting children and develop their talents in well-equipped facilities under the guidance of many 'excellent' and 'qualified' coaches. In order to qualify as a coach in the Soviet Union, individuals

⁷⁵ Natalie Barker-Ruchti, 'Ballerinas and Pixies: A Genealogy of the Changing Female Gymnastics Body', *International Journal of the History of Sport* 26, no. 1 (2009): 50.

⁷⁶ Theorie und Praxis der Körperkultur [Theory and Practice of Physical Culture], 3 (1976): 76, quoted in Riordan, 'Some Comparisons', 123.

⁷⁷ Beamish and Ritchie, *Fastest, Highest, Strongest*, 20.

⁷⁸ Michael Kalinski, 'State Sponsored Research on Creatine Supplements and Blood Doping in Elite Soviet Sport', *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 46, no. 3 (2003): 446.

⁷⁹ Smith, interview.

were required to attend university or institutes of physical education and sport for a three year period before they were granted access to athletes. This ensured that the quality and standard of their coaches was consistently high because they were all qualified to a similar level, whereas in Britain for example, anyone who was willing to donate their free time would have been welcomed to train and teach athletes.⁸⁰ The average coach working in a Soviet sport school earned 200-300 roubles a month which roughly equates to £6.40, but if the coach was working with 'Masters' of sport he/she earned a considerably larger salary.⁸¹ There was also a sense of loyalty towards their coaches in the Soviet Union, whereby once they approached an age where it was no longer suitable for them to coach or they were no longer considered in 'touch with current coaching methods', they would be provided with other jobs and many moved into physical education teaching, talent identification of younger athletes and sports administration.⁸² These opportunities would never have been offered to British coaches, and some would argue that even in the modern era, coaches in Britain fail to be supported once their coaching career is over.

Speak and Ambler observed that the Soviet knowledge of sports medicine was particularly advanced and widespread, far outranking anything previously observed in Britain. Each Sport School had a suite of medical rooms in which 'many physiotherapists' were available to assist, and children were 'tested six months after they begin to attend, to establish whether they have enough potential to continue.' The use of such methods would have been, and in many cases would continue to be considered inappropriate by those in the West. There were other rooms that were supervised by a qualified doctor which included ones for treatment, diagnosis and massage, but perhaps the most beneficial and advanced use of these rooms was the ability to establish whether illness or injury was the 'result of physiological deficiency or overtraining.'⁸³

Although the use of these techniques is now commonplace in elite British sport, at the time that the Soviets were implementing these methods they would have been relatively unknown elsewhere. For the most part, Western athletes would have relied on the observations and medical knowledge of their coaches, which in some cases would have been very limited. It was made even more apparent that British and Soviet sport systems had been founded on different political, economic and cultural principles when Speak and Ambler described an incident at the Leningrad Sports School between the director of the gymnastic school, who was a former Olympic champion, and a group of three young (aged 14, 13 and 11 respectively) female gymnasts. 'The quality of the work appeared to be of international calibre and the

⁸⁰ Michael Speak and Victoria Ambler. *Physical Education, Recreation and Sport in the U.S.S.R* (Lancaster: Centre for Physical Education University of Lancaster, 1976), 27; Terry Denison, interview by author, September 14, 2011, Leeds.

⁸¹ Speak and Ambler, *Sport in the U.S.S.R*, 27; £6.40 in 1975 would be the equivalent of £52.54 in 2012. Information gathered from <http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-1633409/Historic-inflation-calculator-value-money-changed-1900.html>

⁸² Speak and Ambler, *Sport in the U.S.S.R*, 27.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 23, 25.

coaches were very, very demanding. At one stage the coach told the girl, "you'll do it until you cannot stand".⁸⁴ It was acknowledged that the work was very repetitive, and this essentially highlighted the exact nature of the relationship between the athletes, coaches and the system. The athletes were being utilised as a means to an end, cogs within a much larger machine. This is not to say that they were undervalued or not respected by their coaches, but there was a clear agenda to their participation in sport, something which would have been alien to British athletes, especially children. Vassil Girginov and Ivan Sandanski suggest that athletes in the East and West were 'following different patterns of socialisation through sport' which had been framed by different structures and 'attitudes to sporting practice'.⁸⁵ Speak and Ambler concluded with the suggestion that the focused direction of Soviet sport and physical culture 'could solve many of the problems associated with the British system', but that a sporting system which had been built on the values of amateurism, to which it remained fiercely loyal, would probably have preferred to retain its problems rather than 'sacrifice personal and professional freedom' by adopting Soviet methods.⁸⁶

Olympic coach Terry Denison also saw the Soviet sport system first hand when he and Adrian Moorhouse (Olympic gold medallist) arranged to visit and train with the swim team in 1981. Comparisons can be drawn between his experiences and those reported in 1975 by Speak and Ambler. He commented that 'the whole Soviet system was really very, very efficient...they were more organised and planned on a national level, more back-up support, more scientific support...they were just like we are today.' Denison experienced just how advanced the Soviet's medical knowledge was when Moorhouse incurred an injury to his shoulder on the second day of the visit,

If he had had that sort of an injury back home, it would have been physio treatment, if we could get it, it would certainly have been a number of days out of the water in recovery, however, as soon as he got the injury, they brought the sport scientists in and they sprayed him with, I didn't know what but it was obviously some sort of coolant thing that they had in these files that they had, they gave him physio treatment immediately, the physios told us what we should do over night and then the next day and he was back in the water. That would have been impossible over here at that time. It was all strapped up just like you see the athletes strapped up today, it was done well and he didn't lose a day's training. Whereas, in England, it would have been quite a serious injury. So it was obvious that there were things available that we didn't know about or we weren't using in this country, not in swimming anyway, I don't know if athletics was or whatever but swimming wasn't.⁸⁷

Although Denison acknowledged that the Soviet coaches and swim team were 'very welcoming' and 'very supportive', it was clear that they had some reservations about sharing all their training methods. Denison commented 'the only time in Russia it didn't work was when I asked to see the science labs, to see what

⁸⁴ Ibid., 36.

⁸⁵ Vassil Girginov and Ivan Sandanski, 'From Participants to Competitors: The Transformation of British Gymnastics and the Role of the Eastern European Model of Sport', *International Journal of the History of Sport* 21, no. 5 (2004): 817.

⁸⁶ Speak and Ambler, *Sport in the U.S.S.R.*, 92.

⁸⁷ Denison, interview,

they were doing, that caused a bit of consternation.’ After much deliberation he was allowed to view the lab, but far from seeing the methods and techniques being implemented, he was subjected to ‘a beautiful pristine lab with not a soul in it!’ It was obvious that they did not want outsiders to see what they were doing. However, Denison believes that this was not just because they were doing anything unethical, but due more to the fact that he was the opposition, and sharing such secrets and methods would have disadvantaged them.⁸⁸

Immediately prior to and following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, it had begun to emerge that success in Soviet sport had been achieved by a comprehensive athletic agenda into which research into exercise biochemistry, physiology and psychology were fully integrated. Sport institutions received specific research assignments from the Union of Research Institute of Physical Culture and by 1970 more than twenty-eight of these institutions were in existence.⁸⁹ Sport psychology, in particular, received considerable attention. Other nations appeared to disregard the benefit of the discipline, but shortly after WWII, having had a close association with aspects of sport psychology, primarily through the work of Avksenty Cezarevich Puni, the Soviet Union began to develop this as a self-contained science which continued to progress and be utilised alongside other aspects of performance enhancement. Puni had been a keen sportsman as a child, and following the Civil War, he was offered the position of a sport organiser, a combination of factors which created an interest in the area of sport psychology and its potential impact on training and performance. In 1929, Puni undertook undergraduate and postgraduate study at the P. F. Lesgaft institute of Physical Culture where he became heavily involved in research relating to psychological issues and sporting performance. Following WWII, Puni made attempts to formalise the discipline of sport psychology and developed a department at the Institute of Physical Culture. He successfully inspired others and they began to develop sport psychology courses for students and researchers as well as creating multiple laboratories so that relevant research could be conducted.⁹⁰ Following the success of the Soviet team in 1952, in which the sports sciences were attributed as being significant factors in the teams’ performances, there was an increased demand for applied research and education in sport psychology so that coaches could effectively incorporate these methods into their training.⁹¹

Although America, through the work of Coleman Griffith in the 1920s, had made attempts to develop the discipline of sport psychology, it had failed to progress because many did not appreciate the true value of the subject. By 1932, his laboratory at the University of Illinois had been closed, primarily because of a lack of financial investment although it has also been suggested that Griffith had lost the support of the

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Kalinski, ‘State Sponsored Research’, 446.

⁹⁰ Tatiana Ryba, Natalia Stambulova, and Craig Wisberg, ‘The Russian Origins of Sport Psychology: A Translation of an Early Work of A. C. Puni’, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 17, no. 2 (2005), 158-9.

⁹¹ Ibid., 159-60.

Illinois football coach, Robert Zuppke, because he failed to see any improvement in his team as a result of Griffith's methods.⁹² It was at this point that Griffith ceased the psychological work he had undertaken with professional sports teams and sport psychology in the United States did not really surface again until the 1960s. Unlike Puni, Griffith had been unable to 'train or stimulate others to follow in his footsteps' and consequently the discipline remained latent in America.⁹³ However, perhaps the most influential and important development to emerge from Soviet sporting research was an alternative training paradigm termed, periodisation. Lev Pavlovich Matveyev analysed the athletic performances of a large number of athletes across a range of different sports and produced a systematic training programme which would encourage the optimal development of an athlete's performance.⁹⁴ In 1965, he published his theory in the *Periodisation of Sport Training*, and after it was translated into the majority of languages used throughout the Soviet Bloc, this encouraged the wide-spread dissemination of the training method to a large number of Soviet coaches and athletes.⁹⁵

Key Factors

The sporting Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union had been far-reaching, stretching from the aftermath of the Second World War and lasting until the dissolution of the Soviet States in 1991. The rivalry reached its peak in the 1980s when the United States, in retaliation to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, staged a boycott of the planned Moscow Games. However, to suggest that this boycott was solely a reaction to the Soviet presence in Afghanistan would be simplistic. A multitude of factors, which cannot be covered in detail here, coupled with the awarding of the 1980 Games to a communist state which would obviously use it as a form of political propaganda, culminated in the eventual boycott. Initially not all countries were in support of the boycott and even those considered close allies of the United States appeared reluctant, but under pressure other nations gradually began to follow suit. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher voiced her support for the boycott, which was approved by the House of Commons in March 1980. But since the Olympic Charter states that 'the NOC have the exclusive authority for the representation of their exclusive countries', the British Olympic Association (BOA) took the decision to defy the government and sent a team to Moscow.⁹⁶ This seemingly placed a strain on the relationship it had forged with the government when the Minister of State at the time, Douglas Hurd, stated that 'sport itself

⁹² Christopher D. Green, 'Psychology Strikes Out: Coleman R. Griffith and the Chicago Cubs', *History of Psychology* 6, no. 3 (2003): 269-70.

⁹³ Ryba, Stambulova, and Wrisberg, 'Russian Origins of Psychology', 167.

⁹⁴ Nicholas David Bourne, 'Fast Science: A History of Training Theory and Methods for Elite Runners through 1975' (PhD diss., Texas University, 2008), 33-4.

⁹⁵ Lev Pavlovich Matveyev, *Periodisation of Sport Training* (Moscow: Fizkultura I Sport, 1965).

⁹⁶ 'Moscow Should Not Be Allowed an Olympics Spectacle', *The Times*, March 18, 1980, 5; Hugh Noyes, 'MPs Vote For Boycott of Olympics by Majority of 168', *The Times*, March 18, 1980, 1; International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Charter* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1997), 62; John Hennessy, 'Britons Vote to Send Team to Olympics', *The Times*, March 28, 1980, 1.

has lost the support in Parliament by the BOA's decision' and that it was unlikely that the government 'would make an effort to repair the damage to sport in this country.'⁹⁷ This rift undoubtedly influenced the willingness of the government to provide both the BOA and British sport with further financial support, and this will be explored further in the following chapter. In response to American actions, the Soviet Union staged a boycott of their own four years later when the Games were held in Los Angeles. Soviet authorities claimed their absence was because they feared for the safety of their athletes in a country that had such a strong anti-communist climate but there was an overriding belief amongst many that although there were various factors surrounding the Soviet decision not to participate, it was essentially orchestrated as a 'tit for tat' response to the American actions of four years previous.⁹⁸

A series of complex events, such as the political and economic reform of the Soviet Union which had been initiated by Mickail Gorbachev during the 1980s, and the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 subsequently contributed to the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, and this effectively marked the end of the Cold War.⁹⁹ From this point onwards, the focus on success in elite sport at the expense of development in other areas of society was no longer a dominating principle, but the influence of the Soviets remained strong and not all aspects of Soviet sport disappeared. Long before the dissolution, it had become evident that Soviet athletes were paid professionals, or 'shamateurs', and that a system of open professionalisation had clearly worked dividends for them, so other nations began to actively encourage an alteration to eligibility standards for entrance into the Olympic Games. Although this did not cause an immediate removal of the amateur ruling at the Olympic Games, and it was not until 1988 that professional athletes were eligible to enter, nations began to shift towards a professional approach, particularly in the way in which internal sport systems were organised.¹⁰⁰ However, the British, who considered themselves to have a different respect and appreciation for amateurism, would where possible, continue to control and organise their sport along amateur lines, whereby honorary officials continued to make executive decisions about the direction of their sports. Nevertheless, as pressures began to mount as more and more nations moved towards open professionalisation, Britain was encouraged to follow suit. However, even in the 1970s and 1980s when amateurism was no longer considered the guiding principle in British sport, its influence and impact remained ever present.

It has been established here that there were two areas in particular, government intervention and sports science, had paid significant dividends to Soviet sport. The far reaching sporting success of the Soviet Union encouraged governments around the world to emulate some of their sporting policies and the

⁹⁷ Douglas Hurd, Minister of State to Hector Munro, Parliamentary Under-Secretary, April 21, 1980, <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/foi/images/0,,1717021,00.html> (accessed April 26, 2012).

⁹⁸ 'A Soviet Nyet to the Games' *Time Magazine*, May 21, 1984, Section A.

⁹⁹ Michael J. Hogan, *The End of the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

¹⁰⁰ Edelman, 'Professionalisation of Soviet Sport', 45.

significant contributions made to the understanding of exercise biochemistry, sports nutrition and sport psychology, and the development of sophisticated methods of training such as periodisation, would transform sport worldwide. As government intervention and sports science were two key areas which apparently ensured the prolonged success of the Soviet Union, it makes sense to analyse the influence these two areas subsequently had on British sport. Consequently, the final four chapters specifically focus on these two areas from a British perspective, and try to establish how the continuing influence of amateurism, and attitudes to coaches, may have affected the rate of their uptake and development. During the 1990s, British sporting policies began to reflect some of those which had been in use in the Soviet Union, and while it could be argued that these systems would have been put in place regardless of whether the Soviets existed as an exemplar, it does seem to have been highly influential.¹⁰¹ However, while Soviet sporting policies encouraged greater specialisation in British sport, particularly through increased government intervention, there was less of a desire to utilise sports science techniques and its incorporation was not initially encouraged. There appears to have been a significant lag between the emergence of particular training techniques and their uptake in Britain. The first public, government funded example of research in British sport did not emerge until 1965 with the BOA directed Mexican altitude project, and this will be discussed in more depth in the following chapter. It should be noted at this point, that there was one Soviet training method, periodisation, which had an influence on British coaching, especially after 1975 when Frank Dick reproduced these Soviet principles for a British audience. However, even then it was not widely welcomed. This resistance to scientific training methods in Britain could well be due to some ethical concerns surrounding Eastern Bloc techniques since the dubious practices believed to be commonly in use within the Soviet schemes had become inextricably linked with sports science methods. An association, therefore, was made between the incorporation of science and cheating in sport because it was increasingly difficult to disassociate the two.¹⁰² In relation to this Terry Denison commented,

The system was...fantastic at identifying talent, of putting talent in the right places, of getting the right coaches and the right sport scientists together, the system was brilliant but it involved the use of drugs, so that tainted everything...you couldn't justify the use of drugs on young people anyway...but also, you couldn't even look at the rest of it and say well, they did that well didn't they, well, yeah but...we can't be following that. It just tainted everything. But their systems were good; the Soviet sport school system was good.¹⁰³

According to Roberta Park another factor that delayed the introduction of sports science and scientific training methods into British sport, was the strict amateur ethos that continued to permeate and dominate

¹⁰¹ Allison and Monnington, 'Sport, Prestige and Relations', 115.

¹⁰² Smith, interview.

¹⁰³ Denison, interview.

British sport.¹⁰⁴ Consequently, while coaching was beginning to gain some acceptance in Britain, there was still an apparent uneasiness surrounding the use of science to improve sporting performance and this will become clear in the following chapters.

¹⁰⁴ Park, 'Cells or Soaring?', 1710.

Chapter Six: Soviet Influences on British Sport

British sporting performances had continually declined since the interwar period, but it was the emergence of the Soviet Union that now made these losses even more apparent. Previously, the results of British athletes could be attributed to the impact of the war and the continued strict adherence to amateurism, but the success of the Soviets meant that these excuses were no longer satisfactory. This chapter analyses the impact of the Soviet Union on British sport, and indicates how the success of the Soviets resulted in calls to adopt a more specialised sporting model. The meagre performances of British athletes at the 1952 Olympics appear to have been much more influential in terms of encouraging change than the results experienced previously. Also, athlete unrest at both Helsinki and Melbourne suggests that discontent in British sport was now no longer just confined to professional coaches. This chapter considers some of those events and then explores why, despite increasing pressures to adopt Soviet techniques of coaching and training, British administrators remained reluctant to incorporate a more specialised approach to coaching. It then goes on to discuss how this resistance ultimately led to a number of coaching resignations in both swimming and athletics. The final section of the chapter suggests that, although National Governing Bodies (NGB) were unwilling to relinquish their master-servant relationship with professional coaches, the Soviet success and continued poor performances of British athletes encouraged external bodies to review the state of British sport.

Helsinki and Melbourne from a British Perspective

The rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States at both the Helsinki and Melbourne Games ensured that competition standards were particularly high. Despite the tentative steps taken after the 1948 Olympics towards improving coaching in Britain, partly because the schemes were still very much devoted to the traditions of amateurism and volunteerism, British athletes were unable to keep pace, and this was clearly highlighted by the lack of achievement, particularly at Helsinki. Whereas previous British failures had been attributed to the aftermath of the war, by 1952 this could no longer be convincingly used to explain failure, and as a result the performances of the British team were widely touted as a 'ghastly failure.'¹ A gold medal tally of just one, coupled with the success of the Soviet Union and the United States, once again stimulated debate about the British sporting system. It was obvious that the alternative training and coaching methods now being utilised abroad far outstripped anything which existed in Britain. Helsinki indicated that the British sport system was ill-equipped to keep pace, for it was apparent that Britain was 'disastrously short of tracks; America has, perhaps, 100 tracks for every one that we possess; and they have indoor facilities as well.'² *The Times* ran articles questioning how the traditionalist view on sport had

¹ University of Birmingham, *Britain in World Sport*, 7; 'Mr. H. Abrahams on the Olympic Games', *The Times*, August 7, 1952.

² Philip Noel-Baker, 'The Olympic Games: Britain's Immense Progress', *The Times*, August 9, 1952, 5.

potentially hampered the development of British training methods and it was suggested that Britain has 'too few coaches and their status still leaves something to be desired.'³ The issue of specialised training techniques was also raised, and although it was acknowledged that some British athletes were beginning to train in a 'laboratory atmosphere of stop watches, statistics and records', many critics continued to question this approach, suggesting that these methods were not suitable for British sport.⁴ This resistance to the incorporation of science into British sport was nothing new. In 1927, A. V. Hill, while completing a one-semester guest lectureship at Cornell University, observed that 'in America...people are more inclined to treat the subject of athletics scientifically...there are I fear, many athletes and sportsmen in England who would be shocked by such an idea.'⁵ Despite Helsinki failures raising questions over science and sport, further progress was not forthcoming. In 1953, British football administrator Sir Stanley Rous commented that, 'the British, compared with many other nations, usually go about their games in a surprisingly unserious way...who cares about the...chemical structure of a muscle.'⁶ It was clear that the debate regarding British sport and science would be on-going, and considering that it was yet another aspect influenced by amateurism, its integration could be a slow process.

Despite widespread criticism, Harold Abrahams made attempts to defend the British athletes and suggested that their performances at the 1952 Games would have been sufficient to secure medals in both 1936 and 1948. In response, *The Times* argued that it was exactly 'this curious backward-looking and sideways thinking' that was the 'root of the problem' in British sport.⁷ It was becoming increasingly apparent that amateurism was no longer an acceptable excuse for poor performances; where individuals had once expressed a fondness for the British amateur ethos, these feelings were gradually being replaced with resentment. The option was clear; if Britain wanted to achieve success in sport, then a shift towards a more specialised system was required. John Disley argued that the close relationship between British sport and amateurism had not only hindered the development of coaching and training, but had also 'built up a psychological barrier to winning' amongst developing athletes.⁸ The *Picture Post* also highlighted the differences between British and foreign interpretations of amateurism and suggested, 'what's the use in 'being British' and saying "the game's the thing - not the result"? No other country comes off so badly. Either we go flat out to win - or not enter.'⁹ It appears that the more professional Soviet system of sport was beginning to have an impact in Britain and it was being increasingly presented by some as a sporting

³ Philip Noel-Baker, 'The Olympic Games: Britain's Immense Progress', *The Times*, August 9, 1952, 5.

⁴ J L. Manning, 'The Olympic Games', *The Times*, August 13, 1952.

⁵ Archibald Hill, *Muscular Movement in Man: The Factors Governing Speed and Recovery from Fatigue* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1921), 2; Park, 'Cells or Soaring?', 1710.

⁶ Stanley Rous, foreword to *Fitness and Injury in Sport: Care, Diagnosis and Treatment by Physical Means*, by Sidney Simon Knight (New York: Van Nostrand, 1953), ix.

⁷ 'Olympic Games', *The Times*, August 13, 1952, 5.

⁸ Disley, 'Reflections on Soviet Sport', 71.

⁹ Geoffrey Hoare, 'Training by Candlelight?', *Picture Post*, August 9, 1952, 12-3.

model that could potentially create opportunities for British athletes. It was suggested that if Britain ever wanted to achieve sporting success again they would need 'to get rid of this absurd smugness about amateurism' and 'train every day, all year round' under the supervision of professional coaches.¹⁰ In this respect, it was comments made by Kenneth Sandilands ('Sandy') Duncan, BOA secretary, which are perhaps the most illuminating. He suggested that

Our Governing Bodies must decide whether they will, or can, make the all-out effort to train their Olympic teams. The day of dilettante in international competition is finished. To achieve supreme success, many months, or perhaps years of hard training must be carried out, and this requires wise direction, and great courage and self-control on the part of the competitor...we must realise precisely what we are up against, discard any surviving old-time methods, and start now planning ahead for the XVIth Olympiad, Melbourne, 1956.¹¹

Although British performances at Melbourne in 1956, where they managed to secure twenty-four medals including six gold, marked a significant improvement on previous Games, it was the emergence of other factors which indicated that British sport remained in a state of flux. There was growing discontent amongst the athletes, particularly over British officials and their definitions of amateurism. Although these disagreements had begun to surface following Helsinki, it was not until Melbourne that athlete dissatisfaction emerged in the public domain. The disputes which initially materialised in the press were associated with the request for 'pocket money' at the Games, something already granted in other countries. It was noted that Australian swimmers had 'received 5s per day pocket money for expenses,' but the appeal for funds by British athletes was denied by the BOA, with Sandy Duncan stating 'definitely no pocket money. You knew that when you accepted the invitation to go to Melbourne.'¹² This comment signifies that even though Duncan had previously acknowledged that British athletes required greater training and a more professional attitude, the BOA and other sporting organisation still remained guarded of their level of control and finances, which suggest that despite signalling an acceptance of specialisation, amateurism remained ever present. Despite initially linking disputes to the matter of money, it gradually became apparent that the issues went much deeper and the far-reaching restrictions which British amateur officials had placed on its athletes were beginning to create repercussions. Jack Crump, athletics team manager from the British Amateur Athletic Board (BAAB), referred to the majority of athletes as a 'miserable lot' who had not approached the competition in the correct way.¹³ This resulted in a wave of criticism being aimed at the British athletes, with one press report suggesting there was 'no point in sending

¹⁰ T. Loftus-Tottenham, 'Amateurs: No Such Thing?', *Picture Post*, February 2, 1952, 8; *Ibid.*

¹¹ British Olympic Association, *Olympic Games 1952: Official Report* (London: World Sports, 1952), 107.

¹² British Olympic Association, *Olympic Games 1956: Official Report* (London: World Sports, 1956), 63; Desmond Hackett, 'British Olympic Athletes Row with Manager Crump', *Daily Express*, November 17, 1956, 9.

¹³ Peter Wilson, 'Athletes are Wasting your Money', *Daily Mirror*, November 28, 1956, 23.

athletes who...clearly don't care whether they win or lose.¹⁴ Chris Brasher, who had won a gold medal in the 3000m steeplechase, came to the defence of the athletes, and declared that although there was a level of 'cynicism' in the team this was because of 'the breakdown in confidence and respect between the officials and athletes.'¹⁵ He also argued that 'sport is undemocratically controlled by a few amateur and professional dictators...old men have clung to the dreams of their childhood when a gentleman was an amateur and an artisan a professional.'¹⁶ British athletes suggested that because officials had failed to progress, they were 'out of touch with the sport', and particularly since the war that this had resulted in a 'wide gap' between athletes and administrators.¹⁷ Athletes were not alone in their criticisms. When questioned why British athletics had 'folded up', the Australian team manager proposed that there was a lack of discipline in the team, administrators were too old and needed replacing by 'younger people who had some conception of what modern athletics entailed', and tellingly there was a lack of coaching.¹⁸ Prompted by the events of Melbourne, many athletes called for a 'complete re-organisation' of the British sport system, something which the BOA were inclined to agree with.¹⁹

It has become apparent that we need more professional coaches in this country and that in some sports the competitors from other countries train over longer distances and for longer hours. The amount of training that competitors felt that they required in 1956 was for some sports more than double that which was considered necessary in 1948.²⁰

In May 1959, a group of seventy athletes, which included John Disley and Chris Brasher, created the International Athletes Club (IAC), which it was hoped would encourage the development of facilities and coaching for British athletics.²¹ In order to tackle some of the issues in athletics they required financial backing, but since this would not be forthcoming from other sources, they set about raising their own funds. They produced a book entitled *Road to Rome* and the royalties were used to organise a pre-Olympic training weekend for forty-eight athletes and ten coaches.²² They also made plans to develop a permanent training centre in Hampshire but lack of finance and active support prevented it from becoming established.²³ It was also hoped that 'never again should a national coach have to dip into his own pocket

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Chris Brasher, 'Cynicism Beats Our Athletes', *Observer*, August 10, 1958, 1.

¹⁶ Chris Brasher, 'Youth and Age in Open Conflict', *Observer*, January 4, 1959, 21.

¹⁷ Chris Brasher, 'Ideas Must be Backed with Cash', *Observer*, May 8, 1960, 31; John Rodda, 'IAC Projects Require Much More Active Support', *Guardian*, April 21, 1961, 4.

¹⁸ Chris Brasher, 'Cynicism Beats Our Athletes', *Observer*, August 10, 1958, 1.

¹⁹ Sydney Hulls, 'Rebel Athletes Say Give Us New Deal', *Daily Express*, December 14, 1956, 12.

²⁰ British Olympic Association, *Olympic Games 1956*, 11.

²¹ Sydney Hulls, 'Star Athletes 'Locked Out'', *Daily Express*, July 18, 1959, 8.

²² Chris Brasher, 'Ideas Must be Backed with Cash', *Observer*, May 8, 1960, 31; John Rodda, 'IAC Projects Require Much More Active Support', *Guardian*, April 21, 1961, 4.

²³ John Rodda, 'IAC Projects Require Much More Active Support', *Guardian*, April 21, 1961, 4.

to enable one of our brightest hopes to travel to London for coaching.²⁴ Despite making considerable progress in a short period of time, when the IAC made attempts to be represented officially they were rebuffed by the BAAB. Although the BAAB did not object to the IAC's existence, they were not willing to offer them a role which could potentially dilute the existing level of authority of amateur officials.²⁵

On paper it seems that attempts were indeed being made to raise the profile of British sport and change how professional coaching was being valued, but in reality, it was also apparent that sporting bodies still had firm ideas regarding the importance of professional coaching. It could be suggested that the way in which amateur administrators approached coaching and athletes was embedded within the culture of their sport because, historically, the connection between administrators and coaches or trainers had always been moulded around the master-servant relationship whereby 'as long as coaches adopted their allotted roles as servants then suitable men might be acceptable as trainers.'²⁶ It was extremely difficult to break down barriers and traditions which had existed in the sport for so long and it is unsurprising that this approach to coaching continued to have a residual impact. However, in the modern era, appointed coaches were no longer willing to accept the role of servant and they wanted greater autonomy and control over their working environment. From the administrators' perspective these professional coaches were now encroaching on matters which did not come under their jurisdiction, and in an attempt to control the situation, they continued to rely on their traditional authoritarian approach. Tom McNab suggests that even as late as the 1960s when he was acting as national coach, there was still this assumption among administrators that 'you'll do as your told, we're the masters here.'²⁷

The following sections examine the development of the coaching schemes in both swimming and athletics after the 1952 Helsinki Games. The evidence suggests, that although changes were being implemented, the control of the sporting bodies, particularly the NGBs, remained with amateur officials who managed their sports according to their traditional beliefs. Although attempts were being made to raise the overall profile of professional coaching in British sport, amateur officials still viewed them with distrust and this was demonstrated by the lack of respect which they offered their national coaches.

Post-Melbourne Coaching Scheme Development

Swimming

Although there had been discussions in the 1952 Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) Committee Minutes about re-opening negotiations with the Ministry of Education regarding grant-aid for coaches, it

²⁴ Chris Brasher, 'Ideas Must be Backed with Cash', *Observer*, May 8, 1960, 31.

²⁵ John Rodda, 'IAC Projects Require Much More Active Support', *Guardian*, April 21, 1961, 4.

²⁶ Day, 'See His Own Faults', 8.

²⁷ McNab, interview.

was not until December 1957 that an official application was submitted.²⁸ Contained within the application was a declaration that the ASA could extend the scope of work to which they were committed 'if only we had a paid coach.' Fern, who believed that because swimming was considered a life skill it was of greater value than any other sport, commented, 'I notice that a grant had been made to the Amateur Fencing Association, no doubt very justifiably, but one can hardly rank fencing in the same category as swimming' and he suggested that swimming 'might well be ranked higher than any other sports for which coaching grants are already made.'²⁹ This reflects the constant battle which occurred between sports to ensure they were receiving the support they felt they were entitled to. Many organisations believed that their sport was somehow superior to other sports and any hint that another association was receiving what they considered to be unwarranted support would immediately be questioned. It might be assumed that under modern conditions NGBs would be more willing to co-operate but, because the environment is now fuelled by the demand for results and greater financial opportunities, the rivalry between organisations has continued to develop and is actually now much more prevalent. Commenting on the situation Bill Furniss explained,

There's a lot of sports that are envious of other sports and think they're not getting a fair crack of the whip and now it's results driven so if you don't produce the results you don't get the money...it used to be that sports could get more, a bigger slice of the cake without producing results.³⁰

The Ministry's response to the ASA's request for money, perhaps because Fern questioned their administrative methods, was not particularly supportive. They asked the ASA to make an official application, as this was the correct procedure, and to outline the scheme they intended to implement if they were to be awarded any funds.³¹ Simply stating that they wished to apply for a grant was not considered enough by the Ministry, even if the ASA saw themselves as superior to other sports. The ASA did submit an application, albeit a very brief one, stating that they wished to appoint a 'National Technical Officer' (NTO) to organise and direct various courses throughout the country.³² Once again the response was less than favourable as the Ministry did not believe this was the 'kind of scheme to which we can properly give grant aid' because it was not within their jurisdiction to 'aid the salaries of organisers.'³³ There was a fear that if they were to award funding to the ASA on such grounds they 'may have other applications following

²⁸ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1951-Committee Minutes, November 28-29, 1952, 31, ASA Headquarters.

²⁹ A H E. Fern to E H B. Baker, December 31, 1957, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

³⁰ Furniss, interview.

³¹ E H B. Baker to A H E. Fern, January 6, 1958, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

³² 'Amateur Swimming Association Proposed Ministry of Education Grant', May 31, 1958, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

³³ E H B. Baker to A H E. Fern, June 25, 1958, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

in their footsteps.³⁴ The ASA were directed to review their application and submit it according to grant aid regulations. Fern responded by suggesting that the ASA were not required to amend their application because the Ministry had clearly misinterpreted what they had outlined. The ASA argued they had only used the term NTO to avoid confusion, because within the ASA, those individuals who had gained the coaching certificate were classified as 'national coaches.' The ASA assured the Ministry that they had every intention of appointing a 'fully qualified coach' and that 'he would follow the procedure adopted by the AAA coaches.'³⁵ Although the majority of the Ministry Committee were content that what the ASA were proposing was a 'bona fide coaching scheme', there were some who were clearly irritated by the ASA's refusal to accept support some eleven years previous and so questioned their intentions. It was noted that 'for 10 years we have dangled this carrot for them to take, and a good deal of unobtrusive action has been taken behind the scenes in order to get them to eat it.'³⁶ An objection was also raised on financial grounds which suggested that the ASA did 'not have a very strong case' to request grant aid because they currently had £16,000 in the bank and were showing a 'regular surplus.' The Ministry 'should not just spend money because it happens to be available' and if the ASA were not willing to undertake a coaching scheme without 'an extra carrot from the Exchequer' then for what plausible reason had the ASA accumulated such a large sum of money?³⁷

This appears to have been a common trait amongst voluntary amateur organisations of the time, whereby they generally had large sums of money available but were reluctant to use it constructively. Even though the ASA had previously commented they were unable to raise funds in a similar fashion to organisations such as the AAA, who had the opportunity to organise competitions and profit from the gate money, their financial position was at the time much healthier than many other organisations and yet they were not prepared to use the funds to further their sport. This was reinforced by a number of interviewees in this research who observed that amateur officials in both the AAA and ASA were much more inclined to use, although often begrudgingly, their own personal finance to cover their expenses rather than drawing on the association's money. Both Tom McNab and Hamilton Smith described situations when, having just begun their national coaching role they required some form of transport to successfully fulfil their commitments. Arthur Kendal who was the Southern Counties AAA secretary had asked McNab if he was going to purchase a car so that he could undertake his role successfully. McNab, who had responded that he was unable to afford a car, described how

He got his cheque book out, this was a guy who was a completely altruistic man, he signed it on the wall I remember and he gave me this cheque!...I always remember that £350 cheque; I

³⁴ Ministry of Education, Minutes, June 11, 1958, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

³⁵ A H E. Fern to E H B. Baker, June 30, 1958, File ED 169/70 MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

³⁶ Ministry of Education, Minutes, July 16, 1958, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

³⁷ Ministry of Education, Minutes, July 17, July 21, 1958, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

mean that was a lot of money in those days, that was a third of my year's salary that he had given me. And that was his personal cheque; it wasn't from the governing body.³⁸

Hamilton Smith described a similar scenario during an encounter that he had with Alderman Fern,

I asked if the association might be able to give me some money and I could buy a car and I could pay it back. He almost had smoke coming out of his ears, money! Money! He was trembling, so he changed the subject and we must have talked about something else for a bit and then suddenly his secretary, the famous Miss Righter by name came in, now how he communicated I don't know, but she came in with a book like this and he took the book and he opened it up and it was a cheque book, it was his cheque book and he wrote me a cheque, his personal cheque, to go and buy a car. He said pay that back when you can! It was £500 in 1963, that's the equivalent of £10-15,000 now...But he wouldn't give me the association's money he gave me his own money.³⁹

Smith commented that this 'aristocratic' and altruistic element was present amongst the majority of amateur officials. He suggested that it was akin to 'what was portrayed in the Chariots of Fire' in which there was an upper class element controlling amateur sport. He explained that 'if you understood that relationship then everything was fine as long as you were positive and respectful.' However, if you questioned either their authority or the way in which they managed the sport that is when 'problems arose.'⁴⁰ Although the context in which these organisations operated was ever-changing, the foundations remained essentially the same. They had been formed by upper-middle class individuals who wanted to have some form of control over amateur sport and this appeared to be a relative constant amongst the amateur associations.

With respect to the issue of grant aid for the ASA, although there appeared to be support for not awarding them the money, there were still some who believed, that despite everything, they had a duty to provide financial help and it was 'not a case of wanting to spend money just because it happens to be available, but of implementing a small part of an offer previously made.' It was also noted, that considering British swimming had only achieved one gold medal in 1956, when it had been assumed that they would have done significantly better, it 'would be a singularly inopportune moment to refuse an application for a grant which...might do much to improve national standards.'⁴¹ There was consistent evidence for both sides of the argument, but it was eventually decided that there would be no grant-aid awarded to the ASA although the Ministry hoped they would 'be able to start a coaching scheme with its own funds.'⁴² While there appears to be a lack of information in both the ASA Committee Minutes and the Ministry of Education documents regarding the ASA's reaction to the rejection, it is clear that, even though they had finances, the ASA did not heed the suggestion and initiate their own coaching scheme.

³⁸ McNab, interview.

