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ATHLETIC MIGRATION, GLOBALIZATION AND IDENTITY FORMATION: THE CASE OF MCDONALD BAILEY, 1944-1954

Roy Dereck McCree

ABSTRACT

Based on the topical and edited life history of McDonald Bailey, a former Trinidadian and British sprint athlete, this study examines the significance of his migration to the UK in 1944 and his representation of Britain for several conceptual and theoretical issues in relation to the classification of sport migrants, identity formation and, to a lesser extent, ludic globalization, in the period 1944-1954. These issues include, the nature of hegemony [as consistent with consent, resistance, subordination and domination], the [intentional and non-intentional] nature of imperialism, the variable bases of human agency, the asymmetrical, two-way nature of dominant-subordinate relations, the inclusive/exclusive, contested, plural nature of identity formation, the circuitous, processual nature of established-outsider relations, and the role of sport and the media as a discursive practice in these processes.

It is suggested that the classification of athletic migrants can be enhanced through the use of a migration continuum and model in which the temporal and spatial categories and motives are more clearly delineated to recognize convergence, divergence as well as changes over time in migrant behaviour. Linked to the importance of sport as an “invented tradition” in the British imagiNation, it is found that Bailey’s representation of Britain after the war and his general emergence as an athlete are intimately connected to the processes of national and sporting reconstruction, the need for a “fantasy shield” of its past greatness, as well as race, class and metropole-colony relations, which are characterized by stereotyping, acceptance, opposition and conflict. In relation to ludic globalization, historically, in both British and American periods of world hegemony, this has been characterized by varying degrees of cultural diversity, hybridity and an increasing contrast in human identities contrary to Maguire (1999), which erases the conceptual and cultural distinction between “imperialism” and any ahistorical notion of “globalization.”
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ATHLETIC MIGRATION, GLOBALIZATION AND IDENTITY FORMATION: THE CASE OF MCDONALD BAILEY, 1944-1954

Roy Dereck McCree

Introduction

The subject matter of this study encompasses four broadly related themes that assumed particular importance and attention during the last decade of the 20th century: globalization, migration, race relations, and identity, particularly national identity. These themes are examined in the context of the sociology of sport which, as a sub-discipline of sociology, also assumed more prominence towards the end of that century in the sense of gaining more academic visibility and acceptance. However, these issues are explored based on a much earlier period in world history, the 1940s-1950s, when some of these processes were still at a relatively embryonic stage. In addition, it is based on the life history of former British and Trinidad and Tobago1 sprinter Emmanuel McDonald Bailey, who left for the United Kingdom in 1944 in order to join the RAF.

Bailey was born in Trinidad in 1920 and became a leading school boy sprinter in the 100 and 220 yards in the West Indies in the 1930s. He first went to Britain in 1939 where he performed unsuccessfully at the championships of the British Amateur Athletic Association (AAA). Some five years later, in 1944, he returned to the UK in order to join the RAF, and during his stay there, he became the leading sprinter in Britain and Europe. In the period 1946-1953, Bailey won the sprint double (100

---

1Trinidad and Tobago is a twin island state whose population is around 1.3 million inhabitants (Central Statistical Office, 1999). Trinidad is the larger of the two islands with a population of 1,223,383, while that of Tobago stands at 51,416. The British seized Trinidad from the Spanish in 1797 and Tobago, which was ceded to Britain some 34 years earlier in 1763, was united with Trinidad in 1889 (Brereton, 1981, pp. 32-51, 153-156). Both islands were under British rule from these periods until 1962 when independence was attained (McCree, 2000b, p. 215).
and 220 yards) at the AAA championships on seven occasions, which resulted in his inclusion in the *Guinness Book of Records* (Wattman, 1968). He also set numerous British and European records, and equalled the world 100 metre record in Belgium in 1951, then held by the American Jesse Owens. Bailey represented Britain at the 1948 and 1952 Olympics held in London and Helsinki respectively, and while he was unsuccessful in London, Bailey captured the bronze medal in the 100m at the 1952 games although he was one of the favourites to capture gold. Bailey stopped competing in 1953 and after an unsuccessful attempt at professional rugby in that year, returned to the West Indies in 1954 (Wattman, 1968; Polytechnic Harriers, 1983; Lagerstrom, 2000; McCree, 2000a). The period of the study covers 1944-1954 therefore, because Bailey left for the UK in 1944 and returned permanently to the West Indies in 1954. In relation to Bailey, the Editor of *Track Stats* (2000, p. 47) commented in 2000: “What does seem surprising is that a comprehensive study of the athletic achievements of one of the greatest of all British sprinters has not been previously attempted…”.

This life history of Bailey therefore attempts to make a contribution to filling this void. However, it is not concerned so much with his “athletic achievements” in its narrow performance or competitive sense, but with its possible sociological significance. More specifically, it seeks to examine the following related questions as they pertain to sport migration, race relations, identity formation, nationalism and imperialism:

1. What set of factors led Bailey to migrate to the UK in 1944?
2. What were his experiences with being accepted as a person and an athlete in post-world war two Britain? Was he treated as an “outsider” by the established group(s) or as an “insider,” and if either, how did it express itself?
3. What conditions facilitated his emergence as an athlete, a popular public figure in the UK, and shaped the reactions to his exploits and actions in both the UK and Trinidad? Were these reactions linked to incipient British political decline after the war in 1945 and the need for a "fantasy shield" to maintain a sense of world dominance at the time or, were they also linked to nascent nationalism in the West Indies?

4. What was the reaction to his decision to represent Britain at the 1948 and 1952 Olympic Games? How did Bailey himself view the representation question?

5. If any what was the probable effect of these events on the nascent nationalist movement in the West Indies, given his popularity and international visibility? Did Bailey’s representation of Britain serve the nationalist cause, did it weaken it or did it serve the imperialist cause?

6. Were Bailey’s decisions and actions linked to the extant relations of domination or dependence that characterized metropole-colony relations during that era or, to the internal conditions of sport development in the colony or both? Or yet still, were Bailey’s actions simply those of a sovereign human agent unfettered by issues of power or exploitation?

While Bailey’s experiences may not have been typical given his athletic stature, it is suggested that through a thorough examination of these experiences, interesting light can possibly be thrown on some of the theoretical, methodological, and political issues involved in the study of sport migration and identity formation, as they expressed themselves in the period under study. Through this study, one also aims to make the following contributions to the sociological study of sport: (1) broaden the range of sports examined in the sociology of sport which, in the Commonwealth Caribbean, has been dominated largely by cricket and to a much lesser extent basketball; (2) help fill a vacuum in the study of sport migration from the Caribbean and the study of sport, generally, and (3)
enhance the growing literature on migration and identity formation internationally as it relates to sport, and the theoretical and methodological approaches to studying these processes.

The examination of these issues is structured around eight chapters: Chapter 1 deals with the Review of the Literature and Explanatory Framework that guides the study; Chapter 2 outlines the Methodology; Chapter 3 presents a Brief History of Athletics in Early 20th Century Trinidad and Tobago; Chapter 4 presents a brief overview of Society in Britain and Trinidad in the period, 1944-1954; Chapter 5 deals with the central organizing theme of the thesis, Athletic Representation and Identity Formation; Chapter 6 examines the Media and Identity Formation; Chapter 7 treats the Amateur and Professional Conflict in Post War Britain while Chapter 8 provides the Conclusion.
CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND EXPLANATORY FRAMEWORK

1.1 Introduction

The efforts at theorizing in the sociology of sport over the last 20 years have been significantly influenced by the wider theoretical debates that have characterized the discipline of sociology as a whole. These relate particularly to the traditional debates surrounding structure and human agency, materialist and non-materialist analyses, or Marxian and non-Marxian analyses, micro and macro levels of analysis together with the notions of cultural imperialism, hegemony, modernization, Americanization and globalization in explaining the international and historical diffusion of sport. Some of these issues are all strikingly illustrated in the debate spawned by Norbert Elias and the Leicester school over the notion of figurational sociology and the theory of the civilizing process in the explanation of the nature and function of sport in general and sport related violence in society in particular (Dunning, Murphy and Williams, 1988, Murphy, Williams and Dunning, 1990; Dunning and Rojek, 1992; Lewis, 1996; Murphy, Dunning, Maguire, 1997). While debate is both integral and very necessary to scientific activity, as with those debates, gridlock and deadlock have become more dominant and pervasive than consensus and compromise. The aim of this study, however, is not to provide some theoretical master key to unlock this deadlock once and for all. Rather, its modest aim is to probe the theoretical labyrinth and make critical use of its more useful insights while offering possible correctives to same in explaining the subject at hand.

---

2Ingham and Donnelly (1997) and Maguire (1999) have provided concise overviews of these debates. The former in particular, has done so in the context of an overall review of the development of the sociology of sport as a discipline although the focus is more on North America.
It seeks to do so based on the empirical study of a renowned former British and Trinidadian athlete, his epoch and his sport, athletics, a sport which has not figured prominently in the literature on the sociology of sport either in the more developed or less developed world.

Consistent with the objectives of this study, this chapter examines work in relation to (a) the study of migration in general and sport migration in particular; (b) globalization and the international diffusion of sport also referred to as *ludic diffusion* or *ludic globalization*; (c) sport and identity formation and (d) the theoretical approaches taken to explaining the varying nature, causes and consequences of these related processes.

**1.2 Studying Athletic Migrants**

Migration can be generally defined as the movement of persons from one geographical location to another which can be for a host of reasons that may include residing with family, employment, career development, political refuge and so on. Internationally, the study of sport migration is still a relatively recent subject although research in this area has been growing since the early 1990s (Bale, 1991; Bale and Maguire, 1994; Houlihan, 1994; Maguire and Stead, 1996; Maguire, 1999; McGovern, 2000). Universally, the study of migration has generally failed to pay any significant attention to the study of sporting migrants whether as athletes or as officials. This lacuna has been attributed to the failure [and perhaps refusal] to see sport migrants as representing a form of labour, and also a failure to see sport generally as representing a realm of "work" (Bale and Maguire, 1994). In addition, this can also be linked to the traditional tendency not to see sport on the whole as an area of social scientific research and teaching (Hargreaves, [Jenny], 1982; Hargreaves, [John], 1982; Coakley, 2001). Not surprisingly therefore, the study of foreign emigration in the Caribbean has followed this same pattern from the time such studies began in the 1960s (Ruck, 1960; Peach, 1968;
Skinner, de Alburque, Bryce Laporte, 1982; Marks and Vessuri, 1983; Harewood, 1983) up to the more recent past (Goulbourne & Chamberlain, 1997; Chamberlain, 1997). These early studies were particularly concerned with the supposed “brain drain” from these societies, their loss of trained and skilled “workers”, and its implications both negative (e.g., shortage of skilled labour) and positive (e.g., value of mirant remittances to families and local economy) for their overall social development. And while such concerns still remain, recent studies on West Indian migration have also focused on the nature and structure of West Indian families abroad and other issues such as ageing (Goulbourne & Chamberlain, 1997; Chamberlain, 1997). Consequently, as a result of this focus, sport migration, whether of an amateur or professional nature, has not received any significant attention from West Indian scholars either at home or abroad, on either side of the Atlantic. While there have been a few interesting biographies of athletes who have played professional sport abroad, these have focused more on cricket and were not concerned with migration per se (Symes, 1980; Steen, 1993; McDonald, 1985). In addition, in terms of theory and methodology, these studies are more literary and journalistic in nature, and relatedly, they tend to be very descriptive, aconceptual and atheoretical.

However, this historical neglect of athletic migration is not at all restricted to the West Indies or the English speaking west. For instance, writing in relation to Latin America, Arbena notes that notwithstanding the significance of sport in this region, and the extent of the migration of athletes, particularly baseball players to North America, this has not received any serious and “systematic” scientific study. In this regard, he noted: “Unfortunately, except for recent studies of the movement of circum-Caribbean baseball players to North America, virtually no part of the phenomenon, historical or contemporary, has received systematic, let alone quantitative study”. (Arbena, 1994, p. 108). The existing and
emerging literature on sport migration, however, has identified several conceptual, methodological and theoretical issues in the study of athletic migration. First of all, and most fundamental, it has been noted that there are different types of migration flows and sport migrants, who can be distinguished in terms of the duration of their migration and their motive(s) for migrating. As regards migration flows, these assume two principal forms: (a) intra-state migration, which describes internal movements within a country and (b) inter-state migration, which describes migration between nation states (Bale and Maguire, 1994, p. 1; Maguire, 1999, pp. 98-99). Inter-state migration, however, can be further subdivided into migration between states on the same continent, for instance as say between the Caribbean and the USA, and migration between states on different continents, as say between Africa, Asia, Europe and the Americas. Inter-state sport migration therefore may be intra-continental and inter-continental in nature. Relatedly, sport migration can also occur between less developed countries, as well as between these countries and the more developed countries. Such migration in any event represents a particular form of inter-state migration. This study can be seen as a case of inter-continental migration (between the Americas and Europe), but given the time period in which it is situated, and in the context of an Empire, it can also be seen as internal migration within an Empire, from colony to metropolis.

Defining the temporal nature of migration and the nature of the migrant’s motive(s), however, seems more problematic than defining the geographical character or trajectory of the migration flows. In the available literature, one can discern two general approaches to characterizing or classifying the nature of sport migration and the sport migrant. One approach, which I prefer to call the time approach, has tended to focus on the duration of the migration while the other has focused on both duration and the motive of the migrant. The meaning of
duration here, based on a reading of the literature, seems to accommodate both the actual time spent by migrants, as well as the general temporal character of the migratory process. As regards the time approach, sport migration and sport migrants have been variously described as “temporary,” “transitory,” “seasonal,” “long term” and “permanent” (Klein, 1994, pp. 186-197; Bale and Sang, 1994, p. 222; Maguire, 1999, pp. 98-99; Arbena, 1994, p. 101). Generally, however, some of these terms tend to be not clearly defined or distinguished, and used loosely, interchangeably and un-problematically, which may present problems for sociological analysis and comparison. While advancing a more elaborate typology for examining sport migration, which is discussed at length below, Maguire distinguishes between two basic forms of temporary migration: “seasonal” and “transitory,” with the latter describing those athletes who “criss cross” the world to participate in sport competition that may last “no more than eight days.” Golf and tennis players are cited as examples of such migrants (Maguire, 1999, p. 98). To this group we may also add track and field athletes, particularly those on the grand prix circuit of athletics. Maguire notes further that this transitory process can take place in the particular “season” or time of year in which the sport is played as both ... “seasonal and transitory migration patterns interweave” (ibid.). In their discussion of Kenyan athletic migration to Europe, Bale and Sang (1994, p. 222) identified two broad groups of athletes: “... those who are domiciled abroad on a long-term but not permanent basis, the second being those who are essentially seasonal [sic] migrants.” While the seasonal migrants are those who spend either summer or winter months only to take part in the European athletic grand prixs, it is not too clear what is meant by “permanent,” although we can possibly infer that it means staying in the country forever. In his discussion of baseball migration to the USA, Arbena notes that historically, this was of a “two-way” nature with Dominicans going to play in the USA in the summer, then returning home to play during the winter months. These he called
“two-way” labour migrants (Arbena, 1994, pp. 196-197). Such a movement therefore was of a seasonal nature and its length simply determined by the length of the baseball season itself. He goes on to note, however, that this migration started to assume a more permanent nature in the 1980s as US baseball became more lucrative. In this regard, he wrote:

In its most current form, the out migration is no longer simply confined to one’s playing career, but is taking on a permanent status. Whereas athletes might have stopped playing in their homeland during the 1980s, they continued to return to visit in the winter. Now, it is increasingly common to find stars ... wintering in Boca Raton, Florida rather than face worsening economic conditions in their homelands. (Arbena, 1994, p. 197)

While noting the shift in the character of migration of Dominican baseball players from being seasonal to being permanent, it is still not too clear whether by “permanent” Arbena means never returning to their “original” home.

The issue of “permanent” migration therefore, raises two pertinent questions. Firstly, is the permanent sport migrant one who never returns to his or her “original” home except for vacation and spends the rest of his/her life in the receiving country? Or, secondly, is the permanent sport migrant also one who spends most of his adult and productive life in a foreign country and finds other work after his/her playing days are over, then returns either before or on reaching the age of retirement? The available literature does not deal with these nuances in the migration process. It is suggested that we might achieve greater conceptual clarity if we speak of a migration continuum, which will encapsulate or subsume the variations and nuances in the migration process. This migration continuum will contain temporary migration at one pole and permanent migration at another, with their main sub sets or variants contained between both poles as shown in Figure 1.
Temporary migration will contain two main sub-sets: transient and seasonal while permanent migration will also contain two sub sets: quasi-permanent or relatively permanent and fully permanent. The seasonal migrant will refer to those athletes and officials (managers, coaches, match officials) who live in the foreign country mainly during the period or season in which competition in their sport is in progress and during pre-season training, which can last up to six months depending on the sport. For example, these may include athletes in such team sports as cricket, football and rugby. The transient migrant, however, refers to those who travel to participate in sport competition for short periods that can vary from one to two weeks and up to a month. The difference between this and seasonal migration is not just the length of time but the fact that the person (i.e., the transient) does not reside in the society in which the competition is held and is almost continuously on the move. This category can include athletes in such individual sports for example, as lawn tennis, golf and track and field. As regards the permanent migration, the quasi-permanent migrant will include two types: (i) those who actually live in the country for several years during the course of their career but who return home when it is over and (ii) those who continue to live in the foreign country long after their active days in sport are over but who eventually return “home.” The fully permanent migrant will include those who never return to live in their country of origin though they may visit.
from time to time. Quasi-permanent sport migrants may also be referred to as “return migrants.”

The other approach to classifying migration and the migrant centres on the work of Joseph Maguire (1999). In his study of global sport migration, Maguire (1999, pp. 104-107) offers what he described as “a preliminary typology of sport labour migration...” in which he identified five different but related categories of sport migrants. In offering this typology, Maguire took care to remind that its categories overlapped and consequently were not mutually exclusive. In this respect, he noted:

... I am aware that the categories identified are not rigid and that in the lived experiences of migrants, the different dimensions overlap and shade together in different combinations. (Maguire, 1999, p. 104)

Maguire’s typology, however, clearly rests on a combination of both the time approach and the migrant’s motive(s). Using these criteria, Maguire identified five categories of migrants: “pioneers,” “settlers,” “mercenaries,” “nomadic cosmopolitans” and “returnees,” (ibid., p. 106). The nature of these motives are revealed in the following outline of these categories. Borrowing from Bromberger (1994), “pioneers” are conceived as those who “possess an almost evangelical zeal in extolling the virtues of ‘their’ sport. Their words and actions seek to convert the natives to their body habitus and sport culture.” As examples of such pioneers, Maguire cites the “19th century missionaries of empire,” “19th-century Sokol/Turner movements,” and the “20th-century YMCA movement.” “Settlers” he defines as those “... who not only bring their sports with them but are sports migrants who subsequently stay and settle in the society where they perform their labour.” As examples of these, he cited basketball and ice hockey athletes among others. Such sport settlers can be seen to represent fully permanent migrants. Mercenary sport migrants are defined as “...
those who are motivated more by short-term gains and are employed as 'hired guns'... . These migrants have little or no attachment to the local, no sense of place in relation to the space where they currently reside or do their body work” (ibid., p. 105). As examples of mercenaries, Maguire cited the cricketers who played in Packer’s World Series cricket and Rebel rugby players who went to South Africa during apartheid. To this category, we can also add the “rebel cricketers” who also played cricket in South Africa during that time. The “nomadic cosmopolitans” describe those athletes who are interested in meeting and experiencing ‘other’ or different cultures and peoples. In his words, “... ‘nomads’ ... are more motivated by a cosmopolitan engagement with migration. They use their sports career to journey: they embark on a quest in which they seek the experience of the ‘other’ and indeed of being the ‘other.’” Certain overseas players in English football together with marathon runners, surfers, snowboarders and “participants in ‘extreme sports’” are provided as examples of this category (ibid., pp. 105-106). The group of “returnees” are those who eventually return home after migrating to participate in sport abroad and include such athletes as “F1 motor-racing drivers,” professional golfers on the PGA tour and professional tennis players on the pro circuit (ibid., p. 106). Returnees therefore, while somewhat nebulous as a discrete category, seem to be the opposite of “settlers.” In addition, the category of returnees appears to have an all inclusive character since all the other migrants are capable of returning home. In this regard, Maguire noted: “Yet some cosmopolitans, along with pioneers, mercenaries and even long-term settlers, act as ‘returnees’ in the global process. The lure of ‘home soil’ can prove too strong” (ibid., p. 106).

In offering comments on Maguire’s typology, we need to be mindful of the following considerations, which relate to both his objectives and method. Firstly, Maguire’s principal objectives are to
examine sport labour migration in the present era of so called “globalization” (while extremely mindful of historical antecedents), the commercialization and politicization of sport and the related effects produced or generated by these processes (viz., sporting and cultural conflicts/struggles between a host of actors that include athletes, clubs, countries, fans, citizens and business interests). Consequently, the typology he advances is grounded in these objectives. Secondly, a typology is not meant to be a perfect, fixed, unchanging construct that is appropriate for all time and in all situations. As a result, as with all classificatory schemas, it is likely to suffer from incompleteness, overlaps, and shades of grey, which Maguire rightly acknowledges (ibid., p. 104). And, as Houlihan (1994, p. 372) reminds us: “Creating typologies is always a dangerous activity.” Its primary value therefore is to serve as a heuristic device through which the analyst can make sense of the world by identifying and explaining relationships in the tumult of dynamic processes in which they are embedded and of which, at times, they are both cause and effect. My intention therefore is neither to make Maguire’s typology perfect nor to offer one that is perfect. Nevertheless, in this regard, there are three related objectives: (a) to point to those problematic areas of the typology and suggest possible alterations or additions in order to refine and strengthen its utility as an analytical construct or heuristic device; (b) to identify the areas of convergence and divergence, in the categories employed, based on the two main criterion that seem to underpin them: duration and motive and (c) in as much as objectives inform method, to relate and/or adapt Maguire’s typology to my own particular objectives. It might be important to note that this examination will be consistent with Maguire’s own admission or suggestion that “this typology requires further investigation” (ibid., pp. 106-107).
In undertaking this (re)examination, there are five major issues to which one draws attention. Firstly, the principal problem with Maguire's notion of "pioneers" is not that they can also be "settlers", but that it seems to refer not to athletes or sport migrants *per se* but to migrants in general who would have carried their sports with them as part of their cultural luggage to a foreign land, as happened for instance during the period of British colonialism. In addition, such migrants appear to differ from all the other categories as regards motive, in their possible use of sport as an instrument of social or political control. The relevance or appropriateness and utility of this category therefore to a "Typology of sport labour migration," in a strict sense, might be questionable. This notwithstanding, one sees the category of "pioneers" as part of Maguire's attempt to place his treatment of contemporary sport migration and globalization of sport, as part of a process of political struggles and cultural diffusion, in proper historical context. Nevertheless, whether they qualify as sport migrants *per se* remains a bit spurious given the nature of the typology outlined (i.e., a "Typology of Sport Labour Migration"). Secondly, in his first outline of the category of "settlers," these were described as those "... who subsequently stay and settle in the society where they perform their labour." However, in his treatment of "returnees," Maguire introduces the term "long term settlers," who are capable of returning home. If this is so, how are we to interpret "stay and settle in the society where they perform their labour", when in fact they may not stay at all? I think this apparent ambiguity or contradiction can be diminished if we speak of two types of settlers: short-term settlers (quasi-permanent) and long-term settlers (permanent). The former will apply to those who eventually return home while the latter will refer to those who never do as in the migration time continuum advanced earlier. Thirdly, while Maguire admits that "in the lived experience of migrants, the different dimensions overlap", in his diagramatic representation of the five different migrant categories, only one is seen to overlap with all
others and that is the category of “returnees” (see Figure 2). Pioneers are not presented as overlapping with settlers, neither are mecenaries with nomadic cosmopolitans nor mercenaries with pioneers, when in fact they do on the basis of both motive and duration. (see Table 1). In capturing (or not capturing) the possible shades of combinations or overlap of the different migrant categories thus, which Maguire admits to, the diagram appears to be either incomplete or inadequate.
Figure 2. Typology of Sport Labour Migration

_Pioneers_
- 19th century missionaries of empire
- 19th century Sokol/Turner movements
- 20th century YMCA movement

_Returnees_
- F1 Motor-racing drivers
- PGA Tour golfers
- Pro-Circuit tennis players

_Settlers_
- ‘Gaelic’ Sports/Kabbadi
- Basketball/Ice Hockey
- Skiidraet

_Mercenaries_
- Packer cricket ‘circus’
- ‘Rebel’ South African rugby tours
- World League of American Football

_Nomadic Cosmopolitans_
- Marathon runners/Japan
- Surfers/snowboarders
- ‘Extreme’ sports participants

Fourthly, there is the issue of the motive(s) of migrants, in which there is also a possible contradiction. On this score, we note that Maguire rightly admits, as well as admonishes, that “… the motivation of elite migrants cannot be reduced to any one cause [since] A complex of motives is involved” (ibid., p. 104). Yet, how can we square this with some of his categories which appear to characterize and/or distinguish the sport migrant in terms of one motive. For instance, we get the impression that the “mercenary” is motivated mainly by “short term gain,” (economic motive) and the “nomads” by “cosmopolitan engagement” (cultural motive), when the nomad maybe as easily motivated by economic gain as the “mercenary” possibly is by cultural discovery. The “pioneers,” however, are seemingly motivated by three major related factors: “an almost evangelical zeal…” for their sport, sport “proselytizing” and social control (political motive). As regards the “settlers,” and “returnees,” as defined by Maguire, it is not exactly clear what their motives are but, from a reading of his definitions, one can possibly suggest that it involves a combination of both sport and economic considerations. In light of the foregoing, I think there is room for saying that given the possible plethora of motives that may inform the actions or orientations of sport migrants, either all motives may assume equal prominence or some may assume more salience over others. In addition, such motives and their ordering may also be subject to change overtime, which serves to problematize the whole process of migrant categorization/classification. We need to add hurriedly, however, that to suggest that some motives may assume more salience over others does not necessarily translate into reductionist or mono causal thinking (although this might be seen as cutting it close). Yet, although Maguire advises against this in his own work, he may have also erred himself in this direction through his attempt to characterize some of his athletic migrant categories in terms of one motive, as noted above. Sixthly, using the time approach alone, the categories of “mercenary,” “nomad” and “returnee” can all be seen as temporary forms
of sport migrants or sport migration, but with some slight measure of variation in terms of their motive(s).

### Table 1. Maguire's Classification of Sport Labour Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant Type</th>
<th>Motive(s)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>zeal for sport; sport conversion; social control</td>
<td>Long/short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>Long term/short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercenary</td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomad</td>
<td>cultural discovery</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnee</td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will suggest the conceptual enhancement of the typology of sport migration advanced by Maguire, primarily by delineating clearly the criteria and the content of these criteria on which such a schema may rest. In this regard, there are four major related criterion, to which some have already been alluded, which include: **duration** (time), **motive** (objectives/intentions of migrant), **context** (social, national, international environment/situation/conditions), and **sport type** (amateur/professional/team/individual). While all four are present in Maguire’s offering, I think they can be made more clear and explicit. The content of these criteria are outlined below.

1. **Duration**: temporary (seasonal/transient), permanent (quasi or short term/forever)

2. **Motive**: economic, political, social/cultural (reside, new life style); sporting/developmental (opportunities to improve one’s skill/talent, to train, to compete, education)

3. **Context**: colonialism, imperialism, independence, nationalism, capitalism/commercialization, contemporary globalization

4. **Sport Type**: Amateur vs Professional sport/Team vs Individual Sport
When reworked and transposed onto the Maguirian typology, we get what is illustrated in Table 2.

### Table 2

**Maguire's Classification of Sport Labour Migration (Modified)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant Type</th>
<th>Motive(s)</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>sport; social control/political</td>
<td>Colonialism (early globalization)</td>
<td>Amateur</td>
<td>Long/short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>Not clear; (sport/economic)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Long/short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercenary</td>
<td>Economic/political</td>
<td>Apartheid/Political/Globalization</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomad</td>
<td>Cultural; economic</td>
<td>Modern day (Late Globalization)</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnee</td>
<td>Not clear; [sport/economic?]</td>
<td>Modern day (Late Globalization)</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the context of the objectives of my own study, I think it is valid to consider expanding the "motive criterion" to include athlete development be it in terms of education or opportunities to train and compete at the highest level. In addition, as regards the additional criterion of "sport type," arguably, this can also be possibly included under the criterion of "context," or "motive." However, it is treated separately not only for reasons of analytical clarity but because it takes cognizance of both the nature of the sport played (amateur vs professional) and the type of sport (team vs individual), which may not easily fit under the rubric of "context" or "motive." I think the delineation and/or elaboration of these criteria not only enables us to see more clearly how the migrant categories advanced by Maguire diverge and converge, but also, to examine more carefully the range of possible bases and consequences of athletic migration together with the dynamic nature of migrant motives and experiences.

---

3 The problem with defining, identifying and understanding human motives is dealt with more substantively in Chapter 2.
In applying this classificatory schema to McDonald Bailey therefore, particular attention was paid to the duration of his stay in the UK (1944-1954), and the peculiarities of the time and context in which he emerged. Based on these considerations, it is suggested that his experience can be seen as a particular case of inter-continental/intra empire, temporary migration of both the short-term settler and return migrant type, occurring in a particular national and international context of social dislocation and transformation in the post-war West Indies and Europe in which amateur sport was the dominant normative framework for involvement in sporting activity. However, the nature of Bailey’s motives, together with those of his critics and supporters, whether cultural, political, economic or sporting and his “lived experiences” are to be ascertained and examined in a closer analysis of his life history, and after due consideration is given to the explanations offered to understand the processes at work.

1.3 Effects of Athletic Migration

In addition to the classification of the migrant and the migration process per se, attention has also focused on explaining the nature and effects of this migration at several related levels, namely individual, club, country and region. To a large extent, much of the work on sport migration, particularly the early work (Bale, 1991; Bale and Maguire, 1994) can be cast in the mould of a type of cost-benefit analysis of the varying effects of this process for both sender and receiver countries, and the conditions at home and abroad which foster this movement. At best, the effects have been perceived as contradictory. On the one hand, for the sender countries, the migration (whether permanent or temporary) has been seen as beneficial for athletes and their country because of the increased opportunities they offer to (a) earn a livelihood and improve their quality of life; (b) provide income to their families through
remittances and to local clubs where they are part of transfer deals (Arbena, 1994, p. 108); (c) to enhance their individual standard of play and the standard of play, chances and football reputation of their country, together with (d) enhancing its international visibility and image. And for the receiver countries, in many cases, it has been seen to impact positively on style of play, club performance, community support and gate attendance. On the other hand, athletic migration has also been seen to produce negative consequences. For the sender countries, these perceived negative effects have included notably: (a) hampering the development of the sport through undermining the quality of play, fan interest, support for local clubs and leagues and ultimately gate receipts; (b) undermining the selection and performance of national teams as a result of athlete commitment to foreign clubs and (c) encouraging or reinforcing historical patterns of dependence particularly in the case of third world to first world migration (Arbena, 1994, pp. 103-106; Klein, 1994, pp. 95-196). And, for the receiver countries, the negative effects have centred mainly around undermining the development of local talent and threatening the livelihood of local players in professional sport. For some, however, the trade off of this migration has been seen as more negative than positive (Arbena, 1994; Klein, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1994), although some might hold the alternative view that the net effect has been more positive.

Apart from the above, what we might term sporting effects, the examination of this migration has also focused on the problems of adjustment and adaptation faced by migrant athletes, which include issues relating to language, communication, lifestyle, racism, personal identity and nationalism (Bale and Maguire, 1994; Maguire and Stead, 1996; Arbena, 1994). It is in respect of the latter three issues with which the study of Bailey is concerned.
In general, however, in terms of the nature of the analysis, the early treatment of the above issues tended to be very descriptive, aconceptual, and atheoretical, but this has changed significantly with the discourse on globalization and sport in the 1990s of which athletic migration formed a significant component.

1.4 Theorising the Globalization of Sport

Remarkably, very little attention has been paid to sport by those studying global cultural processes.- Maguire, 1999, p. 7

The issue of athletic migration has also been examined in the context of globalization generally, and the globalization of sport, also called ludic diffusion, in particular which has been the source of much theoretical debate and controversy towards the end of the 20th century. In this respect, Maguire has noted:

Use of the term globalization has become ... widespread in academic and media discourse over the past two decades. The meaning and usage of the term has been, however, marked by confusion, misinterpretation and contentious debate. (Maguire, 1999, p. 12)

The 1991 academic conference at Keele University, at which the paper by Bale and Sang was first presented, and which resulted in the 1994 book, The Global Sports Arena: Athletic Talent Migration in an Interdependent World, edited by Bale and Joseph Maguire, may have represented the first major scholarly attempt to tackle the phenomenon in question and the related issue of sportization. According to Maguire (1999, p. 79), “The term sportization is used ... to describe the transformation of English pastimes into sports and the export of some of them on a global scale.” Summed up differently, it refers to both a national and international process in the structural transformation and universal diffusion of sport that had its origin in 18th century Britain. The ensuing debate in relation
to these processes has centred mainly around six major related issues: (1) the manner in which international sportization or "ludic diffusion" took place (that is whether by force or consent); (2) the extent of the diffusion (total, partial); (3) its various consequences for the countries involved and the development of sport (destruction, revitalization, development); (4) the impact on cultural identity (homogeneity, diversity, hybridity); (5) the reaction of local or indigenous/native peoples (acceptance, resistance, reinterpretation/indigenization/adaptation) or the link between the local and the global; and (6) the dynamic, reciprocal and yet, asymmetrical nature of international sport relations. In addition, and relatedly, it has also centred around the explanatory utility of several related theoretical constructs to explain these processes, notably: modernization, cultural imperialism, cultural hegemony, globalization and figurational sociology.

In a very broad sense, the term globalization has been used to describe the process by which the nations and peoples of the world have become more "interconnected" and "interdependent" economically, culturally, and politically. However, given the historically asymmetrical character of power relations between nations and peoples, this process has also been seen as "uneven" and "imbalanced", but also characterized by "shifting power balances" (Maguire, 1999, p. 39). The emergence of this process, which has been generally dated to the 15th century with the onset of European imperialism, has gone through various stages of development since that period of time. Capturing the nature of this globalization process, Maguire wrote:

Globalization processes are viewed here as being long-term processes that have occurred unevenly across all areas of the planet. These processes-involving an increasing intensification of global interconnectedness- appear to be gathering momentum and despite their 'unevenness', it is more difficult to understand local or national experiences without reference to these global flows. Every aspect of social reality- people's living conditions, beliefs,
knowledge and actions - is interwined with unfolding globalization processes. These processes include the emergence of a global economy, a transnational cosmopolitan culture and a range of international social movements. (Maguire, 1999, p. 3)

Both Robertson (1992) and Giddens (1990), from whom Maguire borrowed, had also seen globalization in terms of the “intensification” of social interaction on a world scale, its diminiaturation, and the interrelatedness of local and international processes. Giddens, however, has also referred to globalization as an “unlovely term” (1998, p. 28), and others, as either “a myth” or a “farce” (Giddens, 1998, p. 28; Beynon, & Dunkerely, 2000).

Drawing on Dunning (1992) and Robertson (1992), Maguire identified 5 major phases in the globalization of sport or sportization, with each phase coinciding or corresponding to particular or different phases in political, economic, technological, and cultural development, both internally (in the UK and Europe) and on a world scale. Here, however, only a brief sketch of this periodization is presented. The first phase is located in the 18th century, while the second phase is located in the 19th century but more specifically from “the mid-eighteen century until the 1870s” (Dunning, 1992, p. 13, cited in Maguire, 1999, pp. 77-81). These first two phases dealt primarily with the period in which English pastimes, and what we have come to know as modern sport, were being rationalized and transformed into more peaceful, regulated and organized activities linked to the processes of democratization/parliamentarization and industrialization in that society (ibid.). The third phase is dated as “beginning around 1870 and lasting through to the early 1920s” (ibid., pp. 78, 81-84), and was characterized by the mass diffusion of European sports around the world mainly through the vehicle of colonialism. The fourth phase spanned the period from the 1920s to the 1960s and marked the gradual rise of American sport forms (e.g., basketball, baseball, ice hockey, volleyball) consistent with the changing balance of world power.
This phase also marked the gradual decline of the British in sport competition, and the success of some former colonies over their former colonial masters (ibid., 84-86), which is examined in a little more detail in Chapter 4. The fifth phase is located from around the 1960s up to the contemporary period, and is marked by an intensification of some of the sporting and non-sporting trends identified in phase four. But, in addition, it is also marked by increases in athletic migration to the metropoles, the international commercialization of sport, and increased conflicts over identity and nationalism (ibid., 86-89).

If we simplify these stages and the process of sportization further, we can state that there were two broad periods or phases in this process, coinciding with two broad phases of modern world history and development (see also Beynon and Dunkerely, 2000). The first period will be characterized by formal European, and particularly British dominance of the world beginning from around the 15th century up to the second world war (this corresponds to phases 1, 2 and part of phase 3 of Maguire’s periodization). The second period will be characterized by American dominance beginning particularly in the aftermath of world war two and continuing into the contemporary period (this will include part of phase 3 and phases 4 and 5). The explanation of international ludic diffusion has focused on both these periods of British and American hegemony. In a general sense, the time period of this study (1944-1954) is located at the intersection of these two eras, but since the West Indies and what is now called the Commonwealth still remained under British rule during this period, it can be located properly in the period of British hegemony.

In relation to the theoretical approaches to explaining international ludic diffusion, the cultural imperialist thesis, in both its historical (Mangan, 1986, Stoddart, 1988, James, 1963) and sociological versions
(Bale, 1994, Galtung, 1991; Hargreaves, 1986) sees this early ludic diffusion during the period of British hegemony in the 18th and 19th centuries, as not only an expression of British world dominance at the time, but also as a mechanism that facilitated and helped to sustain that dominance over the peoples who formed its Empire through some of the values it distilled (e.g., loyalty, respect for authority etc.). The diffusion process was also characterized by the use of force or coercion, for as Bale notes, “western sports did not simply take root in virgin soil; they were firmly implanted- sometimes ruthlessly- by imperialists” (Bale, 1994, p. 8; cited in Maguire, 1999, p. 28). In addition, it also resulted in the marginalization and destruction of indigenous sporting traditions (Bale, 1994, p. 8, cited in Maguire, 1999, 29-30). This process of diffusion, however, as hinted previously, did not only entail the spread of particular sports per se, but also a particular set of values as to how sport was to be played or not played, which was captured in the notion of the “amateur gentleman” or the “amateur ethos”, and which was seen as peculiarly British in character (James 1963; Mangan 1986; Maguire, 1999, 84; Mc Cree, 1995, 2000b). The contemporary variant of the cultural imperialist thesis, that is, in a period of relative American hegemony, has been illustrated in the diffusion of American baseball to the Dominican Republic, Latin America (Klein, 1989, 1990, 1991; Arbena, 1994), the heavy American influence on the organization of sport in Canada (Kidd 1991), and the internationalization of basketball.

From a modernization perspective, however, this ludic diffusion was also not seen simply in terms of the spread of western sports around the world. Equally important, it was seen to represent the spread of a particular form of rationality through which its agents sought to define the modern condition with differing levels of success. Such rationality included the related processes of codification, bureaucratization, specialization, standardization, scientization and quantification that
characterized the transformation of sport in the 19thC. Invariably, this modernization process involved the transformation of sport from a sacred type activity to a more secular activity (Guttmann, 1978, 1991, 1994; Alt, 1983; Dunning, 1999). Modernization therefore, as an expression of Europeanization, entailed the diffusion of British sport forms, and the ideological (e.g., amateurism, character formation), and organizational framework that governed them.

Advocates of cultural imperialism and modernization, however, have been accused of misrepresenting the dynamic of ludic diffusion by presenting it as a homogenising process in the form of an all rampant westernization, and thereby failing to capture its two-way nature and the capacity of subordinate groups to accept, as well as resist and reinterpret such westernization for their own benefit. In this regard for instance, some have pointed to the Latinization of American baseball in Latin America (Klein, 1990, 1994), the West Indianization (James, 1963; Manley, 1988; Beckles, 1995, 1998; Houlihan, 1994), and the Australianization of English cricket (Houlihan, 1994) and their use as symbols of anti-imperialist resistance. In addition, while he laid stress on the homogenising modernization process, Guttmann also provided two useful examples to illustrate this two-way process. These included the introduction of polo into Britain from India during the period of colonialism, and Japanese judo into Europe and the United States, at a time when Japan was still recovering from the ravages of war (Guttmann, 1991, p. 186; see also Maguire, 1999, pp. 43-44). However, while the relationship between subordinate and dominant groups/nations can assume a multi-directional and oppositional character, the relationship may still remain asymmetrical and advantage the latter due to their political, economic as well as military dominance: "Politically and economically dominant groups normally transfer more of their culture to others than
they accept from them, but the cultural exchanges are rarely unidirectional” (Guttmann, 1991).

