

Please cite the Published Version

Lake, RJ, Eaves, SJ and Nicholson, R (2018) The Development and Transformation of Anglo-American Relations in Lawn Tennis around the Turn of the Twentieth Century. *Sport History Review*, 49 (1). pp. 1-22. ISSN 1087-1659

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/shr.2017-0029>

Publisher: Human Kinetics

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/620055/>

Additional Information: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript provided by Human kinetics of a paper published in *Sport History Review*.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

The Development and Transformation of Anglo-American Relations in Lawn Tennis around the Turn of the Twentieth Century

Robert J. Lake, Simon J. Eaves & Bob Nicholson

Article submission for *Sport History Review*

Abstract

Anglo-American relations in tennis are a fascinating subject, particularly in the period of the late-19th/early-20th century, during which the developments seen both on and off court were reflective and indicative of broader societal shifts, as the US gradually replaced Britain as the world's leading industrialized nation. The aims of this paper are to discuss how Anglo-American relations in lawn tennis shifted throughout this period, from when lawn tennis was "invented" in Britain to the onset of the Great War, and to contextualize these developments in the light of shifting geo-political/economic and cultural relations more generally between the two nations, alongside developments within sport and tennis more specifically. Shifts in the following areas are examined: attitudes toward and opinions of the relative standards of both American and British tennis players from the general public, correspondents and the media of the other nation, in terms of their overall rank and possibilities of success; and, attitudes from tennis officials toward the formal organization of competitions between players of both nations.

Keywords

American exceptionalism; Americanization; trans-Atlantic relations; British imperialism; Davis Cup

Introduction

The decades around the turn of the 20th century marked a transition in Anglo-American relations. Britain enjoyed its most dominant period of imperial rule, but the growing power of an insurgent United States raised questions about how long this status quo might last. As early as 1878, Gladstone argued that the American economy was “passing [Britain] by in a canter” and that Uncle Sam would “at some no very distant time” usurp John Bull’s dominant global position.¹ Britain must recognize this impending challenge and address what he later termed ‘the paramount question of the American future’.² For the next four decades, the prospect of a coming “American future” hung over Britain like a star-spangled Sword of Damocles and cast its shadow over a wide range of transatlantic exchanges and encounters.

The late-nineteenth century saw improvements in transatlantic communication and transportation that facilitated an ever-increasing flow of information, products and people between both nations. After installing the first effective transatlantic telegraph cable in 1866, news that once travelled by boat now pulsed “across the pond” in a matter of hours.³ Similarly, while transatlantic sailing had once been lengthy and uncomfortable, by the 1870s fleets of well-appointed ocean-liners enabled millions of people from all social backgrounds to make the journey in under a week.⁴ The everyday lives of ordinary British and American men and women were becoming increasingly entangled, and meetings between them afforded opportunities to assess relative strengths, dissect political and cultural differences, and assert competing models of national identity.

Underlying these developing relations were also tensions over competing values and belief systems, as both nations fought across various domains for global dominance. Bricknell argues: ‘Geographically and now commercially large, America had by the 1890s become a central player in international markets and foreign affairs. ... The New World stood for everything the old did not; classlessness, equality, youth, meritocracy and dynamism’.⁵ Perceptions of these values were shaped by the rhetoric of “American exceptionalism”; a belief that the United States was destined to transform the world in its own image. For almost a century following the revolution, Britain had the economic and political dominance to denounce predictions of America’s future supremacy, but following the American Civil War, the US ‘overtook Britain in terms of per capita income and industrial output’ and established itself as the ‘world’s leading manufacturing economy’.⁶ Subsequently, British newspapers featured anxious discussions about the “decaying” health of local industries.⁷ Finally, a signal of America’s long-standing policy of political isolationism nearing its end came with the Spanish-American war in 1898. Together, these developments led the Victorian journalist W.T. Stead to conclude that the *Americanization of the World* could no longer be dismissed as empty revolutionary rhetoric, but would become the ‘trend of the twentieth century’.⁸

As previous historical research has demonstrated, sport was a key arena where broader transatlantic tensions were played out.⁹ While the British had a long history of imparting imperial doctrines through cricket and rugby, ‘Britain’s “natural” and inevitable sporting supremacy failed to impress her American rivals. Sport for them, just like wars, trade or commerce was another avenue for beating, bettering or defeating the Old World’.¹⁰ Americans found sports an opportunistic platform from which to promote a positive nationalist discourse in relation to the British, partly through actively redeveloping the English team sports of cricket, rounders and rugby.¹¹ ‘Nationalist desires to differentiate the young republic from its former colonial master’, argued Keys, ‘played a role in the creation of distinct US variations of [these] English sports’, into baseball and American football.¹²

The British often reacted with both disdain and fascination to American cultural forms, though in sport, as in other spheres, the British usually believed their own institutions, practices and policies were superior if not irreproachable. They faced growing fears that

America's aggressively egalitarian version of democracy could undermine Britain's long-held and deeply stratified class system, which was sustained by the widely-held belief that 'guiding the masses' was an upper-class 'responsibility'.¹³ Approaches to sport were a key target, but, often unwilling to negotiate "amateur" ideals, the British initially projected *their* version of amateurism – in the image of a "gentleman amateur" – as unequivocally *the* version to which all athletes worldwide should replicate.¹⁴

American officials, however, were less concerned about limiting coaching/training opportunities or the unrelenting pursuit of competitive success, and American athletes seemed to play sport with less restraint and with a more performance-oriented approach. This became increasingly commonplace in American sport, as Frederick Taylor's theory of "scientific management" (or "Taylorism"), which sought to analyze and synthesize workflows to improve economic efficiency and labour productivity in the workplace, made inroads in other spheres of human endeavour throughout the late-19th/early-20th centuries. American athletes, according to Rader, brought 'the same winning-at-all-costs ethos that prevailed in the marketplace. Hence, defeating one's rivals by any means... was consistent with their experiences in the world of commerce and industry'.¹⁵ This attitude ultimately gave American athletes an edge, but the British criticized their general approach to sport, depicted them as 'savages' and 'cads, cheats, liars who... were incapable of [sportsmanship]... and who knew little about the finer things in life and cared even less: in short, ill-mannered, uncultured philistines'.¹⁶ Their ensuing rivalry was exposed, perhaps most famously, during the 1908 Olympic Games, when divergent interpretations of "amateurism", particularly related to coaching/training in track-and-field athletics, brought a protracted power struggle.¹⁷ There were similar tensions in rowing, sailing and swimming.¹⁸

To date, the sport of lawn tennis within this story has been under-explored, despite it occupying a significant socio-cultural position among upper-middle-class elites.¹⁹ Certainly during early Davis Cup contests and in the years preceding its emergence in 1900, lawn tennis fuelled the flames of Anglo-American sporting rivalry, mirroring broader societal developments in several interesting ways and, like other spheres of popular culture, influenced how the respective British and American public thought of the other. The aims of this paper are to discuss Anglo-American relations in lawn tennis around the turn of the century. The various phases explored here encapsulate the inherent tensions and challenges faced during periods of declining British and rising American prowess, demonstrate how shifting Anglo-American relations in lawn tennis reflected broader social, cultural, political and economic/industrial developments, as Britain's position as the world's leading superpower was challenged by the US.

