

Revisiting the History of the British Empire Games: From the Early Years through to the Inauguration

KAWAMOTO, Masahiro

(地域変動論コース)

Introduction

The Commonwealth Games, which are to be held at Glasgow in the summer of 2014, were originally a series of international sports meetings held every four years since the first one was launched in Hamilton, Canada, in 1930 as the British Empire Games. As Table 1 shows, this has encompassed a history of eighty years and its name has been changed three times. It has nevertheless aroused considerable interest among historians although some of them have focused on the games in recent decades.¹

In this paper, I revisit the preceding period, the games in their embryo stage, the inaugural games and activities of governing bodies in Great Britain and the British Empire for the games in the early period. While much of the previous research is certainly helpful, a partial revision of what historians described is in order by cross-references and original documents, some of which have not been referred to thus far in the historical record. Then I will propose a new perspective for the research of the history of the Empire/Commonwealth Games in the broader context of British imperial and Commonwealth history.

The games on paper and the games in the embryo stage

It is very common that we refer to a peculiar figure and a particular sports meeting when we talk about the origin of the Empire/Commonwealth Games. The former is John Astley Cooper, who wrote several articles, published in London mainly in the 1890s and 1900s, proposing an imperial sports event, and the latter is the athletic meeting on the grounds of the Festival of Empire in Crystal Palace, London, in 1911. The official publication of the sixth Games in Cardiff in 1958 introduced the story of Cooper and the meeting in 1911, and the website of Commonwealth Games England has made reference to this in the past.² Katharine Moore is the pioneer as an academic who researched this preceding period of the history of the Games. The perspective and arguments developed in her research are still very much worthy of reference. Recent research by other historians, however, should also be noted, and we

Table 1 : Empire Games / Commonwealth Games 1930-2018

Year	Host city	Number of participating countries	Number of sports	Number of events	Number of athletes	Title of the Games
1930	Hamilton, Canada	11	6	59	400	British Empire Games
1934	London, England	16	6	68	500	
1938	Sydney, Australia	15	7	71	464	
1950	Auckland, New Zealand	12	9	88	590	
1954	Vancouver, Canada	24	9	91	662	British Empire & Commonwealth Games
1958	Cardiff, Wales	35	9	94	1122	
1962	Perth, Australia	35	9	104	863	
1966	Kingston, Jamaica	34	9	110	1050	British Commonwealth Games
1970	Edinburgh, Scotland	42	9	121	1383	
1974	Christchurch, New Zealand	38	9	121	1276	Commonwealth Games
1978	Edmonton, Canada	46	10	128	1474	
1982	Brisbane, Australia	45	10	142	1583	
1986	Edinburgh, Scotland	26	10	163	1662	
1990	Auckland, New Zealand	55	10	204	2073	
1994	Victoria, Canada	63	10	217	2557	
1998	Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	70	15	213	3633	
2002	Manchester, England	72	17	281	3679	
2006	Melbourne, Australia	71	16	245	4049	
2010	Delhi, India	71	17	272	4345	
2014	Glasgow, Scotland	—	—	—	—	
2018	Gold Coast, Australia	—	—	—	—	

* Compiled by the author from the official website of the Commonwealth Games Federation (<http://www.thecgf.com/games/growth.asp/> and http://www.thecgf.com/games/games_index.asp), and revised through the inspection of the Official Histories of each Games.

need to revisit the history of the Games by considering overall achievement. In this chapter I reconstruct a story before the first Games in 1930 and propose the basis for a historical study of the Games.

The personal history of John Astley Cooper is not so well known, though the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography contains an entry on him.³ He was born in Adelaide, South Australia, and baptized in 1858. His father was an English-born vicar and the family returned to England in 1870. As described in the Dictionary, however, “Little is known about his professional and private life”. He indicated his presence in public mainly through some newspaper articles and periodicals published in London at the turn of the century. Through these articles he insisted on the merits and importance of the unity of the British Empire and its promotion by public representation such as exhibitions, conferences and sport meetings.

Under the rise and fall of the movement for the imperial federation, the earliest of his articles which proposed an imperial event was an anonymous one published in a magazine called *Greater Britain* in July, 1891. It prompted, as Moore noticed, “considerable discussion of a proposal to celebrate the cultural, industrial and athletic achievements of the British race.”⁴ Cooper also presented himself as the initial proponent of the idea of what he termed “United English Festival,” or the “English Festival”, consisting of exhibitions with conferences, contests for scholarships and athletic meetings.⁵ The event he advocated carried racial implications as well.⁶ He claimed that he would “propose as a means of increasing the good will and the good understanding of the Empire, also with the hope of drawing closer the family bonds between the United States and the Empire of the Queen” and that this scheme “encourages a common understanding of the English race”.⁷

Letters and articles followed the proposal which was consequently publicised and debated in the London press. Moore appropriately revealed that the athletic meeting became a focal point because it was popular to the extent to which Cooper himself was surprised by this discussion.⁸ Cooper recalled in his article in *The Nineteenth Century* in July, 1893, the objective of his original suggestion, noting he had attempted “to bring about, outside of existing political and commercial organisations... a common periodical representing gathering, and to establish a National and Racial Festival.”⁹ He had accepted, noticed Moore, the overwhelming response to the athletic portion of his plan and identified the characteristics of sportsmen—health, pluck, physical vigour, self-denial and fair play—as the very attributes which had contributed so successfully to Britain’s empire-building.¹⁰

His proposal provoked enthusiastic discussion and a significant amount of support in the press in London along with support overseas in publication such as the *Referee*, a periodical “of sports and pastime” issued in Sydney, New South Wales. Nevertheless, this was directly followed by neither a so-called “Britannic festival” nor a sporting event. In terms of the athletic meeting, the standstill was substantially caused by the fact that he was unlikely to have any intentions of getting cooperation from the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA), the governing body of athletics in England. Cooper declared that he was only suggesting an idea and expected the appropriate sport governing bodies to work out the practical details. On the other hand the AAA consistently showed an indifferent attitude to the idea. Moore revealed this in detail in the process from the first appearance in the minutes of the AAA to the final glimpse of the Pan-Britannic Festival in 1894.¹¹ She argued that a major stumbling block, probably the most crucial for the festival, was Cooper’s

relationship with the AAA, which was characterised by a situation compounded by an apparent misunderstanding of roles and procedures. It is likely that, as she asserted, it was a most unjust fate for an idea which had received a great deal of attention and praise elsewhere.

We should pay more attention to the impact from the ongoing plan of the Olympiad. By late 1894 Baron Pierre de Coubertin had started to promote the revival of the ancient Olympic Games. Cooper might seemingly have promoted his idea and communicated with those who were relevant to sporting organisations in the empire overseas. He insisted in his article that his idea had attracted general support from America, India, Australia and South Africa.¹² The *Referee* in Sydney reported that the honorary secretary of the New Zealand Amateur Athletic Association had heard from Cooper that the AAA in England had approved his scheme, but no evidence has been found which indicates any AAA endorsement of Cooper's idea.¹³ On the other hand, as is well known from, for example, J.J. MacAloon's authentic work, de Coubertin campaigned for the Olympic Games much more practically and enthusiastically by negotiating with sporting persons, politicians, entrepreneurs and other dignitaries in relevant countries.¹⁴

De Coubertin's promotion of his plan for a world-wide athletic meeting was much more aggressive than Cooper's action and attitude. The contrast between the two was rather intriguing. According to Moore's description, Cooper was an imperial dreamer and De Coubertin was an active aristocrat idealist. She also referred to the potent formula summarized by MacAloon, quoting "Coubertin's drive and personality, the resources of money, prestige, and social contacts he commanded, and his total investment in his identity as a sports entrepreneur and reformer were essential to his success." Finally, as she concluded, "attention was diverted", and "the Pan-Britannic Festival faded from public view."¹⁵

