

## Never the Gentleman: Caste, Class and the Amateur Myth in English First Class Cricket, 1920s to the 1960s

### Abstract

This article analyses the near-impossibility, for the duration of the amateur-professional divide, of cricketers born into working class families being admitted to amateur status, and, thus, to county captaincy, in the English first class game. Its principal argument is that the hegemony achieved in the latter half of the nineteenth century by the English upper class (the aristocracy, major landowners and leaders of financial capital and their families) had one of its most visible manifestations in the culture of first class cricket. The hegemony of this group (represented by the Marylebone Cricket Club) was sustained by a specific myth of amateurism that was rooted in caste-like social relations. By the late 1930s these relations had become unsustainable and hegemony was maintained by a subtle and unacknowledged switch to from relations of status to relations of class. In the early 1960s the this elite, in the face of new financial imperatives made concessions to the emergent elite of impression management, one of which was their (reluctant) abandonment of the amateur-professional divide. The article charts this process, using several case studies of working class professional cricketers, each of which brought the ideological reality of the amateur myth into sharp relief.

This article was partly inspired by the recent and renewed attention paid to the working class amateur in sport<sup>1</sup>. It takes as its starting point the near-impossibility, between the late nineteenth century and the abolition of the amateur-professional divide in 1962, of cricketers born into working class families being admitted to amateur status (a precondition, among other things, for county captaincy) in the English first class game. It pays particular attention to the ideological means of rationalising this exclusion. The argument will draw on the work of Max Weber, Martin J. Wiener, Mike Marqusee and others. In summary, it will be that the hegemony achieved in the latter half of the nineteenth century by the English upper class (the aristocracy, major landowners and leaders of financial capital and their families) was played out in the culture of first class cricket. In this culture the industrial middle class (strongest in the North of England) had been assimilated, and the working class marginalised, in ways that approximated more to caste than to social class relations, caste being 'a closed status group'<sup>2</sup>. In cricket the vehicle for this process was the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC), a private institution which dominated cricket governance, in the UK and abroad, until 1993. The MCC, custodians of cricket's seemingly timeless pastoral aura and with ready access to patronage, was able to sustain an essentially eighteenth century status order well into the mid-

twentieth century. Equally, however, the guardians of the hierarchy, were, contrary to many of their critics, quick to respond to social change when their vital interests were at stake. In this sense, the stewards of English cricket were prepared to countenance serious changes in cricket culture, largely to safeguard their stewardship. By the early 1960s MCC had accepted (with clear reluctance) that this hegemony could only be salvaged by abandoning the amateur-professional distinction, once it became clear that English first class cricket must now rely for its survival on commercial sponsorship – initially of one-day cricket. Sponsors could not expect to sell an explicitly class-divided sport to a mass audience. Thus, concessions were made to the rising elite of impression management (advertising, PR and kindred professions), an elite which had already made wealthy men of leading cricketers, amateur and professional alike. As Marqusee argued for the period between the 1960s and the 1980s, English cricket was transformed by the last generation of amateurs. The various case studies examined here illustrate this process and together may therefore be construed as an exercise in prosopography, which has recent precedent in sport history<sup>3</sup>. I have also had in mind C. Wright Mills' famous assertion that 'the sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society'<sup>4</sup>. The article draws on some of the established literature on professionals and amateurs in county cricket – notably, Marshall's *Gentlemen and Players*<sup>5</sup>, largely a compilation of interviews with retired county players, published in 1987 and Ric Sissons' social history of the professional cricketer<sup>6</sup> – as well as on biographies<sup>7</sup> and on newspaper reports and other commentary published at the relevant historical moments. It may be read as a companion piece to my 'Time, Gentleman, Please' of 2000<sup>8</sup>.

### Class, Status and Cricket

In the mid-nineteenth century, Britain was established, to borrow two well-worn phrases, as the cradle of the industrial revolution and as the workshop of the world, but, as Martin J. Weiner has convincingly argued, this did not bring a triumph of the industrial spirit, nor did it see industrialists rising to the apex of the class structure. Instead leading industrialists were steadily assimilated into

the British upper class, often by admission to the peerage or barony<sup>9</sup>, and, as Wiener observes, the 'dominant collective self-image of English culture became less and less that of the world's workshop. On the contrary, this image was challenged by the counterimage of an ancient, little-disturbed "green and pleasant land"<sup>10</sup>. This 'green and pleasant' culture – 'a distinctive product of the interpenetration of landed, commercial and industrial interests at the top of the social structure' was forged and sustained in the British public schools and elite universities and was characterised by a 'gentlemanly self-assurance and respect for hierarchical order'<sup>11</sup>. Nowhere, perhaps, were these traits more manifest than in English first class cricket, based as it was on the county system and, thus, on the patronage of the landed gentry and the City of London financial elite<sup>12</sup>, who clearly, in Weber's terms, constituted a vital status group within a broad social class<sup>13</sup>. In county cricket a masters-and-men ethos was established and sustained between the late nineteenth century and the early 1960s and was expressed in the amateur-professional divide. For the purposes of this essay, three things are important about this divide. First, as a number of historians have noted, the sharpening of the divide coincides, broadly speaking, with the growth of working class power<sup>14</sup> as seen in the rise of the trade union movement and the founding of the Labour Party. But, whereas in other sports amateurism became a basis for establishing different codes – as with rugby's great split of 1895<sup>15</sup> – or largely discrete social worlds – the result, for example, of the founding of the Amateur Football Association in 1907<sup>16</sup> – amateurs and professionals in first class cricket continued routinely to play together in the same teams. Second, what Ross McKibbin describes as the caste-like relationships that were entailed in cricket's amateur-professional divide<sup>17</sup> were rationalised by the ethos of the English gentleman (as amateurs were always described) who possessed inherent qualities of leadership; who, having private means, was not motivated by thoughts of personal gain; and who played with a sense of adventure and *joie de jeu*. Once a county cricketer born and bred outside of the elite milieu represented by the country's public schools and most prestigious universities was admitted to amateur status and/or to the amateur preserve of county captaincy,

the caste basis for the amateur myth would be undermined. The myth would instead assume a class rationale and, thus, begin to erode.

Third, while on the face of it the distinction between 'gentlemen' and 'players' seems for much of its history to have been widely accepted, it periodically became a visible issue, as two of the following case studies illustrate. Its contentiousness grew after the Second World War when it was challenged, chiefly by the professionals and mostly over the issue of amateur captaincy<sup>18</sup>.

In the period before and after the First World War, if the exclusivity of amateur captaincy was to be successfully challenged, the most likely beneficiary seemed to many observers to be the Surrey and England batsman Jack Hobbs.

#### Jack Hobbs: An Amateur in All But Name?

Hobbs is important here for several reasons. First, his origins were unambiguously working class: he was born in 1882 into late-Victorian poverty in a run-down district of Cambridge, to a labourer and his wife. He was one of twelve children. Hobbs' father worked as a slater and as a servant/groundsman at one of the colleges of Cambridge University. Second, Hobbs was a cricketer of the highest class: regarded by the game's leading chroniclers as one of England's finest ever batsmen, he represented Surrey between 1905 and 1934 and England during the period 1908 to 1930; in all he played 61 Tests – a record which, in other times, might have brought him the captaincy of the team. Third, when Sir Pelham Warner, a devout paternalist who zealously policed the amateur-professional divide, saw Hobbs play in the early 1900s he pronounced him 'the professional who batted exactly like an amateur'<sup>19</sup>. Hobbs also seems to have been held in almost universally high regard as a person. On the face of it, then, with such playing and personal virtues, Hobbs should have been a candidate for the England captaincy. After the First World War, as former Surrey captain Percy Fender recalled, 'gentlemen' were in shorter supply: 'so far as amateurs were concerned we'd been able to call on many young men from wealthy families, but with disappearing fortunes and rising income tax they became fewer in number'<sup>20</sup>. Indeed, simply by being whom and what he was,

Hobbs became a focal point for an intermittent disgruntlement (in the sports press and privately, among the more assertive professionals) about amateur status in first class cricket. Why, it might have been asked, should such an apparently saintly man change in a dingier changing room than the gentlemen? As Hobbs' most recent biographer has written: 'The very idea of keeping down this national hero, simply because he was paid for his brilliance, would have repelled most of the British public'<sup>21</sup>. And why should such an accomplished batsman (and national sporting hero) take orders from lesser players, simply because they had been to public school and university? Yet Hobbs was not a viable candidate for captaincy in first class cricket, for at least two reasons.