³⁹ Smith, interview.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ministry of Education, Minutes, July 24, 1958, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁴² E H B. Baker to A H E. Fern, August 7, 1958, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

Despite the many objections raised by the Ministry, within a year they were re-considering their position on the matter after the ASA had submitted a revised application. When the coaching grants were initially established it had been agreed that they would be able to subsidise the work of twenty-five to thirty coaches at an annual cost of £20,000. However, in reality they were only spending £7,000 per year to fund ten full time coaches across four different sports, athletics, fencing, women's hockey and lawn tennis. This, it was agreed, was a 'very much smaller scheme than was originally contemplated.'⁴³ It would appear that the amateur organisations were not the only ones who had been reluctant to spend available funds. It was eventually agreed to offer a grant to the ASA for 80 per cent of the salary of one professional coach, and the ASA immediately got 'busy to find the right man for the job.'⁴⁴ The position was advertised and the ASA received over twenty applications from individuals willing to fulfil the position at an annual salary of £1,000. However, one applicant, A. D. Kinnear, who was well known to the ASA because of his previous involvement with the Loughborough Summer School, was considered the most suitable and qualified candidate for the role, even if he wanted an annual salary of £1,500.⁴⁵ The Ministry approved Kinnear's appointment and considered the ASA 'very lucky' to have secured a coach of such 'calibre.' Since Kinnear had accepted a lower salary than he was currently receiving in order to take up the role, this confirmed to the Ministry of 'his enthusiasm even at some personal loss.'⁴⁶

On 1 January 1960, Kinnear took up office, and as was standard protocol with all the coaching grants, he was contracted to submit annual reports to the Ministry outlining the work that he had completed. Amongst the many tours and lectures which Kinnear had organised and presented, it was noted that he had also visited a hydrodynamics laboratory on the Isle of Wight 'in an attempt to solve the many problems associated with resistance and propulsion in the water.'⁴⁷ Although initiatives like this could have potentially done much to improve the standard of British swimming, the Ministry were less than satisfied and they reminded the ASA that 'our grant is given on the distinct understanding that his main duty will be the training of persons to fit them to become local coaches...I am sure that Mr Kinnear will be anxious to keep in mind the main object for which our grant is given.'⁴⁸ The Ministry was obviously keen to remain in control, particularly regarding the function of the national coaches. The very principle on which the coaching grants were allocated, which was not to raise the profile of British sport internationally, but to train a contingent of honorary coaches, demonstrates that amateurism and all its associated principles remained a very powerful force in British sport. Although the coaching schemes often received praise from other countries,

⁴³ Ministry of Education, 'Coaching Grants', File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁴⁴ E H B. Baker to A H E. Fern, April 20, 1959, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA; A H E. Fern to E H B. Baker, April 22, 1959, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁴⁵ A H E. Fern to E H B. Baker, September 29, 1959, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁴⁶ Ministry of Education, Minutes AW0628/17, October 1, 1959, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁴⁷ A D. Kinnear to A H E. Fern, February 22, 1960, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁴⁸ E H B. Baker to A H E. Fern, March 3, 1960, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

particularly America, this was probably more to do with the fact that it was so very different to anything experienced abroad where the emphasis was not on developing voluntary coaches but on utilising their many professional coaches to improve their international standing in sport.⁴⁹

Unlike the athletics coaches, Kinnear and other sporting national coaches were not given the opportunity to coach individual athletes on a regular basis. In his first annual report, although it was noted he had spent two months intermittently coaching the entire Olympic Squad (which was distinctly different to the system in athletics), he appealed to the Ministry to allow him to coach athletes consistently because, 'If I am to keep in touch with coaching I must be permitted to coach several pupils at varying levels of ability.'⁵⁰ Tom McNab comments that a real strength of the athletics scheme was that that they were allowed to coach a small number of athletes. He claimed it was a 'bad mistake' that other national coaches were prevented from coaching because that meant that they 'stopped experiencing' and, as a result, stopped developing their expertise.⁵¹ There is no evidence to suggest that Kinnear was ever granted permission to coach a select group of swimmers on a regular basis and the first indication that NTO were going to be permitted to do this came in 1967 with the appointment of Hamilton Bland. Hamilton Smith recalls that in 1972-3 Bland persuaded the first director of swimming, Norman Sarsfield, to allow him to operate within a club environment for nine months. He became the head coach at Coventry and so became the first ever local authority professional coach. From this point onward, the programme continued to develop and was rolled out to other situations throughout the country, with local authorities funding professional swimming coaches to work within certain clubs.⁵²

By 1961, it was becoming increasingly apparent that Kinnear was unable to manage the workload and fulfil his duties effectively without some sort of assistance, especially when it was revealed that within a one year period he had 'covered approximately 20,000 miles by road and rail...worked with 6,000 swimmers and non-swimmers and approximately 13,000 interested persons' had attended his lectures and demonstrations.⁵³ It is unsurprising, therefore, that his duties 'fully occupy his time and leave him little margin even to visit his home to see his wife and family.'⁵⁴ The Ministry approved the ASA's application for a second NTO in June 1961 and they began interviewing for a suitable appointment although the interviewing process was 'delayed owing to queries raised by Mr Kinnear in connection with his job as

⁴⁹ Larry Montague, 'Coaching Scheme Progress', *Manchester Guardian*, April 9, 1954, 13.

⁵⁰ A D. Kinnear, 'Annual Report for 1960', File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁵¹ McNab, interview.

⁵² Smith, interview.

⁵³ A D. Kinnear, 'Annual Report for 1962', File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁵⁴ A H E. Fern to E H B. Baker, April 27, 1961, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

National Coach.⁵⁵ As with the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) national coaches, Kinnear felt he was not being utilised in the most productive way in order to further develop British swimming. But the ASA worked hard to persuade him to stay, partly by making changes in his terms of employment, following which he signed a contract for a further two years.⁵⁶ This was the first real sign in any official documents that Kinnear was beginning to have issues with his job, and there is a sense he was now feeling undervalued.

Although the ASA had successfully dealt with the issue on this occasion, this was a portent of things to come. Despite the delay, a decision was made in November 1961 to appoint Tony Holmyard at a salary of £950-980 per annum, and he was scheduled to begin his official duties on 1 January 1962.⁵⁷ In Kinnear's annual report in 1962, he recognised that the appointment of the second NTO had resolved some of his difficulties but he wanted the programme to expand further. He suggested that he would 'like to see greater development in the organisation of coaching throughout the country with a closer liaison between coaches' because this would create a system which allowed for the 'regular exchange of ideas.'⁵⁸ Kinnear could see real benefit in allowing coaches to share ideas, something which many of the coaches interviewed for this research suggested was one of the ways they gained a lot of their coaching knowledge, and this highlights just how advanced Kinnear's coaching ability and awareness actually was.⁵⁹ Kinnear also expressed a desire to develop a 'universal system of bringing the better swimmers together for group and team training in areas', which is very similar to Koskie's proposals following the 1948 Olympics.⁶⁰ The fact that over ten years later such a scheme had still not come to fruition demonstrates just how reluctant amateur sporting organisations were to initiate change.

As with the AAA national coaches, it appears that the environment in which the NTO's operated was difficult. Holmyard resigned after less than two years and he was replaced by Hamilton Smith who began his duties on 1 October 1963.⁶¹ Smith had emigrated to Canada and had been coaching there for about eighteen months when he received a telegram from Kinnear (who he had become acquainted with at Loughborough) explaining that the ASA were advertising for another national coach and he wanted him to apply. Smith was keen but he did not have the funds to pay for the airfare until he received another

⁵⁵ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1961-Committee Minutes, June 10, 1961, 21, ASA Headquarters; E H B. Baker to H. Sager, May 16, 1961, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA; J W. Ramaeres to E H B. Baker, September 11, 1961, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁵⁶ J W. Ramaeres to E H B. Baker, September 11, 1961, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁵⁷ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1961-Committee Minutes, December 1-2, 1961, 27, ASA Headquarters; A H E. Fern to L C J. Martin, December 12, 1961, File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA; *the exact figure is unclear as the ASA's Minutes and communication with the Ministry state different amounts.

⁵⁸ A D. Kinnear, 'Annual Report for 1962', File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁵⁹ Alan Lynn, interview by author, April 8, 2011, Stirling, Scotland; Furniss, interview; Denison, interview.

⁶⁰ A D. Kinnear, 'Annual Report for 1962', File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

⁶¹ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1962, 6, ASA Headquarters; Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1963-Committee Minutes, March 29-30, 1963, 25 ASA Headquarters.

telegram, this time from Alderman Fern, simply stating 'come for an interview we will pay your fare.' Within two days he was on a plane and being interviewed by 'the whole of the ASA committee...half of them didn't know the shallow end from the deep end in any sort of coaching or technical context but Bert had wanted me to get the job, so I got the job.'⁶² The ASA appealed to the Ministry for a further grant to appoint a third NTO and Helen Elkington started in her role on 1 April 1964.⁶³ Working in an environment where there was constant questioning from the amateur administration regarding the work of the NTOs eventually began to take its toll. In 1966 new terms of employment were handed to the three NTOs but there was disagreement over some issues and they refused to sign them.⁶⁴ They were given until April 1967 to comply, and although Kinnear and Elkington were content (for the time being) to continue their work, Smith decided to resign.⁶⁵ He explained that it was not one specific factor that caused him to leave, but a culmination of reasons, although 'the straw that broke the camel's back' was when he was accused of cheating on his expenses. It transpired that there had been a complication with the paperwork and that Smith had been submitting it correctly but it was not being processed. By then, he had become so frustrated with the working environment and the amateur officials that he had already made the decision to leave and return to education.⁶⁶

Shortly after Smith's resignation, the ASA were awarded another Ministry grant to appoint three further NTOs, Hamilton Bland, John Hogg and Charles Wilson. Unfortunately for British swimming, Kinnear was soon to follow Smith and resign. Kinnear had issues with Smith's intended replacement, John Stace, who had been personally selected by Sarsfield. This was no real surprise since Kinnear and Sarsfield had always had a somewhat strained relationship because they failed to find common ground over the status of professional coaches.⁶⁷ Stace did not hold the diploma of Physical Education, which Kinnear believed should have been a prerequisite in order for an individual to fulfil the role of NTO successfully. He commented,

I have spent 7 and a half years building up a scheme which has earned the respect and support of the teaching and physical education professions, and the competitive swimming fraternity. The basis of its success had been the high qualifications in teaching physical education and swimming of its officers...and their exceptional ability. I am not prepared to lower these standards by accepting what I consider to be unqualified personnel.⁶⁸

⁶² Smith, interview.

⁶³ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1963, 5-6, ASA Headquarters.

⁶⁴ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1967-Committee Minutes, January 27, 1967, 12, ASA Headquarters.

⁶⁵ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1967-Committee Minutes, June 2-3, 1967, 20, ASA Headquarters.

⁶⁶ Smith, interview.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Brian Crowther, 'Chief Coach Resigns on Principle', *Guardian*, July 25, 1967, 13.

The ASA Committee was 'not prepared to take the advice of Mr Kinnear on this particular occasion' and therefore, on principle, he resigned as of October 1967.⁶⁹ Once the basis of Kinnear's resignation was made public, the ASA received a torrent of criticism from various bodies 'deploring the resignation of Mr. A. D. Kinnear.' In response, the ASA defended their actions suggesting that Kinnear had recognised that Stace was the best candidate for the job but his only objection was regarding the absence of the teaching qualification.⁷⁰ Whether or not this was the case, their refusal to even consider Kinnear's opinion, it was claimed, resulted in the 'greatest loss' to British swimming of an individual 'who had done so much towards the improvement of coaching and towards the dissemination of information.'⁷¹ Kinnear never coached again. He withdrew his coaching services from the 1968 Olympics but he did agree to fulfil an arrangement he made with ITV to be a swimming commentator at the 1968 and 1972 Games. He had no further direct contact with swimmers and instead ran a restaurant with his wife before retiring to Spain in 1981. He passed away at the Aberdeen Acute Stroke Unit in January 2011. Reflecting on his time working with the ASA he referred to the 'system as an example of a ruling oligarchy run by very few personalities.'⁷² Although swimming may have progressed in terms of coaching provision and athlete development, it was clear that amateur administrators still controlled much of sport and they stuck by their traditional principles, even if this resulted in a significant loss to the sport.

Athletics

In athletics, the relationships between British coaches and administrators remained strained with the establishment refusing to accommodate the views of professional coaches. The emergence of the Soviet Union and the use of the Olympic Games as a means to demonstrate their superiority resulted in an increase in the acceptance of professional coaches abroad. Dyson and his colleagues could see these individuals were receiving a salary which was commensurate with their status and that they had the respect and support of their officials, something which coaches in Britain were unlikely to achieve while amateurism continued to dominate as a sporting philosophy. Amateur officials believed they understood the 'simple' mechanics of coaching and as such they continued to exert pressure over the direction of sport. Les Truelove, who took over from Jack Crump as British team manager, often referred to coaching as '90 per cent. Kidology' and outwardly expressed that he did 'not believe in coaching', an opinion which reflected the views of the majority of administrators.⁷³ This perspective on the value of the coaching role resulted in frequent disagreements between administrators and the national coaches, particularly Dyson. Many

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1967-Committee Minutes, June 2-3, 1967, 34, ASA Headquarters.

⁷¹ Smith, interview: Keil and Wix, *In the Swim*, 97.

⁷² Keil and Wix, *In the Swim*, 97.

⁷³ Christopher Brasher, 'The Path to Rome: Smoothing the Way', *Observer*, October 4, 1959, 31.

officials felt that the work of the national coaches did not warrant any sort of status and they made no attempt to mediate an approach which would ultimately mark the beginning of the end of Dyson's role as national coach.⁷⁴

In 1957, Dyson had accompanied the British athletics team on a tour of Poland and Germany when Crump, in attendance as team manager, failed to consult Dyson before making changes to the order of the relay team, which resulted in a poor performance. Dyson demanded to be allowed to return home and, although he was eventually persuaded to stay, the rift between Dyson and Crump was almost irreparable.⁷⁵ Once the press learnt of Crump's actions, criticisms of the 'pig-headed' administrators and 'out of touch' system began to surface.⁷⁶ It had become obvious that Dyson was being undervalued when it was revealed that his role in Warsaw consisted of 'weighing a discus, a javelin and a hammer', errands it was suggested 'which an office boy...might be required to do.'⁷⁷ One reporter was 'appalled' because 'surely the job of chief coach in this country's athletics organisation entitles him to a more official position than implement checker on a foreign tour.'⁷⁸ The options were clear, if Britain was to continue to improve in athletics then coaches were a necessity, and in order for the coaches to perform to their potential, they needed to be 'treated better than native bearers.'⁷⁹ Dyson voiced his own opinion in July 1958, when he stated that he had 'always approved of the British system where coaches serve under honorary team managers' but he believed that the team manager should only overrule the coach's decision regarding technical matters in the 'most exceptional circumstances.' Although no coach could be a '100 per cent expert' in all track and field events, he believed that professional coaches who had been 'at it for years' and taught and coached athletics full-time were probably more qualified to make technical decisions than the 'part-time administrative official.'⁸⁰ Administrators actually saw no need for a coach at international competitions suggesting that it was 'unnecessary' because they believed that anyone had the ability to make successful last minute changes, thus there was no issue with someone like Crump making the changes that he did. Dyson's response was simple. If after all the time of working with professional coaches, administrators still thought they could make technical alterations without harming performances, then it was clear that nothing had progressed and they still did 'not understand the nature of coaching.'⁸¹ Commenting on the events of the 1957 Poland tour, Tom McNab observed that this act by Crump probably made Dyson reassess his position as chief coach because it was becoming increasingly apparent, that even after eleven years, the

⁷⁴ Tony Ward, *Echoes of Infamy*, *Running Magazine*, April, 1987, File HA Box 3, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁷⁵ Peter Wilson 'Athletics Chief Talks Dyson into Staying', *Daily Mirror*, September 9, 1957, 3.

⁷⁶ Peter Wilson, 'Why Miss the Coach?', *Daily Mirror*, August 29, 1959, 19.

⁷⁷ Peter Wilson 'Athletics Chief Talks Dyson into Staying', *Daily Mirror*, September 9, 1957, 3.

⁷⁸ Peter Wilson, 'The Eyes Have It', *Daily Mirror*, September 12, 1957, 23.

⁷⁹ Peter Wilson 'Athletics Chief Talks Dyson into Staying', *Daily Mirror*, September 9, 1957, 3.

⁸⁰ John Weatley, 'Experience Tells', *Athletics Weekly*, July 1958, 2.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

sport had made very little progress in terms of embracing professional coaching. Overruling Dyson on coaching matters almost certainly encouraged him to move to a different environment which would place more value on his expertise as a coach.⁸²

Attempts to undermine Dyson were ongoing; Dennis Watts was selected to accompany the British team to the Commonwealth Games in 1958 and then later in the year at the European Championships in Stockholm when the AAA made their first appointment of a team coach, rather than as a mere observer, they selected John Le Masurier to travel with the team. While Dyson's absence from the team coach role came as a surprise to many, Dyson had been expecting it and, although the appointment of a team coach could be viewed as a defining moment, for the AAA a more likely reason for the selection was the potential of such an action to aggravate Dyson.⁸³ Considering the AAA now frequently referred to Dyson as the 'Little Cesar' it is unsurprising that when he offered his services to the 1959 Russia Tour, an act which the AAA believed was an attempt to bolster his own profile, they refused to accept, claiming that because of financial reasons only one coach could be sent with the team and that Lionel Pugh had already been appointed. However, when the IAC discovered that Dyson had been omitted on financial grounds they proposed to cover all his expenses. While the IAC were convinced the AAA would 'somehow try to wiggle out of accepting this gesture to a man who has done much for and received little from British athletics' they wanted to demonstrate the level of support Dyson had from the athletes.⁸⁴ As the IAC had predicted, the AAA refused to accept their offer with Harold Abrahams claiming that the reasons for not taking two coaches with the team ran much deeper than mere finances, although he refused to elaborate further as to what the exact reasons were.⁸⁵ In another public act of blatant disregard for Dyson's value as a coach, the AAA tried to ensure that he would not be involved with the 1960 Olympic team. However, this attempt backfired when Truelove fell ill and was unable to manage the team, and as a result, Dyson had to be appointed as unofficial team manager.⁸⁶

Following the series of disputes between Dyson and the AAA, one press report commented that a simple way to avoid further disagreements would be to 'just treat him as the chief coach!'⁸⁷ Nevertheless, in a final move that would ensure Dyson's resignation, the AAA commissioned a confidential enquiry in April 1959 into the terms and conditions of the national coaching roles. Harold Abrahams' nephew, Anthony Abrahams, was appointed to conduct the review and he presented his main conclusions to the AAA in September 1959 (a full written review was subsequently published in November 1959). Anthony Abrahams

⁸² McNab, interview.

⁸³ Tony Ward, 'Echoes of Infamy', *Running Magazine*, April, 1987, File HA Box 3, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; 'A Momentous Weekend', *Athletics Weekly*, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁸⁴ Peter Wilson, 'We Want Dyson- We'll Pay, Say Athletes', *Daily Mirror*, August 28, 1959, 23.

⁸⁵ Peter Wilson, 'Why Miss the Coach?', *Daily Mirror*, August 29, 1959, 19.

⁸⁶ Roy Moor, 'Chief Coach Quits Over Pay', *Daily Mail*, July 5, 1961.

⁸⁷ Sydney Hulls, 'Dyson Must Have Bosses' Support', *Daily Express*, December 3, 1960, 10.

praised the coaching scheme referring to it as 'first class' and suggesting that employing 'professional servants' to train amateur coaches was of great importance to the development of a sport like athletics. Echoing the sentiments of his uncle, he commented that its development had been 'particularly British' and suggested that the main successes of the scheme were the result of the AAA's ability to resist 'the temptation to concentrate the efforts of its professional coaches upon a few super-athletes in an attempt to win gold medals.' In other countries, there had been active encouragement of this use of coaches and although in many cases this had resulted in greater international success, it had reduced the professional coach to a 'ruthless demi-god' who dispensed his 'cracker-barrel philosophy' to his charges. He believed that the AAA scheme had greater value than those abroad because it had 'been built on a broader, more educational basis and...in a more wholesome way.'⁸⁸

It had been suggested to Anthony Abrahams that the appointment of a Director of Coaching would allow the scheme to expand and ensure that the national coaches were being utilised in the most beneficial way. As this is now a successful and integral part of both coaching and administration in many sports, it might be assumed that such an opportunity should have been actively encouraged. However, Anthony Abrahams rejected the suggestion arguing that employing a Director would be a waste of money since 'the chief national coach is completely competent to deal with current technical problems.'⁸⁹ Anthony Abrahams' declaration that the chief coach was more than capable to deal with such an obligation emphasises what was being expected of national coaches. Although they were paid at college lecturer rates, their role involved not only an extensive range of demanding duties but also significant amounts of travel which often resulted in working a large amount of unsociable hours.⁹⁰ When commenting on the work of John Le Masurier, it was noted that 'during the year, he spends a total of forty Saturdays and Sundays away from home on AAA business.'⁹¹

There appeared to be an assumption within the AAA that the national coaches were being offered extremely good terms of employment, and that if these coaches were to seek employment elsewhere would not receive comparable salaries. However, after reviewing the employment conditions, Anthony Abrahams was inclined to disagree, noting that if the coaches were to take up teaching and lecturing posts elsewhere they 'could earn, quite easily, what the Association at present pays them.' Not only could they earn more they would also 'have less arduous jobs and a more settled home life.'⁹² This view was reinforced when Jim Alford resigned from his post in 1961 following his appointment as chief coach to

⁸⁸ Anthony Abrahams, 'Review of the Amateur Athletic Association Coaching Scheme', November, 1959, 17, File HA Box 14, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 18-19.

⁹⁰ Lovesey, *Official Centenary*, 123.

⁹¹ Anthony Abrahams, 'Review of the Amateur Athletic Association Coaching Scheme', November, 1959, 13, File HA Box 14, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁹² Ibid., 16.

Northern Rhodesia where it was said he had been offered better terms of employment and a much higher salary.⁹³ This example again accentuates the problems that most British sporting administrators had with professional coaching. While Britain had long been considered one of the world's leading sporting nations, although perhaps not in terms of performance, they were unwilling to offer a more attractive contract than a much less affluent nation such as Northern Rhodesia in order to secure the services of a leading athletics coach. The AAA claimed that Alford's resignation was primarily due to his securing a more lucrative contract abroad but it would appear that there were many underlying reasons, particularly associated with the legacy of amateurism, that had influenced him to leave his coaching post. The AAA's determination to ensure the national coaches remained under their strict control and were never allowed to fully develop as professional coaches were clearly important factors behind the resignation of Alford, described by Dyson as 'one as of the finest athletics coaches in the world.'⁹⁴ Alford commented that he was 'fed up with the attitude of AAA officials'⁹⁵ because 'they look down on us coaches because we are professionals; distrust our work and our motives; insult us by sending us to important international events as observers who are not allowed to help our own athletes.'⁹⁶

Anthony Abrahams had observed the national coaches in a working environment, seemingly experiencing first-hand quite how laborious and demanding the national coaching roles had become, and he described Dennis Watts as having been 'steadily overworked for the past eleven years.'⁹⁷ As a result he advised that the coaching salaries be increased from £1,200 to £1,370 per year (deemed the equivalent of a Senior Lecturer salary) and that the chief coach always be paid £350 above what the other national coaches received. He suggested that if this could not be met due to financial restraints then the national coaches should be told 'as soon as possible as it may well be that several of them would then wish to seek other employment.'⁹⁸

The AAA had commissioned this review, at least partly, because they saw it as an opportunity to ensure that Dyson would not be willing to accept any new terms of employment and leave the role of chief coach. Their plan appeared to be a success when, in December 1960, Dyson submitted his resignation and although this was quickly retracted the AAA had no issues with leaking his supposedly confidential resignation to the press.⁹⁹ However, far from turning public opinion against Dyson as it had been hoped,

⁹³ 'Coach No 3 in "I Quit" Storm', *Daily Mirror*, October 24, 1961, 25; John Bromley, 'Mirror Spotlight', *Daily Mirror*, February 25, 1963, 20.

⁹⁴ John Bromley, 'Mirror Spotlight', *Daily Mirror*, February 25, 1963, 20.

⁹⁵ 'Coach No 3 in "I Quit" Storm', *Daily Mirror*, October 24, 1961, 25.

⁹⁶ John Bromley, 'Mirror Spotlight', *Daily Mirror*, February 25, 1963, 20.

⁹⁷ Anthony Abrahams, Review of the Amateur Athletic Association Coaching Scheme, November, 1959, 10, File HA Box 14, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁹⁸ Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, October 27, 1956, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; Anthony Abrahams, 'Review of the Amateur Athletic Association Coaching Scheme', November, 1959, 19, File HA Box 14, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁹⁹ George Harley, 'Dyson Shock- AAA Jump the Gun', *Daily Mirror*, December 2, 1960, 27.

the reaction to Dyson's 'resignation' was one of disbelief and many athletes and sporting officials came forward to praise his efforts and demonstrate their support for him as a coach. Don Anthony, a finalist in the hammer at the 1956 Games stated, 'It will put athletics back a dozen years, Dyson is almost irreplaceable. His appointment was one of the most progressive steps ever made in British athletics' and Arthur Rowe suggested that 'this is a very serious loss to British athletics. Geoff is one of the finest coaches in the world...an expert in all aspects of sport.'¹⁰⁰ Regardless of the level of public support for Dyson, the AAA seemed determined to ensure that he left his coaching post, so, in an action which disregarded the recommendations of Abrahams' report, a decision was initially made to remove the £350 differential in salary between the chief coach and the other national coaches, although this was subsequently reversed.¹⁰¹ Perhaps this had been done to annoy Dyson and to guarantee he would not accept the new terms of employment, but when he asked to discuss these initiatives, his opinions were simply disregarded. It was commented that,

The Chief National Coach asked permission to make a statement regarding National Coaches. This statement dealt at length with feelings of insecurity of position and salary and with the relationship between National Coaches and the Association. A long discussion followed but no action was recommended.¹⁰²

This confrontational approach, coupled with years of struggle over amateurism and the role of a coach, resulted in Dyson's decision to leave his post. Despite the coaching scheme owing 'much of its shape and a good deal of its success to his personal efforts', it was noted in the minutes, without thanks (which had been commonplace upon the resignation of previous coaches), that Dyson had resigned on 1 September 1961 with six months' pay.¹⁰³ In answering questions about why the AAA had been willing to grant six months' pay, a letter to the Ministry of Education revealed that Dyson had provided six months' notice, effective from 1 September 1961 and therefore, according to his contract, he would remain in the national coach role until 28 February 1962. However, the AAA believed it would have been 'extremely embarrassing to have to keep him employed until then, in view of his openly expressed criticism of their policy in respect of their coaching scheme' and, therefore, they wished to 'terminate his employment on 1st September by

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Tony Ward, 'Echoes of Infamy', *Running Magazine*, April, 1987, File HA Box 3, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, January 7, 1961, File 1/2/13/2, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

¹⁰² Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, January 7, 1961, File 1/2/13/2, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

¹⁰³ Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, January 1, 1949, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; E. Strickland, 'Report by the Coaching Administrator', 1961, File 1/2/13/2, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives; Anthony Abrahams, 'Review of the Amateur Athletic Association Coaching Scheme', November, 1959, 14, File HA Box 14, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

paying him six months' salary and then getting rid of him.'¹⁰⁴ The AAA made a request to the Ministry that, in light of the situation, they be willing to continue to pay the grant intended for Dyson's salary so that it could be used in a severance package. Although the Ministry sympathised, they were unwilling to pay for a coach who would no longer be carrying out their required duties and so they advised the AAA that if they were unwilling to keep Dyson in their employment, they should 'cut its losses, pay Mr Dyson what his contract required them to pay, and get rid of him on the 1st September.'¹⁰⁵ The AAA were so determined not to have Dyson working in the AAA that they were willing to pay his remaining six months' salary from their own funds rather than letting him complete his work and having the benefit of financial support from the Ministry.

Dyson was not the only national coach who resented the lack of cooperation he received from the AAA because, in November 1961, Lionel Pugh followed Dyson and left his post. According to the AAA this was the result of a disagreement regarding the appointment of a team coach for the Empire and Commonwealth Games in 1962.¹⁰⁶ Prior to leaving, Pugh commented, quite openly to both the press and the AAA, that in ten years he had only been selected for one official English team and even after he volunteered his service to the British team when they travelled to Paris in September 1961 they decided not to take a coach at all.¹⁰⁷ As in previous cases, the reasons behind Pugh's resignation actually went much deeper. On leaving the AAA, he stated that he 'agreed with the principles which Geoff Dyson fought for...let us be honest - most athletic officials do not want coaches with personality who are prepared to speak honestly.'¹⁰⁸

The quick succession of three resignations from national coach positions resulted in an open questioning of the AAA's methods and values. Although they had repeatedly claimed the resignations had been entirely the coaches' decisions, it was clear that the unwillingness of the AAA to allow professional coaches the freedom to do their job successfully had left them no other option. All three agreed that they had left because they were 'frustrated by Victorian-minded administrators who resented their advice.'¹⁰⁹ Geoff Elliot, one of Britain's leading pole-vaulters, agreed commenting that 'while I would have been willing to admit that a clash of personalities would have led to one resignation. I cannot believe that it has led to three...unless the personality in the wrong is an official of the AAA.' As a result, he explained that he was

¹⁰⁴ E H B. Baker, Note-0605/81, July 19, 1961, File ED 169/31 MoE Collection: AAA, NA; E H L. Clynes to E H B. Baker, August 9, 1961, File ED 169/31, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

¹⁰⁵ E H B. Baker, Note-0605/81, July 19, 1961, File ED 169/31 MoE Collection: AAA, NA; E H L. Clynes to E H B. Baker, August 9, 1961, File ED 169/31, MoE Collection: AAA, NA.

¹⁰⁶ E. Strickland, 'Report by the Coaching Administrator, 1961', File 1/2/13/2, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

¹⁰⁷ 'Coach No 3 in "I Quit" Storm', *Daily Mirror*, October 24, 1961, 25.

¹⁰⁸ Terry O' Connor, 'Pugh Storms Over "Lies and Deceit"', Private Collection-Dyson Family.

¹⁰⁹ 'Britain May Try to Lure Dyson Back Home', Private Collection-Dyson Family.

'dissociating' himself from the AAA because the 'distasteful events' which had led to the three resignation were 'unforgivable.'¹¹⁰

While amateur administrators remained steadfast in their approach to professional coaching, it would seem that the continued poor results of British athletes was now encouraging other individuals to question the state of British sport. It had become apparent that if British sport was to improve then an in-depth review of the individual components of the sporting model was required. However, it was equally obvious that this review would not be forthcoming from the NGBs themselves and this prompted external bodies to take control. The following two sections analyse the 1956 report, *Britain in the World of Sport*, and the 1960 *Wolfenden Report* and indicates how these signalled a new approach to sport in Britain.

Britain in the World of Sport

Although British athletes had fared considerably better at Melbourne than they had at Helsinki, the long series of high-profile defeats British teams suffered during the 1940s and 50s could not be ignored. This, coupled with the emergence of the Soviet Union, put pressure on the prevailing amateur hegemony and it was becoming increasingly apparent that that this approach was no longer sufficient to ensure success. If Britain wanted to perform well internationally, more sophisticated coaching and intense training was required. Prompted by these issues, a group of individuals at the University of Birmingham investigated the state of British sport in 1956 and subsequently published a pamphlet entitled *Britain in the World of Sport*. The report presented an array of recommendations which ranged from amateurism, to coaching and the finance of international competition. Comparisons were drawn with other countries and the report concluded that if Britain was to prevent future poor performances then the 'traditional' amateur regulations needed to be relaxed. In addition, the current levels of government intervention in sport, via the Ministry of Education, needed to be expanded because the opportunities for sporting organisations to secure financial support were limited and increasingly accompanied by unrealistic demands. Dyson praised the report stating that 'at a time of much idle conjecture and muddled thinking over Britain's sporting performances' it is refreshing to read the 'informed, carefully reasoned and well expressed views of a group of people who know what they are talking about.'¹¹¹ Dyson argued that this report should not remain confined to the sporting world but 'should be read by every politician and councillor' in the country since it provided a useful and informative insight into the correct direction of British sport. With regards to amateurism in sport the report argued that,

¹¹⁰ Geoff Elliot, 'The AAA Are Frightened of the Professionals they Employ', *Singapore Free Press*, December 28, 1961, 19.

¹¹¹ Geoffrey Dyson, *Britain in the World of Sport* (Review), *AAA Coaching Newsletter*, July 1956, 9-10, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

When Britain takes part in international competitions the [amateur] regulations often prevent the selection of our best players. Practice abroad is often less in line with this precept. "Amateur" Soviet athletes and "amateur" American college athletes enjoy coaching opportunities, training facilities and freedom from financial sacrifice not regularly available to English athletes outside the armed forces.¹¹²

It was also suggested that the amateur ethos was embedded within the notion of the 'spirit of the game.' Although this may have been satisfactory for those individuals who chose to play for fun, this idea of 'playing for game's sake' was no longer applicable to the high performance levels now being observed internationally.¹¹³ These 'rising standards are paid for by training which is both more intensive and extensive. The single-minded attitude to sport, which makes such training possible, is not easily allied to the detachment necessary to regard the result as unimportant.' The authors believed that 'the government could be asked to allocate specific funds to sports', and although this may have been considered somewhat unorthodox by traditionalists, it was becoming ever more apparent that it was now a necessity if Britain was to compete effectively.¹¹⁴ This suggestion rapidly gained support and a year later it was being argued in the press that, in athletics,

Our national coaching scheme is financed by an annual grant of £3,000 from the Ministry of Education, plus a fluctuating sum, privately donated, of approximately £3,500. Now costs are rising – among other things, the salary of coaches. This means that, unless fresh help is given, the coaching scheme will be on its uppers in two-and-a-half years. Other amateur sports – swimming, gymnastics, cycling – are nearly always fighting undeserved financial crises...The Arts Council get £860,000 a year – with supervision and scrutiny, but without interference in control - from the Government. A grant one-twentieth as big – *without strings* – would save amateur sport.¹¹⁵

It is not clear whether the '*without strings*' comment refers to the demands placed on sporting bodies as a prerequisite for grant aid from the Ministry. However it is clear, that although the reporter declares that government intervention would 'save amateur sport', what is actually being described here is, by traditional definitions, no longer amateur at all. The suggestion of financial intervention from the government in itself signifies a shift away from the true amateur tradition and the rising salaries of coaches to which the author refers suggests an increasing degree of professionalism within British sport.

A final proposal within the 1956 publication centred on the idea that sporting bodies might develop an advisory council which would enable a greater level of coordination between organisations and encourage practical developments. Any changes or modifications to accepted practices in sport would require input from individuals who were 'involved enough to appreciate the problems but detached enough' to

¹¹² University of Birmingham, *Britain in World Sport*, 62.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 62, 64.

¹¹⁵ Denzil Batchelor, 'Sportfolio', *Picture Post*, February 25, 1957, 8.

recommend solutions. If British sport continued 'neither taking a policy decision to withdraw from international sport, nor taking sufficiently energetic steps to see that representative teams really are representative...our declining performance will be resented at home and misinterpreted abroad.' The responses of the British public had been, and would continue to be, fuelled by a press which generally described every defeat of British athletes as a 'calamity.' The authors commented that such a situation could be easily rectified by using an 'advisory council' to introduce improvements in training and coaching facilities, which it was argued would help reverse the defeats experienced in the late 1940s and early 1950s.¹¹⁶

It would appear from this document that some individuals were beginning to accept that the values of amateurism and fair play were no longer a suitable foundation on which to base international sport because success, more than ever before, now required significant resources, intense training, and most importantly, a focus on winning and not just taking part. *Britain in the World of Sport* was a revolutionary publication for its time because it questioned the much cherished amateur tradition in a constructive way. Far from suggesting a shift from amateurism without offering any direction, as many press reports did at the time, it offered practical ideas which could be incorporated into and potentially shape the future of British sport. Although the subsequent 1960 *Wolfenden Report* has long been considered the 'blue-print' for the future development of British sport, it is difficult to argue with those who view *Britain in the World of Sport*, with its many innovative recommendations, as the primary catalyst for future progress.¹¹⁷

The Wolfenden Report

Barrie Houlihan and Anita White argue that the motivation of the Wilson Government to establish a Sports Council in 1965 was 'less a reflection of its particular interest in sport and recreation than of its general willingness to expand the boundaries of the welfare state.'¹¹⁸ Whether this is true or not, crucial to this increased willingness of the government to become involved in sport, was the publication of the *Wolfenden Report, Sport in the Community* (1960). Although the establishment of the Wolfenden Committee in 1957 was primarily the result of much lobbying by the Central Council of Physical Recreation (CCPR), the significance of the Birmingham University Department 1956 publication should also not be overlooked. Prompted by a number of factors, such as the success and development of sport in other countries, particularly the Soviet Union and the United States, and a growing realisation that international sport was

¹¹⁶ University of Birmingham, *Britain in World Sport*, 65, 68.

¹¹⁷ Allison and Monnington, 'Sport, Prestige and Relations', 119.

¹¹⁸ Barrie Houlihan and Anita White, *The Politics of Sport Development: Development of Sport or Development through Sport?* (London: Routledge, 2002), 17.

now inextricably linked with prestige, the CCPR had commissioned the *Wolfenden Report* in an attempt to resolve issues and improve the structure and organisation of British sport.¹¹⁹

The history and the development of the CCPR are covered in great depth in the seminal work of Justin Evans (secretary of both the CCPR and Wolfenden Committee) and although it would be inappropriate to deal with the organisation in detail here, a brief overview is necessary. The Central Council of Recreative Physical Training (CCPRT), as it was then known, was established in 1935 as a direct result of the influence of Philys C. Colson, who consequently played a dominant role in the 'creation, growth and functioning of the CCPR.'¹²⁰ Colson could see the benefit of enlisting the help of powerful and influential individuals from the sporting world so she appealed to Sir Stanley Rous and Lord Aberdare, amongst others, to be founding members of the CCPRT. Rous, an amateur football player in his youth, secretary of the FA and eventually president of FIFA, had clear ideas about the position of amateurism in sport. Similarly, Aberdare, who was a member of the IOC and went on to become chairman of the NFC and a member of the 1948 London Games Organising Committee, did his utmost to ensure that the amateur principles of sport remained a consistent factor in British sport. As many of the members who initially agreed to serve had come from amateur sporting backgrounds, it was inevitable that their cultural values and beliefs influenced both the direction and development of the Council. The Council had been created in response to various issues of the time, including high unemployment rates, a state of poor national health and a 'realisation by the governing bodies of sport that some form of collective cooperation could assist hugely with both separate and corporate aspirations.'¹²¹ The CCPRT was initially involved with the development of the NFC, increasing the provision of recreational facilities in an attempt to raise fitness levels amongst communities, and affording school leavers the opportunity to participate in sport.¹²² In 1944, the CCPRT became the CCPR, by which point it had already developed into an influential and proactive body within British sport. The CCPR had established itself as an umbrella organisation for a wide range of sporting bodies and become heavily involved in a number of activities including the training of coaches and physical education teachers.¹²³ It has been suggested that 'the CCPR transformed the concept of recreation in Britain. Long before the purposeful use of leisure became a general topic of discussion...the Council set about creating recreation centres, training leaders and coaches, encouraging participation and developing new recreational centres.'¹²⁴ It was against this successful background that the CCPR commissioned the creation of the *Wolfenden Report*.