We should notice, however, that the plan of the Olympic Games overshadowed that of the Britannic Festival not because of its similarity in concept and the scale of perspectives of the event. Cooper criticized the 1908 Olympic Games in London as "purely a hybrid, babel gathering... neither Greek nor... Pan-Britannic Olympic gathering for the people of the British Empire and other English-speaking countries which I have advocated." He also assumed that the 1908 Olympic was "nothing more nor[sic.] less than a side show to the Franco-British Exhibition."¹⁶

As far as the characteristics of the Olympic Games in this early period, Cooper's view was acute and righteous even if his personal sentiment was reflected in it. The Games in 1908 was initially to be held in Rome but after the city gave it up, the games

in London were hastily arranged by the cooperation of the British Olympic Association and Imre Kiralfy, the exhibition organiser. The Franco-British exhibition had been prepared for some years since Kiralfy launched the idea and acquired the site at Shepherd's Bush, west London, and the Olympiad was in fact added to it.¹⁷ So the 1908 Games was quite literally "a side show to the Franco-British Exhibition."¹⁸ It is, however, not unique at all as a sideshow Olympics of the exhibition, as the Games in 1900 was attached to the *Exposition Universelle* in Paris and the 1904 Games was held as one of the main attractions of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. Other than the Olympics, the athletes—or the "people"—often competed on the exhibition grounds. The "Anthropology Days" is infamous as the racial athletic meeting in St. Louis, U.S.A.,¹⁹ while in Manchester, U.K., local athletes and cyclists gathered to compete at the stadium with the seats of more than six thousand on site during the period which the Royal Jubilee Exhibition was held in 1887.²⁰

It is ironic enough that the idea initiated by Cooper who has denounced the Olympics at the White City, London, in 1908 was largely realised as a sideshow of the imperial exhibition within a few years after the Games. In 1911, Festival of Empire, or the imperial exhibition, was held in Sydenham, a southern suburb of London. Buildings and attractions for the exhibition were built in the park, while the Crystal Palace, having been moved from Hyde Park and rebuilt in 1854, was filled with various displays and events. Many visitors saw the pavilions and the displays of the dominions and colonies including Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa and India.²¹ The Festival had a lot of sub events and sideshows just as other great exhibitions did. One of the largest ones was the Pageant of London at the amphitheatre built on site. This outdoor play is assumed to be a part in the *Pageantitis*, the rage of the historical pageant in England in the early twentieth century.²² The Pageant consisted of episodes from the history of London depicted from the viewpoint which was closely connected with the British Empire, and it took two days to put on the whole story. It was voluntarily performed by thousands of the residents from various parts of London and attracted many more thousands in three months on stage.²³ A sports meeting was also held as a sub event of the Festival on the exhibition ground, though it seems to have been less impressive than the pageant in vogue.

The exhibition with the industrial, cultural, and sports displays emerged at the Crystal Palace in 1911 as if the Pan-Britannic Festival in Cooper's proposal would be realised. The Festival of Empire, however, never reproduced the actual structure and format proposed by Cooper. As Moore noticed, though the powerful sentiment and

philosophy of celebrating the achievements of the British Empire lived long and could be reproduced, no evidence that Cooper was more or less involved in preparations for the Festival of Empire has been discovered.²⁴

The *Referee*, the weekly paper issued in London reported that the original idea of bringing the athletes of the colonies and Great Britain together was conceived by William Henry, the honorary secretary of the Life Saving Society.²⁵ He discussed his idea with the governing bodies during the tour of the dominions in early 1911, and he successfully got their support in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, with the patronage of the new King George V and the honorary presidency of Lord Desborough, William Grenfell. Grenfell was the most well-known aristocrat as a sportsman by contemporaries, representing Harrow at cricket and Oxford in fencing, athletics and rowing, as well as mountaineer, hunter, horseman, swimmer and fisherman.²⁶ He was one of the founders of the British Olympic Association and the president of the Games in 1908, along with the presidency of various sporting organisations. So it might be assumed that, given that he intermittently became the acting president of the Life Saving Society, he might have taken the initiative in planning the sports meeting at Crystal Palace in 1911.

It was decided that the teams which scored the highest points added up from the result of each event would win the cup contributed by the Earl of Lonsdale, Hugh C. Lowther. The fifth Earl is, like Lord Desborough, a sporting aristocrat who was well known in the field of boxing, hunting, horse riding and other sports and deeply committed to the governing bodies in various sports.²⁷ Contrary to the event proposed by Cooper, therefore, the imperial sport meeting as a part of the Festival of Empire was endorsed by the eminent personalities in sports of the home country.²⁸ Australia, New Zealand and Canada sent their athletes to London, despite the subsequent withdrawal of South Africa, and the three teams—Australasia, Canada and the United Kingdom—competed for the cup in the track races, swimming, wrestling and boxing.

It is assumed to have been an austere event as an imperial sports meeting. The athletic meeting on 24 June consisted of the 100 yards, the 220 yards, the 1/2 mile, the one mile, the 120 yards hurdles, and the only three athletes each of whom represented their team competed. The 300 yards, the 3/4 mile and the 2 miles were also on the programme as noncompeting races, in which all but one who took part — the exception being a Canadian for the 3/4 mile — were athletes from the British Isles.²⁹ The swimming races of the 100 yards and the one mile were held on 1 July in which, just as was the case with athletics, three swimmers representing each of their teams

competed.³⁰ Wrestling and boxing on 5 July had one class each, middle weight and heavy weight respectively. It was quite difficult to apply the pointing system referred later to these two events, partly causing default of the Australian team after a too exhausting match.³¹ The number of placing of each event was accumulated and Canada with 16 won the Lonsdale Cup against the U.K. 17 and Australasia 21.³²

Festival of Empire itself had initially planned to be held in 1910 but because of the sudden death of Edward VII it opened one year later. During the period of holding the Festival, the imperial conference, formerly called “colonial conference” and renamed by the request of the dominions, was held. Along with the foundation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 and the Coronation of the new king, these might create an atmosphere of popular interest in the empire. Some of those who attended the imperial sports meeting from the dominions were also conscious of this atmosphere. Richard Coombes, the Honorary Manager of the Australasian team, stated at the annual dinner of the AAA, “the Colonies had grown up. In the political world there had been a conference, upon terms of equality, between the Overseas Dominions and the Mother Country; could not something of the same kind be brought about in athletics?”³³ Lord Desborough and the Earl of Lonsdale, both of whom were not only aristocrat sportsmen in Great Britain but also travelling over the overseas empire, were directly engaged in the imperial sports meeting at Crystal Palace, and it is plausible for sporting elites in the dominions to employ such political rhetoric.