First, amateur hegemony in first class cricket, underpinned as it was by gentlemanly patronage, was at that time unassailable. Critics knew this: for example, when, early in 1925, England were two Tests down in Australia and Cecil 'Ciss' Parkin, England and Lancashire off spinner, criticised England skipper A.E.R. Gilligan (Dulwich College and Cambridge and captain of Sussex) in a ghosted article for the *Weekly Dispatch*, he fell short of calling for Hobbs to be given the captaincy. This, for the time, would have been an unacceptable breach of protocol. Instead, despite declaring Hobbs to be a better captain, he suggested Percy Chapman (Uppingham School and Cambridge University and the current Kent captain) should take over, under Hobbs supervision. This alone was deemed, again according to Hobbs' most recent biographer, to be 'dynamite' and the *Dispatch* put Parkin's suggestion on its front page<sup>22</sup>. Parkin's article prompted Lord Hawke's widely quoted remark, later that year at the Annual General Meeting of Yorkshire County Cricket Club, 'pray God no professional will ever captain England'<sup>23</sup>. Hawke's exclamation provoked a brief public discussion, with some professionals registering a dignified objection and the left wing *Daily Herald* calling for Hobbs to captain the national side<sup>24</sup>.

Second, Hobbs himself fully accepted cricket's social divisions and indeed helped to police them. Cambridge blue Maurice Allom, who played as an amateur for Surrey in the early 1930s, said that 'the senior pros like Jack Hobbs would come down like a ton of bricks on any signs of "bolshiness" by

the junior professionals'<sup>25</sup>. Moreover, when in 1926 he was asked to assume the England captaincy temporarily, Hobbs was the first to point out that an amateur - stockbroker Greville Stevens (Oxford University and Middlesex), at 25 almost twenty years younger than Hobbs – was available<sup>26</sup>. 'We call the amateurs "Sir" or "Mr" as a matter of courtesy'<sup>27</sup>, wrote Hobbs the same year, and he defended the principle of separate dressing rooms, even when his captain Percy Fender was proposing to abolish it, on the throwaway ground that it gave the pro's 'the chance to moan' in private<sup>28</sup>. The point about the era in which Hobbs played was that at that time amateur first class cricketers were pre-defined as carefree, chivalrous (the guardians of true sportsmanship) and stylish. Logically, therefore, professional cricketers were those who lacked these characteristics – except when they didn't, in which case, since they were not thought to have had independent access to these virtues, they were seen simply as having learned them from their social betters. Charles Williams (ex-Cambridge University and Essex) acknowledged this when he pointed out recently that what had been intended as a compliment to Hobbs as an individual was also an ascription of certain virtues to amateurs as a breed – an 'an assertion that the amateur's way of playing was in some way superior to that of the professional'.<sup>29</sup> Jack Hobbs, it appears, was a loved servant, acknowledged by cricket's establishment as an honorary amateur, so long as he knew his place in the game's hierarchy<sup>30</sup>. Hobbs seems never to have relinquished his respect for this hierarchy and its attendant myths. In 1953, by then 71, Hobbs reflected: 'There is one other thing which force of circumstances has changed, regrettably. It is the reduction in the number of people in England who can afford, in these times, to keep in the game as amateur players. What great players were produced in the days when fathers could afford to keep their sons playing cricket after they came down from the 'Varsity'<sup>31</sup>. Even allowing for the routinely 'exemplary'<sup>32</sup> nature of these ghosted biographies this verged on the obsequious. Jack Hobbs' deference did not sit well with all his professional colleagues, some of whom wished, if not to become amateurs themselves, nevertheless to raise the status of the professional cricketer and one day to gain access for professionals to county captaincy: Herbert Sutcliffe, for example, who opened the batting for England with Hobbs in the 1930s, felt Hobbs

disliked responsibility and expressed disappointment in him<sup>33</sup> - a sentiment likely to have been shared by other professionals. Hobbs' knighthood, conferred the same year in the Coronation Honours List, may be read partly as a reward for his unflinching deference.

Sutcliffe himself was involved in what remains the most politically complex controversy in the history of captaincy in county cricket. I consider this now.

### The Looks of a Gent: Herbert Sutcliffe

Sutcliffe is important here for a number of reasons. First, once again, he had had plainly humble beginnings. He was born into a working class family in Nidderdale, North Yorkshire in 1894. His father worked in a saw mill. Orphaned at a young age, he had left school at 13 and got a job in a boot and shoe factory. Second, he was ostentatiously upwardly mobile. If Hobbs played like an amateur, Sutcliffe lived like one. While both men became comparatively prosperous from, or via, cricket and, for example, could afford to have their sons privately educated, Sutcliffe was the more conspicuously self-gentrified of the two, thus assuming a greater status ambiguity. Herbert Sutcliffe enthusiastically embraced well-to-do middle class life. He opened sports outfitters shops in Leeds and Wakefield in the mid-1920s, married the personal secretary of a mill owner and bought a mansion in several acres outside Pudsey, on the outskirts of Leeds. He drove a limousine and later a Rolls Royce. He modified his accent and is said to have rebuked his wife for talking 'Yorkshire'<sup>34</sup>. Local sports reporter Don Mosey befriended Sutcliffe and played golf with him but never once addressed him as other than 'Mr Sutcliffe', a designation in the cricket world ordinarily reserved for amateurs<sup>35</sup>. Moreover, amateur cricketers noted Sutcliffe's social confidence. The Surrey captain Monty Garland Wells (St Pauls School and Oxford) once said of him: 'Herbert was very much a gentleman. He had the looks of a gent. He did not think it wrong to call amateurs by their Christian names'<sup>36</sup>. And Alan Gibson, Oxford University-educated BBC cricket journalist, wrote that Sutcliffe '...batted like a product of Pudsey, which he was – not Malvern. But he was a gentleman all right. His table manners, if I may so put it, were perfection, both on and off the table', adding that he 'spoke in

accents of the purest Teddington<sup>37</sup> and was 'a notably smooth and efficient public speaker...'<sup>38</sup>. And the official historian of Yorkshire County Cricket Club observes that Sutcliffe 'was probably the first to use, on hot days, what would now be called a deodorant...'<sup>39</sup>

Third, in November of 1927, Sutcliffe, who had made his England debut three years earlier, was offered the captaincy of Yorkshire – as a professional – and accepted it. The ensuing controversy, during which Sutcliffe withdrew from the captaincy, revealed an interesting balance of political forces in the debate – at both local and national level - over class and captaincy. The dispute, of which Yorkshire County Cricket Club has kept no official record<sup>40</sup>, was played as follows.

In the summer of 1927 Yorkshire's captain, 48 year old Boer War veteran Major Arthur Lupton had stood down. He had been the team's only amateur. In 104 matches for the county and three seasons as captain, he had finished with a batting average of under 11 and a highest score of 43 – a record well below what would have warranted his selection as a player. Most importantly, in this context, there had, according to Michael Marshall, been 'rumblings' of discontent at Lupton's appointment back in 1925, – not merely for his age and modest cricketing abilities, but for the fact that he'd only previously played once for the county and that had been in 1908<sup>41</sup>.