¹¹⁹ 'National Sport Enquiry', *The Times*, November 1, 1957, 6.

¹²⁰ Justin Evans, *The Story of the CCPR-1935 to 1972: Service to Sport* (London: Pelham Books, 1974), 25.

¹²¹ John Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics since 1960* (London: The Falmer Press, 1990), 6.

¹²² Houlihan and White, *Politics of Sport Development*, 18.

¹²³ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 5; Houlihan and White, *Politics of Sport Development*, 18.

¹²⁴ Evans, *Story of the CCPR*, 11.

The Wolfenden Report of 1960 appeared to heed the calls of those who had demanded a new approach to sport in Britain. It subsequently emerged as a publication of both significance and influence because not only did it raise the profile of sport from a government perspective, it also indirectly led to other key developments such as the appointment of the first British Minister for Sport in 1962 and the creation of the Sports Council in 1965.¹²⁵ However, despite this eventual success, the initial establishment of the Wolfenden Committee in 1957 'aroused no particular concern other than general broad interest' even though the recommendations of the report would 'alter the face of British Sport within a decade.'¹²⁶ For the first time in British history, there was to be a formal recognition that the government had a responsibility not only to provide opportunities for the public at large but also to support elite athletes at a national level.

The committee, which was composed of twelve individuals and chaired by Sir John Wolfenden, was appointed to conduct an impartial study on the factors which were affecting the 'development of games, sport and outdoor activities in the UK and to make recommendations...as to any practical measures which should be taken...in order that these activities may play their full part in promoting the general welfare of the community.'¹²⁷ The first meeting was in January 1958 and for the following two years the committee proceeded to collect oral and written evidence from a variety of sporting bodies, government departments and other interested parties, which included Geoff Dyson and other national coaches. In 1960, the *Wolfenden Report* made fifty-seven recommendations which covered several areas in depth including coaching, amateurism and facilities and these were all shaped around the notion of the 'gap', defined as the break between school sports and adult participation.¹²⁸ Developing recommendations around the Wolfenden 'gap', as well as making suggestions to improvements in international sport, allowed the identification of a concept which could be 'interpreted positively by those with a concern for the social development of young people and those with a narrower concern for the production of the next generation of elite athletes, thus uniting two significant elements within the sports lobby.'¹²⁹ This demonstrates the report's versatility in being able to appeal to a wide variety of administrative bodies thereby ensuring that each organisation would benefit. As Fred Coalter and others indicate 'the concern of Wolfenden was to achieve reforms which would not introduce major structural change, but would assist existing organisations to perform more efficiently.'¹³⁰ Houlihan and White suggest that this diplomacy and the simplicity of the

¹²⁵ Houlihan and White, *Politics of Sport Development*, 18.

¹²⁶ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 8.

¹²⁷ CCPR, *Sport and the Community: The Report of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport - 1960* (London: CCPR, 1960), 5.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 150, 23.

¹²⁹ Houlihan and White, *Politics of Sport Development*, 19.

¹³⁰ Fred Coalter, Jonathan Long, and Brian Duffield, *Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure* (London: Sports Council and Economic and Social Research Council, 1986), 46.

recommendations within the report guaranteed that it had a substantial and long-term impact on the development of British sport.¹³¹

The running theme throughout the report was an ongoing defence of the voluntary infrastructure within British sport; often accrediting it as the foundation or cornerstone of sports development and organisation. It was noted,

The whole fabric of British sport is held together by the labours of unpaid and devoted enthusiasts, who at all levels give of their time and energy in order that other people may enjoy themselves. In countless ways these volunteers, unsung and often unhonoured, make the wheels go round; without them the incredible variety of activities we have examined simply could not exist.¹³²

Although they suggested, albeit tentatively, that there were some disadvantages to the voluntary tradition, it was argued that 'where there are weaknesses and shortcomings the reason is not so much lack of interest as lack of money.' Since volunteerism had always been a strong component of amateurism it is clear to see why they approached the subject with caution. In order for the *Wolfenden Report* to act as a catalyst for change in British sport, it required widespread support, and alienating the traditionalists in British sport who valued amateurism could result in the report being marginalised. However, the report was explicit about government intervention, which needed to be forthcoming if British sport was to improve in terms of coaching and facilities. The committee were therefore placed in a predicament, and this came across strongly throughout the report. It was clear that a professional system of organisation, coupled with some form of government involvement, would improve the overall standard of British sport but they were keen to preserve both volunteerism and the autonomy of the NGBs, referred to as a 'sacred principle.'¹³³ In the end it was concluded, that although

We believe that public opinion in this country would want our national participation in international sport to continue to depend in the main upon voluntary effort but...we have come to the conclusion that some measure of statutory financial assistance should be forthcoming to support the administrative and other work of the B.O.A.¹³⁴

Contained within the report was also recognition that some NGBs still had reservations about engaging professional coaches since 'some Governing Bodies have taken an active interest in coaching, while others have been content...to let the game develop without coaching.' Far from trying to encourage NGBs to adopt a more positive approach with regards to professional coaching, it was clear that the committee did not want to be viewed as encroaching on their autonomy when it was recognised that, with regards to

¹³¹ Houlihan and White, *Politics of Sport Development*, 20.

¹³² CCPR, *Wolfenden Committee on Sport*, 11.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 11, 13.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 47.

recommending an increased coaching presence in sport, 'some governing bodies...do not share that view, and we entirely recognise their right to their opinion and their policy.' Attempts were also made to establish why coaching had 'tended to play a technically less effective role in sport in Britain than elsewhere.' The committee concluded that this was primarily historical and 'connected with the essentially haphazard and amateur way in which the sports themselves have grown up.' The 'carefree participation and a tolerance of low standards' present in British sport may not have been 'antagonistic' to the development of coaching but it certainly did not 'energetically encourage it.'¹³⁵ However, the committee praised the work of the Ministry of Education coaching schemes, noting that despite the somewhat hostile environment towards professional coaching in British sport, they had managed to support initiatives in a handful of sports. Despite this acknowledgement, it was apparent that the expertise of professional coaches remained undervalued in the majority of sports. The committee suggested that the coaching schemes would only 'prosper' if each of the NGBs involved 'whole heartedly believes in it' and, in order to achieve this, they would need to be willing to regard the appointment of national coaches as fundamental to ensuring its success. Although the committee could see the benefits of using the national coaches to develop a contingent of honorary coaches, there was a fear that it would present a situation whereby there would be an 'over-supply of coaches.' Such a suggestion could indicate that some members of the committee still possessed a suspicion of coaching, because although there was some flexibility regarding the inclusion of coaches in sport, they did not want a situation to arise whereby there was an abundance of professional coaches as they could then potentially be in a position to control British sport. It was declared that this situation could be avoided by not only implementing a system of re-examination of the honorary coaches but also by diverting more of the national coaches' time to a focus on elite athletes because they believed it seemed 'logical that...any national or official representative team should have the services of the professional national coaches.' Despite recommending more coaching opportunities and 'more and better organised coaching' there was a reticence within the committee to endorse a shift in coaching direction towards an American or Soviet system. Even though American athletes often experienced greater success due to a sophisticated coaching structure, it was 'not obvious that the...American systems are preferable to our own' because the British system of sport 'has considerable merits.'¹³⁶

The string of defeats suffered by British competitors and the overall gradually diminishing competitiveness of British sport, which in part had acted as a catalyst for both *Britain in the World of Sport* and the *Wolfenden Report*, was addressed in great depth. It was obvious that British sporting techniques and training were no longer adequate to ensure success and, although they did not have definitive evidence, the committee were inclined to believe that sports abroad were 'prepared to devote much more

¹³⁵ Ibid., 36, 39.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 39, 41, 40, 37.

time and much more money to [training and practising] than we are in Britain.' It was recognised that if British sport was to compete effectively abroad then not only was some form of investment required but there had to be an acceptance that sports, which included competition at the Olympic Games, were being subjected to rising standards of performance, and there was a need for more intensive and wide-spread training.¹³⁷ There was an agreement amongst committee members that 'for those players who display a degree of skill and promise which justifies the expectation that they will develop into "top-class" performers...the player will need equipment and training and match-play on a high competitive level at home and abroad.'¹³⁸ Despite urging the NGBs to adopt a more vigorous approach to the training and conditioning of athletes, the report never appeared to shift too far from the accepted system of amateur British sport and it argued that both winning and losing needed to be kept in perspective. It was insisted that

It is not the end of the world if British teams are defeated, still less is it a symptom or proof of national decadence. To talk, as some do, as if sport could properly be used as a major instrument in international diplomacy, or as if a nation's authority and influence in world affairs at large are to be measured by its successes or failures in the Olympic Games, seems to us to reveal a serious lack of sense of proportion.¹³⁹

The traditional attitudes within British sport once again emerged in suggestions that the British public had come to expect success purely because 'so many sports and games originated in this country and were later adopted abroad.' Tied in with this reverence towards the supposed 'golden days' of sport was an assumption that the reason British competitors were no longer successful was not because British standards had dropped but because others nations had progressed. It was pointed out that, 'with the great development of international sport and the increase in the number of participating nations, success is likely to become increasingly rare and hard to achieve' and so an adjustment of attitude was required, one which would fully appreciate the standards now seen abroad. Even though it was acknowledged that the notion of 'being a good loser' could result in a defeatist attitude, the committee believed that it was 'better to lose gracefully and good-humouredly than to win by sharp practice or unsportsmanlike conduct.'¹⁴⁰

The majority of comments and recommendations contained within the report were in some way related to amateurism. There was an underlying respect for its principles and a reluctance to shift too far from its ethos. While this report was attempting to instil change in British sport, which would inevitably require the adaptation of some amateur principles, there was still a latent apprehension about dealing with the topic even though it was acknowledged that the foundations and environment in which the amateur principles

¹³⁷ Ibid., 60.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 53.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 58.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 58, 59.

had been founded were radically different. In fact, it was proposed that the retention of traditional amateur principles was essential to 'preserve standards of behaviour and sportsmanship, to ensure fair grouping for competition, and to reflect in sport the social dimensions which were then current in society as a whole.' The differing interpretations of 'amateur' by various NGBs had resulted in a situation whereby the amateur principles were not always comprehensible and appropriate for sport.¹⁴¹ There was unanimous 'dissatisfaction with the present position' regarding the role of amateurism but, in line with the beliefs of many of its members, the committee were 'not agreed as to the ultimate solution for the present difficulties.'¹⁴² There were some, particularly Albert Davis Munrow, who believed 'that the right solution is to abolish, quite simply and straightforwardly, the formal distinction between amateur and professional' but the majority were unable to 'accept this radical solution' and Arthur Porritt, for one, emphasised that he would refuse to sign off on the report if such a clause was included. The outcome of this debate appeared to be influenced by the on-going loyalty which the committee had to the NGBs and their autonomy, since it was generally agreed, that 'for so long as the Governing Body is recognised as the controlling authority in its particular sport it must, we feel, have the authority to decide who may participate in that sport, and on what terms.' Removing this power from the NGBs, it was believed would be an infringement of autonomy so serious as to 'deprive its title of meaning.' Ultimately, the committee urged 'Governing Bodies not to confuse autonomy with separatism or non-co-operation' as it had become apparent that amateur organisations were becoming increasingly discrete from each other, and that if British sport was to progress then it would require a combined coordinated effort.¹⁴³

There was one significant proposal that could be considered somewhat at odds with the overall reoccurring theme of amateurism within the report, the creation of a Sports Development Council (SDC). The recommendations of the committee seemingly mirrored those suggested in *Britain in the World of Sport*, in that the SDC would consist of a 'small body of six to ten persons of varied experience who have a general knowledge of the field and such personal standing as will give them accepted authority and influence.'¹⁴⁴ It was proposed that a sum of £5,000,000 be made available for use by the SDC, for which it would be only loosely accountable to parliament. The NGBs would also have some form of authority and discretion as to how the money was allocated. These suggestions allowed for greater public investment in sport but also protected the voluntary foundation of the NGBs and allowed them to retain some level of autonomy. Considering the persistent defence of the voluntary and amateur traditions in British sport perhaps the most radical proposal by the committee was that the SDC should become involved in the bio-medical aspects of sport. Apart from isolated instances of unofficial engagement with the sciences, there

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 54, 53.

¹⁴² Ibid., 87.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 54-5, 44.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 79.

had been little engagement with these kinds of support services but this was now being proposed as a means of improving British performance. It was suggested that

With the very limited resources available to them several medical and scientific groups...have carried out constructive and instructive work. But much of this has hitherto been un-co-ordinated, and we see a real opportunity for the Sports Development Council to encourage and stimulate an increased and more widespread interest in medical and scientific matters related to sport. Not the least significant of these are advances in methods of training and technique.¹⁴⁵

Initial reactions to the *Wolfenden Report* although varied, were for the most part favourable. Perhaps the most important group, the NGBs, saw potential in the report and its proposals.¹⁴⁶ The press also offered support; particularly *The Times*, the *Daily Express* and *The Economist*, which was somewhat surprising given that the report contained criticisms about the press at large.¹⁴⁷ The committee had described the press as being more concerned 'with sensationalism than accuracy, with circulation than truth' and claimed that reporters lacked the 'knowledge or experience to comment adequately or constructively on the sport about which they write and that this ignorance shows itself inevitably in ill-balanced judgements and a failure to understand or to represent correctly what they have seen.'¹⁴⁸ The press response to *Wolfenden* suggests that there was real potential in the report because, despite its criticisms, the majority of newspapers supported the proposals. Nevertheless, the press were realistic and well aware that it would be difficult to instigate any real changes, particularly with regard to amateurism and the NGBs. *The Economist* commented,

They [the NGBs] are mostly not particularly democratic bodies, members who play club subscriptions have little direct opportunity to vote them out of office and spectators who pay entrance fees have even less. They are generally composed of people who have given a lifetime of service (and sometimes spent a deal of their own money) for their sport. But once in office their different methods of running their organisations, though extraordinarily haphazard, are often characterised by a determined restrictionism and a most dubious autocracy.¹⁴⁹

Although there was support for the development of a Sports Council from a number of sporting organisations, the Executive Committee of the CCPR and the Ministry of Education were much less positive. Even from the outset of the report when the committee were attempting to gather evidence, the Ministry were not particularly accommodating. Evans commented that 'no-one could be found to speak to the committee with any real authority about the Ministry's policy.' When a meeting was eventually arranged it was with three civil servants who possessed little authority in the grants procedure but, even so, they

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 83.

¹⁴⁶ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 11.

¹⁴⁷ *House of Commons Parliamentary Debates*, 'Wolfenden Report (part two)', June 29, 1960, vol 625, par. 7.0, 1459.

¹⁴⁸ CCPR, *Wolfenden Committee on Sport*, 62.

¹⁴⁹ 'Sporting Offer?', *The Economist*, October 1, 1960, 21.

were unable to 'conceal the fact that...the development of sport was not high among the Ministry's priorities.'¹⁵⁰ Once it emerged that it was the intention of the committee to recommend 'that grant aid for sport should no longer be administered through the Ministry of Education', the Ministry voiced their objections.¹⁵¹ Although the Ministry were quite comfortable with having some of their financial burden removed, when they recognised that this would also require them to relinquish a degree of power, they opposed the transfer of responsibility to another organisation on the grounds that 'public opinion was not yet ready for the State to take a greater part in grant-aiding adult sport, in view of the tradition of voluntary participation.'¹⁵² By linking themselves to the values of amateurism, they were able to present themselves as an organisation that would act in the best interests of British sport, particularly from a traditionalist's perspective, because they would ensure that sport would only be subjected to limited government control. The Ministry also claimed that if the government was to assign greater funds to sport then they were the most obvious choice as a means of distribution because they had 'greater experience in this field than any other' and they would ensure that support was provided to worthy organisations.¹⁵³ Colson of the CCPR also raised objections to the suggestion of an advisory council and, considering the CCPR were in receipt of the largest Ministry of Education grant, her opposition appeared to be well-founded. If the power of grant-aid was removed from the Ministry and bestowed upon another body there would be no guarantee of the same level of financial support for the CCPR, and since this was their primary source of income, Colson was obviously keen for this to continue.¹⁵⁴

After the report had been published and it was clear that the SDC was indeed a fundamental recommendation, it was not welcomed, or supported, by either the CCPR or the Ministry of Education, hardly surprising considering their reactions during the development phases of the report. The Ministry strongly defended their actions and stated that 'if local authorities and government departments have not done more in the past it was not because the machinery was inadequate but because the government chose other priorities.'¹⁵⁵ The CCPR Executive Committee was split over the possible creation of a SDC, with some in favour and others strongly opposed. However, to avoid their disagreements being made public the decision was taken to not press the matter to a vote and members were discouraged from

¹⁵⁰ Evans, *Story of the CCPR*, 150.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵² Ministry of Education, Minute of Oral Evidence Presented by the Ministry of Education, December 16, 1958, 2, File ED 169/73, Ministry of Education and Department of Education and Science Collection: The Wolfenden Committee of Sport, National Archives, Kew (hereafter cited as MoE Collection: Wolfenden, NA).

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 3; E B H. Baker, 'Debate on Wolfenden Report', April 20, 1961, File ED 169/73, MoE Collection: Wolfenden, NA.

¹⁵⁵ Ministry of Education, Draft Memorandum for the Affairs Committee, 3, File ED 169/73, MoE Collection: Wolfenden, NA.

expressing any personal views about the SDC.¹⁵⁶ The Ministry, on the other hand, were not so diplomatic; they very publicly rejected outright the proposal for a SDC and appealed to others to do the same.¹⁵⁷

Considering the *Wolfenden Report* was a private initiative and not a government endorsed report, the levels of attention it received from official channels was unprecedented.¹⁵⁸ In February and April 1961, the report was debated in the House of Lords and House of Commons, respectively, and although the discussions were supportive, the government showed little commitment to accepting the report's recommendations.¹⁵⁹ In the February debate, it was noted that 'the government had not taken a final decision about the SDC, but were doubtful whether such a radical intervention was needed.'¹⁶⁰ Much to the satisfaction of both the CCPR and Ministry of Education, the notion of developing a SDC would lie dormant for another four years before any concrete developments took place. As a result of this delay, Kevin Jeffreys has argued that, despite the belief that the *Wolfenden Report* had been the catalyst for change in British sport, the actual 'short term and medium term impact' were minimal. However, even though the proposal may not have been addressed straight away it did prompt other smaller changes which had more immediate impact. It was agreed that more capital investment was required in sporting facilities, including the creation of new swimming baths, and so the ceiling of the Ministry of Education's grant aid for such initiatives was increased from £3,300 to £6,600 for each sport. There was also a realisation that professional coaches were being undervalued, and in an attempt to improve their status, an agreement was made to increase the Ministry's grant for coaches' salaries from £1,000 to £1,200. Alterations were also made to enable sports to apply for administrative grants towards their coaching schemes. Although it was never in the Ministry's policy to refuse such grants there had been a reluctance to award financial support on these grounds alone.¹⁶¹ Jeffreys suggests that these developments would have come about regardless of the report and argues that 'the most generous interpretation of what happened was that Wolfenden pushed the government to consider going a bit further and faster than it might otherwise have done.' However, there is no available evidence to suggest that the government was intending to make these improvements until the emergence of the report.¹⁶²

Wolfenden clearly made an impact, but perhaps in a slightly different way to that envisaged by the CCPR when they commissioned the report. Despite the ever increasing body of support for its proposals and a growing awareness that other countries were now exploiting sport for international recognition, something which Britain was still ill-equipped to compete with, the Conservative Government at the time of

¹⁵⁶ Evans, *Story of the CCPR*, 155.

¹⁵⁷ Ministry of Education, Draft Memorandum for the Affairs Committee, 4, File ED 169/73, MoE Collection: Wolfenden, NA.

¹⁵⁸ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 11.

¹⁵⁹ *House of Commons Parliamentary Debates*, 'Sport (Wolfenden Committee's Report)', April 28, 1961, Vol. 639.

¹⁶⁰ E B H. Baker, 'Debate on Wolfenden Report', April 20, 1961, 1, File ED 169/73, MoE Collection: Wolfenden, NA.

¹⁶¹ E B H. Baker, 'Debate on Wolfenden Report', April 20, 1961, File ED 169/73, MoE Collection: Wolfenden, NA.

¹⁶² Kevin Jeffreys, 'The Impact of the Wolfenden Report on Sport', (Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the British Society of Sports History, Wellcome Collection, London, September 10-11, 2010).

the publication remained somewhat cautious regarding the role of the state in sport in Britain. However, although it would be another four years before the creation of a SDC, there was an indication that the battle for greater government investment in sport was being won when in 1962, Lord Hailsham, Lord President of the Council and Minister for Science, was appointed as 'Minister with special responsibility for sport.'¹⁶³ Considering this idea had been rejected by the Prime Minister in 1961, claiming that sport did not require such a 'spectacular' means of support, it seems that the government were now less averse to assisting sport and were gradually becoming more accommodating. Those parties who envisaged progress solely in terms of the development of a SDC were somewhat disappointed, particularly when it emerged that while he agreed with the majority of material contained within the *Wolfenden Report*, Hailsham did not agree with the establishment of a SDC.¹⁶⁴ His steadfast opposition to the development of a SDC was not popular, and during a House of Commons debate in 1964 the question was asked 'Does the Prime Minister realise that the Lord President of the council is either too busy to be interested in sport or is just not interested in sport?'¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, although Hailsham fought until the end of his term in office against the development of a SDC, his appointment did bring about greater government investment both in coaching and in international sport.¹⁶⁶ For example, in June 1963, for the first time in British sporting history, the government announced that financial assistance would be available 'in suitable cases' to support British amateur sporting teams competing in international events, a welcome development to many NGBs considering that the Tokyo 1964 Olympic Games was on the horizon.¹⁶⁷

The Soviet sporting model, with its almost guaranteed success, appears to have offered an alternative to the struggling British methods. However, while the British press and some of the sporting world called for an adoption of this more specialised approach, amateur administrators continued to shy away from these issues, particularly those associated with coaching. This continued reluctance of the NGBs to allow professional coaches a greater level of freedom, particularly with regards to their coaching role, eventually resulted in the loss of influential coaches in both athletics and swimming. Both Dyson and Kinnear were key individuals in the international coaching world but, because administrators were unwilling to relinquish amateur control, British sport experienced significant losses and this undoubtedly slowed the progress of British athletes. However, although amateur administrators continued to control their sports along traditional lines, developments such as *Britain in the World of Sport* and the *Wolfenden Report* were now encouraging greater government intervention, and considering the British government had always

¹⁶³ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 12.

¹⁶⁴ Evans, *Story of the CCPR*, 157.

¹⁶⁵ *House of Commons Parliamentary Debates*, 'Sport (Ministerial Responsibility)', March 17, 1964, Vol. 691, 1183.

¹⁶⁶ Evans, *Story of the CCPR*, 158.

¹⁶⁷ I F T. Martin to Ministry of Education, February 5, 1965, File ED 169/127, Ministry of Education and Department of Education and Science Collection: Sports Council, National Archives, Kew (hereafter cited as MoE Collection: Sports Council, NA); Evans, *Story of the CCPR*, 158.

remained distant from the issues of sport, this could be considered somewhat of a breakthrough. The following chapter analyses this increased government intervention, and suggests that although changes were increasingly being implemented following pressures external to specific sports, amateur administrators within the NGBs continued to resist change.

Chapter Seven: Government Intervention and the National Governing Bodies' Battle for Autonomy

Encouraged by previous publications such as the *Wolfenden Report* and a realisation that success at the Olympics now had political as well as sporting significance, the British government began to take a much more active role in British sport, particularly after the 1960s. However, increased government involvement in British sport would inevitably demand greater specialisation because financial support became indirectly linked to sporting success and medal attainment. Despite this need for greater professionalisation, the National Governing Bodies (NGB) fought to retain their autonomy and to control their sports in the way that they deemed appropriate. By offering evidence from both perspectives, from that of official channels which demonstrates where and when new developments were being implemented and also from that of the NGBs and coaches, this chapter will demonstrate that although British sport was gradually becoming professionalised, the amateur NGBs with their amateur perspectives on both sport and coaching, still to some extent, continued to regulate British sport. In order to achieve this, the chapter first analyses how a perceived threat to their autonomy and control made organisations fearful of change and government involvement. Subsequent sections highlight how an increase in centralised funding and support improved the overall profile and perceived value of British coaching, and why, even though the emergence of elite sport as a discrete domain for government intervention ensured that amateurism was no longer a guiding principle, its legacy and influence remained.

1965 Advisory Sports Council

It has been claimed that there should be no relation between sport and politics- that sport and politics do not mix. I myself would oppose this contention...sport and politics are becoming increasingly and irrevocably intertwined...as day follows night there is an involvement of politics with sport. But of course from a sporting perception the essential word is involvement - not interference.¹

The Labour Government under Harold Wilson entered office in October 1964, and remaining true to their manifesto with regards to sport, Denis Howell Joint Under-Secretary of State for Education and Science, was appointed as Minister with responsibility for sport. An Advisory Sports Council (ASC) was soon established in February 1965 to advise the government 'on matters relating to the development of amateur sport and physical recreation services and to foster cooperation among the statutory authorities and voluntary organisations.'² The ASC was purely an advisory body and not the executive Sports Council recommended in the *Wolfenden Report*, so the control of sport was to be handled through a department of

¹ Richard Palmer, 'Enquiry into the Sports Council', 1985, File BOA/PAR/3, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

² *House of Lords Parliamentary Debates*, 'Establishment of a Sports Council', February 3, 1965, Vol. 262; Iain Dale, *Labour Party General Election Manifestos 1900-1997* (London: Routledge, 2000), 103.

state and not through a body of men and women well versed in sport. Although the government had now agreed to implement one of the main recommendations of the *Wolfenden Report*, John Coghlan argues that the advisory nature of this new body prevented it from 'having teeth and a cutting edge' in the organisation and control of sport in Britain.³ Nevertheless, support for sport now increased, which for the most part, was due to the work of Denis Howell, who had been appointed deputy chairman of the Sports Council. Considered by some as the best Sports Minister Britain has ever seen, Howell was described as 'a credit to British sport, a trail blazer' and his commitment to sport would ensure that significant progress was made regarding sports provision.⁴ Regardless of the uncertainties and disagreements about the direction that sport should take, financial support from the government was now forthcoming. Four years on from Wolfenden, the government, for the first time in British history, was now inextricably and formally linked with sport.⁵

One of the first tasks of the ASC was to assist elite sport and four committees, each with their own specific focus, were developed in order to broaden the scope of work that could be attempted; the International Committee, the Research and Statistics Committee, the Sports Development and Coaching Committee and the Facilities Planning Committee.⁶ The International Committee had been established to deal with the issues of British elite sport both at home and abroad and to develop a programme to finance the training and preparation of national teams which would complement the Olympic four year cycle. They presented this to the government, which then agreed to donate £30,000 directly to the Olympic Appeal for the 1964 Games.⁷ The 'Appeal', which had traditionally been raised through public donations, was now being supported officially and this provided the British Olympic Association (BOA) with a 'safety net' if they were ever unable to achieve their targets through other contributions.⁸

The Sports Development and Coaching Committee was created to provide advice to the government regarding those areas of British coaching which required financial support. It was agreed that more national coaches were necessary and that more full-time professional members of staff were required within the NGBs, so the funds allocated for coaching and administration increased from £565,000 in 1965-6 to £876,608 by 1970.⁹ This growing recognition for coaching was also reflected in the development of the British Association of National Coaches (BANC) in 1965. Formed by two national coaches, Geoff Gleeson of Judo and Bob Anderson of Fencing, they had noted the growing need to bring 'together contemporary

³ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 22.

⁴ John Goodbody, 'Manchester's Ship Comes in with Flag Flying', *The Times*, May 20, 1988, 48.

⁵ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 15.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 272.

⁷ UK Steering Committee: British Empire and Commonwealth Games, Memorandum on the Participation of the Six Team from the British Isles at the British Empire and Commonwealth Games Kingston, Jamaica in August 1966, April 1965, 1, File ED 169/127, MoE Collection: Sports Council, NA.

⁸ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 33-4.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 35.

thinking about training and coaching in Britain.¹⁰ They organised annual conferences, which were to become 'the bedrock of their existence' because they encouraged the coming together of likeminded individuals and the dissemination of information from 'high calibre speakers.'¹¹ From his own experience, Tom McNab suggests that national coaches were not given any training on the job by their particular NGBs, and the BANC provided the opportunity to gain knowledge from other coaches who were often in a similar situation, and it also re-affirmed their professional identity as a coach.¹² However, its creation caused a degree of consternation within NGBs and the Sports Council because the organisation would not be directly under their authority, and therefore they had no way of controlling what the BANC was doing.¹³ The Sports Council were particularly cautious about its activities and appointed a liaison officer, Harry Littlewood, who although he was a 'nice guy...he was under a watching brief to make sure these men did not stray into forbidden territory, he had to report back about these chaps like they were some kind of mafia that had suddenly arisen.'¹⁴ McNab suggests that the Sports Council had a tendency to align themselves with the NGBs rather than the coaches because 'they were people they could get on with' and they had established that the administrators were generally in control. Because the Sports Council would 'gravitate to where the power was' they tried to appease the NGBs by monitoring BANC activities. The NGBs had always assumed that they were the 'voice of coaches' because they came directly under their jurisdiction, so they remained concerned about the activities of the BANC as there was a fear they were actually beginning to 'speak on behalf of the coaches.'¹⁵

How Coaching Was Valued

The whole attitude towards coaching was very, very poor, right throughout sport, not just in my sport but all throughout sport. They distrusted the whole idea of actual preparation and really taking it seriously. We were still permeated with the public school ideas of 'good show old chap', that kind of approach.¹⁶

British sport was now experiencing improved organisation and increased government investment. There was also a growing acknowledgement of the value of coaching and attempts were being made, to not only improve the provision of coaching, but also raise its profile. However, the following section, presented predominately through the use of interview material gathered from Geoff Dyson by Tom McNab in 1970,

¹⁰ Hamish Telfer, 'To Be Seen but Never Heard: The Struggle For a "Voice" for Coaches in Britain: A Brief Account of the Context, Life Cycle and Demise of the British Association of National Coaches (BANC)', *International Sports Studies* 33, no. 1 (2011): 57.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 58.

¹² McNab, interview.

¹³ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 46.

¹⁴ Telfer, 'Seen but Never Heard', 58; McNab, interview.

¹⁵ Telfer, 'Seen but Never Heard', 58.

¹⁶ McNab, interview.

traces the development of British coaching in this period and demonstrates that, although changes were being implemented along official lines, the control of the NGBs and coaches remained firmly with amateur officials who continued to manage their sports (and coaches) according to their long-established beliefs. Consequently, despite attempts to raise the overall profile of coaching, because amateur officials still viewed professional coaches with a degree of uncertainty, reflected in their unwillingness to accommodate them more fully within their sports, coaching still struggled to find acceptance within British sport.

Amateur Attitude towards Professional Coaches within the NGBs

When Dyson was appointed national coach in 1947, the athletic administrators were still suspicious of the act of coaching and of the coaches themselves. This suspicion, and the amateur attitudes taken towards coaching, remained in the sport for many years. This was potentially because so many of these administrators had a long association with their sports and they were able to influence the perspectives taken by any new officials. Tom McNab suggests that when national coaches were introduced into athletics, the administrators felt threatened by their presence and this further fuelled the level of resistance which the administrators had towards coaches. Prior to the appointment of the national coaches, the administrators were the 'top dogs', the people whom everybody approached if they had issue, but when national coaches appeared 'they challenged them.' Harold Abrahams in particular was never satisfied with this scenario and displayed considerable 'malice' towards the coaches, especially Dyson, who 'was a particular manifestation that he didn't like.'¹⁷

Amateur Officials Unwilling to Take Direction

The question arises then that if the administrators felt so threatened by the introduction of coaches why they were willing to go down this route. During discussion on this issue, Hamilton Smith suggests that amateur officials, who were generally from an upper-class background, 'recognised that they didn't know an awful lot' about the technical matters of their sport so they felt it necessary to appoint coaches to manage this.¹⁸ However, despite accepting input from coaches on technical matters, administrators still viewed them with a degree of superiority because they saw themselves as the 'masters' and the national coaches 'as a serf, a sort of creature.'¹⁹ It was unsurprising therefore, that they were not willing to take direction from the coaches.²⁰ When Dyson suggested to Rowland Harper, a member of Coaching Committee, that he should be referred to as the 'Director of Coaching', because that was essentially the job

¹⁷ McNab, interview.

¹⁸ Smith, interview.

¹⁹ McNab, interview.

²⁰ Smith, interview.

he was doing, Harper replied 'Oh, the Coaching Committee would never agree to that, for we cannot be directed by anyone.'²¹

Coupled with this refusal to take direction, amateur administrators viewed the coaches as inferior, because they had very little respect for them. Dyson noted that 'Harold Abrahams didn't make any differentiation between a coach who held a stopwatch and a coach who had to do a big national administrative job. He couldn't care less about it.'²² McNab suggests that because the people involved in the administration of the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) 'were very conservative people by nature', they had a tendency to disregard the value of the coaches. He explained that they never supported the national coaches in any of their activities and they never connected with them on a personal level. The relationship was purely professional, and they 'never asked about whether you had a family or a wife or what you were doing.'²³ If the national coaches ever demonstrated any sort of initiative, as Dyson and Kinnear frequently did, then administrators viewed them 'with suspicion', but if coaches followed directions and 'didn't cause any ripples of any sort', they would be tolerated.²⁴ From the administrator's perspective, since they were not only controlling and managing the coaching scheme but also ensuring its success, they were the ones that should receive recognition, not the coaches. Dyson believed, that 'as long as the official gets the OBE because of the overall success of the coaching scheme and as long as the athlete doesn't mention his coach's name too many times on television, all is well.' He went further to suggest that if this was not the case then on 'the rare occasions when they are any sort of awards to be gained, why is it the officials always get them?'²⁵

Dyson recalled a period where the AAA were encountering 'money trouble', and at this point it was suggested that they could only afford to keep the national coaches on for a maximum of five years (because their salary would increase annually). As many of these individuals came from a physical education background, it was suggested that they would then be able to return to teaching and continue to pass on their knowledge. Dyson argued that this would be a complete waste of both resources and money because the national coaches would just reach the point 'when they've become national coaches, and then you would get rid of them.'²⁶ Lack of finances is one obvious reason why administrators were keen to replace the national coaches, but it could also be suggested that there was a desire to remove the coaches before they had the opportunity to build their reputations to a point where they would be willing to challenge the authority and decision of the administrators. Officials could justify replacing national coaches, because

²¹ Dyson, interview.

²² Ibid.

²³ McNab, interview.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Dyson, interview.

²⁶ Ibid.

not only would this would reduce financial expenditure, but it would also ensure that any new coaches which they employed would be fairly willing, initially at least, to accept direction without much disagreement.

While both the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) and AAA appointed 'foreign' coaches to work at Loughborough Summer School over the years, the majority of sporting organisations remained very reserved about accepting advice from foreigners because there was a desire to control the methods that were to be introduced into British sport. This was even reflected within the boundaries of the coaches' own organisation. Dyson recalled an incident at the BANC Committee meeting during a discussion about potential speakers for an upcoming conference, when all the names being mentioned were British, he argued,

For twenty years you British have been talking to yourselves, I know theoretically you go to the Olympic Games I know in theory you're in the Olympic Village and you rub shoulders with the other coaches and you learn - but that's not the way. I've been to too many Olympic Games to know...that's not the way you learn, and [in reality] you and your athletes come back from your international trips with very, very little opportunity of technical exchange with other people. By and large you British have been talking to yourselves and now you're thinking up a British Association of National Coaches conference and out comes one of the familiar names to talk on the familiar subject. Why on earth don't you spend a few hundred dollars and get someone to come over from across the seas and say something quite outrageous, something which maybe wrong but something which will set you thinking.²⁷

Public Perception of Coaching

Sporting administrators were not the only ones that had difficulty accepting coaching since it was noted that the British public also failed to acknowledge its value. This could have been due to a lack of education on the subject, because at this time, the British public were rarely exposed to coaching and there was a degree of uncertainty regarding what the job entailed. Dyson believed, that 'when they see that little man run out on the Wembley football ground with his bottle of water and his sponge, I personally think that is what they think it is.' The 'average British person wouldn't be able to explain the difference between a trainer and a coach' and that while he was national coach, his neighbours and other individuals, who were fully aware of his role, would complain to him about their ailments, to which he would respond 'well go and see someone', because this was their concept of what a coach was.²⁸ Individuals who did understand the role of the coach felt that it was 'unimportant' and did not see the benefit because they still had 'this suspicion' that the coach was 'a sort of hanger-on in many sports.'²⁹

Dyson suggested that the way in which sport developed in Britain may have influenced how people perceived coaching. The act of coaching ultimately undermined amateurism and what sport stood for,

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

consequently, a culture developed whereby coaching was never fully embraced within British sport. Because amateurism was cherished for so long in British sport, it became increasingly difficult to change this culture, something, which by the late 1960s, Dyson suggested 'we're only just very slowly in Britain beginning to get rid of.'³⁰ If this really was the situation, then it is unsurprising that for sporting administrators and a proportion of the British public, coaching was accompanied by negative connotations. As sport had developed somewhat differently in other countries, particularly in America and the Soviet Union, coaching was seen differently and generally welcomed. Coaching had a much greater presence, especially within American schooling when the majority of the American public would have been exposed to and experienced the coaching process. McNab highlights that 'the coach was a god to them, that whole idea of the coaches being a leader was fundamental to American society, here it never was...it's been built into their psyche from the beginning.'³¹

Although not universally accepted, there was a slow and gradual recognition by some within sport, that if Britain was to improve and challenge other nations then some form of intervention was required. As a result, the amount of coaching within British sport began to increase, particularly after the 1950s. As resources increased to support coaching provision, so too did the expectations from the British public as to what coaching could achieve. A general consensus developed around the notion that since athletes now had the opportunity to experience regular coaching, this would immediately act to remedy the poor standard of British performances. When coaching did not have an instant impact it was then viewed as not being particularly successful and so the British public and press began to 'bemoan their lot, the fact that they aren't getting out of coaching what they think, or they ought to be getting.' Even though there was an increased awareness, there continued to be an underlying disregard for coaching, particularly when it did not deliver to expectations. It therefore became increasingly difficult to alter existing perceptions, and although it might indeed be the key to ensuring British success, the British public continued to harbour 'a rather uneasy feeling about coaching.'³²

By the late 1960s Dyson suggested that 'there's no reason now in this day and age, why coaching and officiating should be divorced.'³³ However, it would appear that the traditions which had directed British sport for so long, continued in some way to control aspects of sport, and although Dyson and colleagues had made efforts to break down these barriers, during his time as national coach, even he had to 'wonder' if they had made any impact.³⁴ There was an ongoing assumption amongst British administrators that they could continue to offer mediocre salaries and contracts and still entice individuals who had the ability and

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ McNab, interview.