In order to avoid the explanatory limitations of cultural imperialist and modernization approaches to ludic diffusion, there has been a recourse to the Gramscian notion of hegemony, since it sees domination not solely in terms of coercion but in terms of consent and acceptance by the subordinated of relations of power (Ingham, 1997). In addition, however, hegemony also allows for resistance to domination by the dominated, which can serve to capture the contested and negotiated nature of sport as a whole. In this regard, drawing on Donnelly (1981), Guttmann (1991, p. 186) also noted:

Like other aspects of culture, sports are ‘contested terrain’ (Donnelly, 1988). For that reason, scholars have reached for the Gramscian concept of hegemony, a concept that modifies the starkly reductionist contrast between the rulers and the ruled in order to account for resistance as well as submission.

While Donnelly (1996) accepts that the notion of cultural hegemony enables you to see the reciprocal character of cultural relations on a world scale, he also recognizes the asymmetrical character of this process. He stated thus that “… cultural hegemony maybe seen as a two-way but imbalanced process of cultural exchange, interpenetration, and interpretation” (ibid., p. 243). To Guttmann, however, both cultural hegemony and cultural imperialist approaches err in suggesting that the agents of ludic diffusion intentionally aim at converting others to adopt their particular sport forms, since those who adopt such sport forms may do so without their bidding or knowledge. Mandle and Mandle (1988, 1990, 1994) offer a similar argument in trying to account for the popularity of American basketball in the Caribbean, seeing it not as an expression of US imperialism but as an exercise of free choice on the part of West Indians. But, in relation to Guttmann (1991, p. 187), he noted:
Both terms, cultural hegemony and cultural imperialism, imply intentionality, which is unfortunate because those who adopt a sport are often the eager initiators of a transaction of which the 'donors' are scarcely aware.

Guttmann's point, however, is spurious on both logical and empirical grounds, for even granted that ludic diffusion and conversion were not deliberately intended, the fact that someone adopts a sport of their own volition, does not necessarily take away from its imperialist significance or utility. This is so for, as Maguire and the figurationalists are at pains to emphasize, human action and their effects can have both an intended and unintended character, and the fact that they were not intended does not necessarily mean that they may not be welcomed by those whose interests they may potentially serve. In order to assess or determine the imperialist character or significance of human action therefore, attention has to be accorded to both the issues of intent and its effects, whether direct or indirect, intended or unintended. In his stern critique of Guttmann (1994), Ingham (1997, p. 306) was perhaps making a similar point when he wrote:

To be sure, we are not always fully conscious of our intentions/interests-they are often prereflexive- but this does not mean that they do not have an effect on behaviour.

Consequently, the litmus test or criterion of imperialism cannot be restricted to the voluntary or non voluntary character of the process but must also factor in the possible unintended effects of the human actions involved, to which Ingham rightly draws attention. Put differently, and succinctly, the point on intentionality or non-intentionality is a moot one since it is not at variance with an imperialist analysis. So, for instance, although Mandle and Mandle argue that the popularity of basketball in the Caribbean is an expression of voluntarism and not American cultural imperialism, the fact of the matter is that its popularity has served to reinforce the dominance of American culture in the region, insert us more
into that hegemonic space and invariably, provide other markets for American media houses such as ESPN and NBC, together with NBA merchandising.

The notion of cultural hegemony has also been suggested as a way out of the contemporary debate on the nature of sport globalization in the present period of relative American hegemony. In this debate, some have explained this process in terms of either Americanization (Donnelly, 1996; Kidd, 1991; Klein, 1990, 1991, 1994), the expansionist dynamics of capitalism (McKay and Miller, 1991; McKay et al, 1993), or modernization (Guttmann, 1991, 1994). The cultural hegemony approach, while admitting to the heavily Americanized character of the present global traffic, also acknowledges that this has not been of a one way or uncontested character. This is evident in both the Latinization and Japanization of American baseball and its use in such a way that it is consistent with their particular social values and interests (Houlihan, 1994). In addition, the popularity of English derived soccer in the USA, notwithstanding the ups and downs in establishing a professional league (Abrams, 1995), and attempts to introduce American football in the UK (Maguire, 1994, 1999) may also be cited as an example of the two-way character of this process.

As a reaction and alternative to the reductionist oriented Americanization and cultural imperialist theses to explain contemporary ludic diffusion or globalization of sport, a more inclusive notion of globalization has been advanced, one that stresses its heterogenous/plural and transnational character. In the latter conception, the globalization processes underway in sport are seen as leading towards the creation of a global sport culture that is distinct from the many global and local influences that helped to shape it, be they European, Japanese or North American. The resultant plural product has been variously described as
"creolized," "hybridized," and "transcultural," which exists *sui generis* (Houlihan, 1994, pp. 359-360; Maguire, 1999, pp. 25-26, pp. 176-206). Maguire, however, while concurring with this "hybridization" perspective, also cautions that taken too far, it can ignore the power imbalances that exist in the world and misrepresent the problematic nature of human agency by making the individual appear "... to be sovereign" and can "freely choose from the global sport *mélange*" (Maguire, 1999, p. 26).

Given this variation in the interpretation of the globalization of sport, Houlihan has pointed to two major positions in the debate: one which sees globalization "as a conceptual extension of the longer established notion of cultural imperialism", whether in the form of Americanization or Europeanization, and the other which sees it as an expression of "hybridization" (Houlihan, 1994, p. 364). Notwithstanding the divergence of views, and while cautioning against holding too high theoretical expectations, Houlihan still believes that it can be "extremely valuable" in making sense of the debate. He wrote thus:

> There is a danger that too much will be expected of the concept and that its failure to explain adequately a wide range of issues and problems in the cultural politics of sport will lead to its premature abandonment. In addition, there is always the temptation among social scientists to overextend and overanalyze a concept until it

---

4It is important to note that this globalization debate relating to homogenization and pluralization/hybridization is definitely not new. The examination of these processes was a central concern in the sociological and anthropological literature of the Caribbean since the 1930s through the pioneering work of Jean Pryce Mars (1959) in Haiti, Herskovits (1937, 1941) and M.G. Smith (1965, 1984). Their work was driven by an interest in the cultural implications of the encounter between European, African and Asian culture in the "New World." Their major focus was the extent to which African and Indian culture was retained, reinterpreted or adapted to create something new in the context of European dominance, and the conditions of plantation slavery and Indian indentureship. These early studies also resulted in the celebrated debate over the notion of "plural society" advanced by M.G. Smith (1965, 1984, 1991) to explain the structure and workings of Caribbean societies and the competing notions of "plantation society," "creolization" and class analysis (McCree, 1999). This debate has not subsided and has even intensified in the contemporary period as different ethnic groups contest historical notions of national identity which may have privileged European and African derived cultural forms (Premdas, 1999; Yelvington, 1993).
dies of exhaustion. The interaction between one culture and another, both of which are dynamic, is not going to be amenable to tidy analysis, but the concept of globalization is extremely valuable in sensitizing researchers to the complexities of the debate. (Houlihan, 1994, p. 372)

Neither Donnelly (1996) nor Rowe et al (1994), however, share the optimism and enthusiasm of Houlihan about the concept as they stress either its heavily Americanized or teleological character, respectively. In addition, I wish to raise another concern. This has to do with the tendency in popular and official usage to see “globalization” and even the globalization of sport together with its associated cultural effects (viz., homogenisation, diversity, hybridity) in a very restricted temporal sense as some recent process beginning somewhere in the 1980s and accelerating in the 1990s. Undeniably, the present contemporary phase of globalization contains many contextual differences of a quantitative and qualitative nature compared to the earlier phase of globalization in which this study is situated (1944-1954). Differences that are driven by a propitious conjuncture of several related economic, political, cultural and technological processes in particular relation to the computer and communications revolution. The issues of cultural homogeneity, diversity and hybridity, however, also characterized earlier periods of globalization and this study of Bailey will be used to interrogate and show this. In addition, it is proposed that the foregoing theoretical discussion might be helpful in explaining or throwing light on the following areas:

1. Examining the decision of Bailey to represent Britain at the 1948 and 1952 Olympics. Was Bailey exercising “free will”? Was his action merely an expression of the latent and manifest workings of imperialism? Was his “consent” to run an expression of hegemony? What was Bailey’s intent, if any? What were the unintended consequences of his action, to him and to others, if any?
2. Examining the historical introduction and development of sport in general and track and field in particular in the then colony of Trinidad and Tobago. Was this process a combined case of modernization, cultural imperialism and cultural hegemony or was one more ascendant than the other, if any? It might be of interest to note that as far as this author is aware, there has been no systematic sociological study of this process in our West Indian context as it relates particularly to the sport of athletics.

1.5 Sportization and Figurational Sociology

Maguire (1999) in an attempt to resolve some of the above theoretical issues and, presumably, carry the discussion forward, has advanced a “figurational” approach to the study of sportization and globalization. The figurational approach, also referred to as the “developmental” or “process-sociological approach,” was first developed by the German Norbert Elias (Elias, 1970, 1939/2000; Dunning, 1992). While brief descriptions can often be incomplete and misleading, this perspective sought to emphasize four major characteristics of social life and development: (1) its processual and long term nature; (2) the autonomous potential of human action (i.e., having the capacity to think and act in accordance with one’s own interests); (3) the planned/unplanned and intended/unintended nature of such action and (4) the interdependent/reciprocal, albeit asymmetrical nature of social relations or processes (Elias, 1970, 1939/2000; Dunning, 1992, 1999; Dunning and Rojek, 1992). One touches on this perspective here, as it applies to sport, since it assumes relevance for the examination of the diffusion of sport to the British colonies (dealt with in Chapter 3) and the issues of identity.

5 Though the notion of “figurational sociology,” Elias also sought to transcend the many dichotomies that existed in sociology and social thought generally (particularly the individual-society couplet), as well as Marxian economic reductionism that was dominant during the time that he wrote (Elias, 1970, 1939/2000; Dunning, 1992; Mennell, 1992).
formation raised by Bailey’s movement to and representation of Britain which are closely examined in Chapters 5, 6 and 7. Consequently, the above issues are explored further below.

Influenced by this theoretical perspective, and also by the work of several authors such as Dunning (1992, 1999), Apparudai (1990), Robertson (1990a&b, 1992, 1995), Featherstone (1991), and Nederveen (1995), Maguire bemoaned and challenged the “mono causal, unidirectional and reductionist thinking” that characterized the discourse on international ludic diffusion (Maguire, 1999, p. 61). Consistent with this, he takes to task analytical approaches that emphasize solely either political, economic, or cultural factors, and which fail to see how these articulate or criss cross to shape the processes at work and our understanding of them. But, even more important, is the stress on the need to view social life and change as a process which is dynamic, interactive and long term in nature consistent with the figurational conception of reality. Consequently, Maguire makes a strong plea for a theoretical framework that is multi-variable (politics, economics, culture, ideology), multi-level (national, regional, global, group, individual, internal, external), multi-directional (e.g., as in the general two-way character of cultural diffusion), dynamic, open ended, long term and most importantly, processual in character. This framework must also recognise both the homogenising, and heterogenising tendencies involved in ludic diffusion, and the asymmetrical character of power relations or networks in which they are enmeshed or embedded. Furthermore, this dynamic, interactive process is based on a conception of people as “knowledgeable, creative, active agents” (Maguire, 1999, p. 148), whose actions can have intended as well as unintended consequences, or can be planned as well as unplanned. In other words, the theoretical apparatus must be grounded in human agency while recognising the constraints of such agency or the power imbalances that can shape its workings. Capturing the figurational
approach to describing and explaining globalization and *sportization* processes, Maguire wrote:

Globalization processes involve multidirectional movements of people, practices, customs and ideas. Yet, although the globe can be understood as an interdependent whole, in different figurational fields, established (core) and outsider (peripheral) groups and nation states are constantly vying with each other for dominant positions. Global processes are multidirectional, involve a series of power-balances, yet have *neither* the hidden hand of progress *nor* some all-pervasive, over-arching conspiracy guiding them. For process-sociologists, globalization processes have a blind, unplanned dimension to them and a relative autonomy from the intentions of specific groups of people. These processes, then, are also bound up in a multiple set of ‘disjunctures’ (Apparudai, 1990), ….which have a high degree of unpredictability …and which process-sociologists would view as an integral feature of human interdependencies. (Maguire, 1999, p. 40).

After mapping his conceptual coordinates or delineating his analytical parameters in his study of *sportization*, Maguire develops his theoretical framework further by drawing on such related Eliasian/figurational notions as the “commingling of cultures,” “diminishing contrasts and increasing varieties” and “established/outsider relations.” These notions lie at the heart of the figurational conception of society or in their language, “human figurations,” and the variously called “cross-cultural”, and “comparative” civilizational analysis of *sportization*. Through these concepts, he develops further his analysis of the reciprocal and uneven nature of cultural exchanges between dominant and subordinate groups, combined with the elitist and political uses of culture in the construction and representation of identity.
As developed by Elias, the above processes formed an integral feature of the civilizing process\(^6\) and the development of human societies. A key feature of this process is the development of particular norms, values, and modes of conduct which are deemed not only socially acceptable and proper, but which are also used by the dominant groups to distinguish themselves from those whom they consider their social inferiors or subordinates. While this process may entail the use of force, over time, however, their mark of distinction or exclusivity may trickle or seep down into the subordinate groups through emulation and imitation, which is referred to as “the double-bind tendency.” As a corollary of this, the groups may eventually become more similar in culture and behaviour, although this does not necessarily mean the elimination of all differences between them. However, this process is not unidirectional, for the culture of the subordinate groups can also seep into the behaviour or culture of the dominant groups, although not necessarily to the same degree given the fundamentally asymmetrical character of power relations between them. This process of cultural exchange, albeit unbalanced, is referred to as the “commingling of cultures.”\(^7\) Applying these concepts to the European colonization process, and metropole-colony relations, Maguire wrote:

---

\(^6\)The elitist, Eurocentric and racist connotation of “civilization” is generally acknowledged, but Elias’ use of the term has been excluded from such a classification (Dunning, 1992, p. 262). The civilising process (TCP), as conceived by Elias, focuses mainly on the development of European society from the middle ages “up to about the First World War” (ibid., p. 267). This development contained many related features (state formation, functional democratization/reduction of power differentials, greater chains of interdependence, increased wealth etc.), but one of the major features was the lowering of the threshold of violence, linked to democratization, the creation of “proper” norms of social conduct, and the exercise of greater self restraint. However, Elias was also well aware of the violent counter tendencies within Europe itself and, in particular relation to Nazi Germany, which he experienced personally. This episode he saw as a “decivilizing” spurt which was consistent with the curvilinear nature of the civilizing process as a whole. Civilizing and decivilizing tendencies thus may occur parallely as happened with violent European expansion abroad and the repugnance to violence within Europe itself (Dunning, 1992; Mennell, 1992).

\(^7\)The notions of “commingling of cultures” and “the double bind” can be equated easily with the more familiar notions of “acculturation” and “inter culturation”, which speak to the same cultural processes or dynamics involved in relations between different groups.
Western societies were acting ... as a form of established group on a world level. Their tastes and conduct including their sports, were part of this, and these practices acted in similar ways to elite cultural activities and manners within Western societies. They were signs of distinction, prestige and power. Yet, just as established groups within Western societies found that their initially distinguishing forms of conduct seeped down to lower social strata, so the occidentals of the colonies discovered that a similar process occurred in their dealings with their colonial social inferiors. A double-bind tendency was at work. Indeed, as a result of this cultural interchange, outsider, non-Western codes and customs began to permeate back into Western societies. It was never a one-way traffic. Polo, for example, practised so avidly by established groups in southern England, is a game form derived, at the height of Empire, from the Indian continent. (Maguire, 1999, pp. 43-44)

The relations between dominant and subordinate groups therefore, whether expressed internally as upper class/lower class or externally, as metropole-colony relations, can assume a two-way character, and it is through this “commingling,” and “the double bind tendency” that differences between them can diminish and new varieties or cultural possibilities can emerge through an amalgam of influences from both (Maguire, 1999, pp. 41-46). An equally important effect of these processes, however, is increased social interdependence and a reduction or equalizing of power differentials between the contending groups, which is captured in the notion of “functional democratization” (ibid.). In these respects, Donnelly (1996, p. 250) notes that the figurational approach converges with the cultural hegemony perspective since this also allows for cultural reciprocity or exchanges between contending groups, and “addresses homogenizing and differentiating tendencies.” One may also add that they both assign individuals agency to challenge or resist domination by other human agents and processes. One major area of difference, however, lies in the fact that figurational theory, unlike the theory of hegemony as conceived by Gramsci, never offered a conception of power which explicitly showed that in the relations between dominant
and subordinate groups/nations power could have assumed a consensual as well as a coercive character and linked to particular notions of “common sense”. This is why there is a recourse to Gramsci to examine the possible significance of Bailey’s consenting to run for Britain and to deal with dominant-subordinate relations generally, within sport and without (Rowe, 2004; Giulianotti, 2005).

Apart from the centrifugal and centripetal processes occurring in social figurations, another key feature of social relations is the “established-outsider figuration” (Elias, 1994, cited in Maguire, 1999, p. 52). This figuration speaks to the capacity of established or dominant groups to establish powerful collective identities or “I/we/they/them images” based on particular notions of superiority/inferiority, which are deployed and sustained through strategies of exclusion and negative stigmatization of subordinate groups. The ability of groups to stigmatize or exclude, and presumably resist same, varies in direct proportion to their power. However, although the power of a dominant group may decline “considerably over time”, it may find “… it difficult to shed itself of the group-charismatic we-image that conferred on its members a sense of superiority and self-worth” (Maguire, 1999, p. 52). In the context of British colonisation, the notion of the gentleman, within and outside the context of sport, was cited as serving this we-they identity function by distinguishing the ruler (the British/civilized) from the ruled (the natives/uncivilized) (ibid., 53).

These related processes identified above, the commingling of cultures, the double bind tendency, the diminishing contrasts and increasing varieties, and established/outside relations are integral to the figurational approach and inter-civilizational analysis proposed by Maguire to describe and explain the processes of athletic migration, sportization and globalization. They also bear directly on the issues of
identity formation, at both individual and collective levels, which have also figured prominently in the discourse on athletic migration and sportization. Here, we are particularly concerned with the issue of national identity or nationalism, to which Bailey's representation of Britain gave rise in some quarters (McCree, 2000a).

1.6 Sport and Nationalism

What are the connections between global sport, national identity and identity politics? - Maguire, 1999, p. 40

One of the major issues to which the migration of athletes and globalization has given rise, has been the question of identity, particularly national identity and nationalism. As used here, the notion of nationalism is seen to refer to a particular set of ideas, values and practices that are oriented towards the valorization of and identification with a particular collectivity, in this case, a nation. Such an orientation can have many bases such as race, ethnicity, class, language, geography and, of course, sport either singularly or in combination. Since its accelerated international diffusion in the 19th century, sport has been incorporated into the struggles and conflicts between and within nations (Hobsbawm, 1983, pp. 263-307; Maguire, 1999, pp. 176-177). Maguire notes in this regard:

Historically, international sports contests, as they developed in the late nineteenth century, became a form of patriot games in which particular views of national identities and habitus codes were constructed and represented. (Maguire, 1999, p. 176)

In a very useful discussion on the implications of European integration and globalization for British identity and more so English identity, 8

---

8Dominic Malcolm (2001) offers a relatively recent examination of the role of cricket in the construction of English identity and, in the context of class and ethnic “stacking” in the game historically.
Maguire (1999, pp. 181-189) examines the historical role assumed by sport in the construction of such identity by drawing on ideas from several authors such as Elias (1987/1991, 1994), Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983), Anderson (1983), Bourdieu (1984) and Giddens (1986). These relate particularly to such notions as the “invention of tradition”, “imagined communities”, the habitus and “practical and discursive consciousness.”

As conceived by Hobsbawm (1983, pp. 1-4), the notion of “invented traditions” refers to the creation of particular practices, activities and values “of a ritual or symbolic nature”, which seek to establish a link with the past or “… with a suitable historic past…”. That past need not go far back into “the assumed mists of time…” but can be of recent origin, “… a matter of a few years…” Such traditions may assume both a formal, informal, official or unofficial character and serve particular ideological or social functions (viz., cohesion, stability, elite control), especially in periods marked by significant social changes or transformations. In these respects, for instance, he notes the use of sport by members of the new and rising middle classes in 19th century Britain, particularly the last three decades, as a strategy of class distinction and acceptance through the invention of particular sports such as tennis and golf, and the notion of amateurism.9 In addition, this period marked the incipient rise or use of sport as “symbols” of nationalism such as “Welsh rugby as distinct from English soccer, and Gaelic football in Ireland (1884)…” (Hobsbawm, 1983, p. 300). This practice was also aided by the early development of international sport contests such as the Davis Cup in tennis (1890), Test matches in cricket (1877) and the revived Olympic games (1896) (ibid.).

---

9The invention of sport traditions and their use in class formation and class relations in 19th and 20th century have also been shown for the USA (Ingham, 1978), and Canada (Gruneau, 1999). Additionally, both Terret (1995) and Pope (1996) examined the invention of amateurism in both the UK and the USA, respectively, and the (in) famous conflict it occasioned with professional sports in the 19th and 20th century.
As a result of this increased politicization of sport, it was to be used by the leaders of nations to form, reform and sustain particular images of themselves even though those images may have been at variance with their actual reality (Maguire, 1999, pp. 189-202), or in the language of the figurationalists, may have displayed very little “reality-congruence.”

In the latter respect for instance, Elias has noted that nations or groups that were once powerful may continue to make believe that this is still so. And, they may do this through a range of strategies that might include teaching about the past, old architecture and focusing on recent successes that serve as reminders of past dominance. Such reality-incongruent self-images tantamount to what he calls “fantasy shields” and “a fantasy image” of past greatness, which can also prove detrimental to those individuals themselves. He wrote thus:

A striking example in our time is that of the we-image and we-ideal of once powerful nations whose superiority in relation to others has declined ... The radiance of their collective life as a nation has gone; their power superiority in relation to other groups ... is irretrievably lost. Yet the dream of their special charisma is kept alive in a variety of ways—through the teaching of history, the old buildings, masterpieces of the nation in the time of its glory, or through new achievements which seemingly confirm the greatness of the past. For a time, the fantasy shield of their imagined charisma as a leading established group may give a declining nation strength to carry on... But the discrepancy between the actual and the imagined position of one’s group among others can also entail a mistaken assessment of one’s resources and, as a consequence, suggest a group strategy in pursuit of a fantasy image of one’s own greatness that may lead to self-destruction as well as the destruction of other interdependent groups. The dreams of nations (as of other groups) are dangerous. An overgrown we-ideal is a symptom of a collective illness. (Elias, 1994, pp. xliii-xliv, see also Maguire 1999, pp. 180-182)
However, whether real or imaginary, it is suggested that “The ‘image’ of the nation is constitutive of a person’s self image” (Maguire, 1999, p. 184) or personal identity. In this regard, Elias suggests thus that notions of individual and the collectivity (construed or defined here as “nation” or “national character”) are two sides of the same coin and not as discrete as normally conceived or presented (Elias 1996, p. 152, cited in Maguire, 1999, p. 184). Furthermore, the image(s) of the nation, or the sense of what constitutes its national identity or national character, are bound up in the emotions, “habitus codes” as well as the discursive and practical consciousness of the individual through which they are both produced and reproduced. The habitus, Bourdieu conceived basically as the values and behavioural predispositions of the individual, which are shaped by their particular social origin. Practical consciousness refers to the everyday, unplanned, taken for granted actions of individuals, while discursive consciousness refers to the more “cognitively based decision-making” or planned and calculative action (Giddens, 1986, 41-44, cited in Maguire, 1999, p. 185). The notions of habitus and identity, however, are not monolithic or singular but are multi-layered as they exist at individual, group and national levels. Additionally, they are also subject to challenge and change. The individual, for instance, in the language of Elias may have a particular I-We identity or habitus code, with the first person singular pronoun serving to represent their sense of individuality or “individual self” and the first person plural serving to represent their collective identity be it as a member of a group or of a nation (ibid., pp. 186-187). Relatedly, individuals may display multiple identities along “local, regional, national and global” lines. Writing of the pluralized or multilayered nature of identity and the habitus, Maguire, borrowing from Elias, wrote:

... people in complex nation-states, have multiple identities that are many-layered-local, regional, national, global. These layers form a flexible lattice work of the habitus of a person. (Elias, 1996, p. 153, cited in Maguire, 1999, pp. 185-186).
And, Elias, wrote himself:

... the social habitus ... in more complex societies ... has many layers. Someone may, for example, have the peculiarities of a Liverpool-English or a black Forest-German European. It depends on the number of interlocking planes in his [sic] society how many layers are interwoven in the social habitus of the person. (Elias, 1987-1991, p. 183, cited in Maguire, 1999, p. 186)

Invariably, the I-We identity or habitus code serves to determine group or national boundaries and membership by distinguishing ‘us’- the “insiders/established”, from ‘them’- the “outsiders”, and these boundaries “tend to harden and become more sharply defined” in the presence of “outsiders” (ibid.,186-87). Consistent with the dynamic of power relations and identity formation, however, it is recognized that the status of “established” and “outsider” can change reciprocally. By this, it is meant that the “established” can become “outsiders” while “outsiders” can also become “established” particularly as “power ratios” or differentials change (Elias and Scotson, 1994, pp. xxxv, xlv, xlv). In a manner of speaking, the tables can turn on the established-outsider figuration that existed hitherto and lead to a relative repositioning of the human agents involved. One suggests however that in examining this transition process, we need to pay close attention to the particular character it may assume along the way. There are two points to be made in this regard. Firstly, I am suggesting that in this possible transition from outsider to established status, we examine this process to see not only its oppositional nature but also whether it is of an (a) emergent or (b) an accommodating character, if any. I use the term “emergent” here in the sense used by Raymond Williams to refer to the idea that new cultural meanings and values, new practices, new relationships and kinds of relationships are continuously being created in the process of social interaction (Williams, 1977, pp. 122-123; McCree, 2000b, p. 203). Elaborating further on the nature of the “emergent”, Williams noted that while it may represent an alternative and a source of opposition to the dominant culture, elements of the emergent
culture are also vulnerable to incorporation by the bearers of the dominant culture. But, much incorporation is often veiled as “recognition”, “acknowledgement” and a “form of acceptance” (ibid.). We should note however that while the incorporation or accommodation of the emergent can be construed as some form of acceptance by the dominant, those so incorporated may still be in a position of relative subordination. In other words, acceptance of the “outsider” does not necessarily translate into being seen as a status equal by the “established”. Here, such incorporation might be equated with just toleration. Indeed, in his own examination of Mozart’s life history, Elias showed that although Mozart was invited to dine and reside for a while in the household of aristocratic rulers of the day, this did not alter his inferior bourgeois social status (Elias, 1993, pp. 16-17). He was tolerated not a social equal. In the context of this study, it is suggested that the experiences of Bailey might possibly offer an opportunity to examine the vagaries of the transition from outsider to established status in terms of its incipient/emergent, oppositional and accommodating character, although these do not exhaust the processual possibilities. Secondly, one also needs to examine the circuitous or contradictory character of this possible transformation across different social contexts. By this, we mean that in moving from “outsider” to “established” in one context, it may simultaneously result in the person becoming an “outsider” in another where, previously, s/he may have been “established”. For instance, in the context of Bailey, let us assume, for the sake of argument, that he had moved from being seen as an “outsider” in British society as a result of his visibility and popularity as an athlete (of course it does not necessarily follow), and if so, the question is: did he simultaneously become an “outsider” to the people of Trinidad and Tobago and their nationalist aspirations? Understanding this possible transformation from outsider to established and vice versa together with the varying perception of that transformation within and across social
contexts is important since it has significant implications for the process of identity (re)formation\textsuperscript{10} and the politics of sport.

As intimated earlier, Maguire notes that the national character/habitus is shaped by and through discursive practices, such as media reporting on sport, and the conscious creation and deployment of images, histories and invented traditions that form part of the "imagined community of the nation." Anderson saw nations as imagined political communities "... because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (1983, p. 6). The discursive practices are also bound up with practices at "the practical consciousness" level, which include unrecognised activities, and deeply rooted recollections that form part of the common stock of shared knowledge and experiences (Maguire, 1999, p. 187). In this regard, Maguire wrote:

While the process of national habitus-character-formation is framed, constructed and represented by and through discursive practices (such as the production and consumption of media sport discourses), these practices themselves are interwoven with activities occurring at the level of 'practical consciousness'. While the former involve a set of consciously created images, histories, symbols and invented traditions which have endured for greater and lesser periods of time and which confer meaning on what is involved in being psychologically and socially part of the 'imagined community' of the nation, the latter entail unnoticed activities, deeply rooted memories, that are part of the group's collectively shared embodied experiences and stocks of knowledge. (Maguire, 1999, p. 187).

\textsuperscript{10}In the context of the Commonwealth Caribbean, the illustrious Sir Vidia Naipaul can serve as a perfect illustration of this contradictory process. It can be said that the more Naipaul became a part of British society (established), the more divorced he seems to have become from West Indian society and the country of his birth in particular (outsider). Of course, the well noted irony is that the bulk of his writings are based on the very society to which he seems to have become a stranger. In Britain thus, while he has gone from stranger/outsider to 'Sir,' in the West Indies, he has moved from established to stranger.
It is upon these discursive and practical activities that some of the leaders and people of once powerful nations base their “fantasy shields” and “fantasy images” of past dominance, otherwise described as “wilful nostalgia” (ibid., 187, 189).

While Maguire’s treatment of the above theoretical and political issues is located primarily in the contemporary stage of sportization and the processes of European integration and globalization, they still assume relevance for the earlier period of sportization/globalization in which this study is located (i.e., 1944-1954). In this regard for instance, the following related questions are examined: Was the emergence and public support for Bailey between 1944 and 1954 in Britain, and media discourses concerning same, linked to an incipient English “fantasy shield” that was ushered in by its political and economic (mis) fortunes during that period and the incipient decline of its Empire? Did this and his elite athletic status spare Bailey from the treatment that was normally meted out to those perceived as “outsiders”? In the first place, was Bailey perceived as an “outsider” in Britain? Relatedly, can the experience(s) of Bailey shed light on the “established/outsider” relationship and the nature of the transition from “outsider” to “established” status whether emergent, oppositional, accommodating or any other form it may have assumed for that matter? In addition, did Bailey possess a singular identity (Trinidadian) or multiple identity (Trinidadian and British subject)? Did Bailey weaken or strengthen the early development of nationalist feelings or a sense of national identity in Trinidad through his representation of Britain? These are some of the issues relating to imperialism, nationalism, and race relations that the study of Bailey seeks to engage.
1.7 Summary-Conclusion

This chapter had several major objectives which included chiefly, a critical examination of the meaning of athletic migration, the attempt to categorize/classify sporting migrants together with the related processes of sportization, the globalization of sport and the theoretical debates that they have spawned. The 1980s and 1990s marked a gradual but consistent attempt to study the migration of athletes around the world, a phenomena which was generally excluded from the mainstream concern with non-athletic forms of migration in both the Americas and in Europe. These relatively recent efforts, however, have presented several conceptual and theoretical challenges and debates. As far as the geographical trajectory of athletic migration is concerned two major types were identified: those of an intra-nation and inter-nation nature with the latter assuming both intra-continental and inter-continental forms. The definition of athletic migration and athletic migrants, however, proved more problematic. Two general approaches to classifying athletic migration and migrants were identified: one based largely on time spent in a particular geographical location and the other on a mixture of both time spent and the motive(s) of the migrants. In order to avoid what was seen as conceptual looseness and terminological ambiguity contained in the former approach (i.e., time approach), a preliminary migration continuum was suggested. This continuum contained temporary migration at one pole, sub-divided into transient and seasonal migration, and permanent migration at the other, sub-divided into quasi-permanent migration and fully permanent forms of migration. The second approach rests solely on the pioneering sport migration typology offered by Maguire in his study of athletic migration and sportization in which four main types of athletic migrants were identified: pioneer, settler, mercenary, nomad and returnee. While mindful of the problematic nature of typologies, in order to sharpen the conceptual clarity and heuristic utility of Maguire’s, it was suggested that
the definition of those criteria on which the typology rested could have been more clearly delineated and defined in terms of duration (temporary/permanent), motives (economic, political, cultural, educational, developmental etc.), context (colonialism, independence, professionalization, commercialization, etc.) and type of sport (amateur/professional, individual/team). It is proposed that the major advantage of this delineation is that it enables the analyst and reader to see a little more clearly the areas of convergence and divergence in the migrant categories employed in the typology as well as the intricacies of such classification in studying migrant motives. By so doing, it is hoped that it can enhance our understanding of the athletic migration process.

While much of the early work on athletic migration approximated a type of descriptive balance sheet of the process for both sender and receiver countries, some studies have been informed by more mainstream theoretical approaches drawn from sociology and the sociology of development in particular. These have included the theories of cultural imperialism, cultural hegemony, globalization and figurational sociology which have focused on the related processes of ludic diffusion and sportization of which athletic migration forms an integral component. The examination of the global diffusion of modern sport, in both periods of British and American hegemony, has been concerned with several related issues: how it is diffused (by force or consent), the extent of the diffusion (total or partial), its consequences for the countries involved and the development of sport (destruction, revitalization, development), the reaction of local/indigenous peoples (acceptance, resistance, reinterpretation/indigenization/adaptation), the impact on cultural identities (homogeneity, diversity, hybridity) and the reciprocal yet asymmetrical nature of the exchange process. Some of these processes have been variously explained in terms of modernization which focuses on the values (e.g., amateur-gentleman, character formation) and
rationalization of sport (e.g., bureaucratization, regulation, standardization etc.); imperialism which focuses on coercion and destruction; cultural hegemony à la Gramsci which focuses on domination, as well as consent, resistance/reinterpretation/indigenization, and the two-way, albeit asymmetrical nature of the diffusion process; capitalism, its expansionist dynamics and globalization with its focus on diversity and hybridity. The latter concept, however (i.e., globalization) has also proved contentious and of dubious theoretical import to some because of its ideologically biased and teological character together with its suggestion that the cultural processes to which it directs attention are new or recent. While some conceive of it as a homogenising process (based largely on Americanization in the present era), that is merely an extension of imperialism, others point to it as a pluralized, hybridized and relatively autonomous transcultural process containing elements of different world cultures.

In an attempt to avert the moncausal and reductionist approach to treating the processes of sportization and globalization contained in some of the above perspectives, Maguire (1999) has offered a figurational approach to explaining the nature and dynamic of that process. In this approach, which shares some similarity with the notion of cultural hegemony (e.g., both point to the reciprocal nature of cultural exchanges between different groups and the centrality of human agency), great stress is placed on viewing the process as a long term, dynamic and open ended one that has a multi-variable, multi-level, and multi-directional, albeit asymmetrical character, which recognizes human agency and its constraints. It was also noted though that one of the major sources of difference between figurational theory and hegemony theory was the latter’s view that the exercise of power could be based equally on the consent of the subordinated as it can be on the use of force or coercion although Elias (1939/2000) was aware of both the “relational and
polymorphous" character of power (Dunning, 2002, p. 213). The figurational perspective was further employed together with ideas from such thinkers as Hobsbawm, Anderson, Bourdieu and Giddens to examine the issues of identity formation in general and nationalism in particular, which have also figured prominently in the discourse on sport and athletic migration, and which forms a principal object of this study.

Historically, and beginning from the last third of the 19th century in particular, sport has formed part of the process of defining nations, identities and the invention of traditions related thereto. It is through such traditions that those who form such nations can try and have tried to create and sustain particular images of themselves whether imaginary ("fantasy shield") or real. Regardless of its ontological character, however, the sense of national identity or character, is bound up in the habitus codes (values and behaviour), discursive consciousness (planned action/consciously created images, histories etc.) and practical consciousness (everyday, unplanned actions) of the individual. The individual and the collective identity or the I-We identity therefore, are organically related and not completely separate in any strict dichotomous sense contrary to a dominant historical and prevailing perception. Relatedly, the I-We identity can serve to define group boundaries and distinguish the "outsiders" from the "established", which suggests that identities can be inclusive as well as exclusive at the same time. Relatedly, identity can also assume a multiple or plural character as it can exist along "local, regional, national and global" lines.

While this study is very much informed by a figurational framework, it adopts an eclectic approach by also borrowing from other theoretical perspectives, namely cultural hegemony à la Gramsci, Raymond Williams’ notion of “emergent” cultural forms, as well as those of Bourdieu and Anderson. This approach is based on the belief that
theory building in sociological research is better served or enhanced through effecting theoretical mergers rather than through theoretical monopolies or monism although we may still veer more to one theoretical school than the other. This approach is not suggested for all situations but as the empirical situation warrants, without surrendering too much of our theoretical identities or orientation since there are limits to any process. In other words, theoretical cross-fertilization should be preferred to theoretical chauvinism which still stalks sociological research in general and sport sociology in particular. This is one of the major ways to avoid or diminish the “debilitating consequences” of what Dunning (2002, p. 211) recently dubbed “paradigm wars” in making a call for more theoretical tolerance in the study of sport. My own theoretical approach to this study is informed by these suggested theoretical guidelines and/or advisories.

Through the examination of the life history of former sprint athlete McDonald Bailey, the above conceptual and theoretical issues as they relate to athletic migration, sportization/ludic diffusion, group relations, identity formation, nationalism and imperialism are explored. More specifically, these issues relate to (i) the nature of athlete motivation to migrate; (ii) the nature of sportization/ludic diffusion as consistent with imperialism, modernization, and cultural hegemony; (iii) the nature of hegemony as consistent with consent, resistance and domination; (iv) the nature of imperialism (can it be intentional as well as unintentional); (v) the dynamic nature of identity formation and the role of habitus codes, discursive and practical consciousness in this process and (vi) the processual, circuitous nature of outsider-established group relations.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

In spite of the deadlocks and deficiencies that characterize the theoretical discourse on athletic migration and sportization, it still seems to be more advanced or developed than the methodological approaches that inform some of the various studies. Generally, these have tended to be very impressionistic, descriptive, anecdotal and lacking in methodological rigour (see for instance Arbena 1994, Klein, 1994). Of the sociological studies on the subject, just a few have deviated from this general pattern by employing some form of formal interviewing or by using a mix of qualitative (interviews) and quantitative strategies (survey questionnaires). These works include those of Olin and Pentilla’s (1994) on professional basketball migration to Finland during the 1980s, Bale’s (1991) study on student athletic migration to the United States and Maguire and Stead’s (1996) work on foreign cricket migration into the UK. The first two studies, however, while employing a mix of strategies, focus more on the questionnaire results, while the latter’s use of interviews lacks depth in examining the life history of the migrant athletes. It is not surprising thus that Maguire (1999) himself can state that “No detailed research on the lived experiences of migrants from less developed countries, for example African and East European soccer players, so far exists.” While Maguire cites as an example of this lacuna migrant footballers, the same easily applies to a host of other sports and migrant athletes, both historically and today. It is hoped that the use of the life history method in the study of McDonald Bailey can make a contribution both to filling this lacuna in the study of sport migration and to improving
the methodological approaches to its study. What follows is a brief exposition on the meaning, nature, development, and problems of this approach, and the other related sources of data and methods employed in this study.

2.2 Life History Method

The life history method (LHM), which has also been referred to as the “case history,” has had a rather chequered history itself in the social sciences. It was first pioneered by anthropologists in the 19th century for whom it was known as the “life story”, which meant an account “of a person’s life as delivered orally by the person himself” (Bertaux, 1981, p. 7). Denzin (1970/1978, p. 215) also defines it as “… the experiences held by one person, or one group, or one organization as this person, group, or organization interprets those experiences.” However, the terminology, “life story”, eventually changed to “life history” as other forms or sources of data were used to supplement the individual’s version of events be it through interviews with others, or the use of documents and reports (Lagness, 1965, pp. 4-5, cited in Bertaux, 1981, pp. 7-8). Denzin captures this elaboration or broadening of the method when he notes that “Life history materials include any record or document, including the case histories of social agencies, that throws light on the subjective behaviour of individuals or groups. These may range from letters to autobiographies, from newspaper accounts to court records” (Denzin, 1970/1978, p. 215).