This imperial sports meeting, however, aroused neither popular interest nor great excitement as imperial propaganda. This is easily supposed from its scale and contents. Coombes, the manager of the Australasian team, obviously expressed his complaint about the lack of enthusiasm on the side of the home country. His critical comment on England’s absence of interest in the athletic meeting on 24 June was printed in the article on the *Referee* in Sydney: All the enthusiasm on Saturday [24 June] was shown by the Colonials... The British public did not take the meeting seriously—and they could scarcely be expected to do so, in view of the manner in which the authorities dealt with it.³⁴ It is intriguing, however, to find a nuanced divergence among the criticism by the Australian press, the attitude of the governing body AAA, and the tone of the press in London.³⁵

It is certain, as Moore pointed out, that the minutes of the AAA contain a single brief reference to the imperial meeting at Crystal Palace and the organisation brought much more attention to the annual AAA championship.³⁶ Here we should also take the nature of this championship into consideration.³⁷ In the earlier period of the championship which was first held at the Lillie Bridge athletic ground in West

Brompton, London, on 3 July, 1880, it was a rather modest event.³⁸ It has been gradually deserved a world stage of amateur athletics governed by the AAA. It is significant that the AAA championship has long been open to the “amateur” athletes not only in England—the AAA is basically an English association—and the rest of Great Britain, but also those from overseas.³⁹

The AAA championships in 1911 were held at Stamford Bridge, London, on 1 July, just one week after the imperial meeting. It consisted of 14 events of track and field, and its entrants were not only the affiliated athletes in Great Britain but also those who came from Canada, Australia and New Zealand to compete at Crystal Palace, besides those from the U.S.A. and European countries. Among the winners of each event, the American won in the 100 yards and the 220 yards, the Canadian—the captain of the team for Crystal Palace meeting—in the 440 yards, the Finnish in the 4 miles, the German in the 880 yards, High Jump and Pole Vault, an athlete of Cambridge University AC from India in the 120 yard hurdles, the Irish in Long Jump and Shot Put.⁴⁰

This means that the annual Championships in England could be characterised as an international athletic meeting rather than a national or imperial ones. It is plausible to consider this based on one reason — at least the background — the fact that the AAA had little interest in Cooper’s idea in the early 1890s and less enthusiasm for the imperial athletic meeting in 1911.⁴¹ It might be fair that the *Referee* in London reported “Considering the cold, blustering wind which blew across the Palace track during the afternoon, the attendance of visitors on the stands and around the track was much larger than was anticipated.”⁴² The paper, however, reported the result of the AAA championships in much more detail than that of the imperial meeting held one week earlier. The comment on the former expressed their serious concern about the relatively small number of English athletes who had won the title compared with those from overseas, which obviously is assumed that they took the AAA championships as an international competition.⁴³ The tone of the press reflects the notable difference in scale between two meetings held in London in the middle of the year 1911. The *Referee* in Sydney reported Coombes candidly complained: The imminence of Championships does not excuse the apathy displayed by the governing body [the AAA] in regard to the Empire meeting... and with the greatest desire to be absolutely fair to them, it cannot be said that the course they adopted made for success.⁴⁴

Considering the consistent indifference to an imperial sports gathering around the turn of the century, some might suppose the indifference of people in Britain to the

British Empire itself.⁴⁵ As far as various events are concerned, however, such as the exhibition and the pageant in Britain in this period, the outcome of each event presumably depends upon its management including the method of securing human and financial resources as well as the manipulation of political discourses rather than the extent of the sympathy for ideology, nationalism and the imperial consciousness.⁴⁶ In terms of the idea of imperial sports meetings, the ill fortune is likely to have been caused not by a lack of interest in the empire and imperialism but by lack of basic cooperation and broader perspective on the world of sports both in the U.K. and the colonies. At least an aspect of the “ill fortune” could be indicated in the dinner hosted by Lord Desborough on 27 July at which all the competitors and officials were presented. Several speakers alluded to the benefits of interaction among Empire members both on and off the field of competition, while Lord Desborough acclaimed the increased cooperation in sports. Coombes, with James Merrick, the counterpart of Canada, made a suggestion to assemble in London to train together as an Empire team a week before the Olympics in 1912.⁴⁷ Although they employed a way of thinking and a rhetoric for a sort of imperialism or the cooperation of the empire, it should never go unnoticed that they thought substantially of the achievement of their athletes, and vindicated their promotion in the world of sports. We have every reason to believe that an idea of a “British Empire team” entered in the Olympic Games in 1912 was not well received and that it took nearly two decades to give birth to the British Empire Games since they appreciated the imperial cooperation in sports in London.

The first British Empire Games revisited

Here we attempt a general survey of the beginning of the British Empire Games and a review of previous research on the event so as to provide space to introduce new viewpoints for examining both the British imperial and Commonwealth history and sports history.

The British Empire after the First World War has been recently assumed to have not suffered a rapid and overall decline but was instead partially reinvented as the British Commonwealth of Nations in 1931, when the Dominions officially acquired the status as an independent nation-state by the Statute of Westminster. The emergence of the British Commonwealth brought a new phase in the history of the British Empire, even though the dominions had already acted by then as if it were independent states in international relations and the newly-formed Commonwealth was clearly understood as the club of the white dominions and the home country. In the

interwar period, unprecedented campaigns, which implicitly aimed at enforcing imperial unity, got under way and examples of this included encouraging migration to the dominions by the Empire Settlement Act holding the British Empire Exhibitions in London (1924 and 1925) and in Glasgow (1938), and promoting various products and consumer goods made in the empire along with the empire itself by the Empire Marketing Board.⁴⁸ It might be difficult to assess the impact of the imperial propaganda of this kind in the interwar British society. In the Empire Exhibition at Wembley, for example, the dominions and colonies as well as the home country were engaged primarily for their own interests, while a considerable amount of visitors to the exhibition enjoyed various attractions and funfair on site rather than sluggish displays of machinery and engineering.⁴⁹

The impact of such imperial propaganda, however, is much more recognisable by the Empire Exhibition in 1924 with the attendance of more than sixteen million people over six months than by the Empire Games in the 1930s. It might be contrasting that the Empire Exhibition at Wembley was the first project of this kind since the Festival of Empire had been held in 1911 and no imperial sports meeting had taken place since then except the athletic competitions between American and Empire athletes in the 1919 Inter-Allied Games in Paris and sports meetings held either in England or the USA in the 1920s. Despite the opening of the Wembley Stadium and the overly “imperial” aims of the Exhibition, as Gorman noted, imperial sports meetings were never held during the period of opening the Exhibition.⁵⁰ It is rather suggestive that the stadium was then used as, instead of the ground for athletics, the stage of the Pageant of Empire, the outdoor play representing the history of the British Empire, which is most likely to remind someone of the Pageant of London at Crystal Palace in 1911.

Melville Marks Robinson, who was the manager of the track and field section of the Canadian Olympic team in 1928 and the sports editor of the *Hamilton Spectator* in Hamilton, Ontario, took the initiative at the inauguration of the British Empire Games. He told the officials from every part of the empire attending the Olympics in Amsterdam about his idea of the imperial sports meeting and asked them for their cooperation. His idea, as the *official program* in 1930 described, immediately found favour with representatives of all British Dominions.⁵¹

In remarkable contrast to Cooper at the turn of the century, Robinson made positive approaches to relevant individuals and organisations. His promotional activities led to the formation of the British Empire Games Committee, chaired by E.W. Beatty, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the Amateur Athletic

Union (AAU) of Canada. The members of the committee were not only from business but also from the athletic community, such as R. Kerr, the gold medallist in the 200 metres at the 1908 Olympics, and J.R. Cornelius, the Honorary Coach of Canadian Olympic team in 1928. Robinson visited all the way to London in early 1930 to successfully persuade a reluctant AAA in England to send the team to the Games.⁵² As compared with Cooper, it is assumed to be quite remarkable that he ensured the support from business and athletics and the cooperation of the dominant governing body in Britain for an imperial sports meeting worthy of the name.