Early Developments

The reaction of Americans to the introduction of lawn tennis into their republic in the 1870s was not greeted with the same desire for differentiation as with cricket and football. This was probably due to the different timings of their introductions but also likely due to how the different classes in America responded to new British cultural forms. Immediately upon its emergence in Britain, lawn tennis boasted aristocratic clientele and, within a few years, a prestigious tournament – the Wimbledon Championships – that quickly established itself within the London "season".²⁰

As was typical of 19th-century "old money" in the US, they regarded aristocratic British recreations with awe and sought to emulate or even ape them through conspicuous consumption.²¹ This was seen in outdoor pursuits like sailing alongside club-based sports like golf and lawn tennis along the eastern seaboard, where clubhouses oftentimes dwarfed their

British equivalents in sheer size and opulence. As lawn tennis sets traversed the Atlantic, supplied with updated lists of aristocrats who had purchased the game, so too did news of Britain's first famous champions of the 1880s, the Renshaw brothers. The socially aspirational "nouveau riche" found lawn tennis a suitably active pastime that afforded them enhanced status.²² As the American population grew and the power balance gradually shifted toward the new-money entrepreneurial class, only the old elite enclaves like Newport, RI remained as symbols of their once dominant socio-cultural, if not also economic and political, positions. As in other socio-cultural domains, lawn tennis slowly democratized in the early-mid twentieth century, whereby traditional American republican values were increasingly mixed with capitalist values of the insurgent professional classes.

British lawn tennis commanded international reverence, through its leading clubs, tournaments and players, alongside its own Lawn Tennis Association (LTA), which formed in 1888 to rapidly become the de facto international federation, before the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF) commenced operations in 1913. Dozens of overseas clubs and associations sought LTA affiliation in the 1890s/1900s, as British rules and regulations were almost universally accepted, but the USNLTA chose not to.²³ Their refusal to affiliate, in broader terms, reflected the assertiveness to "go it alone" that had long been characteristic of America's relationship with Britain, in numerous other aspects, including music, theatre and language.

In the aftermath of the Revolution, for example, efforts were quickly made to establish, codify and celebrate a distinctively American branch of the English language that showed little deference in matters of spelling, vocabulary, and grammar. 'As an independent nation', proclaimed the lexicographer, Noah Webster:

Our honor requires us to have a system of our own, in language as well as government. Great Britain... should no longer be our standard. ... She is at too great a distance to be our model, and to instruct us in the principles of our own tongue.²⁴

A similar impulse informed the administration of American lawn tennis. While they shared some socio-cultural similarities with Britain, the aspirational middle class who occupied an increasingly central role in administration were less deferential than their "old money" counterparts, and not afraid to distinguish themselves. They adopted Wimbledon's rules for their national championships in Newport, instituted in 1881, and also used the British "Ayres" ball before switching to the American-made Wright & Ditson ball in 1887.²⁵ However, for reasons not yet fully understood, they also developed their own amateur definition, in 1889, some years before the British thought it expedient to do so,²⁶ and instituted different rules for the foot-fault and the length of breaks between sets.

Despite "exceptionalist" beliefs, the Americans continued to recognize British players as legitimate champions until at least the mid-1890s. British prowess, however, was often assumed rather than explicitly tested, given the lack of opportunities for international competitions.²⁷ Nevertheless, American officials such as James Dwight, USNLTA President from 1882-84, believed strongly that they would eventually beat the British, but only through intense preparations and training that involved challenging and learning from them. So impressed was Dwight with reports of the Renshaw's play that he arranged to train with them in Cannes in 1884, before competing alongside them in several British tournaments, joined by fellow Americans Richard Sears and A.L. Rives. Of these endeavours, the British weekly, *Pastime*, wrote condescendingly: 'Our visitors are here on a pleasure trip, and do not pretend to be equal to the Renshaw's, [Herbert] Lawford and others. They play to learn, not teach'.²⁸

Of the three Americans that competed at Wimbledon in the 1880s, only Dwight progressed beyond the first round by reaching the 1885 quarter-final. From such results, Americans tended to agree with British assessments of their comparative abilities. An American correspondent in *Pastime* admitted: 'The number of good players is continually

increasing. When I say good players, I mean good for us. We have only two American players [Dwight and Sears] who compare well with the better class of English players'; below them, there was 'quite a break'.²⁹ It was an assessment shared by many. Henry Slocum, a leading American player, emasculated American males by stating of their relative inferiority: 'the playing of ... several English women, is better than that of the average man in this country'.³⁰ Such acuties reflected, according to Park, a broader 'anxiety that Americans were physically inferior to their English contemporaries'.³¹

Perceptions of American inferiority also persisted off court. While they sought to institute a world-leading national championship, American officials immediately recognized they could not compete with Wimbledon's prestige, nor its tradition and high-class – and later, royal – patronage. This was certainly indicative of American fascination, at least among north-eastern elites, with British high culture, often showing deference in matters of taste. While American writers were often keen to emphasise their country's cultural independence and bang the drum of exceptionalism, crumbs of praise from the British were hungrily sought after and consumed. The successes of Mark Twain, Buffalo Bill and other American writers and performers in Britain, alongside cultural exports like American humour, slang, wild-west shows and cocktail-drinks, were enthusiastically celebrated by the American press. Indeed, while some Victorian critics denigrated American popular culture, many Britons were fascinated to explore American life and cultural innovations.³²

Similarly, the ways in which Americans both played and organized lawn tennis was another point of British fascination. Their curiosity was particularly apparent early on. *Pastime* wrote favourably of American advances in 1885:

The rapidity with which lawn tennis assumed a leading position in England is likely to be rivalled by its progress in the United States. Rarely do our Yankee cousins take up anything, whether it business, politics, or pleasure, in a half-hearted manner, and the genuine "thoroughness" with which our genteel pastime has been adopted by them augurs well for its future in America.³³

Another correspondent situated the insurgence of American lawn tennis within their emerging global dominance at large:

It is universally admitted nowadays that there is much weight in the claims... that the land of the future lies beyond the Atlantic. It therefore behoves the philosopher who would form an idea of the character of the coming race... to keep an eye on the pursuits of our American kinsmen. At present there are unmistakable indications of a great "boom" in lawn tennis throughout the Northern States.

However, the article went on to disparage American tennis as 'crude and immature', by way of critiquing magazine photographs:

Long vistas of serried courts are depicted with luxurious club-houses in the background; but one notices with amazement that primitive nets and posts are general and in a photo-engraving of a match for the championship, the two competitors are playing in a double court with a long double net without side-stays. These relics of the dark ages are, to say the least, instructive.

Nevertheless, the article concluded confidently that 'within a few years the Americans [will] have as much to teach us about the game as they have now to learn from us'.³⁴

British player, E.C. Meers, highlighted the British fascination with American tennis, declaring: 'Some account of the present state of the game of lawn tennis in America is certain to prove interesting to the readers of *Pastime*'. Having just returned from the US Nationals – one of the first British players to compete there – he spared few details in describing 'what he saw and heard'. American rackets and balls were different but still satisfactory, but other aspects were markedly inferior; their nets were 'most flimsy' and net-posts intruded on play, rising a foot above the height of the net. The Newport courts were 'good, level, true and well-

kept', but others were 'very bad... such as no good English player would attempt to play upon [them]'.³⁵ He continued: 'the general standard of play among the first fifteen or twenty of the American experts is very far above what it has been the habit of the players on our side of the water to think'. The male players were 'courteous and educated gentlemen, and more jealous even than ourselves, if possible, for the honour and gentlemanly conduct of the game'. However, he concluded:

I do not think that the Americans will beat us at lawn tennis... but they have done enough both to encourage themselves and to show us that we must not stand still if we wish to keep the lead. May they go on and prosper will be the hearty wish of all English lawn-tennis players.³⁶

British readers were later regaled by descriptions of palatial American club grounds, including one in Louisville, Kentucky that featured 'a good-sized gymnasium, dining-room', 'social rooms for ladies and gentlemen', 'a large veranda [surrounding] the building on all sides' and 'sixteen fine turf courts'. 'Evidently lawn tennis players in Louisville are ahead of those in England so far as club houses are concerned'.³⁷