In the context of sociology, the early use and development of the LHM has been associated with sociologists at the University of Chicago, more popularly known as the Chicago School, who employed it in their early studies on crime and deviance in American society in the 1920s (Bertaux, 1981, p. 5; Denzin, 1970/1978, p. 214; Silverman, 1993, pp. 31-36). However, with the development of quantitative survey research, the LHM, Bertaux (1981, p. 5) notes was “almost abandoned … altogether…” by
sociologists (see also Denzin, 1970/1978, pp. 248-249). Many of the quantitatively minded saw it as merely an “adjunct to the survey and statistical analysis,” whose primary utility was of an exploratory nature and to help generate questions and hypotheses (ibid.). This general situation persisted into the 1970s and 1980s (Denzin, 1970/1978, Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Silverman 1985; 1993, p. 204) until another “spurt” of interest followed over the last 10-20 years. This has been attributed to several related factors, notably: (1) the general limitations and failure of quantitative research to explain social phenomena satisfactorily despite its great promise and claims; (2) the rise of post-modernism, interdisciplinary research and methodological pluralism and (3) the rise of the feminist movement and feminist research which has tended to privilege this method because it supposedly enables the subject’s voice to be heard (see Denzin and Lincoln, 1994 and Silverman, 1993). The latter meshed easily with a major political goal of the movement which was to empower women, hidden from history, by giving them a greater voice and greater visibility. Today, therefore, the qualitative tradition, in all its varied forms, is a part of the methodological mainstream although this has not eliminated the fundamental divisions and dissensus which it spawned.

In his examination of the LHM, Denzin (1970/1978, pp. 217-218) notes that they maybe of three types: complete, topical and edited. In the complete approach, one “… attempts to cover the entire sweep of the subject’s life experiences” whereas in the topical approach, “… only one
phase of the subject’s life is presented.” However, “The edited life history may be either topical or complete.” By editing, Denzin refers to the “… interspersing of comments, explanations and questions by someone other than the focal subject” through the use of interviews and/or documentary sources. Since this study focuses on a specific period in the life of McDonald Bailey (1944-1954), and that of the world, it can be classified as the “topical” type of LHM, which corresponds to what is generally referred to as the “slice-of-life” approach (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). In addition, it is also of an edited character since it will be interspersed with “… comments, explanations and questions by someone other than the focal subject” namely, past athletes and officials. During the course of this study, at least 10 interviews were conducted with Bailey by the author between 2000 and 2005. However, the author first interviewed Bailey in 1996 as part of the oral and pictorial studies project of the University of the West Indies before any idea of basing my doctoral thesis on his athletic career ever arose and from that time onward, we have kept in touch with each other.

The general rationale for using the LHM can be derived from two of its major strengths. Firstly, given its nature, it allows the researchee to present his/her own definition or interpretation of events, which can enable the researcher to probe further into their inner worlds of meaning. This can then put the researcher in a much better position to understand their actions or thinking, which is not strictly possible with the cold, orthodox, positivist, survey approaches. Moreover, such an approach seems particularly suited to probing the issues of identity and identity formation and their social construction or invention with which this study is concerned. As a result of this, the LHM, as intimated earlier, gives the researchee agency by allowing them a greater voice and control over the overtones. The term “subject” would be restricted to their use in quotations from other authors.
research process and the representation of their experiences. Secondly, the LHM (as with all case studies generally) can enable the researcher to examine more closely, conveniently and less costly the workings of broader social processes on a diminuaturized scale. One major reason that can be advanced for this has to do with the very nature of individuals and the very nature of social processes themselves. In this respect, individuals are conceived not only as the conduit and reflectors of social processes but also as their initiators or creators. In either direction however (as conduit and creator), the individual can be seen as the process and the process as the individual and, in as much they can be distinct, they are merely two-sides of the same existential coin. To stress the centrality of the human agent in social life, however, does not necessarily imply an absolutist or idealist position on the nature of human conduct which sees them existing free from constraints. Because individuals depend on each other for one reason or another, this mutual dependence or interdependence, combined with the uneven distribution of resources and power can impose certain limits on their degrees of freedom to act or not act and to think or not think. Consequently, all individuals (either as conduits or creators) may not have the same degree of control or influence over social processes/relations. Some may have more control/influence than others depending on their location in the particular hierarchy of social relations or the prevailing “power ratio”. This location or positioning, however, is not necessarily static as it may change overtime in both forward (more control/influence) and backward (less control/influence) directions. Individuals therefore may possess relative autonomy to think and act stemming from the interdependent nature of social relations/processes, and the uneven distribution of resources and power in any given social context (Elias, 1970, 1939/2000, 1997; Gruneau, 1983/1999).

Nevertheless, given the centrality of the human agent to the social process and the social process to the human agent, it is reasonable and
logical to suggest that the examination of an individual’s life might enable us to examine some of the (larger) social processes to which they are indissolubly connected whether knowingly/unknowingly, by accident or design. In this regard for instance, in both his study of the life history of Mozart and the sub-urban community of Winston Parva in Leicester, Elias shows how an examination of the “micro-process” or “microcosm” can “throw light” on the workings of “the macro-process” or “macrocosm” “and vice versa” (Elias 1993, pp.23-24, 43: Elias and Scotson 1964/1994, pp. xii, xvii, li). This is the same analytical thread and advantage that runs through all similar type case studies be it of an individual, group, community or organizational nature. As it pertains to the study of Bailey, some of these related macro- and micro-processes relate to athletic migration, the global diffusion of sport, imperialism, race relations, and identity formation (viz., nationalism, personal/group identity).

The main strengths of the LHM however (viz., granting a greater, voice to researchee, analysis of larger social processes), are almost equally matched by its challenges and limitations, which have to do mainly with the problems of internal and external validity. The problem of internal validity covers a range of related issues that include notably, reinterpretation/revisionism, distortions, time span, maturation, and reactivity (Denzin, 1970/1978, pp. 197-201, pp. 236-240). Reinterpretation or revisionism, as it is also called, is a major problem that confronts the LHM although it is neither unique nor restricted to this approach, for it is common to almost all forms of historical or interview research which includes ‘survey’ research as well. Revisionism describes the tendency of individuals to reinterpret past experiences or events in such a way that it presents them or others in a good or favourable light (Denzin, 1970/1978, p. 239). Consistent with this, they may choose to ignore or underplay certain features of their life while highlighting others (ibid.). Relatedly, they may engage in what I choose to call “false causal
attribution," which simply means assigning the wrong cause or interpretation to explaining certain actions or processes in order to create or protect a particular image of themselves or others. Denzin also seems to refer to this as the “fallacy of motive” (Denzin, 1970/1978, p. 223). Such revisionism can seriously distort the researchee’s actual experiences and invariably impair the objective(s) of the research. Distortion, however, may not always be deliberate but may result from the long time span of the events, poor memory/recollection or a poor and incomplete understanding of what transpired or did not transpire in the first place (ibid., pp. 239-240).

Added to the problems of revisionism and recollection are those of maturation and reactivity. As individuals mature and grow old, as time changes and as they encounter a wider range of experiences, their outlook on life, including their own, and on social issues may change or undergo modification. In turn, these maturational changes may influence a researchee’s representation or recollection of events, as well as the researcher’s approach to the study and to the researchee, since s/he too maybe also maturing. This problem can be compounded if a friendship should develop between researcher and researchee in the course of the study, although such a friendship may also be potentially beneficial. These developments, however, may influence the researcher to omit, downplay, or overemphasize certain details or situations at the expense of others (Denzin, 1970/1978, pp. 237-238). In order to assess the possible impact of this occurrence on the validity of the findings or analysis, one strategy suggested is that “....the observer maintain a log book over the entire period of the study...” (ibid., pp. 237-239). The problem of reactivity is another common research problem which speaks to the effects that the researcher can have on a subject’s opinions and behaviour in the course of their interaction. Denzin suggests that two possible strategies to deal with this include having “... subjects go back over earlier conversations and productions and reevaluate them in terms of present feelings ...” and
having researchers “... keep written notes on what their impact has been.” These effects can be evaluated subsequently for possible inclusion in the life history (ibid., pp. 237-238).

Apart from these specific strategies for dealing with the possible effects of maturation and reactivity on the research process, a major strategy advocated for dealing with these problems and those of revisionism and recollection is the method of triangulation, the principal purpose of which is to obtain corroboration of what is told or reported. This entails consulting other sources of data that include interviews with “significant others” and other persons generally, who might be helpful to the study, as well as examining documentary sources, such as government documents, organizational records, letters, diaries, songs, and media reports. However, while advocating the use of triangulation in order to attain corroboration and validity, Denzin (1970/1978, p. 240) also reminds that “… it must first be remembered that the objectivity of a recalled event is of less value than its subjective impact on the person recalling it.” Yet, this notwithstanding, he still reiterates the need for multiple perspectives on particular events and situations:

The subjective remembrances and interpretations must be taken at face value- but in addition to these, as many different perspectives as possible must be brought to bear upon each specific event and situation. (ibid., p. 240)

In the context of this study, the alternative sources of data and possibly “different perspectives” involved (i) interviews with surviving and appropriate athletes and officials from that era of which eight came from Trinidad and four from the UK; (ii) the analysis of available organizational records of relevant athletic bodies, newspaper reports, athletic publications together with his own newspaper columns for the Daily Express during his time in the UK. Interviewees were asked questions dealing particularly with: (i) the controversy over his selection
for Britain at the 1948 London Olympics; (ii) his decision to represent Britain at those Olympics and (iii) the consequences of this decision. Many of the respondents, however, were found to have very limited knowledge of the 1948 controversy while some had no knowledge at all. As a result, one had to rely more on the newspaper reports of the matter.

Denzin's methodological "eclecticism" however, a characterization attributed to Fielding and Fielding (1986), has come under criticism from certain quarters for its supposedly naïve assumption or suggestion that the "... practice of 'method triangulation' can serve to overcome partial views and present something like a complete picture" (Silverman, 1993, p. 157). In this respect, Hammersley and Atkinson (1983, p. 157) advise that "one should not adopt a naively "optimistic" view that the aggregation of data from different sources will unproblematically add up to produce a more complete picture" (cited in Silverman, 1993, p. 1993). Given this impossible mission, it is argued further that the role of the researcher is not to act as umpire or match referee as such, and use data "... to adjudicate between participants' competing versions but to understand the situated work that they do" (Dingwall, 1981, cited in Silverman, 1993, pp. 157-158). While not eschewing the use and potential value of "multiple methods," Silverman comes down heavily on "triangulation" for this seeming "... 'mistake .... in using data to adjudicate between accounts ... while remaining blind to the sense of each account in the context in which it arises" (1993, p. 158). Thus in rather harsh terms, and in his own methodological self-adjudication, he concluded bluntly:

... the major problem with triangulation as a test of validity is that, by counterposing different contexts, it ignores the context-bound and skilful character of social interaction\footnote{At best something appears confusing and at worst contradictory, in the statement that "by counterposing different contexts, it ignores the context-bound ... character of social interaction..." The question is: how can you provide a context and ignore it at one and the same time?} and assumes that members are 'cultural dopes', who need a sociologist to dispel their illusions ... (ibid., p. 158)
While we must not lose sight of the larger point being driven home by Silverman and others (i.e., the spatial and temporal specificity of social action and knowledge together with the need to take cognizance of it, a point which Weber (1978) had made decades earlier), one feels that they may have gone a little overboard, and in the process misrepresent inadvertently, both the role of the sociologist (as adjudicator) and triangulation itself. The irony is that the use of life history and oral interviews, as noted earlier, and which form the core of the strategy in this study, are premised on the very idea that people may see and interpret things differently in accordance with their own interests and experiences. But, the task of the sociologist (as adjudicator) is to identify consistencies, as well as reconcile differences in such accounts as it relates to the objectives of the investigation and other social processes of which those persons formed or form a part. Surely, with this approach, how can the sociologist be accused of seeing the researchee as either a “cultural dupe” or ignoring the “context-bound” nature of their accounts? The use of triangulation thus, and particularly as approached in this study, is not at variance with contextuality and human agency, for they lie at its very heart.

Apart from triangulation, another prescribed approach to validation in qualitative research is what is termed “analytic induction” (AI) which bears on the problem of external validity. External validity, in its orthodox empiricist sense, has to do with the representativeness and generalizability of a particular case study to a wider population and “the restrictions arising from time and spatial locations” of the study (Denzin, 1970/1978, p. 236). External validity, therefore, is nomothetic in character given its concern with generalizations. Relatedly, the concept of AI rests on making generalisations that have “universal application” or that apply to “… all instances of the problem..” (ibid., pp. 191-196, p. 233; Silverman, 1993, pp. 160-162). The litmus test of these generalizations,
however, is based on the identification of "negative" or "deviant" cases of the phenomena. If these are found, then the problematic or hypothesis is either reformulated or altered but if they are not, it is accepted (ibid.). Given the nature and time period of this study, the use of AI seems neither possible nor relevant, although this does not rule out the examination of the experiences of other West Indian migrants at the time and athletes, such as both renowned West Indian and Trinidadian cricketer Learie Constantine, and Jamaican middle distance Olympic champion Dr. Arthur Wint (both deceased). Rather, following on Mitchell (1983), it is felt that "the issue should be couched in terms of the generalisability of cases to theoretical propositions rather than to populations or universes" (cited in Silverman, 1993, p. 160; see also Silverman, 1985, pp. 111-115). In the context of this study, for instance, some of these theoretical propositions relate to the following:

1. the nature of imperialism as consistent with both intentionality and unintentionality
2. the reciprocal and asymmetrical nature of dominant-subordinate relations
3. the nature of hegemony as consistent with both consent, resistance and domination
4. the role of sport in the construction and deconstruction of notions of Empire, nation and the "invention of traditions"
5. the role of habitus codes, discursive and practical consciousness in identity formation
6. the dynamic, exclusive, inclusive or plural nature of identity formation and
7. the dynamic, circuitous nature of established-outsider relationships.

---

14 Arthur Wint was British middle distance champion during his time as a medical student in London, and a close friend of Bailey. Both also belonged to the same athletic club, Polytechnic Harriers.
Put differently, with this approach, the trust of validity will hinge around showing the extent to which Bailey’s life experiences examined and his account of these confirm or falsify the theoretical issues or propositions above. However, while some have dismissed these concerns over validity in qualitative research altogether because of its association with quantitative research (Marshall and Rossman, 1989; Agar, 1986; Stanley and Wise, 1983), like Silverman, I am of the view that “… the issue of validity is appropriate whatever one’s theoretical orientation or use of quantitative or qualitative data” (1993, p. 156).

2.3 Weber and Human Behaviour

Since a major foci of this study are certain decisions of Bailey (e.g., to migrate to Britain, join the RAF, represent Britain at the Olympics, try professional rugby), and the possible motives that underpinned them, it might be of use to consider some of Weber’s methodological guidelines concerning the study of motives or human action. It is also felt that such guidelines can sensitize us even more to the problematic nature of trying to understand motives and in the process enhance, as well as complement the approach to understanding the motives of athletic migrants, which was discussed in Chapter 1. There, it was noted that athletic migrants maybe motivated by a host of related factors of a political, economic or cultural nature, either singularly or in combination. For Weber, a motive was “… a complex of subjective meaning which seems to the actor himself or to the observer an adequate ground for the conduct in question” (1978, p. 11). Weber’s focus on meaning formed the core of his position that for any hypothesis or theory to be valid, it must be adequate at both the level of meaning and at the level of causation (Ingham, 1978, p. 24; Weber, 1978, pp. 9-12). In order to ascertain meaning, Weber prescribed the method of verstehen, which required that the researcher first grasp the meaning of action to an individual
and by locating it in its particular context, which was alluded to earlier in our discussion on triangulation. When such meaning is understood, then we can be in a position to ascribe motive to behaviour (ibid.) and understand the basis for the action in question. For example some of the actions we have in mind here, as previously noted, include Bailey’s decision to migrate to Britain, join the RAF, represent Britain at the Olympics and to try professional rugby.

However, whilst he placed enormous emphasis on the “subjective meaning of action” in the explanation of “social action,” Weber was at the same time acutely aware of the objective (or subjective?) problems to be encountered in so doing. In relation to this, he made three important points. Firstly, he noted that

In the first place the ‘conscious motives’ may well, even to the actor himself, conceal the various "motives" and "repressions" which constitute the real driving force of his action. Thus in such cases even subjectively honest self-analysis has only a relative value. Then it is the task of the sociologist to be aware of his motivational situation and to describe and analyse it, even though it has not been concretely part of the conscious intention of the actor; possibly not at all, at least not fully. (ibid., pp. 9-10)

Secondly, he observed that

... processes of action which seem to an observer to be the same or similar may fit into exceedingly various complexes of motive in the case of the actual actor. Then even though the situations appear superficially to be very similar we must actually understand them or interpret them as very different, perhaps, in terms of meaning, directly opposed. (ibid., p. 10)

And, thirdly, he pointed out that

In a large number of cases we know from experience it is not possible to arrive at even an approximate estimate of the relative strength of conflicting motives and very often we cannot be certain of our interpretation. Only the actual outcome of the conflict gives a solid basis of judgement. (ibid., p. 10)
However, while Weber suggests that "... only the actual outcome... of ... conflict..." can serve as "a solid basis of judgment" for understanding human motives, this may not be necessarily so. Since the actions of individuals can produce effects or outcomes that were not originally intended, outcomes may not serve as a valid indicator of actors' motives. In addition, outcomes may be the product of political and other compromises, which may be at variance with the motives of actors. Nevertheless, given the problems which he noted himself, Weber was well aware that *verstehen* was vulnerable to misinterpretation and misunderstanding. In addition, the chances or the probability of this misinterpretation increased in those situations where the culture or society under study was foreign to the researcher, or in situations where the study was based on some past epoch (Ingham, 1978, p. 31) and, which is the case in this study of McDonald Bailey.

In addition, in respect of action *per se*, Weber identified four broad types of "meaningfully oriented actions" although two of these types approximated "borderline" status (Weber, 1978, pp. 25-26). These comprised: the "instrumentally rational," the "value-rational," the "affectual (especially emotional)" and the "traditional" modes of action. Action that is "instrumentally rational" is based on the actor's identification or definition of (differing) ends, the (differing) means to their attainment together with the assessment of the possible consequences of choosing particular means and/or ends over others (*ibid.*, p. 26). So defined, instrumental action can be easily equated with Bourdieu's discursive level of consciousness previously discussed given its planned and calculative nature (see Chapter 1). "Value-rational action" is based on "... a conscious belief in the value for its own sake of some ethical, aesthetic, religious, or other forms of behaviour, independently of its prospect of success" (*ibid.*, pp. 24-25). "Affectual action" is based on "the actor's specific affects and feelings." It may be considered "borderline" because it may represent "an uncontrolled reaction to some exceptional stimulus." But, while it does not contain the "self-
conscious” characteristic of the “value-rational orientation” (VRO), they both share a common trait in the performance of “the specific type of action for its own sake,” and not for some result “ulterior to it.” “Traditional action” is based on “ingrained habituation.” It may be considered “borderline” because it often represents an “almost automatic reaction to habitual stimuli,” and because this can often assume a “self-conscious” form, this type “may shade over into value-rationality” (ibid.). Additionally, Weber notes that both “affectual” and “traditional” action are necessarily at variance with an “instrumental rational orientation” (IRO). The former forms of action can also be likened to Bourdieu’s practical level of consciousness given their traditional, everyday, unplanned nature (see Chapter 1, p. 43). As regards the IRO and the VRO, while they may both display a “self-conscious” element, the substantive difference lies in the fact that with the VRO, the action is pursued “for its own sake,” without a consideration of consequences, while with the IRO, the reverse is the case (ibid.).

From the foregoing, it is evident that Weber's four modes of action are not watertight categories for, in some instances, they overlap. Weber recognised this, and pointed out further, that the distinctions were also blurred empirically; that they represented ideal (“pure”) types of action, and that they were not exhaustive. He wrote thus:

It would be very unusual to find concrete cases of action, especially of social action, which were oriented only in one or another of these ways. Furthermore, this classification of the modes of orientation of action is in no sense meant to exhaust the possibilities of the field, but only to formulate in conceptually pure form certain sociologically important types to which actual action is more or less closely approximated, or in much the more common case, which constitute its elements. (Weber, 1978, p. 26)

The question to be posed and determined thus is whether some of Bailey’s actions or decisions (e.g., to migrate, join the RAF, represent Britain at the Olympics and to play professional rugby) corresponded to a particular species of instrumental, value rational or traditional action, if
any, and the extent to which he was aware of his own motives for his particular decisions or actions, together with their consequences, in the context that he did so. Surely, while Maguire's typology of athletic migration does sensitize us to some degree to the varying and overlapping nature of human motives, the discussion did not dwell on the problematic nature of establishing such motives in the first place and, as understood by the athletes themselves. In addition, it does not consider the possibility that athletes may not really know the basis of their actions and even more importantly, that there is no necessary isomorphic relationship between motives, actions and outcomes, to which Weber directs attention. It is in these senses that a recourse to Weber can possibly enhance the approach to studying and classifying the athletic migration process or perhaps, any migration process for that matter.

The approach to this study is also very much guided by what C. Wright Mills (1959) refers to as the “sociological imagination,” (SI) which passes easily as both a methodological and theoretical injunction in the study and explanation of social phenomena. This “sociological imagination” he described as a particular “quality of mind” “ ... which enables its possessor to understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and external career of a variety of individuals... “ or “ ... to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society” (ibid., p. 6). This notion of the SI is captured in his famous dictum that

No social study that does not come back to the problems of biography, of history and of their intersections within a society has completed its intellectual journey. (ibid., p. 6)

In the context of this study, what the SI means therefore, is that the examination of the life history of the individual (in this case Bailey) has to be located in broader social relations and processes which may have
shaped his "lived experiences", and which he may also have influenced either practically or symbolically. Invariably, what this means is that a life history often involves the study of many lives and processes and not just the narrow object of that history.

Another sociologist to stress forcefully this fact is Norbert Elias, which is strikingly illustrated in his own life history of the famed musician Wolfgang Mozart (Elias, 1993). Throughout his study, Elias continuously stresses the need to examine and explain the various experiences of Mozart by taking full cognizance of the wider social relations/processes in which he was located during his time. Using this approach, Mozart's frustrated (and failed) attempts to achieve a permanent musical appointment in a higher aristocratic court, to break free from dependence on court patronage, acquire more artistic independence (follow his "inner voices"), be treated as a status equal to his social superiors even, are all explained in terms of the structure of court society that prevailed at the time and the power imbalances that characterized it. In this structure, the ascendant class were the court aristocrats while the subordinate classes included the bourgeoisie to which Mozart belonged. Given their ascendancy, it was the former who set the standards of cultural behaviour and cultural tastes or, in the words of Elias, "... the canon of court behaviour ... feeling... and taste," and determined your fate as an artist through their (in)validation. Mozart's struggle therefore cannot be narrowly construed as a personal one but one between two social groups differentially located in the hierarchy of social relations. Stressing this need to understand the individual (in this case Mozart) in the context of their time, their social position and the interdependent, yet asymmetrical network of social relations (figuration) in which they are embedded, Elias wrote:

15Denzin (1989) has sought to illustrate directly the significance of the SI and Mills' distinction between personal troubles and public issues in his examination of alcohol consumption and various forms of violence including domestic abuse.
Mozart’s individual fate, his destiny as a unique human being and thus also as a unique artist, was heavily influenced by his social situation, the dependence of a musician of his time on court society. ... One needs to be able to draw a clear picture of the social pressures acting on the individual. Such a study is not a historical narrative but the elaboration of a verifiable theoretical model of the figuration which a person— in this case an eighteen-century artist-formed through his interdependence with other social figures at the time. (Elias, 1993, p. 14)

As it applies to this study, sensitivity to these analytical injunctions of Mills and Elias will involve examining the possible link between some of the experiences (e.g., his emergence as an athlete and level of popularity in Britain) and decisions of Bailey (e.g., to migrate to Britain, join the RAF, represent Britain, turn to professional rugby), together with their consequences and the social processes and relations that prevailed in Britain and the West Indies around that time. To probe these possible links, one intends to make use of relevant media reports and other secondary sources of data, as well as interviews with survivors from that period and Bailey himself.

2.4 Sampling Media/Newspaper

While the concept of ‘media’ covers a wide range of communicative devices or strategies (e.g., magazines, radio, television, newspapers), as the major media of the day, this study focused particularly on the newspaper which was subjected to content analysis. In total, 4 newspapers were selected, two each from Britain and Trinidad. The newspapers selected for Britain were the Daily Express and Daily Mirror while for Trinidad, they were the Trinidad Guardian and the Port of Spain Gazette. The selection of the newspapers however, was part arbitrary and part logical. As regards the British newspapers chosen, in a 1952 Hulton Readership Survey of British newspapers, the top 8 daily newspapers were identified (see Table 3), and the top two were found to
be the *Daily Express* and the *Daily Mirror*, with a readership of 10, 476,000 and 10,350,000, respectively.\(^{16}\) The *Daily Express*, however, was chosen before this author had seen the results of this survey, and primarily because Bailey had previously indicated to me that he once wrote a column in this newspaper.\(^{17}\) However, the *Daily Mirror* was selected after having seen the results of the 1952 Hulton Readership Survey. When taken together, the size of the readership of both the *Express* and the *Mirror*, creates a condition which can allow them to have a greater impact on the national habitus and the general process of identity formation (positively or negatively) although it can be difficult to assess the effect of media reporting on public attitudes and *vice versa*, and particularly given the historical nature of this study. In addition, we should note that although there is a time lag between the year of the Hulton survey, 1952, and the earlier period of Bailey’s career covered by the this study (i.e., 1946-1951), this does not necessarily undermine the validity of their use for examining the process of identity formation at the collective and related individual levels.

In terms of the time period, the examination of the newspapers was based on the period January-December of each year spanning 1946-1953 although the majority of the reports concerning athletics would have occurred during the formal track and field season, which generally ran from May to September. However, it was thought more prudent to examine the full 12-month period since there are often athletic or athletic related reports and activities in both the pre-season and post-season periods. In all, and for the British newspapers, a total of 189 reports dealing with or including references to McDonald Bailey in both the *Daily

\(^{16}\) In May 1947, in the context of the rationing of newsprint, the readership of the *Express* was put at 3,792,421 (*Daily Express*, June 5 1947), while in 1951, its average daily circulation was put at 4,119,458 (*Daily Express*, January 7 1952).

\(^{17}\) In 1952, Bailey wrote a series of articles for the *Daily Express* which can be described as a travel diary based on his trips, visits and experiences as an athlete in Europe, the West Indies and Africa.
Express and the Daily Mirror between 1946 and 1953 were examined. And, of these reports, 104 or 55 per cent came from the Daily Mirror while 85 or 45% came from the Daily Express.

Table 3. Hulton Survey of Top British Newspapers, 1952 (mn)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Readership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Express</td>
<td>10,476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>10,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
<td>5,170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Herald</td>
<td>4,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Chronicle</td>
<td>3,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>1,930,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Graphic</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As it relates to Trinidad and Tobago, the two newspapers selected were those that are generally considered the two principal national dailies at the time: the Trinidad Guardian and the Port of Spain Gazette. However, no data relating to the size of their readership then are known to exist. In all, 368 reports relating to or containing references to Bailey were examined of which 194 or 52.7 per cent came from the Trinidad Guardian and 174 or 47.3 per cent came from the Port of Spain Gazette. It must be noted however, that the vast majority of these reports (77%) originated from foreign sources, largely in Britain, whilst a minority (23%) originated locally. And, in addition, the foreign reports came from a rather mixed bag of British sources that included: News of the World, Manchester Guardian, Daily Graphic, Daily Herald, Daily Mail, The Star, Evening Standard, the Sunday Pictorial as well as the Daily Mirror and Daily Express. However, many reports just had the international news agency Reuters, as their source.
2.5 Content Analysis

Content analysis has been defined as “a systematic method for examining the message or content of the print media in order to draw references about the communication system” (Budd et al., 1967, cited in Vincent et. al, 2002, p. 323). Through this method, one can attempt to infer and understand the various meanings, messages and images conveyed by the mass media as it relates to a host of phenomena that may include race, class, gender, nation and nationality etc.. Language however, whether written or non-written, is not just a conveyor of meanings and messages in a narrow linguistic sense but also of prevailing authority and power relations between individuals and collectivities. Consequently, in the context of the media, the language of reporting, description and analysis can serve as a useful barometer to understanding such relations and processes together with changes or continuities related thereto. However, at the same time that it can reflect ideas, relations, and processes, language can also misrepresent same by sending the wrong or misleading message(s). And this might apply even more so in the context of the media not generally known for methodological rigour and prone to inaccuracies and distortions driven by particular commercial, organizational, political and ideological interests of which the reader and even journalists might not necessarily be aware. In addition, language can have intended as well as unintended effects and, as much as it can reveal, can also be used to mask the “real motives” or intentions of human actors.

In a recent content analysis of the (non)equitable nature of American (New York Times, USA Today), British (The Times and Daily Mail) and Canadian (Globe and Mail and Toronto Star) newspaper coverage of male and female athletes at the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games, Vincent et.al (2002, p. 323) employed two broad measures of media coverage: “verbal (articles) and non-verbal (photographs)”. Articles were examined and
classified either negative or positive based on several "qualitative
categories" that included: "physical appearance/attire", "psychological
characteristics" (e.g., "mentally focused"); "physical strength/athleticism,
and "family role" (ibid., p. 323). In the context of this study, particular
attention will be paid to the category or categories used to describe
Bailey’s identity which will be counted in order to get some idea as to
which category or identity assumed or did not assume salience. As part of
the examination of the newspaper articles, the authors also examined their
size and number, together with the nature of "first headline words" and
"first headline size" measured in terms of square inches (ibid., pp. 326-
328). For the purpose of this study, however, we examine mainly the
number of headlined articles relating to Bailey. In relation to photographs,
borrowing from Rintala and Birell (1984), these were divided into 4 broad
categories: "competitive" (athlete presented actually taking part in his/her
own sport); "non-competitive" (athlete not presented actually taking part in
own sport "but clothing or the setting made the athlete’s sport
apparent"); "active" ("athlete was physically doing some other sport") and
"posed" ("athlete was depicted in a non-sporting setting, or by
head/shoulders only") (cited in Vincent et al., 2002, p. 324). In addition,
both articles and photos were examined in terms of their "page
prominence" (top, middle, or bottom) and "the section prominence (front
page, front page of the sports section, sports section)" (ibid., p. 323). In
examining media portrayals of Bailey and the salience he assumed in post-
war British sport and society, we pay particular attention to the language
used in reporting, together with the number of headline articles and photos
employed.
2.6 Summary-Conclusion

Notwithstanding the interesting studies that have been done in the area, the methodological approaches to the study of sport migration seem to occupy a distant second place to the theoretical approaches related thereto, in spite of the shortcomings of the latter. What is particularly lacking, are more in-depth studies of the life experiences of migrant athletes. This study seeks to make a corrective to this situation through studying the life history of one such migrant ex-athlete, McDonald Bailey.

The LHM, however, has gone through its own cycle of popularity, marginalization and resurgence since its development in the 19th century. Its renewed relevance and legitimacy in the last quarter of the 20th century was due in no small measure to several methodological and political developments, which included notably, the rise of post-modernism, methodological pluralism, feminism together with the general failure surrounding the promise of positivism. There are three major types of LHM: the complete (which examines the researchee’s entire life), the topical (which examines one phase of the researchee’s life) either of which may assume an edited character involving the views and recollections of individuals other than those of just the researchee in question. This study is based on the edited topical approach. While the great advantages of the LHM is that it privileges the researchee’s own voice and interpretations, and enables the closer examination of larger processes on a small scale, it poses particular problems in terms of validity, and particularly internal validity. Internal validity includes a set of related problems that may arise during the research process such as reinterpretation/revisionism, distortions stemming from poor memory and poor understandings, maturation, and reactivity. One of the major approaches advocated to deal with the problems of internal validity is methodological triangulation. The latter involves the use of multiple sources of data or strategies of data
collection (such as interviews with other appropriate individuals, and documentary sources) in order to help corroborate findings or information. While some have taken issue with triangulation for its potential to misrepresent the “context-bound” or “situated” nature of actors’ accounts, their capacity for self-thought, and the role of the sociologist as a sort of self-righteous “adjudicator,” the author has argued that, on the contrary, the adopted approach in this study (based on the LHM and content analysis) is not at variance with either contextuality or human agency since it is grounded in them. But, in addition to triangulation, another major approach to ascertaining validity in qualitative research is “analytical induction” (AI). AI basically involves making general propositions about a phenomena, then searching for negative or deviant cases to what is proposed with the aim of either accepting or rejecting them. If such cases are not found, the propositions are accepted but if they are found then the problematic is reformulated until it is consistent with the empirical data. However, while this approach may help to deal with the problem of “external validity” (generalizibility/representativeness of findings) it is not viewed as appropriate or relevant to the research at hand given its peculiar historical nature, although the examination of the experiences of other West Indian migrants in general, and West Indian athletes in particular around that time is not ruled out. Consequently, the approach taken in this study is not to examine generalizability strictly in relation to some “population,” but in relation to the theoretical propositions which guide the study.

Since a major focus of this study is the explanation of certain actions of Bailey and the possible motives that underpinned them, if any, it was suggested that Weber’s (1978) methodological prescriptions surrounding the varying and problematic nature of human action might be of some utility in this regard. Consequently, there were four major methodological advisories. Firstly, he noted that human actors may not
know why they really acted the way they did in the first place. As a result, although they may have some conscious knowledge of the bases for their action, this may merely mask the different “motives” and “repercussions,” which may have served as the “real driving forces” of the action.

Secondly, he observed that individuals may often act based on a “complex of motives,” and that the same action may not necessarily have the same meaning to the individual even where the situation may appear to be the same to the observer. Thirdly, he noted that where the motives of individuals conflict, it may be very difficult to ascertain the strength or dominance one assumed over the other in shaping their course of action. We may add however, that even where the motives of individuals do not conflict, knowing which one played a greater role than the other in shaping human action might still be difficult and further, it is also possible that certain motives may assume equal importance thus precluding a need to establish them in some sort of hierarchy. In addition, overtime, motives may also change in either a planned or unplanned manner and produce negative as well as positive results. Fourthly, and in respect of their action orientations, Weber indicated that the action of individuals may be informed by one or more “modes of action,”: the instrumental, the value rational, the affectual and the traditional. Additionally, given the historical character of this study, these problems are made more difficult due to the potential problems associated with internal validity. The recourse to Weber here connects with several other areas of this study which include Maguire’s typology on the classification of athletic migrants in terms of their motives, Bourdieu’s notions of discursive (equated with instrumental action) and practical consciousness (equated with affectual and traditional action) and the figuralists stress on the planned as well as unplanned nature of human action.

Consistent with the above concerns about validity, together with the historical nature of this study and some of its major propositions,
particular attention was paid to C. Wright Mills' (1959) methodological and theoretical injunction contained in his notion of the "sociological imagination." In brief, this notion admonishes the researcher to be sensitive to the links between biography, and history or to make the connections between "the intimate realities of ourselves ..." and the "... larger social realities" in the study of social phenomena. In this context, it is appropriate that the author now provides a brief history of sport in general and track and field in particular, in Trinidad and Tobago, which we examine in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3

A BRIEF HISTORY OF ATHLETICS IN
IN EARLY 20TH CENTURY TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

3.1 Introduction

Given its British and colonial past, the history of sport in the Commonwealth Caribbean necessarily involves some treatment of colonialism and imperialism since these were the principal processes that facilitated the diffusion of modern sport to this area of the world and throughout its Empire. Against this historical backdrop, and consistent with the general objectives of this thesis, this chapter has several related aims which involve an examination of (1) the general diffusion of sport from Britain to its colonies; (2) the dominant ideology or meaning system that shaped the character or content of this diffusion; (3) the challenges that arose to that dominant ideology and (4) the early organization and development of track and field in Trinidad during the first half of the 20th century. In exploring these processes, we also establish the particular sporting context in which Bailey left for the UK in 1944.

3.2 Early Development of Sport and Athletics in Trinidad

As we noted previously (see Chapter 1, Footnote 1, p.1), Trinidad was captured by the British from the Spaniards in 1797, although it was not until 1802 that this was legalized through the treaty of Amiens (Bowen and Montserin, 1949, pp.9-11). Thus, Trinidad became a British possession before the processes of sportization and industrialization had reached an advanced stage in Britain itself in the mid to late nineteenth
However, because Trinidad was first colonized by the Spaniards in the 15th century and had a very influential French presence following the *Cedula* of population of 1783, it is not yet known whether any form of sport was first introduced through these influences, before the arrival of the English in the late 18th and 19th centuries. Moreover, and even more fundamental, since the Caribbean was inhabited by peoples before the arrival of the Europeans, it will also be of interest to ascertain the type of games in which they engaged and the possible effects that the Encounter with Europe had upon them, if any. The dominant received view, however, is that modern sports as we know it today, were introduced into these parts by the British in the 19th century. The general agents of this process of diffusion were the British expatriates who were located in the military, civil service, education, the church, agricultural production, the nascent oil industry, the commercial and financial sectors (Matthews, 1965; McCree, 1995). Writing in relation to this process of diffusion and its agents, albeit in particular relation to the development of football, a former black Catholic prelate and sociologist, Dr. Basil Matthews, noted in 1965:

The recreational life of the Colony was similarly given tone and direction by these self same interests. It was these people who...

---

18 In order to avoid any possible misrepresentation, this statement recognizes that *sportization* did not originate in the 19th century for, it has been noted that this process took place in two broad phases or “waves”: “... an eighteenth-century wave in which the principal pastimes that began to emerge as modern sports were cricket, fox hunting, horse racing and boxing; and a second, nineteenth century wave in which soccer, rugby, tennis and athletics began to take on modern forms” (Dunning 1992, Elias and Dunning, 1986, cited in Murphy, Sheard and Waddington, 2000, p. 93). The second wave of this process coincided with the period of British control and development of Trinidad, which had been initiated towards the end of the first wave in 1797.

19 Although Trinidad was first colonized by the Spanish, it was not as settled and “developed” as many of its possessions in Latin America. Consequently, it was generally considered a neglected colony (Brereton, 1981). In order to help change this situation, in 1783, a *Cedula* of Population was passed by the Spanish, which allowed persons to acquire lands and settle in the colony “irrespective of nationality” (Bowen and Montserin, 1948, p. 11). Many of such persons included planters and inhabitants from the French possessions of Guadeloupe, Martinique, Saint Domingue (present day Haiti) and the island of Grenada. The French presence was so powerful that the French language was at one time a dominant language in the society (Brereton, 1981).
introduced Association Football to Trinidad. It was these people and their institutions who sired and nurtured the Football way of life in Trinidad and Tobago. (Matthews, 1965, p. 1)

Indeed, what Matthews notes in relation to the development of football can easily be applied to the development of other sports in the then colony. Sport however, did not only assume some narrowly defined recreational purpose, but political and ideological ones as well, and more so in the context of an Empire.

In this respect, it can be said that the role assigned to sport in the Caribbean was grounded squarely on the British public school model that was engineered and popularized in the mid-nineteenth century by Thomas Arnold, famous headmaster of Rugby. The public school encouraged what became known variously as the “games ethos,” “games ethic” and the “games cult.” Mangan (1986) notes that this ethos emphasized a set of virtues such as fair play, discipline, obedience, loyalty, respect for authority, collectivism (e.g., team more important than player) as opposed to individualism, together with courage and stoicism. These lofty traits were also the supposed corner stone of the amateur ethos or the cult of the amateur-gentleman which became the dominant paradigm for prescribing and proscribing behaviour on and off the field of sport from the 19th century right into the 20th century (Ingham, 1978; Hargreaves, 1986; Gruneau, 1983, 1999). Describing the short and long term impact of the public school and the games ethos on the development of British society in particular, Hargreaves noted:

The public school made gentlemen of the rising bourgeoisie at the expense of their potential liberal rationalism and the main vehicle was the games cult and all the ritual surrounding it. An ideology was encoded in the practice of public-school sport which was to become an important component of British political culture; and it was also to have long-lasting effects on the character of sport in Britain. The public-school model of sport had an ultimately wide-
reaching and indirect influence. Not only was it disseminated by public-school and Oxbridge men over a relatively long period lasting well into the next century, via their direct presence in sporting institutions, but also some of its main features were institutionalized in other sectors of society which mediated sport for the majority of the population, notably the state schools in the following century. (Hargreaves, 1986, pp. 44-45)

Consistent with the values it espoused, sport in the public school became an instrument for developing (a) personal character; (b) leaders for the British empire and British society and (c) compliance among peoples both within Britain and its Empire as a whole. This is why Hargreaves can describe the “games cult” as “a new disciplinary technology” outside of work to regulate and control individuals (Hargreaves, 1986, p. 42). Writing of the significance of the public schools and the games ethos for the British Empire as a whole, Mangan has noted that “Imperialism, Education and Games were an Imperial Trinity, as sacred to the upper-class Victorian educator as Liberty, Equality and Fraternity were to the Revolutionary Jacobin” (ibid., p. 37). 20

The existence of the games ethos in the Caribbean has been well documented in the case of the sport of cricket (James, 1963; Manley, 1988; Beckles, 1998). For the sport of track and field, however, as well as many other sports, there has been for the most part little or no serious academic research or writings that deal with their origins and early development during either the period of colonialism or of independence (that is from 1962 in the case of Trinidad and Tobago), and up to this day. In addition, organizational records of relevant bodies for the sport containing minutes of meetings and particular plans and initiatives are either non-existent or extremely sparse (McCree, 1990).