Initially, the appointment of Sutcliffe (then *en route* to South Africa) was welcomed. A headline in the *Yorkshire Post* read 'PROFESSIONAL TO LEAD YORKSHIRE', beneath which the committee meeting at which Sutcliffe had been elected was said to have been 'well attended'. Alderman Richard Ingham of Pudsey declared that the committee had 'done the right thing': 'In this democratic age, the appointment, I think, will be a popular one with the public at large. We should all like to see an amateur in charge of the Yorkshire team, but we must go out for the best cricketer as captain, irrespective of whether he is an amateur or professional'. Club president Lord Hawke (Eton and Cambridge), who only two years earlier had insisted that no professional should 'ever captain England', now said of that remark that he had been 'talking of an All-England team and not of Yorkshire, which is a different matter'. The article also pointed out that Yorkshire had had several

professional captains in the late nineteenth century<sup>42</sup>. The matter seemed to be settled, but two days later dissent was clearly in the wind.

On 5<sup>th</sup> November the *Post* noted reports in 'some London papers' that Lord Hawke had voted against Sutcliffe. 'We are authorised to deny this statement', the paper stated, adding that since Sutcliffe had been elected by a majority, Hawke, as chair of the meeting, had not actually been called upon to vote. This brief statement is interesting, since it seems both to have originated in London (implying, perhaps, the involvement of the MCC) and to have been designed to distance Hawke from Sutcliffe's appointment. (It later became known that voting had been close – Sutcliffe was elected by two votes – and that the committee had voted by an equally narrow margin against allowing Sutcliffe to have amateur status.<sup>43</sup>)

Just as intriguing were statements on the same page by Yorkshire professionals Roy Kilner, Maurice Leyland and Arthur Dolphin. Kilner expressed 'surprise' at the club's decision, pointing out that Sutcliffe was not the senior professional in the Yorkshire side, and both he and Dolphin pronounced it 'regrettable' that the team would not now be led by an amateur. Considerable trouble seems to have been taken to procure these statements since the three cricketers had only just arrived in Bombay, where they were to spend the winter coaching. Moreover, given the authoritarian nature of English cricket governance at the time (and long after), it seems unlikely that the three were able to make their remarks without official sanction. Some Australian newspapers were quoted approving the decision (the *Melbourne Herald* said it 'was perhaps to be expected that the first English county to break from tradition would be Yorkshire, where the keenness for cricket is unrivalled') but there followed a letter from J. Dawson of South Ferriby, Barton-on-Humber, which, while declaring admiration for Sutcliffe, called for the captaincy to go to the club's senior professional, Wilfred Rhodes<sup>44</sup>.

Three days on and, under the headline

RHODES AND THE YORKSHIRE CAPTAINCY

“NEVER OFFERED TO HIM”

the *Post* reported that Rhodes ‘knew nothing about the matter’ until he read of Sutcliffe’s appointment in the press. The short article stressed Rhodes’ years of service (29), his experience of captaining Yorkshire in the absence of an amateur and his co-option the previous year onto the Test Match Selection Committee<sup>45</sup>. Twenty four hours later the paper carried lengthy comments attributed to Rhodes, purportedly to counter talk that he was unwilling to captain the county. Rhodes gave strong support to the notion that he had been slighted: ‘One could not help thinking that after playing so long the committee would have given me first chance of refusal of the captaincy. It almost looks as if my services were not appreciated’. Rhodes too expressed regret that an amateur could not be found to succeed Lupton ‘who was very popular with us’ and his testimony was backed up by angry letters from Yorkshire members re-shaping the narrative as one of Rhodes’ rejection, rather than of Sutcliffe’s appointment. One correspondent, G.W. Hudson of Headingley, threatened to withdraw his subscription if the committee did not rescind their decision and offer the captaincy to Rhodes<sup>46</sup>.

Over the next few days a variety of views, for and against the appointment, featured in the *Yorkshire Post*, but the most decisive intervention came from S.E. Grimshaw of Leeds. Grimshaw affirmed what was now, at least in the local media, the prevailing view: the absence of an amateur to succeed Lupton was a shame, but, if no amateur could be found, the job must go to Rhodes. He then challenged the club: ‘I wish the county committee to regard this letter as an ultimatum to the effect that unless the rescind their decision within 21 days, I shall take a poll of the club members and by that means get a clear idea of the wishes of the majority’<sup>47</sup>. Sid Grimshaw was a retired school teacher and local cricketer who, importantly, knew the Yorkshire players socially. The questionnaire that he subsequently sent to Yorkshire members consisted of two questions: ‘Are you in favour of the appointment of an amateur or a professional?’ and ‘If it is not possible to secure a suitable amateur, whom are you in favour of – Wilfred Rhodes or Herbert Sutcliffe?’<sup>48</sup> The responses to both

questions ran heavily against Sutcliffe and he withdrew. The club appointed local landowner and Old Etonian Sir William Worsley as captain. He captained Yorkshire for two seasons and averaged a meagre 15 with the bat.

The political mechanics of this episode are not easy to read, but a number of sensible suggestions can be made.

First Hawke, as the club's president, having taken the precaution of asking his friend Sir Home Gordon to take soundings around the counties to assess the acceptability of a professional captain<sup>49</sup>, seems, according to his biographer, to have 'vacillated'<sup>50</sup>. More specifically, Hawke had, perhaps, been concerned to weigh the views of the Yorkshire committee (which proved to be in favour of Sutcliffe's captaincy) against the feeling around the counties and at Lords, where opposition is likely to have been strong. It seems arguable that Hawke found he had miscalculated and had thus approved a campaign, via the local press and the grass-roots membership, to retrieve the situation. Certainly there were political noises to which Hawke would have been sensitive. For example, there had been a period of prolonged trade union militancy following the First World War which culminated in the General Strike of 1926, during which first class cricket fixtures were maintained, there very likely being scant sympathy for the strikers among the cricket hierarchy. Perhaps most importantly, the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 had cast a long political shadow over Western Europe and the English cricket Establishment and attendant mythmakers worked hard to counter any hint of egalitarian aspiration that this seismic political event might have provoked.

Preeminent in this regard was E.H.D. Sewell, an imperialist, writer and ex-cricketer from a prominent military family. In 1926, using the pseudonym 'A County Cricketer', Sewell published a book called *A Searchlight on English Cricket*. The English game, he insisted, was 'at the cross-roads' and risking 'another year of Disgrace', the England team, 'mostly professionals' whom he deems 'vastly overpaid', having lost 12 out of the 15 Tests played against Australia since the First World War<sup>51</sup>. Much of the book is a paean of praise for the paternalism of governing figures like Hawke himself,

defending them against charges of snobbery and insisting upon the 'ever-necessary convention that in our social system there must for all time – if we are to remain an Empire – be marked distinctions between the paid and the unpaid'<sup>52</sup>. Moreover, the secretary of the Yorkshire committee was Frederick Toone, a man closely in touch with current political thinking at the commanding heights on English cricket, having managed the MCC tour of Australia over the winter of 1924-5. He was also, like England captain Arthur Gilligan, a member of British Fascists, a group who worked as strike-breakers and were naturally opposed to the growth of working class power – such as the appointment of Sutcliffe might be seen to signify<sup>53</sup>. It seems doubtful that, at the MCC or in the shires, Sutcliffe's appointment was seen as a blow for Bolshevism or as a threat to the British Empire. It is, perhaps, more plausible to suggest that Hawke and Toone became aware, especially at a time of high national tension, that a Sutcliffe captaincy would be seen as a disruption of the natural order of things and that a reversal of the decision to appoint Sutcliffe would be welcomed.