³² Dyson, interview.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

knowledge to implement change. In 1968, it emerged that AAA administrators were willing to offer only £3000 a year for an individual to undertake an expansion of the role that Dyson had once occupied. Dyson viewed the low salary offer as an insult to any applicant, and he asked,

Have the powers-that-be stopped to think of the enormity of the task, the committees they now have to attend; the travelling; the man-management that'll be involved; the smattering of technical knowledge; and many different facets of the game to pay such a man £3000 a year?³⁵

Despite this reluctance to embrace coaching, British athletes were beginning to experience increasing international success, particularly after the 1960s, although the evidence presented here would seem to suggest that these results were being achieved in spite of the system rather than because of it. At Wimbledon, Angela Mortimer and Ann Jones, in 1961 and 1969 respectively, provided Britain with its first ladies singles titles since 1937 and England won the football World Cup in 1966, a success in sporting endeavours that appeared to provide a boost to public morale; the football victory in particular created an 'immense feeling of national pride and the atmosphere in Trafalgar Square was something akin to VE day.'³⁶ Perhaps prompted by these events, and awareness that British sporting organisation still required development, the Sports Council underwent a series of alterations and improvements.

The 1972 Executive Sports Council and Modern Developments

In 1972, the newly appointed Conservative Government created an Executive Sports Council (ESC) by Royal Charter. Whether this creation was the result of international sporting victories or the realisation that sport now had a much larger role within society is unclear, but it seems obvious that the Conservative government were seeking to change the organisation of the current body even before they got into office. It was felt that the current ASC was too closely linked to government and a more 'arm's length' approach would be suitable. A newly formed ESC would retain all the advisory functions of the ASC but it would have the additional responsibility for carrying out grant-aiding to voluntary organisations. The 'new' Sports Council fulfilled the wishes of The *Wolfenden Report* since the organisation would receive funding from the government but it would be free from state control. This also seemingly satisfied those who valued the existing voluntary infrastructure, because in some ways, it allowed sport in Britain to continue in the same vein as before. The organisational structure would remain firmly based within the voluntary sector and,

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 44; Jonathan Stevenson, 'The Story of the 1966 World Cup', Jonathan Stevenson's Blog BBC Sport, entry posted May 6, 2010, http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/jonathanstevenson/2010/05/the_story_of_the_1966_world_cu.html (accessed June 26, 2012).

despite an increased government involvement, via enhanced levels of funding, the government would not attempt to interfere in terms of organisation.³⁷

Despite the creation of the ESC receiving widespread approval from many sports, the Central Council of Physical Recreation (CCPR) viewed the situation as anything but beneficial and this move posed a serious threat to the relationship between the CCPR and the Sports Council. The existing connections between the original ASC and the CCPR had been so close, that some suggested that 'during this period [1965-71] it became increasingly difficult to detach the work of the CCPR from that of the [Advisory] Sports Council.'³⁸ When discussions about the creation of the potential ESC began, it was generally concluded that if the Sports Council developed into an executive body, the CCPR, which had been so closely involved with its activities, 'must accept some form of merger or absorption with the Sports Council.'³⁹ As the CCPR were well aware that any alteration in the organisational situation would compromise their level of control over British sport, they continually resisted the creation of the ESC. However, their efforts proved futile, and in 1972 when the ESC was created, the two bodies were merged and the CCPR went into voluntary liquidation, transferring all of its assets and staff to the ESC.⁴⁰ By agreeing to abide by these terms, the CCPR remained in existence to act as a representative body of the NGBs, and as a purely consultative body for the new ESC.

The main objective of the ESC was to 'develop and improve the knowledge and practice of sport and physical recreation in the interests of social welfare and the enjoyment of leisure among the public at large and to encourage the attainment of high standards.'⁴¹ Although the Council's primary concerns were with mass participation, they also had a focus on elite and international sport. The aim was to 'raise the standards of performance in sport and physical recreation', but because there was a general consensus that increasing facilities was 'the first priority', it was agreed that mass sport would be the initial focus and this resulted in the emergence of the scheme known as 'Sport for All.'⁴² It has been subsequently argued that the 'Sport for All' policy was never more than a slogan and that the continual demand by the government to direct resources to specific groups, resulted in 'Sport for All' becoming known as 'sport for the disadvantaged' and 'sport for the inner city youth.'⁴³

An increasing awareness by the government that 'success in international competition had an important part to play in national morale', resulted in more funding being funnelled towards the ESC for the

³⁷ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 66.

³⁸ Evans, *Story of the CCPR*, 209.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 218.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 224.

⁴¹ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 67.

⁴² Mick Green, 'Olympic Glory or Grassroots Development? Sport Policy Priorities in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom, 1960-2006', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no.7 (2007): 936.

⁴³ Barrie Houlihan, *The Government and Politics of Sport* (London: Routledge, 1991), 99.

purposes of elite and international sport.⁴⁴ In 1975, the first White Paper on sport, *Sport and Recreation*, expressed the desire of the government to direct resources to those who were considered 'gifted' in sport with a suggestion that this was to be done through the development of 'centres of excellence' based in colleges and universities.⁴⁵ As Ken Hardman and Roland Naul suggest, this document acted as 'a precursor to a change in philosophy, a call for a better coordinated system of performance sport to enable young people to develop their full potential.'⁴⁶ Despite initial resistance from some NGBs, because such a move signalled a loss of some of their autonomy, the ESC could see the benefit of such a scheme and gave its support. In 1977, the first centre of excellence opened in Leeds, which was soon followed by centres in both Manchester and Birmingham. The creation of centres of excellence marked an important landmark for coaching in Britain because it provided a focus for the development of top-level elite coaching for both Olympic and non-Olympic sports.⁴⁷ This increased concentration on elite level coaching encouraged debates and disagreements between the NGBs and the ESC regarding the development of a coaching framework in British sport.⁴⁸ A lack of consensus regarding the direction of elite British coaching emerged because

There has always been...a somewhat schizophrenic attitude to coaching and coaches and nothing rouses the sporting passions more quickly than the topic of coaching. Perhaps it is a throw-back in the psyche to those halcyon days when athletes just took off their coats and ran.⁴⁹

There was a growing realisation that in order to deal with issues of coaching there needed to be some sort of centralised body that could work in association with both the NGBs and other sporting organisations to guarantee a degree of cooperation with regards to coaching policies. In 1983, encouraged by the years of lobbying by the BANC, the Sports Council established a 'coaching arm', known as the National Coaching Foundation (NCF). Influenced by the sporting systems which had developed in the East, it was believed that a network system of coaching units set up within universities and colleges would ensure greater collaboration throughout the country.⁵⁰ By 1987, Leeds Polytechnic was acting as the NCF headquarters and there was a network of fourteen national coaching centres housed within other higher education institutes.⁵¹ The NCF initially associated itself with producing study packs and organising short courses in an attempt to create a national standard for coaching. By 1990, it had developed a sports coaching diploma

⁴⁴ Department of the Environment, *Sport and Recreation* (London: Williams Lea, 1975), 18.

⁴⁵ Department of the Environment, *Sport and Recreation*.

⁴⁶ Ken Hardman and Roland Naul, 'The Development of Sporting Excellence in England and Germany: An Historical Comparison', in *Sport in the Global Village*, ed. Ralph Wilcox (Morgantown: WV Fitness Information Technology, 1994), 451.

⁴⁷ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 103; Houlihan and White, *Politics of Sport Development*, 46.

⁴⁸ Houlihan and White, *Politics of Sport Development*, 46.

⁴⁹ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 46.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 176-7; John Lyle, *Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaches' Behaviour* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 13.

⁵¹ Paul Robinson, *Foundations of Sports Coaching* (Oxon: Routledge, 2010), 8.

on a distance learning basis, which soon became the 'gold standard' amongst high-level experienced coaches.⁵² However, whilst interest in the diploma course was initially high, Les Burwitz, who had involvement with the programme while working at Manchester Metropolitan University, suggests that the distance learning format was 'one of the critical limitations.'⁵³ The diploma was directed towards active coaches, who by their very nature were very committed to their coaching role and, therefore, getting them to complete even a part-time academic role was difficult. Burwitz believes that 'it took a lot of nurturing' to get people from start to finish and that was only if they were willing to remain on the course for the duration. Nevertheless, one significant positive of the NCF programme was that it raised awareness amongst the NGBs regarding the potential benefits of coaching, and those NGBs which saw the coaching qualification as a positive initiative encouraged, and in some cases even funded their coaches to participate in the programme. The work of the NCF continued to expand during the 1990s, but as academic institutions became aware that they could run similar undergraduate coaching programmes and therefore gain financially, the emphasis was shifted away from the NCF. Burwitz indicates that when institutions began to encroach on what had been considered NCF territory, this 'was the kiss of death' and it marked the end of the NCF.⁵⁴ As the programmes became obsolete, the NCF gradually began to reduce its scope and a series of redevelopments led to it being rebranded as Sports Coach UK in 2001.

The election of John Major in 1990 saw another shift in the government's approach to sport and witnessed the introduction of new structural changes. Mick Green suggests that the 1996 policy statement *Sport: Raising the Game* signalled that sport was now considered 'a discrete domain for government intervention' as the 'organisational, administrative and funding framework for elite-level support' was further developed.⁵⁵ *Raising the Game* focused on plans to develop elite institutes of sport and considered how universities, in particular, could assist in the development of elite athletes. Essential to the new structure of British sport was the introduction of the National Lottery in 1994, something which Hamilton Smith referred to as 'the greatest thing of all.'⁵⁶ The impact of the lottery was a recurring theme in all of the interviews conducted for this research.⁵⁷ Everyone involved suggested that the availability of funding from the Lottery was a pivotal moment because it caused a shift in the direction of British sport. For the first time, significant sums of money were being allocated to elite sport and this allowed for the introduction of improved methods of coaching and training. Terry Denison commented 'I remember we had a budget of £100,000 a year for British swimming, international swimming, once we got into Lottery funding that went up into the £2

⁵² Lyle, *Sports Coaching Concepts*, 11.

⁵³ Les Burwitz, interview by author, June 25, 2011, Crewe, Cheshire.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Green, 'Olympic Glory or Grassroots', 937.

⁵⁶ Ibid.; Smith, interview.

⁵⁷ McNab, interview; Denison, interview; Smith, interview; Furniss, interview; Rowell, interview; Burwitz, interview; Lynn, interview.

million bracket so suddenly there was a whole different game.⁵⁸ Les Burwitz suggests that the Lottery funding introduced the idea of payment by results and this encouraged more exploration of ways of 'enhancing and improving their particular sport's performance.'⁵⁹ This sentiment was echoed by Sarah Rowell who considers the Lottery as the 'catalyst' for introducing people into sport whose main focus was just on performance.⁶⁰ The eventual reconstruction of the Sports Council in 1996 into the UK Sports Council (now UK Sport) and the English Sports Council (now Sport England) was a final decisive move by the Conservative Government to increase provision for sport and it also reflected the widespread view that separate organisations were needed. The UK Sports Council was to be responsible for developing excellence in sport and controlling drug-related issues, whereas the English Sports Council would be more focused on grass-roots level sport and its development towards excellence. This division was yet another reflection of the government's desire to improve elite sporting success at international level.⁶¹

More recently, and perhaps encouraged by the success of Soviet sporting policies in such areas, there has been an increased emphasis placed on all NGBs to have talent identification strategies which involve the development of 'performance pathways' for individuals who wish to progress to higher levels of competition.⁶² This became more firmly established through the *Game Plan* publication in 2002, which stipulated that each NGB had to develop a sport-specific Long Term Athletic Development (LTAD) plan in order to secure government funding.⁶³ The LTAD model was developed by Istvan Balyi and proposed that a 'specific and well-planned training, competition and recovery regime would ensure optimum development throughout an athlete's career.'⁶⁴ Ultimately, how successful an athlete is and whether they are able to achieve elite levels is predominately determined by training well over a long period time. Balyi concluded that it takes eight to twelve years or 10,000 hours of training for a talented athlete to reach elite levels and this has become a central notion of LTAD.⁶⁵

Sporting Future for All, which was published in 2000, signalled a further change in the way that British sport was being funded, particularly at the elite level.⁶⁶ In acknowledging that international success had its advantages, the government now wanted some guarantee of outcome from their investment. The report stated that each sport would be required to develop realistic medal targets and 'the success or failure in

⁵⁸ Denison, interview.

⁵⁹ Burwitz, interview.

⁶⁰ Rowell, interview.

⁶¹ Houlihan and White, *Politics of Sport Development*, 70.

⁶² Green, 'Olympic Glory or Grassroots', 940.

⁶³ Melanie Lang and Richard Light, 'Interpreting and Implementing the Long Term Athlete Development Model: English Swimming Coaches' Views on the (Swimming) LTAD in Practice', *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching* 5, no. 3 (2010): 389; Department for Culture Media and Sport/Strategy Unit, *Game Plan: A Strategy for Delivering the Government's Sport and Physical Activity Objectives* (London: Cabinet Office, 2002), 125-8.

⁶⁴ Istvan Balyi, *Sport System Building and Long-Term Athlete Development in British Columbia* (Canada: SportsMed BC, 2001), 1-2.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 1; Lang and Light, 'Interpreting and Implementing', 390; Day, 'Craft Coaching', 180-1.

⁶⁶ Department for Culture Media and Sport, *A Sporting Future for All* (London: DCMS, 2002).

achieving milestone targets in performance...will be an important factor in deciding future levels of funding.⁶⁷ Examples of this can be seen in both British swimming and cycling. Elite swimming in Great Britain has experienced variable success at the Olympic Games; at the Sydney Games in 2000 they achieved no medals and four years later in Athens they only achieved two bronze medals. Poor performances at Sydney would have resulted in a drop in funding, and the possibility of performing well at the following Games would have been difficult to achieve. However, those two bronze medals in Athens created a slight increase in funding which clearly paid dividends when Rebecca Adlington secured two gold medals at the Beijing Games in 2008. Although a total of six medals were achieved in British swimming, it was primarily these two gold medals that generated a 24 per cent increase in funding from £20.66 to £25.61 million for the 2012 London Games. Similarly, cycling achieved fourteen medals in total at Beijing, eight more than the expected target, which resulted in a 21.5 per cent increase in funding for the 2012 Games.⁶⁸ But such financial investment by the government is entirely dependent on results and if a sport fails to achieve its medal targets then the funding is reduced or withdrawn, which has recently been the case with British shooting. For the 2008 Games, their funding was £5.06 million and they were required to achieve two medals but when British shooters did not secure any medals, their funding for the following Games suffered a 75.8 per cent decrease to £1.225 million.⁶⁹ Mick Green argues that the unfavourable consequence of such a scheme is that without funding, Olympic athletes struggle to achieve the medal performances demanded by the government targets, and the resource-dependent relationship which all Olympic sports now have with government is one that will only endure if the sport delivers its Olympic targets.⁷⁰

As a result of increased government involvement and greater funding availability, predominately through the creation of the lottery, there have been calls for a more specialised approach to British sport preparation. Particularly in the last thirty years, it has gradually been accepted within the majority of NGBs, that if British athletes were/are to pose a serious threat for medals at World Championships and the Olympics then a structured and carefully directed coaching and training programme was required. Greater specialisation and the abolishment of the amateur ruling at the Olympic Games in 1986 marked a gradual breakdown of some amateur barriers in British sport. However, despite this shift towards greater specialisation and because amateurism controlled and directed British sport for so long, it is inevitable that some remnants of its ethos will remain. An example of this underlying presence of amateurism can be seen in the recent debate surrounding Dwain Chambers and his eligibility for the 2012 Olympic Games.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 16.

⁶⁸ BBC Sport, '2012 Funding Sport-by-Sport', http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/olympic_games/7761495.stm (accessed January 6, 2012).

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Green, 'Olympic Glory or Grassroots', 939.

Chambers was found guilty of doping and served a two years suspension in 2003 but under a British Olympic Association (BOA) by-law he was also served a life ban from Olympic competition. The argument which surrounded the debate was associated with the fact that if Chambers was a citizen of any other country the life-ban would not stand, and consequently it was being contested on the grounds that the BOA were not following the accepted global standards. From a British perspective, Chambers had violated the basic ethics of fair play and deserved to be punished, but the World Anti-Doping Agency ruled that the BOA by-law was not compliant with their policy, resulting in the BOA appealing against the decision at the Court of Arbitration for Sport. A 'very disappointed' BOA lost its appeal, yet this incident does demonstrate the ongoing presence of amateurism within British sport and how the remnants of its ethos continues to impact on everyday events at all levels of sport.⁷¹ The long held assumption that the traditions and rules of British sport are in some way superior to those in the rest of the world seems to still be held as a self-evident truth and an international ruling which is good enough for every other athlete in the world does not meet the high expectations of British sport.

Although this is just one example of the continuing amateur legacy a number of the interviewees in this study offered further examples. Terry Denison explained that 'I think we've moved on, but there is still something of the old amateur tradition and there is still something of it's not quite right, it's professional, it's not quite acceptable.'⁷² Bill Furniss suggests, that as was the case previously, 'even now...I still think coaches are undervalued.'⁷³ Although some elite level coaches were now on 'pretty good salaries' he believes that this is not really comparable to other positions in the sports world, given the environment in which they have to work in, and the pressures which they have to face. He argues that there is 'no comparison' between a coach working with an athlete, and sports support services, and 'yet a lot of sport service people are paid more than the coaches they support! Which is somewhat of an anomaly!'⁷⁴

When questioned if amateurism still influences British sport, Dave Collins responded 'staggeringly, completely and utterly.' He suggested that 'people who loved athletics tried to run athletics, for athletics' and, as a result, the performance of British athletes had continued to diminish. The results at the 2004 Athens Games, as in the 1908 Games, covered up significant failures in the British sporting system. Kelly Holmes had managed to achieve two gold medals, and while Collins accepts she prepared and worked hard for that result, that British athletics had been 'saved by the Americans having a bad day at the office and Kelly having two good days at the office...it covered up loads of other things, they couldn't carry on

⁷¹ BBC Sport, 'London 2012: Dwain Chambers Eligible after Court Ruling', April 30, 2012, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/olympics/17853070> (accessed July 5, 2012).

⁷² Denison, interview.

⁷³ Furniss, interview.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

going like that.⁷⁵ Unlike 1908, attempts were made to try and remedy the situation, but Collins suggests that because of the hold that amateurism still had over British athletics, the sport failed to progress. He explained that,

Soon after I got the performance director job someone asked me if I had seen the Southern League results and I said 'No' and they said 'well you aren't really interested in athletics are you?' No, I'm interested in winning, I am interested in performance. I'm a performance director not an athletics director and that for me, that was the difference. The traditions of athletics and its failure to embrace quick enough the new world has limited it and in my perception continues to limit and that ethos is still there.⁷⁶

Tom McNab suggests, that although its principles may not be as influential as they once were, because amateurism was such a persistent feature of British sport for such a long period of time, the amateur legacy has left a 'vacuum' which will subsequently impact on any future developments. He commented,

I had this naive belief when I was young that once we got professional coaches in charge, professional administrators that we would suddenly, we would fly off. I thought that's the way, indoor facilities here we go. Totally wrong. It left a vacuum, the amateur setup, it left no one behind that had any professional attitudes to develop athletics in coaching or any other way.⁷⁷

For McNab, while athletics has not suffered from a lack of investment particularly in the last ten years, these resources have not been utilised in the correct way so they have offered no benefit to the sport; 'the advantage we've had is building facilities, which are excellent, but the men, not the walls make the city and there's this belief that if you have all these facilities and systems in place that you can produce performance.'⁷⁸ This sort of mind-set appears to be a throwback to a time when amateurism was the main guiding principle of British sport because there have been examples elsewhere in this thesis that suggest that amateur administrators always placed the value of facilities above coaches. There was an assumption, that if the equipment and facilities were provided, then that in turn would produce results, and this attitude still appears to be present, particularly in athletics. If sports are not supplied with individuals who have the correct technical ability they will never have the opportunity to improve. However, McNab suggests that thanks to the far-reaching impact of amateurism, which has left such a big void in many sports, 'we don't have the right people in place and I'm not sure we ever will have.'⁷⁹

Although the continuation of the amateur influence has been considered primarily from a limiting perspective, some interviewees suggest that its influence has in some ways been beneficial for British sport and that it should be encouraged to continue. Frank Dick is grateful that the amateur tradition remains

⁷⁵ Collins, interview.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ McNab, interview.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

because 'we had and we still have people who are amateur who are producing world class performances from their athletes.' He often had this argument with Harry Wilson, in which he asked 'If I give you a million is Steve [Ovett] going to run much faster?' Wilson suggested that was not the point but Dick argued,

Yes it is, it's an attitude...it's not economics. I'd love to support if we could do it, give proper rewards to those persons who produce genius as amateurs but that's not possible, but that the fact is, getting paid doesn't make you a good coach.⁸⁰

Hamilton Smith suggests that the amateur tradition has actively encouraged individuals to donate their time to sport and this has made British sport available to everyone. The option for anyone to volunteer ensured that it has not become an exclusive past-time only for elite athletes, as was frequently seen in other countries such as the Soviet Union. Like Dick, Smith recognises that money does not make someone an expert coach. The unique aspect of the British sporting system is that 'giants' in coaching can emerge simply because they had been willing to volunteer. These individuals are not initially motivated by the prospect of money or success, but simply because they want to help progress their chosen sport.⁸¹ Similarly, Les Burwitz indicates that he would 'fight' for the 'old school ethos of the amateur coach' because this forms the back-bone of what British sport represents. He suggests that, 'yes we need mechanisms to be able to compete at the highest level but let's not throw the baby out with the bath water all the time.' He argues the grassroots American coaches are often 'mirror images of professional coaches', and as such, they treat the athletes (often children) in a way that is inappropriate and not conducive to their development. This is something that Burwitz would not like to see transposed to British sport because 'it's much better that we are amateurs in our approach, providing we know when to cut off and when to shift from play to a professional mode so they've got a half decent chance of achieving medals.'⁸² This recognition that there is a significant difference in terms of the required support for grassroots and elite level sport has now become ever more widespread.

As the NGBs became ever more reliant on government for financial support, which is now dependent on achieving targets, it was inevitable that they would lose some of their autonomy. Perhaps this is one of the factors that diluted the influence of amateurism within the NGBs because they were now no longer able to control their sport, and their professional coaches as they once had. As British sport continued to develop it became apparent that a different approach was required for grassroots and elite sport, and that amateurism did not have a place in an elite sporting model. If Britain wanted to achieve similar success to that seen in the Soviet Union, it would require greater specialisation and a focus on winning. However, although it gradually became accepted that amateurism was no longer considered the guiding principle in

⁸⁰ Frank Dick, interview by author, May 27, 2011, Manchester.

⁸¹ Smith, interview.

⁸² Burwitz, interview.

British sport, it is clear from the interviews conducted here that some of its legacy and ethos are still present, even in elite sport. The following chapters address another specific area of specialisation, sports science, and suggest that although Soviet successes encouraged an increased amount of government involvement in British sport, there was a much slower uptake of sports science. Having said that, there appears to have been a greater acceptance of medical support, as demonstrated by the 1965 Altitude Research project, which provides an interesting case study of how advanced the relationship between sport and science could become, even in the amateur era.

Chapter Eight- Emergence of Sports Science and Medicine in British Sport

Despite the successes enjoyed by Soviet athletes in the 1950s, there was a significant lag between the emergence of Soviet sports science techniques and its uptake in British sport, although medical involvement was always more readily accommodated. While an adherence to amateurism may have been behind the reluctance to engage with scientists, a different approach was taken to individuals associated with the medical world. Because doctors were perceived to be of the correct social standing, amateur administrators were happy to incorporate them, especially if they were prepared to assist in a voluntary and honorary capacity. This chapter explores that relationship and suggests that even though medicine and medical men were accepted within amateur sport, the manner in which the medical world engaged with sport remained under the control of amateur administrators and this was reflected in the ad-hoc and informal way in which it functioned. In order to explain that relationship, this chapter traces the early development of sports science and medicine, when the emphasis was on discovery rather than improvement, and suggests how this appears to have shaped future development. This is followed by a consideration of how the way in which British sports medicine developed and functioned, which was characterised by a lack of qualified personnel and focus, reinforced the very amateur nature of its organisation. Finally, this chapter considers a short case study which suggests, that even though sports medicine was becoming more formalised and established within British sport, there was still much uncertainty surrounding its integration among the amateurs who controlled sport.

Early Forms of Sports Science

Matters of very great significant interest can be found in the performances of that extraordinary machine, the human athlete.¹

In order to comprehend the widespread and rapid changes that took place in the post-war period, it is beneficial to understand and appreciate the evolution of science and sport during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The early research studies that were carried out during this period were essentially designed to monitor the human physiological response to exercise, rather than to systematically study athletic performance. The capacity in which modern sports science and medicine is recognised, whereby science is applied to training, could therefore be considered a fairly recent development.² As the relationship between science and sport had not yet been clearly defined, most of the early research into the physiology of elite sportsman was aimed at identifying the peculiar characteristics of these 'curiosities or

¹ Archibald Hill, 'Are Athletes Machines?', *Scientific American* 137, no. 2 (1927): 126.

² Rob Beamish and Ian Ritchie, 'From Fixed Capacities to Performance-Enhancement: The Paradigm Shift in the Science of Training and the Use of Performance-Enhancing Substances', *Sport in History* 25, no. 3 (2005): 414.

freaks of nature' rather than improving their performance.³ The scientific marginality of sport during this period may have caused this lack of clarity in the relationship. Although sport provided the researcher with a source of physiological data, this constituted only a small part of a much larger area of interest in physical performances that included manual labour and military service, which at the time were considered much more important than sport.⁴ For example, in 1899 Oskar Zoth focused on the pedalling action of cyclists and concluded that muscle physiology played a specific role in the execution of such an activity but he did not suggest that his results could be applied to improving physical performance.⁵ Similarly, in 1903 Thomas Storrey identified that the condition and irritability of voluntary muscles following a sprinter's warm-up could be useful in formulating a scientific rationale for warming-up but this was never discussed in relation to runners using such a technique to improve overall sprinting time.⁶ It could also be suggested that the majority of researchers at the time did not express an interest in applying science to improving athletic performance because of the widespread belief that overtraining and overexertion could cause damage to the vital organs of the body, particularly the heart.⁷

Relationship between Early Sports Science and Coaches

Although scientific research into particular areas of sport was beginning to gain momentum, the communication between scientists and the athletic community was fairly limited.⁸ Because research remained largely confined to scientific journals, which were not readily accessible, coaches continued to rely on their 'accumulated experience' and knowledge.⁹ However, it does also need to be considered that even if communication between the researchers and coaches would have been conducive to the transfer of knowledge and ideas, coaches would have remained reluctant to incorporate 'experimental science.'¹⁰ Victorian and Edwardian coaches or 'trainers', as they were commonly known, relied heavily on a 'craft knowledge' which would have been acquired through a process of experience and the oral and visual transfer of coaching knowledge.¹¹ During this time, coaching craft was generally transmitted through personal contacts and coach-athlete relationships. The successful coaching philosophies which Alfred

³ John Hoberman, *Mortal Engines The Science of Performance and the Dehumanization of Sport* (New York: The Free Press, 1992), 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 6; Ivan Waddington, 'The Development of Sports Medicine', *Sociology of Sports Journal* 12 (1996): 183.

⁵ Oskar Zoth, 'Ueber die Formen der Pedalarbeit beim Radfahren' [On the forms of pedal work in cycling] *European Journal of Physiology* 76, no.7-8 (1899): 319-55.

⁶ Thomas Storrey, 'The Immediate influence of Exercise upon the Irritability of Human Voluntary Muscle', *American Journal of Physiology* 9, no. 1 (1903): 52-5.

⁷ Waddington, 'Development of Sports Medicine', 183.

⁸ Dave Day, "'Magical and Fanciful Theories": Sports Psychologists and Craft Coaches', *Sports Coaching Review* 1, no. 1 (2012): forthcoming.

⁹ Bourne, 'Fast Science', 119-20; Jack W. Berryman and Roberta J. Park, *Sport and Exercise Science: Essays in the History of Sports Medicine* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 70.

¹⁰ Day, 'Craft Coaching', 179.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 182.

Shrubb had experienced while training under Harry Andrews were then passed on to other athletes when Shrubb became athletics coach at Oxford University. Consequently, coaching was 'considered an art as much as a science', something which had been forged and developed through accumulated wisdom.¹² Although the phrase 'scientific' became increasingly associated with most Victorian training methods, this was not used to indicate the incorporation of scientific principles but rather to demonstrate a systematic process of training that would produce skill and physical fitness.¹³

The suggestion that the experience of trainers was worth more than the, as yet, underdeveloped knowledge of the medical world was clearly outlined in the *British Medical Journal* in 1873:

The absence of any scientific work on exercise and training for the guidance of athletes is to us no matter of surprise. Experience has built up a system of training which, although in some respects...open to improvement by the application of scientific knowledge, is on the whole probably much more correct than would be the programme recommended by the whole body of our savants in the Council...When we come to the effects of training and exercise on the health of the body, we are at a loss.¹⁴

Consequently, coaches developed their own strategy of effective training long before the incorporation of science proved or disproved its effectiveness. However, even in contemporary sport, which has seen the institutionalisation of sports science, there are some coaches who continue to rely on traditional knowledge and personal methods. Since the credibility of a coach has always been associated with competition outcomes, it is unsurprising that there has been some reluctance to shift away from methods which have proved to be successful. As Dave Day highlights, 'many prominent coaches have achieved consistent results without the use of a scientific approach and, because their methods are successful, they feel no obligation to provide theoretical justification.'¹⁵ This seems to be reflected in comments by Arthur Lydiard who is noted to have said, 'Coaches already know what works, and the scientist's job is to tell them why it works!'¹⁶ Similarly, athletics coach Steve Jones suggests his coaching is 'simple...there's no science in it, no heart-rate monitors, nothing...it's just about running instinctively...none of it comes out of a book. It all comes out of my own experience.'¹⁷ Aspects of this ongoing reluctance of coaches to fully incorporate science will be explored in chapter nine.

¹² Day, "Magical and Fanciful Theories", forthcoming.

¹³ Berryman and Park, *Sport and Exercise Science*, 70; Day, 'Craft Coaching', 179.

¹⁴ Anon, 'Reviews and Notices', *The British Medical Journal* 1, no. 687 (1873): 589.

¹⁵ Day, 'Craft Coaching', 187.

¹⁶ Ross Tucker, 'Coaching and Science: What's the Big Deal and Who Cares for the Science?', *The Science of Sport*, <http://www.sportsscientists.com/2009/10/coaching-and-science-asset-or-liability.html> (accessed July 4, 2012).

¹⁷ Simon Turnbull, 'It's Easy to Keep up with the Jones Boy - But then he is 54', *Independent*, October 25, 2009.

Interwar Developments

Despite this continued disconnection between science and sport, developments had begun to emerge in Europe during the first half of the century, which indicate that attempts were being made to bridge the gap between science and sport and encourage greater formalisation. During the interwar period, European researchers had begun to develop a 'scientific body of knowledge' concerning human anatomy and physiology, and this is why this era is commonly considered as the formative years of what is now recognised as sports science.¹⁸ However even prior to this, German researchers had been particularly influential because of the many advances and developments that were emerging from their work. Roberta Park suggests that the 1911 Dresden International Hygiene Exhibition provides significant evidence that attempts were being made to launch a more formalised programme of sports science.¹⁹ The exhibition was comprised of different sections, including those related to sport, and upon completion of the exhibition, Henry Beyer a German-born United States Naval Officer, praised its success.²⁰ He commended the last minute efforts made by England as having added to the 'completeness of the results of the undertaking' but he regretted the absence of America, and concluded that the achievements which Germany had made in terms of scientific study in this field were far advanced to those seen anywhere in America.²¹ In an attempt to continue the success achieved at Dresden, a decision was made to establish a research laboratory in the Charlottenburg district in Berlin, and as part of the preparation for the planned 1916 Games in Berlin there was a nationwide drive in Germany to advance the study of sport and focus research on the limiting factors of improving athletic performance.²² However, as Park notes, it would be another three decades before similar initiatives were seen in America.²³

Progress was being made in the 1920s, particularly in the field of exercise physiology, by David Bruce Dill at the Harvard Fatigue Laboratory and A. V. Hill who won the Nobel Prize for 'physiology or medicine' in 1922 for discoveries relating to heat production in the muscle. British physiologist Hill, described as 'a giant in the field of physiology', had a major impact and Ernst Jokl later suggested that Hill's writings and lectures had provided an impetus to the emerging field.²⁴ In 1923, he became the professor of physiology at the University College London, although his best known work was in 1910 which focussed on heat production in the muscle of a frog. Hill had a personal interest in the study of athletic performance, so in 1922 he undertook research in the area of muscular contraction, lactic acid production and oxygen debt within the

¹⁸ Beamish and Ritchie, *Fastest, Highest, Strongest*, 55.

¹⁹ Park, 'Cells or Soaring?', 1713.

²⁰ Anon, 'International Hygiene Exhibition Dresden 1911', *The Journal of Hygiene* 10, no. 1 (1910): 131.

²¹ Henry Beyer, 'The International Hygiene Exhibition at Dresden', *Popular Science Monthly* 80 (1912): 124-5, 128.

²² Park, 'Cells or Soaring?', 1713.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ George Brooks, Thomas Fahey and Kenneth Baldwin, *Exercise Physiology: Human Bioenergetics and its Applications*, 4th ed. (California, Mayfield Publishing 2005), 10; Ernst Jokl, '90th Birthday of Professor A. V. Hill', *The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness* 16, no.4 (1976): 349.

human body.²⁵ These experiments were physically demanding and therefore it was considered appropriate to work with athletes in training because they were willing to work to their maximum capacity.²⁶ As Hill explained in 1927, this factor played a significant role in his research with athletes,

The processes of athletics are simple and measurable and carried out to a constant degree, namely to the utmost of a man's powers...and athletes themselves, being in a state of health and dynamic equilibrium, can be experimented on without danger and can repeat their performances exactly again and again. I might perhaps state a third reason and say, as I said in Philadelphia, that the study of athletes and athletics is "amusing": certainly to us and sometimes I hope to them.²⁷

Hill's work had an impact worldwide and David Bruce Dill credited him for providing the inspiration for much of the work they produced at the Harvard Fatigue Laboratory. Opened in 1927 as part of a joint venture between the Harvard Medical and Business Schools, it was responsible for producing some of the most extensive physiological and fatigue research data of the period.²⁸ A large proportion of the research which was carried out there involved the use of athletes and, by working in conjunction with physiologist, Arlie V. Bock and the Boston General Hospital, were able to carry out a series of research studies in 1928 which also involved Clarence DeMar, who had been in a trained state continuously for approximately twenty years.²⁹ Results demonstrated that physical training, amongst other things, significantly increased the lung capacity and reduced the pulse rate which had led researchers to conclude that the athlete who is in a trained state is more efficient than the sedentary individual because they have a superior ability to be able to meet the demand for oxygen.³⁰ However, the research team failed to bridge the gap between monitoring the physiological response to exercise and effective performance enhancement. This was particularly frustrating for DeMar who remained disdainful of the efforts of officials, trainers and coaches throughout his life.³¹ In fact, he attributed his failure in the 1912 Olympics to their training methods.³²

²⁵ David Basset, 'Scientific Contributions of A. V. Hill: Exercise Physiology Pioneer', *Journal of Applied Physiology* 93 (2002): 1573.

²⁶ Beamish and Ritchie, 'From Fixed Capacities', 418.

²⁷ Hill, *Muscular Movement in Man*, 3.

²⁸ Basset, 'Scientific Contributions of A. V. Hill', 1573.

²⁹ Robin Wolfe Scheffler, 'The Fate of a Progressive Science: The Harvard Fatigue Laboratory, Athletes, the Science of Work and the Politics of Reform', *Endeavour* 35, no. 2-3 (2011): 48; Arlie V. Bock, C. Vancaulaert, David Bruce Dill, Asbjörn Fölling, and Lewis M. Hurxthal 'Studies in Muscular Activity IV: The "Steady State" and the Respiratory Quotient during Work', *Journal of Physiology* 66, no. 2 (1928): 162-74; David Bruce Dill, John H. Talbott, and H T. Edwards, 'Studies in Muscular Activity VI: Response of Several Individuals to a Fixed Task', *Journal of Physiology* 69, no. 3 (1930): 267-305; David Bruce Dill, John H. Talbott, and T H. Edwards, 'Studies in Muscular Activity VII: Factors Limiting the Capacity for Work', *Journal of Physiology* 77, no. 1 (1932): 49-62.

³⁰ Arlie V. Bock, C. Vancaulaert, David Bruce Dill, Asbjörn Fölling, and Lewis M. Hurxthal 'Studies in Muscular Activity III: Dynamical Changes Occurring in Man at Work', *Journal of Physiology* 66, no. 2 (1928): 159.

³¹ David Martin, 'Physiology: Its Role in Explaining Athletic Performance', *New Studies in Athletics* 10, no.1 (1995): 12.