These mixed accounts neatly capture the twin narratives of British perceptions of American cultural advances generally. While some were in awe of their energy and dynamism and respected America's more egalitarian society, others wrote condescendingly of American culture as uncouth and vulgar. Overall, the sense that the future of lawn tennis prowess lay westward was expressed by numerous commentators. Still, in Britain, some clung blindly to the belief in British methods, while others seemed unconcerned about the likelihood of being overtaken by American play; LTA officials showed inertia in reacting to claims that Britain's dominance was waning.³⁸ Regarding American advances, one *Pastime* correspondent responded: 'Let us hope that we may next season have the pleasure of entertaining the coming winner of the American Championship at Wimbledon, even if we have to congratulate him on adding our laurels to his own'.³⁹

British attitudes toward their potential loss of on-court prowess can be located within broader contexts of a declining empire and burgeoning American nationalism. Rather than show dismay, the British often celebrated the success of their American (and Australasian) "cousins", as they were not considered "true" foreigners. This phenomenon was seen across many cultural domains. Indeed, when W.T. Stead contemplated the prospect of a coming American future, he interpreted it as an inheritance built upon Britain's own achievements:

As the creation of the Americans is the greatest achievement of our race, there is no reason to resent the part the Americans are playing in refashioning the world in their image, which, after all, is substantially the image of ourselves.⁴⁰

For him, and other political thinkers like Cecil Rhodes, the US was no longer a competitor, but a powerful global partner that would ensure Britain's continued influence and act as a counterweight to the insurgence of Russia and Germany.⁴¹ In sport, the adoption of competitors from British dominions – e.g. South Africa, Canada, Australia and New Zealand – as honorary "Britishers" persisted deep into the twentieth century, and underlined their interwar efforts to create an Empire team for the Olympics. However, the extension of this honorary position to Americans was never comprehensively or wholeheartedly adopted, which suggests, perhaps, that opinions similar to Stead's developed into minority ones as British-American sporting relations become increasingly antagonistic throughout the early 20th century.

For British tennis officials, of greater concern than losing matches was losing their position of leadership as *the* recognized guardians of how the sport should be played and administrated globally. Though assisted by it, their sense of dominance did not absolutely depend on on-court supremacy. The Americans, however, attached great importance to on-court victories, as a means to legitimize their efforts and provide a platform to challenge the

British. Given how they approached other sporting contests, like sailing's America's Cup,⁴² the British perhaps should have been prepared for the Americans in lawn tennis to attach greater political significance to international contests.

Emerging Tensions

In Britain, tensions emerged with their American cousins over on- and off-court matters. At times, they showed dismay toward seemingly unwelcome American encroachments onto "their" sports' hallowed grounds. Sometimes, opposition came across as cultural snobbery, as when "Cavendish", a leading tennis official, criticized the infiltration of American phraseology into popular vernacular, e.g.: 'taking' games, 'semi-final', and 'tournament' instead of prize-meeting.⁴³

Tensions also emerged over disagreements in rules and regulations. The British were incredulous when, in 1889, the Americans adopted a slightly different foot-fault rule for serving. In two separate *Pastime* articles, the USNLTA were urged to concede to British authority on the matter:

It is to be regretted that the laws of lawn tennis adopted by the USNLTA are not identical with those in force in this country. Any diversity in the laws renders international matches more difficult to arrange. ... Surely the association of America and the Colonies could agree with *our* LTA to accept one code of laws [emphasis added].⁴⁴

Alongside criticisms of American courts and equipment – e.g. nets, net posts, balls and rackets – the British also targeted American tactical approaches. *Pastime* critiqued the advice being offered to female players by Henry Slocum:

It is strange... to find such an authority recommending ladies to master the volley in order to economise energy. In this country no player of experience doubts that the exertion of running up to the net in the single game is much more exhausting than playing from the back of the court. ... Such little points as these are signs of the crude and immature condition of lawn tennis in America.⁴⁵

Here, Slocum was advocating an aggressive volley game for female players, to approach the net and finish points early to conserve energy, but the British discounted this advice. Though divergent gender norms in Britain and America were not uncovered in previous research that examined gendered etiquette and playing styles in women's tennis, this statement could provide evidence of such a distinction emerging,⁴⁶ while the American is advocating an aggressive approach, the British reject the idea of female players exerting themselves so assertively. It also, perhaps more obviously, indicates divergent attitudes toward training and physical preparation, as the British seem to discount Slocum's progressive advice. This demonstrates how, at the root of some of these developing tensions, there were issues of class, gender, respectability and different interpretations of amateurism. The British naturally considered themselves administrative leaders and also the authorities on proper decorum and taste, setting standards that all players were expected to respect and adhere.⁴⁷ Meanwhile, the Americans asserted themselves as leaders in coaching and training methods, privileging a more proactive approach to developing talent.⁴⁸

Outside of sport, similar viewpoints were expressed as British commentators condemned aspects of American culture that were slowly infiltrating British society. For example, many cultural gatekeepers viewed with alarm the introduction of sensationalised American editorial and typographical techniques into late-Victorian, popular newspapers; the gross materialism and advanced democratic egalitarianism of American society was an ominous portent, and their newspapers seemed to encapsulate this threat most virulently.⁴⁹

Similarly, the financial journalist Raymond Radclyffe attacked the vulgarity of modern American culture and its rejection of traditional values: '[Chicago] has no law beyond that of the dollars; no morality and no manners. ... Its newspapers are filled with the vilest advertisements. ... Education, refinement – everything is sacrificed to the need of the hour – money'.⁵⁰ Naturally, these visceral condemnations of American culture served to reinforce Britain's national identity as the arbiter of good taste; a cultural primacy that no amount of dollars could buy.⁵¹

Cultural representations in lawn tennis were part of the same process, but a stumbling block for the aspirational Americans in the 1880s-90s was the lack of British interest in arranging transatlantic competitions. While James Dwight persisted in his quest to attract British players to American tournaments and institute an official challenge-match, the LTA were unresponsive, refusing to officially sanction American tours, declining opportunities to institute challenge-matches, and also smugly proclaiming the US Nationals unworthy of British interest and the USNLTA as essentially administratively inferior.⁵² Even when Dwight approached the LTA directly in 1897, albeit through his friend but by then *former* LTA Secretary, Herbert Chipp, the Council declined on tenuous 'financial grounds'.⁵³ This response was indicative of British conceit at the time, stemming from class- and racially-based imperialist ideology, as they looked down upon other administrative bodies that did not share their values or exalted status.⁵⁴

Throughout this period, the British frequently ridiculed American playing conditions. The LTA's official mouthpiece, *Pastime*, was one of several publications that made overstated claims 'tainted with hyperbole'. As Lake describes: 'Sensationalist reports exaggerated American deficiencies; they were described as inferior players, who used sub-standard rackets, balls, nets and posts, played on poorly-maintained courts and according to inferior rules'.⁵⁵ Even the American climate was targeted; E.C. Meers described the 'humid atmosphere' in the North-East as 'to say the best of it, trying', while another correspondent discussed 'the heat of a New York August' and the 'fabled mosquito' as issues.⁵⁶ These points reinforced British conceptions of their own superiority, and likely deterred British players from competing in the US. Later, they became convenient excuses for British defeats.