20The games ethos, which privileged sport over traditional academic learning, had its opponents both within (Dewey, 1995 a&b) and outside the public schools (Hargreaves, 1986) but this did not displace its prominence. As Hargreaves notes, “... the criticism was to little avail” (ibid., p. 42).
The available literature suggests that by the first two decades of the 20th century, the staging of local competition in track and field was well established in both the schools and the community in the colony of Trinidad (Noel, 1974). In the absence of a national association, the organization and promotion of track and field fell to community based clubs throughout the country, and institutional based clubs linked to the armed forces, namely the military and the police, oil companies and the Government. The move to greater bureaucratization and centralization in track and field at a national and regional level occurred in the 1940s with the formation of several bodies. These included the Tobago Amateur Athletic Association, a regional body formed in February 1945 (Trinidad Guardian, February 4, 1945), the Arima Athletic Association, a regional body formed in January 1946 (Trinidad Guardian, January 13, 1946)21, the Amateur Athletic Association (AAA), the national body formed in June 1945 (Trinidad Guardian, June 16, 1945), and the Trinidad Olympic Committee formed in 1947 (Trinidad Guardian, September 27, 1947). It was the AAA, however, which was to assume overall responsibility for the organization and development of the sport nationally (Noel, 1974; AAA 1963).22 Its responsibilities involved the selection of national teams, sanctioning and supervising local sport meetings, classifying athletes into A or B divisions based primarily on performance, staging its own annual sport meeting and the overall development of the sport. The number of clubs registered with the AAA varied between 15 and 48 from 1945 to 1947 (Trinidad Guardian, September 23, 1945, May 14, 1947, March 23, 1948).

21 In 1949 national associations were also formed for the sports of netball and basketball (Trinidad Guardian, January 22, 1949; May 20, 1949).
22 The AAA also assumed responsibility for the sport of cycling which was to break away and form its own association in 1950 (Trinidad Guardian, August 1, 2, 1950; October 4, 1950; Port of Spain Gazette, November 5, 1950). This dual control seemed linked to the fact that the staging of athletic meetings in this period, and before the formation of the AAA, involved both track and field and cycling events. It may also be of interest to note
With respect to the social composition of its leadership, the officers of the Association were members of the island’s social and professional elite who were drawn mainly from the military, the judiciary, the church, the field of medicine, the civil service and business, which was the general pattern across all sports. In addition, in the context of the island’s extant social structure, they comprised both whites, blacks and ‘browns’, but with the whites holding the key organizational positions (Noel, 1974; McCree, 1990, 1995; AAA, 1963). It is of interest to note that McDonald Bailey’s father, a school teacher and principal, was to become a member of the General Committee of the AAA (Trinidad Guardian, March 26 1946; March 23 1948) and also served as a member of the national Olympic Committee (Trinidad Guardian, August 23 1946). He was therefore involved in the administration of the sport nationally while his son was an active athlete.

Reflecting the British influence on sport development in the country, the AAA adhered to the games or amateur ethos as the normative framework for the conduct of athletic activity in the colony. This was first gleaned from the written comments of its first secretary just around three months after its formation in June 1945. In an article extolling the virtues of amateurism, in which he referred to England as “the home of much pride in amateur athletics”, its Secretary noted:

Amateur sport does not fall into the category of a trade or profession where it is necessary to consider as a means to an end the requirement of the much desired “bread and butter.” In principle and practice it forgets work and enters into regulated and organized play, and whoever desires to enter into the play must do so with the conscious thought of sacrificing “bread and butter” instead of trying to earn it. When this is put into correct practice, the virtue of amateurism then becomes pronounced through the individual as a high mark in character enriching his colony’s

that the centralization of football organization at the national level had occurred much earlier in 1908 with the formation of the Trinidad Football Association (McCree, 1995).
glory and worth and the amateur prestige is superbly upheld. (*Port of Spain Gazette*, September 23 1945)

Not surprisingly thus, in the first annual report of the AAA, amateurism was further endorsed when the secretary called on clubs to support the association “… in the practice of principles universally established for the conduct and regulation of amateur athletics and cycling” (*Trinidad Guardian*, March 26 1946). This however did not deter the AAA from either making or declaring profits from its annual championships (*Trinidad Guardian*, March 23 1948).\(^{23}\) The Trinidad AAA’s subscription to the amateur ethos can be evidenced further in the criteria for participation in its annual championships when it stated that: “The association’s championships are confined to amateurs born or resident for two years (Her Majesty’s Forces- one year) prior to the date of the competition in Trinidad and Tobago…” (*Trinidad Guardian*, May 9 1947). In 1946, the AAA formally applied for membership in the International Amateur Athletic Association (IAAF) (*Trinidad Guardian*, June 13 1946), which was provisionally granted in 1947 (*Trinidad Guardian*, May 14 1947) and eventually ratified in 1948, the year of the London Olympics.

The promotion of amateurism, however, was contested for it was not subscribed to by all. For instance, in January 1946, just under a year following the formation of the AAA, one well known sport organizer signalled his intention to introduce professional cycling in Trinidad influenced by the existence of same in Jamaica (*Trinidad Guardian*, January 13 1946). While the sport in question was cycling and not athletics, the subject of this study, one thinks that it still assumes relevance for showing the extent to which amateurism governed the operations of

---

\(^{23}\)In the only report found by this author with respect to this, it is revealed that the AAA made a “profit” of $151.32 in 1946 and $904.00 in 1947 (*Trinidad Guardian*, March 23 1948).
the AAA, which was the controlling body for both track and field and cycling at the time (see Footnote 22). In reacting however, the AAA, the local guardian of the amateur cult, sought immediately to thwart this development by directing its membership to its IAAF derived laws, which not only prohibited professional sports, but penalized those who infringed them through disqualification as an amateur and from national selection. In its published notice to this effect, entitled “Notice to Affiliated Clubs”, the AAA stated:

In connection with the proposal to institute professional athletics and cycling in the Colony, the attention of all affiliated clubs is called to No. 41 (1 &2) of the Laws of the Association. Forfeiture of the Amateur status of any athlete or cyclist also excludes the right to be considered for Colony representation at meetings held in the West Indies, South America and other centers whose Associations are governed by the Laws of the International Amateur Athletic Federation and the National Cyclists Union. (Trinidad Guardian, March 6 1946).

Commenting on the formation of the AAA and identifying the contents of this rule 41 alluded to in the above citation, one local writer noted that

... at rule 41, an Amateur is defined as one who has never competed for a money prize, or monetary considerations in any Athletic sport or been in any way interested in a stated bet or wager made in connection with any athletic competition in which he was an entrant or competitor, who has never engaged in, assisted in or taught any athletic exercise for pecuniary considerations, or in any way exploited his athletic ability for profit, and who has never taken part in any athletic competition with anyone who is not an amateur. (Trinidad Gazette, August 5 1945, p.6)

This warning issued by the AAA refers to “professional athletics” but the initiative was concerned solely with the introduction of professional cycling and not “professional athletics” per se. This misunderstanding may have happened because the sponsor of the initiative referred to the advantage “... for athletes to be paid as a whole..” and not just cyclists (Trinidad Guardian, January 13 1946). The promoter of the initiative was also a former national cyclist.
This official aversion to professional sports, however, was sternly criticized by a returning Trinidadian who had reportedly “... lived in England and [the] Continent for over 35 years,” and also served in the Royal Navy during both world wars (Port of Spain Gazette, November 21 1948). Describing Trinidad as “Victorian” in this respect, he remarked:

I do believe ... that if the general existing prejudice against professional status was overcome, it would be the first step towards the general improvement in sports in the Colony. In this I find Trinidad still Victorian, but I think it quite possible that with the introduction of professionalism in sports here greater interest would be taken by the athletes, sports promoters, sport fans and eventually, Government .. (Port of Spain Gazette, November 21 1948)

One cannot help noting en passant that the rearguard action of the local AAA was reminiscent of similar measures taken in the 19th and 20th centuries by elite adherents of the amateur ethos in Britain and North America against professional sports. Its action however, appeared to have worked for a considerable while in discouraging the introduction of professional cycling, for it was not until around five years later, in 1951, that the idea emerged again and through the initiative of the same individual (one Mr. A.N. Alexander). In this regard, for instance, we read the following report:

Five members of the Legislative Council have been invited to attend a meeting to be held on Monday August 27 for the purpose of forming a body to hold professional cycling in this colony. This was disclosed yesterday by Mr A.N. Alexander, Sports Supervisor.

---

25 The crack down on professional sports in Britain for instance, involved a range of strategies that included: (i) disqualification of amateur status for those who played with or against professional players; (ii) disqualification from national selection; (iii) debarring even qualified or trained persons who lectured on or were involved in sporting activity for money from amateur sport; (iv) rejection of “broken time” (compensation to athletes for wages lost through time off from work to compete) and (v) separatism as existed in cricket where professionals and amateurs had to eat and take the field of play separately (Hargreaves, 1986, Baker, 1995; Vamplew, 1988; Ingham, 1978; Pope, 1996). This amateur-professional divide is examined further in Chapter 7.
A letter from the Jamaican Cycling Board of Control with the rules governing professional cycling will be disclosed. Several local cyclists have stated that they would like to turn professionals in order that they may be able to take part in professional cycling in Jamaica and elsewhere. Ninety-five percent of the cyclists in Jamaica are professionals, Mr. Alexander revealed... *(Port of Spain Gazette, August 24 1951)*

In a further report on this development around four months later in December 1951, it is revealed that a Professional Cycling Club had been established in Trinidad, the President of which was also named. Reacting positively to this development, an official of the Jamaican Professional Cyclists Union reportedly said to their Trinidadian counterparts:

I am very glad that definite steps are being made to establish cycling on a professional basis as I am sure it will be a great help to the cyclists and will go a long way towards improving the standard in the colony. *(Port of Spain Gazette, December 30 1951)*

Unfortunately, no information was obtained on the eventual outcome of this initiative in Trinidad which could be considered as a radical one for the island at the time since it was not known to have had any precedent. For our purposes, however, it is significant at three levels: (i) it helps to show the extent to which the ideology of amateurism constituted the dominant normative framework for the conduct of athletic activity in the colony; (2) it helps to show the oppositional nature of some emergent cultural or sport forms, in this case professionalism, and that amateurism did not go unchallenged or uncontested and (3) it shows that there was some semblance of an amateur-professional divide among the social

*In Trinidad, we must recall, the AAA was the controlling body for track and field and cycling. It might be of some interest to note that this idea was resurfacing in 1951 following the split between the AAA and its cycling members who broke away from the AAA and formed their own cycling association in late 1950 *(Trinidad Guardian, October 4 1950)*. The AAA then would have had no jurisdiction over cycling when the idea remerged. However, whether there was any significant relationship between the two developments (the formation of an independent cycling body and the renewed attempt to introduce professional cycling) is not known.*
classes in Trinidad sport akin to what existed in 19th and early 20th century Britain and North America, contrary to what was previously suggested by this author (McCree 1995; 2000a, p. 215), although not to the same degree. In respect of the latter, for instance, in a previous study on attempts to develop professional football in Trinidad, it was stated that "the amateur-professional cleavage" had failed "to reproduce itself in this former colony" (ibid.). While this was true for football, in the case of athletics and cycling, however, this was not the case although the cleavage does not appear to have developed with the same intensity and results as obtained in Britain, which saw, in the case of rugby, the formation of the famous professional Rugby League in 1895 as an alternative to the traditional amateur Rugby Union and the eventual ascension of professional sports over amateurism. Here, amateurism was to remain more or less intact, for though challenged, it was never superseded, while professionalism remained a residual tendency.

Apart from the apparent constraint imposed by the advocates of amateurism, some of the major recurring complaints among local

---

27 Football in Trinidad has been historically associated with professional and commercial elements. With respect to the latter, it has been found that in late 1949 and the early 1950s, a local football pool, inspired by a similar practice in British football, operated in Trinidad, without any apparent opposition (Port of Spain Gazette, May 15 1949; Trinidad Guardian, July 29 1952, August 6 1952). The advent of professional football however, first occurred not through the establishment of leagues or clubs but through the award of professional contracts to a couple of local football players to play professional football in nearby Venezuela in the mid-1940s (Trinidad Guardian, November 24 1946; Port of Spain Gazette, January 24 1946). These footballers, however, were never banned or prevented from playing in the local amateur football leagues on their return or debarred from national selection. Professionalism then was easily accommodated alongside the dominant amateur football tradition. In addition, when the North American Soccer League (NASL) was established in 1967, Trinidadians players who were contracted were also not just allowed but were welcomed to play for the country and their former local amateur clubs. And, while the attempts to professionalize football locally between 1969-1983, through the establishment of clubs and leagues was met with opposition, as noted elsewhere, this "... had nothing to do with the middle class dominated ruling body protecting amateurism ... from a still nascent professionalism, but rather with protecting their power and authority over the game which was threatened" (McCree, 2000, p.214). Moreover, from 1995 up to today, there has existed a professional league of sorts in Trinidad, which has had the backing of the ruling body. The amateur-professional divide thus has never really existed in the sport of football in Trinidad.
administrators and athletes in the post-world war two period, as it was to be in the post-independence period, had to do with the absence or inadequacy of necessary infrastructure, coaching programmes and funding for athletes to participate in competition abroad (Trinidad Guardian, September 1 1948). For instance, in its 1946 report, the secretary of the AAA stated *inter alia*,

```
All considered the association would seem to have passed through a successful year. The march of time demands that the association should adapt itself to the construction and consolidation of certain regarded aims such as the acquirement of grounds for the training of our athletes and cyclists and the promotion of fixtures in general and the procuring of equipment if we are to develop and claim our place of pride as a pattern in the scheme of Colonial Development and Welfare. (Trinidad Guardian, May 14 1947)
```

In 1950, a national athletic coach, and former coaching advisor to Bailey in his youth, (Albert E. Browne), commented:

```
We must not lose sight of the fact that training facilities for athletes in Trinidad are very poor. Most of the world's running is done in cinder tracks, which are said to be about three to five yards faster than our turf and when we compare our timing against that of other runners, say in the United Kingdom, our athletes, sprinters especially, must be considered very good. (Trinidad Guardian, December 1 1950)
```

And, in a 1951 editorial, the Trinidad Guardian commented that “For a sports minded country such as we are many of the facilities are outstandingly bad.” (Trinidad Guardian, April 25 1951). In an attempt to address these concerns and further the development of sport, the Colonial Government had set up a Stadium Committee as early as 1947 to examine the costs and feasibility of constructing a national stadium (Stadium Committee Report, 1950). After several years however, and the drawing up of actual plans for the stadium, which was to be modelled after that of Wembley (Trinidad Guardian, August 27 1950), it was decided that it
would have been too costly to build and the idea was shelved in 1950 (Stadium Committee Report, 1950).  

As far as the financing of colony teams was concerned, this was normally done through a mixture of public subscriptions, fund raising drives by the AAA, and government assistance. It was the rule rather than the exception, however, that financing was normally achieved at the last minute and teams had to be cut (*Trinidad Guardian*, February 7 1948; June 21 1952; July 3 1952) or prevented all together from competing abroad (*Trinidad Guardian*, October 8 1949; *Trinidad Guardian*, December 14 1952) because of financial problems.

These developmental problems, however, did not appear to have impacted too negatively upon public or athlete interest in the sport of track and field since sport meetings continued to be held regularly throughout the country. For instance, based on reports in the Trinidad press, 36 track and field meetings were held between 1941 and 1944, while 41 were held between 1945 and 1947. In addition to these local meetings, some athletes also took part annually in regional sport meetings held in other Caribbean territories such as Grenada, Guyana, Curacao, Barbados and Jamaica.

When Bailey left for the UK in 1944 to join the RAF therefore, this was the general condition of track and field in Trinidad in relation to coaching, financing, infrastructure, competition and its amateur character. He left behind a vibrant athletic tradition which was still in its embryonic stage of emergence.

---

28 This national stadium was eventually built in 1982 with a capacity of 25,000 although it was preceded by a much smaller municipal stadium built in 1972, with a much smaller capacity of around 3,000.
3.3 Summary-Conclusion

It is generally believed that modern organized sport was first introduced into Trinidad and Tobago in the 19th century by the British who captured the island from the Spaniards in 1797. Concomitant with the diffusion of sports was the diffusion of a set of ideas surrounding its value to the British and its colonial possessions as it relates to issues of social control, identity formation and the pursuit of leisure. Some of these ideas were expressed in what has been variously called the “games ethos”, and the amateur cult which, though challenged locally and abroad, became the dominant legitimizing framework for the conduct of sporting activity within Britain and its Empire. This amateurism can be considered an expression of modernization in sport and invariably, a process of Westernization that resulted from colonialism. This westernization process however, was not a completely homogenous one since it contained two diametrically opposed approaches to sporting activity: amateurism and professionalism, although in the context of the times, it was the former which was ascendant. However, as shown below, the conflict generated by amateur-professional sport in Trinidad differed fundamentally from its expression in Britain.

While the amateurism upheld by the Trinidad AAA was generally dominant, it was still challenged through attempts to introduce professional cycling based on similar developments in Jamaica, although this apparently never materialized, linked in no small measure to opposition from the amateur oriented AAA. But, while the amateur-professional divide did exist, it did not develop to the same cut throat extent as obtained in Britain, and consequently, amateurism remained generally ascendant in the colony. However, while there was undoubtedly an amateur-professional divide in local athletics, one still suggests that amateurism, as it was articulated then, was not being used as a signifier of
class status or identity as was the case in Britain, which was consistent
with previous findings for soccer in Trinidad (McCree, 1995; 2000a). In
the case of Britain, it is well known that in the 19th and 20th century, the
notion of the amateur-gentleman was used to distinguish the elites,
particularly those of the middle class, from the commoners, as well as to
distinguish the colonizer from the colonized in the context of metropole-
colony relations (Hargreaves, 1986; Maguire, 1999), although over time
the double bind sets in and what was a basis of class difference becomes a
basis for class commonality within the general hierarchical structure of
social relations. In the case of Trinidad, it is suggested that amateurism
did not assume the same class distinction function for the social elites for
two major reasons. Firstly, as will be shown in Chapter 4, in the historical
period in question, class distinctions in Trinidad’s social structure were
already sufficiently demarcated by such ascriptive factors as colour and
ethnicity. For instance, the upper and middle classes were generally
associated with white persons or acceptable approximations to same, while
the working and poorer classes were generally associated with blacks and
Asians (Braithwaite, 1953/1975). Secondly, the professional and
proprietary classes through which amateurism was diffused were already
dominant, well placed and distinguished in the extant social hierarchy,
which did not warrant the construction of any sport ideology either to
distinguish them from the supposed “commoners” or gain acceptance by
the dominant elites as obtained in 19th and 20th century Britain since in the
context of Trinidad, they were the dominant elites. However, while it can
be argued that since these local elites were already dominant in the
society, they did not really need to gain social validation or acceptance
from anybody, it can also be argued in a Gramscian sense that the general
adherence to amateurism at the popular level may have contributed further
to this dominance and acceptance by facilitating or inducing the consent of
the governed through their general subscription to amateurism. And this
was particularly so in the case of the ruling organizational elites in track
and field who resisted the emergence of professional sport in Trinidad. In addition, if anything, given the double bind effect, what amateurism did was not so much to distinguish or differentiate the major contending classes and groups in Trinidad but to homogenize them, at least in sport, by creating a common value or idea (i.e., amateurism) with which they both generally identified. However, while amateurism may have symbolically united disparate social groups and classes by acting as a common sport identity, it was not sufficient to erode the class, racial and ethnic differences between them and the exclusionary tendencies that obtained within sport itself and the society at large (see Chapter 4).

The organization and development of the sport of track and field in early 20th century Trinidad and Tobago was carried out by a combination of community and institutional based clubs. The early 1940s witnessed a movement to greater centralization and bureaucratization in the sport with the formation of several regional and national bodies that included the national body (AAA), formed in 1945. In the post-world war two period, the elite and professional dominated AAA assumed national responsibility for the development of the sport, which was run along amateur lines. The most significant problems facing the association and athletes in this period and thereafter were financing, coaching and inadequate facilities. An attempt to alleviate some of these problems through the construction of a national stadium failed since the cost of the stadium proved prohibitive. In spite of these problems, interest in track and field did not seem to have waned since sport meetings continued to be held throughout the country. In 1944 thus, when McDonald Bailey left for Britain, he was leaving behind what appeared to be a well established tradition of athletic competition, albeit plagued by particular developmental problems of an ideological, financial and infrastructural nature.
CHAPTER 4

SOCIETY IN BRITAIN AND TRINIDAD, 1944-1954: A BRIEF OVERVIEW

4.1 Introduction

In order to help understand some of the (re)actions, decisions and attitudes on the part of British officials, the media, Bailey, the public and to probe better some of the theoretical objectives of the study, it is fundamental that we examine the social situation that prevailed in both Britain and Trinidad in the period under study (1944-1954). The chapter thus will be divided into two major related sections, one dealing with the social context in Britain and the other, Trinidad. One should state from the outset, however, that what follows is not and does not pretend to be a comprehensive account of the histories of these societies for the period in question. The principal objective is to establish sufficiently the social context and processes that prevailed in these societies at the particular historical moment, while recognizing the linkages with relevant precedents and antecedents, in order to facilitate the analysis and understanding of the issues being investigated. We begin with Britain.

4.2 Britain and Aftermath of War

In the context of the ravages of war and a declining Empire, the major task faced by British people and their leaders post-1945 was the reconstruction, restoration and renewal of their social life and international image. One writer suggested this much when he noted:

Through wars, depressions and reconstructions we watch the birth of a new society- a society in search of self-improvement, dominated on the one hand by the fight against poverty and on the other by its changed status in the world. (Bédarida, 1979, p. 167)
As it did elsewhere, the two world wars exacted a heavy and costly toll on British people and their conditions of existence. Writing of the inter-war years, 1918-1939, Constantine noted:

In the popular view, these years and especially the 1930s were a time of unbroken depression, deprivation and decay. It is an image coloured in dark tones, a palette made up of dole queues, hunger marches, slum houses, malnutrition and bitter class and industrial relations. (Constantine, 1983, p.1)

The depressed social conditions, however, that existed in the inter-war years, not only persisted after WWII, but worsened. They were characterized by continuing poverty, varying and high levels of unemployment, a depleted building and housing stock, deplorable housing conditions, poor nutrition and health services, shortages of food, clothing, and rationing (Bédarida, 1979; Marwick, 1982; Constantine, 1983; Fraser, 1984). This ushered in what has been called “the period of austerity”, which Marwick (1982, p. 75) described as “rock-hard and grey.” It was only from 1949, almost five years after the war had ended, that the rationing of basic necessities (clothing, milk, flour, eggs and soap) and the use of “coupons” began to be gradually abolished, a process that continued up to 1956 (Marwick, 1982, pp. 18, 74-75). In order to deal with these manifold social problems, the then Government passed a series of hitherto unprecedented legislation linked to its related goals of social betterment, income redistribution and social equality. The busy social agenda saw the passage of a series of legislation: 1946-National Insurance Act, National Health Service Act, New Towns Act; 1948-National Assistance Act, Children’s Act; 1949- National Parks and the National Conservancy Act aimed particularly at urban renewal (Marwick, 1982, pp. 24, 54-65; Bédarida, 1979, pp. 191-195). A major consequence of this legislation was the creation of a more elaborate system of social security, the rise of the Welfare State and more generally, the dirigiste state (Marwick, 1982; Fraser, 1984). This was expressed further in a spate of nationalizations
in industry (e.g., coal, iron) and certain services (e.g., health, transportation) towards the end of the 1940s (ibid.). It was in this overall context of reconstruction that British leaders welcomed in 1947, the financial hand of assistance from the United States, known as the Marshall plan.

The process of decline was also evident in the field of sport as defeats were experienced in several disciplines that included boxing, golf, and tennis but even more so, in its two premier sports, cricket and football (Port of Spain Gazette, August 8 1950). What made these latter losses even more painful was that they were at the hands of colonies and former colonies. In the case of cricket for instance, England experienced successive Test series losses to the West Indies. The first took place in the West Indies (0-2), on the 1947-1948 tour, which represented the first post-war encounter between the two teams and then, in England, on the 1950 tour, which they lost 1-3 (Richards and Wong, 1990). The latter triumph assumed historical proportion for it had meant the first series win by the West Indies in England since their entry into Test cricket in 1928. Yet, what proved even more excruciating to many English hearts was the 0-1 loss to the USA in the 1950 World Cup of football in Brazil, (Port of Spain Gazette, July 1 1950) which had closely followed defeat in the second Test against the West Indies at Lords. The Daily Mail reportedly summed it up as “a black out for English sport” as Britons went into “mourning” (ibid.). Subsequent defeat to Spain (0-2) led to their early departure from the 1950 World Cup (Port of Spain Gazette, August 8 1950). In addition, the 3-6 defeat to Hungary was another excruciating blow. Indeed, all this may have just served to add insult to the injuries of war. The losses even moved one Government MP to call for the establishment of a Ministry of Sport which was rejected by the then Government (Port of Spain Gazette, August 8 1950).
In addition, in spite of the losses experienced in certain critical sports, attendance at sport and leisure activities witnessed a return of the crowds who understandably would have welcomed the return to recreation after the devastation of war. For instance, in football, the aggregate crowd for the third round of the football Cup in 1946 was estimated at 1,254,400 (Daily Express, January 11 1946), while “some 100,000” spectators attended the 1948 FA Cup Final (The Times, April 26 1948). In athletics, an estimated 60,000 and 72,000 reportedly attended the Glasgow Rangers Sports in 1946 and 1947, respectively (The Times, August 5 1946; The Times, August 4 1947). Additionally, an estimated 50,000 attended the 1946 France-Great Britain athletic contest at White City (The Times, August 6 1946; Daily Express, August 1946) while for the 1948 Olympics held in London, there were 1,247,283 paying spectators (Daily Express, February 16 1948). This is why Marwick can state that “As the war ended, there was a great and immediate resurgence of the leisure activities characteristic of the inter-war years” (ibid., p. 75).

One of the more lasting effects of war, however, was Britain’s loss of its “status as a world power”, due to the gradual erosion of her colonial Empire and the rise of the two new superpowers, the USA and the USSR (Bédarida, 1979, p. 189). Marwick, suggests, however, that it may have taken some time before this had sunk in among the British people:

How far, and at what point, a majority of the British people had digested the fact that Britain was no longer a major world power is difficult to determine: probably not till the 1960s, though, objectively, Suez is the watershed.29 In the imagery of newsreel, press, radio, and television, Britain continued to be presented, along with France, as a ‘big’ country; the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, and Denmark, though already beginning to

---

29The Suez watershed refers to Britain’s failed involvement in the attempt to remove the Egyptian President, Colonel Nasser, together with the Americans and the Israelis, in what became known as the Suez Crisis of 1956 (Marwick, 1982, p. 105).
demonstrate considerable economic power, were 'small' countries. Undoubtedly a pervasive sentiment was 'we won the war.' (Marwick, 1982, p. 106)

The post-war media image of Britain to which Marwick refers can be seen as an expression of the deployment of discursive practices upon which rested the "fantasy image" of their past greatness given its "reality-incongruent" character (see Chapter 1). But, whether knowingly or unknowingly, surely, Britain had become a relatively spent force after the wars, which had ushered in its gradual economic and political decline as an imperial power on the world stage. However, this notwithstanding, we must also remember at the same time that much of the infrastructure of its colonial empire was still intact during the period of Bailey, 1944-1954, and it is this which may have helped contribute to the belief that Britain was still "a big country." Surely, the mighty had fallen but it would take another 20 years or so before the sun finally set on the hey day of the British Empire after many of its former colonial possessions became independent, a process which formally began with the independence of India in 1947. It was the migrants from this Empire who were to pose another challenge to the process of reconstruction, restoration and renewal in the "period of austerity" and thereafter.

4.3 Coloured Migration into Britain

Historically, Britain has been a migration destination. During the period of the wars and thereafter, this included not only its colonial 'subjects', but also Europeans who included refugees and those who came under the schemes for European Voluntary Workers (Senior and Manley, 1956, pp. 2-3). However, given the focus of this study, this brief overview of immigration into the UK and its consequences, will deal
particularly with black West Indian migration, while mindful of its historical antecedents and the generalities surrounding coloured migration as a whole.

The entry and treatment of coloured immigrants from the colonial territories of Asia, Africa and the West Indies was one of the many challenges faced by British people and their leaders in the period after the war, which added to the complexities of their situation. The term “coloured” is a concept that has been used historically and universally to refer to all non-white peoples in both white and non-white dominated societies. As it was used then (and now), the term coloured included a rather mixed bag of various nationalities, ethnicities and races such as Chinese, Indians, Pakistanis, Africans and West Indians, who were subdivided further into their own peculiar groupings based on language, group loyalty and nationality. Depending on the context thus, the use of the term “coloured” was as convenient as it was misleading to classify a very differentiated grouping of peoples. In Britain, Banton notes that in spite of this internal differentiation, such immigrants “...were lumped together as one class of people—‘coloured’” and tended to be perceived as the same (Banton 1967: 368,369).

In attempting to date the origins of blacks in Britain, Little (1948/1972, p. 213) noted in the late 1940s that “Negroes appear to have formed a part, albeit a small one, of the population of Great Britain for rather more than three hundred years” while Banton (1960, p. 55), writing in the late 1950s, noted: “Coloured people have been resident in Great Britain for over four hundred years.” While there is some uncertainty as to

---

30 It should be noted that Britain also experienced emigration. In this regard, annual net out-migration was estimated to be “at least 60,000 persons” from the mid 1940s to the mid 1950s (Senior and Manley, 1956, p. 11).

31 In the West Indies, however, the term “coloured” was used historically to refer to the offspring of whites and blacks, who were also known as “mulattoes” and “browns.”
when blacks first entered Britain, there is some agreement that this generally took place in the 16th century when they were imported as slaves "... to serve as domestics in fashionable households" (Banton 1960, p. 55; Little, 1948/1972, p. 188), a development which coincided with the commencement of British exploration of the African coast. In the ensuing years and centuries others came as visitors, seamen, and students, the children of either African tribal chiefs or wealthy British planters (Little, 1948/1972, pp. 209-213). Apart from the generally transitory class of students, however, the minority of blacks who were to be found in England were engaged mainly in menial, low status occupations that included those of coachmen, footmen, Army bandsmen, cleaners and tailors (ibid., p. 213). As a result, the dominant perception and status of blacks was that of "servant and slave" although "there appears to have been no particular aversion to meeting or mixing with a person simply on the ground of his colour" (ibid., p. 225).

World War I (1914-1918) and World War II (1939-1945) led to another wave of black migrants into Britain to work as labourers in munition factories, seamen and soldiers in the war effort (Little, 1948/1972, p. 216). The end of WWII also led to an intensification of West Indian migration to Britain in order to help deal with the labour shortages in such areas as construction, transport, and health. This migratory process was also shaped by the conditions of unemployment,

The terms "black" and "coloured" in the West Indies therefore, do not have the same meaning.
32 In 1770, the population of blacks in London was estimated between 14,000 and 20,000. While there were also blacks outside of London in seaport towns and country estates, the vast majority was concentrated in London (Little, 1948/1972, pp. 192-193; Griffith et al., 1960, pp. 14-16), much like today.
33 The early educational links between the West Indies and West Africa were institutionalised with the affiliation of Codrington College of Barbados and the Fourah Bay college of Sierra Leone in 1875 and 1876, respectively with the University of Durham. The subjects studied included mainly theology at first, medicine, and law (Little, 1948/1972, p. 214).
underemployment, low wages, poverty and the lack of opportunities in the West Indies itself (Peach, 1968; Byron, 1994). The arrival of the SS Empire Windrush in June 1948, with 492 workers, is viewed as marking the official start of British Government sanctioned West Indian migration into Britain after the war to deal with the shortage of labour. As the arrangement continued, the number of West Indian migrant workers moved officially from 492 in 1948 to 26,400 by 1956 (Banton, 1959, p. 157; Griffith et al., 1960). This migration had several peculiar characteristics in terms of race, gender, class and nationality: it comprised largely black working class males, the majority of whom came from Jamaica, the largest British colonial possession in the West Indies (Senior and Manley, 1956; Banton, 1960).

This influx of a more permanent group of immigrants was to have significant implications for the future development of Britain as a whole and the development of race relations in particular. In the first half of the 20th century, however, race relations and what became known as the “colour bar”, which was the popular term used then to describe problems of racial prejudice and discrimination, was not perceived as a significant problem in the UK. Little notes that the general attitude was one of “apathy” and even among the Government of the day “... where the tendency was to brush the whole troublesome business under the carpet” (Little, 1948/1972, p. vii). Bloom noted further, that “In the 1940s interest in race relations was spasmodic in England” (cited in Little, 1948/1972, p. 2). The publication of Kenneth Little’s *Negroes in Britain* in 1948, for instance, was the first major scholarly publication on the subject up to that time, apart from its treatment in the popular press (ibid., pp. 3-4). It took sometime therefore before the “race question” became a national concern and even for race relations itself to become a legitimate area of study.

---

34 The lone female migrant on the 1948 Empire Windrush turned out to be a stowaway (Banton, 1960).
But, surely, as the population of coloureds gradually increased in the post-war period, together with the incidence of discrimination, political and academic interest in the problem also gradually increased (Little, 1948/1972; Senior and Manley, 1956; Banton, 1959; Griffith, et al 1960).\textsuperscript{35}

### 4.4 Prejudice and Discrimination

From the available literature for the period, it has been shown that coloureds encountered prejudice and discrimination in all spheres of life: on the streets, in education, employment, housing, transportation, restaurants, leisure, sport and in intimate relations with whites, particularly marriage (Little, 1948/1972, see pp. 269-292 in particular; Senior and Manley, 1956; Banton, 1960; Braithwaite, 2001). In addition, coloureds were variously perceived as or called, among other things, ‘strangers’, ‘foreigners’, ‘outsiders’ and even ‘alien’ (Little, 1948/1972; Senior and Manley, 1956; Banton, 1960; Braithwaite, 2001). One “English observer”, confirming the existence of the colour bar, noted:

> The African or West Indian student has an even worse time (than the Indian student), for he is darker skinned than many Indians and suffers more, probably, from the colour bar. English people in buses or trains will get up and move to other seats if a coloured person sits next to them; very often a coloured man searching for lodgings will find the door slammed in his face. There are hotels, dance halls, and restaurants who will refuse him admittance. (Trevelyan, 1942; cited in Little, 1948/1972, p. 278)

However, while ‘colour bar’ existed, everyone did not subscribe to it, which can be illustrated in the sports of boxing and cricket. In boxing

---

\textsuperscript{35}The establishment of the Institute of Race Relations in 1958 can be seen as an expression of the increased governmental interest in the subject. This political and academic interest were to blossom further in the 1960s and 1970s in response to problems of racial inequality (Griffith et al, 1960; Patterson, 1963; Solomos, 1993; Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, 1982)
for instance, "coloured Empire boxers" at one time were officially debarred from contesting British or home titles and invariably, representing Britain although they were allowed to fight for British Empire titles (*Daily Express*, March 27 1947; May 20 1947) where the colour bar still manifested itself. In 1947, for instance, the British Empire featherweight title erupted in controversy when the white British boxer, Al Phillips, was declared the winner over coloured opponent Cliff Anderson, who was felt to have won by members of the crowd and the press covering the event (*Daily Express*, March 19, 27 1947). In this regard, the headline of the *Daily Express* screamed: "Crowd Boo Al Phillips fight verdict: DOWN THREE TIMES." In support of Anderson, the enraged crowd reportedly "threw buns and crumpled programmes at the officials who entered the ring" and "... roared their appreciation of his great fight ... until the second round of [sic] main supporting bout was well under way" (*Daily Express*, March 19 1947). The decision brought the issue of the colour bar in boxing back into public focus, and was taken up by two Members of Parliament at the time and even the then Colonial Secretary, Mr. Creech Jones, who called for its abolition (*Daily Express*, March 27, May 20 1947). The controversy was also reported in the local Trinidad press (*Port of Spain Gazette*, March 27, March 30, April 6 1947). The practice of the colour bar in boxing also reared its head in the build up to the 1950 Empire Games in New Zealand, when the *London Evening News* reported that a black boxer, who incidentally turned out to be a Trinidadian, Percy Lewis, was selected as a reserve in preference for his white opponent whom he had beaten in the trials for the said games (cited in *Port of Spain Gazette*, December 18 1949). In addition, in cricket, black players stood little chance of playing in county cricket, which was not generally the case in League cricket. In the latter respect, in the inter-war years, the Lancashire league became a sort of haven for black West Indian cricketers, who were said "to receive the adulation of the local white population" because of their impact on the community's fortunes in
cricket and its pride, prestige and identity ((Hill, 1994, pp. 57-59). One of these players, Learie Constantine, who played for Nelson from 1929 to 1938 became one of the leading stars for the community (ibid., pp. 55-57), and was said to be “... respected as a man who somehow carried the reputation of the local community on his shoulders...” (ibid., p. 56). However, we are also told that the arrival of Constantine “…was not warmly greeted by the county players.” In this regard for instance, a former Lancashire professional had commented:

In those days, the thought of a coloured chap playing for Lancashire was ludicrous. We Lancastrians were clannish in those enlightened days … We wanted none of Constantine … We would refuse to play … In all fairness I must say that we had nothing against Learie Constantine personally. He was, in fact, very popular with us. There was no personal vendetta. But the thought of a black man taking the place of a white man in our side was anathema. It was as simple as that. (Hopwood, 1975; Bearshaw, 1990, p. 271; cited in Hill 1994, p. 58)

In addition, Constantine “admitted that he had been the victim of some ‘shots’ (snubs) because of his colour” in Nelson but this paled when compared to his ejection from the Imperial Hotel in London in 1943 “in an attempt to appease the sensibilities of white American guests”36 (Holmes, 1988, pp. 202-203, cited in Hill, 1994, p. 57; Little, 1948/1972, p. 246; Scobie, 1972, pp. 188-189). However, the deeper significance of these experiences of blacks in boxing and cricket (and as will be shown with Bailey in athletics), is that sport was not all about colour bar. Rather, it admitted a range of attitudes that included rejection, opposition, acceptance and support, consistent with the attitudes in the wider society. Indeed, one notes for instance that while some whites may have had problems with Constantine, it was the white managers of the cricket club

36 Similarly, in Trinidad, in 1945, the hiring of coloured pilots on British West Indian Airways (BWIA) was termed a “difficulty” because white American passengers could have objected. This matter was raised in the British House of Commons by then Independent, Mr. Thomas Driberg (Port of Spain Gazette, December 9 1945).
Nelson who had contracted him in the first place for what was then more than a very tidy sum\textsuperscript{37} and, it was the white community of Nelson that 'adulated' him.

Nevertheless, as a result of the colour bar experience, many became disillusioned since it went contrary to the fair and equal treatment they were made to expect, as British subjects, from the British government and religious sources (Little, 1948/1972, pp. 245-247; 278-279) and the love and loyalty they were taught to display towards the British crown. The idealistic expectations of the West Indian are captured by Banton, when, in distinguishing the former from Pakistanis and Indians, he wrote:

The West Indians, on the other hand, have less definite ideas of returning. Partly this is because they do not see such a sharp difference between the land of their birth and the land of their citizenship; Britain is the 'mother country' and in innumerable little ways they have identified themselves with her from their early schooldays. They are British subjects. They are Christians. They wish to be British socially as well as in legal status and they have never imagined that anyone might combat what they have grown up to regard as a praiseworthy intention. They expect to be received as fellow-subjects of the Queen and to enjoy social equality with other British subjects. (Banton, 1960, pp. 123-124)

This disillusionment is captured in the following poem attributed to a West Indian:

We, who are taught to love thee, hold thee dear,  
Think of thy welfare as our own,  
Die for thee, honour thee, and love thee well,  
The British name, the King upon the throne,  
With eager hearts we came to our Fatherland  
To know; with loyalty, and love and honour grown  
Out of distance. With hope from youth held dear

\textsuperscript{37}Constantine reportedly received “upwards of £1000.00 a season ... as his basic wage”, a considerable sum then for anyone and £500 from his benefit in 1936 (Hill, 1994, p. 55).
To find too soon these hopes for ever flown .... (Kanaka, “The Colour Bar in Britain”, in the Spectator, 1934, cited in Little, 1948/1972, p. 282)

The colour bar experiences flew against the professed meritocratic and egalitarian ideals among English people in general, and the more professed enlightened attitudes that they were supposed to have towards coloureds, which Little (1948/1972, pp. 244-245) captured as follows:

In the abstract sense, however, English people on the whole are favourably disposed and sympathetic towards the coloured man. They believe as keenly in the idea of his being given “a square deal” as in that of democracy. They deplore the suggestion that he should be exploited, and are hardly less anxious (in no less abstract and general terms) that he should go forward on terms of equality with the white man.