³² James Currens and Paul White 'Half a Century of Running: Clinical, Physiological and Autopsy Findings in the Case of Clarence DeMar (Mr Marathon)', *The New England Journal of Medicine* 265 (1961): 990.

During this period, there was also a connection between the medical and scientific aspects of sport and the Olympic Games. The first obvious example of this emerged at the 1908 London Games when the Organising Committee insisted on medical checks for any individuals wishing to enter the marathon event. Each competitor was required to submit a 'medical certificate of fitness' with his entry and then undergo further medical examinations by officers appointed by the British Olympic Council.³³ The committee could also be credited with introducing the first drugs ban at the Olympics when it was stated that 'no competitor either at the start or during the progress of the race may take or receive any drug. The breach of this rule will operate as an absolute disqualification.'³⁴ Although they had no way of actually proving if individuals were taking any substances, they had unknowingly set in motion a series of developments which would culminate in a more controlled competitive environment at Olympic competitions. Despite these early efforts, the first real example of a concentrated programme of scientific research at an Olympic competition occurred at the 1928 Games in Amsterdam after Professor Buytendijk had contacted the Organising Committee in 1927 to establish if he could 'take advantage of the presence of athletes during the Olympic Games to carry out sport-physiological research.'³⁵ The committee had been more than willing to lend their support and they even installed a laboratory for him to carry out his research.³⁶ Buytendijk enlisted the help of many scholars and researchers from around the world including two Britons, Professor Crighton Bramwell and Dr Reginald Ellis. Many varied investigations were undertaken on the athletes and it was concluded 'that such investigations were not only of scientific importance, but must also be considered of the greatest significance for the sports world and medical advisers.'³⁷ All the researchers involved in the programme were so convinced of its benefits and its potential to further the field of research that they suggested that it should become a permanent feature of future Games under the direct supervision of the International Olympic Committee (IOC).³⁸ However, it was highlighted that despite the 'praiseworthy co-operation of many trainers and athletes, a very large proportion of the competitors shirked the examinations', something, which they argued, was attributable to 'short-sightedness.'³⁹ While researchers believed that statistical investigation was essential if they were to bridge the gap between the medical aspects of sport and the potential to achieve success, it was apparent that many athletes and coaches remained indifferent about its benefits. This probably stemmed from the notion that many athletes and trainers of the time viewed the scientific investigation of sport and exercise as being purely for the benefit of

³³ Theodore Andrea Cook, *The Official Report of the Olympic Games of 1908* (London, British Olympic Association: 1908), 72.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ G Van Rossem, ed., *The Ninth Olympiad being The Official Report of the Olympic Games of 1928 Celebrated at Amsterdam* ed. (Amsterdam: J. H. De Bussy, 1928), 950-951.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 951.

³⁷ Professor Buytendijk, 'Short Report Regarding the Medical Scientific Research Work during the Olympic Games', in *Official Report of 1928*, 952.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 953.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 955.

the researcher because there was a general inability to successfully connect experimental results with performance enhancement.⁴⁰

Although these early studies were beginning to establish that physical exercise did influence the biological mechanisms of the body, because exercise physiology and sports science were still very much in their formative years, they were unable to apply their findings to a practical setting. Beamish and Ritchie suggest that 'part of the reason was the inevitable and perpetual gulf that exists between theory and practice.' Also, for many countries, this was an era which saw the 'apogee of amateur sport's emphasis on character development and education through athletic competition', and as such, outcome and performance enhancement were not considered the primary goal.⁴¹ As previously demonstrated, it was not until the Cold War and the emergence of the Soviet Union that the socio-cultural conditions which were conducive to the application of modern training principles.⁴²

Development of Sports Medicine

The provision of medical services to sport in Britain has for years been bedevilled by our casual amateur attitude. Simply caricatured this is: "sport isn't serious, so sports medicine can't be".⁴³

British sport has always had an association with some form of medical support, but because of antagonism towards the professional aspects of sport, it has always been organised on an informal, ad-hoc basis. During the formative periods of British sport, the medical profession consisted of middle-class men, who by their very nature, would have been inclined to respect and support the amateur ideals of sport. Because these men presented no threat to its ethos, there was less resistance towards their involvement. Although Adolphe Abrahams claimed to have attended in the position of the British athletics Medical Officer at the 1908 Games, it was not until 1928 that it was officially noted that an honorary Medical Officer had travelled with the British team.⁴⁴ It was also in 1928 that the association now known as the Fédération Internationale de Médecine du Sport (FIMS) was formed at the Winter Olympics in St Mortiz.⁴⁵ The volunteerism and amateurism present in British sport essentially shaped and controlled the way in which sports medicine

⁴⁰ Day, 'Craft Coaching', 187.

⁴¹ Beamish and Ritchie, *Fastest, Highest, Strongest*, 56.

⁴² Beamish and Ritchie, 'From Fixed Capacities', 416; *Ibid.*, 59.

⁴³ Peter Sperryn, 'With No Thanks to the DHSS, Let's List Our Achievements', *Medical News*, February 9, 1984, 30, File GC/253/A/36/12, Volume 36: The Development of Sports Medicine in Twentieth Century Britain Collection: Sports Medicine Related Documents-Peter Sperryn, Wellcome Collection, Wellcome Library, London (hereafter cited as Sports Medicine: Sperryn Collection, Wellcome Archives).

⁴⁴ Vanessa Heggie, in *Development of Sports Medicine*, 41.

⁴⁵ Harry Thompson, in *Development of Sports Medicine*, 18.

developed, and it was not until the mid-1950s that any sort of structure begins to emerge.⁴⁶ The British Association of Sport and Medicine (BASM) was formed in 1953 by a group of doctors who had been acting as medical advisors to a number of National Governing Bodies (NGB). Sir Adolphe Abrahams was appointed president, Sir Arthur Porritt acted as chairman and Dr William Tegner was honorary secretary. The BASM was founded with the 'aim of making it the authoritative body on every medical aspect of athletics and exercise.'⁴⁷ Although the organisation began to expand, membership was reserved only for individuals with a recognised medical qualification and for those who had been nominated by the NGBs to act in an advisory capacity (often national coaches), so by 1960 the association had only grown to about 100 members. In 1961, it was decided to make the BASM more accessible to 'those in professions related to sport and medicine' and it granted membership to psychologists, physiologists, physiotherapists and physical educationalists. As a result of this liberal policy on membership, the association numbers had almost trebled within two years.⁴⁸

However, the activity of BASM was minimal in the first few years, possibly because of an ingrained hostility towards formal sports medicine.⁴⁹ Observations on the status of British sports medicine in the mid-1960s noted that there was 'no money, not just no recognition, but a "vindictive hostility" to the expression "sports medicine" in the senior medical world.'⁵⁰ As a result, despite the early association between sport and medicine in Britain, because progress towards a more formalised and professional relationship had been influenced by other factors, it persistently trailed developments being established in other countries.⁵¹ In 1960, the Secretary General of FIMS commented that although sports medicine was now widely accepted and utilised within many countries in Europe, it remained relatively unknown in Britain.⁵² In 1970, it was observed that 'British athletes desperately need a good medical service. Their success depends on it. And if specialised treatment is not provided...will fall further and further behind the rest of the world.'⁵³ Despite this appeal to improve the provision of British sports medicine, it was clear that issues remained unresolved. In 1990, some twenty years after this complaint, it was commented that,

⁴⁶ Neil Carter, 'Metatarsals and Magic Sponges: English Football and the Development of Sports Medicine', *Journal of Sports History* 34, no. 1 (2007): 417.

⁴⁷ British Association of Sport and Medicine, General Meeting, February 27, 1953, File SA/BSM/A/2/1, British Association of Sport and Exercise Medicine 1952-2003 Collection: Minutes and Associated Papers 1952-82, Wellcome Collection, Wellcome Library, London (hereafter cited as BASM Collection, Wellcome Archives); Anon, 'A Brief History of the British Association of Sport and Medicine', *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, no. 3 (1968): 143.

⁴⁸ Anon, 'Brief History Sport Medicine', 143.

⁴⁹ Vanessa Heggie, 'Sport (and Exercise) Medicine in Britain: Healthy Citizens and Abnormal Athletes', *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 28, no. 2 (2011): 257.

⁵⁰ Peter Sperryn, in *Development of Sports Medicine*, 22.

⁵¹ Dan Tunstall Pedoe, Requirements for an Institute of Sports Medicine, February 19, 1985, File GC/253/A/36/14, Volume 36: The Development of Sports Medicine in Twentieth Century Britain Collection: Sports Medicine Related Documents-Dan Tunstall Pedoe, Wellcome Collection, Wellcome Library, London (hereafter cited as Sports Medicine: Pedoe Collection, Wellcome Archives).

⁵² Carter, 'Metatarsals and Magic Sponges', 403.

⁵³ Peter Wilson, 'Dr Liz Puts Her Finger on the Spot', *Daily Mirror*, August 4, 1972, 26.

Despite achieving outstanding success at the highest level of international competition in a wide range of sports, Britain had lagged behind many countries in providing medical support at both elite and grassroots level...The Director of Coaching for the British Amateur Athletic Board has expressed the opinion that at each major games approximately 25% of this country's medal winning opportunities is lost through illness or injury.⁵⁴

This apparent indifference towards sports medicine in Britain resulted in a lack of funding and the slow development as a formal speciality. It was not until 1981 that a postgraduate Diploma in Sports Medicine was offered by the London Hospital Medical College, which eventually developed into a Masters degree in Sports and Exercise Medicine.⁵⁵ It was only in 2005 that Sport and Exercise Medicine was officially recognised by the British government as a specialism.⁵⁶ Sarah Rowell commented that 'one of the things that always did interest me was that sports science was funded well before sports medicine was and in some ways there is argument that you can't use sports science unless you've got uninjured athletes.'⁵⁷ Because of the lack of formal qualifications there has been difficulty in controlling the standard and the people involved. Peter Sperryn who became team doctor for the British Amateur Athletic Board (BAAB) in 1969 explained that,

They always had a team of "physios", most of whom weren't, and this caused a great deal of ill feeling between the professions. They had some very well-known and highly favoured masseurs called physiotherapists, with no qualifications except charm, and they made a good cup of tea and looked after the worries of the team.⁵⁸

In the 1970s, there were attempts to reduce the animosity between the bodies of professional medical staff and amateur assistants, when the British Olympic Association (BOA) declared, that 'in future unqualified persons would not be taken to the Olympic Games described as physiotherapists.'⁵⁹ However, it was clear that issues of suitability and qualifications remained a problem. In the mid-1980s it was noted that the BASM had written to the BOA expressing their 'disquiet' regarding the selection of some doctors because they lacked suitable experience in the sporting environment.⁶⁰ Even as late as 1995 there had been complaints about some doctors working with sports teams who were not correctly qualified. Although it was 'ideal' that doctors who were working in conjunction with team should hold a Diploma in Sports Medicine,

⁵⁴ Sports Council, 'Discussion Paper - Medical Support for Sport', April 10, 1990, 1, File SA/BSM/A/1/1, BASM Collection, Wellcome Archives.

⁵⁵ Carter, 'Metatarsals and Magic Sponges', 403.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Rowell, interview.

⁵⁸ Peter Sperryn, in *Development of Sports Medicine*, 42-3.

⁵⁹ British Association of Sport and Medicine, Executive Committee Minutes, March 14, 1974, File SA/BSM/A/2/2, BASM Collection, Wellcome Archives.

⁶⁰ Dr D T. Pedoe to C. Palmer, February 19, 1985, File GC/253/A/36/14, Sports Medicine: Pedoe Collection, Wellcome Archives.

there was no way to enforce this because it was not an actual requirement.⁶¹ This reticence to question the qualifications and suitability of these individuals appears to have been closely associated with notions of amateurism and volunteerism:

What of the worthy doctors, who accompany our international teams abroad, or give up their time for no reward, out of interest and involvement in sport? Commendable as it is, interest and involvement do not make up for specialised expertise. Every time I, or any other critic, assail officials in various sports for different inadequacies. I am made to feel a “cad” or an “outsider” because I have attacked someone “who after all, old boy, isn’t getting anything out of it and is just doing it for the love of the sport”.⁶²

For sporting organisations, questioning of the qualities of these individuals displayed a lack of appreciation for both amateurism and the voluntary tradition since these individuals donated their free time in order to make a vital contribution to British sport. From the traditionalists’ perspective, they were in some ways untouchable, a perception which severely hampered the growth of sports medicine in British sport.

Even as it gradually became an established practice to utilise qualified doctors within international sporting teams, the whole process still remained very ‘amateur’. Malcolm Read was a member of the 1968 Olympic hockey team and trained as a doctor. He went with a number of teams to several Olympic Games and also went on world tours with the British hockey team but he never received any remuneration. It was generally accepted that doctors would donate their services to sports teams and use their own holiday to be able to attend events, but Read faced difficulties when his employer refused to pay him while he was away from the practice. He described another situation in 1986 when he was asked to act as chief medical officer for the Olympics. After being approached by the BOA, he explained that in order to do the job correctly it would require a minimum of four days a week and they would need to pay him accordingly. However, he was told that he would not be paid and that he was expected to fulfil such duties voluntarily. Unsurprisingly, he refused to take on the job, explaining that it would be ‘impossible’ to try and earn a living and work four days a week for free.⁶³

This expectation that doctors should fulfil sporting duties on a voluntary basis was not confined to the BOA. The Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) and the BAAB both wanted to incorporate some form of sports medicine, but only on an amateur honorary basis, and they expected doctors to donate their time free of charge just as all the other honorary officials and coaches did. Peter Sperryn, who became honorary secretary of BASM in 1964, and who had a long involvement with the BAAB, explained that when he became team doctor for the European Championships at Helsinki in 1971, it was highlighted at a meeting

⁶¹ Dr S. Motto to Dr M. Read, April 6, 1995, 1, File GC/253/A/36/11, Volume 36: The Development of Sports Medicine in Twentieth Century Britain Collection: Sports Medicine Related Documents-Malcolm Read 3, Wellcome Collection, Wellcome Library, London.

⁶² Peter Wilson, ‘Dr Liz Puts Her Finger on the Spot’, *Daily Mirror*, August 4, 1972, 26.

⁶³ Dr Malcolm Read, in *Development of Sports Medicine*, 46.

prior to the event, that while athletes would be awarded a 'per diem' allowance, support staff would receive nothing. When questioned, Harold Abrahams explained 'there is no allowance, we don't have any money.' It later transpired that there were team expenses but Abrahams had carried them to Helsinki and back in a hope that they would not have to 'waste' any of them. Eventually, the doctors and support staff were offered 'pocket money', but as Sperryn highlights, 'it was a gratuity and not a fee!'⁶⁴ A further example occurred in 1971 when he was already an established BAAB medical officer, but had recently qualified as a consultant. He approached Arthur Gold in order to develop a medical centre at Loughborough where the athletes could visit on an annual basis and have routine tests. As this was something that the BAAB had requested, Sperryn hoped he may receive some sort of funding. However, 'the minute that I had suggested some remuneration on professional terms, strictly according to the NHS consultant contracts - I wasn't playing Harley Street - I was sacked!'⁶⁵

Resistance within the NGBs towards the professionalisation of the medical services was exacerbated by the fact that medical organisations were unwilling to cooperate with each other. As with many other areas of British amateur sport, this continual battle for autonomy between different organisations seems to have made a negative impact. Although it was acknowledged by the medical contingent that 'doctors and coaches do not work closely enough together, with doctors probably being most at fault', the cohesion between sporting bodies was minimal.⁶⁶ Even in the late 1990s, it was still being noted by UK Sport that friction between organisations had slowed the overall development of sports medicine. Apparently, 'from what is reported to us by both coaches and athletes, and from our own experience of trying to develop sports medicine services, development of sports medicine has on occasions been hindered by disagreements within the discipline.'⁶⁷ In 1992, the Sports Council supported the development of a National Sports Medicine Institute (NSMI), which it was hoped would bring some form of standardisation and cohesion.⁶⁸ However, far from creating an environment which was conducive to the development of British sports medicine this resulted in even more animosity between organisations as they fought to preserve their own autonomy. In 1999, it was observed that there was 'an unstated agenda with some sort of power struggle developing' between the BASM and NSMI but it was hoped that 'the endemic strain of confrontation and disagreement' could be eliminated and that the two bodies could 'work together in mutual trust.'⁶⁹ Despite this plea, disputes continued between the two organisations and this was particularly

⁶⁴ Dr Peter Sperryn, in *Development of Sports Medicine*, 44-5.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁶⁶ Dr E L. Lloyd to National Coaching Foundation, July 13, 1998, File SA/BSM/B/5, BASM Collection, Wellcome Archives.

⁶⁷ D. Chesterton to J. Clegg, June 23, 1999, File SA/BSM/G/2, British Association of Sport and Exercise Medicine 1952-2003 Collection: John Clegg Papers 1997-99, Wellcome Collection, Wellcome Library, London (hereafter cited as BASM Collection: Clegg Papers, Wellcome Archives).

⁶⁸ Dr D. Tunstall and Dr P. Sperryn to National Sports Medicine Institute, January 28, 1991, File GC/253/A/36/12, Sports Medicine: Sperryn Collection, Wellcome Archives.

⁶⁹ Dr M. Bottomley to J. Clegg, December 14, 1999, File SA/BSM/G/2, BASM Collection: Clegg Papers, Wellcome Archives.

apparent when the NSMI attempted to control aspects of sports medicine that the BASM believed to be under their authority, causing an aggressive response:

It is vital that the BASM is recognised as the professional body for Sports Medicine Practitioners. Any involvement of the NSMI could be disruptive to this process...I think that at this time it is vitally important that Sports Medicine presents a united front, and I firmly believe that BASM is the organisation best place to represent doctors in this speciality.⁷⁰

Although British sport has had a long association with medical practitioners, it has been fairly informal and unstructured and the progress and development of sports medicine into a respected, recognised speciality has been constantly influenced by constraints associated with amateurism. As with other aspects of British sport, there was a belief that sports medicine should be conducted on an honorary basis. This has influenced the quality of medical support that British athletes have received and subsequently restricted the level of performance that athletes have been able to reach. However, despite this somewhat uncoordinated integration of medicine into British sport, the reactions to the issue of the effects of altitude at the Mexico Games in 1968 encouraged a greater formalisation of sports medicine, because it was recognised that athletes would not be able to compete effectively without some form of medical assistance. The altitude debate that emerged following the awarding of the Games to Mexico does appear to have offered some sort of direction to British sports medicine, and the following section uses the altitude research conducted in 1965 as a case study to illustrate the effect of this debate on the future of British sports medicine.

1965 Altitude Research and British Sport

During the 1960s in British sport, research into various aspects of elite sport began to expand. Prior to this, apart from the limited amount of research being conducted by independent bodies, information associated with sports science was not widely available to coaches.⁷¹ Frank Dick has suggested that an increased interest in physiology in the mid-1960s was a direct result of the impending 1968 Mexico Games, and a realisation that altitude and dehydration played an important role within sporting performance. A need to know more about these principles in the practical sense in order to assist coaches, was the catalyst for not only training at altitude but also for the wider interest and incorporation of sports science and medicine into British sport.⁷² It is also likely that the sporting success of other nations, particularly the Soviet Union, with their very sophisticated and advanced sports science systems had begun to influence British sport. This combination of factors caused the BOA to become more involved in the development of British sports science partly through the launch of their Mexican research project in 1965 which specifically focused on

⁷⁰ Dr M. Cullen to J. Clegg, December 6, 1999, File SA/BSM/G/2, BASM Collection: Clegg Papers, Wellcome Archives.

⁷¹ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 45.

⁷² Dick, interview.

the effects of altitude. This represents a pivotal movement in the history of British sports science because it was the first instance of a major British sporting organisation investing a large sum of money into a sporting research project. A total of £5,000 was allocated, which consisted of £2,500 from the government via the Sports Council and £2,500 from the BOA itself.⁷³ As Vanessa Heggie notes, the relative novelty of the BOA engaging in such a research project may be lost on modern audiences but this was the birth of a modern, medicalised, 'expert' BOA.⁷⁴

An 'ad-hoc' Medical Advisory Committee was formed in March 1965 by the BASM at the request of the BOA and included representatives from both bodies. The intention of the committee was to discuss and resolve matters associated with altitude and the impending Mexico Games.⁷⁵ It was concluded that in order to fully understand the impact of altitude on athletic performances they would need to carry out their own body of research, and within a matter of months a draft scheme had been developed by Dr Raymond Owen of the BOA.⁷⁶ The object of the project was to 'find out how British Competitors are likely to react to the conditions in Mexico City at the Olympic Games in 1968 and to support findings with such physiological tests as seem necessary.'⁷⁷ It was initially agreed that that research would consist of three separate studies, one at sea-level in the UK, one at sea-level in Acapulco and one at altitude in Mexico City. However, on the advice of Dr Lewis Griffith Cresswell Evans Pugh, who had experience of working at altitude through his Everest studies, the Acapulco leg of the research was dropped.⁷⁸ The other projects were quickly approved as there was a desire to get the study underway as soon as was feasibly possible because 'any longer delay would only increase the many wild rumours that already exist' surrounding the issues of altitude.⁷⁹ It was agreed that Owen would be in charge of the overall team and act as a representative for the BOA while in Mexico, and Pugh would control the technical aspects of the research and carry out all the necessary testing.⁸⁰ Two other members of the research team were Arthur Gold, honorary secretary of the BAAB, and John Le Masurier, AAA national coach, who were responsible for selecting six athletes of 'international calibre' to participate in the study.⁸¹ Dr Noel Bleasdale, who was

⁷³ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, July 14, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁷⁴ Heggie, 'British Making a Fuss', 225.

⁷⁵ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, March 8, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁷⁶ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, April 20, June 2, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁷⁷ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, June 2, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁷⁸ Heggie, 'British Making a Fuss', 219.

⁷⁹ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, June 2, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁸⁰ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, July 14, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁸¹ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, July 24, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

heavily involved with the medical aspects of the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA), and a representative on the Medical Advisory Committee, indicated the ASA's desire to include two swimmers, one male and one female in the altitude programme. However, this request was denied on the grounds that 'the swimmers body was 15 centimetres under the water when competing and that no altitude tests were being carried out on women.'⁸² The project began in Britain on 4 October 1965 and the athletes were monitored at the Medical Research Council facilities. They were requested to combine weekly sessions of interval training, one mile time trials, and three mile races with their regular training schedule.⁸³ After this was completed, the research team, along with the athletes, travelled to Mexico on the 6 November 1965.⁸⁴

It is clear from the BOA evidence that there was issue with how Pugh conducted himself during the research, and this consequently created tension between him and others on the team. The main area of concern appeared to be the premature releasing of research results and other information to the press. Although it was agreed that both Pugh and Owen were authorised to make press statements, it was hoped that information would remain confidential until the report was completed.⁸⁵ During the first week of research in Mexico an article appeared in the *Star* stating that 'our Mexico athletes lose 24%.' BOA secretary, Sandy Duncan, clearly had issues with this leaking of information and immediately contacted Owen to advise him to 'clamp down a bit' because the report had also stated 'categorically that Dr. Pugh says that the Olympic team will require four weeks acclimatisation.'⁸⁶ Owen proved incapable of preventing further disclosures in the second week of the study when 'Dr. Pugh said there had been an average 5.5 per cent decrease in performance of runners compared with those at sea level.'⁸⁷ Disgruntled, Duncan wrote directly to Pugh stating,

Your comments - if indeed they were made, and one cannot rely on newspaper reports - are however causing embarrassment over here. We agreed mutually and in Committee that the main results and conclusions of the project should not be released until all the results of the project had been analysed. No doubt you did not in fact make the comment as quoted, since this would be pre-judging the results to be obtained in the third and fourth weeks. Sufficient to say that the remark attributed to you is causing some consternation over here.⁸⁸

⁸² British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, July 14, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁸³ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, June 2, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁸⁴ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, June 24, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁸⁵ British Olympic Association, Medical Advisory Committee Minutes, July 14, 1965, File BOA/MED/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁸⁶ K S. Duncan to Dr R. Owen, November 15, 1965, File BOA/MED/2/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁸⁷ 'Runners Improve in Mexico City', *The Times*, November 20, 1965, 4.

⁸⁸ K S. Duncan to Dr L G C E. Pugh, November 22, 1965, File BOA/MED/2/1, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

By early December the research team had returned to Britain and begun to collate their findings. Using the data presented to them the BOA established, that 'all endurance competitors in the 1968 British Olympic Team should arrive in Mexico City approximately 4 weeks before the opening ceremony...competitors in explosive events should arrive in Mexico City a minimum of 3 weeks beforehand.'⁸⁹ This recommendation represented a minimum and ideally the athletes would be given a longer period of training at altitude. This placed the IOC in a somewhat difficult situation, because under the rules of Olympic competition set in 1960, in order to be considered as an amateur, an athlete was not permitted more than four weeks in one year at a designated training camp.⁹⁰ As both the President and Vice-president of the IOC, Avery Brundage and Lord Exeter respectively, had a strong allegiance to the principles of amateurism and its place within the Olympic Movement it was necessary for them to clarify the situation regarding altitude training. Not only regarding the length of time necessary for individuals to adjust to elevated altitude levels but also the length of time permitted under the amateur ruling. Prior to a decision being made, it would appear that the British study was considered one of the most comprehensive and significant as it was frequently referred to during discussions.⁹¹ After much uncertainty, in August 1966, the IOC formally declared that in order to achieve fairness amongst competitors 'no athletes, other than those who usually live or train at such heights shall specifically do so at high altitude for more than 4 weeks in the last 4 months before the opening of the Games.'⁹²

This imposition of a four week limit on high-altitude training for those who did not 'usually live or train' in such conditions caused widespread criticism regarding the selection of the host site. In April 1966, a group of British athletes voiced their displeasure of this 'disastrous mistake' in a letter to *The Times*. Their objections appeared to stem from belief that not only would they be placed in danger by competing (after it had been repeatedly suggested that athletes could potentially die from competing in Mexico) but also that some athletes would have an unfair advantage. They argued that, 'the fundamental principle of the Olympic movement that all participants should compete on equal terms will have been completely subverted.'⁹³ The majority of performances would 'fall far short of normal national, let alone Olympic standards' and therefore, although they accepted that it was no longer possible to relocate the site of the Games, they hoped that the organisers would be willing to compromise. They suggested that the endurance events should be held at a low-altitude venue, thus eliminating the issues of altitude acclimatisation, but these requests were

⁸⁹ British Olympic Association, 'Report of the Medical Research Project into the Effects of Altitude in Mexico City in 1965', April, 1966, 13, File BOA/MED/3/4, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁹⁰ Comité International Olympique, 'Training Camps', *Olympic Review*, no. 1 (1967): 22.

⁹¹ Alison Wrynn, 'A Debt was Paid Off in Tears: Science, IOC Politics and the Debate about High-Altitude in the 1968 Mexico City Olympics', *International Journal of the History of Sport* 23, no. 7 (2006): 1160.

⁹² British Olympic Association, Press Statement, July 7, 1966, File BOA/MED/2/2, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

⁹³ Letter to the editor, *The Times*, April 16, 1966, 9; 'Britain Calls For Limit on High Altitude Training', *The Times*, February 3, 1966, 3.

ignored.⁹⁴ Other criticisms from British amateur officials appeared to be associated with the conditions of amateurism, whereby it was suggested that the amount of training required to compete at altitude would require a large amount of extra subsidy and support, and this would ultimately invalidate the ruling principle of the Olympic Movement.⁹⁵ It was established that British athletes would not be able to compete at altitude with the regular minimal amount of training, and it was clear there was uncertainty about increases in training volume. For amateur officials the issue was, 'how amateur can the distance runner of the future be if he must find some way of living most of the year at altitude?'⁹⁶ Considering their rigid definitions of amateurism had long since provided British officials with an excuse for poor British performances, it was obvious why there was such a strong defence of its principles.⁹⁷ Roger Bannister, who had always criticised the choice of Mexico, appeared to offer Britain as an example of true amateurism when he stated,

How can any amateur athlete view with enthusiasm being used as a "guinea-pig" in low pressure acclimatisation experiments? Little wonder that Russia and America have not so far complained, but smaller countries look to us for a defence of the amateur.⁹⁸

This suggestion that neither Russia nor America would have an issue with altitude, appeared to imply that Bannister believed they were not truly amateur. Although they may have been considered amateur by the IOC, from the perspective of the British officials, by conducting extensive research on their athletes and having a 'win at all costs' attitude, these countries were breaching the true meaning of sport.

As a result of the Cold War, there was now wide-spread acceptance that British athletes would be beaten by the 'shamateur' nations of Russia and America, but by holding the Games at altitude, there was now an additional concern that Britain could also be beaten by third world countries. Repeating previous excuses made over the issue of British defeats by 'lesser nations', Bannister argued that British athletes would be beaten, not because they were athletically inferior but simply because the nations in question had the opportunity to capitalise on an environment that was conducive to altitude acclimatisation. Despite expressing, although in a somewhat condescending manner, that he was 'really in favour of Kenya winning as many medals as she can' he made his beliefs explicitly clear when he commented, that when 'a novice won an Olympic title because of the chance of his birthplace...this is utterly wrong.'⁹⁹

Regardless of the protests over the selection of Mexico, it was becoming increasingly apparent that the IOC would not be willing to select a new site. As Chris Brasher highlighted, it was therefore 'time to use our brains to overcome handicaps imposed on a lowland country which keeps most of its sport in a

⁹⁴ Letter to the editor, *The Times*, April 16, 1966, 9.

⁹⁵ H A. Meyer, 'Olympic Games in Mexico', *The Times*, April 20, 1966, 13.

⁹⁶ Roger Bannister, 'A Debt Was Paid off in Tears', *Sports Illustrated*, November 11, 1968, 22-3.

⁹⁷ Heggie, 'British Making a Fuss', 225.

⁹⁸ Roger Bannister 'Olympic Games in Mexico', *The Times*, April 18, 1966, 11.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

perpetual state of penury.¹⁰⁰ The BOA had begun its efforts to establish suitable training arrangements for British competitors following an offer from the French government to train at the high-altitude athletic centre in Font Romeu. Although it was accepted that British and other sea-level competitors would be disadvantaged in Mexico, the BOA believed 'Britain could do outstandingly well...because we have the technology, the know-how.'¹⁰¹ According to the mounting scientific evidence, it was clear that training at altitude would ensure that the athlete would acclimatise quicker, and ultimately perform better, and therefore, the IOC were forced to revise its limit on altitude training. They announced, that although the 'general operation of special training camps is not in accordance with the spirit of amateur sport', in light of the evidence, they were willing to allow a further two weeks training in the year of Olympic competition only, thereby allowing a total of six weeks training at altitude.¹⁰² While it might be assumed that British sporting organisations would wish to take advantage of this opportunity, the ongoing influence of the amateur ethos was reflected in attitudes taken to the offer of high altitude training in France, when 'the response from the 20 or so sports which face the biggest Olympic problem in their history was, 'some interest.'¹⁰³ The resources available to aid acclimatisation were also not being utilised correctly. Pugh, who was at the time one of the most educated people on the subject in Britain, had stated that he felt 'powerless' because not one NGB sought his advice on how to successfully train for Mexico.¹⁰⁴

However, one NGB was keenly aware of the potential issues of competing at altitude and had begun to formulate their own training plans some years earlier. In 1966, the ASA had reserved £6,000 to develop an 'Olympic Training Squad' which would consist of swimmers whose performance could equal a 'sixth placed finalist in the 1964 Olympic Games.' In order to deal with the issue of altitude acclimatisation the squad would travel to Switzerland at Christmas in 1967 for ten days. While they were at high-altitude it was agreed that they would not swim but instead participate in different endurance activities in order to acquire the full benefit of training at altitude. In addition to this, the team would also spend ten days at both Easter and Spring in 1968 training at the Font Romeu centre in the Pyrenees, as well as utilising the full four week IOC allowance by acclimatising in Mexico before the opening of the Games.¹⁰⁵ As it was always the intention of the ASA 'to secure the widest publicity' for their altitude training and preparation plans, it was inevitable that they would be subjected to criticism.¹⁰⁶ When Norman Sarsfield, team manager of the 'Olympic Training Squad', was questioned about their methods and how they could apparently defy the IOC rulings, he responded

¹⁰⁰ Chris Brasher, 'Let's Stop Being Gentlemen', *Observer*, May 28, 1967, 14.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² Comité International Olympique, 'Training Camps', *Olympic Review*, no. 1 (1967): 22.

¹⁰³ Chris Brasher, 'Let's Stop Being Gentlemen', *The Observer*, May 28, 1967, 14.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1966-Committee Minutes, December 17, 1966, 57-8, ASA Headquarters.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

Do the IOC really think that the Russians are spending £3,500,000 on an altitude training centre in the Caucasus and then not be able to use it in Olympic year? Are the Australians going to abandon their training camp at 7,000 ft in the Snowy Mountains? Have the Americans built a centre at Lake Tahoe at 6,200 ft so that they can leave it idle? I am sure we will be told that whatever the others do we must not sin but I am going to recommend to the ASA committee...that we go right ahead with our plans because all other countries are going ahead.¹⁰⁷

Chris Brasher fully supported the ASA and suggested that 'it is time we stopped being supposed gentlemen and become modern realists with a professional attitude.' However, he did acknowledge that 'such a whole hearted approach' would never be taken in British athletics while the traditional amateur officials remained in charge.¹⁰⁸

The BOA's response to Sarsfield was not quite as supportive, since, 'what happens if the swimmers, for instance, ignore the rules? Do the BOA tell them they must not do it, and if they still insist on it will they then be forbidden to take part in the Games?'¹⁰⁹ Contained herein was essentially the issue with the altitude debate and how it challenged the values of the Olympic Movement. Although it had long been established that 'shamateurs' frequently participated in the Olympics no action could be taken because the IOC had no proof. The altitude debate offered the IOC the opportunity to uncover evidence that athletes had exceeded the allotted time training at altitude, and according to IOC ruling, would no longer be amateur, but this was no guarantee the IOC would take action. The widespread feeling was that it was no longer a case of whether an athlete was truly amateur, but whether the IOC would actually enforce the amateur ruling. Essentially there could not be a solution to the altitude debate until 'the thorny old problem of amateurs and professionals is finally cleared up.'¹¹⁰ As a result, the IOC's choice of venue seemingly acted as a pivotal moment regarding amateur status in the Olympic Movement. It had been established that athletes who had been born, grown up and trained at high-altitude were predisposed to success in endurance events and that athletes born at sea-level could replicate such success by training or living at altitude.¹¹¹ Perhaps one of the factors that 'hastened the end of [the] ideals of amateurism' within the Olympic Movement more than any other was an understanding that living and training at altitude could potentially improve performance in certain events. Consequently, athletes needed the freedom to live and train where it would be best to improve their own performance.¹¹² From a British sports science perspective, as the research which had been commissioned by the BOA was so influential in the altitude

¹⁰⁷ Chris Brasher, 'Let's Stop Being Gentlemen', *Observer*, May 28, 1967, 14.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Dr R. Owen to K S. Duncan, May 29, 1967, File BOA/MED/2/3, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

¹¹⁰ 'Britain Call for Limit on High Altitude Training', *The Times*, February 3, 1966, 3.

¹¹¹ Wrynn, 'Debt Paid Off', 1166.

¹¹² 'Ideals of Amateurism Nearing Their End', *The Times*, October 28, 1968, 11; Wrynn, 'Debt Paid Off', 1166.

debate, it was clear that the large investment of both time and money in the research project had been fully justified and this appeared to provide the impetus required for researchers to continue their work.

During the late 1960s, the increasing use of ergogenic aids and drugs in sport was beginning to present a problem both ethically and morally for sports administrators and coaches. At the time there was a particular focus on the use of anabolic steroids and their effect on both performance and the human body. The BOA stated that 'in the doses alleged to be used by some athletes to give an improved performance, there is a grave risk of danger to health, such as sterility in the male...other affects may not be apparent immediately.'¹¹³ There was so much uncertainty surrounding its use that in an attempt to discover more information about the substance and develop methods of detection, in 1970, the Sports Council offered a three year grant to Professor Brooks and the St Thomas Hospital. By 1973, Brooks and his team had successfully developed a urine screening method to detect the use of anabolic steroids and the IOC soon adopted this as the official testing method for use during the Olympic Games. The Sports Council were so encouraged by the results of the study that they agreed to fund the research for a further two years, by which point Britain had emerged as a leading country in this field of research, and this success continued to provide momentum for further research in other areas.¹¹⁴

The medical and scientific aspects of sport were becoming ever more present in British sport but because of the legacy of amateurism there was still an underlying uncertainty about its use among officials and coaches. However, the concerns over altitude at the 1968 Games appear to have encouraged a greater formalisation of British sports medicine because it had been established that athletes could suffer physiologically without some form medical support. Yet as well as offering direction, the altitude issue also raised further questions regarding the issues of amateurism. It could be considered somewhat ironic that the 1965 British research caused a dilution of the amateur ruling at the Olympic Games; a nation which had fought so hard to preserve amateurism by limiting the integration of professional coaching and specialised training techniques had now, through engaging with scientific research, raised questions about the place of amateurism at the Olympics. Although the sports sciences remained marginalised in British sport at this time, pockets of research had begun to emerge in the post-war period which indicates that some sports, particularly swimming, were willing to integrate them into their programmes. However, as the following chapter highlights, these advances were occurring because of a few influential coaches and individuals rather than being initiated or actively encouraged by the NGBs themselves. As Terry Denison notes, the administrators 'didn't obstruct it, but they weren't proactive in saying this is what we should do... they relied on the chief coaches or whatever to say, this is what I need.'¹¹⁵

¹¹³ British Olympic Association, Memorandum on Anabolic Steroids, December 14, 1966, File BOA/MED/2/2, BOA Collection, UEL Archives.

¹¹⁴ Coghlan, *Sport and British Politics*, 45, 105.

¹¹⁵ Denison, interview.