The City Council of Hamilton approved the budget in the hope of providing opportunities to advertise the city and leave an infrastructure legacy.⁵³ The background of their positive attitudes to the first Empire Games was partly derived from the special relationship between the city and the popular imperialism along with the economical expectations. As Gorman described, Hamilton in Ontario had fostered a reputation as an Empire City in Canada. C. Fessenden, the originator of the idea of Empire Day, lived in Hamilton and her proposal was stimulated by such influential actions of G.W. Ross, the Premier of Ontario at the turn of the century, as to establish the closest school day to the birthday of Queen Victoria as Empire Day.⁵⁴ H. Ferguson, the Premier of Ontario in 1930, proudly declared that the personal relationships fostered through the Games were a more significant manifestation of imperialism than the symbolic unity represented by the office of the Governor General.⁵⁵

The first British Empire Games opened at the Hamilton City Stadium on 16 August, 1930. The Commonwealth Games Federation (CGF) officially confirms that 400 competitors in total from eleven countries and colonies came to the first Games comprised of 59 events in six sports (athletics, swimming, wrestling, boxing, rowing and lawn bowls).⁵⁶ Participating countries were the four nations of the U.K., Australia, Canada, Newfoundland, New Zealand, South Africa, Bermuda and British Guiana.⁵⁷ As the latter two colonies sent only a few athletes and officials, and as England and Canada dominated the medal count, it was for all intents and purposes a competition between the home country and the dominions.⁵⁸

Gorman discussed the first Empire Games from the viewpoint of the relationships intertwined with amateurism, imperialism and internationalism in sports. He suggests that imperialism was not the only single aspect of the games and examines the various meanings which organisers, participants and supporters attached to the event. He then reveals that local and national organisers used the Games to convey civic and national identities to the rest of the empire and that the athletes were ambivalent

about imperialism, placing the Games within the international sporting community.

The argument by Gorman over the first Empire Games deserves much attention in two ways. First, he obviously avoids the oversimplification of describing the Empire Games as a popular representation of the unity of the Empire and imperialism. As Gorman declared, his approach to the Games as the intersection of various interests relies heavily on the research by M. Dawson into the British Empire and Commonwealth Games in Vancouver in 1954. Dawson emphasised that the Games were motivated by the expectation of economic development and promotion of sports both in Vancouver and in British Columbia as well as the advertisement of the city and the province, by focusing on several competing interests there and the complexity of Canada's imperial connection.⁵⁹ Gorman precisely points out similar aspects also in the Empire Games in Hamilton.

Secondly, it is noticeable that he shows dissent to some extent in the argument about popular imperialism during this period in Britain and the British world. The Empire/Commonwealth Games have often been and are still apt to be seen as a remnant—or a legacy—of the empire and the imperialism. Although the bulk of the research into popular imperialism and the impact of various representations of the empire have produced remarkable achievements in British historiography, it is necessary not to overestimate the effect of contemporary imperial propaganda. We should preferably pay more attention to the equivocality of so-called imperial events and ascertain the intersection of interests in each event. Gorman properly approached the first Empire Games not only from the perspective of imperialism but from amateurism and internationalism. While internationalism could be found, as we observed above, even in the AAA championships already in the late nineteenth century, it is significant to reveal the relationship and interaction between imperialism, or the system derived from the dominance of the empire, and internationalism developing in the twentieth century.

Now we can bring forward the argument about the Empire Games in its early period. We should, for example, put more emphasis on the differences in some critical aspects between the first Games in 1930 and the following Games. In Hamilton the Games events were held around the city where other sports meetings concurrently—in the same place during the same period—were held, and attracted much more competitors in total than the Games.⁶⁰ The “Official Program”, or the timetable of the events, of the Empire Games in 1930 indicated that the imperial competitions as a part of the Games were coexistent with the events of the Canadian and International Canoe Championships, the Canadian Women's athletic Championships, the

International Yachting and the Ontario schoolboy athletic championships (see Figure 1 and Table 2).⁶¹ It is notable that this style of meeting would be never found again in the following games, while, as referred to above, the imperial athletic meeting in 1911 had open events mainly attended by domestic athletes. Although the organiser and its supporters intensely presented the Empire Games for its own sake, the event as a whole at Hamilton in the summer of 1930 apparently emerged as a meeting of multiple sports including the Empire Games.

The assumed rivalry between the Olympics and the Empire Games should also be considered more elaborately. Gorman argues that some supporters of the Games believed that the contemporary Olympic movement had compromised its amateur ideals by embracing spectacle over the spirit of competition and sought to differentiate their event from the Olympics.⁶² In some of the participating countries, on the other hand, the same organisation and sometimes the same staff engaged in practical business of both Games. The office of the British Empire Games Federation was situated within that of the British Olympic Association from the start until the late twentieth century.⁶³ In Canada the sub-committees for the Olympics and the Empire Games respectively established in the AAU of Canada, the national sports organisation, until the Empire Games committee was detached from the AAU. These entangled structures might have brought about a compromise and coexistence rather than rivalry between the two games.

From the historiographical of point of view, it might be more worth examining the difference between the first Games in 1930 and the fifth in 1954 than explaining the similarity between them. Inevitably it should be recognised that the future of the Games must have been to some extent uncertain when the Games in Hamilton came to a close. Despite the fact that they then decided the next Games would be held in Johannesburg, South Africa, four years later, the country effectively gave up holding the Games by the spring of 1932.⁶⁴ After some—not all, as referred to later—officials of the dominions and the home country discussed the fate of the Games, it was officially decided at the beginning of 1933 that England accepted the idea to hold them instead.

The reason why South Africa gave up organising the Games was apparently its racial policy which understandably caused controversial concerns even in sports and led to the subsequent secession of South Africa from the Games through her withdrawal of the Commonwealth of Nations. The Games, argued Gorman, provided an arena for the expression of more than just a unified ‘imperial’ identity.⁶⁵ Whether or not we agree with A. Guttmann’s argument that sport contains ‘emancipatory

Official Program

Tuesday, August 19.

9.00 a.m. — Empire Lawn Bowling Gage Park Greens

10.00 a.m. — International Canoe Championships
Hamilton Bay (Off Eastwood Park)

Junior Single Blade Single
Senior Double Blade Tandem
Junior Single Blade Four
Senior Double Blade Single
Senior Single Blade Tandem
Junior Double Blade Four
War Canoe

10.00 a.m. — International Yachting Hamilton Bay

2.00 p.m. — Empire Lawn Bowling Gage Park Greens

2.30 p.m. — International Canoe Championships
Hamilton Bay

Junior Double Blade Single
Junior Single Blade Tandem
Senior Double Blade Four
Senior Single Blade Single
Junior Double Blade Tandem
Senior Single Blade Four
War Canoe

All races to be half mile straight away.

2.30 p.m. — International Yachting Hamilton Bay

2.30 p.m. — Canadian Women's Championships
Hamilton Stadium

3.00 p.m. — International Rowing Hamilton Bay

6.30 p.m. — Empire Rowing Hamilton Bay
Double Sculls
Eight Oared Shells

8.30 p.m. — Swimming Municipal Pool

100 Yards Free Style (men)
800 Yards Relay (men)
200 Yards Breast Stroke (men)
400 Yards Free Style (women)
Fancy Springboard Diving (women)

Figure 1: A page of The *Official Program* of the Empire Games in 1930
(Reproduced from *The Official Program of the British Empire Games 1930*, Hamilton, 1930, no paging.)

Table 2 : Timetable reproduced from The *Official Program* of the Empire Games in 1930

Saturday, August 16.	
2.30 p.m.	Opening Ceremonies …Hamilton Stadium
3.00 p.m.	Athletics ……………Hamilton Stadium
	440 Yards Hurdles (heats and finals)
	220 Yards (heats and finals)
	880 Yards (heats)
	6 Miles
	Throwing the Discus
	Running, Hop, Step and Jump
8.30 p.m.	Empire Swimming, Municipal Bathing Pool
	440 Yards Free Style
	Fancy Springboard Diving (men)
	100 Yards Back Stroke (women)
	200 Yards Breast Stroke (women)
Monday, August 18.	
9.00 a.m.	Empire Lawn Bowling, Gage Park Greens
10.00 a.m.	<u>Canadian Canoe Championships, Hamilton Bay (Off Eastwood Park)</u>
	Intermediate Single Blade Single
	Junior Double Blade Fours
	Intermediate Single Blade Tandem
	Junior Double Blade Single
	Intermediate Single Blade Fours
	Junior Double Blade Tandem
2.00 p.m.	Empire Lawn Bowling……Gage Park Greens
2.00 p.m.	<u>Canadian Canoe Championships, Hamilton Bay (Off Eastwood Park)</u>
	Junior Single Blade Single
	Senior Single Blade Single
	Half Mile War Canoe
	Junior Single Blade Fours
	Senior Single Blade Tandem
	Junior Single Blade Tandem
	Senior Single Blade Fours
	Mile War Canoe

3.00 p.m. Empire High Diving, Off Eastwood Park

8.30 p.m. Empire Swimming, Municipal Bathing Pool

1500 Yards Free Style (men)

100 Yards Back Stroke (men)

100 Yards Free Style (women)

400 Yards Relay (women)

Tuesday, August 19.