However, as with almost all social situations, there are always tendencies and processes that run counter to prevailing practices and predispositions whether dominant or subordinate and negative or positive. Such countervailing tendencies were evident in the anti-slavery movement in the 18th and 19th centuries and, similarly, in the 20th century, it was also evident among many across the social class and occupational spectrum who displayed tolerance towards and acceptance of coloureds in work, business and general social interaction (Banton, 1960, pp. 245-247; 261-267). The chances of a more favourable reaction from whites are said to have increased with education, language, and the possession of some talent be it artistic or athletic, “physical looks” or being good humoured. “With some it is the musical and artistic talent of various Negro artists such as Paul Robeson; or the music of Negro spirituals. Some admire the cricketing abilities of West Indian teams and of Indian players.” (ibid., 265). However, writing of the ambivalence and inconsistency of some people towards coloureds, Senior and Manley (1956, p.9) noted that “…migrants maybe idolized as sportsmen and entertainers, but rejected as
lodgers, spouses and even fellow workers.” British people therefore harboured a range of contrasting attitudes and predispositions towards blacks and coloureds as a whole. Capturing this, Little wrote in 1948 that “modern attitudes in this country towards the coloured man ... involve[d] paternalism as well as repugnance, and friendliness and sympathy as well as condescension...” (Little, 1948/1972, p. 232).

This focus on racial prejudice and discrimination, however, in the context of coloured migration into Britain, does not ignore the fact that British society was also very much fragmented along class lines, a factor which may also have influenced race relations. In this regard, in attempting to explain those relations, Little advanced the view that British attitudes to blacks were shaped as much by class considerations as race, which he linked in part to the consequences of industrialization (Little, 1948/1972, pp. 238-239). Industrialization, he noted, helped produce an “acute and almost unique sense of class-consciousness...” in English society, which affected the middle classes more than the upper classes, and which affected relations between whites as well as between whites and blacks. The irony however, is that in this process, a decisive criterion of class status among the status anxious middle classes was not so much material (wealth and income) but education credentials, together with social manners, dress, language and self-confidence (ibid., pp. x-xi). These latter criteria blacks were not generally deemed to satisfy and, as a result, this helped to influence their rejection and reinforce their already low social status (ibid., pp. 239-240). Writing in the 1972 preface to his original 1948 text, Negroes in Britain, Little stated that “… although there is no doubt at all that coloured people in this country do indeed experience prejudice and discrimination, part of the reason is their failure, conscious or unconscious, to measure up to English ‘class standards’ ” (ibid., p. xi). To Little therefore, the problem of the colour bar was bound up with the nature of the “English hierarchical socio-economic system ...” (ibid., p.
43) of which it was a mere expression, and which affected both blacks and whites in similar as well as differing ways (Bloom, cited in Little, 1948/1972, p. 45). However, Little also noted that aversion to coloureds among the middle class was particularly pronounced no matter how educated, wealthy or religious they were (ibid., p. 301). The problem of the colour bar therefore existed across all social strata in England, albeit in varying forms and degrees. Yet, having a more liberal attitude towards coloureds was cited as "the criterion of higher-class membership in some sub-divisions of the social system..." (ibid., p. 264). The factors of race, ethnicity and class were also operative in shaping the workings of social relations in Trinidad.

4.5 Society in Trinidad

This brief examination of society in mid-20th century Trinidad will focus on two major related issues: (1) the nature of the figuration of social relations in the extant colony and (2) the nature of nationalist tendencies within the broader figuration or context of metropole-colony relations.

Like many other societies within the British Empire and without, the immigration of various groups of peoples has played a determinate role in the early formation and development of Trinidad society. This early immigration, be it of a largely forced (e.g., slave trade) or voluntary nature (e.g., Indian indentureship) was linked primarily to the labour needs of agricultural production which dominated the economy in the 18th and 19th centuries. As a result, historically, Trinidad has always been a culturally diverse society comprising people of varying ethnicities, races, language and nationalities from Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas. Census data in the period under study (i.e., 1944-1954) showed that of the total population of 558, 330 in 1946, the major groups numerically were African (46.9%) and Indians (35.1), while the smaller groups included the
‘Mixed’ (14.1%), followed by Whites (2.1%) and Chinese (1.0%) (Harewood, 1975, p. 97). However, given the nature of European colonization, and the experience with slavery and indentureship, it was the European element, albeit a small minority, which was to assume a dominant position in the society linked to their historical control of economic resources and the apparatus of Government. As a result, the society became heavily stratified along the lines of race and colour, at the apex of which were the whites followed by those variously called coloureds, mulattoes and browns, with blacks at the bottom. These race and colour groupings also coincided with the three basic class divisions: upper (largely white), middle (largely coloured) and lower/working class (largely black). Describing Trinidad society in 1953, Trinidadian sociologist, Lloyd Braithwaite (1953/1975, p. 41) observed that

[it] was ... stratified very largely on racial lines; and one in which the biological division of skin colour played an important part in the differentiation of social class... In the upper group, ... there was the white ... The barriers to rising were almost completely prohibitive and in many respects that situation still obtains. The middle-class consisted predominantly of coloured people, that is of light-skinned and brown-skinned people, while the lower class consisted predominantly of black.

Apart from blacks, the other groups that were at the bottom of the social ladder were the Chinese, Syrians, Lebanese, and Indians (ibid., pp. 44-47). In such a situation, the factors of race, ethnicity and colour, what Braithwaite called the ascriptive-particularistic “scale of values”, governed relations between all groups in all spheres of the society, notably in patterns of mobility, marriage, employment, leisure and sport (ibid., pp. 41-42; 48-55; 60-68). In sport, the workings of ascriptive factors were expressed in the composition of teams and the processes of selection and appointment of captains at both club and national levels (Braithwaite, 38Historically, the term “coloured” and “black” did not have the same connotation in West Indian society. See footnote 31.
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1953/1975; James, 1963). At the club level, for instance, in many sports, teams were either white, coloured, black, Chinese, or Portuguese. These ascriptive factors were also to figure in several political and economic developments in the island before and after WWII.

Post-war Trinidad witnessed the continuation and intensification of economic and political processes that had been set in train during the inter-war years and even before. Chief among these were demands for self government, independence, universal adult suffrage, and greater industrial democracy through the legal recognition of trade unions and the process of collective bargaining. The decisive factor that served as the motor force of these demands was the 1937 labour rebellions that shook not just Trinidad but the entire West Indies (Lewis, 1938; Thomas, 1987).

Following the recommendations of the Royal Commission of Enquiry set up in 1938 under the chairmanship of Lord Moyne, there were several major political, economic and policy changes on the part of the British Government towards its colonies in the West Indies. These included notably: (a) the establishment of a Colonial Development and Welfare Fund in the Colonial Office in 1940; (b) the granting of adult suffrage to Jamaica in 1944 followed by Trinidad in 1946 and (c) the legal recognition of trade unions (Ryan, 1972; Beckford and Witter, 1980; Thomas, 1987). Several of the more lasting effects were the development of a more organized working class movement and consciousness, together with the development of a sense of island nationalism and West Indian regionalism. In pre and early post-war Trinidad, however, fragmentation in the body politic due to differences of personality, education, class origins, ethnicity, leadership style, and political ideology stymied the

\[39\text{In Trinidad, the disturbances, which were concentrated in the southern oilfields, resulted in 14 deaths, injury to many and property damage (Ryan, 1972, p. 47). As a result, the British government had to call on its military troops to help curb the upheaval (ibid., pp. 64-65; Singh, 1987, pp. 66-67).}\]
development of a sufficiently cohesive, organized and strong nationalist movement built around mass national support to pose any serious threat to British rule in the immediate aftermath of war. The very demand for self-government or ‘home rule’ for instance, was not supported by all (Trinidad Guardian, March 23 1952). In this regard, one writer in the press even questioned the ‘capacity’ of Trinidadians to govern themselves:

I dislike to think what would happen to this Colony if it were governed solely by local people. We prate of subjection by outsiders and make much ado with words concerning this or that aspect of affliction by Colonial rule; but while I admit that the infirmities of colonialism are patent to reflective and patriotic minds, it is in my belief that Trinidadians will only know what subjection is when they are ruled totally by their own people.

Born and bred in this island and having consciously addressed myself to the study of local men and things, I have grown disillusioned as to the capacity and character of most of our leaders to discharge the exacting duties of governing the people for the people... (Trinidad Guardian, March 23 1952)

In addition, a majority view among the spokespersons for the Indian population opposed the granting of adult suffrage and self-government, because of fear that it will only lead to Negro domination of the society, although a minority view supported the process of democratization and empowerment (Ryan, 1972, pp. 30-32; 38-40; Williams, 1962, 218-220).

Apart from these cleavages, it is important to note that in spite of what appeared to be fierce opposition to British rule and calls for more local control and participation in politics, there were still expressions of identification with and strong loyalty towards the British Crown and Empire among some of the very leaders who agitated for political reform and the citizenry at large. For instance, in his Manifesto for the first

---

40This fund apparently “placed at the disposal of the Colonial secretary 20 million dollars a year for development and two million for research for a period of ten years” (Port of Spain Gazette, April 27 1945).
elections held under universal suffrage in 1946, the principal leader of the June 1937 labour revolts in Trinidad, Uriah Butler, a black, stated:

May the next Anniversary of our historic June Revolution (from which date we date the New and ever-growing interest now taken in our General condition by the Government and the people of Great Britain) find our country still under the Union Jack [Emphasis added] but recognized and treated by Imperial Britain as the equal of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa (whom we fought to bring under the Union Jack) and all the other self-governing portions of the British Empire (cited in Williams, 1962, p. 237)

Unmistakably, therefore, one of the significant effects of British imperialism appears to have been the creation of a multi-layered identity in some of its colonies, one which identified with the local island society, together with the West Indies as a whole and another which identified with the British Monarchy and Empire. Such a multiple identity can be gleaned further in several major developments across the 1940s and 1950s, which included: the various Win the War funds; the failed attempt to celebrate 150 years of British rule in 1947; the deaths of King George VI in 1952 and Queen Mary in 1953 and the Coronation in 1953.

As part of the British Empire, British colonies were actively involved in both World War I and II. This involvement, however, was not limited to the provision of personnel to help in the fighting, but also involved the actual provision of money to help finance the war. In this regard, in Trinidad, there existed several War Funds: The Red Cross Fund, The Bomber Fund, the Win the War Fund, the Wind the War Association Welfare Fund and the Red Cross Invasion Fund (Trinidad Guardian, April 22 1941; March 22 1942; Port of Spain Gazette, September 1 1945). In addition, many sport clubs and organizations at the community and national level, in both urban and rural areas, donated the proceeds from their sporting events to the war effort (Trinidad Guardian, February 18
For instance, between 1940 and mid-1944, the local Win the War Association was able to raise and donate some $528,631.85 to the war effort (*Trinidad Guardian*, August 19 1944). And, for the British West Indies as a whole, Scobie (1972, p. 190) notes that “by the middle of 1944, the British West Indies had also contributed over £750,000 to the United Kingdom for general war purposes, nearly £400,000 for war charities and more than £425,000 for the purchase of aircraft for the Royal Air Force. Their governments and peoples had lent the United Kingdom over £1,400,000 free of interest”.

Just under a year following the end of war, in 1946, the issue arose as to whether Trinidad should officially celebrate the 150th anniversary of its capture by the British in 1797, which was set for February 18 1947 (*Trinidad Guardian*, October 18 1946). Opinion was divided on the matter, however, for while elements among the media, the City Council and the wider public favoured the celebration, neither the Colonial Government nor the Colonial Office, rather ironically, were in favour. The position of the latter two entities reportedly rested on the fact that although Trinidad was in fact captured in 1797 by the British, it was not until 1802 that this was ratified by the Treaty of Amiens (*Trinidad Guardian*, September 24 1946; November 5 1946). The author found no evidence to suggest, however, that this matter was eventually resolved in favour of the celebrationists, and it would seem that official celebration of this anniversary never took place.

Three more contrasting developments that include the deaths of both King George VI in February 1952 and Queen Mary in 1953, together with the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, also in 1953, help to highlight even more the extent of identification with Britain at the time. In respect of the first, local press reports revealed significant public expression of
sympathy on the King’s passing as life in the colony came to a veritable halt through the closure of schools, businesses and government offices. Writing in relation to the capital city, the *Trinidad Guardian* noted that “The usually busy streets of downtown Port of Spain were deserted.” (*Trinidad Guardian*, February 7 1952). Its Editorial was also headlined, “The King’s Death is a Tragic Blow” (February 7 1952). In the other major local daily, the *Port of Spain Gazette*, headlines read: “Trinidad Shocked by Sad News: Regret on All Sides” (February 7 1952), “Heroic Monarch Passes” (February 7 1952) and “Colony Pledges Loyal Devotion” (February 9 1952). One letter writer to the Editor of the *Trinidad Guardian*, however, suggested that not all were as moved over the passing of the King, and not Trinidadians, but persons described as ‘English’ of whom the letter writer was highly critical:

> It is passing strange that one Government department whose supervisory personnel is English failed to join with other Government organizations and even private firms in mourning the death of our late Monarch, King George VI. Despite the fact that Englishmen are supposedly more loyal in [sic] the Sovereign of England than West Indians this department allowed little employees not even as little as two hours off. Is it because English personnel now in Trinidad thinks that the feeling of loyalty has vanished? (*Trinidad Guardian*, February 17 1952).

Indeed, assuming that the writer was Trinidian, the sentiments of the writer who signed the letter, “Bewildered,” suggests that some Trinidadians were more English than the English themselves. The death of Queen Mary in March 1953 was also marked by expressions of official and public sympathy. Even proceedings in the colony’s courts were interrupted as there were moments of silence and temporary adjournments (*Trinidad Guardian*, March 26 1953).

The local reaction to the Coronation in June 1953, which followed not too long after the death of Queen Mary, was marked by an even
greater outpouring of emotion. To recognize and commemorate this historic occasion, a series of special events were held throughout the island. These included: the granting of Coronation scholarships to worthy school children, the presentation of 390 Coronation medals to outstanding locals, together with the staging of massive youth rallies, a military parade and firework displays which culminated in a mini-Carnival throughout the island (Trinidad Guardian, April 9 1953, May 1, 20, 24, 28-30 1953; June 2,3,6,10 1953). In addition to these local activities, a delegation of individuals from across the West Indies personally attended the Coronation in England (Trinidad Guardian, May 20 1953). There was also a literary outpouring of emotion in homage to the Queen. For instance, in one newspaper, the author counted no less than 15 poems dedicated to the Queen (Trinidad Guardian, March 31, May 17, May 30, June 4 1953). One of the poems entitled, “On Every Mind”, read:

Her Majesty Elizabeth most dear  
Will soon be crowned in England’s air  
But we of this small happy country town  
Will join in gala and sincere renown  
Gov’tment buildings, and private ones too  
Are now toned up with red, white and blue  
Arima’s Town Hall is being primed  
For the one occasion on every mind (Trinidad Guardian, May 30 1953)

The depth of loyalty to and identification with Britain and the monarchy in Trinidad can be captured further in the following editorial which appeared in the Trinidad Guardian of May 30 1953, just before the commencement of Coronation celebrations:

... In this Colony whose loyalty and devotion to the British Crown are no less profound than are those of the Commonwealth and Empire, everything is being done to ensure that the Coronation celebrations are of a form and to an extent of which the entire British family can be proud. And what is so significant about [it]
all is that what we have around us today is no mere empty gesture undertaken in blind conformity with official directives.

... However critical our people sometimes become at the application to the Colony of British colonial policy or the interpretation of that policy by those who share responsibility for its interpretation, they treasure their British heritage. And on such royal occasions as Coronation of a Sovereign, existence of such a feeling is put beyond question.

... Nor can there be any suggestion that they are confined to any one class or section of the country. Few if anybody in Trinidad today do not share or are untouched by those sentiments. Truly will Coronation be a time of national rejoicing. But it ought not to stop there. It should also be a time of national dedication—dedication to the upholding and safeguarding of those things which as members of the British family we have all come to know, respect and cherish.

Notwithstanding the opposition to colonialism therefore, in some quarters and the development of nationalist feelings, many Trinidadians still showed a strong “feeling of loyalty” to Britain, its Monarchy and “their British heritage.” While this can be seen as contradictory, it can also be seen as an expression of their multiple identities which contained the identification with “their British heritage,” Trinidad, the West Indies and their particular social grouping (class as well as ethnic). The activation of one identity over the other, as happened in the case of the royal deaths and Coronation, seems to have been shaped by the context or the nature of the prevailing social processes together with the particular admixture of expectations and interests in which or through which they unravelled.

4.6 Summary—Conclusion

The first half of the 20th century marked another decisive period and turning point in the development of the people of Britain and the world. The cumulative effect of two world wars had brought in its wake enormous death and ruin to many, which ushered in “a period of austerity”
in the process of recovery. For the British, it had resulted not only in social change internally, but also long term political decline internationally. The decline had also expressed itself in the field of sport relatively long established as a symbolic space through which British identity and civilization was constructed and sustained. In response to these reversals of fortunes, the post-war period was marked by a very systematic thrust led by the Government to reconstruct, restore and renew its social life and international image. To these ends, governmental measures were taken to improve conditions in transport, health, housing, public assistance, the environment, as well as to diversify and resuscitate the economy through the nationalization of several industries. However, in spite of its political decline and gradual erosion of its once mighty Empire, there remained a certain element of denial as the image of Britain as a mighty world power persisted. In this regard, the media played a critical role in sustaining this “fantasy shield” or “wilful nostalgia” about its past. Yet, although the process of decline of its Empire had surely set in, Britain still maintained many colonial possessions after the war, which were to be gradually relinquished thereafter, as a response in part to the rise of nationalist movements in the colonies and their demands for independence.

The process of post-war reconstruction was made even more challenging due to the presence and immigration of coloured peoples into Britain, many of whom were imported as labourers to help with the very reconstruction process as a result of the labour shortages that had resulted from the war. While the origins of blacks in Britain dates back to the 16th century, the early 20th century wars had provided a new context and impetus for a larger and more sustained movement of blacks into the country, particularly West Indians, aided by the British government and influenced also by dire economic conditions in the West Indies. The blacks who came were distinguished in terms of gender, nationality, class
background, skill and professional ambition but, whatever their social characteristics, their presence was to pose an enormous challenge to race relations and the development of Britain. The single most important problem faced by the immigrants was racial prejudice and discrimination, which they encountered on the streets, at work, leisure, sport, in housing, and in intimate relations with whites across the class, occupational, and educational spectrum. They were variously perceived as 'strangers,' 'outsiders' and generally associated with low status in the extant hierarchy of social relations. While in some cases the problems were more imaginary than real, the experience of the colour bar disillusioned many immigrants who had associated the British with democratic ideals of equality and justice. But, the reality was to prove different from the rhetoric however well intentioned.

White British reaction to or treatment of coloureds, however, represented an assortment of attitudes that included rejection, arrogance, paternalism, tolerance, friendliness and acceptance. It was suggested that this mixed treatment could have been also shaped by the language, social manners and particular skill or talent of the immigrant (e.g., top athletes and artistes), although the latter offered no guarantee of being spared the effects of the colour bar. As in Britain, blacks in Trinidad were also generally associated with a low social status although they were the dominant group numerically, unlike the situation in Britain where they were a very small minority. This resulted further in the general valorisation of whiteness since whites became associated with wealth, power and high status while blacks were generally devalorised since they became associated with poverty, powerlessness and low status. In this figuration, social relations became rigidly divided along the lines of race and colour and so much so that the major class divisions also overlapped with the major racial divisions. These values and variables significantly shaped the discriminatory character of social interaction in patterns of
mobility, employment, education, intimate relations, marriage, leisure and sporting activity although there were tendencies to egalitarianism and meritocracy in a society that was still under colonial rule.

The transformation in the character of these social relations through democratization and the empowerment of the subordinate groups, which were being called for long before the wars, was given a turbo boost through the West Indies wide labour disturbances, which reached their apogée in 1937. The disturbances marked a watershed in the development of these societies as they induced significant changes in colonial policy on the part of both the British Government and foreign companies in the major sectors of the economy towards the peoples of the colonies. The major gains of the disturbances included: a renewed impetus to the movement for self-government and independence; a greater national consciousness or sense of nationalism and regionalism; a greater working class consciousness, together with a more organized working class through the development of trade unionism. Racial and other differences in the society, however, stymied the development of a more cohesive and powerful nationalist movement, which remained fragmented.

The movement for self-government and independence, however, contained its own particular contradictions, as there were still many in the society among both its local leaders and the populace at large, who still expressed strong identification with and loyalty towards Britain and its monarchy. This loyalty was clearly revealed in the financial and human support given to the war effort, attempts to celebrate the 150th anniversary of British rule in 1947, local reaction to the deaths of King George VI in 1952 and Queen Mary in 1953 together with the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth in 1953. These developments clearly showed that Trinidadians possessed multiple identities built around identification with Britain, Trinidad and the West Indies and which would have also included their
particular social grouping. The extent to which one identity assumed salience over the other, however, appeared to be driven by the particular context or processes with which the individual was confronted and the varying expectations and interests which informed them. It is in the context of these multiple identities and the social conditions of post-war Britain and Trinidad that we proceed to examine the possible significance of the controversies that arose over McDonald Bailey’s representation of Britain in athletic competition.
CHAPTER 5

ATHLETIC REPRESENTATION AND IDENTITY FORMATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the significance of Bailey’s representation of Britain in international competition in general but, in particular, it focuses on the controversy that erupted over his selection for Britain at the 1948 Olympic Games and, to a lesser extent, the 1950 British Empire Games. This examination relates to several related theoretical propositions that guide this study. These refer to (a) the nature of hegemony as consistent with both consent, resistance and domination; (b) the nature of imperialism as consistent with both intentionality and non-intentionality; (c) the reciprocal and asymmetrical nature of dominant-subordinate-relations; (d) role of sport in the construction of notions of Empire, nation and the “invention of traditions” in the process of identity formation and (e) the multiple/singular, inclusive/exclusive nature of this process. In addition, with respect to (d), it seeks to answer the following questions: (i) was the emergence, the public and official support for Bailey between 1946 and 1953 in Britain, and media discourses concerning same, linked to an incipient English “fantasy shield” that was ushered in by its political and economic misfortunes due to war and the gradual decline of its Empire? and (ii) did Bailey’s decision to represent Britain at the Olympic Games weaken or strengthen the development of early nationalist feelings and a sense of national identity in post-war Trinidad?

To this end the chapter is divided into five major parts. Firstly, we examine the factors motivating Bailey to join the RAF and move to the UK in 1944. Secondly, we provide the particular sporting and non-sporting context in the immediate post-war period in Britain in which
Bailey emerged as a leading international athlete. Thirdly, we examine the chronology of events and controversy surrounding his selection for Britain at the 1948 Olympic Games and the 1950 British Empire Games (see Appendix II for schematic outline of this chronology). Fourthly, we examine the findings from interviews conducted with past officials and athletes in Trinidad and Britain concerning Bailey’s selection for Britain and its consequences. Fifthly, we examine the theoretical significance of the findings from the interview and the documentary research relating to Bailey’s representation of Britain at the Olympic Games and in general, as they relate to the aforementioned theoretical issues. It should be noted that there is some attention to detail in presenting the events surrounding Bailey’s selection for Britain and the respondent interviews in order to capture properly not just the particular processes and their vagaries as they unfolded but to provide the context for understanding the possible meaning(s) and bases of the actions and decisions of those involved so that we can properly interrogate the theoretical issues that inform this study.

5.2 Factors Motivating Bailey to Migrate

In 1944 McDonald Bailey joined the RAF and left for the UK as World War II neared its end. Bailey’s motivation to join the RAF and go to UK, however, has to be understood in terms of his childhood dreams and ambition to become a top athlete and to visit England with which he appeared fascinated. His first visit to England was in 1939 in order to take part in the annual championships of the British AAA. This visit made an indelible impression and impact on the young 18 year old Bailey and his future development as an athlete. In this regard, he recounted:

It was a great experience. I always wanted to see England. London is a great city. It is still one of the greatest cities in my experience travelling through the world. I saw some of my heroes I read about in F. M. Webster’s book live, competing and that was the great
inspiration for me; so that when I came back to Trinidad, I really began to take my running seriously. The experience gained at White City was one which led me to become later one of the top sprinters of the world. I was motivated. I felt that this was an opportunity that I was longing for. I recall the days at the grounds at Queens Royal College [One of the elite secondary schools of the day] when I heard of Jessie Owen’s great exploits and here I was in England running against some big names and seeing some of the champion sprinters of the Commonwealth that I read about (Interview with author, March 18 1996).

This early visit to England therefore, together with the experience gained, appeared to have merely reinvigorated Bailey’s athletic appetite and yearning to return there. In explaining his decision to join the RAF around 5 years later in 1944 thus, Bailey made it clear that it was motivated by his love for England and his development as an athlete together with a sense of “adventure” rather than with any desire to display “bravery or gallantry” in war. So strong was Bailey’s athletic ambition that he even carried with him newspaper clippings of his exploits in Trinidad which he brought to the attention of the RAF’s sport’s officer where he was eventually stationed at Uxbridge. In addition, Bailey went so far as to write to the British AAA in order to remind them of his participation in their 1939 championships, albeit unsuccessfully, and to notify them of his presence in England as a member of the RAF, to which they apparently responded positively by inviting him to take part in some of their early warm up meetings. The interview exchange with Bailey in these respects is reproduced below:

McCree: Why you joined the RAF?

Bailey: How you mean why I joined?

---

Bailey revealed in interview that he had actually first tried to join the Canadian air force in 1942 but was prevented from doing so because of the inability to get a flight out due to the conditions of war. However, in 1944, a newspaper add inviting Trinidadians to join the RAF appeared to which Bailey responded and was eventually selected after undergoing a written examination and a short period of training.
Bailey: Oh for God’s sake man Roy! The adventure I told you. Roy, I went to England in ’39. I loved England. The war nearly caught me in England but I came back and I saw another opportunity to go to England to run. It didn’t have anything to do with bravery or gallantry, anything like that and in a sense, we were all British subjects. But it is instructive to say at this point that all these air force and army personnel have sport officers. And I took my clippings to the sports officer. He was an Australian incidentally. I can’t remember his name now. And I took it to him. He saw where in Trinidad I ran the 100 yards in 9.8 seconds which he thought was fantastic because in England when you ran 100 yards in 9.8 seconds you must be damn fast because of the climate and so on. ... the nearest city to our training camp, which is in Melsham, Wiltshire, was in the city of Bath and the sports officer says, look, you should take part in [sic], its coming on to the spring and summer, why don’t you take entry there. I say yea, I will be glad. And not only that, I took the opportunity to write to the AAA reminding them I was in England in 1939 as an 18 year old. And they wrote back saying they were glad to know that I was back in England, albeit I was in the RAF, and started to invite me a little later on to various little trial meetings they would have before the major meetings which was good for me. (Interview with author, December 28 2004)

Bailey was recruited to the RAF as a personnel officer and eventually posted to the RAF’s elite station at Uxbridge, Middlesex, which he attributed chiefly to his athletic ability and the sporting infrastructure available at this station. He related in this regard:

Bailey: After the examination and when you are trained initially, then you’re posted to other stations. But the RAF athletic association by this time had heard of me; had heard that I was in England in ’39 as a youngster. And they wanted to make sure that I would get a posting where I could continue not with the RAF training as such but with my athletic training among other things. Arthur Wint, the Jamaican, because they knew that he too was a promising athlete, they made sure that Arthur Wint and I were posted from our respective training places to the RAF station Uxbridge, Middlesex, which was the elite RAF station in Great Britain(!). Uxbridge had its own stadium, its own cinder track and
the buildings where you slept as RAF personnel, whatever duties you may have been performing, you would have thought you were in a hotel, because they were all red brick buildings, 2, 3 stories high. That is the elite station! And this is another example of how they have no compunction taking two black youngsters who were potential good athletes and who would represent the RAF in athletics to Uxbridge. We were the only two black fellas there. (Interview with author, December 28 2004)

However, although selected to the RAF as a personnel officer, Bailey informs that his duty in the RAF as well as that of his compatriot Jamaican, Arthur Wint, was to run which was to continue even after the war until his departure from the RAF in 1948. In addition, as a result of his talent and eventual prominence, Bailey revealed that he received privileged treatment not only to train but in the receipt of foodstuff during a period when rationing was still in force. In the latter regard, Bailey officially was allowed to have “whatever I wanted.”

McCree: What was your job definition in the RAF?

Bailey: (slight laughter). I don’t want to be facetious. My job definition was training when I wanted to go on the track. Arthur Wint and I ... didn’t have any particular job to do. We used to ‘lime.’ That is how spoilt we were. When we wanted to train we went and train. I got married in ’46 and then I didn’t have to live in. I travelled everyday from London to Uxbridge which is one hour on the tube train. I got so ingratiated at Uxbridge that the Commanding Officer, Captain Owen ... President of the RAF athletic association ... permitted me to go to the officer in charge of rations and instructed the officer to let me have whatever I wanted. Why? Because people in England were still on ration cards. You are getting the picture Roy? They were all on ration cards but he was so tickled at the fact that Wint and I were at Uxbridge and we would be representing the RAF at athletic meetings and so on, instructed the officer in charge of rations to let me have butter if I wanted, steak if I wanted, eggs if I wanted, bacon. It was funny and, as I was travelling everyday when I knew I had this facility, I used to walk with a nice plastic zip bag and the police at the entrance to Uxbridge, that’s the RAF police,
who would search anybody if they felt like searching, any RAF personnel, they were instructed from the group Captain himself don't stop me. They knew I had rations but ... Wint and I were favourites at the station. They knew we were athletes and so on. There was no attempt to embarrass me or to say well, “Airman let me see what you have in there.” Not at all. As a matter of fact when I first went home with my rations my mother in law, who I lived with at the time, and my wife Doris couldn’t believe their eyes. “Where you got this from?” And I told them the story. I didn’t steel it. We had sufficient to give friends. (Interview with author, December 28 2004)

Probed further on his reasons for joining the RAF, Bailey confirmed that it was influenced by the feeling that it would have exposed him to more opportunities “to take part in athletics” which “Trinidad was in no position to offer me.” As he remarked: “The short answer to what you are asking me is I always felt that if I went back to England, I would have opportunities to take part in athletics, whether in the RAF or with the AAA or wherever. That was my chief thing.” (Interview with author, December 28 2004).

Bailey’s decision to join the RAF in 1944 therefore was driven by multiple related motives of an affective (love for London and England), traditional (love for sport) and instrumental nature (developing athletic ability, realizing childhood dreams, adventure of war). However, although other factors were operative, this decision to join the RAF was primarily a strategy to return to England and pursue his athletic ambitions which limited competitive opportunities and conditions in Trinidad did not afford him. He had entered a society, however, during a period of significant social change when the development of sport and other areas of life were faced with tremendous challenges.
5.3 Development of Athletics in Post-War Britain

As we noted in Chapter 4, in the aftermath of two successive world wars and more so the second world war, British people and their leaders were faced with a major task of reconstruction on almost every front: politics, the economy, social services (education, electricity, communications etc.), as well as sport. Additionally, in the context of an Empire, this reconstruction also assumed an internal as well as an external character.

In the area of sport, war had seen the cessation of almost all official athletic competition both within and without Britain. Internationally, for instance, the war had resulted in the cancellation of two of the Olympic Games (1940 and 1944), while within Britain, it had resulted in the cancellation of the British national track and field championships together with such other major sport meetings as the Kinnaird Trophy Competition, Glasgow Rangers Police Sports, the Inter-county championships, inter-University championships and a host of other District and County competitions. In addition, the war(s) resulted in the cancellation of intra-European competition such as the European championships, and the various inter-city (e.g., London vs. Gothenburg) and inter-country meets (e.g., Great Britain vs France), which were normally held annually.

The post-war period witnessed the gradual resumption of these various meets in Britain, Europe and internationally as the world tried to recover from the trauma of war. In the Caribbean also, this period also saw the reintroduction of the Central American and Caribbean Games (CAC) in 1946, since it was last held in 1938 (Trinidad Guardian, December 7 1946); and the Pan American Games in 1945 which was postponed in 1942 because of war (Trinidad Guardian, April 14 1945).
McDonald’s Bailey’s emergence as a top athlete therefore in the post second world war period and the staging of the 1948 Olympic Games in London took place in the context of this process of reconstruction within sport nationally (within Britain), regionally (within Europe) and internationally.

In this period, however, as in other realms of the society, British athletics was confronted with several major developmental problems which related to: inadequate facilities, lack of access to existing facilities, lack of coaching programmes, financial assistance for national athletes, and State and private sector support of athletics. In the build up to and in the aftermath of both the 1948 and 1952 Olympic Games held in London and Helsinki, respectively, these problems were raised by a range of individuals that included officials of the British Amateur Athletic Association (AAA), coaches, journalists and the public at large. The major task of the AAA in the post-war period thus was the revitalization and development of athletics in Britain since the cessation of official athletic activities in 1939. In its first annual report after the war, the main objective of the AAA was stated clearly as follows:

The main activities of the Association during the year have been rightly centralised on getting the sport into being a real life force again. A goodly measure of success has been achieved and it is gratifying to be able to record that the A.A.A. has lost none of its status as an active force in the sporting world. The Executive and Committees have met the many difficulties which have arisen with cheerfulness and determination and it should not be long before the Association not only regains the extent of its operations in pre-war days, but even exceeds them. (AAA, 1946, p. 1)

In order to make track and field “a real life force again”, however, and also deal with issues relating to its international standing and prestige on and off the track (AAA, 1952), the AAA had to confront a host of developmental problems in relation to infrastructure, equipment, coaching,
financing, and competition. With respect to coaching several related initiatives were undertaken which included the introduction of a system of full time national coaches, area coaches and honorary or voluntary coaches, the "resuscitation" of the Summer School in coaching at Loughborough College aimed at coaches and athletes (AAA, 1948, p. 7); the introduction of Young Athlete Courses, "Weekend Courses in special events" (AAA, 1952, p. 10); a Winter Training Scheme (AAA, 1954, p. 14) together with personal training and the award of scholarships for promising athletes. An annual Conference of National Coaches was also introduced around 1947 (AAA, 1954, p. 15) and, as a result of these initiatives there was a marked increase in the number of honorary coaches. For instance in the 1952 AAA report we are told that "The number of honorary coaches has grown in six years from 160 to 1,300" (AAA, 1952, p. 15), while in its 1954 report we are told that "we have as many as 1,400 qualified Honorary Coaches" (AAA, 1954, p. 4). In the 1953 report, however, we are also told that the number of coaches was "still too few ... and ... insufficient to meet the needs of a host of young athletes ..." (AAA, 1953, p. 13). The number of full time national coaches amounted to just five in 1953 (AAA, 1953, p. 11).

The provision of improved facilities, however, which centred around the construction of new cinder tracks, proved even more challenging due in no small measure to the greater financial expenditure involved. The inadequate and unsatisfactory state of such facilities and their implications for British competitiveness and youth involvement in athletics were captured in the 1950 report of the AAA, where it was stated:

42 Although this summer coaching school was initially launched to deal primarily with the development of athletics within Britain, it eventually attracted participants from inside and outside its Empire (AAA 1951, 7; AAA 1953, 10-11). Countries included Sweden, Israel, Egypt, France, Yugoslavia, Malaya and Taiwan, India and Pakistan and even Trinidad and Tobago.

43 The first full time, professional track and field coach was appointed in 1946, in the person of Major GHG Dyson, a former Essex hurdler (The Times, December 13 1946; AAA, 1946, p. 1).
Most of our Clubs throughout the country are, however, without proper facilities for training, although for many years appeals have been made for amenities similar to those available to other sports. Unless we have the tracks, we require, it is quite clear that we shall not maintain the promise of our 1950 international successes in future Olympic Games and other International Events against the improving foreign competition- in other countries there is a recognition of the need for adequate facilities. Of equal importance is the need of the tens of thousands of young athletes in our Clubs and of those youths who would take up our sport if more facilities were available. (AAA, 1950, p. 3)

In 1950, the total number of cinder tracks “In the whole of England and Wales…” was 66 (AAA, 1950, p. 3). In 1953, the number had increased by some 74% to 115 of which 47 (40.9%) were public and 68 (59.1%) private (AAA, 1953, p. 14), which still fell short of the AAA’s target of 200 tracks to meet the requirements of the population (AAA, 1950, p. 3; AAA, 1951, p. 12). In addition to outdoor facilities, there were also concerns over facilities for “winter indoor training” (AAA, 1951, p. 1; AAA, 1954, pp. 3, 14).

Another significant task faced by the AAA in the immediate post-war period had to do with its very (re)organization. This reorganization involved primarily: (a) the decentralization of its organizational apparatus through the creation of several more district committees in order to administer better other areas of the country (AAA, 1946, p. 1; AAA, 1948, p. 7); (b) the decentralization of its national coaching committee through the establishment of coaching sub-committees and Honorary Coaching Secretaries to deal with specific sub-regions throughout the country (AAA, 1948, p. 7); (c) its incorporation as a Company (AAA, 1948, p. 3) and (d) its assumption of control of all track, field, cross-country and walking events in the country (The Times, December 13 1946). These
organizational changes formed part and parcel of its developmental objectives after the war.

In this drive to revitalize and develop track and field in post-war Britain, the AAA collaborated with and received the support of several bodies that included the Central Council of Physical Recreation (CCPR), the National Association of Organisers in Physical Education (NAOPE), the National Playing Field Association (NPFA), the Schools A.A, Local Authorities, the press, the Ministry of Education and Royal assistance in the person of the Duke of Edinburgh (AAA, 1952, p. 2), who also served as President of the National Playing Fields Association (AAA, 1953, p. 4). The AAA had representatives on each of these bodies which, in turn, had representatives on its coaching committee (AAA, 1948, p. 6). Relatedly, given the social consequences of the wars, there was great concern over the physical well being and health of the general population and of youths in particular. As a consequence, sport and recreation became a major means through which this concern was to be addressed. It was in this context that the CCPR launched the National Sports Development Fund in April 1947 in order "... to encourage more people to take an active part in popular games and sports, and to provide for national recreation centres and the exchanging of sports ideas and members with the Empire and other countries" (The Times, April 19 1947). A message from the then King serves to confirm further the concerns and objectives of the CCPR. This message read thus:

I have heard with pleasure of the inauguration of the National Sports Development Fund. As a nation we have led the world in many activities, not least among these being sports and games. The health and stamina of my people, so tried in two world wars, has

---

44In order to assist the AAA with its development plans, the Ministry of Education gave it several grants and also helped pay the salaries of its professional coaches (The Times, July 24 1947; AAA, 1948, pp. 6-7). In relation to the press, the News of the World and the News Chronicle sponsored athletic meetings, the proceeds from which went to the AAA (AAA, 1948-1954).
been principally derived from their love for outdoor activities. As patron I have watched with keen interest the marked progress that has been made by the Central Council of Physical Recreation and its 159 member associations, and I know that the work of the council has afforded much enjoyment and added health to thousands of young men and women. It deserves, through the National Sports Development Fund, the support of all. (The Times, April 19 1947)

The efforts of the AAA were to bring results gradually, which assumed particular significance in relation to its concerns over British prestige after the war. In this regard, commenting on the successes of British athletes during 1952, the AAA stated in its annual report that:

The enhancement of our national prestige and the inspiration of these performances to the increasing number of boys and young men now participating in athletic events cannot be emphasized too strongly. (AAA, 1950, p. 1)

It was in the context of this broader process of rebuilding track and field and sport on the whole in Britain linked to issues of health, national pride, prestige and power that Bailey emerged as one of its top post-war athletes, and in which the controversy over his selection for the 1948 Olympics has to be located.