Dwight continued to pursue the development of Anglo-American relations throughout the 1890s, despite being discouraged by the LTA's intransigence and further mediocre performances from American players at Wimbledon; it was not until 1898 that an American ventured beyond the third round. Dwight's efforts were indicative of American enthusiasm to seek competitive sporting relations with Britain, as Pope and Nauright described: 'Symptomatic of more than a century of cultural rivalry, elite Americans were especially keen to imitate and test the "mother" country. This sporting rivalry... raged (especially) from the late-nineteenth century through to the mid-twentieth'. While the US pursued its "manifest destiny" of cultural expansion, partly through instituting sporting relations with Britain; the British, it seems, at least initially, 'viewed such competitions as "sporting" rather than do or die events'.⁵⁷

In 1894, the first year of his second USNLTA presidential term, Dwight stated: 'There is nothing that I should like better than to see some of the best English players here'; such visits would 'excite more interest or stimulate our players more'. Regular contests would 'put players on their mettle as nothing else possibly could', and would allow comparisons to 'be drawn between the different styles of play, which would be beneficial to both, but particularly to the American game'.⁵⁸ That summer, the popular Irishman Manliffe Goodbody returned after two previous sojourns (1888 & 1892) to compete in several American tournaments, before reaching the Challenge Round of the US Nationals. The *New York Times* reported: 'Goodbody deserves a vote of thanks, according to lovers of tennis. His appearance at Newport imparted a kind of international flavor to the proceedings and roused

interest in the game to the highest pitch'. His ventures were expected to lead to 'international contests' staged 'on both sides of the water'.⁵⁹

Goodbody's compatriots, Joshua Pim (1893 and '94 Wimbledon champion) and Harold Mahony (future Wimbledon champion, 1896), returned in 1895 by personal invitation from Dwight's friend Harry L. Ayer, of Boston's West Newton Neighborhood Club, to play in a round-robin competition against four top American players; the Irish pair won all but one of their matches. The event's success resulted in a reciprocal tour to Britain in 1896 for one of the American players, Bill Larned, which was sanctioned by Dwight and the USNLTA, alongside another sojourn for Mahony, with his British comrades Wilberforce Eaves and Harold Nisbet, back to the US in 1897. The following summer, Dwight tried to send Americans Larned and Bob Wrenn over to Britain, but due to 'business engagements' and some of their compatriots volunteering in the Spanish-American War, a tour never materialized.⁶⁰ These reciprocal tours played a vital role in instituting the Davis Cup in 1900.

American Ascendancy at Home

From the late-1890s, events abroad helped precipitate the growing feeling among the British that their nation and its Empire were in decline. The Second Boer War, from 1899-1902, became an embarrassing fiasco as British preparations and tactics were widely condemned.⁶¹ The increasing industrial might of Germany and the US also invited a crisis of confidence, as the British seemed perceptively unwilling to adopt new technologies and modernize in accordance with foreign methods, thus stifling creativity, innovation, entrepreneurialism and the "scientific spirit".⁶²

America, on the other hand, was closely associated in the Victorian imagination with innovation. Thomas Edison, for example, was widely known in Britain and his company's latest inventions received regular press coverage.⁶³ Similarly, when Chicago hosted the 1893 World's Fair, British visitors enjoyed 'an early encounter with tomorrow' amidst a modern metropolis of towering skyscrapers and electrified streetcars.⁶⁴ While some British critics attacked the frenetic pace and vulgar commercialism of modern American life, the contrast between Uncle Sam's "go ahead" energy and John Bull's apparent stagnation caused alarm.

This sense of decline was also reflected in numerous sports, including rowing and track-and-field athletics. The 1869 Oxford-Harvard boat race, only narrowly won by the heavily-favoured British crew along its own Thames River, signalled the end of unequivocal British dominance. Some years later, in 1895, the mighty London Athletic Club was shocked in defeat in Manhattan to the New York Athletic Club, losing all eleven of its events. Similarly with lawn tennis, despite Dwight modestly claiming in early 1897 that 'the English players are class for class better than ours',⁶⁵ the late-summer US tour of Mahony, Eaves and Nisbet proved a key turning-point. Not only did it strengthen and deepen Anglo-American relations, but also reinforced for the Americans 'a growing belief of equality on the lawn courts'.⁶⁶ The British trio performed worse than expected; only Eaves made a significant impact across the four tournaments by reaching the Challenge Round of the US Nationals.⁶⁷ These results led Jehial Parmly Paret, the American lawn tennis player and journalist, to proclaim: 'American players have won the greatest international victory in the annals of the sport'.⁶⁸ Others saw this as "proof" of America "catching up", an outcome many considered inevitable. London's *St. James's Gazette* opined: 'perhaps next year America will be the leading country for the game'.⁶⁹

Several British correspondents and the players themselves offered accounts of their poor performances in the 1897 tour. Eaves, for example, condemned the seven-minute breaks between sets, which, when 'further extended by one's opponent claiming the services of a

shoe-cleaner', were considered unsporting: 'it seems to me that a decided encroachment on one's good nature is made'.⁷⁰ Similarly, "unfamiliar climatic conditions" were again raised as an issue; the British players were 'prevented from showing their true form because of the impossibility of becoming acclimatised in the time of their disposal', argued a *Lawn Tennis* correspondent. "Enthusiast", from the USNLTA's *Lawn Tennis Bulletin*, responded:

We all on both sides of the water expected the Englishmen to win... but when... it was demonstrated beyond a doubt that our two best American players are at least equal to the three English visitors, it comes with exceedingly bad grace... to claim that the three players were... ill all the time from the effects of [the climate].⁷¹

With an obvious bias, *Lawn Tennis Bulletin* concluded its assessment of the 1897 tour by discounting any excuses: 'The fact is that our players have been improving very fast in the last three years, and we have now demonstrated beyond a doubt that in tennis we are on a full par with the English'.⁷² To substantiate this claim, however, the Americans exaggerated the British players' rankings, particularly Eaves' who was proclaimed 'the foremost player in England'.⁷³ It was said: 'There is no better tennis player in the world than W.V. Eaves. ... A careful student... cannot fail to rank Eaves either a tie for first with R.F. Doherty' or equal to or better than 'the great Wilfred Baddeley'. While Eaves was certainly exceptionally good, to rank a player who had not yet won a Wimbledon singles crown – and never would – as better than or even equal to Doherty, who went on to win four straight from 1897-1900, and Baddeley, who won three times already, between 1891 and '95, is misleading. Nevertheless, it was claimed: 'No fair-minded critic can now say we are not the unqualified equals in singles of our English brothers. In doubles we are their superiors'.⁷⁴

Paret perhaps gave the most balanced accounts during this period. Recognizing that Wimbledon's conditions presented an equal if not greater disadvantage upon American players, he admitted they 'will often find themselves outclassed', hampered by British weather and climate. In many tournaments, 'wind or rain or both make good play very difficult', and 'an American who is accustomed to bright warm days and little or no wind will find these conditions a decided handicap'. Accordingly, despite American advances, Paret still considered the British superior:

The best of the British experts... would have a better chance for our championship than any of our men abroad. Under neutral conditions... I should expect a close match but ultimate defeat for the best team we could turn out if opposed by the best of the British.⁷⁵

As no challenge-matches or tours took place in 1898 and 1899, the next meeting was the inaugural Davis Cup contest in 1900, when the British were comprehensively defeated 3-0 at Boston's Longwood Cricket Club. These performances now invited discussions beyond climate and playing conditions, to comparative skills and tactics. Some American correspondents, such as the highly-ranked player Clarence Hobart, continued to assume British superiority in the standards of courts, equipment, facilities and tournaments, opining in *Golf and Lawn Tennis*: 'In almost every particular the English accessories are nearer to the ideal than ours'. In what must have seemed music to British ears, he then asserted: 'Should we not, then, aim to conform closely to English standards wherever we see an improvement on our own?'.⁷⁶ Indeed, just as there were opposing camps in Britain – those who admired American approaches to sport and those who rejected and denigrated their more "professional" attitudes – Americans also were divided, and while Hobart and a handful of others may have admired British approaches to amateur sport, his opinion at this juncture seemed a minority one, challenged by others who boldly asserted American superiority in skills and tactics. Alongside developing more aggressive volleying and lobbing, of most significance was a new serve the three American players had mastered, referred to as the "American twist". Especially when delivered by the left-handed Dwight Davis, the service