Chapter Nine: British Coaches and Sports Science in the Post-War Period

As the ethos of amateurism still permeated throughout British sport during the early post-war period, sports science developed in a very disconnected manner, similar to that of sports medicine. There was no central scheme controlling its formation and the minimal progress that was being achieved, as with other aspects of British sport, was because of individual initiatives, predominately led by experienced and skilled coaches. This chapter explores these post-war developments and explains how increased government intervention and funding created a greater system of centralisation and coordination. The text demonstrates how the ways in which swimming and athletics utilised and incorporated science during the post-war period were a reflection of their differing positions on amateurism and specialisation, and then, by using the National Coaching Foundation (NCF) as an example, illustrates how greater funding and direction from the government stimulated the development of an efficient sports science support system. Finally, using interview material gathered from coaches, the chapter explores what factors, other than those related to amateurism, may have prevented or discouraged some coaches from utilising scientific methods.

Science, Coaches and Swimming at Loughborough

The Loughborough Swimming School was significantly more accommodating of scientific principles than its counterpart in athletics. Perhaps this was due to the greater acceptance of professionalisation in swimming, which is not to say professional coaches were accepted and valued within the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA), but as previously noted, professional coaches have always had a more significant presence in swimming compared to that of athletics.

The second Loughborough Course in 1948, saw for the first time, the involvement of a medical officer. Dr R. H. Bolton, attended in an honorary capacity in order to provide lectures for the swimmers, compile their medical histories and monitor them throughout the course. It was also noted that 'he was particularly interested in observing their reactions to training.'¹ Max Madders, a lecturer at Birmingham University and an 'old friend' of Harry Koskie, was invited to administer 'swimming gymnastics' and 'relaxation techniques.'² It was believed that if swimmers were taught how to relax by means of land exercises, they would then successfully be able to transfer this to the water and improve their stroke technique.³ Madders, and his wife Jane both acted as physiotherapists for the swimmers and were responsible for administering 'sun ray and infra red.'⁴ Particularly in the 1950s, the widespread use of ultra-violet radiation had become

¹ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1948-'Olympic Games (1948) Preparation 2nd Special Training Course Loughborough College, March 26-April 4, 1948', 30, ASA Headquarters

² Harry Koskie, 'Olympic Games (1948) Preparation', ASA Headquarters.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1948-'Olympic Games (1948) Preparation 2nd Special Training Course Loughborough College, March 26-April 4, 1948', 30, ASA Headquarters.

common practice. Prior to the outbreak of the Second World War there had been a high prevalence of the bone deforming disease, rickets, and in an attempt to try and reduce incidence rates, milk was fortified with vitamin D. While this successfully eradicated rickets in both the United States and Europe, it gradually began to emerge that overfortification of milk had caused widespread vitamin D toxicity in Britain and it was, therefore, subsequently banned throughout Europe. As a result, because it had been discovered that exposure to ultra-violet radiation prevented and treated rickets there was a widespread uptake of such methods.⁵ The use of ultra-violet radiation at Loughborough became a regular aspect of the course and whilst this may have been primarily for medicinal purposes it does also need to be considered that there could have been additional benefits.⁶ By the 1930s, research by Soviet and German researchers had established that there were athletic benefits of using UV radiation:

It is a well-known fact that physical performance can be increased through ultra-violet irradiation. In 1927, a heated argument arose after the decision by the German Swimmers' Association to use the sunlamp, as an artificial aid, as it may constitute an athletic unfairness, doping, so to speak.⁷

In reality, this kind of research was confined to the East at this time and the continued use of UV at Loughborough was purely because Madders, Koskie and Kinnear could see that it was having a positive impact on the swimmers.

By 1949, Madders had taken responsibility for the course because Koskie felt he could no longer donate enough of his time to ensure its efficient running. Madders, coming from a physical education background, had a familiarity with strength exercises and he began to introduce swimmers to conditioning activities because he regarded 'greater physical strength' in British swimmers as essential if they were 'to reach the top.'⁸ Strength exercises continued to feature prominently on the course and as the techniques began to evolve with improved research, so too did the methods used at Loughborough. Another point of interest of the 1949 course was the use of a 'mechanical pacer' which had been purchased by the ASA for £20. It was considered a 'great help in controlling the speed of the swimmers' and it enabled them to learn pace judgment.⁹

⁵ Michael F. Holick and Tai C. Chen, 'Vitamin D Deficiency: A Worldwide Problem with Health Consequences', *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 87, no. 4 (2008): 1080.

⁶ Dr Noel Bleasdale, Annual Report 1950-'ASA Advanced Training Course: Report of Dr. H N. Bleasdale, Medical Officer', 41, ASA Headquarters.

⁷ G W. Parade and H. Otto, 'Die Beeinflussung der Leistungsfähigkeit Durch Hohensonnenbestrahlung' [The Effect of Sunlight on Performance] *Zeitschrift für Klinische Medizin* 137 (1940): 17-21, quoted in John J. Cannell et al., 'Athletic Performance and Vitamin D', *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 41, no. 5 (2009): 1104.

⁸ Max Madders, Annual Report 1949- 'Loughborough College Summer School ASA Advanced Training: Report of Max Madders, Tutor', 29, ASA Headquarters.

⁹ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1949-'Loughborough College Summer School ASA Advanced Training', 28-29, ASA Headquarters.

In 1950, £500 which had been raised from a number of sources, including contributions from the readers of the *Swimming Times*, was allocated to allow Madders to visit Japan in order to study their methods of teaching swimming and 'the specialised training given to competitive swimmers.'¹⁰ One press report observed that he would be the 'first English coach to be sent abroad on an ASA sponsored mission to help our champions', and it was hoped that while he was there, he would have the opportunity to compare the 'techniques and methods of training.'¹¹ Unfortunately, the ASA Committee abandoned his visit suggesting that 'the time is not now opportune for the visit to take place' and all the subscriptions were returned to the respective donors.¹² In 1951, Madders was authorised to visit Holland to observe the 'training methods of Jan Stender', the successful Dutch Olympic coach who had developed world record performers for the 1948 Olympics, and this time, the ASA seeing the potential of the visit for British swimming, fully supported the trip.¹³ The ASA's view appeared to be based on the record of Stender, whose swimmers held forty-one individual world records and had participated in ten world record relay teams.¹⁴

Dr Noel Bleasdale had become the new resident medical officer in 1949 and he served the Loughborough swim school for many years. During this time, he carried out tests on the swimmers and the nature of his research and testing became ever more sophisticated as the school developed. For example, in 1949 he monitored vital capacity and pulse rates and noted that the resting pulse rates of the swimmers was exceptionally slow, leading him to believe that 'this is very significant when one considers that a small body always tends to have a higher pulse rate and indicates that cardiac function is well above average.'¹⁵ In 1950, he was administering glucose and vitamin B supplements throughout the fortnight in an attempt to establish their impact on performance.¹⁶ By 1960, he was conducting an array of tests on the swimmers including chest x-rays, electrocardiograms, oxygen diffusion of the lungs and ventilatory costs of interval training. This research had been conducted in association with the 'London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine', which suggested that British swimming was beginning to establish research relationships with

¹⁰ Amateur Swimming Association, ASA Annual Report 1950-Committee Minutes, March 31-April 1, 1950, 12, ASA Headquarters; £500 in 1950 would be the equivalent to £13,910 in 2012. Information gathered from <http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-1633409/Historic-inflation-calculator-value-money-changed-1900.html>

¹¹ 'They Try to Smear UK Sportsmen', *Straits Times*, June 18, 1950, 19.

¹² Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1950-'ASA Advanced Training Course: Recommendations for 1951', 44, ASA Headquarters.

¹³ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1951-Committee Minutes, March 3, 1951, 11, ASA Headquarters.

¹⁴ International Swimming Hall of Fame, Jan Stender (NED), <http://www.ishof.org/Honorees/73/73jstender.html> (accessed on February 7, 2012).

¹⁵ Dr Noel Bleasdale, Annual Report 1949-'Loughborough College Summer School ASA Advanced Training: Report of Dr H. Noel Bleasdale on the Health of the Loughborough Swimmer', 31, ASA Headquarters.

¹⁶ Dr Noel Bleasdale, Annual Report 1950-'ASA Advanced Training Course: Report of Dr. H N. Bleasdale, Medical Officer', 42, ASA Headquarters.

higher education institutes in order to ensure the further development of scientific principles in swimming.¹⁷ Bleasdale's focus on swimming nutrition became more explicit, and in 1964, it was reported that he had given the swimmers 'Pro-Nutro', a concentrated food he had located in South Africa that was predominately used to treat malnutrition. He concluded that it made 'an excellent pre-game meal' because it contained a good balance of 'protein, carbohydrate, fat, minerals and vitamins.'¹⁸ These pioneering investigations by Bleasdale and his colleagues suggest that they were at the forefront of this type of research in the British athletic world as there is no evidence to suggest that athletics or any other sport of the time was carrying out this level of study on a regular basis.¹⁹

The Loughborough Swim School continued to develop, and by 1954 the course had entered what Koskie referred to as its third phase. The first phase (1947-8) had been to gather and train a suitable team for the 1948 Games; the second phase (1949-53) was to establish Loughborough by training as many coaches and swimmers in four years. The third phase (1954 onwards) involved what Koskie had 'always had in mind' and that was the long term preparation of future Olympic swimming teams.²⁰ Koskie's 'third phase' was facilitated by an increase in available pool time on the course after the Loughborough School was moved to Easter in 1953, which ensured that the baths would be available all day long rather than the previous four hours a day. A. D. Kinnear was appointed as assistant tutor and Matt Mann ran the course in 1954.²¹ It had been agreed that it would benefit British swimming if 'the services of a coach, with outstanding abilities from another country', could be enlisted to run the course. Mann, who had previously assisted the ASA in 1951 when he visited with his Michigan State University team, had agreed to assist on the proviso that the ASA would pay his airfare, and similar to his previous visit he would request no payment for his services.²² Despite initial concerns from the organisers, primarily because Mann did not have an overall plan for the ten days, it was unanimously concluded, that owing to his personal attributes and his ability to keep the swimmers 'on their toes', the course had been a success, so much so that it was suggested that it had made British 'swimming history.' Although Mann took an informal approach, it was noted that the swimmers 'worked harder than they had ever worked for anyone' although this was probably attributable to his keen interest in hard work and his strong dislike for 'slackness.'²³ The 1954 course had

¹⁷ Dr Noel Bleasdale, Annual Report 1960-'ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course 1960: Medical Officer's Report', 48, ASA Headquarters.

¹⁸ Dr Noel Bleasdale, Annual Report 1963-'Report of the Advanced Swimming Training Course at Loughborough 1963: Medical Officer's Report', 38, ASA Headquarters.

¹⁹ Keil and Wix, *In the Swim*, 65.

²⁰ Harry Koskie, 'Suggestions for a Practical Training Plan', October 23, 1952, 1, ASA Headquarters.

²¹ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1952-'ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course Loughborough 1952', 57, ASA Headquarters; Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1953-ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course Meeting, July 30, 1953, 28, ASA Headquarters.

²² Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1953-ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course Meeting, July 30, 1953, 28, ASA Headquarters.

²³ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1954-'ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course', 49, ASA Headquarters.

been the most successful to date. In exposing the swimmers to a coach of international calibre and including strength and relaxation exercises, as well as Bleasdale's medical expertise, the Loughborough swim school had exceeded expectations. It was unique for its time in Britain and certainly acted as an exemplar for similar ventures elsewhere.²⁴

The 1956 course saw the culmination of Koskie's 'ten year plan' and the introduction of new methods of training and coaching. Weight training was incorporated into the scheme and it was hoped that eventually it would 'be found in every swimmer's training schedule.'²⁵ Al Murray, who Hamilton Smith referred to as a 'great iconic figure of coaching and weight training in those days', had been appointed (for an undisclosed sum) by the ASA to introduce the swimmers to land training methods.²⁶ Kinnear's admiration for science, and the potential of his coaching ability were beginning to emerge when it was noted that the introduction of the new weight training methods, and the utilisation of Murray, had been due to his drive to set up these new ventures.²⁷ Symptomatic of the creative nature of coach thinking were the attempts by Madders and Kinnear on the 1956 course to analyse the movements of an eel. They were agreed that if they could establish the key principle behind efficient 'undulatory movement' in the water then they would be able to demonstrate this to the swimmers to ensure they were as 'supple' and 'flexible' as an eel.²⁸

All the expense outlaid for the increased training of swimmers and the introduction of scientific principles into British swimming were considered fully justified when Judy Grinham achieved the first British swimming gold medal for thirty-two years at the 1956 Melbourne Games.²⁹ Notwithstanding the success of British swimmers at the Games, it was obvious however, the British training methods still trailed behind the advanced techniques being implemented in both Australia and America. Comments made by the honorary team manager, A. C. Price following the Games demonstrate, that despite all the advances, the amateur tradition remained ever present. Although he could appreciate the 'sacrifices and the tremendous amount of hard work' it had taken for the Australian and American swimmers to achieve the results they had, he doubted the desire of those involved in sport in Britain to adopt their systems because it was not 'in accord with our British outlook.'³⁰

²⁴ Keil and Wix, *In the Swim*, 66.

²⁵ Max Madders, Annual Report 1956-'ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course 1956', 42, ASA Headquarters.

²⁶ Smith, interview; Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1956-'ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course 1956', 43, ASA Headquarters.

²⁷ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1956-'ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course 1956', 43, ASA Headquarters.

²⁸ 'Swimmers Study Wriggling Eel', *Singapore Free Press*, April 28, 1956, 15.

²⁹ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1956, 6, ASA Headquarters.

³⁰ A. C. Price, Annual Report 1956-'Olympic Games 1956: Hon. Team Manager's Report', 52, ASA Headquarters.

From 1957, Kinnear was appointed as tutor at Loughborough and he began to develop further his theme of 'land and water conditioning.'³¹ Al Murray was again in attendance and he increased the amount and type of weight training that the swimmers were exposed to by including the use of 'pulley weight and spring work.'³² However, it was a year later that Kinnear really sought to improve the scientific methods being implemented at Loughborough by recruiting the services of John Atha, to organise a scheme of 'tests and measurements.'³³ Atha, who was a member of staff at Loughborough College of Technology introduced a battery of tests for the swimmers, including balance, pulse-rate, strength, power and agility.³⁴ Hamilton Smith experienced Atha's 'tests and measurements' as a swimmer and recalled that he incorporated the use of dynamometers and had a keen interest in shoulder flexibility. Atha had also experimented with a flotation tank in order to establish the swimmer's centre of gravity and buoyancy.³⁵ Not only did Kinnear have the swimmers accumulating a daily average of 4,000 yards, and had drastically increased the volume of circuit and weight training, he also introduced the use of underwater filming and because of this, Smith referred to him as 'way ahead of his time.'³⁶ The swimmers were filmed on the first day of the course, and through the cooperation of Kodak Ltd, they were able to analyse the film with the swimmers and coaches only four days later, which was considered highly beneficial because it demonstrated to the swimmers the exact nature of their faults and allowed for in-depth discussion.³⁷

The increase in scientific provision at Loughborough could be accounted for by Kinnear's keen interest in the area. Prompted by the *Wolfenden Report*, in his 1960 annual report Kinnear commented that the ASA should continue to make provisions to 'widen their scope' and carry out research into various aspects of swimming, since the 'mechanical problems' and 'physiological problems in training' for the competitive swimmer were areas that needed to be urgently addressed.³⁸ Smith, who worked in close association with him during his time as National Technical Officer, suggested that Kinnear was aware that if new principles were to be incorporated into swimming then he had to bring in outside experts.³⁹ Evidence clearly suggests that he did this on a regular basis, particularly when he appointed both Murray and Atha, although, internationally the individual who was the most influential with regards to science and swimming during this period was an American, Jim or "Doc" Counsilman. Counsilman was appointed head coach at Indiana University in 1958 and began to develop a new swimming programme and methods of training by combining swimming techniques with the physiological and psychological knowledge he had gained

³¹ A D. Kinnear, Annual Report 1957-'ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course 1957: Director's Report', 57, ASA Headquarters.

³² *Ibid.*, 57-8.

³³ A D. Kinnear, Annual Report 1959-'ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course: Director's Report', 55, ASA Headquarters.

³⁴ Keil and Wix, *In the Swim*, 68.

³⁵ Smith, interview.

³⁶ Keil and Wix, *In the Swim*, 68; *Ibid.*

³⁷ A D. Kinnear, Annual Report 1959-'ASA Advanced Swimming Training Course: Director's Report', 55, ASA Headquarters.

³⁸ A D. Kinnear, 'Annual Report for 1960', File ED 169/70, MoE Collection: ASA, NA.

³⁹ Smith, interview.

through his doctorate, hence the name "Doc". As coach at Indiana University he experienced unprecedented success, and as result he was selected as Olympic head coach for the 1964 and 1976 Games, during which the swimmers achieved forty-eight medals of which seventeen were gold.⁴⁰ Counsilman had adopted training principles from track and field and re-structured them so they could be used successfully within swimming. Smith suggested that he was the first person to introduce the idea of repetition into swimming, and he made coaches begin to question the science behind swimming 'as opposed to having preconceived notions of how the strokes might be swam.'⁴¹ Counsilman's book, *The Science of Swimming* was published in 1968 and soon became established as the swimming 'bible'.⁴² Even though it was produced over forty years ago, the principles which he applied to swimming are as relevant and applicable now as they were then. This demonstrates quite how advanced his coaching ability was and Kinnear was acutely aware of this. If British swimming was to progress successfully along scientific lines he needed to incorporate Counsilman's principles on swimming, and so he arranged for "Doc" to visit from America. Smith recalled Counsilman's visit to Britain and described how he had brought some of his swimmers over to run sessions. During one of the demonstrations at Crystal Palace, there were over 300 people in attendance.⁴³

As the integration of scientific training methods became ever more widespread, it was obvious that the ASA Committee not only wished to exert some control over the use of these scientific methods but they also required a body that could answer their specific scientific queries, so they introduced a Scientific Advisory Committee.⁴⁴ The committee comprised six members, including both Atha and Kinnear, and its aim was the 'scientific investigation of all aspects of aquatic sport and of swimming training', with a specific focus on the physiological implications of interval training, the somatotyping of swimmers and their relationship to style and technique in their chosen events.⁴⁵ The committee expressed a desire to build good relationships with external bodies, including university departments, and this was the beginning of the environment which is commonplace today, whereby National Governing Bodies (NGB) have close affiliations with universities, particularly sports science departments. The ASA began working in conjunction with the physiologists at Middlesex Hospital and carried out physiological tests on eight selected Southern Counties swimmers. This testing was similar to that of Atha's at Loughborough, but now that it had the benefit of extra financial backing from the ASA Committee the researchers were able to incorporate the use

⁴⁰ Indiana University, 'Doc Counsilman: Making Waves', <http://www.indiana.edu/~radiotv/wtiu/doc/docbio.html> (accessed February 9, 2012).

⁴¹ Smith, interview.

⁴² James E. Counsilman, *The Science of Swimming* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1968).

⁴³ Smith, interview.

⁴⁴ Keil and Wix, *In the Swim*, 82; Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1959-Scientific Sub-Committee Minutes, July 25, 1959, 47, ASA Headquarters.

⁴⁵ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1959-Committee Minutes, April 20, 1959, 17, ASA Headquarters; Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1959-Scientific Sub-Committee Minutes, July 25, 1959, 47, ASA Headquarters.

of 'more modern equipment.'⁴⁶ In 1960, the committee had been authorised to undertake an 'ambitious investigation' into the techniques of swimming strokes and its associated resistance in the water using the tank and wind tunnel at Liverpool University. In Kinnear's 1960 annual report he had expressed a desire to undertake such research and it can be assumed that he was the driving force behind such a venture.⁴⁷

One indication that the ASA were keen to monitor, and perhaps incorporate some Soviet methods of training and coaching surfaced in 1960 when they authorised Dr E. Kendall, honorary secretary of the Scientific Advisory Committee, to visit the Department of Medical Research at Lenin Stadium in Moscow. Kendall had already been in discussions with a Professor Litvinoff, who had informed him about the physiological dangers of intensive training and suitable ways to prevent overtraining and staleness.⁴⁸ However, perhaps the most progressive work of the Scientific Advisory Committee was attempting to establish a bridge between coaches and the use of sports science by running annual weekend courses for coaches, which focused on different aspects of science in swimming. The course, which created a 'great deal of interest amongst coaches', continued to develop, and it was noted that the twenty coaches in attendance in 1964, had all paid their own expenses to attend, which signifies that they were so intent on gaining a greater scientific base for their coaching that they were willing to participate in the course even at some personal cost.⁴⁹

The Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) and the Incorporation of Science

In athletics, the relationship between science and coaching took a slightly different form from swimming, but despite this, it still relied on the drive and initiative of experienced coaches. The writing of uncomplicated instructional booklets and pamphlets for use by the honorary coaches was an expected duty of the AAA national coaches.⁵⁰ However, as the scheme progressed, the manuscripts which had once been fairly basic and consisting of no more than a few pages, developed into informative in-depth publications which were set to have a far reaching influence. The most renowned, and arguably the most influential, in the series of these publications was Geoff Dyson's *The Mechanics of Athletics*. The book was published in 1962, translated into French, Italian, Spanish and Japanese and ran to eight editions. Considering Dyson had left school at ten and was self educated, to produce a book of such calibre was a great achievement.⁵¹ He always had a keen interest in engineering and human mechanics, and often applied these principles

⁴⁶ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1959-Scientific Sub-Committee Minutes, July 25, 1959, 47, ASA Headquarters.

⁴⁷ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1960, 7, ASA Headquarters; Amateur Swimming Association, Report for 1961, 8, ASA Headquarters.

⁴⁸ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1961-Committee Minutes, August 26, 1961, 25, ASA Headquarters.

⁴⁹ Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1963-Scientific Advisory Sub-Committee Report 1963, 66, ASA Headquarters; Amateur Swimming Association, Annual Report 1965-Meeting of the ASA Scientific Advisory Committee, January 4, 1965, 97, ASA Headquarters.

⁵⁰ Amateur Athletic Association, Coaching Committee Minutes, May 6, 1949, File 1/2/13/1, AAA Collection, Birmingham Archives.

⁵¹ Timothy Dyson, telephone discussion with author, July 29, 2011.

when working with his own athletes through various methods such as “his nibs” and film loops, but presenting this information in a book allowed the dissemination of his scientific principles to a much wider audience. The far reaching significance of Dyson’s book was noted in the 1980s when Tom Tellez, coach to Carl Lewis, referred to it as ‘his bible’ and suggested that any success he had achieved as a coach could be credited to Dyson, because ‘his book started me on the trail of discovering the real facts about track and field.’⁵²

John Disley suggested that Dyson ‘devoted his life to making coaching a science’ and that he was acutely aware of the benefits that the application of scientific principles could offer sport.⁵³ The opening passage of his book quoted Leonardo Da Vinci in observing that ‘those who are enamoured of practice without science are like a pilot who goes into a ship without rudder or compass and never has any certainty of where he is going.’⁵⁴ While he acknowledged the importance of a sound knowledge of science in sport, Dyson believed that it was the application of those principles that would ensure success. He commented that ‘because athletes learn their skills through kinaesthetic sensations’, descriptive rather than mechanical explanations are often more beneficial for the athletes as ‘too much analysis bears paralysis!’⁵⁵ If the coach could successfully correct faults and inspire confidence using such a method then ‘herein lies the art, as opposed to the science, of coaching athletics.’⁵⁶ Frank Dick later referred to a similar principle, whereby at the point of competition ‘athletes have to relate to simple things...focussing, being calm and allowing them to get the adrenaline mix that they need to go out there and deliver.’ Describing a scenario at the 1992 Barcelona Olympics when he was Director of Athletics, Dick explained that ‘when one luckless sport psychologist thought it was a good idea to walk into the warm-up area...I made sure that the military escorted him off very quickly, I didn’t want anybody in there who could distract the athletes.’⁵⁷

Dyson’s book was predominately an analysis of the mechanics of sport, or ‘biomechanics’ as it is now more commonly known. However, he suggested (as he did frequently) that this comprised just one area among many and that if the athlete was to benefit fully, the application of other scientific principles were required, thereby subjecting the athlete to an integrated multi-science approach.⁵⁸ He suggested that,

In his study of athletic performance the modern coach stands at the crossroads of several sciences. Thus, to the physiologist, athletic performance is a phenomenon of cells, humours, tissues and nutrient fluids obeying organic laws. The psychologist sees the athlete as a consciousness and a personality, while to the physicist he suggests a machine unique in its

⁵² Tony Ward, ‘Geoff Dyson and the Appliance of Science’, <http://tonyward-trackchat.blogspot.com/2009/04/geoff-dyson-and-appliance-of-science.html> (accessed February 10, 2012).

⁵³ John Disley, England Athletics Hall of Fame, 2008, Private Collection-Dyson Family.

⁵⁴ Geoffrey Dyson, *The Mechanics of Athletics* (Kent: Biddles Limited, 1977).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 11; Dyson, ‘Forty Years on’, 208.

⁵⁶ Dyson, *Mechanics of Athletics*, 11.

⁵⁷ Dick, interview.

⁵⁸ Dyson, *Mechanics of Athletics*, 13.

organisation, adaptiveness and complexity. To the imaginative coach the borders of these and other specialities are seen to overlap; the techniques of one science become meaningful and illuminating in others.⁵⁹

Dyson believed that it was the combined effort of many sciences working in successful conjunction with the coach and athlete that would ensure success in a specified event, and although his book is now forty years old, his principles remain relevant, especially when it is considered that the integration of the many sub-disciplines of sports science is now common practice in the sporting world.

Frank Dick introduced science not only into athletics but a multitude of sports when he produced *Sports Training Principles* in 1980.⁶⁰ He presented an adapted overview of the principles of periodisation, a training method widely used in Eastern Europe, which allowed British coaches to apply this revolutionary method of planning into their training programmes. Dick suggests that he was constantly aware of the impact of science on training and sport, and although he felt he had enough scientific 'know-how' to do his job effectively, he was conscious that something was lacking. The 'bridge between training and the art of delivery on the day seemed to me to be bound into the notion of preparation, was there something out there that was making that bridge?' He monitored the research emerging from Poland that had a specific focus on speed and also noted what the Romanian and Finnish coaches were implementing with their athletes. It was at this point that he became aware of the training paradigm which was being utilised and developed by Soviet researchers, in particular Lev Pavlovich Matveyev, and the work being conducted on the same subject by Dietrich Harre in Leipzig in Germany.⁶¹ He

looked at periodisation of athlete planning and that was it, I could see the whole...there was a connection between everything you did from the moment you started training until you finished your competitions in the summer and then that caused me to look a lot deeper at whole notion of adaptation because I began to understand the cycles very well and the notion that you adapted during recovery not during activity.⁶²

Prior to the emergence of periodisation in Britain there was only basic long term planning of training programmes, because scientific understanding was lacking and training was often just fitted in around other factors.⁶³ Breaking an athlete's training into meso (4-6 weeks) and micro (1 week) cycles allowed for optimal adaptation since altering the training programme every six weeks 'shocked' the body and prompted further adaptations. This had to be planned carefully because if changes were made prior to six weeks then the athlete would not get the full benefit from the programme.

⁵⁹ Dyson, 'Forty Years on', 207.

⁶⁰ Frank Dick, *Sports Training Principles* (London, Lepus Books, 1980).

⁶¹ Dick, interview.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

By adapting the theories of periodisation for a Western audience Dick enabled British coaches and athletes to utilise the successful methods that Soviet Olympic teams had incorporated during the 1960s and 1970s and his interpretation of periodisation has been considered pivotal moment in the history of training in Britain.

Formalisation of Sports Science in Britain

During the 1970s, scientific work with a specific focus on sport, particularly in the areas of experimental psychology and physiology, were beginning to emerge in universities and higher education institutes throughout Britain. However, because the Sports Council was unable to develop an efficient sports science system, coordination between these establishments was lacking, as was a successful process of dissemination. Consequently, as well as dealing with coaching issues, it was decided that one of the main responsibilities of the NCF would be to ensure the development and formalisation of sports science, but as with other aspects of British sport, progress was slowed by a lack of finance. It was not until 1989 that the Sports Science Support Programme (SSSP) and the Sports Science Education Programme (SSEP) were established within the NCF.⁶⁴

Sarah Rowell suggests that prior to the development of the SSSP, any sports science that was being employed 'was there simply because the governing bodies had been enlightened enough to decide it wanted to use some of the money it got to do it.' However, because the value of sports science had not yet been firmly established, in reality probably very few NGBs were using their funding for such a provision, particularly when some organisations were receiving so little financial support. When the SSSP emerged, the Sports Council agreed to 'ring fence' £900,000 a year to be used solely for sports science research and support, which then provided an opportunity for those NGBs which may have had the desire but not the available finance to incorporate sports science into their sport.⁶⁵ The SSEP essentially controlled and administered this funding from the Sports Council but the SSSP, which Sarah Rowell had been appointed to oversee, dealt with the sports directly through the NGBs. Rowell was a pioneering figure in the development of British Sports Science. Les Burwitz, who was involved with the SSSP, not only through the British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences (BASES) or British Association of Sport Science (BASS) as it was originally known, but also through Crewe and Alsager College, suggested that if Rowell had not worked as effectively as she did, 'I don't think sport science would have been accepted in the way it has been accepted in terms of performance sport.'⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Rowell, interview.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Burwitz, interview.

Rowell's role was to initially meet with the sports and discuss with them what sort of support they required. If they had clear notions of the practitioners they wanted to work with then these links would be made, but for others, it was a case of establishing a relationship between suitable practitioners and NGBs. A tender would be advertised, and researchers, which at the time meant individuals involved with BASES, would then respond. Then it would be Rowell's responsibility to appoint suitable practitioners to work with a specific sport project, most of which were based within higher education institutes, although a small number were housed at Lilleshalle National Sports Centre.⁶⁷ Once the practitioner was placed within the sport, the project would be monitored via frequent reports from both the researchers and the NGBs to ensure they were achieving what they had initially set out to achieve.⁶⁸ If it was felt that what was being delivered was not suitable or was not making a difference then it would be Rowell's decision to end the project. Because she was in this position of authority and essentially controlled what each sport would receive in terms of support, Burwitz suggests that 'at the time there was a lot of complaints and animosity towards Sarah' because some NGBs 'thought she had a bias against them and some thought she had a bias in favour of them.' But considering the circumstances, whereby she had to 'almost write on behalf of the Governing Body what was required, assess applications that were made and try to make the right decisions...she did a reasonably good job in a difficult position.'⁶⁹

As with other aspects of British sport, where organisations remained suspicious of each other, Rowell believes that BASES 'were probably a bit annoyed' that the NCF had been given the authority and responsibility to control the SSSP, because they believed it came under their jurisdiction. However, as Burwitz highlights, when BASES was initially formed it was no more than 'an academic club' run by volunteers and it took time before it began to impact on the 'sharp end of the delivery on performance sport.'⁷⁰ Since the NCF was an organisation controlled by paid employees and was closely linked with the Sports Council, it was inevitable that they would be offered the responsibility to control the SSSP. When it became apparent that these programmes required some form of quality assurance, the NCF worked in conjunction with BASES to develop a system of accreditation. It became a requirement that the programme leader on each project had to have BASES accreditation and this helped ensure that there was an agreed level of standardisation across all the programmes, which in turn made them easier to monitor and control.⁷¹

⁶⁷ Rowell, interview; *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Rowell, interview; Burwitz, interview.

⁶⁹ Burwitz, interview.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Rowell, interview.

When the SSSP initially emerged, it was well received by the majority of NGBs and 'there was always more demand than there was funding available.'⁷² However, some sports were more willing than others to fully embrace the programme. Burwitz, who did work with both the athletics and netball programmes suggested that because the 'traditions were so grounded' it was 'very hard to break down some of those traditional barriers and boundaries.' In order for sport to progress performance-wise, some of the 'old school things needed to go', but because there was so much power in the 'old brigade' of the more traditional sports such as swimming and athletics, it was increasingly difficult to ensure the successful integration of scientific aspects. Sports such as cycling, who had much more control over their 'own destiny' in terms of how the sport developed, were much more willing to experiment and incorporate new methods. Burwitz explained that he was in discussions with British cycling in 1998 when Peter Keen was in charge, someone who Burwitz suggested, 'had a vision that was ahead of its time.' Keen wanted to establish an academy at the Alsager College Campus 'where their young starlets could train.' As British Cycling was based in Manchester it was sometimes taking them over an hour to get onto safe roads outside the centre of Manchester, but if they were to be based in Cheshire they would have the opportunity to access safe roads within minutes. 'They wanted cheap accommodation; they wanted access to science, access to medical massage, physiotherapy...a pleasant, safe environment where they wouldn't be hassled in any way.' Although the plan was never executed, 'nobody else was thinking along those lines at the time.' They also realised that in order to progress to the next level performance wise they needed to be investing in the level below by working with the young individuals who they had found through their very basic talent identification programme.⁷³

Although the success rate 'in terms of getting the right delivery matching what the governing body was actually looking for...was probably no more than 50-60 per cent', the SSSP was generally deemed productive, particularly when the climate in which it was required to function is taken into consideration.⁷⁴ Rowell suggests that this programme was the start of true integration between the sports sciences and NGBs in British sport and many of the relationships between the practitioners and the sports were extremely positive, with some programmes lasting eight years or more.⁷⁵ In addition, since projects were available to all sports because it was based on a 'first come, first serve' basis, some of the smaller sports such as Lacrosse, were able to secure funding to carry out programmes.⁷⁶ While one of the major positives of the SSSP was its level of availability for all sports, unfortunately, as elite British sport has moved towards a more professional and controlled system in terms of funding and support, these opportunities, particularly

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Burwitz, interview.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Rowell, interview; Ibid.

⁷⁶ Rowell, interview.

for minor sports, are no longer readily available.

Rowell suggests that although the majority of sports involved did profit from the SSSP it did not always reach its full potential because of the climate in which it was required to function.⁷⁷ This was apparently a result of the resistance expressed to the integration of science within some sports rather than the calibre of science that was actually being implemented. Burwitz believes that sports science in the UK at this time 'was at least on par if not leading the way' in terms of scientific research. However, because 'people needed to prove themselves, evidence needed to be gathered to show these things actually worked...it took quite a few years before sports science was accepted and used in practice by some of the Governing Bodies.'⁷⁸ Partly because sports science had the potential to threaten some of the pillars of the amateur ethos, many of the more 'traditional' NGBs were initially suspicious of its use, which in some ways is understandable particularly as many of its benefits had yet to be proven. Yet this desire to remain true to amateurism in Britain, in contrast to attitudes in other countries, may have also delayed the development of sports science and had a subsequent impact on the performance of elite British athletes.⁷⁹

The SSSP ended on the 31 March 1998, almost ten years after its initial inception.⁸⁰ Rowell believes that it was ultimately terminated because of the introduction of Lottery Funding. Prior to the onset of the Lottery, funding for each project would be placed under 'tight financial controls' and there were set rates and strict financial boundaries regarding how much would be offered to both practitioners and consultants working on the projects. However when Lottery Funding came in, 'it was basically an open book' because the NGBs now had access to other sources of financial support and had no need to go through the SSSP, which now lost control over the projects, and it was eventually run down because it was being superseded by Lottery programmes.⁸¹ Reviewing the SSSP, Rowell suggested that while a lot of the NGBs had used the programme, 'some of them probably used it because it was there, rather than they really believed in it.' However from that point onwards, British sports science in Britain continued to expand because people had had the initial opportunity to discover that science had the potential to make a difference. The combination of these factors has resulted in contemporary attitudes to performance sport whereby 'you would be hard pushed...to find many coaches that believe that it is coaching alone that make an Olympic Champion in any sport.'⁸²

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Burwitz, interview.

⁷⁹ Peter Wilson, 'Dr Liz Puts Her Finger on the Spot', *Daily Mirror*, August 4, 1972, 26.

⁸⁰ Rowell, interview.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

Resistance to Sports Science

There is no attempt to apply the sciences to sport, sport has been obliged to apply and adapt themselves to the sciences, that was a mistake. Science in my knowledge has never led sport and it shouldn't. In fact I believe in the very words of Sir Winston Churchill when he said, 'scientists should be on tap not on top'.⁸³

Les Burwitz believes that it took about fifteen years from the initial introduction of science through the NCF SSSP for it to be widely accepted and even then he suggested that 'it was more about one-off relationships actually beginning to work'.⁸⁴ The following section explores, from the perspective of the coach in particular, some of the rationales offered for continuing resistance to the incorporation of science in British sport. The evidence examined in chapter four suggested that British loyalty to amateurism and an aversion to the integration of Soviet methods delayed the incorporation of sports science, and although this may account for the resistance among amateur officials, evidence collected from professional coaches suggests that the reluctance to the incorporation of sports science was far more complex.

Frank Dick suggests that coaches initially resisted sports science because there was an assumption that the research and testing that sports scientists were conducting were purely a means to further their own research and would not be of any benefit to the athlete. He explained

It's not an experiment, this is not a scientific experiment, this is not a laboratory. If you're gonna do tests...first of all, maybe very old fashioned, I want to know what the hell you are doing, I don't want my athletes legs to look like Swiss cheese and I want to know why and I want to see the outcome because whatever you're doing has got to be effective for what I'm doing, it has to be exclusively in the interest of the athlete. I don't want some daft experiment going on that someone wants to get a degree on at the expense of the athlete, these are not guinea pigs.⁸⁵

Although this may not have been the intention of the all sport scientists, Alan Lynn described a similar scenario whereby when he was a swimmer, his coach had a strong connection with the local Physical Education College and they would often have researchers join them during training session to carry out various tests. Although the testing being conducted was fairly basic, the swimmers were being made to do 'some pretty extensive things' in the lab. However, his coach had been 'furious' after the completion of the experiments because the researchers had failed to provide any scientific information to the coach. The swimmers had just been used as 'subjects' and received no real benefit from co-operating with sports science staff.⁸⁶ It was situations like this, where academics were purely 'using' the swimmers to gain data which could then be used in publications, which potentially tainted how coaches viewed the integration of

⁸³ Dick, Interview.

⁸⁴ Burwitz, interview.

⁸⁵ Dick, interview.

⁸⁶ Lynn, interview.

sports science. In order for the relationship to be successful it needed to be mutually beneficial for both the scientists and the coach. This perceived exploitation of the swimmers influenced how the coaches perceived academics and discouraged coaches from allowing further testing in the future.