Second, it's likely that an amateur captaincy suited the majority of the Yorkshire team, both as men and as cricketers. Certainly, throwing their weight behind Rhodes was an oblique demand for an amateur captaincy, since Rhodes, a taciturn individual, now 50 and with no airs or graces, would not have relished, or be suited to, the social side of the job. Indeed, it's possible that the Yorkshire pro's resented Sutcliffe because he *did* have airs and graces and was such an obvious social climber. Class bitterness, refracted through a northern, 'Yorkie' masculinity<sup>54</sup>, often either dissolved into tantrums or was projected onto a 'silver spoon' myth of the south of England – as manifested in the ill feeling shown in a matches against the (predominantly amateur) Middlesex XI in 1924<sup>55</sup>. It is likely that the county's professionals themselves preferred to maintain the Master-and-Men arrangement, on which this truculence thrived. While they invariably resented amateurs and liked to manipulate them – it was often said that Rhodes would declare a Yorkshire innings closed without even telling Major Lupton – they likely preferred to be captained by an amateur, rather than by one of their own.

The episode showed that a humbly born cricketer, his country mansion and the initial decision of his club committee notwithstanding, could still not be admitted to the gentlemanly realm of team leadership, but this was only achieved by overturning an appointment that had been democratically arrived at. In the end, albeit by different routes, the Yorkshire dressing room and a majority of the club's membership communed around the same assumption as the game's paternalist governors – namely that a professional captain could not command the necessary respect. Ironically, the comparatively low cricket ability of Lupton and Worsley may, for a time, have strengthened the position of the amateur captain – these men could be seen as above the fray, above politics, and there only to exercise authority. Besides, counties still depended on upper class patronage and this might be jeopardised by the appointment of a professional captain: one of the strongest protests to the *Yorkshire Post* had come from Charles Crane, President of the amateur Craven Gentlemen Cricket Club, who warned of 'financial' consequences if Sutcliffe's captaincy were to stand<sup>56</sup>.

There can be little doubt that Sutcliffe's removal from the captaincy was welcomed at the MCC, regardless of whether or not it had been achieved with their connivance. In the following year's *John Wisden's Cricket Almanack*, a mouthpiece for ruling opinion in English cricket, the editor, Stewart Caine, welcomed the passing of this challenge to establishment hegemony. 'The matter', he wrote, 'naturally raised the question whether the practice which so generally obtains of giving the captaincy of a county eleven to an amateur, even of modest attainments, carries with it greater advantages than the appointment of an experienced professional. Personally I think it does'<sup>57</sup>.

#### Player to Gentleman: The Case of Walter ('Wally') Hammond

It is tempting to think that the case of Wally Hammond, who in 1937 became the first professional county cricketer in the twentieth century to be permitted to take amateur status, undermined this

establishment hegemony. More accurately it seems to have signalled a tacit shift from caste to class in the disposition of the myth of amateurism. Cricket's hierarchy effectively did a deal with Hammond, at the time England's best batsman: each had something that the other wanted.

Walter Hammond was born in Dover in 1903, the son of a corporal in the Royal Artillery who died in the First World War. He was sent to grammar school in Cirencester, giving him an affiliation with Gloucestershire, for which county he made his debut as a professional cricketer in 1920. (The following year he signed on as a professional footballer for Bristol Rovers – at the time an unassailable working class credential – and played for them until 1924.) He represented Gloucestershire between 1920 and 1946 and again in 1951. He played for England from 1927 and 1947, featuring in 85 Tests. Like Sutcliffe, Hammond was a social climber but he was not as well-off financially. His biographer notes that he 'paid homage, in conversation and print, to the game's lofty elite'<sup>58</sup>, although he lacked Sutcliffe's probity, and he had gentlemanly pretensions, wearing suits from Savile Row and discouraging people he considered socially inferior from calling him 'Wally'. He seldom socialised with teammates. At 34, as one of his biographers points out, Hammond 'was the most famous person in Bristol. He played golf with the city's business men and was welcome at Badminton, the home of the Duke of Beaufort. Well-dressed in double-breasted suits or plus-fours as fitted the occasion, commanding attention wherever he went, he had aspired to a social status no English professional cricketer, not even Jack Hobbs, had approached. But on the £400 or so a year which Gloucestershire paid him, together with his [meet-and-greet] job at Henlys [car dealers], he found it a struggle to keep up appearances'<sup>59</sup>. (£400 was nevertheless toward the upper end of middle class incomes for the time<sup>60</sup>.)

For their part in the mid-1930s the MCC had reached the point where no credible amateur captain of the England team could be found. As Ric Sissons points out, whereas in 1928 205 amateurs had featured on the county circuit, by 1933 this was down to 133 and few of these approached test match standard<sup>61</sup>. In 1936 the Gloucestershire chairman was 'instructed' to ask Hammond if he

would be prepared to play as an amateur, assuming the familiar county sinecure of assistant secretary and sharing the captaincy with the amateur Bev Lyon. Hammond, significantly, declined on financial grounds<sup>62</sup>. Establishment figures therefore moved to make the transition worth Hammond's while. Hammond was made a director of Marsham Tyres, 'influential MCC members' having approached Dunlop, the parent company, to ask that he be made financially independent of cricket and, on becoming an amateur, he was admitted to MCC membership: the MCC rolled out the red carpet – Hammond was proposed by Stanley Baldwin and seconded by Sir Stanley Jackson, a former Conservative Prime Minister and Chairman of the Party respectively. The year after captaining the Players versus the Gentlemen in 1937 Hammond was invited to lead the Gentlemen XI in the same fixture and further efforts were made to assimilate him into English cricket's elite culture. For example, Lords insider Sir Home Gordon<sup>63</sup> in 1939 paid tribute to 'the admitted excellence of Hammond in leadership'<sup>64</sup> and any mention of Hammond's reputation for marital infidelity or the fact that he was believed to have contracted a sexually transmitted disease in the Caribbean in 1926<sup>65</sup> was suppressed. Wilfred Brookes, the editor of *Wisden Cricketers' Almanack*, wrote in the same year, that Hammond had solved a 'very ticklish problem for the Selection Committee' by proving to doubters (of whom Brookes had been one) that he could cope with the responsibility of the England captaincy: indeed he had 'surprised his closest friends by his intelligent tactics'<sup>66</sup>. On top of which Hammond enjoyed the support of the leading patrician Sir Pelham Warner, who approved his conversion to amateur status and wrote the foreword for his first cricket memoir in 1946. 'It cannot be an easy thing' wrote Warner of Hammond, 'to pass from professional to amateur, but he did it gracefully and naturally, and in the doing of it made many new admirers and friends'<sup>67</sup>.

Amateur hegemony survived therefore through adaptation. These tributes to Hammond by establishment spokespeople, such as Gordon, Brookes and Warner, showed a tacit abandonment of the 'birth-and-breeding' rationale for amateurism and an acknowledgement that now amateurism no longer resided in upper middle class heritage: it could be acquired, even 'gracefully' and, of all

things, 'naturally', by a person born into a humble home and educated outside of the public school-Oxbridge nexus. Hammond's transition was permitted because no 'birth' amateur was a sufficiently credible cricketer to captain England. That being the case, he represented the next best option: because he was widely regarded as the best player of his generation; because he had experience of captaincy at county level; because he was socially aspiring; and because he had the perceived reticence of a gentleman – he never discussed his private life in public.

MCC finally relinquished amateur status as a necessity for the England captaincy in 1954 when they appointed the Yorkshire professional Len Hutton to the role. Hutton's tenure as England captain is a classic study in the growing ambiguity that attended the concept of amateurism in English cricket after the Second World War. To be sure, the romantic notion of the amateur still remained strong in some quarters and one of its chief proponents was influential *Daily Telegraph* cricket correspondent and BBC broadcaster E.W Swanton. David Kynaston has noted how Swanton, covering the Gentlemen v. Players match of 1950, described a century by Gentlemen captain Freddie Brown as reminding him of 'how cricket used to be played' before the game embraced 'a dreary philosophy of safety first'. A similar performance by Players captain Tom Dollery was seen as less significant and Brown was immediately named as England captain to tour Australia<sup>68</sup>. However, it appears that the 'dreary' pragmatism inimical to Swanton's amateur myth world is what procured the England captaincy for Hutton two years later.