5.4 Bailey and the 1948 London Olympics: Chronology of a Controversy

Bailey’s selection for Britain at the 1948 London Olympics became embroiled in confusion and controversy (see Appendix II for schematic outline). Unfortunately, available organizational records of the British AAA for the period in question were of little assistance for understanding the evolution of this controversy. In this regard, although one found the minutes for three General Committee meetings in 1948 (May 1st, October 2nd, and December 4th), no detailed reference or treatment of the representation controversy was found. A General
Committee meeting of February 7 1948 was referred to but was not found among the available records held at the Sports and Documentation Centre at the University of Birmingham. In addition, the twelve respondents interviewed had very little or no knowledge of the controversy taking place. As a result of this, one had to rely heavily on newspaper accounts or reports in both the UK and Trinidad press to capture the process as it unfolded, and the positions or reactions of all those involved including Bailey.

As the 1948 Olympics approached, Mr. J. Crump, secretary of the British Amateur Athletic Board (BAAB) and designated team manager, made it publicly clear that no stone was to be left unturned in identifying the best athletes around both the country and throughout the Empire and preparing them for the games. In this regard, we read the following report in *The Times* of July 30 1947:

> Some of the British plans for the Olympic Games of 1948 were announced yesterday by Mr. J. Crump, who combines the duties of secretary of the British Amateur Athletic Board with that of team manager. No pains are being spared to discover ability, not only in this country but in the forces overseas and among Colonial fellow citizens with no national team of their own. The present season has been one of exceptional intensity, the aim being to give every likely man a maximum of first class experience. Training and coaching will proceed throughout the winter, with, it is hoped, an intensive period of a week or so in the spring. (*The Times*, July 30 1947)

And, in an earlier report in the *Daily Express* of March 26 1947, the British Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) announced its plans to identify and prepare athletes for the upcoming Games:

> LAUNCHING of a “better British sport” campaign was announced by the Amateur Athletic Association yesterday.
Also outlined was their Olympic Games talent-spotting and training scheme starting this season. Selectors will make a concentrated country-wide talent search. They will study Olympic aspirants in a series of special fixtures. Not official Olympic trials-those will come later-but races that will give every earnest unknown a chance to emerge as an Olympic hope.

Next season, athletes shaping up to a place in the Olympic team will be given new-style instruction known as "tutorial training." Under this system, experts will give individual coaching to the near-Olympic athlete in his own event. It is a big break from the old method of coaching by classes.

...NOW, under the new scheme, our athletes of today and tomorrow will have all the facilities the Three A's can muster-excluding the old juicy stamina-building steak and etceteras.

A register of volunteer coaches, limited to 500, has been compiled. Already 61 coaches have been registered. "Sports scholarships" have been arranged covering an August course at Loughborough College, Leicestershire.

It is hoped to award a scholarship to one athlete from every affiliated district. He will receive expert tuition and study-bedroom accommodation free of charge. (*Daily Express*, March 26 1947)

Because of Bailey's superlative performances in 1946 and 1947, very early on he was seen as a possible medal hopeful for the British at the 1948 Olympic Games. For instance, as early as 1946, some two years

---

45 In 1946, Bailey won the 100 and 220 yards sprint at the AAA championships and equalled Eric Liddell's 23 year-old British 100 yards record. He had equalled it twice before in the same year but it was turned down because the track was found to be shorter than 100 yards in one instance, and in another, there was only one time keeper present instead of the required three if a record is to be validated (*The Sporting Life*, July 8 1946; *Trinidad Guardian*, August 4 1946). In 1947, Bailey also received the Harvey Memorial Gold Cup from the AAA for winning the 100 and 220 yards at the AAA Championships (*The Times*, Saturday October 11 1947).

46 Other "black" athletes who were also seen as possible medal hopefuls included Jamaican 400m and 800 metre runner, Arthur Wint, and the Nigerian field athlete (long and high jump), Prince Adedoyin, both of whom were medical students at the time. Adedoyin, however, was based in Ireland, while Bailey and Wint were based in London. In addition, some also had eyes on Jamaican Herb McKenley, international 400m champion, who was a student at the University of Illinois in the USA, at the time (*Trinidad Guardian*, August 4 1946).
before the Olympic Games, Frank Butler, of the *Daily Express*, at the time the largest mass circulation daily newspaper in Britain (see Table 3, Chapter 2), identified both Bailey and Wint as possible medal hopefuls for Britain. Before the British AAA championships of 1946, he wrote thus:

Whether Britain takes it or hands it out in the 1948 Olympics may depend on two coloured sprinters, McDonald Bailey from Trinidad and Arthur Wint of Jamaica. Certainly these Streaks of Ink were untouchable in the 100, 220, 440 and 880 yards heats of the A.A.A. Championships at White City last night.

Whether they are good enough for the Swedish and American sprinters is not yet known but at least this patriotic scribe is thanking heaven that there is no colour bar in athletics.

Wint released something of a body blow at our Olympic hopes when after trotting—it could hardly be described as running—his way to ridiculously easy wins in the quarter and half-mile heats last night he told me he may be returning to Jamaica when demobilized from the R.A.F. at the end of the year. (*Daily Express*, July 20 1946)

Following these same championships, he also wrote: “McDonald Bailey and Arthur Wint of course, took the 100, 220, 440 and 880 yards events between them. *Let us keep our fingers crossed that these Streaks of Ink will run for us in 1948*” [Emphasis added] (*Daily Express*, July 22 1946). Furthermore, in direct reference to Bailey after his equalling of Eric Liddell’s 23-year-old British 100 yards record was finally officially accepted, Butler again wrote: “Only a bad start robbed Bailey of the British record. ...He is, undoubtedly, one of our big Olympic hopes” (*Daily Express*, August 6 1946). In another 1946 report appearing in the local *Trinidad Guardian*, we are provided with similar reaction from other British journalists, and Bailey’s own delight at the prospect of representing Britain at the Olympics although the immediate reaction of the Secretary of the AAA, Mr. Holt, was less enthusiastic and more guarded:
The British sports writers enthusiastically acclaim the star performances of Arthur Wint and McDonald Bailey in winning four events at the White City Amateur Athletic Championships on Saturday...

The tenor of all the newspaper comments is the hope that these two West Indians will be available for the British team in the Olympic Games in 1948. “Let us keep our fingers crossed and hope that these streaks of ink will run for us” is a typical remark.

“A tall slim coloured boy from Trinidad looks like being Britain’s No. 1 Olympic hope. E. McDonald Bailey, 25 year old R.A.F. air craftsman, who is just about the swiftest thing on two legs anywhere on earth today, is prepared to run for Great Britain in the Olympics if he is asked.” This is how George Harrison, one of the best known sports writers in Britain, starts off his column in a Sunday newspaper.

John Macadam, another famous sports writer, also refers to the same topic ... He writes: “Questioned as to the possibility of Britain seeking the services of those superb runners, McDonald Bailey and Arthur Wint, secretary Holt, said, “We shall make no claims. The countries and the runners will please themselves.”

“Personally,” Macadam admits, we are on the side of the A.A. Angels in this matter but it must be conceded that there is an opposite case to be argued. Both Wint and Bailey are reported to be anxious to stay in this country—Bailey made it clear after his sprint successes that it was only the question of a post-war job that left him undecided—and there is a powerful school of thought in favour of finding a job, giving Wint any assistance he requires in the pursuit of his medical career and rescuing the other Jamaican star, Herb McKenley, from the University of Illinois.”

Macadam goes on: “From the British point of view this would be more than desirable. These three, with Wooderson, Wilson and Paterson, form the nucleus, at any rate, of a fighting Olympic team and since sporting success appears to count almost as much at the conference as gold deposits, who is to say that Britain should be denied such a bargaining point?

... In his column, George Harrison deals with an even more controversial side of the future of West Indians in British athletics. He nicknames McDonald Bailey the “Brown Bullet” and describes
him as “the most colourful character running on British tracks these days.”

Discussing his chances of running for Britain in the Olympic Games, Harrison says that McDonald Bailey has already figured in an international team and has his British colours for doing so. “Therefore we can safely take it that the pundits of athletics in this country have sorted out the facts and have decided that he is able to go for Britain.”

Mentioning that Mac wants to run for Britain (he says: “I feel that by running for this country I should still, in a way, be representing Trinidad and I know that the folk at home would be just as pleased and proud as I to know that I was considered worthy of a place in the Great Britain team for the Olympics.”) Harrison sums up: “So it would appear that the matter now rests with the Amateur Athletic Association. If they invite Bailey to stir those long muscular pins of his on Britain’s behalf when the Olympics comes around, you can make a safe guess that there will be a world title or two coming our way.” ... (Trinidad Guardian, August 4 1946)

In May 1947, however, under a year later, Bailey is reported in the Trinidad Guardian as stating that “there is no truth in reports that he is running for Britain” in the Olympics, expressing his preference instead “to represent Trinidad.” He was still “uncertain” nevertheless since up to that point Trinidad was yet to be formally invited to the Games and neither was he invited to represent them (Trinidad Guardian, May 22 1947).

Four months earlier, in January 1947, while he was in Trinidad, Bailey also reportedly stated that “I would gladly run for Trinidad” (Trinidad Guardian, January 14 1947). In addition, in the Sporting Life of August 7 1947, in a report headlined, “Mac’ Will Run For Trinidad,” it is also suggested that Bailey “… will run for Trinidad at the Olympic Games in London next year” after it was learnt that Trinidad had accepted the invitation to participate in the Games. This was confirmed further, in a subsequent local report in the Trinidad Guardian of November 14 1947, entitled, “MacD. Bailey Almost Certain To Run For Trinidad At
Olympics.” As part of an interview with Bailey’s father in Trinidad, it was reported:

MacDonald Bailey, holder of two British sprint titles, is almost certain to represent Trinidad at the 1948 Olympics in London, but a few arrangements remain to be completed before it can be made official.

Bailey, Trinidad born sprinter who married an English girl a couple of years ago seems inclined to live in England, his father stated yesterday when interviewed at his home....

...His father stated that as a boy Mac always said: “I will run at the Olympics one of these days.” Maybe its only time and health that are keeping him from the Games. Mac may throw away a fortune for the Olympics. ...

He wants to get into shape, and to know what Trinidad is doing about the games for he prefers to run for his native land...

(Trinidad Guardian, November 14 1947)

On another brief visit to Trinidad towards the end of November 1947, Bailey again confirmed suggestions that he was going to represent Trinidad at the Olympics. In this regard, it was reported:

McDonald Bailey, who has been British sprint champion for the past two years, told the “Trinidad Guardian” yesterday, on his arrival here with the repatriated servicemen, that he will run for Trinidad at the Olympics should the Colony send a team to the Games.

Mac stated that he attended a meeting of the Trinidad Olympic Games Committee yesterday and they propose sending a team to London next year. ....

“I would be proud to run for Trinidad,” Bailey said. “My main concern is a decent relay side in the 400 metres event. It is a spectacular event and it will give me the feeling that I am taking part in the games. It gives me a better chance.”

---

47 Trinidad was invited to participate in the 1948 Olympic Games in July 1947 (Trinidad Guardian, July 16 1947).
Bailey ended by saying that it would not be his fault if his bad leg does not stand up to the test and he would run for Trinidad should they send a team. *(Trinidad Guardian, December 6 1947)*

So, while the *Trinidad Guardian* report of August 4 1946 quoted Bailey as welcoming the opportunity to represent Britain at the Olympics, subsequent reports suggested that he was favouring Trinidad and, contrary to the yearnings of the British press.

However, although still a colony of Great Britain, Bailey’s eventual selection for Britain was not automatic or straightforward, since this appeared conditional on whether Trinidad was sending a national team to the Games. Apparently, the reported British practice or “policy” until then was to allow colonial athletes to represent their particular colony in such competitions if they were sending a team. However, if this was not the case, then the athlete became eligible for selection on the British team. When the full British team for the Olympics was first announced thus, in October 1947, Bailey was not included consistent with this policy, although his selection would have been still welcomed. For instance, in reporting on the British team selected, *The Times* of October 30 1947 wrote:

*The British Amateur Athletic Board, as promised, have produced the list of athletes- 196 in number-from which the team to represent Great Britain at the Olympic Games in London next summer will in the main be chosen.*

*It will not fail to be noted that the West Indian, Mc Donald Bailey, is not included, but that should surprise no one who appreciates the British policy of never selecting Colonial athletes until their own countries have decided whether or no [sic] to enter a team of their own. So far, Trinidad has not made any such decision, and it is still possible that the British team will be strengthened by the inclusion of McDonald Bailey....* [Emphasis added]

Jamaica has accepted the invitation to take part in the Olympic Games in London next year. Presumably they will call on A.S.
The initial non-selection of Bailey also echoed the earlier statement by Mr. J. E. Holt, the Secretary of the AAA, that “We shall make no claims. The countries and runners will please themselves” (Trinidad Guardian, August 4 1946). Although a report in the Sporting Life suggests that it was done “at his request” (May 26 1948), the Trinidad and Tobago Olympic Committee’s (TTOC) decision to allow Bailey to represent Britain at the games although Trinidad was sending a team, enabled the British AAA to select him eventually. And, this was in spite of their reported policy on the selection of colonial athletes whose territories had their own athletic representatives at the competition in question. The existence and adherence to this policy, however, was not particularly clear as revealed in the following Times report of May 26 1948:

It was confirmed yesterday that although Trinidad have entered a small team for the Games, they will have no objection to the inclusion of McDonald Bailey in the British team as they readily recognize that his advance in athletics has been entirely due to Bailey’s long stay in England. The British Olympic Board state that, although in future athletes should not be selected by other countries when their own is represented at the Games, they could not at this stage give any pledge not to select Bailey. [Emphasis added] (The Times, May 26 1948)

Thus while The Times report of October 30 1947 suggested that the policy of not selecting colonial athletes was in force, that of May 26 1948 above, suggested that this was not necessarily so, which still left open the possible selection of Bailey for Britain. This issue of eligibility did come before the General Committee of the AAA earlier on May 1 1948, but “After discussions it was decided to leave the matter to the decision of the BAAB.” Unfortunately, no detailed records of either the deliberations of the AAA or those of the BAAB and its letter on the subject sent to the
BAAA were found. The only official organizational record found of this issue read as follows:

ELIGIBILITY OF DOMINION AND COLONIAL ATHLETES TO COMPETE FOR GREAT BRITAIN

The honorary Secretary read a letter from the British Olympic Committee defining the circumstances in which Dominion and Colonial athletes could represent Great Britain in the Olympic Games. After discussions it was decided to leave the matter to the decision of the B.A.A.B. (AAA, General Committee Meeting, May 1 1948, N.p.)

In giving their own rationale for permitting Bailey to represent Britain, as early as January 1948, the Trinidad and Tobago Olympic Committee (TTOC) reportedly stated as follows in the Trinidad Guardian:

... Firstly, practically the whole of MacDonald Bailey’s training to the high athletic standard he has now achieved has been due to the care, attention, and encouragement he has received from the British Amateur Athletic Board while a member of the R.A.F. in England. Secondly, MacDonald Bailey is at present and has been ever since he became a first class athlete, resident in England. Thirdly, it has been made clear to the Trinidad and Tobago Olympic Committee by the British Amateur Athletic Board that they are willing to avail themselves of MacDonald Bailey’s services if he were not included in the Colony’s team. Fourthly, it is universally acknowledged that success in relay events at the Olympics carries great honour and prestige. If Mac Donald Bailey represents the United Kingdom in the short-distance races it is probable that he would be included in their short distance relay team. Unfortunately, on this occasion the Colony will not be in a position to send a relay team. Fifthly, Mac Donald Bailey, as a possible member of the UK team will benefit from the high standard of training, care and attention which are available to such members in the United Kingdom and

Finally, bearing in mind that MacDonald Bailey is now at the zenith of his athletic career it is felt by the committee that the care, training, attention, and facilities which have been responsible for his success should not be denied him in his effort to crown his
career by competing fully in his very best form in the coming Olympic Games. (*Trinidad Guardian*, January 18 1948)

The decision of the TTOC was enthusiastically welcomed by both Bailey and within Britain among members of the media and the athletic establishment. In his reaction, Bailey reflected a man whose allegiance was torn for while feeling “honoured and delighted” over the opportunity to represent Britain, at the same time, he stated that he was “still prepared to run for his country.” Echoing some of the sentiments of the TTOC in the rationale for their decision, he stated thus:

I am pleased. It has been my view for a long time that I should represent Britain if chosen. But naturally, I was prepared to give Trinidad first claim on my services. I want to make it quite clear that I am still prepared to run for my country although my main interests are in Britain, where I have gained nearly all my training and achieved all my successes. If Britain wants me I shall be honoured and delighted. (*Trinidad Guardian*, January 27 1948)

With respect to the reaction of the British media, in one report emanating from London, entitled “MacBailey May Run For Britain,” which appeared in the *Trinidad Guardian* of January 20 1948, we read:

Britain’s chances in the Olympics are brightened today by the news that Trinidad has notified the British Amateur Athletic Board that MacDonald Bailey will be released to run for Britain. This information was contained in a cable Bailey has just received from the Trinidad Olympic Committee. (*Trinidad Guardian*, January 20 1948)

And, in another report in the *Daily Herald*, which appeared in the *Port of Spain Gazette*, it was reported:

Mac is a five-star addition to our list of hopes. If he can reach the peak of his form by July there is every prospect of the 100 metres title coming to Britain. (*Port of Spain Gazette*, April 14 1948)
The BAAB, however, while welcoming the “generous gesture” of the Trinidad AAA, still appeared very cautious by indicating that Bailey’s selection was not automatic for he had to be considered “along with all other athletes in this country.” Their reaction and position was expressed in a formal letter to the Trinidad AAA, signed by secretary Jack Crump, which appeared in the *Port of Spain Gazette* of Sunday March 14 1948, and read in part:

Dear Mr. Rogers,

Thank you for your letter of the 23rd January and your cable sent a week previously, I purposely delayed replying to your cable until your letter had arrived. In the meantime, of course, the Press got to hear of your decision with regard to McDonald Bailey and I was therefore obliged to make some statement. I also reported the decision of your Olympic Committee to the British Board at its meeting on Saturday last 24th January.

We do recognize to the full the extremely generous gesture you have made in making Bailey available for Great Britain. The reasons you give for doing so are, to my mind, most sportsman like. You may now assume that MacDonald Bailey will along with all other athletes in this country, be given due consideration when the team to represent Great Britain is fully chosen. …

Will you please convey to the members of your Committee the warm appreciation of the British Amateur Athletic Board for their generous and sportsman like gesture.

However, in a later report in *The Times* in May 1948, the British Olympic Board is seen to be less diplomatic, for it revealed:

The British Olympic Board state that although in future athletes should not be selected by other countries when their own is represented at the Games, they could not at this stage give any pledge not to select Bailey. [Emphasis added] (*The Times*, May 26 1948)
The Sporting Life, in an article entitled, "Bailey Runs For Britain," also reported:

TWO matters about which there has been a considerable amount of conjecture were clarified at a Press conference of the British Amateur Athletic Board yesterday.

First was that E. McDonald Bailey, the Trinidad sprinter, would definitely be eligible for selection for the British team which will compete in the Olympic Games;

In the case of McDonald Bailey, it seems to be the general opinion of most countries that if an athlete's own country is competing at the Games then he should participate in the Games as a member of that country and not for another country.

Last year Trinidad, who are sending a team of athletes to the Games, gave McDonald Bailey permission, at his request, to compete for Britain.

British Board Secretary said that whilst in principle the Board felt that the rule barring athletes from competing for another country when their own country was taking part in the Games was a good one for future Olympics, they were not prepared to regard McDonald Bailey as being ineligible for selection for Great Britain [Emphasis added]. (The Sporting Life, May 26 1948)

The Daily Mirror, in another celebratory type headline, "Bailey for us," also reported: "McDonald Bailey, Trinidad sprinter, is considered by the British A.A. Board to be eligible to represent Britain in the Olympic Games" (Daily Mirror, May 26 1948). However, Bailey's delight and that of the British media over the possibility of his running for Britain was almost erased owing primarily to injury and doubts over his fitness for the Games.

---

48 Laurie Rogers was the secretary of the Trinidad AAA.
5.5 Injury, Doubts and Bailey’s Selection

In the midst of expressions of delight, however, over Bailey’s availability to represent Britain at the 1948 Olympic games, serious doubts were to arise over his fitness and readiness owing to a serious injury sustained while competing in August 1947, which had brought a premature end to his track season that year (Daily Express, August 5 1947; Daily Mirror, August 5 1947; The Sporting Life, September 11 1947). In this respect, after a medical examination of Bailey in April 1948 by Sir Adolph Abrahams, the doctor reportedly stated: “I doubt if MacDonald Bailey will be fit for the Olympic Games” (Trinidad Guardian, April 20 1948). In response to this news, Jack Crump, then secretary of the BAAB and designated Olympic team manager reportedly commented in the same report: “I should have said his fitness would not be good enough for the Olympics and it would be a very serious decision to include such a man in our team. But I don’t want to say anymore for the time being” (Trinidad Guardian, April 20 1948). However, in response to reports that possible hip surgery may rule Bailey out of the Olympics, Jack Crump was also previously reported by the Daily Express as stating: “I have heard about this bad news. The decision will be one for a doctor and Mac to make. Certainly, we shall do everything in our power to help McDonald Bailey” (Daily Express, April 16 1948). Interestingly, an earlier report appearing in the local Trinidad Guardian in January 1948, but written by a Reuter’s Sports Editor, had suggested that Bailey had not only recovered from the injury but was going to represent Trinidad. It read:

MacDonald Bailey tore his thigh muscle badly last August, and has been prevented from running since. Specialists feared the coloured man’s chances of his getting fit for the Olympics were very slim, and rumours to the effect that MacDonald Bailey would never run again were rife at one time. However, both men have recovered

---

49 The other person referred to here is sprinter John Archer who had suffered a broken limb while playing rugby in 1946 (Trinidad Guardian, January 16 1948).
and will represent their respective countries in the Olympics. 
*(Trinidad Guardian, January 16 1948)*

Some in the media, however, were also saddened at this prospect and its possible consequences for both Britain and Bailey. Frank Butler of the *Daily Express*, for instance, wrote: “If Mac decides to end his career it will be a blow to the British Olympic team, [for whom the Trinidad sprinter chose to run when his own country announced it would not send a team to the Games]. Apart from Great Britain’s loss, it would be a personal tragedy for this brilliant runner to have to end his career in his peak year *(Daily Express, April 16 1948)*. The *London Daily Mail* also described this development as “a severe blow to their Olympic chances” *(cited in Port of Spain Gazette, April 28 1948)*. And, in another report emanating from London, Bailey’s fitness and chances of representing Britain were also put in doubt: “It might be in Bailey’s interests to be entered for Trinidad because he might not be selected for Britain. It is felt that his injured leg will not stand up to the strain, the British selectors might deem it wiser to pick a fitter man sure to run, if not quite so fast than to choose Bailey, who might break down before the final was reached” *(Trinidad Guardian, Wednesday May 5 1948)*.

When the final British team was announced for the Olympics in June 1948 thus, to the dismay of Bailey in particular, he was only chosen for the 100 yards, albeit only provisionally so, and was offered to represent Trinidad instead since his final selection for Britain was still in doubt. However, it remains unclear whether the BAAB’s decision had to do with either his eligibility or his injury, although Jack Crump is reported as dismissing the injury as a consideration. In a report entitled, “Bailey, Offered To Trinidad, Wants to Run For Britain,” Armour Milne of the *Daily Mirror* wrote:
McDonald Bailey, famous coloured sprinter, still wants to run for Britain in the Olympic Games.

The British selectors consider he should represent the country of his birth-Trinidad—and have offered them his services.

In any case, Britain say they will not include him in any Olympic event other than the 100 metres. Even there, his selection at present is only provisional. Trinidad Olympic Committee are willing to let Bailey run in the 100 and 200 metres—if he is fit.

The selectors refuse to disclose their reasons for not selecting Bailey for the 200 metres and the relay. Mr. J.C.G. Crump, the Olympic team manager, says that the question of Bailey’s fitness or otherwise has not been taken into consideration.

Prince Adedoyin, of Nigeria, is included in the British team for three events. Dr. Harold Moody, who was born in London of Jamaican parents, is selected for the shot put. (Daily Express, Thursday July 8 1948)

However, even the day before, the Daily Mirror, in a headline, “Olympic Games Team Surprise: Mac Bailey Surprise,” had reported:

GREAT BRITAIN’S Olympic Games athletics team, to be announced today, is likely to contain one big surprise: omission of E. McDonald Bailey, famous coloured runner, from the 200 metres. In spite of his recent come-back to form, Bailey is expected to run only in the 100 metres—and even there not as first string.

I imagine that the relay selections will produce surprises. Bailey’s prolonged leg trouble means that he must not be overworked, and he is not likely to be included. (Daily Mirror, July 7 1948)

Bailey himself was stunned at the decision, and in the same report is quoted as stating that: “This is the biggest shock I have ever had... I cannot understand it. If I am allowed to make my own decision I shall still accept the invitation to represent Britain—even though I would run only in the one race” (Daily Mirror, July 8 1948). Bailey, however, so apparently
stunned by the decision is reported to have blamed it on the "colour bar." In this respect, in a front page article in the *Daily Express* entitled, "BAILEY: I'M VICTIM OF COLOUR BAR", Bailey vents his anger and disappointment at the decision and the unilateral, apparently secretive manner in which it was done. The report read *inter alia*:

I was good enough for Britain in internationals until last year. Then it was suggested that Britain might be poaching from Trinidad if she had me in her Olympic team. But, Trinidad said that was all right. Why ask them again at the eleventh hour-and behind my back? I was not consulted. I wanted to run in the relay in which Trinidad will not take part. And I feel one of the crowd with the English boys. This is only an excuse. (*Daily Express*, July 8 1948)\(^{50}\)

Bailey is also quoted further as saying: “I’m surprised I’m not even second or third choice at 200 metres … because I’ve run some of my best races for Britain at this distance. And my speed surely applies in the relay? However, this is only a personal opinion and the selectors must be regarded as the best judges” (*Daily Express*, July 14 1948).

In a detailed report on the controversy appearing in the *Trinidad Guardian* of July 8 1948 and entitled, “Bailey May Run For Trinidad If Fit,” Bailey again expressed his disappointment while questioning whether the reason had to do with his injury. In this report it is also suggested that the BAAB’s decision may have been influenced by concerns over the

---

\(^{50}\)The possible workings of the colour bar in relation to Bailey first publicly surfaced in mid-1946, in relation to the apparent delay in accepting his equalling of the British 23yr 100 yards record held previously by Eric Liddell (*Daily Express*, August 6 1946). This issue was recently raised by David Miller in the *Daily Telegraph* in a 2000 interview with Bailey, while on visit to the UK (*Daily Telegraph*, December 11 2000). In this regard, Miller wrote: "Yet, hugely popular though he was with promoters and crowds everywhere-especially at the old White City-there existed a subterranean racist attitude among some. It was surprising how often domestic records went unratified because the track was allegedly centimetres short, there was no wind gauge, or too few stop-watches."
eligibility question and giving a British born athlete the chance of competing. The report read as follows:

The Trinidad sprinter MacDonald Bailey may not run for Britain in the Olympic Games, it was announced by the British selection committee in issuing Britain’s track and field teams for the Olympics.

The British Olympic Committee have left Bailey out of both the 200 metres and the four at the 100 metres relay and selected him for the 100 metres only, if Trinidad do not require him to run for them. The British Olympic Committee have cabled Trinidad saying they would prefer that Bailey runs for Trinidad, but that if they do not see their way to nominate him he will run for Britain in this event.

Bailey learned of the British Board’s decision to telegraph Trinidad by official letter which he received today.

“I cannot think why they have done this … I am an ex-serviceman. Four years ago, I represented Britain in a match and I have continued to do so to the best of my ability and now, in effect they say they do not require me. Is it because of my recent mishap and the Board does not think I have as good a chance as I had before it? In any case, I think it is wrong not to have told me on Sunday when the telegram was sent instead of waiting until today.”

The “Trinidad Guardian” understands that before the Trinidad team left for England the Trinidad Olympic Committee decided that if McDonald Bailey should become available for Trinidad decision as to whether he should run for his homeland would be left to Commander Charles H. Hayward, deputy team attendant, Mr. Errol Knowles, manager, and Mr. Laurie Rogers, the secretary, after seeing Bailey’s form in England and being satisfied with his physical fitness. The Trinidad Olympic Committee has not made any official statement as to its reply to the British Olympic Board’s cable, but it is understood to have cabled saying that the decision is in the hands of Commander Hayward, Mr. Knowles and Mr. Rogers, and acceptance is subject to Bailey being medically fit and provided it entails no further expense to the Trinidad Committee.

The “Trinidad Guardian” understands that the committee is willing that Bailey run for Trinidad in the 100 and 200 metre events provided the selectors decide that he should run.
If the committee members now on the high seas do not reach England before entries close Bailey could be entered for Trinidad in the 100 and 200 metre events subject to the condition that he is medically fit.

The British Amateur Athletic Board spokesman, the former Olympic sprint champion, Harold Abrahams, said that his Board had taken this decision bearing in mind that the British Olympic Committee had asked the bodies of various sports not to include athletes born outside Britain but with residential qualifications, if the athletes could run for the country in which they were born.

He also pointed out that if they included MacDonald Bailey, they would be depriving someone without dual qualifications of a place in the British team, in this case the European champion, John Archer, who runs if Bailey is chosen for Trinidad.

Bailey was carefully considered. The selection board spent more than seven hours of deliberation before selection of the team, most of it doubtless, being spent on the question of MacDonald Bailey. The team was chosen alphabetically, there being no “first string” to any particular event. *(Trinidad Guardian, July 8 1948)*

Media reaction in Britain generally sympathized with Bailey’s predicament and were critical of the apparent *volte face* of the BAAB. They pointed to the inconsistencies in the positions expressed by Jack Crump, designated team manager and member of the BAAB, together with the possible role of Mac’s injury and his “inconsistent form” leading up to the Olympics, in determining their final decision. However, there was general rejection of Bailey’s reported colour bar allegation, by both officials of the athletic establishment and the media. In one such report appearing in the *Trinidad Guardian* of July 8 1948, entitled, “UK Press Sympathises With Bailey,” we read the following:

*The widest prominence is given in the London newspapers today to the MacDonald Bailey sensation, and a large measure of sympathy is expressed with the Trinidad sprinter. Authoritative comment comes from John Britton in the “Sporting Chronicle.” Britton writes: “It is very difficult to understand the Board’s move.*
Back in January when Trinidad offered Bailey to Britain, Jack Crump, team manager to the British Board, said the offer was appreciated and Bailey would be considered when it came to choosing the team programmes. Then in May, Crump announced the Board had decided that Dominion and Colonial athletes were eligible for Britain provided their own countries did not require them.

The only clue it seems is Crump’s next sentence that day that it did not follow that Bailey would be automatically chosen. His selection would depend on his performance during the next few weeks.

Britton admits that Mac’s form this season had not been outstanding, but maintains he should at least have been included in the relay. He asks: “Is the Board afraid that his leg may give way again?” Bailey himself says his leg is fine.” Here I think Britton has hit the nail on the head. Bailey’s assertion last night that he was the victim of the colour bar was dismissed by Lord Burghley, chairman of the British Olympic Association as “fantastic.”

Lord Burghley pointed out that the Nigerian Prince Adedoyin, was running for Britain, as Nigeria had no Olympic team. He added: “If Trinidad was not sending a team Bailey would run for Britain. As it is he makes way for another boy who might have been white or coloured.”

This statement by Lord Burghley avoids the question, however, why the British Board gratefully accepted Trinidad’s offer of Bailey in the first place, only to turn round at the eleventh hour and without a word to Mac himself. (Trinidad Guardian, July 8 1948)

The Sporting Life also expressed puzzlement at the decision of the BAAB for, in a report entitled: “BRITAIN’S TEAM FOR OLYMPIC GAMES: Strange Case of McD. Bailey And Trinidad”, we read the following:

… why did the Board decide at a late hour to send a cablegram to Trinidad saying that they would prefer McDonald Bailey to run for Trinidad instead of Britain? Why also did they select Bailey for the 100 metres only and not include his name in the list of eight from which the 4 x 100 metres relay team will be chosen. …

Months ago Bailey said he would prefer to run for Britain, especially as he hoped he would then be able to compete in three races: the 100 and 200 metres and the 4 x 100 metres relay.
Best part of the seven hours which the Board spent on Sunday deliberating on Britain's team must have been spent on the Bailey affair, for most of the other names on the list were more or less automatic choices—especially after the results in the A.A.A. Championships. (*The Sporting Life*, July 8 1948)

Interestingly, all of this was happening while the officials accompanying the Trinidad Olympic team were still *en route* to Britain. They were to learn of these developments only when they arrived in the UK and from MacDonald Bailey himself who met them on arrival (*Trinidad Guardian*, Tuesday July 13 1948). In another report emanating from London and appearing in the front page of the *Trinidad Guardian* entitled, “Rogers Talks With Crump About Bailey, “the general sympathy towards Bailey is also reported but his allegation of “colour bar” is dismissed. The report stated, *inter alia*, that “Sunday newspapers referred to the matter at length and there is pretty general agreement that the matter was handled in a hole-and-corner manner and that “Mac” has been treated shabbily. But I do not believe there is justification of colour bar—though his feelings in this respect are understandable” (*Trinidad Guardian*, Tuesday July 13 1948).

Amidst the apparent media furore and frenzy, and after discussions among British and Trinidad athletic officials, the decision as to who Bailey was going to represent at the Olympic Games was left to Bailey himself, and he chose to represent Britain. In making this public, however, and in explaining the BAAB’s approach to the question, its spokesperson again denied and denounced the allegation of “colour bar” attributed to Bailey, who also used the opportunity “to dissociate himself with the suggestion.” In a front page headline entitled, “Bailey To Run

---

51 Between January and July 1948, before the start of the Olympic games the author identified at least 23 headline newspaper reports in the local *Trinidad Guardian* and 22 in the *Port of Spain Gazette* in relation to Bailey, the vast majority of which emanated from Britain and dealt either directly or indirectly with the representation issue (see Appendix I A). A similar focus on Bailey was shown in the *Daily Express* and the *Mirror* (see Appendix I B).
For Britain” appearing in the *Trinidad Guardian* of July 14 1948, we read the following report:

MacDonald Bailey, the Trinidad sprinter will run for Great Britain in the 100 metres in the Olympic Games, it was officially announced today.

Bailey was present at a Press conference in London today, and smiled his agreement at the statement by Jack Crump, British team manager, who disclosed that Bailey had been given the personal choice of what country he should represent.

Crump said he had discussed the matter with Errol Knowles, Trinidad’s Olympic team manager, who had contacted Bailey and ascertained that he desired to run for Britain. Crump added that the Board had acceded to Bailey’s request to stay at home and not live in a housing camp during the Games, and he emphasized that there was no question of the colour bar entering into the business. Bailey’s decision means that the 100 metres is the only Olympic event he will contest. He is not included in the 200 metres or relay race for Britain.

Before Crump announced the decision, he said that the British Board had been angry at the misrepresentation of the facts. When McDonald Bailey first ran for Britain, he was told that he could run for only one country in the Games, and was asked to see the Trinidad Olympic Committee when he went back about his position. This he did. Bailey, he declared, said he would prefer to run for Britain and get a chance of competing in the relay for that country.

“The reason why Bailey was not selected for the 200 metres and the 100 metres was that the board considered it had made a better selection,” said Crump. “It was however felt that Bailey should have an opportunity to run in the 200 metres, and for this reason, the telegram was sent to Trinidad.”

Knowles, who was also present concurred with the remarks of Crump and MacDonald Bailey himself said that he wished to dissociate himself with the suggestion that the colour bar entered into the matter. (*Trinidad Guardian*, July 14 1948)

---

52 In another report, Crump was reported as describing the allegations of colour bar as “ridiculous and contemptuous” (*Trinidad Guardian*, July 16 1948).
In an article entitled, "'MAC'BAILEY WILL RUN FOR BRITAIN: Trinidad Sprinter Was Given His Own Choice", *The Sporting Life* also reported in part:

MCDONALD BAILEY will run for Britain at the Games and not Trinidad. The news, which will be welcomed by all British track enthusiasts, was made known yesterday, following discussion between Jack Crump, British team manager, and Mr. Errol Knowles, over here in charge of the Trinidad team...

Bailey was present at yesterday's conference and was all smiles when Mr. Crump disclosed that the British record-holder had been given the personal choice of what country he should represent, and he had decided in favour of Britain. He will accordingly carry the Union Jack in the 100 metres. (*The Sporting Life*, July 14 1948)

In a further report on the matter in the Trinidad media on July 16 1948, and headed, "Bailey Runs For Britain On Principle", Bailey is quoted further on the reason for his own decision. In this report, we read: "Explaining his decision to run for Britain in the Olympics, MacDonald Bailey said yesterday he made his choice on principle. 'It had been decided a long time ago that I should run for Britain and I am sticking to that,' he said" (*Trinidad Guardian*, July 16 1948). Another report of July 21 1948, apparently by a local Trinidad reporter (Peter Ditton), who was in London at the time, provides a more direct response on the matter from the manager of the Trinidad Olympic delegation, Mr. Knowles, who commented, perhaps tongue in cheek:

Before I left I asked Mr. Knowles what he thought about the MacDonald Bailey question. He pointed out that Mac had made up his mind and that had really settled the matter. "It is not as if Mac had repeatedly said he did not want to run for Britain ... He decided he would rather run for Britain in one event than for Trinidad in two. If that is what he wants then O.K. I'm happy." (*Trinidad Guardian*, July 21 1948)
One of the British respondents interviewed who had some recollection of the event, was Doug Wilson, a former British middle distance champion and also a member of the Polytechnic Harriers with Bailey. Wilson, however, while recalling the controversy surrounding Bailey's selection for Britain in 1948, Bailey's ultimate decision and the injury he sustained, was still not too clear on some of the details and was generally uncertain as to whether the peculiarities of his selection had to do with either the workings of "the colour bar" or his injury and general health. In addition, while Wilson suggested that the selection of Mac was not opposed by British athletes, he also suggested that the same did not apply to the officials some of whom felt that Bailey should have represented Trinidad. The latter revelation suggests therefore that Bailey's selection to represent Britain may not have been welcomed by all within the British athletic establishment, although he was not too clear on the extent of this opposition, which was never really suggested in the media. His comments are presented below.

McCree: You were aware of any controversy surrounding Mac's selection and representation of Britain in 1948?

Wilson: Oh yes. I have heard quite a bit. He elected to run for Britain rather than Trinidad. I think he told me he wasn't even sure Trinidad would have any money to put a team in and that's why he elected any way to run for Britain. And certain people in those days, some of the officials didn't like the idea, I don't think, of him running; if he came from Trinidad, he should run for Trinidad, but he elected to run for Britain. And then, he had some trouble with his form ... pulled muscles and things. He eventually got selected but, the thing I still don't know today is why he wasn't selected for the 200 metres. He was selected for the 100 metres but not the 200 metres.

McCree: Do you know why?

Wilson: I cannot remember...

McCree: Can you speculate? Colour bar?
Wilson: It maybe that. In fact even that I don’t know. It sounds like it. But when you come to think of it, the people in that 4 by 100 team weren’t in Bailey’s class but one or two had beaten him when he was a bit off form, Jack Gregory, Ken Jones, Jack Archer and I think Paul Barry. But why, I cannot remember now but my goodness. I think he had pulled a muscle and had been beaten once or twice just before the Games. So .... I supposed it was touch and go. At one time they thought whether he would run or not and also he had a very bad cold on the day. He was not at all well.

McCree: There were some AAA officials who wanted him to run?

Wilson: There were only two officials who were virtual dictators in those days: Crump and Abrahams. They were the two. Nobody else mattered very much. That’s the way it was.

McCree: When you said some officials may have had problems with him representing Britain, was it unanimous or was it a case of one official against another?

Wilson: It was never .. in today’s press, they would have gone berserk. There would have been interviews on television. .. It seemed to me, I just can’t remember at the time, it was glossed over at that time...

McCree: Did his injury have more to do with it...