9.00 a.m. Empire Lawn Bowling.....Gage Park Greens

10.00 a.m. International Canoe Championships, Hamilton Bay (Off Eastwood Park)

Junior Single Blade Single

Senior Double Blade Tandem

Junior Single Blade Four[*sic.*]

Senior Double Blade Single

Senior Single Blade Tandem

Junior Double Blade Four[*sic.*]

War Canoe

10.00 a.m. International Yachting.....Hamilton Bay

2.00 p.m. Empire Lawn Bowling.....Gage Park Greens

2.30 p.m. International Canoe Championships, Hamilton Bay

Junior Double Blade Single

Junior Single Blade Tandem

Senior Double Blade Four[*sic.*]

Senior Single Blade Single

Junior Double Blade Tandem

Senior Single Blade Four[*sic.*]

War Canoe

All races to be half mile straight away.

2.30 p.m. International Yachting.....Hamilton Bay

2.30 p.m. Canadian Women' s Championships Hamilton Stadium

3.00 p.m. International Rowing.....Hamilton Bay

6.30 p.m. Empire Rowing.....Hamilton Bay

Double Sculls

Eight Oared Shells

8.30 p.m. Swimming.....Municipal Pool

100 Yards Free Style (men)

800 Yards Relay (men)
 200 Yards Breast Stroke (men)
 400 Yards Free Style (women)
 Fancy Springboard Diving (women)

Wednesday, August 20.

9.00 a.m. Empire Lawn Bowling.....Gage Park Greens
10.00 a.m. International Yachting.....Hamilton Bay
 2.00 p.m. Empire Lawn Bowling.....Gage Park Greens
3.00 p.m. International Rowing.....Hamilton Bay
 6.30 p.m. Empire Rowing.....Hamilton Bay
 Single Sculls
 Four Oared Shells with Cox
 Four Oared Shells without Cox
 8.30 p.m. Empire Boxing and Wrestling, Hamilton Arena

Thursday, August 21.

10.00 a.m. International Yachting.....Hamilton Bay
 10.00 a.m. Empire Lawn Bowling.....Gage Park Greens
 2.00 p.m. Empire Lawn Bowling.....Gage Park Greens
 4.30 p.m. Empire MarathonHamilton Stadium

The Marathon will start and finish at Hamilton Stadium. Before leaving the stadium the competitors will run five laps and a fraction around the track which will be equivalent to 1 mile, 711 yards. They will then run 23 mile, 1,502 yards over the regular course of the Hamilton Olympic Club, which will take them out King St., through Stoney Creek to the junction with Main Street at the Saltfleet Monument, from there to Winona Village, then back to the stadium via Barton St, Lake Avenue, Van Wagner' s Beach, Woodward Avenue, Barton to the stadium, completing the race the contestants will run three laps and a fraction around the Stadium track.

5.00 p.m. Empire Athletics.....Hamilton Stadium
 100 Yards (heats)
 120 Yards Hurdles (heats)
 440 Yards (heats)
 880 Yards (finals)
 Three Miles
 Putting the Shot

High Jump
Throwing the Hammer
Throwing the Discus
8.30 p.m. Empire Boxing and Wrestling, Hamilton Arena
Friday, August 22.
9.00 a.m. Empire Lawn Bowling.....Gage Park Greens
<u>10.00 a.m. Ontario Schoolboy Championships, Hamilton Stadium</u>
<u>10.00 a.m. International Skiff Race.....Hamilton Bay</u>
<u>2.00 p.m. Ontario Schoolboy Championships, Hamilton Stadium</u>
2.00 p.m. Empire Lawn Bowling.....Gage Park Greens
8.30 p.m. Empire Boxing and Wrestling, Hamilton Arena
Saturday, August 23.
<u>10.00 a.m. International Skiff Race.....Hamilton Bay</u>
2.30 p.m. Empire Athletics.....Hamilton Stadium
440 Yards (finals)
120 Yards Hurdles (finals)
440 Yards Relay
1 Mile Relay
100 Yards Final
1 Mile
Steeplechase
Broad Jump
Pole Vault
Javelin Throw
5.00 p.m. Presentation of Prizes
Closing Ceremonies
7.00 p.m. Complimentary Dinner to Empire Athletes and Officials at Royal Connaught Hotel

Source: The Official Program of the British Empire Games 1930, Hamilton, 1930.

[※Events which were NOT the competition of the Empire Games are marked with underlines by the author.]

potential', and with Gorman's argument that the success of non-white athletes in the Games would spur the rest of the Empire to take one of its first steps against South Africa's race-based regime, it could be assumed that the Empire Games constructed another arena of discussion, and a manifestation of the Empire and Commonwealth countries.

The matter of female athletes in the Empire Games also seems to have been more appreciated than Gorman suggests. It must be noted that women competed only in the swimming and diving events in Hamilton and Henry de Baillet-Latour, the IOC president, visited the Games but made a point of skipping the concurrent Canadian women's athletic championship, stating that he did not approve of women in competitive sport.⁶⁶ Nevertheless the Empire Games in 1934 introduced for the first time women's athletic competitions including the 880 yards.⁶⁷ It stood in remarkable contrast with the case of the 800 metres women's race in the Olympiad, because the race in Amsterdam in 1928 is conventionally referred to as a trigger in cancelling the same distance race for women in the 1932 games and after for some time.

In addition it is necessary to look more closely into the intersection of nationalism and imperialism in Britain, which would provide a new perspective for the argument about the twentieth century British imperial and commonwealth history. I focused on the establishment of sports governing bodies and those activities in Great Britain for the Empire Games so as to find out the divergence within the home country and the interaction of nationalism and imperialism.⁶⁸

The separated national teams from the U.K. have been sent to the Empire/Commonwealth Games since the first games were held in 1930. While an article of *The Times* reported that the organiser of the Hamilton Games desired such format of participating and that those in the home country accepted it, the latter was not well enough prepared for this both in their financial and organisational respects. Even the teams from Great Britain which were ostensibly affluent could not afford the travel expense to the Games overseas, so the Scottish sports governing bodies, for example, made every effort to raise money to participate in the first Games in Canada.