Hutton had replaced Hammond as England's best batsman. He was also a Yorkshireman and Yorkshiremen had a special place in the paternalist mythology of English cricket. Indeed, the chief exponent of this mythology, Neville Cardus of the *Manchester Guardian*, was often accused of inventing Yorkshire cricketers as a quirky, dialect-speaking northern tribe of curmudgeonly, but loyal, competitors<sup>69</sup>. Concerned to have a captain resolute enough to take on the Australians in 1953, the MCC seem to have opted for Hutton in order to infuse the captaincy with fabled (albeit 'dreary') Yorkshire grit. This seems to be affirmed by the fact that amateur ex-England captain

Freddie Brown, by then a Test selector, played for England under Hutton. Moreover, on Hutton's retirement in 1956, Yorkshire cricket writer J.M. Kilburn wrote: 'The outstanding characteristic of his captaincy was shrewdness. He made no romantic gestures; he lit no fires of inspiration. He invited admiration rather than affection and would have exchanged either or both for effective obedience. A Test-match rubber played under Hutton's captaincy became a business undertaking with its principal satisfactions represented by the dividends paid. Hutton did not expect his players to enjoy their Test matches until the scoreboard showed victory. He could not countenance a light-hearted approach to any cricket match when the result of that match had a meaning<sup>70</sup>'.

Hutton was made a member of MCC and knighted on retirement but, throughout his captaincy, remained in many respects 'below the salt'. At Yorkshire he remained senior professional and, as such, was at the beck and call of the club's committee<sup>71</sup>. Thus, Hawke's expressed view of 1927 was reversed and Hutton only captained Yorkshire when the regular captain, amateur Norman Yardley, was unavailable. Yorkshire maintained amateur captaincy until 1960 and the appointment of Vic Wilson.

It was also borne in on Hutton that he was only a stopgap<sup>72</sup>. The clear heirs apparent to the England captaincy were Peter May and David Sheppard, both of whom had played for England while still undergraduates at Cambridge University. Unlike Sutcliffe or Hammond was not an ostentatious social climber. Although he tried to modify his Yorkshire accent, he was ill at ease among the Lords gentry, having played in the days of separate dressing rooms, and, according to Birley, trailed 'clouds of pre-war subservience'<sup>73</sup>. He and his wife Dorothy found themselves marginalised at the annual Scarborough cricket festival which 'to the amateur cricketer and his wife, was the equivalent of Henley, Wimbledon or Ascot, part of the English social scene in which the lines of demarcation were understood'<sup>74</sup>.

Hutton's status permitted the game's myth-makers to attribute any undue 'safety first' strategy to professional captaincy and not to the prescriptions of the selectors - Swanton, among others, duly

criticised Hutton's caution<sup>75</sup>. Moreover, Hutton suffered from stress-related illness, including temporary blindness – a sure sign to the traditionalists that the responsibilities of captaincy were too much for a professional. Hutton's captaincy lasted only a year, following which, after two matches in Pakistan for which David Sheppard was appointed, the captaincy passed to Peter May. May, although he had the familiar amateur profile (Charterhouse School and Cambridge) would later be credited with all the same traits disparaged in Hutton. For example, Ray Illingworth, cut from the same Yorkshire cloth as Hutton, praised May as 'quite a hard man' and 'highly professional'<sup>76</sup>.

#### Jim Laker: Amateurism as the Last Laugh?

The case of Jim Laker, a professional who became an amateur in the early 1960s, shows the amateur myth in the state of disintegration that the collapse of the 'birth amateur' myth had helped to make inevitable. This disintegration was hastened by the parlous state of county cricket's finances and the consequent need of the MCC to accommodate further elites – in this case, the elites of 'impression management, within its magic circle.

Jim Laker was one of the most prominent English professional cricketers of the 1950s. Born in 1922 in Frizinghall, near Bradford, the son of a stonemason and an uncertificated teacher, Laker played for Surrey from 1946 to 1959 and represented England in 46 Test matches between 1948 and 1959. He is best remembered, first, for taking 19 wickets in the Fourth Test against Australia at Old Trafford in 1956 and, second, for the open resentment of amateur privilege which he expressed for much of his career in county cricket. It is less well known that he played the final two years of his county career (1962-4) as an amateur (with Essex) and thus became very possibly the only working class player to make this transition. The circumstances of Laker's conversion are illustrative of perhaps the greatest threat in the twentieth century to the hegemony of English cricket's traditional elite, with its power base in the shires and the City of London. This hegemony survived, but the historic cult of the amateur did not.

As Angus Calder's widely quoted study of life in wartime Britain amply showed, unabashed class privilege persisted amid a generally hard-pressed population<sup>77</sup>, but there is little doubt that, given the more egalitarian public mood expressed by Labour's General Election victory in 1945, ascribed status would be more difficult to justify after the war was over. Remarkably, in two memoirs that are likely to have had prior approval from Lords, Wally Hammond passed critical judgment on the amateur-professional divide. In the first, written (for him) when he was still England captain (and approved by his patron Sir Pelham Warner, who, as noted, wrote the foreword), he recalled his professional career as a 'happy time. But I had not made very much money, and there was no particular prospect of a fortune ahead'. As an amateur 'inevitably I get a twinge now and again when I recall the old days of carefree fun...'<sup>78</sup>. This was a straight reversal of English cricket's historic narrative of amateurism, in which amateurs, by definition, had been the carefree, fun-loving cricketers and professionals purportedly dour and weighed down by anxiety for their pay packets. In a second memoir, in 1952, Hammond went further, now condemning Lord Hawke (who had died in 1938) for his hope that a professional would never captain England: 'This an extraordinary attitude to adopt, because apparently it is only the nominal status, not the man or his characteristics, to which objection is taken. I can say this because I captained England, after most of a cricket lifetime as a professional. I was the same man as before, or perhaps I even had a slightly declining skill by that time. But because I had changed my label all was well. I submit that this is illogical'. He then re-discovers the notion that a 'large part of the career of a "pro" nowadays is beset with anxiety' and decries the fact that many amateurs were given sinecures by their clubs or local firms to enable them to play cricket<sup>79</sup>. Thus, in the post-war period, ambiguities in the cricket's politics of amateurism were being openly acknowledged. Despite this a determination to maintain the amateur façade was perceptible, as the case of Laker showed.

By the late 1950s Laker was both a prominent public figure and a man of some means. This was not a new phenomenon for professional cricketers: Hobbs and Sutcliffe and others had gained a measure of financial independence and, as Sissons notes, despite continuing snobberies such men

had, for some time, 'become socially accepted in the most illustrious circles'<sup>80</sup>. For Hammond the door to amateur status had been opened and when in 1958 Laker approached Sir George 'Gubby' Allen at the MCC about the possibility of becoming an amateur, Allen initially pronounced it a 'absolutely splendid' idea. Allen (Eton and Cambridge), a stockbroker, had been part of a 'ginger group' of pragmatists at MCC who had worked after the war to soften the amateur-professional divide and in 1949 had procured honorary membership of MCC for leading retired professional cricketers<sup>81</sup>. However, the tone of the conversation cooled rapidly when Laker told Allen that his motive for seeking amateur status was the fact that, on the forthcoming England tour of Australia, amateurs would be receiving more in expenses than professionals would be paid in wages<sup>82</sup>. Allen was trying to promote an ameliorated political climate in which these hypocrisies could continue. Having been on the brink of admission to the gentlemen's club that was amateur status, Laker soon became a pariah. The same year he told a meeting of the Cricket Society that 'a cricketer who cannot afford to play as an amateur either should not play or should become a professional...broken time payments for amateurs on tour [are] the biggest load of poppycock I have heard. An amateur can make more money on the side than a professional'<sup>83</sup>. In 1960 he published an autobiography in which he recounted an altercation with his Surrey captain, Peter May, who had accused him of not trying in a match against Kent at Blackheath two years earlier<sup>84</sup>. Laker never played for Surrey or England again; his honorary membership of MCC (he had been a beneficiary of the Allen reform of 1949) was cancelled.