Wilson: I think it was a convenient thing for the selectors to put it like that. I think it gave them some sort of a case to only select him for the 100. It could have been that because Mac did have a lot of pulled muscles around that time and then they thought he was a bit unreliable. It may be that. I think people felt, not the athletes, the selectors felt, the athletes couldn’t care less, the selectors felt that he should run for Trinidad. Not colour bar exactly. It might have been half and half but there was nothing official. (Interview with author, June 18 2003)

One of the other British respondents was Guinness Book of Records founder, Norris McWhirter, another contemporary of Bailey, who also represented Britain in the sprints, but was a member of the opposing London club Archilles AC. Unlike Wilson, McWhirter had no knowledge or memory of the controversy surrounding Bailey’s selection and the media interest that it sparked. What he did recall was the fact that Bailey
was only selected to run the 100m and neither the 200m nor the 4x100m relay. But while he believed that concerns about Bailey’s fitness kept him out of the 200m, he did not know why he was not selected for the relay team. In addition, like Wilson, McWhirter indicated that British athletes did not oppose Bailey’s selection (Interview with author, June 20 2003). The lack or absence of knowledge surrounding Bailey’s decision to represent Britain in 1948 seems widespread and exists up to today, for in a recent publication on British Athletics in 1950, the author wrote: “Because Trinidad did not have an Olympic Committee he was able to compete for GBR....” (Sheridan, 2000, p.56). The author is also wrong to suggest that “Trinidad did not have an Olympic Committee” since, in fact, it was that very Olympic Committee which had agreed to Bailey representing Britain in 1948 as previously noted (see page 142).

5.6 Reaction in Trinidad

If we judge from the number of newspaper reports alone on the subject in the two major local daily newspapers at the time, the Trinidad Guardian, and the Port of Spain Gazette, we can easily say that there was considerable media interest shown in the issue of McDonald Bailey’s representation at the 1948 Olympic Games, which also applied to the British newspapers examined (see Appendices I A&B). In this respect, for instance, one notes that between January and July 1948, before the start of the Olympic games, there were at least 23 headline newspaper reports (both front and sport pages) in the local Trinidad Guardian and 22 in the Port of Spain Gazette in relation to Bailey and the representation controversy.53 We should note, however, that some of these reports appearing in both local dailies would have been the same foreign reports emanating from England (see Appendix I A & B). And, of these, the
majority dealt either directly or indirectly with the issue of Bailey’s representation of Britain at the Olympic Games. At the same time, however, one can argue that such reports may say more about media reaction than reaction among the public at large, particularly sport fans, athletic officials and athletes. In trying to gauge popular reaction however, one had to use newspaper reports as a guide, together with interviews of past athletes and athletic officials in Trinidad.

As far as the position of the Trinidad Olympic Committee is concerned we have already noted that as early as January 1948, they had decided to make Bailey available to represent Britain. However, a close examination of relevant newspaper reports found that reaction to Bailey’s decision to represent Britain was mixed at best, with one body of opinion being supportive and sympathetic while another was in opposition. This mixed reaction was captured in the Port of Spain Gazette which, in an article entitled, “Opinions Are Divided On Bailey’s Decision To Run For Great Britain”, revealed the following opinions:

Mr. A.N. Alexander, local sport official, said “I am disappointed with Bailey’s decision to run for Britain in the Olympics and one of my chief reasons for giving this view is that if he had decided to run for Trinidad, we could have a relay team but as “Mac” decided we are out of this picture. In my opinion Mac’s father influenced his decision. Also I am certain that Mrs. Bailey, who is a keen sporting enthusiast, according to talks I had with her when she visited this island in 1946 will be very pleased to see her husband compete for Britain. For the little that I know, Mac’s ambition was ever to be in the frontline and this is one of the chief reasons for his joining the RAF Ground Crew from Trinidad and I also believe that the publicity that Mac received from the English press, he would never dream to get in Trinidad. Nevertheless! I wish him all the success in his efforts to fly the flag of Britain.

53 The number of reports relating directly to Bailey in the build up to the Olympic Games amounted to 12 in the Daily Mirror and 13 in the Daily Express (see Appendix IB).
George Baker, the well known Trinidad sprinter said: “Well, this whole thing is a complicated affair, but I still feel that “Mac” made the right move having to remain in England when the Olympics are over. Everybody is playing a game; I feel it is the fault of the Local Olympic Games Committee for delaying the selection of the local team too long, because if they had selected the team earlier, Bailey would have known exactly what his position was. Failing this, however, Bailey decided to run for England so as not to be left out of the Games; while England on the other hand seemed anxious for Trinidad to have him as a result of his recent leg injury. Now to get away from the colour question which is in the minds of everyone, they had to show the world that this was not in the question by selecting him to run in the 100 metres ... fearing that his leg might breakdown.”

Ken Laughlin, local sports commentator and critic said: “As regards Bailey’s running for Britain, I am not acquainted with the facts as to why he was not selected to run in the 100 yards and 200 metres. When he was fit last year, there would have been no doubt in the minds of the AAA of England about Bailey’s representing Britain in the sprint events. However, as a result of his recent leg injury the AAA must have been reluctant in selecting him for the 100 yards and 200 metres. The question of Bailey’s running for Britain would never have come up had he not suffered the leg injury. It is apparent that the AAA officials who are on the spot realized that they would have been taking quite a chance had they selected Bailey as their No. 1 man. They probably felt that Bailey’s leg injury would not stand up to the strain of running heats, then finals in the ... 100 metres and then 200 metres. Bailey’s decision to run for Britain must have been chiefly made to please the English public who looked to him when the going was good. I do not blame him, after all Trinidad agreed to his running for Britain didn’t they?”

George Harvey, a young sport enthusiast declared: “Bailey? It is quite time that Bailey should realize that he is not an Englishman. In the first place when he was given the enviable honour of choosing which country he would like to represent ... to the surprise of every Trinidadian, he picked Great Britain! What happens to Bailey he has brought it upon himself.” (Port of Spain Gazette, Sunday July 18 1948)

In a subsequent editorial of the same Port of Spain Gazette on “The Olympic Games,” the editor, appeared diplomatic as well as sympathetic,
as he focused on those who still wished Bailey success and the supposed main purpose of the Olympics which was the honour of competing:

Our own MacDONALD BAILEY has already done a lot for the name of Trinidad. Now for reasons better known to himself, he has decided to try to be of service to the Mother Country. Not wishing at the moment to go into the reasons for this decision, we merely observe that despite many criticisms of his action, the great majority of Trinidadians wish him as much success as they wish every member of our own five-man team because, after all, it is the spirit of sport in every sense of the word that underlines the whole idea of the Olympic Games, and indeed the honour to the athlete is not so much the winning of a race for any particular country as the fact that he is an actual participant in the World Olympics. (*Port of Spain Gazette*, Thursday July 29 1948)

In the *Trinidad Guardian*, the other major daily at the time, less was found on the nature of public reaction to Bailey. One letter writer, however, did briefly state that “With regard to McDonald Bailey, a lot can be said for and against....” although not providing any elaboration (*Trinidad Guardian*, January 28 1948). And, in another report in reaction to the TOC’s decision to make Bailey available to Britain, the *Trinidad Guardian* editorialized in part, as follows:

But the most interesting decision reached by the committee is the one affecting McDonald Bailey, the brilliant Trinidad runner, who has been so successful in Europe.

The committee decided not to include Bailey in the Trinidad contingent mainly because our outstanding sprinter had indicated on his last visit here that he would represent his home Colony if a relay team were sent, and this has not been found possible. Of course there are other reasons for the committee’s action, but this is clearly the one which carried most weight.

We are certain this decision will be a disappointment both to Bailey who represented Trinidad twice in the last seven years, and to a large number of Trinidadians. Bailey’s performances in Europe have proved that Trinidad sprinters can hold their own with
the world’s best, but at least he should have the satisfaction on this occasion of wearing the colours of Great Britain. [Emphasis added] (Trinidad Guardian, January 20 1948)

Interviews with surviving athletes from that era and former Trinidad athletic officials, also help confirm the mixed reaction shown towards Bailey’s decision as well as the perceived reason(s) for his decision together with its long term implications for himself and the development of the sport locally. In all some eight individuals were interviewed, most of whom were former officials of the governing body for the sport in Trinidad and former national athletes in their day between the 1950s and 2000.

The interviews produced several major findings, which include the following: (1) there was very strong objection among the Trinidad public to Bailey’s decision to represent Britain at the Olympic Games for they saw it as a “betrayal” of the country; (2) some members of the ruling Trinidad Amateur Athletic Association (AAA) at the time also opposed Bailey’s decision; (3) athletes and officials appeared divided on the question as some supported him while others did not; (4) Bailey’s decision was attributed to uncertainty surrounding Trinidad’s participation in the games and the failure of the Trinidad AAA to notify him early enough that Trinidad was sending a team to the games; (5) his decision negatively affected his short and long term involvement in the administration and development of the sport in Trinidad as he was at best marginalized and at worst excluded from this process following his retirement from running in 1954 and on his return to Trinidad in 1963; (6) up to this day, as with most of the British respondents, there is still absolutely no accurate knowledge of the chronology and context of events surrounding Bailey’s decision to represent Britain, and his own varying positions and justification for so doing. In brief, the interview responses in relation to Bailey’s decision can generally be placed into two major
camps: the supportive and the oppositional with the latter appearing more
salient and enduring.

Dr. Jesse Noel, a graduate of Cambridge University and former
President of the National Amateur Athletic Association (NAAA) of
Trinidad (1971-1972), who was ten years old in 1948, was one of those
who had a supportive and empathetic view of Bailey’s decision. In
interview, he revealed the negative reaction towards Bailey among the
public, athletic officials and even the Trinidad Government, years after his
career had ended, as well as his lack of knowledge of some of the details
of Bailey’s decision and the local organization of the sport after the war.
Given his past position in the administration, his views are presented at
some length:

McCree: What do you know about the representation controversy
surrounding McDonald Bailey at the 1948 Olympics?

Noel: We did not have an organized association at the time. ...54
McDonald Bailey ... went to join the RAF. But before doing so he
was already a Trinidadian sprinter of note because he was winning
his races down here ... After he went to England, .... he still kept
in touch with his native Trinidad, still a colony, and did come
down to represent us at the first Central American and Caribbean
games in 1946, while still living in England! So that shows that he
was a native son, proud of his Trinidad and Tobago origin and so
proud that he came back from England where he was domiciled to
represent Trinidad and Tobago in the first Central American
Games and won a medal for us there. He won a bronze medal. Not
many Trinidadians and Tobagonians know this: that McDonald
Bailey represented Trinidad and Tobago at the first Central
American games in Barranquilla, Colombia, and won a bronze
medal for us. Then he went back to England. Now that is two
years prior to the Olympic Games in 1948. When he went back to
England, he became outstanding there as the best sprinter in the
land, and when the 1948 Olympics was coming around, it was in
fact the first time that Trinidad and Tobago were going to be
involved. And because of the nature of our administration at the

54This is not correct. At the time of the 1948 Olympic Games, there existed the local
AAA, which was established in 1945 (see Chapter 3).
time, it depended on funds, and funds from impresarios and interested persons. Not even the government, not even the government\textsuperscript{55} So McDonald Bailey was never told in any certain way that Trinidad and Tobago would include him in a team for the same reason that I am saying, this uncertainty with regard to raising funds and making up your mind (of course it still happens today in Trinidad and Tobago unfortunately). Athletic teams going away never seem to be sure until the very last minute of the finance and that sort of thing. So while that was going on Bailey was still considered the number one runner for England and England would have been very happy to have him represent them in their own back yard, because the Games are being held in London. So not having a definite word from Trinidad, at the last minute Bailey had to make up his mind, ... so he agreed then to run for England. Now in those days, Trinidad and Tobago was a colony of Great Britain. McDonald Bailey was a British citizen just as I was up until our independence [in 1962]. When I went to England for the first time, I was a British citizen, born in Trinidad and Tobago. So, it was a very easy matter for him to be called to represent the country where he lived and where he was in fact a citizen. So he accepted ... I have myself been a student in England and I was there in the colonial days when Trinidad was a colony. I know how we feel about our land of birth and I am pretty sure that it was with a heavy heart that McDonald Bailey would have had to give up the right to represent Trinidad and Tobago and to accede to the requests of the British people to represent them. But he did so and I remembered talking to Mannie Ramjohn\textsuperscript{56} before he died and up to that day some years ago Mannie Ramjohn was still of the view that Bailey let down Trinidad ... based on a lack of information of the reality of the situation. And this was the same view I found when I became the President of the athletic Association and McDonald Bailey returned to Trinidad. I found within the Association there was a hard core feeling that this man had let us down. He betrayed us and there was a sort of resistance to him coming into the Association even though I thought that we should have had him in an ex-officio, honorary manner, absorbing as much as we could from his experience. There was a resistance towards him and I thought that made Bailey very sad.

\textsuperscript{55}This is also not correct. In colonial Trinidad, funding for national sport teams was obtained through two main sources: public subscriptions and Government subventions. For the 1948 Olympics for instance, the colonial Government donated some $5,000 while another $5,000 were obtained through public subscriptions (Trinidad Guardian, June 30 1948; Port of Spain Gazette, June 13 1948). In their preparation for the Olympics, the British athletic authorities also had to make public appeals for funding in 1948 (The Times, May 20 1948) and 1952 (Daily Express, November 23 1951).

\textsuperscript{56}Mannie Ramjohn was of Indian descent and a contemporary of Bailey who also represented Trinidad at the 1948 Olympics. He has since passed on.
McCree: Was there anyone else like you of like mind in the NAAA?

Noel: I can't remember. I really can't remember anybody else. I remember there was a certain stiffness with regard to Bailey but I, of course, was honoured to meet the man and to know about him because his father and my father were friends. They were both headmasters a like but we had never met and Bailey is a lot older than I am. So I was very honoured to meet him and very happy to know, to hear all about his life because I think ... may have been because of this ... he actually spent a long time in Guyana helping the Guyanese with their social development and sport when ... if he was appreciated by Trinidad and Tobago, he could have been here doing the same thing. But when he came back to Trinidad to settle and reside here, I remember the fact that he was still considered like the man who let us down and who didn't run for us did create problems for him socially. I tended to get close to him. I used to go and visit him and his family and got to know his children, and I was aware that this was a man who had a tremendous amount to offer to us but was being frustrated because of the attitude.

McCree: How did the Government of the day respond to him when he returned? This was after his career had ended.

Noel: I think they tended to be indifferent. I think for the great man that he was, I think there was a tendency for one to be indifferent. And I also blame the press because if we had informed writers in the press, they could have helped solve that problem by interviewing him but people tended to keep away from McDonald Bailey rather than to embrace him as a national hero, which is what he is.

McCree: What was popular opinion like? Do you have a sense of what the public mood, that tricky public mood was like?

Noel: I think that the majority of people felt that this was a man who ran for Great Britain and not for Trinidad and Tobago and they didn’t understand. Some people did understand. I remember Cumberbatch understood and some of the old athletes who have now passed on and [I] spoke to, they understood, especially Cumberbatch, because Cumberbatch had represented Trinidad overseas and knew about the difficulties and knew all the sorts of things.

57 After his retirement from athletics in 1954, Bailey took up an appointment with the Booker sugar company in then British Guiana where he stayed until 1963, when he returned to Trinidad.
problems that McDonald Bailey would have faced. So there were only few people who really knew the situation, knew the circumstances, knew the background to the problem, who could appreciate that we were not treating this man as he deserved to be treated. (Interview with author, January 26 2004)

Another former official and national track athlete, Zeno Constance, 20 years old at the time in 1948, while expressing reluctance to speak on the matter, was one of those who did not hold a supportive view of Bailey’s decision to represent Britain. In this regard, he stated that “I found it was not in order that you are a Trinidian and you go out there and you can’t compete and you give a lot of excuses.” And, as it relates to public reaction, he also noted that “It was the consensus of Trinidad that he should have run for Trinidad.” (Interview with author, February 4 2004).

In addition, through the newspaper research, it was found that the general disappointment and nationalist backlash of Bailey’s decision was also expressed in four other major ways. These included: (i) his failure to be nominated for consideration in the inaugural selection of the Trinidad sportsman of the year in 1951 or be included among the top ten athletes of that year by local sport journalists (Trinidad Guardian, January 13 1952); (ii) the fact that he was never commended by the local athletic association or anyone publicly after equalling the world 100m record in 1951, then held by American Jesse Owens, which he confirmed in interview; (iii) his failure to be included among the 390 persons who were nominated to receive special medals to commemorate the 1953 Coronation of Queen Elizabeth (Trinidad Guardian, June 3) and (iv) the fact that he was never invited to participate in any athletic championship in Trinidad post-1948, during the height of his athletic ascendancy in Europe, which was also confirmed by Bailey in interview with this author. What makes Bailey’s omission from any local awards even more glaring was that in 1951 he
had equalled the world 100 metre record in Yugoslavia and had won his fifth double (i.e., both 100m and 200m races) at the annual championships of the British AAA. In addition, in 1953, Coronation year, he achieved the feat of winning 14 titles at the British championships after winning the double (i.e., 100 and 200m) for a record 7 years, 5 of it in succession. This feat had also followed his winning a bronze medal in the 100 metres at the 1952 Helsinki Olympics.

The above findings together with those of the interviews serve to confirm further the extent of the Trinidad public’s opposition to Bailey’s decision to represent Britain at the 1948 London Olympics because it offended nationalist sentiments. The interviews, however, also reveal that there is still substantial ignorance within Trinidad as well concerning the chronology and context of Bailey’s selection for Britain since this was attributed principally to problems of sponsorship for the Trinidad team, uncertainty over their participation in the games, and poor communication on the part of the members of the Trinidad athletic establishment with Bailey. One of the Trinidad respondent’s (i.e., Georgie Lewis) claim thus that “... the Trinidad public really did not know the facts …” surrounding Bailey’s decision (Interview with author, April 8 2003) is right, but neither did he nor those who ascribed blame to the financial, organizational and communication failings of the local AAA.

Interestingly, in a more recent explanation for his own decision in both the local media and in interview with the author, Bailey’s own version of events was also largely at variance with some of “the facts.” In a 1996 interview for instance with this author, Bailey had the following to say with regard to the charge that he was “disloyal” to Trinidad:

I have to be defending this nonsense over and over and over. Trinidad said they had no objection to my representing Britain. I suppose they thought they would have to equip me; they had to
give me pocket money ... And what's wrong with representing Britain? In any case we were British subjects. Weren't we? Has anybody queried why certain people went into the army and the RAF and fought for Britain? But you have people who even when you take the trouble to explain to them, you know what they turn around and tell me, "well, that is your version." Only recently Dr Jesse Noel [former President of the Athletic Association of Trinidad and Tobago] had to put this matter to rest again and explain the situation to them, because they want to insist ... in other words, that I was disloyal... Nothing hurt me more than that! Up to [recently] a fella stopped me ... [and said]: 'Mac I read all your [newspaper] articles you know and I enjoy them, but I never forgave you ... representing Britain.' I said look chump, are you interested? 'Yea, let me hear what you have to say.' I related the story as I just told you and he turned around and told me, 'well, that is your version.' I say well I don't know what other version you want and I left him and walked off." (Interview with author, March 18 1996; McCree, 2000, p. 14).

And, more recently, in two interviews in the Trinidad Express, one in December 2003 and the other in August 2004, Bailey restated the same basic position he expressed in 1996. In the first interview with Kwame Laurence, Bailey is quoted verbatim as saying:

I'm absolutely misunderstood! Spitefully so by some people. It infuriates me when they say I turned my back on the country. Every time I stepped on a track in Great Britain, Trinidad was mentioned. When I was told, in '46 ... that representation was being made for T&T to be represented at the 1948 Olympics in London, I asked that they give me early warning, so I could adjust, mentally and physically, to the task ahead.

And in what appears to be a non-verbatim quotation, the reporter also noted further:

Bailey, who had been living in Great Britain since 1944, waited to the end of 1946, and kept waiting throughout 1947. With the 1948 calendar in use, and word from back home still not forthcoming, he wrote his dad, Charles McDonald Bailey.

58Bailey once wrote regularly in the Catholic News, the local organ of the Catholic Church.
The elder Bailey, a member of the Olympic Association informed his son that while permission had been granted for the country to compete in London, there was no guarantee the officials would get money to fund T&T’s participation. His father suggested that he accept the invitation to wear Great Britain colours at the London Games. *(Trinidad Express, December 2003)*

In the 2004 interview with Trinidad Express reporter David Brewster, Bailey again restated his basic account of the reasons why he represented Britain at the 1948 Olympic Games. Lamenting the historical ignorance surrounding the reasons for Bailey’s decision, Brewster stated that “The tragedy of his life has been the fact that sport fans, and even writers of his generation, never got the facts straight, and as such never knew the real reason for him running for Britain and not Trinidad and Tobago at the London Olympics.” *(ibid.)* In addition, in the published interview, simply entitled “Let’s Forgive Mac”, Brewster made a direct and passionate plea to the public to forgive Bailey, in view of the circumstances of his decision and because “his heart has always been with us.” In what can be considered a veritable *cri de coeur*, Brewster wrote on the heels of the 2004 Athens Olympics:

> It is … fitting that we erase from our hearts any ill-feeling towards Bailey for running for Britain because his heart has always been with us, not only at the Olympics but all the British Open Championships and in all the big races he won in Europe and the USA. *(Daily Express, ‘Express Sports,’ August 5 2004)*

Indeed, Bailey is generally correct when he states that “Trinidad had no objection to my representing Britain” and by “Trinidad”, it is understood to refer to the decision of the Trinidad and Tobago Olympic Committee to allow him to run for Britain. However, contrary to what Bailey now suggests, neither lack of information as to Trinidad’s participation in the games nor lack of money to send a team played any role in his decision to represent Britain, although funding constraints did
result in a small 5 man team being sent (Port of Spain Gazette, June 13, July 29 1948; Trinidad Guardian, January 18, June 1, 3 1948). In any event, Bailey lived in Britain at the time, so it is not clear how the lack or absence of funding can be cited as a factor shaping his decision. While there were twists and turns to the issue of Bailey’s selection due primarily to the injury he sustained in the summer of 1947, the records clearly reveal that Bailey was eventually allowed to make his own choice as to whom he will represent and he choose to represent Britain, “on principle”. What can possibly explain then this huge gap between what Bailey said and did in 1948 and his responses over 40 years later with respect to his decision to represent Britain in the 1948 London Olympics? Is it just a straight and simple case of poor or selective memory or, is it a straight and simple case of Bailey “sexing” up the historical record? And, if the latter, to what instrumental end was it? Or, to pose it in the language used by Weber, what was “the real driving force of his action?” (see Chapter 2). It is contended here that Bailey’s new version of events constitutes a classical case of respondent revisionism and false causal attribution which highlights one of the problems of internal validity faced in life history research in particular and social research in general. In an attempt to account for such revisionism in the case of Bailey, one contends that it can be attributed to his need to erase the historical perception of him as a “traitor” in order put his Trinidad nationalism beyond doubt and thereby protect in the process his athletic legacy.

As can be gleaned from his persistent angry response to the anti-nationalist charge, the questions that have surrounded Bailey’s national identity and nationalist orientation over the past 55 years continue to haunt him and remains one of the most enduring long term consequences of his decision to represent Britain at the Olympics. The dominant and persistent historical perception of Bailey, however, as “disloyal” or “a traitor” to Trinidad does not do justice to his own nationalist inclinations and the
multiple nature of the identities through which he was represented in the local and British press (see Chapter 6). Such nationalist inclinations and the multiple nature of Bailey’s identity were also evident in the build up to the 1950 Empire Games in Christchurch, New Zealand.

5.7 1950 Empire Games

For the 1950 Empire games, Bailey’s selection or participation was also enmeshed in uncertainty although not on the same scale as that of the 1948 Olympic games. This time, however, the issue had nothing to do with any injury but his eligibility to represent Britain amidst uncertainty again as to whether Trinidad was also sending a team to the said games. In one of the early reports surrounding this matter, which appeared in the front page of the Trinidad Guardian on August 20 1949, we read the following:

It is now stated that if MacDonald Bailey does not run for Trinidad in the British Empire Games, in New Zealand, next year, he will not be able to run at all.

Contrary to Olympic rules, competitors in the British Empire Games must, it is now revealed run for the country of their birth. Mac confirmed this when I asked to day about the whole matter of his running in the Empire Games.

It was stated in the London “Star” tonight that he set his heart to run for England, but he informs me that this is quite untrue. “I want to run for Trinidad.” He said.

It is not known here whether Trinidad is sending a team to New Zealand, but if so, the selectors should also consider the claims of the much improved Trinidad sprinter, ex-RAF Aircrafman, Clayton Gibbs, who was chosen to represent the AAA versus the Services in the 220 yards. … (Trinidad Guardian, August 20 1949)

In a subsequent report, however, appearing in the Daily Express of August 24 1949, we are told that while Bailey was legally eligible to represent
Britain because he satisfied a residency requirement, the policy of the AAA gave preference to the selection of athletes “born in England.” In other words while Bailey was eligible \textit{de jure} to represent Britain at the Empire Games, \textit{de facto}, he was not. This matter and the inconsistency in the selection and eligibility of Bailey to represent Britain was reported as follows:

CONTROVERSY about whether McDonald Bailey, Trinidad's Man-in-a-Hurry, was eligible for the Empire Games in New Zealand in February was settled yesterday.

He is eligible. Any member of the Commonwealth with six months residential qualification can represent us but A.A.A. policy for these Games is against choosing any athlete not born in England.

Jack Crump, British Board team manager, said: "Never in the past have the selectors made an exception. It would be against the true spirit of the Games. It applies to Scots, Irishmen and Welshmen just as it does to any member of the Empire born outside of England.

On the rule itself Mr. Crump added: "The written law may allow athletes not born in England to compete for us but the unwritten law is to give English born competitors first claim."

We appreciate Jack Crump's view because it would be wrong to discourage English-born athletes but we cannot see the purpose of the rule if it is to be ignored. Why not get it scrapped?

And we cannot see how the A.A.A. justifies picking Bailey for England in the past if he is not eligible in the Empire Games. Bailey, of course, cannot have it both ways, either. But to this observer, who has been among those thrilled at some of Mac's record-breaking performances it seems a pity if an athlete who has put hundreds of pounds on athletic "gates" in the past four years is left out of the Games.

Says Mac: "I would be happy to run for Trinidad if they were sending a team. I'm willing to work my passage." \textit{(Daily Express, August 24 1949)}
The position expressed by Jack Crump in the above report was basically restated by the AAA’s selection committee around three weeks later at its meeting held on September 15th 1949. The text of that decision read:

After lengthy and serious discussion on the question of the eligibility of certain athletes to represent England, the Committee agreed that, whilst not of necessity restricting representation to athletes born in England, the selectors would act on the principle that any athlete born in a constituent part of the British Empire, should not be selected to represent England in the Empires Games. (AAA, September 15 1949, p. 3)

This matter was broached publicly by Bailey as a guest on a London radio programme in which he again expressed his willingness to represent Trinidad, and even “urged the formation of a West Indies Athletic Federation in order to ‘save embarrassment to West Indian athletes,’ on occasions where both Great Britain and the Colonies participate in major athletic meetings” (Trinidad Guardian, August 30 1949). In a subsequent report in November 1949, Bailey not only restated his willingness to represent Trinidad but to pay his own passage to the Games if Trinidad was not sending a team. In this regard, a Reuter’s report in the Trinidad Guardian read:

McDonald Bailey, the Trinidadian sprinter said tonight that he would be prepared to go to New Zealand for the Empire Games at Auckland next February if his country nominated him. He would like to know that Trinidad had done this.

“I am quite willing to bear the expenses of the passage but I want to know I can go as quickly as possible because of my business plans,” he said.

Bailey had written to the Trinidad Association some months ago about the Empire Games, but then learnt that Trinidad was not sending a team. Should Trinidad officially nominate Bailey, he would be willing to compete. (Trinidad Guardian, November 16 1949)
As a result of the lack of funds to send a team to the Games, the Trinidad AAA eventually nominated Bailey as a “one man team” to the games, but this was only in response to a suggestion of the British Empire Games organizing committee in New Zealand who had offered to sponsor Bailey’s participation in the games (Port of Spain Gazette, November 4; Trinidad Guardian, November 17, 1949). This decision of the Trinidad AAA was also reported in both the Daily Express of November 22 1949 and The Times of November 23 1949. The latter report read: “A Reuter message from Auckland states that Trinidad has agreed to nominate E. McDonald Bailey as the only representative for the Empire Games.”

In spite of all this effort, however, Bailey never went to the Empire Games in New Zealand, the reasons for which still remain unknown to this researcher and it seems, to Bailey himself. For instance, in the latter respect, when Bailey was interviewed for this study, he expressed ignorance of the whole matter: “I don’t know anything about it. In any case I didn’t take part.” (Interview with author, September 19 2003). The only athletic meeting in which he remembered taking part in New Zealand and, as a member of the British team was the 1950 Christchurch Centennial Games. No newspaper or any other report was found explaining the reasons for Bailey’s non-appearance at the Games in which he had clearly expressed a strong interest in competing for his home country, and which was to be made possible through the sponsorship of the organizing committee of the Games in New Zealand. Bailey’s apparent poor memory as well as that of those interviewed in Britain and Trinidad concerning the controversy over his selection for Britain can

---

59 Another local newspaper also reported that the Empire Games Organizing Committee had made similar overtures to the three Jamaican Olympians, Arthur Wint, Les Laing and Herb McKenley, since Jamaica was also not sending a team to the games (Port of Spain Gazette, November 4 1949).
again serve to highlight the problem of recall in doing social research in
general and historical research in particular.

Having established the sporting and non-sporting context of
Bailey’s representation and non-representation of Britain, we now
examine the theoretical significance of the decisions and processes related
thereto.

5.8 Theoretical Significance

The theoretical questions or issues raised by Bailey’s
representation of Britain that are treated here relate to: (i) the role of sport
in the process of identity formation and the “invention of traditions”
related thereto; (ii) the use of sport and Bailey as part of a “fantasy shield”
of British power and greatness in the post-war period; (iii) the nature of
imperialism as consistent with both intentionality and non-intentionality;
(iv) the nature of hegemony as consistent with consent, resistance and
domination; (v) the reciprocal and asymmetrical nature of dominant-
subordinate relations and (vi) the multiple/singular, inclusive/exclusive
nature of identity formation.

In examining the theoretical significance of the representation
issues that arose over Bailey’s participation in both the 1948 Olympic
Games and the 1950 Empire Games, particular attention has to be paid to
the process as it unfolded and was played out among several major actors:
the media (this is examined in more detail in Chapter 6), the British and
Trinidad athletic establishments, the Trinidad public and Bailey himself.
We can safely say that these constituted a particular figuration in which or
through which the process and dynamic of the Bailey representation
question unfolded and was eventually resolved.
As we noted in Chapter 4, in the aftermath of two successive world wars in the first half of the 20th century, British people and their leaders were confronted with a tremendous task of reconstruction, restoration and renewal of their society linked intimately to concerns over their lost or dented pride, prestige and power in the figuration of international relations. It was in this context that sport in general assumed significant practical and symbolic value, and where there were also setbacks and problems of restoration and renewal. In the latter regard, in Chapter 1, we had noted that the fourth broad phase in the unfolding process of globalization, from the 1920s to the 1960s, and in which the period of this study is situated (1944-1954) was marked by a gradual decline of the British in sport competition (see Chapter 1). Relatedly, we had also noted in Chapter 4 that in two of their major sports, football and cricket, the British experienced shattering defeats to the USA, Hungary and the West Indies, respectively in the immediate post-war period. These were not just sporting minions but one a colonial possession and the other a former colony, which could easily have been seen as adding insult to the injuries of war. After the loss to the West Indies on the 1948 tour for instance, the Daily Express, in an article entitled “Inglorious End to MCC Tour” wrote: “One thing is certain: English prestige has fallen to the level of the Caribbean and the boys in the bleachers, who do not lack exuberance or eloquence when on top, announce publicly that they now regard the West Indies as the main challengers to the Australians” (Daily Express, April 2 1948).

But, in particular relation to the sport of track and field, which is the subject of this study, it was shown that in the period 1946-1954, the ruling British AAA undertook several related developmental initiatives in administration, coaching, and infrastructural provision with a view not only to making the sport “a real live force again” but to enhance its international competitiveness and status in the discipline. In this respect,
the major or primary motives of the AAA were clear and, in light of this, it can be argued that the emergence, general acceptance and popularity of Bailey after the war was associated with the plans of the British athletic establishment to revitalize the sport of track and field in Britain and in the process help rebuild a weakened British pride, prestige and power on the athletic field, as well as off it. Bailey did not produce these plans but they would have helped to produce him as a top international athlete by providing the opportunities to compete within Britain and without. In addition, apart from the developmental initiatives of the British athletic establishment, another important post-war factor that facilitated Bailey’s emergence and popular appeal was the retirement of British sprint champion Cyril B. Holmes soon after the war (Daily Mirror, September 3 1945). Holmes’ retirement had created a void in British sprinting and it is this void that Bailey more than aptly helped to fill. While the restoration of British pride and prestige was the expectation that surrounded all its athletes, it can still be said that Bailey fitted easily into their plans since he was the leading sprinter and athlete of his generation in Britain and Europe, who, from various accounts, had captured the imagination because of his sheer ability and achievements (Polytechnic Harriers, 1983; Athletics Weekly, January 3 1953, p. 7; May 1, 8 1954; Wattman, 1968, pp. 32-35; Electronic Telegraph, December 11 2000; Lagerstrom, 2000; Linley 2000). And, this is why his selection for Britain generally, and in the Olympics in particular, was not just welcomed but relished by officials and the media alike since he resonated with their collective needs, hopes and development objectives at the time. Regardless of his colonial and ethnic origin, what mattered was that he was British champion, and one of the great British medal hopes, not Trinidadian, not West Indian although his social origin was generally recognized. This can be highlighted in the

60 In 1953, his final year as an amateur athlete, Bailey authored the book, If It’s Speed You’re After, published by Stanley Paul. It was part biography and part training manual. Bailey also appeared in the Guinness Book of Records for the 14 athletic sprint titles won
headline of the *Daily Mirror*, which simply read “Bailey for us” following his decision to represent Britain in 1948, and the statement in the *Daily Herald* that “Mac is a five star addition to our list of hopes.” While the extent of Bailey’s achievements at both Olympic games\(^6\) did not live up to general expectations, this does not take away from the fact that he was still highly prized and seen as a great asset, real and symbolic, to the task of reconstruction and renewal in the sport of athletics in particular and society as a whole.

Relatedly, as contended above, but in relation to the British public at large, one contends further that the huge support for sport in post-war Britain as evidenced by the large crowd attendances and the substantial interest shown in Bailey and other athletes was not motivated solely by some apolitical “quest for excitement,” their traditional interest in sport and the celebration of freedom. In addition, it was also motivated by a quest to restore British pride, prestige and power in a period when the peace was still shaky, wounds were still fresh and the task of healing and reconstructing still incipient and uncertain. As Hobsbawm noted, it is in such periods of dislocation and instability that “invented traditions”, whether old or new, can serve critical functions be it of stability, cohesion or renewal for a nation, as surely obtained in post-war Britain. In this regard for instance, Baker suggests that sport did not only contribute to the process of recovery after the war but was one of the areas of social life where “an appearance of normalcy” was realized more “rapidly.” He wrote thus:

\[^6\] Although neither Bailey nor McCorquodale, the other British representative, won any medals in the 100 yards final at the 1948 Olympics, it was noted that it was the first time that the British had made an Olympic final since 1928 and the first time ever that they had two persons in the final (AAA, 1948, p. 3). In the 1952 Helsinki Olympics, Bailey won only a bronze medal in the 100 metres after being considered one of the favourites for gold.
In the immediate aftermath of the war there was an understandable and generally shared desire to return to normal, certainly as far as normalcy was expressed in the way individuals lived on a day to day basis. Of relevance to such desires was the post-war recovery of the sports world which, capped by the successful staging of the Olympic Games in London in 1948, was achieved more rapidly, an appearance of normalcy was more quickly re-established, than was the case in many other aspects of British life.” (Baker, 1995, p. 100)

It must be noted, however, that since the role of sport in the construction of the British nation and Empire was established much earlier, its use in the post-war period did not form part of any new “invented tradition” in the process of identity formation. Rather, one can easily say that it was merely a continuation of that tradition in a period marked by significant changes and transformations where the value of sport may have assumed even more relevance than ever before. In such a situation therefore, sport was being used by some individuals and organizations within British society as a means of not so much forming, but reforming/repairing and sustaining a particular image of themselves as a world power, although this image may have been at variance with the reality of their gradual repositioning in international affairs or the process of changing power balances in the post-war world. In directing attention to this “reality-incongruent” image, Marwick had noted earlier in Chapter 4:

How far, and at what point, a majority of the British people had digested the fact that Britain was no longer a major world power is difficult to determine: probably not till the 1960s, though, objectively, Suez is the watershed.62 In the imagery of newsreel, press, radio, and television, Britain continued to be presented, along with France, as a ‘big’ country; the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, and Denmark, though already beginning to

62 The Suez watershed refers to Britain’s failed attempt to remove the Egyptian President, Colonel Nasser, together with the Americans and the Israelis, as a result of the decision to nationalize the Suez Canal, in what became known as the Suez Crisis of 1956 (Marwick, 1982, p. 105),
demonstrate considerable economic power, were ‘small’ countries. Undoubtedly a pervasive sentiment was ‘we won the war.’ (Marwick, 1982, p. 106)

Undeniably, sport formed part of this “imagery” and, as its leading and fastest sprinter ever up to that time, it is suggested that Bailey played a crucial symbolic function in helping the British to sustain what Elias also called the “fantasy shield” or “fantasy image” of their past greatness which, in the immediate aftermath of war, had assumed an incipient character. In post-war Britain thus, it is suggested that generally, the actions of those involved in the sport of track and field (officials, media, sport public) were informed by a complex of motives of a traditional and instrumental nature which relate to the plans to develop the sport, their international image and standing both in sport and outside of it, the quest for excitement and recreation after the ravages of war, together with the historical British interest in or love for sport.

To the extent therefore that the emergence and acceptance of Bailey as an athlete to represent Britain was linked to the development of an incipient fantasy shield of its past stature as a world power, it is contended that he fitted into British imperialist interests or the desire to maintain its image as a dominant imperial power following the war. While some within the British athletic establishment tended to be more diplomatic and guarded than the reporters in the British newspapers examined, it is sufficiently clear that they consciously and deliberately wanted to select Bailey for the 1948 Olympics for reasons noted earlier and in spite of the reported opposition of some. However, from the prevarications of British athletic officialdom and Bailey himself together with the decision of the Trinidad Olympic Committee to permit him to run for Britain, it is abundantly clear that Bailey’s representation of Britain at the 1948 Olympic Games was in no way a case of imperialist coercion or even persuasion although both the media and the British athletic
establishment surely had their eyes on him since 1946 as a possibility to represent Britain at the Olympics. On the contrary, if Bailey’s charge of “colour bar” is indeed true, the reverse might be the case, for this charge could have placed inordinate pressure on the British selectors to compromise further on his ultimate selection in order not to create the perception that “colour bar” was really at work. The British interest in Bailey nevertheless, as previously suggested, was informed by both traditional and instrumental considerations, an important component of which was the restoration of its international image, if only symbolically, as a world power, as well as its international standing in athletics and sport in general. It is argued further that even if the former objective was not intentional, the unintended effect of Bailey’s presence and achievements may have still been welcomed by members of the British athletic establishment, the media, its people and leaders concerned about Britain’s place and image in the new post-war world. Relatedly, this reflects the limitations of restricting the definition of imperialism or imperialist interests solely to the intentional actions of human actors and not also including the unintentional effects of those actions.

In the final resolution of the matter over Bailey’s selection for Britain at the London Olympics, it was revealed that Bailey was given the “choice” as to which country he wanted to represent and “freely consented” to represent Britain instead of Trinidad. Indeed, while this may contain some element of truth, it does not take away from its imperialist significance or value since hegemony theory suggests that “consent” on the part of human agents can also serve the interests of the dominant which, in this case, centred around Britain’s international standing in track and field, its image as a world power and the internal process of reconstruction with which it was confronted in the aftermath of war. The other important caveat, however, is that Bailey’s apparent exercise of choice was also set within the parameters and constraints set
by the British Olympic authorities (viz., if he chose to represent Britain, he
would only have been able to do so in one event and that was the 100m),
which reflected the asymmetrical nature of the relations of power in which
he was embedded and athletes in general. In addition, the fact that Bailey
only learnt of the decision of the BAAB after it had been taken and was
not even consulted, further reveals the asymmetrical nature of those
relations. As a consequence, Bailey’s exercise of choice as to which
country to represent can be better seen as an expression of relative
autonomy rather than autonomy or “free will” since it was based on terms
or parameters set by the British athletic authorities.