The management committee for the fund, composed of the representatives of such sporting bodies in Scotland as athletics, swimming and boxing, and the surplus £63 14s. 9d. consequently provided the basis of a national organisation for multi-sports, as the Scottish National Sports Federation (SNSF) was established in April, 1931. While the participation in the Empire Games and the intention of continued participation practically led to the formation of the SNSF, the organisation's name at first

contained neither “Empire” nor “Commonwealth”. Despite the initial hope that matters of mutual interest to all amateur sports in Scotland could be considered, and after “unsuccessful effort to unify the amateur regulations of the different sports”, the comprehensive designation was quietly replaced by its subtitle “British Empire Games Council for Scotland.”⁶⁹

However great the difficulty was, on the other hand, the Scottish were proud of their organisational development at such an early stage. The minutes of the second SNSF meeting in 1932 noted that its counterpart in England had not been formed yet so that they sent the copy of its constitution to England. A paper bound in the Minute Book of the British Empire Games Council (Scotland) in the 1960s revealed a letter in 1932 to E. Hunter, an English official engaged in the Games, reading as follows:

...(I) am delighted to hear that England is at last awake and about follow the good example of Scotland and form a Council for England of the Empire Games Federation. I accordingly, and with the compliments of Scotland, send to our weaker brother a copy of our Constitution with the advice “Go ye and do likewise!”⁷⁰

We could find out in the document of the Scottish bodies that it was not until the beginning of 1933 that the three representatives from each of the participating countries, duly described as “the basis of the organization for the Empire Games”, gathered in London. The Council of England of the British Empire Games Federation was at length founded in May that year. It is most noticeable that Bobbie Robinson himself stated that he did not intend to go through with the complete committee in the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC) for the Empire Games because of the “indefinite nature of the scheme” and uncertainty of the Games being held in 1934.⁷¹ There is apparently good reason for the Scots to be proud of their advanced steps in the imperial sporting world.

This in no way means, however, that the Scots took the initiative in managing the Games expected to be held in the future. It seems to be contrary to the case because, for example, the SNSF members were not promptly informed of the real reason that South Africa would be virtually stripped of the opportunity to hold the games. It is supposed, as Bruce Kidd suggested, that the AAUC and the associations in some countries refused that the games be held in South Africa which had made it clear that black athletes would not be welcome.⁷² As the SNSF sought the official confirmation “or otherwise through the medium of London”, they seem to have

been far removed from practical discussions on the games.⁷³

The position of the Scottish organisation was apparently unchanged in the case of the 1938 games. Australia and Canada applied to hold it at the meeting of the BEG Federation during the games in London in 1934. While the BEGF explicitly consulted the SNSF in September 1935 about the venue of the next games, the latter's secretary G.W. Ferguson explained at the meeting three weeks later that he had confirmed the press report to the BEGF that Australia was offered the games. They discussed the issue at such length as to write to the BEGF that "while we have every sympathy with Australia's claims as the next venue, we hope that a more detailed offer would come to hand from Canada before the final decision was reached."⁷⁴ Although the Scottish representatives to the BEGF were involved in the official decision in November 1935, it is obvious that they were yet again not so well informed in advance on the venue of the next games.⁷⁵

The Empire Games in the 1930s eventually provided the chance, which was at once a great but contradictory one, for the Scottish sporting elite. While the Scots took pride in preceding their counterpart in England in establishing the national organisation for the Games, they were dismayed with their situation in discussing the arrangements and the future of the Games. The consideration of these cases helped reveal the ambiguous structure of the commonwealth in the sporting world and the subtle intersection of the nationalism and imperialism.

Conclusion

The Games have been and are still held once every four years in the Commonwealth countries since the first Empire Games in Hamilton, except for the period during and immediately after the WWII. The idea of Empire apparently disappeared and the Commonwealth as a political association changed not only its name—"British" was deleted after the late 1940s—but also its membership and very dynamics. The Games were seemingly in close connection with the political change in the Commonwealth and seen as a relic of the British Empire. It should be emphasised, however, that this nearly century-old sports event would gain more importance than was ever assumed. T.M. Shaw refers to the CGF, as well as the Games itself, as a non-state agency in analysing "the English-Speaking Commonwealths" from the perspective of global governance.⁷⁶ In fact, it is notable that nations in Britain have sent their own team to the games, causing to emerge a "commonwealth", different from the political one, in the Empire/Commonwealth

Games. It could also be on the result the process of changing the event's name in comparison with the political stage.

The Commonwealth of Nations agreed with the omission of "British" from its title as an adoption of the new convention "without any formal change" in the Commonwealth Prime Minister meeting in 1948.⁷⁷ On the other hand, the title of the Games has been "formally" changed three times in the 1950-70s. The first case occurred in the Federation's general assembly in July 1952. Representatives of participating countries agreed with the addition of the word "Commonwealth" to the title so that the games in Vancouver in 1954 were officially named "the British Empire & Commonwealth Games". The second one was probably more symbolic as the Federation decided the modification at the general assembly during the Games in Kingston, the capital of Jamaica which had declared its independence a few years before the Games, and was held for the first time outside the dominions and Great Britain. By virtue of this decision the word "Empire" was removed and the "British Commonwealth Games" was held in Edinburgh in 1970.⁷⁸ It should be noted, however, that the representative of Australia had once proposed the same in the general assembly as early as 1956.⁷⁹ At the meeting Sir Harry Alderson from Australia spoke to a motion suggesting changing the title of the Games to "British Commonwealth Games" which he said would be far more convenient than the present title, while Australia had no objection to the present one in itself. The Welsh representative Lord Aberdare asked that a change not be made until after the 1958 games in Cardiff because it had already prepared considerably. After the discussion following the statement by the chairman Sir Arthur Porritt in the negative about the proposed modification, it was agreed unanimously that the title should remain unaltered.

The third alteration of the title was reported more in detail by the press than in previous cases. At the general assembly of the Federation held during the Games in 1970 a representative of Kenya proposed to delete the word "British" from the title, seconded by India. Those who supported the removal of "British" argued that they were known in the United Nations and other places simply as the Commonwealth. The opposition insisted that the word differentiated from the many other commonwealths, for example, the Commonwealth of Australia. The proposal was defeated by only one vote, 19 to 18.⁸⁰ They discussed this matter again in the general assembly during the next Games in Christchurch, New Zealand, in January 1974. The delegation from Nigeria put a motion forward to remove "British", and this time the Duke of Edinburgh, the president of the Federation, did speak in favour of dropping the word from the title. The resolution was carried by 18 votes to 7, and from the

eleventh Games in Edmonton, Canada, it was officially entitled the “Commonwealth Games”.⁸¹

The alteration of the Games’ title is not always assumed to have been handled concurrently in the strict sense of the word with the emergence of the new Commonwealth of Nations. The story as referred to above obviously indicates how to organise and maintain a unique “commonwealth” in the world of sports. This commonwealth might be autonomous to some extent and has been certainly influenced by interaction with social and political situations of the Commonwealth countries. Therefore it should be examined in the broader context of British imperial and commonwealth history. The relationship between Britain and her former dominions and colonies and the political, economic and cultural interactions of the Commonwealth countries should be considered when we examine the transformation of the Empire/Commonwealth Games and the Commonwealth itself. For example, the effects and consequences of the sporting boycott as a part of the anti-apartheid movement in the 1960s to 1980s are worthy of being assessed to reveal the significance and meaning of the Commonwealth Games.⁸² The commercialisation, internationalism and globalisation of sports are also the key to argue about sports history as well as the history of the British Empire and Commonwealth from a broader perspective.⁸³ The more in detail we revisit the history of Empire/Commonwealth Games in the twentieth century, the more it bears fruit in considering the British imperial and commonwealth history.

※This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23500735.