If this revealed the enduringly iron fist in the velvet glove of MCC paternalism the status distinction between amateurs and professionals could not be sustained much longer and it was formally abandoned in 1962, the year of the last Gentlemen v. Players match. The abolition of the divide and Laker's signing for Essex appeared to have been prompted by the same factor – the growing financial crisis in county cricket. Most members of the MCC hierarchy were minded to keep the amateur-professional divide (in 1958 an MCC sub-committee chaired by the Duke of Norfolk had declared distinctive amateur status 'not obsolete'<sup>85</sup>), but the more far-sighted of them were concerned for

the future of the county game: as 'Gubby' Allen later reflected 'I wanted to retain amateur status but realized the financial problems'<sup>86</sup>. The chief political issue at the MCC was not amateur status; it was one-day cricket, now increasingly accepted as the best way to boost cricket's falling attendances, but, during the 1950s, opposed by the traditionalists such as Warner<sup>87</sup>. Sponsorship of a one-day competition was negotiated with the Gillette razor company – a deal that would have been less likely had English cricket opted to maintain its inegalitarian status distinctions<sup>88</sup> - and scheduled to start in 1963.

This meant that when he began to play for Essex in 1962, Jim Laker was crossing what was still a socially and politically significant boundary; indeed, several of the Essex committee, unsure of whether Laker was still *persona non grata* at the MCC and fearing their disapproval, were opposed to his registration<sup>89</sup>. The following year he became no more than a cricketer happy simply to play for nothing bar his expenses.

Significantly, Laker had been recruited by his erstwhile England colleague and Essex captain Trevor Bailey (Dulwich College and Cambridge) who, though an amateur, was as sceptical of the MCC ethos as Laker was. In the early 1950s he had, for example, expressed irritation with white English expatriates of the West Indies who had demanded an English victory in the Test series there in 1953-4 to prevent 'the natives' from becoming 'uppity'<sup>90</sup>. He was also a living contradiction of the myth of the amateur player, becoming known for a dour playing style historically ascribed to the professional. For this the Australian side of the 1950s had dubbed him 'Barnacle Bailey'<sup>91</sup>. More importantly, Bailey was assistant secretary at Essex and, unlike a number of amateurs who held the position, was closely involved in the running of the club. In 1965, for example he was to arrange an interest-free loan from Warwickshire, enabling Essex to buy their ground at Chelmsford<sup>92</sup> and Keith Fletcher, a subsequent Essex captain, who played under Bailey, described him as 'instrumental in taking Essex County Cricket Club into the modern era'<sup>93</sup>. Essex were actually facing extinction in the mid-1960s<sup>94</sup> and no-one is likely to have known this better than Bailey. So he will have judged that in

engaging Laker Essex would be getting a top class cricketer for next to nothing – indeed Laker’s version of the transaction with Bailey was that ‘the following day he picked up a copy of the *Daily Express* and was somewhat surprised to learn that he had agreed to play for the county as an amateur’<sup>95</sup>. Essex would be getting out of Laker what Surrey had got from him over thirteen years as a professional – cheap labour. In a parallel irony Bailey, it seems, had judged (correctly) that Laker, now a prosperous businessman, would, having been such a strong critic of amateur privilege, would now enjoy the piquant pleasure of spending his final playing years occupying that very status.

### Conclusion

English cricket’s governing clique, established in the nineteenth century, based historically in the landed and financial elites and educated in the private schools and the universities of Oxford and Cambridge maintained their hegemony well beyond the superficially democratic 1960s. For much of that time The MCC’s inner circle sustained a masters-and-men relationship with working class cricketers, defending their position by deploying, and, when necessary, adjusting the myth of amateurism. This myth had a wide subscription – at different times Jack Hobbs (the ‘amateur in all but name’) and well over two thousand members of Yorkshire County Cricket Club<sup>96</sup> deferred to it – and it persisted despite at times vigorous contestation and ridicule over the best part of a century. In this myth amateurs were constituted as a caste until they shrank in number to a point where they had to admit outsiders and thus became, by implication at least, a class. This belatedly facilitated the admission of one or two cricketers of working class origin and the master/man distinction was only abandoned, reluctantly, in the face of financial imperative. At this point – the early 1960s – the ‘green and pleasant’ culture of cricket stewardship moved to accommodate a new faction – the impression management elite of marketing, PR and advertising. Most amateurs now, like Hammond, were funded by commercial companies in return for meet-and-greet public appearances at business gatherings. This made it possible for traditionalists to argue that the days of the ‘genuine amateur’ were past. But it also pointed to the fact that both amateurs and professionals were now openly

engaged in the ancillary commercial activities that attached to elite sport. These activities were not in themselves new – Jack Hobbs, for example, and other prominent players of the inter-war period, had made a lot of money from advertising. Indeed, so had amateurs – as with W.G. Grace’s advertisements for Colman’s Mustard in the 1890s<sup>97</sup>. But, when they had done so, professionals of the past had merely reaffirmed their weddedness to the polluting cash nexus, which the elite had always cited as ground for dividing them from amateurs. Now, when Laker said of advertising ‘I would say that the player is welcome to any contract he can get. I’m all for it; as long as advertisers believe they can convince the public that a certain fast bowler really uses a certain type of razor...what’s to stop them?’ he spoke for many cricketers, not just professionals. Indeed, when Bailey had approached him to play for Essex, he and Laker had both been in Manchester doing ‘some promotional work’<sup>98</sup>. In post-war Britain, deference was in decline and social class becoming a matter not only of origins but of destinations. Moreover particular economic activities – in the broad area of media, promotion and consumption – were no longer necessarily disparaged in elite circles: there had been significant affirmation of this in the intake of new Conservative MPs in the General Elections of 1945 and 1951 – young Tory members from the business and ‘impression management’ sectors (advertising, public relations....) successfully campaigned for the Television Act of 1954 and the subsequent introduction of commercial television<sup>99</sup>. When amateur status was abolished in English cricket in 1962, Ted Dexter (Radley School and Cambridge) who had captained both Sussex and England as an amateur, turned professional. He later worked as a journalist for the Sunday Mirror and developed a number of media-related businesses, including his own PR company. Similarly Trevor Bailey recalled in 2011: ‘I did more modelling than any other cricketer of my time. I was not only one of the Brylcreem boys, I also appeared in a number of other ads for breakfast cereal, Shredded Wheat, etc. In the Lucozade energy drink ad, I appeared along with my wife and the eldest son, Kim. I also had a sponsored Ford car.’<sup>100</sup> To secure their own hegemony the MCC themselves now embraced commercialism, a principal motive behind the abandonment of the amateur-professional distinction in 1962 being, as I have argued, the importance of presenting a

somewhat more egalitarian image to sponsors and their target audiences: the Gillette Cup, bearing the name of the American razor company, began the following year. Myriad other corporate sponsorships – by cigarette manufacturers, supermarkets, insurance companies and banks – would soon follow. Thirty years later, in the judgment of Mike Marqusee, this had amounted to a transformation of English cricket and it had been achieved ‘not by personnel from outside, but the last generation of amateurs...’<sup>101</sup>

### Acknowledgements

Thanks for help in the development of this essay to Dilwyn Porter, Neil Carter and Carol Osborne.

---

<sup>1</sup> I’m referring here principally to the publication of Bill Jones’ biography of John Tarrant, *The Ghost Runner* (Edinburgh: Mainstream, 2011) and Charles Williams’ *Gentlemen and Players: The Death of Amateurism in Cricket* (London: Phoenix, 2013) and the subsequent symposium on *Sport and Working-class Amateurism* held at what was then still Leeds Metropolitan University on 4 July 2014, at which Bill Jones was the principal speaker.