‘broke away in such an alarming manner that it was fearfully difficult for a right-handed player to return’, as *Lawn Tennis* reported: ‘Our men have been most decisively beaten in the International match, and beaten, on their own admission, chiefly by their inability to return the service with any effect whatsoever’.⁷⁷

As in 1897, some of the British players criticised the playing conditions. Herbert Roper Barrett recalled: ‘The grounds were abominable. The grass was long. ... The net was a disgrace to civilized lawn tennis, held up by guy ropes that were continually sagging. ... [The balls] were awful – soft and motherly’.⁷⁸ Despite admitting the British were ‘not good enough to win in America’, a *Lawn Tennis* correspondent highlighted some disadvantages the travelling Englishmen faced, including ‘the voyage, the want of practice on strange grounds with strange balls, which are softer than ours and require more hitting, [and] the climate’, before concluding:

we cannot help thinking that American lawn tennis players are in some ways very much behind the times. ... [They] still continue to play on courts which would not be owned by the giver of a suburban garden party in England; courts which are “hairy”, badly prepared and altogether poor. They use nets which are obsolete, and which do not keep the regulation height; and the balls might be vastly improved.⁷⁹

Embarrassed by these excuses, the *Lawn Tennis* editor declared:

We regret to see that excuses are made for the Englishmen on all sorts of grounds... The plain facts are that our men could not return the service, and were handsomely beaten by men who, on the play, were too good for them.⁸⁰

Paret, however, confronted the idea that it was *just* the service that brought defeat, utilizing descriptions about the relative skills of the leading Americans that included strokes other than the service, alongside results that showed the British players being defeated by Americans who did *not* use the twist service.⁸¹ For Paret, the British were simply not good enough; Gore was ranked fifth in England, Black sixth and Barrett thirteenth. Paret described Gore’s backhand as ‘weak’, his volley was ‘not as good as that of many of our second-class men’, his lobbing was ‘nil’, and his play ‘lacked variety’. Black’s play was ‘erratic’; ‘his forehand lacked both speed and length and his volleying too slow’, and he showed ‘utter indifference to success or failure’.⁸²

For Kriplen, it was apparent that the ‘English tennis authorities simply were not too concerned about the level of tennis competition their players would meet in America’.⁸³ However, to excuse the British for their “surprise” about the twist service overlooks the fact that Mahony, Nisbet and Eaves had each faced it during their 1897 tour. When Eaves attempted to offer his views to the LTA, however, they were unreceptive.⁸⁴ Moreover, Mahony and Nisbet were on the LTA committee that arranged the British trip to the US. Had the LTA insisted on systematic training or had Britain’s Davis Cup trio bothered to seek coaching/training advice from Mahony, Eaves or Nisbet, they might have performed better. This was a point echoed by Eustace Miles who ‘criticised the defeated team for showing up without knowledge of or preparation for the American game’.⁸⁵

The chief factors that facilitated British defeat, therefore, seemed to be complacency, alongside their unwillingness to take the contest seriously enough to fully prepare. After the 1897 tour, Paret had remarked of the American’s ‘inordinate thirst for victory’, which he argued, three years later, had not abated; in a lengthy debrief of the 1900 Davis Cup contest, he wrote of Britain’s ‘over-confidence’.⁸⁶

While the Americans might have considered the inaugural contest of national importance, evidently the British players considered it more a social engagement to maintain cordial international relations.⁸⁷ Despite Britain’s best players either being predisposed or unwilling to travel, the LTA felt compelled to send a team, as Roper Barrett reflected candidly: ‘There was no one else to represent England and I felt I had to go despite the

inconvenience and personal expense to which we were put'.⁸⁸ This realization alone facilitated Paret's candid assessment of relative standards. All things considered, he opined:

I am still in doubt as to the international supremacy at lawn tennis, because we have not yet seen these advanced methods of American play [attacking volley and lob, and the "twist" service] used against the English leaders abroad. ... The question of international supremacy must remain in doubt until the players of either country have beaten the others abroad.⁸⁹

The sense that the British trio neglected to approach the contest with anything other than casual interest is revealed in the rather subdued send-off the team received from Liverpool alongside their decision to visit Niagara Falls immediately upon their arrival to the States, rather than undertake pre-match preparations.⁹⁰ Consequently, the British team arrived in Boston just one day before the match's scheduled start, though rainfall the following day afforded an extra day's rest. *Boston Globe* writer Fred Mansfield agreed that their sojourn to the Falls was 'ill-advised' and smacked of over-confidence: 'Their lack of reasonable training on American courts to adequately prepare themselves for the international matches is suggestive'.⁹¹

While it would be a further few years before players from either nation would achieve success abroad, thus negating the claims of home-court advantage, the British defeat in 1900 helped cement America's place alongside Britain at the sport's forefront. Paret boldly declared, 'the period of American inferiority has now passed into history and we have reached the period of equality'.⁹² Moreover, the defeat also forced the LTA to recognize its American counterpart, the USNLTA, as a genuine equal, which defied years of condescension and cold-shouldering.⁹³ In time, leading British commentators would urge their own officials and players to adopt American methods, as they recognized, much as many did of Britain's imperial rule more generally, that their days in the sun were numbered.

Divergent Reactions to the Onset of British Decline

In 1903, at their third attempt, the British finally won the Davis Cup on American soil. The two-man team of Laurie and Reggie Doherty defeated the American trio, Bill Larned and brothers Bob and George Wrenn, 4-1. Their victory offered a response to accusations of 'outdated attitudes to physical conditioning, playing styles, coaching and talent development', but the British came across often as 'defensive, complacent and short-sighted'.⁹⁴ The previous summer, the *Lawn Tennis & Croquet (LT&C)* editor expressed disquiet about the

serious question as to whether English lawn tennis players are advancing with the times or whether they are content to ignore all signs of progress in other countries, and to flatter themselves that things are quite good enough as they are.

Seemingly unconcerned with their demise, the 1900 Davis Cup defeat apparently 'produced scarcely any effect on the play in England, for no one was there to see what happened except the players themselves'. Moreover, the prowess of the Doherty brothers seemed to mask the dearth of players following them, to which he reasoned:

Because we happen to have a couple of players who are unique, is that any reason why the great body of lawn tennis players should stand still? Signs are plainly visible that our supremacy in the game... is threatened on all sides. ... The pupils are now and then winning games against the masters.⁹⁵

A year later, however, the same correspondent summarised the 1903 season: 'In America our representatives have covered themselves with glory, and besides winning the Davis Cup, have annexed both the single and double-handed Championship of that country,

so that now... we have every reason to be satisfied'.⁹⁶ Continuing to ride the Dohertys' coat-tails, British officials voiced few concerns about future prospects; no foreigner had yet won the singles or doubles title at Wimbledon. With the Doherty's committed, the British won four straight Davis Cups (1903-06), but upon retirement, the British won just once more (1912) before the war.

For some, the writing was on the wall. Wimbledon was increasingly attracting foreign players, and top Americans and Australasians encroached on British dominance. The highly respected British lawn tennis journalist, A. Wallis Myers, predicted in 1903:

As for the future of the game in this country, it seems to me to be merely a matter of time before the Championship passes into the hands of American players or foreigners. No young players of any ability are coming to the front, and as soon as the present exponents of first-class play retire, there would seem to be no-one to take their place.⁹⁷

Within two years, Myers' prediction came to fruition.