-
- 1 K.Moore, ‘The 1911 Festival of Empire: A Final Fling?’, in J.A.Mangan and R.B. Small, (eds.), *Sport, Culture, Society - International historical Conference on Sport, Physical Education, Dance, Recreation and Health*, London, 1986; id., ‘The Pan-Britannic Festival: A Tangible but Forlorn Expression of Imperial Unity’, in J.A.Mangan (ed.), *Pleasure, Profit, Proselytism*, London, 1988; id., ‘“The warmth of comradeship”: the first British empire games and imperial solidarity’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 6(2)(1989); id., ‘A Neglected Imperialist: The Promotion of the British Empire in the Writing of John Astley Cooper’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 8 (2)(1991); M.Dawson, ‘Acting Global, Thinking Local: ‘Liquid Imperialism’ and the Multiple Meanings of the 1954 British Empire & Commonwealth Games’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 23(1) (2006); D.Gorman, ‘Amateurism, Imperialism, Internationalism and the First British Empire Games’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 27(4)(2010).
 - 2 H.M.Abrahams (ed.), *Empire Games Book*, Cardiff, 1958. I accessed the web page in 2011 (15 May) [<http://www.weareengland.org/page.asp?section=56§ionTitle=The+history+of+the+Commonwealth+Games>] but now in 2014 it has disappeared.
 - 3 J.R.Lowerson, ‘Cooper, John Astley’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004; online edn, Jan, 2012 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/50365>, accessed on 30 Apr., 2014]
 - 4 Moore, ‘A Neglected Imperialist’, p.257.

-
- 5 *Times*, 30 Oct., 1891, p.3.
- 6 Moore pointed out that Cooper's view of the empire was racist, sexist and ethnocentric. Moore, 'A Neglected Imperialist', p.258.
- 7 *Times*, 30 Oct., 1891, p.3.
- 8 Moore, 'A Neglected Imperialist', pp.259-262.
- 9 J.A.Cooper, 'The Pan-Britannic Gathering', *The Nineteenth Century*, 197 (1893), p.81 quoted in Moore, 'A Neglected Imperialist', p.262.
- 10 Moore, 'A Neglected Imperialist', p.262.
- 11 Moore, 'The Pan-Britannic Festival', pp.155-160.
- 12 Cooper, 'The Pan-Britannic Gathering', p.81.
- 13 Any of such evidence has yet to be revealed since Moore wrote it, and I could not find it either. Moore, 'The Pan-Britannic Festival', p.157.
- 14 J.J.MacAloon, *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games*, London, 2007.
- 15 Moore, 'The Pan-Britannic Festival', p.160; id., 'A Neglected Imperialist', p.263.
- 16 J.A.Cooper, 'Olympic Games: What has been done and what remains to be done', *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 376(1908), p.1012, partly quoted in Moore, 'A Neglected Imperialist', p.263.
- 17 For Kiralfy's profile in detail as an entertainer, a stage manager and an entrepreneur of the spectacles and exhibitions, see B.E.Gregory, 'The Spectacle Plays and Exhibitions of Imre Kiralfy, 1887-1914', unpublished Ph.D. thesis for University of Manchester, 1988.
- 18 This is often mentioned with serious troubles in the competition because of the antagonism between Great Britain and U.S.A., relatively fixing the indifference of the British government, especially the Foreign Office, to the Olympic Movement for some decades afterward. M.Polley, 'No business of ours?: The Foreign Office and the Olympic Games, 1896-1914', *The International Journal of History of Sport*, 13(2)(1996).
- 19 S.Brownell (ed.), *The 1904 Anthropology Days and Olympic Games: Sport, Race, and American Imperialism*, Lincoln(NE), 2008.
- 20 *Manchester Guardian*, 6 June, 1887, p.8; id., 20 June, 1887, p.8, et.al.
- 21 J.M.MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire*, Manchester, 1986, pp.106-107.
- 22 As to this vogue, see A. Yoshino, *Pageant Fever: Local History and Consumerism in Edwardian England*, Tokyo, 2011.
- 23 D.S.Ryan, 'Staging the imperial city: the Pageant of London, 1911', in F.Driver and D.Gilbert, (eds.), *Imperial Cities: Landscape, Display and Identity*, Manchester, 1999.
- 24 Moore, 'The 1911 Festival of Empire', p.85. Nothing new was reported after she wrote this.
- 25 *Referee* (London), 25 June, 1911, p.9. It should be noted that the *Referee* in Sydney, which Moore often referred to in her articles, is different from this London paper.
- 26 I.F.W.Beckett, 'Grenfell, William Henry, Baron Desborough (1855-1945)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004; online edn, May 2012.
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33566>, accessed on 6 Mar., 2014]
- 27 M. Blackett-Ord, 'Lowther, Hugh Cecil, fifth earl of Lonsdale (1857-1944)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011.
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34613>, accessed on 6 Mar., 2014]
- 28 Moore, 'The 1911 Festival of Empire', p.86.
- 29 *Referee* (London), 25 June, 1911, p.9. Although it is true the noncompeting races were also managed as a part of the imperial sports meeting, we need careful circumspection of the characteristics of the meeting. For example, see Gorman, op.cit, p.630.
- 30 *Referee* (London), 2 July, 1911, p.9.
- 31 Moore, 'The 1911 Festival of Empire', p.85.
- 32 Ibid., pp.87-88. Tennis match which initially was included in the meeting and its competition for the Cup was cancelled just before the opening and after the departure of the Australasian team, the manager of the team pressed the request for tennis for a while.
- 33 Quoted in ibid., p.89.

-
- 34 *Referee* (Sydney), 2 Aug., 1911, p.1, quoted in Moore, 'The 1911 Festival of Empire', p.88.
- 35 Coombes officially expressed his appreciation to what Lord Desborough and Henry, the secretary of the event, had done during his team's stay in London. R. Coombes, "Festival of Empire Games (London 1911): Report of the Tour of the Australasian Team", compiled in LAC (Library and Archives Canada) MG30-C164 "Commonwealth Games Association of Canada 1911-1978."
- 36 Moore, 'The 1911 Festival of Empire', pp.88-89.
- 37 Moore is not likely to mention the specific reason and background of the indifference to the imperial athletic meeting in 1911 except their "much more attention", while Gorman suggests the AAA's aspiration for the international athletics during the inaugural period of the Empire Games, not before the Great War. Moore, 'The 1911 Festival of Empire', pp. 88-89; Gorman, *op.cit.*, p.624.
- 38 The inaugural championships in 1880 had 80 entries in total but only one for the one mile and shot put. As to the history of the AAA and its championships, see M.Watson, *The Official History of the AAA 1880-2010*, Cheltenham, 2011.
- 39 Lon Myers, the American entrant, was the first overseas winner of the AAA title as early as in 1881. Watson, *op.cit.*, p.10. Other books are also useful as a reference for its history: P.Lovesey, *The Official Centenary History of the Amateur Athletic Association*, Enfield, 1979; Amateur Athletic Association, *Fifty Years of Progress, 1880-1930 : the Jubilee Souvenir of the Amateur Athletic Association*, London, 1930. As to amateurism of the AAA, see M.Polley, "The Amateur Rules': Amateurism and Professionalism in Post-War British Athletics", in A.Smith and D.Porter (eds.), *Amateurs and Professionals in Post-War British Sport*, London, 2000; M. Huggins, *The Victorians and Sport*, London, 2004, chap.3.
- 40 *Referee* (London), 2 July, 1911, p.9.
- 41 As Gorman pointed out, imperial unity might be honoured more in breach than in practice in the face of a growing internationalism. Gorman, *op.cit.*, p.614. But here we focus on the championship in itself.
- 42 *Referee* (London), 25 June, 1911, p.9.
- 43 *Ibid.*, 9 July, 1911, p.8.
- 44 *Referee* (Sydney), 2 Aug., 1911, p.1.
- 45 B.Porter, *The Absent-minded Imperialist*, Oxford, 2004; id., 'Debate: Further Thoughts on Imperial Absent-Mindedness', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 36(1) (2008); J.M.MacKenzie, 'Debate: 'Comfort' and Conviction: A Response to Bernard Porter', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 36(4) (2008).
- 46 As an example of research by the author of this article into the management of a local event in the boom of the historical pageant from the viewpoint of social history of modern Britain, see (in Japanese) M.Kawamoto, 'The Cult of Historical Pageants in early twentieth century England', *Research Reports of Humanities, Faculty of Humanities and Economics, Kochi University*, 14(2007); M.Kawamoto, 'City and its Local Event during the Pageant Boom: a Study of Dover Pageant (1908)', *Kainan Shigaku*, 47(2009).
- 47 Moore, 'The 1911 Festival of Empire', p.88.
- 48 S.Constantine, *Buy and Build: the Advertising Posters of the Empire Marketing Board*, London, 1986; M.Harper and S. Constantine, *Migration and Empire*, Oxford, 2010; (in Japanese) 川本真浩「一九二四年大英帝国博覧会」指昭博編『イギリスであること』刀水書房、1999年、所収；D. Stephen, *The Empire of Progress: West Africans, Indians, and Britons at the British Empire Exhibition 1924-25*, Basingstoke, 2013.
- 49 A. Clendinning, 'Exhibiting a nation: Canada at the British Empire Exhibition, 1924-1925', *Histoire Sociale*, 77 (2006); (in Japanese) 川本「一九二四年大英帝国博覧会」。It is easy to find jests and illustrations of the imagined visitors to the Empire Exhibition in the magazine *Punch*. *Punch*, vols.166 and 167, 1924.
- 50 Gorman, *op.cit.*, pp.615,623.
- 51 'British Empire Games', *The Official Program of the British Empire Games 1930*, Hamilton, 1930, no paging.