<sup>2</sup> See H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Trans., Eds.) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1967 p.405

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Samantha-Jayne Oldfield and Dave Day ‘Manchester Pedestrianism 1840-1880: A Collective Biography of “Sporting Publicans”’

[http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&ved=0ahUKEwiC-fmwzs3NAhWBIMAKHT\\_CAMYQFggpMAI&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.sussex.ac.uk%2Fchlwr%2Fdocuments%2Fsamantha-oldfield-combined-abstract-and-poster-2009.pdf&usg=AFQjCNF5Y8RPLJdptI2Mw5m0j9q595TxSw&bvm=bv.125801520,d.ZGg](http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&ved=0ahUKEwiC-fmwzs3NAhWBIMAKHT_CAMYQFggpMAI&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.sussex.ac.uk%2Fchlwr%2Fdocuments%2Fsamantha-oldfield-combined-abstract-and-poster-2009.pdf&usg=AFQjCNF5Y8RPLJdptI2Mw5m0j9q595TxSw&bvm=bv.125801520,d.ZGg) Access 29 June 2016

<sup>4</sup> C.Wright Mills *The Sociological Imagination* (Harmondsworth: Pelican) p.12

<sup>5</sup> Michael Marshall *Gentlemen and Players: Conversations with Cricketers* (London: Grafton Books 1987)

<sup>6</sup> Ric Sissons *The Players: A Social History of the Professional Cricketer* (London: The Kingswood Press 1988)

<sup>7</sup> Matt Taylor and Joyce Woolridge have written perceptively about sports biographies and their possible use by historians. Both authors shed light on the history of the genre and on the likely constituent elements of different literary sporting life. See Matthew Taylor ‘From Source to Subject: Sport, History, and Autobiography’ *Journal of Sport History* Vol.35 No.3 Fall 2008 pp.469-491. Woolridge identifies the ‘exemplary’ sport biography as typical in the period before the 1950s in that the subject is portrayed as conforming to gentlemanly ideals. Most of the biographies I draw on fit that description. See Joyce Woolridge ‘These Sporting Lives: Football Autobiographies 1945-1980’ *Sport in History* Vol.28 No.4 December 2008 pp.620-640.

<sup>8</sup> See ‘“Time, Gentlemen, Please”: The Decline of Amateur Captaincy in English County Cricket’ in *Contemporary British History* Vol.14 No.2 Summer pp.31-5

<sup>9</sup> See John Scott *The Upper Classes: Property and Privilege in Britain* (London: Macmillan 1982) p.155

<sup>10</sup> See Martin J. Wiener *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980* (London: Penguin Books 1992) p.158.

<sup>11</sup> John Westgaard and Henrietta Resler *Class in a Capitalist Society: A Study of Contemporary Britain* (London: Pelican 1976) p.6

<sup>12</sup> The best source for verifying the prominence in English cricket governance of men from these social backgrounds is Mike Marqusee *Anyone But England: An Outsider Looks at English Cricket* (London: Aurum Press 2005). See, in particular, pp.82-87, where Marqusee spells out the links, within the nineteenth century MCC, between the landed and financial elite, leading professionals (such as barristers), alcohol magnates, as

---

well as the military and colonial hierarchies. For the predominance of ex-public schoolboys – particularly those from the especially high status ‘Clarendon’ schools - among amateur cricketers between 1940 and 1930 see Peter Cain ‘Education, Income and Status: Amateur Cricketers in England and Wales c.1840-c.1930’ *Sport in History* Vol.30 No.3 September 2010 pp.351-371

<sup>13</sup> See Gerth and Mills pp.180-95

<sup>14</sup> See, for example, Tony Collins *Sport in Capitalist Society: A Short History* (London: Routledge 2013) p.34

<sup>15</sup> See Tony Collins *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture and the Origins of Rugby League Football* (London: Routledge 2006).

<sup>16</sup> See Dilwyn Porter ‘Revenge of the Crouch End Vampires: The AFA, the FA and English Football's ‘Great Split’, 1907–14’ *Sport in History* Volume 26, Issue 3, 2006 pp.406-428

<sup>17</sup> Ross McKibbin *Classes and Cultures: England 1918-1951* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1998) p.335

<sup>18</sup> See Stephen Wagg “Time, Gentlemen, Please” ...

<sup>19</sup> See Rowland Bowen *Cricket: A History of its Growth and Development Throughout the World* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode 1970) pp.141-2; John Arlott *Jack Hobbs: Profile of ‘The Master’* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1982) p.11; Leo McKinstry *Jack Hobbs: England's Greatest Cricketer* (London: Yellow Jersey Press 2011) p.71

<sup>20</sup> Marshall p.23

<sup>21</sup> McKinstry p.19

<sup>22</sup> McKinstry p.234

<sup>23</sup> James P. Coldham *Lord Hawke: A Cricketing Biography* (Marlborough: The Crowood Press 1990) p.184

<sup>24</sup> McKinstry p.235

<sup>25</sup> Marshall p.31

<sup>26</sup> An incident recounted with almost embarrassing humility in Jack Hobbs *Playing for England: My Test Cricket Story* (London: Victor Gollancz 1931) p.129

<sup>27</sup> Jack Hobbs *My Cricket Memories* (London: William Heinemann 1926) p.50

<sup>28</sup> Marshall p.24

<sup>29</sup> Williams *Gentlemen and Players* p.183

<sup>30</sup> There are clear parallels here with the professional Dan Maskell in English lawn tennis. See Robert J. Lake “‘That Excellent Sample of a Professional’: Dan Maskell and the Contradictions of British Amateurism in Twentieth-Century Lawn Tennis’ *Sport in History* Vol.36 No1 March 2016 pp.1-25

<sup>31</sup> Pat Landsberg *Jack Hobbs: Gentleman and Player* London: Todd Publishing 1953 p.79

<sup>32</sup> See Woolridge, 2008

<sup>33</sup> Sissons p.246

<sup>34</sup> Alan Hill *Herbert Sutcliffe: Cricket Maestro* London: Simon and Schuster 1991 pp.84–5.

<sup>35</sup> Don Mosey *We Don't Play it For Fun: A Story of Yorkshire Cricket* London: Methuen 1988 p.55

<sup>36</sup> Hill *Herbert Sutcliffe...* 1991 p.125

<sup>37</sup> A largely affluent, Thames-side district of South West London.

<sup>38</sup> Alan Gibson *The Cricket Captains of England* London: Cassell 1979 p.155

<sup>39</sup> Derek Hodgson *The Official History of Yorkshire County Cricket Club* Marlborough: The Crowood Press 1989 p.104

<sup>40</sup> Michael Marshall wrote in 1987 that the dispute over the offer of the captaincy to Sutcliffe ‘is a closely guarded secret in the sense that no records are available for inspection of the Yorkshire committee’s subsequent actions’ – Marshall p.42. It seems unlikely, given the importance of the issue, that the absence of any record can be attributed to oversight on the club’s part.

<sup>41</sup> Marshall p.38

<sup>42</sup> *Yorkshire Post* 3<sup>rd</sup> November 1927 p.9. The captains listed were Roger Iddison (1863-70) a merchant’s son and the county’s first captain, Joseph Rowbotham (1871-5), Ephraim Lockwood (1876-7) and Thomas Emmett (1878-82).