That the breakthrough came in the women's game was surprising, given that up until the turn of the century, the relative inferiority of women's play in America was widely assumed. In 1886, despite no matches being played between the leading players, it was considered 'greatly inferior to that of [England's] best exponents'.⁹⁸ Similar opinions sustained throughout the last decades of the century. American correspondents in *Lawn Tennis* reported that women's play in Britain remained far superior to that in America; they have 'far more skill than any of our American players have yet acquired', and play, according to Paret, 'a whole class better'.⁹⁹ In 1901, the American player, Marion Jones, made a similar assessment of the respective standards and asserted in the new American magazine *Lawn Tennis*:

There are a number of women players in England who are keen to play a season in this country, and who believe, and rightly, that there is no one here who could prevent their winning our national championship. Sooner or later they will come, and we must meanwhile extend and make the most of our opportunities to improve, by practice, in tournaments. ... Then there should be no reason why we should not hold our own against English women.¹⁰⁰

The following year, top American player Beals C. Wright admitted that English ladies play a 'much stronger game' than do American women.¹⁰¹

In terms of their sustained superiority, however, the *LT&C* review of ladies' play in 1904 tempted fate: 'We may congratulate ourselves that... it will be a long time before the gauntlet is likely to be thrown down and our position challenged'.¹⁰² Indeed, the very next summer, the Californian May Sutton won the Ladies' Singles Championship at Wimbledon, becoming the first overseas champion. Perhaps indicative of British egotism and the weak acknowledgement of women's competitive tennis as a valid reflection and accurate portrayal of national differences in prowess, the opening speech at the dinner celebrating Britain's successful Davis Cup victory against the US, just a few weeks later, entirely overlooked this result. Chairman H.W.W. Wilberforce toasted the Americans, before adding: 'They are a wonderful race. ... Long may they persist in coming over here unsuccessfully'.¹⁰³

Such smugness was ill-conceived. That same year, the Australian Norman Brookes reached the challenge round of the gentlemen's singles, before being beaten by Laurie Doherty. Two years later he achieved his ultimate ambition and broke British dominance in the men's events.

The gradual decline of Britain's supremacy can be attributed partly to their unwavering commitment to an outdated amateur model of performance, which afforded little support to deliberate coaching/training practices and a more performance-oriented approach to talent development, in lawn tennis as in other sports.¹⁰⁴ Leading British players were also

criticized, particularly for failing to learn ‘the lesson’ of the American twist service: ‘[they] have been standing still. ... The vast majority of players have been content to go on in the same old way’.¹⁰⁵ They have ‘persistently refused to adopt the American service’; their ‘attitude ... towards improvements in the game is not encouraging’.¹⁰⁶ The following spring, *LT&C* reported: ‘Happily, there are signs on all sides that our rising players are waking up to the necessity of studying the game seriously if they are ever to rise to the front rank’.¹⁰⁷

For Myers, however, the problem went far deeper than the players’ attitudes; criticising the LTA’s conservatism, he contended: a British player ‘seldom gets any coaching when starting the game, so that his style will, to a great extent, be a matter of chance’.¹⁰⁸ The shift from British to American dominance ‘should cause no surprise’, he argued, ‘as in the public schools in America, the game is encouraged, whilst in this country it is not even permitted’.¹⁰⁹ He then suggested:

The lack of proper instruction in lawn tennis in our public schools, and its support there by the authorities is assuredly a factor in bringing about this serious dearth of advancing ability [in Britain]; but others exist, notably the reluctance of wealthy clubs to employ a professional instructor.¹¹⁰

A leading tournament player, F.W. Payn, agreed that the lack of professional coaching was a key factor, as did P.A. Vaile, who decried the lack of ‘true science’ – i.e. technical instruction – being applied to the game.¹¹¹

The *LT&C* editor agreed, expressing his belief that the British were ‘behind the times’ as the game was overlooked in the leading schools:

It cannot be denied that in all games you must catch your players when young if you wish to get the very best results, and with the game making such vast strides in America... we cannot afford to let any opportunity slip which shall tend to improve our game.¹¹²

Interestingly, much like the *LT&C* correspondent in 1902 who assumed that defeat to the Americans was ‘the best possible thing that could happen to English lawn tennis, for it will give the impetus to the game’,¹¹³ Myers maintained that ‘the invasion of foreign prize-winners’ at Wimbledon would

undoubtedly exercise a highly beneficial effect on English players. ... Once let their supremacy be seriously threatened, as undoubtedly it will be, and English players may be expected to realise their limitations, and seek the means whereby the game shall receive greater encouragement, and the younger generations more opportunities for excelling.¹¹⁴

Such optimism negated to recognize the apathy of the British authorities and their unwillingness to adopt a more purposeful – or “professional” – approach to coaching/training, as American officials had done. In lawn tennis terms at least, the “American future” had now arrived.

Conclusion

In this analysis of shifting Anglo-American relations as “played out” in lawn tennis, distinct phases were apparent that reflected a broader international trend. While Britain was regarded almost universally as the dominant tennis nation, the Americans displayed assertiveness in declining LTA affiliation, instituting different rules and developing innovative playing strokes. As in aspects of popular culture, the British reacted to American advances in lawn tennis with a mixture of admiration and disdain, though they attached comparatively less significance to competitive results. The 1897 and 1900 contests in America, which signalled for them their “arrival” on the world stage as in broader socio-cultural and

economic/industrial matters, brought only lukewarm reaction from the British, who were thought to have made excuses for their defeats. So long as British\LTA leadership was near enough globally acknowledged, on-court results mattered less.

The successes of Britain's colonial "cousins", particularly in Australasia, were routinely celebrated as victories for the British, though at times this smacked of desperation. In 1904, the *LT&C* editor highlighted with obvious pride the 'steady improvement and marked advance of our new men'; previous 'fears' were now 'groundless' as 'some of our young players this year have more than completely given the lie direct to such doubts'. The editor mentioned only one name, however, that of 'leading Cambridge player', A.F. Wilding, who became the youngest ever Scottish Championships winner and showed 'capacity against even the best of our players'.¹¹⁵ What is curious is that Wilding was from New Zealand and, only three years later, would compete *against* Britain to win the Davis Cup for Australasia.

While many British players and officials during this period considered international contests of only marginal consequence, the Americans seemed to consider them of greater importance. This phenomenon indicated that amateur ideals in Britain and the US diverged during this period, as the British retained their deeply-entrenched conservatism while the Americans embraced a more "professional" approach. Rooted in the ideologies of "American exceptionalism", liberal capitalism and Taylorism, this method rationalized the pursuit of success through specialized training and sought to enhance efficiencies and maximize performances. Ultimately, it pulled American amateur sporting ideals away from the traditional British approach, which privileged the effortless pursuit of athletic success through natural talent rather than artificial enhancement. The limitations of Britain's traditional, amateur sporting philosophy were highlighted ultimately through on-court defeats, both in the US and, eventually, also at Wimbledon. The sense that British tennis was entering a period of sharp decline became widespread, and in this regard defeats on court foreshadowed broader developments as Britain's imperial dominance and global influence slowly waned, most notably after the First World War as the US overtook Great Britain as the world's major superpower.

By the interwar period, any sense the British might recapture their former dominant position was quickly and comprehensively quashed. Leading American and French players, both male and female, led the charge, relegating Britain to a second-tier nation throughout the 1920s. America's insurgence in lawn tennis reflected the nation's rise in a broader sense. Despite championing its formation, the Americans refused to join the League of Nations; the US Congress preferred a policy of isolationism, for fear of ceding power. Similarly, in lawn tennis politics, the Americans declined to join the ILTF until the British agreed in 1923 to drop their extra vote and recognize the US Championships as equal to Wimbledon, and other major European championships. The British agreed that the ILTF's credibility depended upon America's inclusion.