There was also an assumption by some coaches, that allowing sports scientists to work with their athletes could impact on the athlete-coach relationship and this made them 'suspicious' of science. Bill Furniss explained that the 'coaching triangle', which consists of the coach, athlete and sports scientist, needs to be well managed in order for the relationship to be successful. He believes that the 'sport scientist can easily interfere with the relationship between the coach and athlete and can easily undermine him.' When sports science was initially introduced, Furniss suggests that it was not well managed and that it caused a lot of tension amongst the coaching contingent. The coaches viewed it as a threat because individuals were coming into the coaching environment and trying to tell the coaches what they were doing wrong and as a result, when sports science was first introduced to swimming, 'it created as many problems as it solved.'⁸⁷

The overriding consensus from the coaches interviewed here, is that although the introduction of money undoubtedly improved British sporting performances, poor management meant that there was a tendency to pour money into projects just in a hope that would develop the sport.⁸⁸ As Denison highlights,

It's not just about having money, you can throw loads of money at whatever you want, but you've got to use it well, you've got to know exactly what it is you want to do with it in order to make a difference.⁸⁹

In the early stages, because sports science was seen as key to improving British performance, large sums of money were funnelled towards its provision and this did result in a greater availability of science to sport. However, it was often so disorganised that coaches viewed it with suspicion. Almost immediately after the introduction of the Lottery funding, science and testing were being 'forced' into sports, and coaches, who had little time to consider how these methods would be incorporated into their training programmes, initially resented both the scientific methods and associated personnel.⁹⁰ Frank Dick suggests that the way in which sports science provision developed in the West ultimately influenced the way in which it was perceived by coaches. Because the structures developed differently in the East, coaches were able to accommodate the sciences much more successfully. He commented,

What was happening in Eastern Europe was that the coaches were asking questions so the scientists could get solutions to their problems. Whereas what was happening in the West was that the sciences were pushing answers to questions that had never been asked, to the

⁸⁷ Furniss, interview.

⁸⁸ Denison, interview.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Dick, interview.

coaches who didn't want to hear the science. So there was a different kind of relationship between sports science and coaching from the very outset.⁹¹

Some coaches suggest that when sports science staff first became involved 'there was a bit of ivory towerism', partly because they were on a higher salary than the coach, and partly because there was a perception that they were some way superior in terms of technical knowledge. They, therefore, made attempts to undermine the coaches.⁹² Sarah Rowell explains that because the sports scientist would 'go in really arrogant and try and say what needs to be done' they would alienate the coach who would perceive the situation as threatening, particularly if the researcher was younger. Subsequently, the coach would become very defensive and resist the researcher's methods, because from their perspective, they had 'never been on the poolside at 5 o'clock in the morning' and therefore, 'what the hell does he know about successful coaching and training.'⁹³ Alan Lynn believes, that 'as long as the coach holds the whip in that relationship I think generally speaking the coach gets what they want.'⁹⁴ If the sports scientists clashes with the coach, then as Sarah Rowell notes, 'the coach will win' and they will ensure the researcher is removed from the environment, possibly to the detriment of the sport since science would no longer be available to coach and athlete. Although the coach may have been 'open to trying it' as soon as the researcher tried to tell the coach they were 'doing it wrong' they would 'fall back to their areas of safety' and rely on the methods to which they had become accustomed.⁹⁵

Many of the coaches believed that there was initially opposition to sports science because the relationships between coach and sports scientists were poorly managed. Alan Lynn knew of relationships that had broken down, but the issue was more to do with personalities with coaches and they were not saying 'I don't want you because you're a sport scientist, they would say I don't want you because you're lazy or I don't want you because I don't like the way you talk to the swimmers.'⁹⁶ Sarah Rowell supports this by suggesting that then when a coach has a problem with a sports scientist it is rarely because they have an issue with their technical skills but because they have a problem with the individual themselves. She explained that the key to the problem is 'in the working relationship between the two groups.'⁹⁷ Lynn further suggests that,

When it worked of course it was about the good relationships that had been built up between the sport scientist and the coaches. By and large it was just about relationships again, when people were accepted, particularly by key people within the sport, there wasn't too much

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Denison, interview.

⁹³ Rowell, interview.

⁹⁴ Lynn, interview.

⁹⁵ Rowell, interview; Collins, interview.

⁹⁶ Lynn, interview.

⁹⁷ Rowell, interview.

difficulty. As with anything, the more you build a relationship, the more you develop trust, the more you start to accept each other's point of view.⁹⁸

In some cases, it was suggested that it was not the coach who had resisted the incorporation of science but other individuals, in particular the amateur officials. Terry Denison described a situation when he was head coach for the Olympic swim team in 1992 and wanted to involve a sport psychologist. This was the first time that a psychologist had been officially involved with the British Olympic swimming team but it was suggested that he had worked well with both the coaches and athletes and the overall consensus was that it had been a benefit to the team. However, because the British swimming results at the 1992 Barcelona Games were not particularly successful, both the press and British officials branded the psychologist as a 'waste of time.' Essentially he was used as a 'scape-goat' for the poor performance of the team and British officials refused to incorporate a psychologist for a number of years after that. As Denison highlights it was not 'until we got into this modern period, post 2000 when we did start to bring it back in', by which time ten or more years of potential development were lost.⁹⁹

Improved Integration of Sports Science

Despite issues, as sports science and coaching have developed there is evidence to suggest that a better working relationship between the two bodies is being established and resistance to sports science is being reduced. Both coaches and sports scientists believe that there is now a greater level of integration.¹⁰⁰ For Terry Denison 'sport scientists are regarded as much more as part of the team now and it's accepted that there will be sport scientists there.' In addition, the 'sport scientists have also had to move on a bit as well because they can now see that there is more to this coaching thing than maybe they thought there was.'¹⁰¹ Sarah Rowell suggests that those sports scientists who have been successfully accepted by coaches and achieved a mutual respect and cooperation 'spend time to get to know the coach, get to know the sport, get to know the event, ask stupid questions and in effect seem to be caring and non-threatening.'¹⁰² When this is achieved, it creates a much a more beneficial training environment for the athlete.

Although the relationship has improved and sports science is more widely accepted, Sarah Rowell suggests that 'it's still not there yet' and that improving this relationship is the responsibility of both the coach and the sports scientist.¹⁰³ However, because the purpose of sports science is to enhance athletic performance through the development of scientific knowledge, and the purpose of coaching is to improve performance through interventions in preparation, it could be suggested that the shared goals of these two

⁹⁸ Lynn, interview.

⁹⁹ Denison, interview.

¹⁰⁰ Rowell, interview.

¹⁰¹ Denison, interview.

¹⁰² Rowell, interview.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

groups, which is that of performance enhancement, is perhaps not compatible with their other goals. For example, considering most of the research conducted by sports scientists is carried out within an academic institution they are therefore subjected to methods of assessment and monitoring such as the Research Excellence Framework (REF). Pressure is placed on researchers to achieve a positive outcome so it is not surprising that there is sometimes a tendency to 'place papers above people.'¹⁰⁴ On the other hand, the 'coach is only interested in one thing, and that is the equivalent of making the boat go faster.'¹⁰⁵ If the sciences are to become more integrated and the relationship is to develop further and ensure a positive dynamic rapport between the two groups, scientists need to ground their research in genuine practical problems and coaches seeking sound science should select researchers who can speak to them in the language of sporting practice.¹⁰⁶ Many of the interviews conducted here suggest that the key to ensuring this is successful lies with relationship management, because as Frank Dick highlights, 'the one thing that prevents us moving forwards in sport is a general inability to manage relationships.'¹⁰⁷ As the professions have a tendency to develop in 'silos', coaches do not develop their expertise in the presence of scientists, while individuals in academia are not generally prepared to work in an applied situation, so they do not have experience of solving problems together.¹⁰⁸ Appointing someone whose main responsibility is purely to monitor and manage relationships, not only between coaches and sports scientists but also between these individuals and their administrators, could potentially ensure successful partnerships.¹⁰⁹ Sarah Rowell also believes that if coaches and researchers were 'grown together' and exposed to semi-real examples, they would both be able to gain a better understanding of where the problems exist and how to work together more efficiently.¹¹⁰

Sports science has become ever more integrated in British sport, particularly in the last thirty years, but the way in which it initially developed and progressed reflected the control that amateurism held over sport in Britain. Similar to their coaches, while administrators did not completely refuse to incorporate the techniques of sports science, there was an underlying uncertainty as to its principles and this was characterised by the resistance which administrators offered towards its amalgamation. As funding and government involvement increased it was inevitable that this would require a greater amount of specialisation from sports coaches and sporting bodies, but because British sport had not been founded on and encouraged to develop under such a premise, there was a lack of understanding regarding its

¹⁰⁴ Celia Brackenridge, 'Ostrich or Eagle? Protection and Professionalism in Sport Science and Coaching' (Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences, Newport, South Wales, September 4-7, 2001).

¹⁰⁵ Rowell, interview.

¹⁰⁶ Brackenridge, 'Ostrich or Eagle?', 12.

¹⁰⁷ Dick, interview.

¹⁰⁸ Rowell, interview.

¹⁰⁹ Dick, interview.

¹¹⁰ Rowell, interview.

successful integration. Evidence would suggest that while amateurism was an important factor it was essentially the lack of understanding associated with its successful integration that caused a degree of resistance amongst some coaches. As Tom McNab has emphasised, even though amateurism was no longer considered the guiding principle by the late twentieth century, the amateur setup had left a void in British sport and the legacy of its ethos had left no one with any sort of professional managerial approach to sport. It was this lack of appreciation of how to integrate the specialised components of sport that ultimately created difficulties in Britain.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ McNab, interview.

Concluding Comments

'Administrators thought they were the most important people; that the sport couldn't exist without them. Nothing could be further from the truth...coaches [are] the key, not administrators.'¹

This thesis has documented the development of coaching, sports science and elite sport throughout the course of the twentieth century in order to trace the trajectory of amateurism and establish what influence, if any, this ethos had on the formation and development of British coaching traditions. While amateurism has previously received a great deal of attention, much of it centred around its early conception and its public-school influences, research which has had a specific focus on coaching traditions and its relationship with amateurism, particularly from a British perspective, has been almost entirely absent. Initially, the researcher's primary focus was on the post-1945 era, but it soon became apparent that in order to understand how and why amateurism had become so influential in British coaching, it was necessary to appreciate its emergence and how this had shaped the future of its life-span. Coupled with this was an acknowledgement that, because amateurism was such a prominent factor, its moral authority would be present in all aspects of British sport. Consequently, in order to gain a true understanding of the evolution of both amateurism and coaching traditions it was established early on in the research that many different facets of British sport would need to be explored in order to produce a cohesive coaching narrative.

While British coaching structures were fairly unorganised in the early part of the twentieth century it gradually emerged that a number of different centralised coaching schemes had been attempted. The investigation of these schemes, and the individuals involved, gave an early indication of how coaching provisions could be formulated even at a time when amateurism was considered a ruling principle, especially within sports like athletics and swimming. Adopting the Olympics as a forum in which to explore British sport ensured that not only could the success (or failure) of coaching developments be assessed but that British coaching and training techniques could also be examined in relation to developments in other nations. In order to achieve these objectives it was necessary to access previously unexplored primary material and this resulted in the utilisation of a number of different archives and organised oral history interviews with high-profile, experienced and accommodating individuals. An enlightening, and perhaps not entirely unexpected aspect of the research, emerged regarding the amateur notion itself, when, as the research progressed, it was constantly reinforced that amateur hegemony went much deeper than merely constraining the development of coaching and coaches. Amateurism was not just a definition or a set of rules that had to be adhered to by a true sporting amateur, whether playing or administering, its ethos was

¹ Peter Snell, 'Coaches the Key, Not Administrators', *New Zealand Herald*, January 9, 2011.

embedded within the fabric of British sport. It was an explicit understanding of how one should approach sport.

Throughout the twentieth century, professional coaching battled to find acceptance within British amateur sport. Even as the relationship between the two strengthened during the latter half of the century, it continued to be viewed with an underlying degree of uncertainty by some National Governing Bodies (NGB) and this was reflected in the way that administrators approached professional coaches. It was the amateur officials' steadfast espousal of amateurism and their continued denigration of professionalism that undoubtedly influenced and fuelled the struggles that professional coaches experienced. It was not that administrators did not appreciate the value of coaching and training, because there are many instances throughout this work that demonstrate they actively sought to appoint amateur honorary coaches, it was just that the notion of professional coaches did not match their vision for sport.

As demonstrated in the introduction of this thesis, this philosophy on professional coaching appears to have stemmed from the initial origins and foundations of amateurism which occurred during the late nineteenth century. As amateur hegemony increased, many sports began to reject professionalism in favour of volunteerism, which is particularly evident in university rowing where the preference was for amateur rather than professional coaches. However, there were some sports, such as cricket, which acknowledged that, if upper-class amateurs were to perform with elegance and style, they required support from skilled and knowledgeable professional coaches. Although there was a willingness to utilise professionals, this did not guarantee that they were regarded as being of equal status. Because many professional coaches and trainers during this period came from a working-class background, there was a desire to marginalise these individuals to ensure they never gained any level of authority within their sport. It was commonly believed that the working classes could not appreciate or understand how to work with upper-class individuals and this issue of class-status was the primary reason why many sports refused to incorporate professional coaches. Even sports which did permit some coaching sought to regulate the lower ranks by the imposition of a master-servant relationship. By accepting this subservient role, professional coaches and trainers lost a degree of dependence and this constrained their traditional working practices which had been founded on experience and experiment. The fact that both Dyson and Kinnear suffered similarly during their time as national coaches is perhaps testimony to the continuing power that NGBs wielded over the structure and nature of the coaching environment. Although the relationships which Dyson and Kinnear held with amateur administrators may not have mirrored those experienced by men in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, there was still this continuing tendency to want to impose control over professional coaches to ensure they did not gain control of the organisation.

This early position on coaching was perhaps further solidified with the formation of the British Olympic Association (BOA) in 1905. Chapter one outlined some of the founding members of the BOA and established that many of them had come from an upper-class, amateur sporting background. As a result, they were imbued with the associated philosophy regarding the place of professional coaching within amateur sport. Their beliefs regarding coaching were then reinforced following the clashes which occurred between Britain and America at the 1908 and 1912 Olympics, revolving partly around their differing perceptions on coaching. While, for the most part, commentators in the British press became increasingly defensive about defeats at the Olympic Games, poor performances did appear to provide an impetus for improving British standards. Proposals for training and coaching schemes began to appear after poor performances at the 1912 Olympics, but because amateurism remained a guiding philosophy, these initiatives developed in a very haphazard and uncoordinated manner. Although the intentions of these efforts, and the individuals who devised them were positive, they were unable to successfully become established because of the British sporting climate and the improvisation which characterised their development. Consequently, because these schemes were unable to gain momentum and rarely survived from one Games to the next, they were never able to substantially improve the performance of British athletes, resulting in an ongoing cycle whereby poor Olympic performances often stimulated the formation of new programmes.

This continued refusal of administrators to willingly accept input from professional coaches and to encourage the developments of coaching schemes, coupled with a struggling British economy and a government which wished to remain distant from the sport domain, resulted in a gradual decline in sporting performances. Beginning shortly after the 1912 Games, and gaining momentum during the twentieth century, British performances reached their low point at the latter stages of the twentieth century. While some Games, such as 1956, saw an improvement in terms of numbers of medals achieved by British athletes, Britain generally struggled to compete against other nations that were employing advanced training and coaching techniques and these international comparisons did provide a platform for innovation. While the poor performances of British athletes rarely persuaded NGBs to initiate far-reaching change in terms of coaching provision, the emergence of Soviet athletes at the Games, explored in chapters six and seven, did encourage some sections of British sport, including the coaches themselves, to explore potential developments. Unlike the previous short-lived and impromptu schemes some of these newer initiatives would later become established aspects of sport in Britain. Perhaps this was possible because of a shifting climate within British sport but it also needs to be considered that these schemes may have prospered where others failed, partly because some centralised initiatives reduced the power of NGBs, which in turn created a degree of flexibility with regards to the amateur boundaries.

Although the NGBs never relinquished their control entirely, a reduction in their influence over coaches, for example, may have been conducive to allowing British sport to develop and progress in a different direction. However, it soon became apparent that even though post-war initiatives were gradually experiencing a longer life-span and encouraging greater utilisation of professional coaches than ever before, the amateur ethos remained ever present. The centralised coaching schemes, analysed in depth in chapters three and four, were always aligned to amateur principles and, rather than encouraging professional coaches to work with promising athletes, the primary objective of the national coaches was to produce a contingent of honorary amateur coaches. Despite imposing restrictions whereby coaches were, for the most part, not to work with athletes, there was still an assumption within the NGBs and the public that these national coaches would somehow raise the standard of British athletes at the Olympics. When this was not immediately forthcoming, it was perceived that it tainted professional coaching, because the limited outcomes of professional coaching did not appear to justify the money which had been spent on appointing them. It is clear, looking retrospectively, that British sporting failure did not occur because of a lack of available coaching expertise. Both Dyson and Kinnear were considered to be at the fore-front of the coaching world during their time in sport although, because amateur administrators continually resisted their integration and imposed a master-servant relationship over these men, they were never able to develop fully as coaches. Individuals such as Dyson and Kinnear could certainly have done much more to further British elite sport if they had been able to function without so many constraints, but because there was never any indication that this would be achieved, they became so disillusioned that they left, either to take up other posts elsewhere or leave their sport altogether. Dyson and Kinnear were by no means isolated cases in British coaching. The continued resistance towards professional coaches undoubtedly resulted in a loss of expert coaching knowledge in Britain as elite men were forced to take up positions abroad.

What has become particularly apparent throughout the research is the fluid nature of the amateur philosophy, particularly with regards to coaching and training techniques. Athletics, in particular, initially opposed the use of professional coaches within the sport but they gradually altered their amateur boundaries, without shifting too far from its principles, to allow them to function. For example, although amateur administrators were resistant to taking advice from foreign coaches, they accommodated them within the Loughborough Summer Schools, thereby demonstrating a rare degree of pragmatism, but only on the proviso that they were there on an honorary basis and were not given too much control. Fluidity of the amateur definition was not just confined to the issues of professional coaching because, as chapters eight and nine demonstrate, this also surfaced within other aspects of British sport. While administrators viewed sports science with a degree of indifference and were wary of encouraging its integration into British sport they were more accepting of certain aspects of medicine. There were even instances of

administrators actively seeking the inclusion of medical support but, as always, this needs to be kept in perspective because it was generally offered to medical men on an honorary basis.

Limitations and Future Research

By utilising a wide number of primary and secondary sources, which included the collection of oral history interviews, this research had contributed to the existing narratives on British coaching in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and offers a platform for future research which has an emphasis on coaching history. However, while they added richness of the data, some limitations of the interviews should be noted here. Because the very nature of research of this type ensures that it constantly evolves and adapts as it progresses, the direction of the questioning was directly related to the point at which the interviews were conducted. Although this could have been resolved by requesting a second interview at a later stage, this was never a practical solution because the majority of individuals selected for this research are still heavily involved in sport full time and it would have been unreasonable to expect them to agree to a further meeting. It should also be noted here, of course, that the personal memories and opinions of these individuals may not always have been entirely accurate and they were certainly coloured by their own experiences with sports administrators and NGBs.

This research covered a number of different aspects of British sport in order to demonstrate the trajectory of amateurism and coaching traditions but, due to time constraints, the number of sports analysed was restricted. If this research were to be extended, the first stage would be to examine other Olympic sports to see how their coaching strategies co-existed with the amateur ethos. For over a century both swimming and athletics in Britain have retained strong connections to amateurism whereas other sports, such as cycling, developed differently and could offer an alternative perspective. Many of the interviewees in the research referred to British cycling and suggested that because of their willingness to utilise forward thinking administrators with a professional attitude, who have then, in turn, encouraged the use of professional coaches, they have been able to secure international success. Another sport which could offer an alternative avenue for research is boxing. As this is now the only remaining sport in the Olympics where athletes have to amateur, it would be intriguing to establish what impact and influence this ruling may have had in terms of the level of coaching encouraged and whether, because it is an amateur event, there is any stigma attached to professionalism and professional coaches.

Amateur Legacy

While conducting this research it was constantly reinforced, by both primary and secondary material, that a professionalised sporting system was never integrated as successfully into Britain as it was in other

countries and that the reasons for this appear to lie with its amateur foundations. If something has always functioned in a certain way, as British sport has, then not only is it difficult to instigate change, but if change does occur, any new situation may well be lacking in individuals who have an understanding of how to take reforms forward. Consequently, although British sport began to experience greater government involvement and increased funding levels during the 1960s, which inevitably prompted change, there was a lack of knowledge regarding how to use these initiatives successfully because British sport had never been previously administered in such a way. Tom McNab suggests that when athletics first received greater funding they did not appoint the correct people and, while he acknowledges that it was not an easy task, they in turn then 'appointed people who weren't very good, second rate people then appointed third rate people so the mediocrity was multiplied.' In order to be successful, he suggests that, 'you've got to appoint people as good as you are. Or better in some ways, if you're going to achieve success.' He notes that sports such as cycling have achieved this whereas athletics continue to struggle to find successful administrators, something which he believes may never be resolved.² Because the sport had been run by amateurs for such a long period, when there was a shift towards greater specialisation, the people with a professional mind-set to ensure that the transition was successful were not available and this was the key to why some amateur principles remain in British sport.

Evidence gained from other interviewees also appears to support this notion whereby the foundations of amateurism have been so influential that sporting organisations remain resistant towards relinquishing their own autonomy and co-operating with others. Sarah Rowell, who was heavily involved in the work of the National Coaching Foundation, suggests that Sport England, UK Sport and Sports Coach UK all have areas of overlap where they could effectively work together, but because they remain jealous of their autonomy these partnerships are not as effective as they could be.³ Similarly, Dave Collins notes that when the UK Sport Institutes were originally established they were seen as separate little companies that would almost compete against each other.⁴ Although sporting bodies like these have undeniably progressed and developed since the early twentieth century, these observations suggest that the residual effects of amateur heritage and volunteerism are still being felt in contemporary British sport.

Previous research by Richard Holt and Tony Mason suggests that during the 1970s and 1980s when amateurism was devalued as the guiding principle in British sport, its ethos ceased to be influential, particularly at the elite end of British sport. They argue that while amateurism may still operate within the lower ranks of sport, essentially, 'the age of the amateur is over.'⁵ Although it is not disputed that the control of amateurism did indeed diminish, the overriding evidence presented here suggests that remnants

² McNab, interview.

³ Sarah Rowell, interview by author, August 31, 2011, Batley, West Yorkshire.

⁴ Collins, interview.

⁵ Holt and Mason, *Sport in Britain*, 36-7.

of its ethos can still be seen, even in elite sport in Britain and that this continues to impact on coaching and coaches. Bill Furniss suggests that while the elite sporting system now in place in Britain has marginalised amateur hegemony and encouraged people to become more selfish, which he believes is a prerequisite in order to be successful in sport, he still experiences examples of amateurism at the performance end of sport.⁶ Fellow swimming coach, Terry Denison, acknowledges that there is now a greater acceptance that if an athlete wants to be successful they have to put in the training and preparation and suggests that this has been encouraged by the emergence of a 'new generation of officialdom' who 'accept that's how it works and they're most supportive of it.'⁷ Especially in swimming, people recognise that 'if you're not training 50,000 metres a week at 16 years of age, you are not going to compete internationally.'⁸ However, he notes that, even within this current results driven climate, there is still an uneasiness associated with professionalism and, while no one out rightly acknowledges this, it remains an underlying presence.

Establishing why this diluted amateur ethos is still visible and able to survive in an environment which is target conscious and money orientated has been particularly challenging. As noted throughout this thesis and in this conclusion, the definitions of amateurism have always taken a degree of fluidity, whereby the application of its principles has been ever changing and moulding itself to accommodate the shifting climate of British sport. While this may have made British sport somewhat ambiguous at times, particularly with regards to what was acceptable in terms of coaching and science, this versatility also guaranteed amateurism a far reaching life span and ensured its continuing presence in elite British sport. Although Alan Lynn suggests that British performance sport is now 'an island...that has drifted further and further from the mainland', particularly as funding and professionalism have increased, he acknowledges that there is still an 'amateur channel' that connects the island to the mainland.⁹ It is this continuing transfer of both athletes and coaches from the mainland (the club and grassroots environment), where the amateur ethos remains particularly ingrained, to the island (elite sport), that ensures amateurism is a continuing influence at all level of British sport.

Influenced by the success of other sporting nations, beginning in the late 1960s and gradually gaining momentum, the British government began to play a more significant and influential role in sport. As the amount of funding that elite sport could be expected to receive from the National Lottery and other sources gradually became dictated by medal targets and results there was increased demand for greater specialisation. Coupled with this increasing specialisation was an ongoing realisation that grassroots and elite level sport required very different types of support and attention, particularly regarding personnel and resources. Despite this increasing level of specialisation in elite sport and a growing detachment between

⁶ Furniss, interview.

⁷ Denison, interview.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Lynn, interview.

the acknowledged separate entities of British sport, many people have and remain to be introduced into sport through grassroots opportunities. At this foundation level of sport, amateurism is particularly influential and, while the amateur ethos is probably not directly comparable to that seen some sixty years ago, the clubs are still voluntarily run by individuals who have a passion for the positive development of the sport. Consequently, the coaches and athletes who function within this setting become immersed in these values and they inexorably incorporate such principles into their own sporting philosophies. As some individuals, coaches and athletes alike, make the transition between the grassroots foundation level to the elite end of sport it is inevitable that this established mind-set will travel with them and, while it is accepted that some dilution may occur, their amateur beliefs and values of sport remain as a powerful underlying presence. As this research has repeatedly shown, amateurism is not just a definition or something that can be switched off; it is an innate tradition, an unconscious state of mind. The only way to prevent this transfer of attitudes would be to alter the foundation of British sport by shifting towards an American or Soviet style model. However, international sporting models, whether they be the Soviet system of sports science or an American system of professional coaching, are not directly compatible with British culture and, while some aspects of these systems may have been cherry picked in the past, they were chosen specifically because they could be moulded to successfully fit into the sporting culture in Britain. It also needs to be considered that, as many of the interviewees highlighted, committed individuals would always fight to retain the British sporting model because the positives, such as the availability of sport for everyone and a belief that anyone has the opportunity to achieve success, outweighed any potential negatives. If the benefits of this unique sporting system are to be retained then it has to be accepted that a diluted ethos of amateurism will continue to influence the elite end of sport. Consequently, how well Britain's athletes will fare in future international sport will depend primarily on how well the system and associated personnel can work within the amateur mind-set. If British sport can attract professionally minded people, there may well be an opportunity at some point to disconnect its two branches, grassroots and elite sport, but this research suggests that, regardless of any future changes, preventing the ethos of amateurism from filtering into elite sport will be particularly challenging.

Appendix A: Short Biographies of Oral History Interviewees

Professor Dave Collins: Holds a PhD in psychology and is also a chartered psychologist. Has worked in various roles associated with performance sport since 1985; was appointed Performance Director for UK Athletics from 2005-2008 and has attended eight Olympic Games with different sports.

Frank Dick: In 1970 he was appointed as National Coach for Athletics in Scotland and in 1979 he became the Director of Coaching for UK Athletics, where he remained until 1994. In 1980 he published *Sports Training Principles* which offered the British audience an interpretation of the principles of periodisation.

Tom McNab: Appointed as National Coach for Southern Counties AAA from 1963-77. In 1966 he developed several programmes including the Five Star Award and a junior national decathlon programme, which produced Daley Thompson. In 1978 he began working as the technical director for *Chariots of Fire* and the following year he trained the British bobsleigh team for the 1980 Lake Placid Games.

Hamilton Smith: A successful swimmer in his youth he frequently attended the Loughborough Summer School where he experienced an array of coaching and scientific methods. He later transferred his skills to coaching and took up various posts until he was appointed as NTO for the ASA from 1963-67. He worked in close conjunction with Bert Kinnear and between them they were responsible for introducing many new and progressive methods into British swimming.

Bill Furniss: Has been head coach at both Nottingham County swim squad and Nova Centurion swimming club since 1980 and he was appointed head coach for the 1996 British Olympic swim team. He is also the coach of 2008 double Olympic gold medallist, Rebecca Adlington.

Terry Denison: Became head coach at the City of Leeds swimming club in 1972 where he went on to coach individuals such as Adrian Moorhouse (Olympic gold medallist), Andrew Astbury (Olympic bronze medallist) and James Hickman (World short course champion). Involved in the coaching staff at six different Olympic Games and was appointed chief coach in 1992. Named coach of the year on ten separate occasions by the British Swimming Coaches Association and in 1999 was awarded an MBE for his services to swimming.

Alan Lynn: Has been involved in the preparation of a number of Olympic swimmers and was named coach of the year by the Scottish national agency for sport, Sportscotland, in 1999. Was appointed Technical

Director of Scottish Swimming in 2000 and remained in the post until 2002. He is now an academic member of staff at the University of Stirling School of Sport and he also coaches at the British Swimming Intensive Training Centre on campus.

Professor Les Burwitz: Gained a PhD at the University of Illinois and was appointed at Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) in 1974. Developed one of the first sports science departments in the country which then later became one of only three departments in the UK to achieve 6 star rating for world class research. In 1984 he was one of the founding members of The British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences. He retired as professor of MMU sport and exercise science in 1997 but was awarded emeritus status.

Dr Sarah Rowell: Successful long distance runner who participated in the 1984 Olympic Games Marathon. Gained a first class honours sports science degree and completed her PhD in 1989. Appointed as the manager of the National Coaching Foundation Sports Science Support Programme and then went on to become a Technical Advisor and helped establish the English Institute of Sport.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archives

Amateur Athletic Association Collection, University of Birmingham Special Collections Archives, Birmingham.

File HA Box 2 - Harold Abrahams: 'Sport, Professionalism and the Olympics'.

File HA Box 3 - Tony Ward: 'Echoes of Infamy'.

File HA Box 14 - Review of the Amateur Athletic Association Coaching Scheme.

File 1/2/4/1 - Olympic Committee Minutes 1911-2.

File 1/2/9/1 - Physical Fitness Committee Minutes 1938-9.

File 1/2/2 - General Committee Minutes 1948.

File 1/2/10 - Development Committee Minutes 1946.

File 1/2/13/1 - Coaching Committee Minutes 1947-1956.

File 1/2/13/2 - Coaching Committee Minutes 1961, Report by Coaching Administrator 1961.

Amateur Swimming Association Headquarters, SportsPark Loughborough University

Annual Reports - 1946 1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1956 1957 1959 1960 1961
1962 1963 1965 1966 1967.

Harry Koskie documents.

British Olympic Association Collection, University of East London Archives, Docklands Campus.

File BOA/M/1/1 - Committee Minutes 1906.

File BOA/PAR/3 - Enquiry into Sports Council.

File BOA/MED/1 - Medical Advisory Committee Minutes 1965.

File BOA/MED/2/1 - Correspondence.

File BOA/MED/2/2 - Press Statements.

File BOA/MED/2/3 - Correspondence.

File BOA/MED/3/4 - Report of the Medical Research Project into the Effects of Altitude in Mexico City in 1965.

National Archives, Kew

National Fitness Council Collection:

File ED 113/54 - Amateur Athletic Association 1937-9.

File ED 113/57 - Amateur Swimming Association 1937-40.

Ministry of Education and Department of Education and Science Collection:

File ED 169/29 - Amateur Athletic Association 1947-63.

File ED 169/30 - Amateur Athletic Association-Coaching 1947-55.

File ED 169/31 - Amateur Athletic Association-Coaching 1956-63.

File ED 169/70 - Amateur Swimming Association 1946-63.

File ED 196/73 - The Wolfenden Committee of Sport.

File ED 169/127 - Sports Council.

Foreign Office Collection:

File FO 371/86796 - 'Why Soviet Sportsman Win', letter British Embassy to Foreign Office.

File FO 973/97 - 'Sport in the Soviet Union – Background Brief'.

Oxford University Athletic Club Archives, Oxford.

Committee Minutes 1928

'The Coach' (1953)

'Coaching Problems 1949-50'

Private Collection - Dyson Family

Photos

Newspaper Cuttings

Army Records

Letters of Correspondence between Dyson and AAA, BAAB, Buckingham Palace.

Copies of AAA Coaching Newsletter

Copies of *Athletics Weekly*

Maureen Gardener's Training Programme

Wellcome Collection, Wellcome Library, London

Volume 36: The Development of Sports Medicine in Twentieth Century Britain Collection:

File GC/253/A/36/12 - Sports Medicine Related Documents: Peter Sperryn.

File GC/253/A/36/11- Sports Medicine Related Documents: Malcolm Read 3.

File GC/253/A/36/14 - Sports Medicine Related Documents: Dan Tunstall Pedoe.

British Association of Sport and Exercise Medicine 1952-2003 Collection:

File SA/BSM/A/2/1 - Minutes and Associated Papers 1952-82.

File SA/BSM/G/2 - John Clegg Papers 1997-9.

File SA/BSM/A/2/2 - Minutes and Associated Papers 1968-83.

File SA/BSM/A/1/1 - Minutes and Associated Papers 1987-92.

File SA/BSM/B/5 - BASM Education Course Correspondance.

Questionnaire

'A Modern History of Sports Medicine: Athlete Questionnaire' - Confidential enquiry into the medical support available for British Olympians pre and immediate post-WW11 conducted by Malcolm Bottomley in September 2001. Questionnaires obtained directly from Malcolm Bottomley.

Interviews

Clifford Bourland, interview conducted by Margaret Costa in December 1999, The Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles Collection, www.la84foundation.org/6oic/OralHistory/OHbourland3.pdf (accessed June 26, 2012).

Melvin Patton, interview conducted by Margaret Costa in December 1999, The Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles Collection, www.la84foundation.org/6oic/OralHistory/OHpatton.pdf (accessed June 26, 2012).

Geoffrey Dyson: interview conducted by Tom McNab in 1970, Transcript obtained from Neil Carter, De Montfort University, Leicester.

Professor Dave Collins: interview conducted by author on 17 February 2011 in Crewe, Cheshire.

Bill Furniss: interview conducted by author on 29 March 2011 in Nottingham.

Tom McNab: interview conducted by author on 6 May 2011 in St Albans, London.

Alan Lynn: interview conducted by author on 8 April 2011 in Stirling, Scotland.

Dr Frank Dick: interview conducted by author on 27 May 2011 in Manchester.

Professor Les Burwitz: interview conducted by author on 25 June 2011 in Crewe, Cheshire.

Hamilton Smith: interview conducted by author on 27 July 2011 in Edinburgh, Scotland.

Timothy Dyson, telephone interview conducted by author on 29 July 2011.

Judith Rawlins (née Dyson), interview conducted by author on 11 August 2011, Devon.

Dr Sarah Rowell: interview conducted by author on 31 August 2011 in Batley, West Yorkshire.

Terry Denison: interview conducted by author on 14 September 2011 in Leeds.

Newspapers and Magazines

Advertiser

Athletics Weekly

Daily Express

Daily Graphic

Daily Mail

Daily Mirror

Evening Sentinel

Glasgow Herald

Grey River Argus

Guardian

Independent

Leniston Daily Sun

New Zealand Herald

Northern Advocate

Observer

Otautau Standard and Wallace Country Chronicle

Palm Beach Post

Picture Post

Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser

Singapore Free Press

Sporting Mirror

Sports Illustrated

Straits Times

Sunday Express
Swimming Times
Sydney Morning Herald
The Belgravian
The Economist
The New York Times Upfront
The New York Times
The Scotsman
The Times
Time Magazine

Reports and Other

- Abrahams, Harold M. *British Olympic Association: The Official Report of the XIth Olympiad Berlin 1936*. London: British Olympic Association, 1937.
- British Olympic Association. *Olympic Games 1952: Official Report*. London: World Sports, 1952.
- British Olympic Association. *Olympic Games 1956: Official Report*. London: World Sports, 1956.
- British Olympic Committee. *The Official Report of the Organising Committee for the XIV Olympiad*. London: Organising Committee for the XIV Olympiad, 1948.
- British Olympic Council. *The Fourth Olympiad: Official Report*. London: British Olympic Association, 1908.
- British Olympic Council. *Aims and Objects of the Olympic Games Fund*. London: British Olympic Association, 1913.
- Buytendilk, Professor. 'Short Report Regarding the Medical Scientific Research Work during the Olympic Games'. In *The Official Report of the Olympic Games of 1928 Celebrated at Amsterdam* ed. G. Van Rossem, 952-5. Amsterdam: J H. De Bussy, 1928.
- CCPR. *Sport and the Community: The Report of the Wolfenden Committee on Sport - 1960*. London: CCPR, 1960.
- Cook, Theodore Andrea. *The Official Report of the Olympic Games of 1908*. London, British Olympic Association: 1908.
- Cook, Theodore Andrea. *The Olympic Games*. London: British Olympic Council, 1908.
- International Olympic Committee. *Olympic Charter*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1997.
- Rossem, G Van, ed. *The Official Report of the Olympic Games of 1928 Celebrated at Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: J H. De Bussy, 1928.
- Sinfield, George. *A Nation of Champions: All about Soviet Sport*. London: Russia Today Society, 1941.
- Speak, Michael, and Victoria Ambler. *Physical Education, Recreation and Sport in the U.S.S.R*. Lancaster: Centre for Physical Education University of Lancaster, 1976.
- Sports Council. *Coaching Matters: A Review of Coaching and Coach Education in the United Kingdom*. London: Sports Council, 1991.
- Swedish Olympic Committee. *The Olympic Games of Stockholm 1912: Official Report*. Stockholm: Wahlstrom and Widstrand, 1912.
- University of Birmingham Physical Education Department. *Britain in the World of Sport: An Examination of the Factors Involved in Participation in Competitive International Sport*. Birmingham: The Physical Education Association, 1956.
- United Kingdom. Board of Education. *Physical Training and Recreation Act, 1937*. 1 Edw. 8 & 1 Geo. 6.