<sup>43</sup> Alan Hill *Herbert Sutcliffe: Cricket Maestro* (Second edition) (Stroud: Stadia 2007) p.110

<sup>44</sup> *Yorkshire Post* 5 November 1927 p.12

<sup>45</sup> *Yorkshire Post* 8 November 1927 p.17

<sup>46</sup> *Yorkshire Post* 9 November 1927 p.17

<sup>47</sup> *Yorkshire Post* 12 November 1927 p.23

<sup>48</sup> Marshall p.41

<sup>49</sup> Gibson *The Cricket Captains...* p.155

<sup>50</sup> Coldham p.185

<sup>51</sup> ‘A County Cricketer’ [E.H.D.Sewell] *A Searchlight on English Cricket* (London: Robert Holden & Co 1926) pp. 5 and 68

- 
- <sup>52</sup> 'A County Cricketer' p.140
- <sup>53</sup> See Andrew Moore 'The "Fascist" Cricket Tour of 1924-25' *Sporting Traditions* Vol.7 No.2 May 1991 pp.164-74 <http://library.la84.org/SportsLibrary/SportingTraditions/1991/st0702/st0702e.pdf> (Access 20th November 2015) Arunabha Sengupta 'The fascist Ashes tour — Arthur Gilligan's visit in 1924-25' <http://www.cricketcountry.com/articles/the-fascist-ashes-tour-arthur-gilligans-visit-in-1924-25-303819> (Posted 9 July 2015; access 20 November 2015)
- <sup>54</sup> See Stephen Wagg 'Muck or Nettles. Men, Masculinity and Myth in Yorkshire Cricket' *Sport in History* Vol. 23 No.2 Winter 2003-4 pp.68-93
- <sup>55</sup> See J.M. Kilburn *A History of Yorkshire Cricket* (Newton Abbott: The Sportsman's Book Club 1971) pp.69-70
- <sup>56</sup> Letter to *Yorkshire Post* 10<sup>th</sup> November 1927 p.17
- <sup>57</sup> *John Wisden's Cricketers' Almanack For 1928* p.348
- <sup>58</sup> See David Foot *Wally Hammond: The Reasons Why* (London: Robson Books) 1996 p.6
- <sup>59</sup> Gerald Howat *Walter Hammond* (London: George Allen & Unwin 1984) p.74
- <sup>60</sup> See McKibbin p.72. See also Dilwyn Porter 'Whistling his Way to Wembley: Percy Harper of Stourbridge, Cup Final Referee' *Sport in History* Vol.35 No.2 June 2015 pp.231-2
- <sup>61</sup> Sissons p.248
- <sup>62</sup> Howat pp.67-8
- <sup>63</sup> Sir Home Seton Charles Montagu Gordon, 12th Baronet Gordon of Embo, Sutherland (1871-1956), was an Old Etonian journalist and publisher
- <sup>64</sup> Sir Home Gordon, Bart *Background of Cricket* (London: Arthur Barker 1939) p.209
- <sup>65</sup> See David Foot *Wally Hammond: The Reasons Why* (London: Robson Books 1996) pp.18-22, 196. See also Arunabha Sengupta 'Wally Hammond: A life of grace, grandeur and grief' <http://www.cricketcountry.com/articles/wally-hammond-a-life-of-grace-grandeur-and-grief-28064> Access 8 May 2016
- <sup>66</sup> Wilfred H. Brookes 'Notes by the Editor' *Wisden Cricketers' Almanack 1939* (London: J. Whitaker and Sons 1939) pp.73-4
- <sup>67</sup> Sir Pelham Warner Foreword to Walter R. Hammond *Cricket My Destiny* (London: Stanley Paul 1946) p.6
- <sup>68</sup> David Kynaston *Austerity Britain 1945-51* (London: Bloomsbury 2007) p.528
- <sup>69</sup> See, for example, Christopher Brookes *His Own Man: The Life of Neville Cardus* (London: Methuen 1985) pp.105-110
- <sup>70</sup> J.M. Kilburn 'Len Hutton Retires' *The Cricketer* Spring 1956 <http://www.espnricinfo.com/cricketer/content/story/148526.html> Access 5 July 2016
- <sup>71</sup> See Gerald Howat *Len Hutton: The Biography* (London: Mandarin 1990) pp.109-10
- <sup>72</sup> See Len Hutton, with Alex Bannister *Fifty Years in Cricket* (London: Stanley Paul 1984) p.72
- <sup>73</sup> Derek Birley *A Social History of English Cricket* (London: Aurum Press 2003) p.283
- <sup>74</sup> Howat *Len Hutton...* p.120
- <sup>75</sup> Howat *Len Hutton...* pp.129-30; Birley *A Social History...* pp. 283-4
- <sup>76</sup> Ray Illingworth and Don Mosey *Yorkshire and Back* (London: Queen Anne Press 1980) p.63
- <sup>77</sup> Angus Calder *The People's War: Britain 1939-1945* (London: Granada Publishing 1971). See, for example, pp.453-473.
- <sup>78</sup> Walter R. Hammond *Cricket My Destiny* (London: Stanley Paul 1946) p.136
- <sup>79</sup> See Walter R. Hammond *Cricket's Secret History* (London: Stanley Paul 1952) pp.55-7
- <sup>80</sup> Sissons p.244
- <sup>81</sup> See E.W. Swanton *Gubby Allen: Man of Cricket* (London: Hutchinson/ Stanley Paul 1985) p.244
- <sup>82</sup> Marshall pp.253-4
- <sup>83</sup> Williams *Gentlemen and Players...* pp.129-30
- <sup>84</sup> Jim Laker *Over To Me* (London: Frederick Muller 1960) pp.11-16
- <sup>85</sup> Marqusee p.118
- <sup>86</sup> Marshall p.255
- <sup>87</sup> See Stephen Wagg 'Everyone seemed to be "with it": cricket politics and the coming of the one-day game, 1940-1970' *Sport in Society* Volume 16, Issue 1, 2013 pp.5-18
- <sup>88</sup> See Stephen Wagg 'Time, Gentlemen, Please" ...'
- <sup>89</sup> Hill *Jim Laker* p.177
- <sup>90</sup> Trevor Bailey *Wickets, Catches and the Odd Run* (London: Willow Books 1986) p.186
- <sup>91</sup> David Lloyd 'Barnacle' Bailey: 'A tower of strength. He was one of a kind and a sad loss' <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/news/barnacle-bailey-a-tower-of-strength-he-was-one-of-a-kind-and-a-sad-loss-2211017.html> 11 February 2011; access 24 May 2016

---

<sup>92</sup> Ijaz Chaudhry 'I did more modelling than any other cricketer of my time' [Interview with Trevor Bailey] <http://www.espncricinfo.com/magazine/content/story/493308.html> Posted 10 January 2011; access 11 May 2016

<sup>93</sup> Derek Pringle 'Trevor Bailey is remembered for his obdurate batting and as one of England's finest all-rounders' [Obituary] *The Telegraph* 10 February 2011  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/cricket/international/england/8317128/Trevor-Bailey-is-remembered-for-his-obdurate-batting-and-as-one-of-Englands-finest-all-rounders.html> Access 11 May 2016

<sup>94</sup> See David Lemmon *Changing Seasons: A History of Cricket in England 1945-1996* (London: Andre Deutsch 1997) pp.221-2

<sup>95</sup> Hill *Jim Laker* p.177

<sup>96</sup> In the poll over the Sutcliffe controversy 2,264 Yorkshire members voted for an amateur captaincy. See Hill *Herbert Sutcliffe...* 2007 p.136

<sup>97</sup> See Simon Briggs 'A hundred years of sport and advertising' *The Telegraph*  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/othersports/2292796/A-hundred-years-of-sport-and-advertising.html>  
Posted 26th February 2008. Access 12 May 2016

<sup>98</sup> Don Mosey *Laker: Portrait of a Legend* (London: Queen Anne Press 1989) pp.76-7

<sup>99</sup> See H.H. Wilson *Pressure Group: The Campaign for Commercial Television* (London: Secker and Warburg 1961)

<sup>100</sup> Chaudhry 'I did more....'

<sup>101</sup> Marqusee p.134