During this period, the Americans also demanded the ILTF adopt their foot-fault rule; they introduced "seeding", and forced the previous-year's champion to "play through", thus abolishing the Challenge Round. Wimbledon adopted these changes in 1923, signalling the decline of unequivocal British authority in lawn tennis matters. As seen more broadly, this shift in Anglo-American relations in lawn tennis was a long and complex process.

¹ W. E. Gladstone, "Kin Beyond Sea," *North American Review* 127 (1878): 180.

² W. E. Gladstone, "A Duel," *North American Review* 398 (1890): 26.

³ See Chester G Hearn, *Circuits in the Sea* (London: Praeger, 2004); John Steel Gordon, *A Thread Across the Ocean*, (London: Simon & Schuster, 2002); Bob Nicholson, "Transatlantic

Connections”, in *The Routledge Handbook of Nineteenth-Century British Periodicals and Newspapers*, ed. Andrew King et al. (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 163-174.

⁴ See Stephen Fox, *The Ocean Railway*, (London: Harper Collins, 2003).

⁵ Louise Bricknell, “Fickle winds and treacherous feelings: Anglo-American relations and the early challenges for the America's Cup.” *Sporting Traditions* 9, no. 2 (1993): 18.

⁶ Stanley L. Engerman & Kenneth L Sokoloff, “Technology and Industrialization, 1790-1914”, in *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States: Vol 2, The Long Nineteenth Century*, ed. Stanley L. Engerman et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 380.

⁷ See: Bob Nicholson, *Looming Large: America and the Late-Victorian Press, 1865-1902* (PhD diss., University of Manchester, 2012), 77-88.

⁸ W. T. Stead, *The Americanisation of the World* (London: Review of Reviews, 1902).

⁹ See: Bricknell, “Fickle winds”; Dyreson, Mark. *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1998); Mark Dyreson, “Globalizing the Nation-Making Process: Modern Sport in World History”. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 20, no. 1 (2003): 91-106; Barbara Keys, *Globalizing sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1930s* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006); Roberta Park, “Sport, Gender and Society in a Transatlantic Victorian Perspective”. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 2, no. 1 (1985): 5-28; Steven Pope, and John Nauright. “American-British Sporting Rivalries and the Making of the Global Sports Industry”. *Comparative American Studies: An International Journal* 14, no. 3-4 (2016): 302-319.

¹⁰ Bricknell, “Fickle Winds”, 19.

¹¹ See: Bricknell, “Fickle Winds”; Mark Dyreson, “Prologue: The Paradoxes of American Insularity, Exceptionalism and Imperialism”. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 22, no. 6 (2005): 938-945; Allen Guttman, *Games and Empires: Modern Sport and Cultural Imperialism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

¹² Keys, *Globalizing Sport*, 66.

¹³ Bricknell, “Fickle Winds”, 20.

¹⁴ See: J.A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

¹⁵ Dave Day. “The British Athlete ‘is born not made’: Transatlantic Tensions over Sports Coaching”. *Journal of Sport History* 44, no. 1 (2017): 20-34; Benjamin Rader. *American Sports: From the Age of Folk Games to the Age of Televised Sports*, 4th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999), 76.

¹⁶ Bricknell, “Fickle Winds”, 20.

¹⁷ Dyreson, “Globalizing”; Matthew P. Llewellyn, “The Battle of Shepherd’s Bush”. *International Journal of the History of Sport* 28, no. 5 (2011): 688-710.

¹⁸ Bricknell, “Fickle “inds”; Day, “The British Athlete”.

¹⁹ See Barry Smart, “Not Playing Around: Global Capitalism, Modern Sport and Consumer Culture”. *Global Networks* 7, no. 2 (2007): 113-134.

²⁰ See: Robert J. Lake *A Social History of Tennis in Britain* (London: Routledge, 2015).

²¹ Melvin L. Adelman, *A Sporting Time: New York City and the Rise of Modern Athletics, 1820-70* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1986); Rader, *American Sports*; Steven A. Riess, *City game: The Evolution of American Urban Society and the Rise of Sports* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1989); Steven A. Riess, “From Pitch to Putt: Sport and Class in Anglo-American Sport”. *Journal of Sport History* 21, no. 2 (1994): 138-184.

²² E. Digby Baltzell *Sporting Gentlemen: Men’s Tennis from the Age of Honor to the Cult of the Superstar* (New York: Free Press, 1995); Rader, *American Sports*.

-
- ²³ See Bud Collins, *The Bud Collins History of Tennis: An Authoritative Encyclopedia and Record Book* (Chicago: New Chapter Press, 2008); Lake, *A Social History*.
- ²⁴ Noah Webster, *Dissertations on the English Language* (Boston: Isaiah Thomas & Co., 1789), 20-21.
- ²⁵ Roger W. Ohnsorg, *Robert Lindley Murray: The Reluctant US Tennis Champion* (Bloomington, IN: Trafford, 2011).
- ²⁶ See: *Pastime* 13 March 1889, 159.
- ²⁷ Lake, *A Social History*.
- ²⁸ *Pastime* 4 June 1884, 358.
- ²⁹ *Pastime* 2 June 1886, 369.
- ³⁰ Henry W Slocum, 'Lawn Tennis as a Game for Women', *Outing*, 4 July 1889, 291-292.
- ³¹ Park 1985, 8
- ³² On American culture in Victorian Britain, see: Robert W Rydell & Rob Kroes, *Buffalo Bill in Bologna* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Nicholson, "Looming Large"; Bob Nicholson, "Jonathan's Jokes: American Humour in the late-Victorian press," *Media History* 18:1 (2012): 33-49; Bob Nicholson, "'You Kick the Bucket; We Do the Rest!': Jokes and the Culture of Reprinting in the Transatlantic Press" *Journal of Victorian Culture* 17:3 (2012): 273-286.
- ³³ *Pastime* 8 April 1885, 216.
- ³⁴ *Pastime* 3 July 1889, 2.
- ³⁵ *Pastime* 11 December 1889, 389.
- ³⁶ *Pastime* 18 December 1889, 404-5.
- ³⁷ *Pastime* 16 April 1890, 243.
- ³⁸ See: Robert J. Lake, & Simon J. Eaves, "Defeat, Decline and Disconnect: A Critical Analysis of Attempted Reform in British Tennis during the Inter-war Period" *Sport in History* 37:1 (2017): 1-24.
- ³⁹ *Pastime* 19 August 1891, 134.
- ⁴⁰ Stead, *Americanisation*, 7.
- ⁴¹ See Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 231-259.
- ⁴² See: Bricknell, "Fickle Winds".
- ⁴³ *Pastime* 13 July 1883.
- ⁴⁴ *Pastime* 25 September 1889, 211.
- ⁴⁵ *Pastime* 3 July 1889, 2.
- ⁴⁶ See: Robert J. Lake, "Gender and Etiquette in 'Mixed Doubles' Lawn Tennis 1870-1939". *International Journal of the History of Sport* 29, no. 5 (2012): 691-710.
- ⁴⁷ Robert J. Lake, "Social Class, Etiquette and Behavioural Restraint in British Lawn Tennis: 1870-1939". *International Journal of the History of Sport* 28, no. 6 (2011): 876-894.
- ⁴⁸ Day, "The British Athlete".
- ⁴⁹ Joel H. Wiener, *The Americanization of the British Press, 1830s-1914* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
- ⁵⁰ Raymond Radclyffe, "A Trip to Chicago and its World's Fair II", *Ludgate Illustrated Magazine*, 6 (1893): 237.
- ⁵¹ See: Bob Nicholson, "The Old World and the New: Negotiating Past, Present, and Future in Anglo-American Humour", in *History and Humour: British and American Perspectives*, ed. Barbara Korte et al. (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2013), 151-170.
- ⁵² Simon J. Eaves & Robert J. Lake, "The 'Ubiquitous Apostle of International Play', Wilberforce Vaughan Eaves: The Forgotten Internationalist of Lawn Tennis". *International Review for the History of Sport* (2017) doi:10.1080/09523367.2017.1295957; Lake, *A Social History*.