- 52 Gorman, op.cit., p.614. (Apropos correcting: Kerr won the bronze not in the 100 yards but in the 100 metres in the 1908 Olympics.)
- 53 Gorman, op.cit., pp.614-615,622. According to the official website of the Commonwealth Games Federation, the city of Hamilton provided 30,000 dollars to help cover travelling costs of the participating nations. <http://www.thecgf.com/games/story.asp> [accessed on 30 Apr., 2014]
- 54 (In Japanese)細川道久『カナダ・ナショナルリズムとイギリス帝国』刀水書房、2007年、especially in the chaps. 2 and 3. Gorman correctly pointed out that, with some reference to the work by A. Thompson, it is not R. Brabazon but Fessenden who should be credited as the inventor of “Empire Day” but with no mention of Ross. Gorman, op.cit., p.616.
- 55 Gorman, op.cit., p.617.
- 56 <http://www.thecgf.com/games/story.asp> [accessed on 30 Apr., 2014] Gorman showed numbers from various sources. Gorman, op.cit., p.618 and footnote 29. As the Empire Games Federation established in the period between the first Games and the second one has changed its name in accordance with the modification of the Games’ title, it is simply called “the Federation” or the contemporary name of the descriptive period in this paper.
- 57 <http://www.thecgf.com/games/intro.asp> [accessed on 30 Apr., 2014] Gorman argued, however, that Northern Ireland was represented under the England team. Gorman, op.cit., footnote 29.
- 58 Gorman, op.cit., pp.618-619. Other than competitors from the U.K. and the dominions, the *Official program* introduced Phil Edwards, a middle distance runner and medallist of Canadian Olympic team, and the rowing team, both from British Guiana, and one swimmer from Bermuda. *The Official Program of the British Empire Games 1930*.
- 59 Dawson, op.cit.
- 60 Gorman, op.cit., p.619.
- 61 *The Official Program of the British Empire Games 1930*. The press certainly reported the result of these events held simultaneously. *Times*, 18 Aug., 1930, p.6, *et al*.
- 62 Gorman, op.cit., p.626.
- 63 C.Dheensaw, *The Commonwealth Games: the First 60 Years 1930-1990*, Sydney, 1994, p.11.
- 64 *Scotsman*, 1 Apr., 1932, p.13.
- 65 Gorman, op.cit., p.628.
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 *Times*, 7 Aug., 1934, p.5.
- 68 M.Kawamoto, ‘British Empire Games and Scotland in the Early Years—National, Imperial, and Sporting Dimensions of the 1930s—’, *Research Reports of Kochi University*, 62(2013).
- 69 A draft (referred as “the 1961 draft” hereinafter) attached to the front hardcover of the British Empire Games Council (Scotland) (Scottish Amateur Sports Federation) Minute Book, No.3 (16 Mar 1960 to 29 Apr 1965). It also mentioned that the formation of the SNSF was already agreed in principle in November 1930 but that “actual official formation date is... 30th April 1931.”
- 70 The 1961 draft.
- 71 “Amateur Athletic Union of Canada Minutes of the 45th Annual Meeting 1932” in LAC MG28-I150, vol.20, pp.89-90; the 1961 draft.
- 72 B.Kidd, *The Struggle for Canadian Sport*, Toronto, 1996, p.73.
- 73 ‘Minute of Second Meeting of the Scottish National Sports Federation held at No.40 Melville Street, Edinburgh on 29th April, 1932.’, in Scottish National Sports Federation Minute Book, No.1 (referred as “the Minute Book No.1” hereinafter).
- 74 A letter from Sir James Leigh-Wood to G.W.Ferguson on 16 Sept., 1935, in the Minute Book No.1; ‘Minute of Meeting of the Scottish National Sports Federation held at Edinburgh on Wednesday 9th October, 1935, at 6.30 .p.m.’, in the Minute Book No.1.
- 75 “Amateur Athletic Union of Canada Minutes of the 48th Annual Meeting 1935” in LAC MG28-I150, vol.20.
- 76 T.M.Shaw, ‘The Commonwealth(s) and Global Governance’, *Global Governance*, 10 (2004); id., *Commonwealth: Inter- and non-state contributions to global governance*, Abingdon, 2008.
- 77 CAB128/13 CM48(67), quoted in (in Japanese)小川浩之『英連邦』中央公論新社、2012年。
- 78 *Constitution of the Commonwealth Games*, (The Commonwealth Games Federation) London,

-
- 1976, p.45.
- 79 “Minutes of the Meeting of the BECGF in General Assembly at Melbourne University on Sunday, 2nd December, 1956, at 10.00 a.m.”, in LAC MG30-C164 vol.17, file.11.
- 80 *Guardian*, 20 July, 1970, p.14; *Times*, 20 July, 1970, p.1.
- 81 *Times*, 28 Jan., 1974, p.8.
- 82 W.D.McIntyre, *A Guide to the contemporary Commonwealth*, Basingstoke, 2001, pp.201-208; id., *The Significance of the Commonwealth, 1965-1990*, Basingstoke, 1991, pp.236-243; D. Macintosh and M. Hawes, *Sport and Canadian Diplomacy*, Montreal, 1994, chap.4; S. Cornelissen, “Resolving “the South Africa problem”: Transnational activism, ideology and race in the Olympic movement, 1960-1991”, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 28(1)(2011). Inspired by these works and by using documents recently opened to the public, one of my articles focuses on the activism of the Commonwealth Secretariat in the process of making Gleneagles Agreement in 1977. (in Japanese) M.Kawamoto, ‘Negotiating the Gleneagles Agreement (1977): A Focus on the Initial Phase Activities of the Commonwealth Secretariat’, *Kainan Shigaku*, 50(2012).
- 83 Guttman argues about the history of sports in modern society and cultural imperialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in his acclaimed book the Japanese translation of which has an appropriate note and suggestion by M. Ishii. A.Guttman, *Games and Empires: Modern Sports and Cultural Imperialism*, New York, 1994 (Japanese translation by M.Tanigawa, *et.al.*, published in Tokyo, 1997). Among noted works concerning sports in the post-colonial world, on the other hand, is Gupta’s article which focuses on the sporting world in India where the Commonwealth Games was held in 2010 and argues about the international sports events and the globalisation of sports. A.Gupta, ‘The Globalization of Sports, the Rise of Non-Western Nations, and the Impact on International Sporting Events’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 26(12)(2009).