- United Kingdom. Department of Education. *Education Act, 1944*. 7 & 8 Geo. 6, c. 31.
- United Kingdom. *House of Commons Parliamentary Debates*, 'Wolfenden Report (part two)', June 29, 1960, Vol. 625.
- United Kingdom. *House of Commons Parliamentary Debates*, 'Sport (Wolfenden Committee's Report)', April 28, 1961, Vol. 639.
- United Kingdom. *House of Lords Parliamentary Debates*, 'Establishment of a Sports Council', February 3, 1965, Vol. 262.
- United Kingdom. Department of the Environment. *Sport and Recreation*. London: Williams Lea, 1975.
- United Kingdom. Department for Culture Media and Sport. *A Sporting Future for All*. London: Department for Culture Media and Sport, 2002.
- United Kingdom. Department for Culture Media and Sport/Strategy Unit. *Game Plan: A Strategy for Delivering the Government's Sport and Physical Activity Objectives*. London: Cabinet Office, 2002.

Contemporary Texts

- Few, William P. 'The Place of Athletics in Education'. In *The Sewanee Review Quarterly*. Ed. John Bell Henneman, 327-40. London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1904.
- George, Walter. *Training*. London: Universal Press Agency, 1902.
- Hill, Archibald. *Muscular Movement in Man: The Factors Governing Speed and Recovery from Fatigue*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1921.
- Whitney, Caspar. *A Sporting Pilgrimage: Riding to Hounds, Golf, Rowing, Football, Club and University Athletics. Studies in English Sport, Past and Present*. New York: Harper, 1895.

Secondary Sources

Texts

- Abrams, Lynn. *Oral History Theory*. Oxon: Routledge, 2010.
- Abrams, Lynn. *The Orphan Country: Children of Scotland's Broken Homes, 1845 to the Present Day*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd, 1998.
- Allison, Lincoln. *Amateurism in Sport: An Analysis and a Defence*. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2001.
- Allison, Lincoln and Terry Monnington. 'Sport, Prestige and International Relations'. In *The Global Politics of Sport*, ed. Lincoln Allison, 106-34. Oxon: Routledge, 2005.
- Baker, Norman. 'A More Even Playing Field? Sport During and After the War'. In *Millions Like Us: British Culture in the Second World War*, ed. Nick Hayes and Jeff Hill, 124-55. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999.
- Balyi, Istvan. *Sport System Building and Long-Term Athlete Development in British Columbia*. Canada: SportsMed BC, 2001.
- Beamish, Rob and Ian Ritchie. *Fastest, Highest, Strongest: A Critique of High Performance Sport*. Oxon: Routledge, 2008.
- Beck, Peter. *Scoring for Britain, International Football and International Politics*. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999.
- Berryman, Jack W., and Roberta J. Park. *Sport and Exercise Science: Essays in the History of Sports Medicine*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1992.
- Birley, Derek. *Land of Sport and Glory: Sport and British Society, 1887-1910*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

- Birley, Derek. *Playing the Games: Sport and British Society, 1910-1945*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Booth, Douglas. *The Field: Truth and Fiction in Sports History*. Oxon: Routledge, 2005.
- Borland, Katherine. 'That's Not What I Said': Interpretive Conflict in Oral Narrative Research'. In *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*. Ed. Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai, 63-76. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- British Olympic Association. *The British Olympic Association and the Olympic Games*. London, British Olympic Association. Quoted in Martin Polley, 'No Business of Ours?: The Foreign Office and the Olympic Games, 1896-1914'. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 13, no. 2 (1996): 96-113.
- Brooks, George, Thomas Fahey, and Kenneth Baldwin. *Exercise Physiology: Human Bioenergetics and its Applications*. 4th ed. California, Mayfield Publishing 2005.
- Brundage, Avery. *The Speeches of President Avery Brundage, 1952-1968*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1969.
- Brundage to *Edström*. January 21, 1947, Brundage Papers Box 42, University of Illinois Collection, Champaign-Urbana. Quoted in Richard Espy, *The Politics of the Olympic Games* (London: University of California Press, 1979).
- Chamberlain, Eric Russell. *Life in Britain*. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd, 1972.
- Chapman, James. 'British Cinema and "The People's War"'. In *Millions Like us? British Culture in the Second World War*. Ed. Nick Hayes and Jeff Hill, 33-61. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999.
- Cleaver, Hylton. 'Rowing'. In *The Sports Book 2: Britain's Prospects in the Olympic Games and in Sport Generally*. Ed. James Rivers, 86-101. London: MacDonald and Co Ltd, 1948.
- Coalter, Fred, Jonathan Long, and Brian Duffield. *Rationale for Public Sector Investment in Leisure*. London: Sports Council and Economic and Social Research Council, 1986.
- Coghlan, John. *Sport and British Politics since 1960*. London: The Falmer Press, 1990.
- Coubertin, Pierre. *Olympism: Selected Writings*. Ed. Norbert Muller. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000.
- Councilman, James E. *The Science of Swimming*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1968.
- Cousins, Geoffrey. 'Golf'. In *The Sports Book 2: Britain's Prospects in the Olympic Games and in Sport Generally*. Ed. James Rivers, 105-281. London: MacDonald and Co Ltd, 1948.
- Dale, Iain. *Labour Party General Election Manifestos 1900-1997*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Day, Dave. 'Walter Brickett. A Respectable Professor'. In *Recording Leisure Lives: Sports, Games and Pastimes in 20th Century Britain*. Ed. Bob Snape and Helen Pussard, 193-214. Brighton: Leisure Studies Association, 2010.
- Dick, Frank. *Sports Training Principles*. London, Lepus Books, 1980.
- Dobson, Alan P. *Anglo-American Relations in the Twentieth Century: Of Friendship, Conflict and the Rise and Decline of Superpowers*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Dyson, Geoffrey. *The Mechanics of Athletics*. Kent: Biddles Limited, 1977.
- Earle, Peter. *The Making of the English Middle Class: Business, Society and Family Life in London 1660-1730*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989.
- Edelman, Robert. *Serious Fun: A History of Spectator Sports in the U.S.S.R.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Elias, Norbert, and Eric Dunning. *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilising Process*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- Espy, Richard. *The Politics of the Olympic Games*. London: University of California Press, 1979.

- Evans, Justin. *The Story of the CCPR - 1935 to 1972: Service to Sport*. London: Pelham Books, 1974.
- Field, Geoffrey G. *Blood, Sweat, and Toil: Remaking the British Working Class, 1939-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- French, Peter A. *Ethics and College Sports: Ethics, Sports, and the University*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2004.
- Gardiner, Juliet. *Wartime Britain 1939-1945*. London: Headline Book Publishing, 2004.
- Glader, Eugene. *Amateurism and Athletics*. New York: Leisure Press, 1978.
- Gorn Elliot J., and Warren Goldstein. *A Brief History of American Sports*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Guttman, Allen. *The Games Must Go on: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- Guttman, Allen. *A Whole New Ball Game: An Interpretation of American Sports*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Guttman, Allen. *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games: Second Edition*. Champaign: The University of Illinois Press, 2002.
- Hampton, Janie. *Austerity Olympics: When the Games Came to London in 1948*. London: Aurum Press, 2008.
- Hardman, Ken, and Roland Naul. 'The Development of Sporting Excellence in England and Germany: An Historical Comparison'. In *Sport in the Global Village*. Ed. Ralph Wilcox, 449-58. Morgantown: WV Fitness Information Technology, 1994.
- Hargreaves, John. *Sport, Power and Culture: A Social and Historical Analysis of Popular Sports in Britain*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1986.
- Harris, Bernard. *The Origins of the British Welfare State: Social Welfare in England and Wales 1800-1945*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Hazan, Baraukh. *Olympic Sports and Propaganda Games: Moscow 1980*. New Brunswick: Transaction Inc, 1982.
- Heggie, Vanessa. *A History of British Sports Medicine*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.
- Heyck, Thomas William. *A History of the Peoples of the British Isles: From 1870 to the Present*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Hoberman, John. *Mortal Engines The Science of Performance and the Dehumanisation of Sport*. New York: The Free Press, 1992.
- Hogan, Michael J. *The End of the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Holler, John H. *The Boer Lessons that Changed and Prepared the British Army for WW1*. Pennsylvania: U.S Army War College, 1999.
- Holt, Richard. *Sport and the British: A Modern History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Holt, Richard and Tony Mason. *Sport in Britain, 1945-2000*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000.
- Horseman, Grace. *Growing up between 1900 & 1920*. Devon: Cottage Publishing, 1996.
- Houlihan, Barrie. *The Government and Politics of Sport*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Houlihan, Barrie, and Anita White. *The Politics of Sport Development: Development of Sport or Development through Sport?*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Huggins, Mike. *Horse Racing and the British: 1919-1939*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
- Huggins, Mike, and Jack Williams. *Sport and the English, 1918-1939*. Oxon: Routledge, 2006.

- Humphries, Stephen. *The Handbook of Oral History: Recording Life Histories*. London: Inter-Action Imprint, 1984.
- Humphries, Stephen. *Hooligans or Rebels? An Oral History of Working Class Childhood and Youth, 1889-1939*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.
- Jeffreys, Kevin. *Sport and Politics in Modern Britain: The Road to 2012*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Johnson, Niall. *Britain and the 1918-1919 Influenza Pandemic: A Dark Epilogue*. Oxon: Routledge, 2006.
- Jones, Stephen G. *Sport, Politics and the Working Class*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Joyce, Patrick. *Democratic Subjects: The Self and the Social in Nineteenth Century England*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1994.
- Keil, Ian and Don Wix. *In the Swim: The Amateur Swimming Association from 1869 to 1994*. Loughborough: Swimming Times, 1996.
- Keys, Barbara. *Globalising Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1930s*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Kirby, Maurice W. *The Decline of British Economic Power since 1870*. Oxon: Routledge, 2006.
- Kohn, George C. *Encyclopedia of Plague and Pestilence: From Ancient Time to Present*. New York: Facts on File Inc, 2008.
- Lanfranchi, Pierre, and Matthew Taylor. 'Professional Football in World War Two Britain'. In *War Culture*. Ed. Pat Kirkham and David Thoms, 187-200. London: Lawrence and Wishart Limited, 1995.
- Lee, Stephen J. *Aspects of British Political History, 1914-1995*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Lloyd-Jones, Roger, and Myrddin John Lewis. *British Industrial Capitalism since the Industrial Revolution*. London: UCL Press, 1998.
- Lovesey, Peter. *The Official Centenary History of the Amateur Athletic Association*. Enfield: Guinness Superlatives, 1979.
- Lowerson, John. *Sport and the English Middle Classes, 1870-1914*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Lyle, John. *Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaches' Behaviour*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- MacAloon, John J. *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games*. Oxon: Routledge, 2008.
- Mackay, Robert. *The Test of War: Inside Britain 1939-1945*. London: Taylor and Francis Group, 1999.
- Martens, Rainer. *Successful Coaching: Fourth Edition*. Champaign: Human Kinetics, 2012.
- Marwick, Arthur. *Britain in the Century of Total War: War Peace and Social Change 1900-1967*. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd, 1968.
- Marwick, Arthur. *British Society since 1945: The Penguin Social History of Britain*. London: Penguin Books, 1990.
- Mason, Tony, ed. *Sport in Britain: A Social History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Mason, Tony, and Eliza Riedi. *Sport and the Military: The British Armed Forces 1880-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Rogan, Matt, and Martin Rogan. *Britain and the Olympic Games: Past Present Legacy*. Leicester: Matador, 2011.
- Matveyev, Lev Pavlovich. *Periodisation of Sport Training*. Moscow: Fizkultura I Sport, 1965.
- Morgan, Ellis. *W G George's '100-UP' Exercise: Rediscovered*. Derby: Dormouse Press, 2011.
- Munslow, Alun. *Deconstructing History*. 2nd ed. Oxon: Routledge, 1996.
- Munslow, Alun. *Narrative and History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

- Nendel, Jim. 'The Cold War: Emerging from the Ice at the 1956 Cortina D' Ampezzo Winter Olympic Games'. In *The Global Nexus Engaged: Past, Present, Future Interdisciplinary Olympic Studies: Sixth International Symposium for Olympic Research*. Ed. Kevin B. Wamsley, Robert K. Barney, and S G. Martyn, 199-203. Ontario: Centre for Olympic Studies, University of Western Ontario, 2002.
- Orilla Hall of Fame Committee. *Orilla Hall of Fame*. Orilla: City of Orilla Hall of Fame Committee, 2008.
- Overman, Steven J. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Sport: How Calvinism and Capitalism Shaped America's Games*. Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2011.
- Pelling, Henry. *Modern Britain: 1886-1955*. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1960.
- Phillips, Murray George. *From Sidelines to Centre Field: A History of Sports Coaching in Australia*. University of New South Wales: University of New South Wales Press Ltd, 2000.
- Polley, Martin. *Moving the Goalposts: A History of Sport and Society in Britain since 1945*. Oxon: Routledge, 1998.
- Polley, Martin. *Sports History: A Practical Guide*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Polley, Martin. *The British Olympics: Britain's Olympic Heritage 1612-2012*. London: English Heritage, 2011.
- Pound, Reginald. *The Lost Generation*. London: Constable, 1964.
- Pugh, Martin. *Sport and Society: A Social and Political History of Britain since 1870*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012.
- Reynolds, Lois A., and E M., Tansey, eds. *The Development of Sports Medicine in Twentieth-Century Britain: The Transcript of a Witness Seminar Held by the Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL, London, on 29 June 2007*. London: Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL, 2009.
- Riordan, James. *Sport in Soviet Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Riordan, James. *The USSR, of Sport under Communism: The USSR, Czechoslovakia, the G.D.R, Cuba*. Ed. James Riordan. London: C. Hurst, 1978.
- Riordan, James. 'The Impact of Communism on Sport'. In *The International Politics of Sport in the 20th Century*. Ed. James Riordan and Arnd Kruger, 48-66. London: E and FN Spon, 1999.
- Ritchie, Donald A. *Doing Oral History: A Practical Guide*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Roberts, Elizabeth. *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working Class Women 1890-1940*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1994.
- Robinson, Paul. *Foundations of Sports Coaching*. Oxon: Routledge, 2010.
- Rous, Stanley. Foreword to *Fitness and Injury in Sport: Care, Diagnosis and Treatment by Physical Means*, by Sidney Simon Knight, ix. New York: Van Nostrand, 1953.
- Rubin, Herbert J., and Irene S. Rubin. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 2nd ed. California: Sage Publications Inc, 2005.
- Rubinstein, William D. *Twentieth-Century Britain: A Political History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Sack, Allen, and Ellen Staurowsky. *College Athletes for Hire: The Evolution and Legacy of the NCAA's Amateur Myth*. Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1998.
- Senn, Alfred Erich. *Power, Politics and the Olympic Games*. Champaign: Human Kinetics, 1999.
- Shneigman, Norman. *The Soviet Road to Olympus: Theory and Practice of Soviet Physical Culture and Sport*. Ontario: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978.

- Smith, Ronald A. *Pay for Play: A History of Big-Time College Athletic Reform*. Illinois, University of Illinois Press, 2011.
- Strenk, Andrew. 'Amateurism: Myth and Reality'. In *Olympism*. Ed. Jeffrey Segrave and Donald Chu, 57-75. Champaign: Human Kinetics Publishers, 1981.
- Svennilson, Ingvar. *Growth and Stagnation in the European Economy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.
- Texas Historical Commission. *Fundamentals of Oral History: Texas Preservation Guidelines*. Texas: Texas Historical Commission, 2004.
- Thompson, Paul. *The Edwardians*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Tucker, Spencer C. *The European Powers in the First World War: An Encyclopaedia*. Oxon: Routledge, 1999.
- Turrini, Joseph M. *The End of Amateurism in American Track and Field*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2010.
- Vamplew, Wray. *Professional Sport in Britain, 1875-1914: Pay Up and Play the Game*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Wahrman, Dror. *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c. 1780-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1995.
- Walsh, Mark, Paul Stephens, and Stephen Moore. *Social Policy and Welfare*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes, 2000.
- War Department Washington. *Instructions for American Servicemen in Britain 1942*. Washington DC: War Department, 1942. Reprinted with foreword by John Pinfold. Bodleian Library: University of Oxford, 2004. Page references are to the 2004 edition.
- Wassong, Stephen. 'Clean Sport: A Twofold Challenge in the Contemporary History of the Modern Olympic Games'. In *Pathways, Critiques and Discourse in Olympic Research*. Ed. Robert K. Barney, Michael K. Heine, Kevin B. Wamsley, and Gordon H. MacDonald, 84-93. London: UWO Press, 2008.
- White, Jerry. *Rothschild Buildings*. London: Pimlico, 2003.
- Williams, Jack. *Cricket and England: A Cultural and Social History of the Inter-War Years*. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999.
- Young, David. *The Modern Olympics: A Struggle for Revival*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Journal Articles

- Allison, Lincoln. 'The Olympic Movement and the End of the Cold War'. *World Affairs* 157, no. 2 (1994): 92-7.
- Anon. 'Reviews and Notices'. *The British Medical Journal* 1, no. 687 (1873): 579-89.
- Anon. 'International Hygiene Exhibition Dresden 1911'. *The Journal of Hygiene* 10, no. 1 (1910): 131-4.
- Anon. 'A Brief History of the British Association of Sport and Medicine'. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, no. 3 (1968): 143-7.
- Bailey, Steve. 'Noble Ally and Olympic Disciple: The Reverend Robert S. de Courcy Laffan, Coubertin's 'Man' in England'. *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, 6 (1997): 51-64.
- Baker, Norman. 'Olympics or Tests: The Disposition of the British Sporting Public, 1948'. *Sporting Traditions* 11, no. 1 (1994): 57-74.
- Baker, Norman. 'The Amateur Ideal in a Society of Equality: Change and Continuity in Post-Second World War British Sport, 1945-48'. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 12, no. 1 (1995): 99-126.

- Baker, Norman. 'Sport and National Prestige: The Case of Britain 1945-48'. *Sporting Traditions* 12, no. 2 (1996): 81-97.
- Baker, Norman. 'Whose Hegemony? The Origins of the Amateur Ethos in Nineteenth Century English Society'. *Sport in History* 24, no.1 (2004): 1-16.
- Barker-Ruchti, Natalie. 'Ballerinas and Pixies: A Genealogy of the Changing Female Gymnastics Body'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 26, no. 1 (2009): 45-62.
- Basset, David. 'Scientific Contributions of A. V. Hill: Exercise Physiology Pioneer'. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 93 (2002): 1567-82.
- Beamish, Rob, and Ian Ritchie, 'From Fixed Capacities to Performance-Enhancement: The Paradigm Shift in the Science of Training and the Use of Performance-Enhancing Substances'. *Sport in History* 25, no. 3 (2005):412-33.
- Beck, Peter. 'Britain and the Cold War's "Cultural Olympics": Responding to the Political Drive of Soviet Sport, 1945-58'. *Contemporary British History* 19, no. 2 (2005): 169-85.
- Beck, Peter. 'The British Government and the Olympic Movement: The 1948 London Olympics'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25, no.5 (2008): 615-47.
- Beyer, Henry. 'The International Hygiene Exhibition at Dresden'. *Popular Science Monthly* 80 (1912): 105-28.
- Bock, Arlie V., C. Vancaulaert, David Bruce Dill, Asbjörn Fölling, and Lewis M. Hurxthal. 'Studies in Muscular Activity III: Dynamical Changes Occurring in Man at Work'. *Journal of Physiology* 66, no. 2 (1928): 136-61.
- Bock, Arlie V., C. Vancaulaert, David Bruce Dill, Asbjörn Fölling, and Lewis M. Hurxthal. 'Studies in Muscular Activity IV: The "Steady State" and the Respiratory Quotient during Work'. *Journal of Physiology* 66, no. 2 (1928): 162-74.
- Carter, Neil. 'Metatarsals and Magic Sponges: English Football and the Development of Sports Medicine'. *Journal of Sports History* 34, no. 1 (2007): 53-73.
- Carter, Neil. 'From Knox to Dyson: Coaching, Amateurism and British Athletics, 1912-1947'. *Sport in History* 30, no. 1 (2010): 55-81.
- Comite International Olympique. 'Training Camps'. *Olympic Review*, no. 1 (1967): 22.
- Coubertin, Pierre de. Olympic Memoires: The Olympic Congress at Le Harve (1897)'. *Olympic Review* 107-108 (1976), 455-574.
- Coubertin, Pierre de. Speech delivered at the Olympic Congress in Brussels, 1905. Quoted in Barbara Krawczyk, 'The Social Origin and Ambivalent Character of the Ideology of Amateur Sport'. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 12, no. 3 (1977): 35-49.
- Currens, James, and Paul White. 'Half a Century of Running: Clinical, Physiological and Autopsy Findings in the Case of Clarence DeMar (Mr Marathon)'. *The New England Journal of Medicine* 265 (1961): 988-93
- Day, Dave. 'Craft Coaching and the 'Discerning Eye' of the Coach'. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching* 6, no. 1 (2011):179-96.
- Day, Dave, Neil Carter and Tegan Carpenter. 'The Olympics, Amateurism and Britain's Coaching Heritage'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* iFirst article (2012): 1-14.
- Day, Dave. "'Magical and Fanciful Theories": Sports Psychologists and Craft Coaches'. *Sports Coaching Review* 1, no. 1 (2012): forthcoming.

- Day, Dave. 'Massaging the Amateur Ethos: British Professional Trainers at the 1912 Olympic Games'. *Sport in History* 32, no. 2 (2012): 1-26.
- Dill, David Bruce, John H. Talbott, and H T. Edwards. 'Studies in Muscular Activity VI: Response of Several Individuals to a Fixed Task'. *Journal of Physiology* 69, no. 3 (1930): 267-305.
- Dill, David Bruce, John H. Talbott, and H T. Edwards. 'Studies in Muscular Activity VII: Factors Limiting the Capacity for Work'. *Journal of Physiology* 77, no. 1 (1932): 49-62.
- Disley, John. 'Reflections on Soviet Sport'. *Physical Recreation*, no. 1 (1956): 71-2.
- Dyreson, Mark. 'Selling American Civilization: The Olympic Games of 1920 and American Culture'. *Olympika* 8 (1999): 1-42.
- Edelman, Robert. 'The Professionalisation of Soviet Sport: The Case of the Soccer Union'. *Journal of Sport History* 17, no. 1 (1990): 44-55.
- Eitzen, Stanley. 'The Sociology of Amateur Sport: An Overview'. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 24, no. 2 (1989): 95-105.
- Girginov, Vassil, and Ivan Sandanski. 'From Participants to Competitors: The Transformation of British Gymnastics and the Role of the Eastern European Model of Sport'. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 21, no. 5 (2004): 815-32.
- Green, Christopher D. 'Psychology Strikes Out: Coleman R. Griffith and the Chicago Cubs'. *History of Psychology* 6, no. 3 (2003): 267-83.
- Green, Mick. 'Olympic Glory or Grassroots Development? Sport Policy Priorities in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom, 1960-2006'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no.7 (2007): 921-53.
- Gunn, Simon. 'Class Identity and the Urban: The Middle Class in the England, c. 1790-1950'. *Urban History* 31, no. 1 (2004): 29-47.
- Hall, Edwin. 'Athletic Professionalism and its Remedies'. *The North American Review* 13, no. 10 (1905): 758-88.
- Heggie, Vanessa. 'Only the British Appear to be Making a Fuss: The Science of Success and the Myth of Amateurism at the Mexico Olympiad, 1968'. *Sport in History* 28, no. 2 (2008): 213-35
- Heggie, Vanessa. 'Sport (and Exercise) Medicine in Britain: Healthy Citizens and Abnormal Athletes'. *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 28, no. 2 (2011): 249-69.
- Hill, Archibald. 'Are Athletes Machines?'. *Scientific American* 137, no. 2 (1927): 124-6.
- Holick, Michael F., and Tai C. Chen. 'Vitamin D Deficiency: A Worldwide Problem with Health Consequences'. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 87, no. 4 (2008): 1080-6
- Holt, Richard, 'The Amateur Body and the Middle-Class Man: Work, Health and Style in Victorian Britain'. *Sport in History* 26, no. 3 (2006): 352-69.
- Huggins, Mike. 'Second-Class Citizens? English Middle-Class Culture and Sport, 1850-1910: Reconsideration'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 17, no. 1 (2000): 1-35.
- Huggins, Mike. 'Sport and the Upper Classes: Introduction'. *Sport in History* 28, no. 3 (2008): 351-63.
- Hunt, Thomas. 'Countering the Soviet Threat in the Olympic Medals Races: The Amateur Sports Act of 1978 and American Athletics Policy Reform'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no. 6 (2007): 796-818.
- Jokl, Ernst. '90th Birthday of Professor A. V. Hill'. *The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness* 16, no 4 (1976): 349.
- Jones, Stephen G. 'State Intervention in Sport and Leisure in Britain between the Wars'. *Journal of Contemporary History* 22, no. 1 (1987): 163-82.

- Kalinski, Michael. 'State Sponsored Research on Creatine Supplements and Blood Doping in Elite Soviet Sport'. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 46, no. 3 (2003): 445-51.
- Kidd, Bruce. 'Taking the Rhetoric Seriously: Proposals for Olympic Education'. *Quest* 48, no.1 (1996): 82-92.
- Krebs, Paula. "'The Last Gentlemen's Wars': Women in the Boer War Concentration Camp Controversy'. *History Workshop Journal* 33, no. 1 (1992): 38-56.
- Laffan, Rev. Robert. Speech delivered at Banquet to Olympic Competitors and Officials. October 31, 1908, 17, British Olympic Association Archives. Quoted in Steve Bailey, 'Noble Ally and Olympic Disciple: The Reverend Robert S. de Courcy Laffan, Coubertin's 'Man' in England'. *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, 6 (1997): 51-64.
- Lake, Robert J. 'Stigmatised, Marginalised, Celebrated: Developments in Lawn Tennis Coaching, 1870-1939'. *Sport in History* 30, no. 1 (2010): 82-103.
- Lang, Melanie, and Richard Light. 'Interpreting and Implementing the Long Term Athlete Development Model: English Swimming Coaches' Views on the (Swimming) LTAD in Practice'. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching* 5, no. 3 (2010): 389-402.
- Light, Rob. 'A "Strange...Absurd...and Somewhat Injurious Influence"? Cricket, Professional Coaching in the Public Schools and the 'Gentleman Amateur' Ethos'. *Sport in History* 30, no. 1 (2010): 8-31.
- Llewellyn, Matthew P. 'A Nation Divided: Great Britain and the Pursuit of Excellence, 1912-1914'. *Journal of Sport History* 35, no, 1 (2008): 73-97.
- Llewellyn, Matthew P. 'Prologue: An Indifferent Beginning'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 28, no. 5 (2011): 625-47.
- Love, Christopher. 'Social Class and the Swimming World: Amateurs and Professionals'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no. 5 (2007): 603-19.
- Luh, Andreas. 'On the Way to a National Socialist Sports System: From Liberal Sports in Clubs and Associations to Directed Sports in National Socialist Organizations'. *European Journal of Sport Science* 3, no. 3 (2003): 1-10.
- Malcolm, Dominic. "'It's Not Cricket": Colonial Legacies and Contemporary Inequalities'. *Journal of Historical Sociology* 14, no. 3 (2001): 253-75.
- Mallea, John R. 'The Victorian Sporting Legacy'. *McGill Journal of Education* 10, no. 2 (1975): 184-96.
- Martin, David. 'Physiology: its Role in Explaining Athletic Performance'. *New Studies in Athletics* 10, no.1 (1995): 9-12.
- Mason, Anthony. 'The Government and the General Strike'. *International Review of Social History* 14, no. 1 (1969): 1-22.
- Massaro, John. 'Press Box Propaganda? The War and *Sports Illustrated*, 1956'. *The Journal of American Culture* 26, no. 3 (2003): 361-70.
- Matthews, George. 'The Controversial Olympic Games of 1908 as Viewed by the *New York Times* and the *Times of London*'. *Journal of Sport History* 7, no. 2 (1980): 40-53.
- Morgan, Kenneth. 'The Boer War and the Media (1899-1902)'. *Twentieth Century British History* 13, no. 1 (2002): 1-16.
- Parade, G W., and H. Otto. 'Die Beeinflussung der Leistungsfähigkeit Durch Hohensonnenbestrahlung' [The Effect of Sunlight on Performance]. *Zeitschrift für Klinische Medizin* 137 (1940): 17-21. Quoted in John J. Cannell, Bruce W. Hollis, Marc B. Sorensen, Timothy N. Taft, and John J B. Anderson,

- 'Athletic Performance and Vitamin D'. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise* 41, no. 5 (2009): 1102-10.
- Park, Roberta J. 'Cells or Soaring?: Historical Reflections on "Visions" of the Body, Athletics, and Modern Olympism'. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no. 12 (2007): 1701-23.
- Park, Roberta J. 'Setting the Scene - Bridging the Gap between Knowledge and Practice: When Americans Really Built Programmes to Foster Healthy Lifestyles, 1918-1940'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25, no. 11 (2008): 1427-52
- Polley, Martin. 'No Business of Ours?: The Foreign Office and the Olympic Games, 1896-1914'. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 13, no. 2 (1996): 96-113.
- Polley, Martin. "'The Amateur Rules": Amateurism and Professionalism in Post-War British Athletics'. *Contemporary British History* 14, no. 2 (2000): 81-114.
- Polley, Martin. 'Olympic Diplomacy: The British Government and the Projected 1940 Olympic Games'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 9, no. 2 (2002): 169-87.
- Polley, Martin. 'The Amateur Ideal and British Sports Diplomacy, 1900-1945'. *Sport in History* 26, no. 3 (2006): 450-67.
- Pope, Steven W. 'Amateurism and American Sports Culture: The Invention of an Athletic Tradition in the United States, 1870-1900'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 13, no. 3 (1996): 290-309.
- Rider, Toby. 'An Unwitting Target: The IOC, Exiled Athletes, and US Government Covert Operations, 1950-1960'. *International Olympic Committee Research Project* (2010): 1-53.
- Riordan, James. 'The Role of Sport in Soviet Foreign Policy'. *Soviet Studies* 26, no. 3 (1974): 322-43.
- Riordan, James. 'Some Comparisons of Women's Sport in East and West'. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 20, no. 1-2 (1985): 117-26.
- Riordan, James. 'Sports Medicine in the Soviet Union and German Democratic Republic'. *Social Science and Medicine* 25, no. 1 (1987): 19-28.
- Riordan, James. 'Rewriting Soviet Sports History'. *Journal of Sports History* 20, no. 3 (1993): 247-58.
- Riordan, James. 'The Rise and Fall of the Soviet Olympic Champions'. *Olympika* 11 (1993): 25-44.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. 'Professionalism in Sports'. *The North American Review* 151, no. 405 (1890): 187-91.
- Ryba, Tatiana, Natalia Stambulova, and Craig Wrisberg. 'The Russian Origins of Sport Psychology: A Translation of an Early Work of A. C. Puni'. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 17, no. 2 (2005): 157-69.
- Saville, John. 'C. R. Attlee: An Assessment'. *Socialist Register* 20 (1983): 144-67.
- Segrave, Jeffrey O., and Don Chu, 'Introduction - The Modern Olympic Games: A Contemporary Sociocultural Analysis'. *Quest* 48 (1996): 2-8.
- Storrey, Thomas. 'The Immediate influence of Exercise upon the Irritability of Human Voluntary Muscle'. *American Journal of Physiology* 9, no. 1 (1903): 52-5.
- Taplin, Eric. 'The Labour General Transport Strike, 1911'. *North West Labour History* 36 (2012): 4-9.
- Telfer, Hamish. 'To Be Seen But Never Heard: The Struggle For a "Voice" for Coaches in Britain: A Brief Account of the Context, Life Cycle and Demise of the British Association of National Coaches (BANC)'. *International Sports Studies* 33, no. 1 (2011): 49-64.
- Terret, Thierry. 'Professional Swimming in England before the Rise of Amateurism, 1837-75'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 12, no. 1 (1995): 18-32.
- Terret, Thierry. 'Introduction: Post War Games'. *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 27, no. 6 (2010): 1001-5.

- Theorie und Praxis der Körperkultur [Theory and Practice of Physical Culture]. 3 (1976): 76. Quoted in James Riordan, 'Some Comparisons of Women's Sport in East and West'. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 20, no. 1-2 (1985): 117-26.
- Thompson, Edward Palmer. 'Patrician Society, Plebeian Culture'. *Journal of Social History* 7, no. 4 (1974): 382-405.
- Thompson, Edward Palmer. 'Eighteenth-Century English Society: Class Struggle Without Class?'. *Social History*, no. 3 (1978): 133-65.
- Waddington, Ivan. 'The Development of Sports Medicine'. *Sociology of Sports Journal* 12 (1996): 179-96.
- Wagg, Stephen. "'Time Gentlemen Please": The Decline of Amateur Captaincy in English County Cricket'. *Contemporary British History* 14, no. 2 (2008): 31-59.
- Warwick, Paul. 'Did Britain Change? An Inquiry into the Causes of National Decline'. *Journal of Contemporary History* 20, no. 1 (1985): 99-133.
- Washburn, John. 'Sport as a Soviet Tool'. *Foreign Affairs* 34, no. 3 (1956): 490-9.
- Winter, Jay. "'Lost Generation" of the First World War'. *Population Studies* 31, no. 3 (1977): 449-66.
- Wolfe Scheffler, Robin. 'The Fate of a Progressive Science: The Harvard Fatigue Laboratory, Athletes, the Science of Work and the Politics of Reform'. *Endeavour* 35, no. 2-3 (2011): 48-54.
- Wrynn, Alison. 'A Debt Was Paid off in Tears: Science, IOC Politics and the Debate about High-Altitude in the 1968 Mexico City Olympics'. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 23, no. 7 (2006): 1152-72.
- Zoth, Oskar. 'Ueber die Formen der Pedalarbeit beim Radfahren' [On the forms of pedal work in cycling]. *European Journal of Physiology* 76, no.7-8 (1899): 319-55.

Theses

- Bourne, Nicholas David. 'Fast Science: A History of Training Theory and Methods for Elite Runners Through 1975'. PhD diss., Texas University, 2008.
- Day, Dave. 'From Barclay to Brickett: Coaching Practices and Coaching Lives in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century England'. PhD diss., DeMontfort University, 2008.
- Lake, Robert James. 'Social Exclusion in British tennis: A History of Privilege and Prejudice'. PhD diss., Brunel University, 2008.
- Parks, Jenifer. 'Red Sport, Red Tape: The Olympic Games, the Soviet Sports Bureaucracy, and the Cold War, 1952-1980'. PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 2009.
- Phillpots, Kyle. 'The Professionalisation of Rugby'. PhD diss., University of Warwick, 2000.

Conference Presentations and Speeches

- Brackenridge, Celia. 'Ostrich or Eagle? Protection and Professionalism in Sport Science and Coaching'. Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences, Newport, South Wales, September 4-7, 2001.
- Day, Dave. 'A Man Cannot See His Own Faults': British Professional Trainers and the 1912 Olympics'. Paper presented at the Sport and Leisure History Seminar, London, February 6, 2012.
- Dyson, Geoffrey. 'Forty Years on: Some Thoughts on Coaching and Development'. Paper Presented at the International Olympic Academy Nineteenth Session, Olympia, July 6-19, 1979.
- Eassom, Simon B. 'From the Bank to the Baron: A 200 Year History of Amateurism Embedded in the Olympic Ideal'. Paper presented at the Second International Symposium for Olympic research, Ontario, Canada, October, 1994.

- Jeffreys, Kevin. 'The Impact of the Wolfenden Report on Sport'. Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the British Society of Sports History, Wellcome Collection, London, September 10-11, 2010.
- Keys, Barbara. 'The Soviet Union, Global Culture, and the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games'. Paper presented at the Conference of Globalization of Sport in Historical Context, University of California, Sand Diego, March, 2005.
- Mewett, Peter. 'Sports Training, Science and Class among British Amateur Athletes in the Mid to Late Nineteenth Century'. Paper Presented at the TASA Conference, University of Western Australia and Murdoch University, December 4-7, 2006.

Internet Resources

- BBC Sport. '2012 Funding Sport-by-Sport'. http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/olympic_games/7761495.stm (accessed January 6, 2012).
- BBC Sport. 'London 2012: Dwain Chambers Eligible after Court Ruling', April 30, 2012. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/olympics/17853070> (accessed July 5, 2012).
- Beckett, Ian F W. 'Grenfell, William Henry, Baron Desborough (1855-1945)'. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online Edition, January 2011. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33566> (accessed October 25, 2011).
- Buchanan, Ian. 'Cook, Sir Theodore Andrea (1867-1928)'. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online Edition. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/55483> (accessed October 25, 2011).
- Canada's Sports Hall of Fame. 'Walter Knox'. <http://www.sportshall.ca/honoured-members/27778/walter-knox/> (accessed September 6, 2011).
- Historic Inflation Calculator. <http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-1633409/Historic-inflation-calculator-value-money-changed-1900.html>.
- Hurd, Douglas to Hector Munro, April 21, 1980. <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/foi/images/0,,1717021,00.html> (accessed April 26, 2012).
- Indiana University. 'Doc Counsilman: Making Waves. <http://www.indiana.edu/~radiotv/wtiu/doc/docbio.html> (accessed February 9, 2012).
- International Swimming Hall of Fame. Jan Stender (NED). <http://www.ishof.org/Honorees/73/73jstender.html> (accessed February 7, 2012).
- Jonathan Stevenson. 'The Story of the 1966 World Cup', Jonathan Steveson's Blog BBC Sport. http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/jonathanstevenson/2010/05/the_story_of_the_1966_world_cu.html (accessed June 26, 2012).
- Mason, Tony. 'Dyson. Geoffrey Harry George (1914-1981)'. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online Edition, May 2012. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/100477?back=,104312> (accessed May 31, 2012).
- Oral History Association. 'Principles and Standards of the Oral History Association'. <http://www.oralhistory.org/do-oral-history/principles-and-practices/oral-history-evaluation-guidelines-revised-in-2000/#1.3> (accessed April 26, 2012).
- Oxford Online Dictionary. s.v. 'amateur'. <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/amateur?region=us> (accessed October 31, 2011).
- Tucker, Ross. 'Coaching and Science: What's the Big Deal and Who Cares for the Science?'. The Science of Sport. <http://www.sportsscientists.com/2009/10/coaching-and-science-asset-or-liability.html> (accessed July 4, 2012).

Ward, Tony. 'Geoff Dyson and the Appliance of Science'. <http://tonyward-trackchat.blogspot.com/2009/04/geoff-dyson-and-appliance-of-science.html> (accessed February 10, 2012).