-
- ⁵³ J. Parmly Paret, *Lawn Tennis: Its Past, Present and Future* (London: Macmillan, 1904), 64-65.
- ⁵⁴ Kevin Jefferys, "The Heyday of Amateurism in Modern Lawn Tennis". *International Journal of the History of Sport* 26, no. 15 (2009): 2236-52; Lake & Eaves, "Defeat, Decline and Disconnect".
- ⁵⁵ Lake, *A Social History*, 75.
- ⁵⁶ See: *Pastime* 11 December 1889, 389; *Pastime* 19 August 1891, 134.
- ⁵⁷ Pope & Nauright, "American-British Sporting Rivalries", 312.
- ⁵⁸ James Dwight, 'English Experts in America', *Official Lawn Tennis Bulletin*, 1897, 206.
- ⁵⁹ 'Gossip of the tennis players', *New York Times*, 3 September, 1894.
- ⁶⁰ *Official Lawn Tennis Bulletin*, 1897, 277; 'American Players Abroad', *American Lawn Tennis* 27 April, 1898, 89.
- ⁶¹ See: John H. Holler, John H. *The Boer Lessons that Changed and Prepared the British Army for WWI* (Pennsylvania: US Army War College, 1999).
- ⁶² Francois Bédarida, *A Social History of England 1851-1975* (London: Methuen, 1979).
- ⁶³ See, for example: "Mr Edison At Home", *Freeman's Journal*, 11 October 1878, 2; "Edison's Anti-Gravitation Under-Clothing", *Punch Almanack*, (1879), 2.
- ⁶⁴ Arnold Lewis, *An Early Encounter with Tomorrow* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997).
- ⁶⁵ Dr James Dwight, 'English Experts in America', *Official Lawn Tennis Bulletin*, 1897, 206.
- ⁶⁶ Eaves & Lake, "The 'Ubiquitous Apostle'".
- ⁶⁷ See: Eaves & Lake, "The 'Ubiquitous Apostle'".
- ⁶⁸ J. Parmly Paret, 'The International Tennis of 1897', *Outing*, October, 1897, 73.
- ⁶⁹ 'The Decline and Fall of Tennis', *St. James's Gazette*, 8 October, 1897, 5.
- ⁷⁰ 'A Chat with the Covered Court and Irish Champion', *Lawn Tennis*, 11 May 1898.
- ⁷¹ *Lawn Tennis* 25 August 1897, p.268; *Lawn Tennis Bulletin* 9 September 1897.
- ⁷² *Lawn Tennis Bulletin* 9 September 1897.
- ⁷³ *Lawn Tennis Bulletin*, cited in *Lawn Tennis* 15 September 1897, 229.
- ⁷⁴ *Lawn Tennis Bulletin* 9 September 1897.
- ⁷⁵ *Lawn Tennis* 31 August 1898, 291-2. Paret repeated these sentiments in *Outing*, an American publication: J Parmly Paret, *Lawn Tennis in Great Britain through the eyes of an American*, *Outing*, 1 October 1898, 73.
- ⁷⁶ *Golf and Lawn Tennis* 28 September 1900, 541.
- ⁷⁷ *Lawn Tennis* 22 August 1900, 309.
- ⁷⁸ Cited in: Myers, A. Wallis. *The Complete Lawn Tennis Player* (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Co., 1908), 243.
- ⁷⁹ *Lawn Tennis* 22 August 1900, 307.
- ⁸⁰ *Lawn Tennis* 22 August 1900, 309.
- ⁸¹ See: *Lawn Tennis* 29 August 1900, 327.
- ⁸² *Lawn Tennis* 7 November 1900, 429.
- ⁸³ Nancy Kriplen, *Dwight Davis: The Man and the Cup*. London: Ebury, 1999, 54.
- ⁸⁴ Eaves & Lake, "The 'Ubiquitous Apostle'".
- ⁸⁵ *Morning Post*, cited in: Kriplen, *Dwight Davis*, 64.
- ⁸⁶ *Outing* December 1897, 224-31; *Lawn Tennis* 7 November 1900, 430.
- ⁸⁷ See: Lake, *A Social History*.
- ⁸⁸ Cited in: Myers, *The Complete*, 244.
- ⁸⁹ *Lawn Tennis* 7 November 1900, 430.
- ⁹⁰ See: Kriplen, *Dwight Davis*.
- ⁹¹ *Boston Globe* 7 August 1900.
- ⁹² The New Era in American Lawn Tennis, *Outing*, 3 June 1901.

-
- ⁹³ Eaves & Lake, “The ‘Ubiquitous Apostle’”.
- ⁹⁴ Lake, *A Social History*, 77.
- ⁹⁵ *LT&C* 27 August 1902, 382-3.
- ⁹⁶ *LT&C* 23 September 1903, 470.
- ⁹⁷ A Wallis Myers. *Lawn Tennis at Home and Abroad* (London: George Newnes Ltd., 1903), 29.
- ⁹⁸ *Pastime* 3 November 1886, 287.
- ⁹⁹ *Lawn Tennis* 10 August 1898, 242; *Lawn Tennis* 31 August 1898, 291-2.
- ¹⁰⁰ Cited in: *Lawn Tennis* 10 July 1901, 208.
- ¹⁰¹ *Lawn Tennis* (US version), cited in: *Lawn Tennis* 5 February 1902, 509.
- ¹⁰² *LT&C* 27 July 1904, 237-8.
- ¹⁰³ *LT&B* 26 July 1905, 242.
- ¹⁰⁴ Day “The British Athlete”; Dave Day & Tegan Carpenter. *A History of Sports Coaching in Britain: Overcoming Amateurism* (London: Routledge, 2016); Simon Eaves, “Coaching, Physical Training and the Changing Landscape of Lawn Tennis: Australia’s Ascendancy to Dominance in the Pre-Great War era”. In, *Sport and Leisure on the Eve of the First World War*, by Dave Day, 72-97 (Crewe: Manchester Metropolitan University, 2016); Richard Holt, *Sport and the British* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989); Jefferys, “The Heyday of Amateurism”; Robert J. Lake, *Social Exclusion in British Tennis: A History of Privilege and Prejudice*. (PhD diss., Brunel University, 2008); Robert J. Lake, “Stigmatised, Marginalised, Celebrated: Developments in Lawn Tennis Coaching 1870-1939”. *Sport in History* 30, no. 1 (2010): 82-103; Lake, *A Social History*; Lake & Eaves, “Defeat, Decline and Disconnect”; Llewellyn & Gleaves, *The Rise and Fall*.
- ¹⁰⁵ *LT&C* 2 July 1902, 192.
- ¹⁰⁶ *LT&C* 27 August 1902, 382-3.
- ¹⁰⁷ *LT&C* 6 May 1903, 36.
- ¹⁰⁸ Myers, *Lawn Tennis at Home*, 16.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 29.
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 132.
- ¹¹¹ F.W. Payn, *Secrets of Lawn Tennis* (London: L. Upcott Gill, 1906), 102; P.A. Vaile, “Prologue”. In, *Great Lawn Tennis Players: Their Methods Illustrated*, by George Beldam and P.A. Vaile, xii (London: Macmillan, 1905).
- ¹¹² *LT&C* 3 June 1903, 104.
- ¹¹³ *LT&C* 3 September 1902, 406-7.
- ¹¹⁴ Myers, *Lawn Tennis at Home*, 132.
- ¹¹⁵ *LT&C* 21 September 1904, 391.