However, while Bailey’s actions served British imperialist or
hegemonic interests, his athletic achievements and his representation of
Britain generally, can also be read as an expression of the multi-directional
nature of the relations between dominant and subordinate groups, whether
constituted as classes or nations, to which both hegemony and figurational
theory (see Chapter 1) direct proper attention. There are two observations
in this regard. Firstly, in McDonald Bailey, here we had a colonial
“subject” who, by dint of his talent, was able to make a significant
contribution to the post-war development, popularity and renewal of
athletics of an imperial power and also aid symbolically in its general
process of recovery and reconstruction. In this respect, one can say that
one of Bailey’s major legacies or lasting effects on British athletics was
the consistent setting of new standards of excellence through establishing
new British and European sprint records and becoming the first man ever
to win 14 sprint titles at the annual championships of the British AAA.
Highlighting Bailey’s impact on post-war British athletics, journalist
David Miller noted as recently as 2000 that Bailey was “… to become a
byword in Britain’s sporting culture. Before the Bannister-Chataway-
Brasher-Pirie era, he was, with Sydney Wooderson, the face of British
athletics” (Daily Telegraph, December 11 2000). Similarly, Sheridan
(2000: 56) also noted recently that “‘Mac’ Bailey was one of the most popular and admired sportsmen in GBR during the post-World War Two years. A personality who was a household name.” And, in a History of British Athletics, British athletic historian, Mel Watman also noted:

Bailey … during the war years, established himself as one of the greatest crowd pleasers in British athletics history. Between 1946 and 1953 no important meeting was complete without the sight of this tall, slim Polytechnic Harrier in full flight. If any sprinter personified ‘poetry in motion’ it was McDonald Bailey. His high level-consistency over a long period was astonishing; more often than not running against mediocre opposition on sluggish tracks and in unfavourable weather conditions he turned in dozens of clockings in the range of 9.6-9.8 for 100 yards and 21.1-21.5 for 220. In ‘Mac’ Bailey Britain had the good fortune to possess one of the world’s most distinguished sprinters of that era … (Watman, 1968, p. 32)

Watman also referred to Bailey along with Roger Bannister and Arthur Wint as “ ‘the Holy Trinity’ of post-war British athletics” (cited in Polley, 1998, 146). The impact of McDonald Bailey on British athletics as well as that of Jamaican Arthur Wint was also captured in the documented history of their former club, Polytechnic Harriers. Following the signing of both athletes to the club in 1945 after the war, it was noted that “… so began a period in both British and Poly athletics which was to rekindle and fire the imagination and enthusiasm of devotees and general public alike. Not only were these fine athletes Olympic medallists, they were equally gentlemen and showmen and a shop-window for our sport; they really brought the crowds back to athletics” (Polytechnic, 1983, p. 13). In particular relation to Bailey, it was noted further that “Mac opted to compete for Great Britain internationally and was a major source of points for his adopted country for eight years, also pausing to collect a record 14 individual AAA titles not to mention assisting the Club to a national relay title” (ibid.). Secondly, Bailey’s general selection for Britain over the period 1945-1953, though shifting and contradictory, could also be seen as
a symbolic and practical blow against the workings of the colour bar at the
time and an expression of the inclusive, democratic tendencies within a
society where colour prejudice and discrimination were widespread. This
suggestion, however, may have to be tempered with the alternate view that
some of his experiences can also serve to symbolize the workings of that
very same “colour bar.” These relate to the suggestion or rather suspicion
that “colour bar” may have informed the manner of his selection for the
1948 Olympics and the apparent delay in accepting that he had broken
Eric Liddell’s 100 metre record. While neither suspicion nor speculation
may constitute fact they may create perceptions that assume fact like
proportions sooner or later. However, although the available evidence at
my disposal does not allow either a categorical acceptance or rejection of
this perception, as far as the 1948 Olympics is concerned, I am of the
view that it was largely doubts over Bailey’s fitness and not his “colour”
that informed the last minute decision by British officials over his
selection to the British team. In addition, when we consider that save for
the 1948 Olympics, the 1950 Empire Games and the European
Championships Bailey was an automatic selection on all AAA, British
national teams and those of his club Polytechnic Harriers between 1945-
1953, including the 1952 Olympics, these incontrovertible facts suggest
that “colour bar” did little to impede his selection, emergence and exploits
as an athlete. Additionally, in 1947, he was awarded the Harvey
Memorial Gold Cup by the British AAA for the best performance at their
annual championships (The Times, October 11 1947), while on five
occasions between 1946 and 1952 he was chosen as the athlete of the year
by his club Polytechnic Harriers and awarded their prestigious Studd
Trophy (Polytechnic, 1983, p. 31). The significance of Bailey’s
representation of Britain therefore, however he may have angered local
nationalist sentiments in Trinidad or Britain, cannot and should not be
reduced to the narrowness and uni-dimensionality of any imperialist
analysis, for “It was never a one-way traffic” (see Chapter 1).
We have tried to explain thus far the possible significance of Bailey’s emergence and acceptance as an athlete among the British, but what possible significance did it hold for Bailey himself as a human agent given his own particular interests, motives and colonial origins? What did representing Britain mean to Bailey? Bailey himself helps to provide the answer in this regard. For instance, writing in his then weekly column with the *Daily Express* in 1952, Bailey expressed the delight and “honour” he felt when he was first selected to represent Britain in May 1945, following the end of war: “Naturally I was thrilled and delighted to have the honour of being chosen to run for this country and to have the chance of wearing my first international colours.” (*Daily Express*, May 17 1952). Bailey’s reaction to represent Britain in 1945, for the first time, was also shared by some in Trinidad. In this regard for instance, the *Port of Spain Gazette* reported:

Cabled advice received yesterday by Mr. McDonald Bailey reveals that Trinidad has had the signal honour conferred on it of having McDonald Bailey selected to represent Great Britain in an athletic meeting to be held in Paris..... Travelling to Scotland to represent the AAA he more than held his own and had the further honour of dining with the Lord and Lady Provost … (*Port of Spain Gazette*, August 13 1945)

And, in relation to representing Britain at the 1948 Olympic Games, Bailey had also reportedly stated some three years later that he was “honoured and delighted” at the prospect although he did state that “I want to make it quite clear that I am still prepared to run for my country …” In an interview with one of my Trinidadian respondents, Bailey’s selection for Britain at the Olympics was also described as an “honour”.

---

63 Reference to Bailey’s father after whom he was named.
64 In an interview with one of my Trinidadian respondents, Bailey’s selection for Britain at the Olympics was also described as an “honour”.
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attributed to several related factors: (i) its history and aura as a great world power, despite the setbacks of war; (ii) its measure as a yardstick of his own progress (as a person and athlete) and (iii) his ascension as a black colonial subject from the colony to the metropole through the public adulation and visibility granted by the British media as a result of his athletic exploits. But, more fundamentally, as it relates to our guiding theoretical framework relating to the indissoluble link between individual and collective identity, this feeling of being honoured on the part of Bailey and some within the colony can be seen as an expression of how the image of a collectivity (in this case Britain) can shape not just the self-image of the individual but that of another collectivity (in this case the colony of Trinidad), in the context of a metropole-colony figuration in which the former was ascendant and valorised more than the latter which was dependent and generally viewed as backward. In other words, to understand how representing Britain was seen as a mark of honour to Bailey and some in Trinidad, we have to understand it not just in terms of a simple imperial framework of dominant and subordinate but in terms of the differential valorisation and representation of both: Britain was advanced and superior, while Trinidad, the colony was backward, dependent and inferior. The irony of this, however, is that the exploits of Bailey, the symbolic subordinate, also served the interests of the dominant, since his stature and achievements as an athlete could also have fed back into the international standing and image of the British both in athletics and generally. In any event this is the argument offered here in any case when we examined the bases of the generally positive reaction to him within Britain. In trying to understand the meaning(s) and motives of Bailey’s actions, however, it is suggested that they were driven by several factors of a traditional, affective and instrumental nature. These relate to the love and dedication to his sport, his personal ambition to run in the Olympics, fulfil a cherished childhood dream and achieve the personal honour, pride and prestige through representing a country which, at the
time, was among the most powerful in the world in spite of the negative fallout of world war. In examining the factors that motivated Bailey to go to the UK in 1944 through the medium of the RAF, we found that his athletic development and dreams were prominent factors. The opportunity to represent Britain provided just that opportunity for him to realize his ambition.

However, while the idea of Bailey representing Britain at the Olympics was welcomed as offering a potential symbolic boost to the pride, prestige and image of the British people and particularly those who ran the sport of track and field, the reverse appeared to have been the case among some in his home country, Trinidad. While reaction to Bailey representing Britain at the Olympics was mixed, the public perception that he was either a "traitor" or "disloyal" does suggest that his actions impacted negatively on nationalist island sentiments, in spite of their incipient and very fragmented nature during the period of Bailey’s athletic career between 1946 and 1953 in Europe. While local nationalist sentiments were given a spurt by the labour revolts of the 1930s throughout the West Indies as shown in Chapter 4, it was only in the mid to late 1950s, after Bailey’s retirement in 1954, that a nationalist movement of sorts was to assume greater momentum and a more organized political character through the attainment of self-government in 1956, in the case of Trinidad, and the eventual development of “party politics” on the island.

It is interesting to note however, that while on the one hand, Bailey’s action was seen to smack of disloyalty to Trinidad nationalist sentiments, on the other hand, within the same society, there existed a significant element of loyalty towards Britain and its monarchy. This was illustrated in the various contributions to the war effort, and the outpouring of emotion following the deaths of King George VI and Queen Mary in
the early 1950s and the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth in 1953 (see Chapter 4). One local newspaper editorial had even suggested that in spite of the problems locals may have had with “British colonial policy”, they still treasured “their British heritage.” While one can see this double loyalty as contradictory, it can also be seen as consistent with the multiple identities inherent in metropole-colony relations, with the peculiar context determining which identity assumes or ought to assume prominence or salience over the other. In the context of sport, particularly international sporting competition which serves to define more sharply the boundaries of collective and individual identities, it was local island identity, while in the context of international war and the rituals of royal death, pomp, and pageant, under colonial rule, it was the British identity or loyalty that held sway. Borrowing from Elias and Bourdieu thus, it can be said that in colonial Trinidad, the social habitus of the individual was a multi-layered one composed of several overlapping identities that included those of the island, its British heritage, the West Indies and their particular social grouping (viz., ethnic, class). These layers of identity formed the crux of “a flexible lattice work” of the person’s and nation’s habitus, a flexibility which was evident in the varied privileging of one over the other depending on the prevailing context and the nature of the actor’s perceived interests, expectations and motives. To use an example drawn from another sport, in the context of West Indies cricket, for instance, the identity that has tended to be privileged or assume salience historically, has been that sense of West Indianness although this has always existed in tension and conflict with the various island nationalisms that constitute the West Indies. CLR James (1963) had also directed attention to the multiple and problematic nature of identity formation in the West Indies. While recognizing the peculiarities of language and culture that characterized it, James had also noted that one of the fundamental and inescapable features of the West Indian condition was its European and more so British heritage of which sport, and cricket in particular, together with the
"gentleman" values it espoused, was its most visible and celebrated expression. James, however, outside of passing reference to Bailey as "the famous Olympic sprinter" in a passage extolling the batting ability of Bailey’s father (ibid., p. 20), never wrote on athletics.

Consequently, in light of the above, while some have seen Bailey’s decision to represent Britain in 1948 as a negation of his Trinidad identity, in spite of his self-proclaimed nationalist orientation, it can also be seen as an expression of the multiple identities bequeathed in part by colonialism and the tensions or conflicts which they can generate (see Figure 3). In addition, it is also suggested that Bailey’s revisionism with respect to his 1948 decision to run for Britain at the Olympics represents an attempt to erase the persistent anti-nationalist label and image of him in order to bring it in line with this nationalist orientation, which became a little more pronounced in Trinidad since political independence from Britain in 1962.
Similarly, however, the British athletic authorities also displayed a multiple behavioural tendency, for while Bailey was eligible \textit{de jure} to represent Britain at the Olympics by dint of being a British citizen/subject, he was not deemed to be eligible to do so at the 1950 Empire Games, since the convention restricted selection to "athletes born in England". In addition, Bailey was also a naturalized citizen who revealed in interview that he had even voted in the 1948 British national elections. In view of this, the selection policy and practices of the British athletic authorities in relation to Bailey can hardly be said to be consistent. For instance, for the Olympic Games and athletic competition generally, the stated established policy of the British athletic authorities was not to select colonial athletes for Britain whose territory also had athletic representation. Yet, they proceeded to select Bailey even though Trinidad
was known to be sending a team to the 1948 Olympics. In this case thus, they were prepared to show flexibility and discretion in the (non) enforcement of their stated selection policy towards colonial athletes. But, in relation to the Empire Games, the situation was reversed as they chose to adhere to the convention of not selecting non-English born athletes although Bailey and others qualified de jure for selection by their own admission (i.e., the British AAA). In this respect, and as noted previously, team manager Jack Crump had reportedly stated that: “The written law may allow athletes not born in England to compete for us but the unwritten law is to give English born competitors first claim” (*Daily Express*, August 24 1949). The reason(s) why the British athletic authorities ignored convention to include Bailey for the Olympic Games, then used convention to exclude him from the Empire Games is a contradiction that may never be answerable, but it is a contradiction nevertheless. In addition, it remains confusing because the British athletic authorities themselves never fully and clearly explained the *raison d'être* of their Empire Games selection policy. The closest we got to some sort of explanation was Jack Crump’s reported statement that to select non-English born athletes “... would be against the true spirit of the Games” (*Daily Express*, August 24 1949), which only raises further questions as to the meaning of either “spirit” or “true spirit.” While it is in the realm of conjecture, I wish to suggest that this inconsistency in selection policy might be partially explainable in terms of the differing nature and function of both the Olympic and Empire Games. The Olympic Games and the Empire Games represented two fundamentally different symbolic spaces, a concept which I use to refer to particular activities, practices and moments which assume value as a signifier or representation of particular values, ideas, desires, relationships, realities, meanings or subset of meanings which shape human behaviour in particular situations. As a symbolic space for instance, the Olympic Games was far more inclusionary and more universalistic in nature and outlook than the Empire
Games which was more exclusionary and parochial as it was restricted to
the members of the British Empire whose existence it served to celebrate,
reflect and help sustain. Additionally, in the aftermath of war, this Empire
needed badly to be reaffirmed as it entered a new era of challenge and
change. In this light, the selection of Bailey, a colonial, to represent
England in the Empire Games as opposed to Great Britain in the Olympic
games, might have been at variance with the symbolic political function of
these games, although it has been argued that Bailey’s selection for Britain
generally, was also linked to concerns over their imperial image and
national identity.

Based on this contradictory selection policy, I make several further
related contentions. Firstly, one contends that the British athletic
authorities seemed to have worked with a very convenient and shifting
notion of eligibility, citizenship and national identity, one which facilitated
representation of Britain in one context (viz., the Olympics) and one
which denied it in others (viz., the Empire Games). Secondly, one
contends that where it was facilitated, it showed the inclusive and flexible
nature of identity formation, and where it was denied it showed its
exclusive and restrictive nature. Thirdly, while sporting competition itself
tends to define or demarcate more sharply the boundaries of collective and
individual identities, the very selection policy of the British athletic
authorities with respect to the Olympic and the Empire Games did the
same and reflected in the process, the we-they habitus code that shaped the
process of identity formation in the construction of the British
imagiNation and invariably the construction of what was considered
colonial possessions. The European Championships also reflected and
reinforced this we-they habitus since “… it was limited to competitors of
European birth or those who have become formally naturalized” (The
Times, July 23 1946). The 1948 British Nationality Act therefore, which
reinforced the British citizenship status of all its colonial subjects (Peach
et al., 1988; British Nationality Act 1948), and can be seen as an act of inclusion to that extent, while helping to define national identity *de jure* did not determine it *de facto* since this was circumscribed by other practices, conventions and predispositions across a range of actors and situations, which the experience of Bailey serves to highlight.

The selection policy towards Bailey thus presents a curious problematic, which highlights the vagaries of the identity formation process. This is so for here we had a black West Indian of Trinidadian origin who was British enough to qualify to represent Britain at the Olympic Games, internationally and to vote in national elections, but was not British enough to do so at either the Empire Games or the European Championships, although he qualified for the former, and even though his athletic records qualified as British and European records. It is suggested that the shifting nature of eligibility, citizenship and national identity in British athletics can be further seen as an expression of the asymmetrical nature of relations of power not just between Bailey and the British athletic authorities but more fundamentally, between metropole and colony. It was the British athletic establishment who defined who was eligible or not eligible to represent Britain and the criterion for same, not Bailey or colonial athletes or even their British born counterparts. Arguably, the situation bears some similarity to the experience of Mozart in his failed efforts for more artistic independence and to be treated as a status equal in court society. In the structure or figuration of this society, however, it was the ascendant court aristocrats who determined the terms of social engagement or interaction which precluded any such possibility (see Chapter 2). While the British athletic authorities may have been more constrained than those aristocrats, like them, they still held the upper hand over athletes whether born or not born in England or Britain. Thus while Bailey surely had speed on the athletic track, he did not set the decision making pace off it or even on it for that matter.
It is important to note however, that this restrictive selection policy in relation to the Empire Games was not shared by all. In the case of Bailey for instance, *Daily Express* journalist Frank Butler while empathetic towards the view articulated earlier by Jack Crump had also pointed to the inconsistency in his selection for Britain and went even further to suggest that the rule be "scrapped". In addition, in the sport of boxing, this restrictive selection policy was also brought into question, and interestingly, it had to with another Trinidadian in the person of featherweight boxer Percy Lewis, who was also in the RAF. In a sport that was renowned for the practice of colour bar, referred to previously in Chapter 4, Lewis's selection as a reserve in preference for his English born counterpart whom he had beaten in the trials was seen to smack of discrimination linked to considerations of colour and birth. This criticism of Lewis's selection as a reserve and the possible reason that underpinned it was contained in a *London Evening News* report, reproduced in the *Port of Spain Gazette*, which read inter alia:

Although the ABA made no announcement in advance that our Empire Games team would be chosen from the winners of the trials at Luton, it was generally anticipated that this would be the case. The selectors, therefore, have laid themselves open to criticism by ignoring the claims of coloured Percy Lewis (RAF) who gained a points decision over Peter Brander.

Lewis is down as the reserve. The point could be made that Brander and Lewis, with a win each over the other in close bouts are roughly on the same mark and that it is better for us to send an Englishman than somebody who was born in Trinidad but this view may not find general acceptance. After all, if the winners were not necessarily to be picked, what was the point of holding trials? (cited in *Port of Spain Gazette*, December 18 1949)

Such internal British criticisms towards the restrictive selection policy for the British Empire games in both athletics and boxing are significant for they do not only reinforce the contested nature of identity formation but point further to the differences that existed among the established white
group with respect to certain exclusionary practices that characterized that process in post-war Britain. In addition, they also underline the normative conception of sport as an activity that has come to be associated with the meritocratic and egalitarian ideals of a democratically oriented society.

However, while it is plausible to argue that Bailey’s representation of Britain at the 1948 Olympics did little for the fledgling nationalist cause in Trinidad after the war, at the same time, and without fear of contradiction, it is contended that the sport of track and field was never really symbolically incorporated into this movement, to the extent that cricket was and even when this movement became more developed after Bailey’s retirement from the sport in 1954. The ideological primacy of cricket vis à vis athletics can be illustrated by the fact that the 1951 inaugural sportsman of the year from which Bailey was completely excluded was awarded to West Indian cricketer Gerry Gomez (Trinidad Guardian, January 13 1952), who was also the only sportsman to receive a Coronation award in 1953 out of the 390 awards that were presented (Trinidad Guardian, June 3 1953). It is suggested further that the possible reasons for the non or limited used of athletics as a symbol of nationalism and anti-imperialist resistance in the West Indies as a whole may have to do with two major related factors: (i) the position of the British in world athletics and (ii) the non-construction of athletics as a symbol of “Englishness” and of Empire à la cricket (McCree 2000, pp.14-15). In respect of the first factor, in track and field, unlike in cricket, football and rugby, the English were never an international force historically, except for that period in the 1980s when Sebastian Coe and Steve Ovett dominated middle distance running. And, in the 1940s, and 1950s, as for much of the 20th century generally, the dominant force in track events and more so the shorter events (i.e., 100m to 400m) and middle distance events (i.e., 800m) to a lesser extent, were the Americans and the
As a result of this, the many victories by Bailey together with the Jamaican Arthur Wint over British and European rivals, however convincing, would not have assumed as much symbolic value as a challenge to British imperial power and dominance as obtained in cricket, which is not to say that they did not assume any symbolic value at all in the West Indian imagination.

In cricket, the situation was totally different for certain reasons, which brings us to the second factor. Firstly, in terms of performance and world standing, the English during the late 19th century and the early 20th century were one of the leading teams internationally, if not the leading team. Secondly, while most sports were used by the British as part of their mission civilatrice and the process of identity formation through the games ethos, it was cricket more than any other game which came to symbolize this ethos the most. Linked perhaps to its elitist character and, as others have noted, it was cricket which became more associated with or symbolic of what was considered “Englishness” or the “English” and the Empire they constructed (Mangan, 1986; Hargreaves, 1986; James, 1963). This construction of cricket’s ideological function was shaped and reinforced further by England’s leading role in the game organizationally and on the field of play, although its position was to be severely shaken by defeats

---

65 The post-war period can be considered a golden era of Jamaican athletics. While medals and placing are limited as a measure of athletic development, at the 1948 Olympics, they won 3 medals which included gold in the 400 metres won by Arthur Wint, who also gained silver in the 800m and gold in the 4&400 metre relay (The Times, August 6 1948; Port of Spain Gazette, September 16, 1952). At the 1952 Helsinki Olympics, the tally increased to five medals, 3 silver (800m, 400m, 100m) and two gold (400m &4&400m). In addition, the Jamaicans set new Olympic records in both the 400m and the 4x400m, and occupied the first two places in the 400m. Arthur Wint won silver in the 800m (Port of Spain Gazette, July 23, 25 1952). In addition, Wint, like McDonald Bailey, represented the London club Polytechnic Harriers where he was the 400m and 800m champion. He won special awards from Poly. in 1948, 1949 and 1952, while Bailey won similar awards in 1946, 1950, 1951, and 1953 (Polytechnic Harriers, 1983, p. 51). Wint and Bailey were also awarded the Harvey Memorial Cup by the AAA in 1947 and 1951, respectively for performances at the annual national championships (ibid., p. 42), where they were regular winners in their respective events between 1946 and 1953. Wint, who graduated as a medical doctor from the University of London, was also awarded the MBE (ibid., p. 14).
after World War II (see Chapter 4). This notwithstanding, its general pre-eminence in cricket was more consistent with its status as an imperial power. In track and field, however, it faced a fundamental contradiction since its generally low international standing was inconsistent with its imperial status, which might also help explain further the symbolic value of Bailey after the war. In light of this, it is suggested here that the general non-construction of athletics as a symbol of Englishness and Empire may have undermined by extension, its use by the West Indian and Trinidadian nationalist movement and people as a space for the symbolic challenge to same.

The non-construction of athletics in the English imagiNation, however, as a symbol of Englishness and Empire compared to cricket, rugby and football, may also be related to the greater value placed on team sports as opposed to individual sports in the process of identity formation. This was so for, as Hargreaves (1986, Chapter 3) notes, team sports were more consistent with the values and virtues of the games ethos espoused by the British elite classes through the public schools which served their national as well as international interests. The argument here, however, may be more one of kind and context for we did see that in the aftermath of war, the individual sport of track and field and the staging of the 1948 Olympic Games in London particularly, assumed significant value as symbolic capital to the British in the process of recovery from war and the generation of pride, prestige, pleasure and power as it sought to repair and restore its international image on the sport field and off it.

5.9 Summary-Conclusion

In sport, as in other realms of the society, in the aftermath of war, the British people and their leaders were faced with a tremendous task of reconstruction, restoration and renewal. Given their history as a world
power, it is understandable that a major preoccupation was the restoration of their lost pride, prestige, power and standing in the world apart from equally pressing concerns over living standards. The sport of track and field was one such sport which was faced with a similar task as it confronted a range of developmental challenges that included finance, organization, infrastructure, coaching, competition, and their standing in the world of athletics. To deal with these challenges, the ruling body for the sport, the AAA, undertook several measures (e.g., special courses in coaching, scholarships to promising athletes) in the post-war period aided by both Government and non-governmental agencies.

It was in the context of this post-war rebirth in athletics and the society at large that Bailey emerged as one of Britain’s top athletes and a good prospect for the British at the 1948 Olympics. His participation in the 1948 Olympics, however, was to become embroiled in controversy. This controversy arose primarily due to doubts over his fitness and the prevarications of the British athletic authorities who first selected him provisionally, then announced a change of heart by suggesting that he run for Trinidad instead just days before the Games began. Since Bailey had burst on to the British athletic scene in 1946 by equalling Eric Liddell’s 23 year old 100 yards record and winning the sprint double at the AAA championships of the same year, eyes were on him as a possible prospect for Britain at the 1948 Olympics. Elements of the British press in particular openly championed Bailey not just as a British Olympic hopeful but as a medal hopeful as well. While some members of the British athletic establishment were more guarded on the issue, and some might have even opposed as reported in the media and suggested in the interviews with the British respondents, others expressed clear delight at the prospect in spite of the supposed practice or policy, which held that colonial athletes should represent their colony once that colony was sending a team to the Games. However, although Trinidad decided to
send a team to the Games after a period of uncertainty, the decision of the Trinidad Olympic Committee in January 1948 to allow Bailey to represent Britain facilitated their clear intention or desire to select Bailey, a decision warmly welcomed by Bailey in spite of his earlier publicly stated preference to represent Trinidad. Unfortunately, a serious injury to Bailey in the summer of 1947 resulted in serious doubts being cast on his fitness and availability to take part in the games. The author shares the view expressed by other commentators in the British and Trinidad press that it is this injury and not any issue of “colour bar” that caused the British athletic authorities to reconsider their selection of Bailey and suggest that he represent Trinidad instead. Bailey of course became incensed over the turn of events and was highly critical of what he perceived to be the undemocratic, non-consultative manner in which the decision was made. He even gained the general sympathy of the British press who also questioned the inconsistency of the British athletic authorities in their selection policy towards him. The matter was finally resolved by allowing Bailey to make his own selection, which he did by choosing Britain.

Bailey’s decision to represent Britain at the 1948 London Olympics, [as well as his representation of Britain generally] was gladly received by British sport journalists, athletic officials and presumably, sport fans. In this regard, there are several related points to note as they relate to the theoretical and methodological framework that is guiding this study (see Chapters 1 and 2). Firstly, it is suggested that British interest in Bailey, be it for the Olympics or generally, was not motivated only by their traditional interest in sport, and the quest for pleasure and excitement following the ravages of war. In addition, it openly assumed an instrumental character since he fitted into the need and efforts to restore British pride, prestige and international standing not only in track and field or sport but generally. Relatedly, it was further suggested that sport formed part of an “invented tradition” which, in the aftermath of war, was
being used not just to stabilize the society but to help the British sustain a "fantasy shield" or "fantasy image" of the past greatness of their Empire whose decline was ushered in by the war. Put differently, British interest in Bailey was characterized by a complex of motives or objectives of a traditional and instrumental character linked to recreation and social reconstruction and, although he would not have been the only [British] athlete to have formed part of these objectives, he surely formed an important part of the process due to his athletic stature. Secondly, although Bailey’s exploits as an athlete assumed relevance to the British imperial image or interests whether intentionally or unintentionally, it is argued here that the orthodox notion of imperialism is not particularly helpful in capturing the interactive dynamic of his impact and representation of Britain. In this regard, hegemony and figurational theory prove more illuminating, for Bailey was never forced, coerced or persuaded to represent Britain be it at the Olympics or anywhere else. And, as shown in the case of the 1948 Olympics, he willingly consented to do so albeit within the constraints set out by the British athletic authorities. Such consent, however, cannot detract from the fact that he still appeared relevant to British interests on and off the track, both practically and symbolically, in their process of reconstruction, restoration and renewal after the war. Put differently, Bailey’s consent was not only consistent with his own interests as a subordinate but also the interests of the dominant, in this case Britain for it is such consent that can also form the basis of hegemony. Thirdly, and relatedly, however, Bailey’s “consent” to run for Britain should not be seen as the expression of some romanticized notion of human agency since his decision was made within the parameters established by the British athletic authorities. As a consequence, because he was not free from constraints in consenting to represent Britain, his action or decision might best be seen as an expression of relative autonomy. Fourthly, Bailey’s athletic exploits between 1946 and 1953 were to set new standards of excellence in
sprinting in both Britain and Europe which appeared to have had a stirring and indelible impact on both the media and public imagination. In the context of the times, this can serve to show how the subordinate, whether constructed as coloured, colonial or both, had produced a very significant impact on the dominant, whether constructed as imperialist, white or both. In addition, it was also suggested that Bailey’s selection for Britain could also be seen as a blow to the “colour bar” and an expression of the inclusive democratic tendencies within the society at the time, although there is an alternate, albeit problematic perception that he may also have been the victim the same “colour bar.” The case of Bailey thus can serve to illustrate the two-way as well as asymmetrical character of dominant-subordinate relations of power to which both hegemony and figurational theory direct attention. While they recognize the asymmetrical nature of such relations, both theoretical orientations are sensitive to the existence of spaces or moments in which subordinate human actors can express agency and in so doing produce effects, helpful (as well as damaging) to themselves and the dominant. The sport of athletics offered Bailey one such space and one such moment.

The asymmetrical relations of power, however, in which Bailey was enmeshed were also in evidence in the shifting and inconsistent criterion of eligibility for national selection used by the British athletic authorities. In this regard, while Bailey was eligible to represent Britain at the Olympic Games and other international contests, he was not deemed to be eligible for either European Championships or the Empire Games because of adherence to the criterion of place of birth. For the Empire Games in particular, while Bailey qualified de jure to represent Britain due to the provisions of the British Nationality Act, it was argued that the convention or established practice was to select only “athletes born in England.” For the Olympic Games, however, while there was also a supposed policy of not selecting athletes once their colony of origin was
participating, it was conveniently bypassed since it suited the interests of the British athletic authorities then to do so. The shifting and inconsistent nature of the British criteria of eligibility for national athletic representation, which also came under criticism internally from British journalists, was seen as an expression of the inclusive and exclusive nature of the process of identity formation, and the workings of the we-they habitus in delineating the boundaries of individual and collective identity in the process of constructing both the British imaginaton and colonial in the context of metropole-colony relations. In addition, it was also suggested that the inconsistent selection policy may have had to do with the differing nature and functions of both Games as symbolic political spaces with one being more universal (i.e., Olympics) and the other more parochial (i.e., Empire Games).

However, while Bailey’s decision to represent Britain at the 1948 Olympics was generally welcomed in Britain, it was received with mixed reaction in Trinidad, where there were two basic responses: one supportive and the other oppositional. Those who opposed saw his decision as an act of disloyalty to and betrayal of his native land, in spite of his reported nationalist inclinations and representation of Trinidad at the 1946 Caribbean and Central American Games two years earlier. The opposition and disappointment was also expressed in Bailey’s exclusion from the inaugural 1951 local sportsman of the year award as well as the 1953 Coronation awards in Trinidad. Post-war Trinidad, however, was a conundrum of not so much confused but multiple identities born out of the nature and history of metropole-colony relations and its pattern of immigration and settlement. Two points are noted in this regard. Firstly, for Bailey, as well as for some in the colony, it was deemed an honour to represent Britain, which, notwithstanding the negative effects of war, could still have been considered a world power. While its Empire had surely started to crumble, it was previously noted that much of it still
remained intact in the post-war period together with its legacy as a mighty nation that once ruled the waves. It was contended that this image of Britain invariably shaped the image or identity of the individual (in this case Bailey) and others in the colony, to the extent that they could feel honoured by their association with it and in spite of the power imbalances that characterized those relations together with the other negative consequences of colonialism (e.g., slavery and dependence). Secondly, although nationalist feelings and some semblance of a nationalist movement existed in the colony of Trinidad, albeit incipient and fragmented, there also existed a significant level of loyalty to Britain and its monarchy. This was strikingly illustrated in the local financial contribution to the war effort, attempts by some to celebrate the 150th anniversary of British rule in 1947, together with the reaction to the deaths of King George VI in 1952, Queen Mary in 1953 and the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth, also in 1953. From an Eliasian perspective, in post-war or pre-independent Trinidad, it was suggested that the social habitus can be seen as a multi-layered one since it contained several major overlapping identities: Trinidadian, British, West Indian and those derived from one’s class, ethnic or racial origins, be it black, or Asian. In addition, for some, sport in general and certain international sport competitions in particular (e.g., the Olympics) represented a space where the island identity assumed or ought to have assumed prominence or priority over any loyalty to or identification with Britain. This was even more so because sport constitutes the major space, up to today, for the vivid and visible expression of such identities and making symbolic expressions of self-affirmation and empowerment. Bailey’s decision to represent Britain thus, while consistent with the multiple identities and allegiances that characterized colonial society, had gone against this prioritizing and the role assigned to sport in the process of identity formation.
This historical label or charge of disloyalty against Bailey has persisted and continues to anger him very much up to this day. In his own defence, Bailey within recent time has suggested that his decision was borne out of the peculiar circumstances of Trinidad’s participation in the 1948 Games characterized by the lack of communication with him and general uncertainty over their participation linked to problems of funding for the trip, together with the fact that the Trinidad athletic authorities “had no objection to my representing Britain.” While some of the Trinidad respondents interviewed, in defence of him, also suggested that resource problems were responsible for Bailey’s decision, their reasoning, like Bailey’s, suffer from several inaccuracies and was generally inconsistent with the actual chronology of events and Bailey’s own active role in the process in which he was allowed to choose the country which he wanted to represent. While it is not clear what was the motive of Bailey or the “real driving force” behind his recent comments, it is contended here that the discrepancy between what Bailey said and did in 1948 and Bailey’s recent recollection of those events constitutes a form of revisionism linked not to poor memory but to Bailey’s attempt to erase this lingering image of him as an anti-nationalist, in order to bring it in line with his own stated nationalist inclinations and so safeguard his athletic legacy.

Apart from this persistent anti-nationalist image of Bailey, and linked to it, another major long term effect of his 1948 decision has had to do with his (non) involvement in the development of athletics in Trinidad. In the latter regard, it was found that Bailey was at best marginalized and, at worst, excluded from the administration and development of track and field in his native country upon his return to Trinidad in the early 1960s. Whatever involvement there may have been seemed to have assumed a largely ceremonial or negligible character in the form of invitations to attend athletic meetings, ceremonies, or serve as track and field official at local athletic meetings.
In spite of the incipient and fragmented nature of Trinidadian nationalism in the immediate post-war period, therefore, Bailey’s decision to represent Britain was still sufficient to hurt nationalist sentiments on the island, although athletics was never used as a symbol of nationalism and anti-imperialism to the extent that cricket was in the construction of the Trinidadian and West Indian imagiNation. In this regard, it was suggested that the differential deployment of athletics and cricket in the early West Indian nationalist movement might be attributable to two major related factors: (1) the differential international position assumed by the English in athletics and cricket, which saw it being dominant in one and having a low standing in the other, and (2) the non-construction of athletics as a symbol of “Englishness” and of Empire à la cricket in the English and West Indian imagiNation. It appears that this function was assumed more by team as opposed to individual sports since they appeared more in tune with the values and virtues of the elite derived games ethos. This notwithstanding, in the immediate aftermath of war, the sport of track and field also assumed a certain measure of importance in helping the British to deal with the processes of reconstruction, restoration and renewal in the quest for the pride, prestige, pleasure and power of former times, whether reality-congruent or not.

It is in the context of several related processes in the economy, the polity, sport and civil society generally, that the emergence of Bailey as an athlete in post-war Britain and his representation of Britain assumes sociological significance in relation to the process of identity formation as it expressed itself in issues of imperialism, hegemony, national identity and race relations in both metropole and colony. In this process of identity formation, the media played a significant role to which we now turn in more detail.
CHAPTER 6

THE MEDIA AND IDENTITY FORMATION

The sports media are charged with the daily task of rendering nations to themselves by weighing and classifying citizens and their actions- Vincent et al., 2002, p. 133

6.1 Introduction

Theoretically, we have postulated that the media can play a critical role in the construction or definition of identity through the potential impact on discursive and relatedly, practical consciousness. In this regard, it was noted in Chapter 1 that “While the process of national habitus-character formation is framed, constructed and represented by and through discursive practices (such as the production and consumption of media sport discourse), these practices themselves are interwoven with activities occurring at the level of practical consciousness” (Maguire, 1999, p. 187). As stated previously, discursive practices or consciousness refer to “consciously created images, histories, symbols and invented traditions” that shape and give meaning to the idea of the nation as an “imagined community” while “practical consciousness” refers to the “unnoticed activities, deeply rooted memories, that are part of the group’s collectively shared embodied experiences and stocks of knowledge” (ibid.). Another defining feature of “practical consciousness” is its unplanned character. The principal objective of this chapter is to examine the validity of the above proposition based on a closer examination of newspaper reports concerning Bailey in both Britain and Trinidad and Tobago. More specifically, it seeks to examine the following related questions which were touched on in Chapter 5: (1) how did the media (re)present Bailey’s identity, singular or plural (e.g., Trinidadian, British, West Indian, coloured); (2) did one identity assume salience or dominance
over the other; (3) to what extent did the media reflect and reinforce the nationalist sentiment or the notion of nation; (4) can media reports on Bailey tell us the extent to which he was seen as an “outsider” in British society or had become accepted as part of it consistent with the dynamic nature of the established-outsider relationship? While some of these issues were broached in Chapter 5, here they are examined more closely through a content analysis of selected newspapers in Britain and Trinidad (see Chapter 2). In examining media portrayals of Bailey and the salience he assumed in post-war British sport and society, we pay particular attention to the language used in reporting, together with the number of headline articles and photos that appear in relation to him.

6.2 Newspaper Findings

In relation to the two British newspapers selected, the findings showed that McDonald Bailey was presented in terms of several identities based on the “descriptors” attached to his name and the context in which he was mentioned. The combined findings for both British newspapers revealed that the identity representations of Bailey which assumed the greater prominence in terms of being mentioned more frequently were in descending order, British (36%), Trinidadian (23.9%) and to some extent, coloured (16.1%), while those assuming less prominence were also in descending order, his Club affiliation (9%), West Indian (8.1%), “Other” (4%) and English (3.1%) (Table 4). The category of “Other” includes references to Bailey’s running for the RAF and the county of Middlesex in the annual inter-county championships. In addition, since the two terms British and English are not necessarily interchangeable although there has been a historical tendency for them to be used as such, it was decided to keep them separate in presenting the findings. But, if both categories are combined (i.e., British and English), it will increase, albeit marginally, the proportion of “British” representations of Bailey, for it will move from 36
per cent to 39.1 per cent. The findings for each newspaper separately revealed the same general pattern of identity portrayal although there were variations between them. For the *Daily Express*, the identities of Bailey which assumed prominence were British (31.8%), Trinidadian (25%) and coloured (15.9%), followed by West Indian (11.3%), Club (9.1%) and Other (5.3%) which assumed least prominence (Table 4). And for the *Daily Mirror*, the representations assuming greater salience were British (41.7%), Trinidadian (22%), and coloured (16.5%) in that order, while those assuming the converse were Club (8.8%), English (5.5%), West Indian (3.3%) and Other (2.2%), also in that order. As suggested in Chapter 5 therefore, the selected British newspapers help confirm that Bailey was represented in terms of multiple identities with some appearing as major or primary (i.e., British, Trinidadian) and others as minor or secondary (e.g., coloured, West Indian) with this being based here simply on the frequency with which they were mentioned in the newspaper reports. Of the three major representations, however, we note that it is the “British” which assumed salience over the others (Trinidadian and coloured), which was even more so in the *Daily Mirror* (41.7%) than in the *Daily Express* (31.8%). In addition, we note that the category of “coloured”, while previously identified as one of the three major representations of Bailey, really did not assume as much numerical prominence as might have been expected, since it accounted for around just 16 percent of all the representations in reports on Bailey. As a consequence, perhaps it maybe more appropriate to place it among the least prominent representations. In the British media representations of Bailey therefore, based on the newspapers selected, it appears that nationality, whether constructed as British or Trinidadian, seems to have overshadowed his racial as well as West Indian origin. The prominence of the former identities in the media reports was reinforced by the fact that while there were 132 counted headline reports surrounding Bailey in the period 1945-1953, in the *Daily Express* and the *Daily Mirror* taken
together, there were only 44 photos (Table 7), which represented 33.3 per cent of all headline reports in relation to Bailey. In addition, the lack of reference to his West Indian origin might be explicable in terms of the fact that the West Indies, at the time of Bailey, was then, as now, still not one united political unit. Formal talks towards this end, through the creation of a West Indian Federation, were only initiated in 1947 (Daily Express, September 12 1947). It was mainly this situation that was reported to have thwarted moves to send a West Indian athletic team to the 1952 Olympic Games (Trinidad Guardian, January 3, 6 1951; Port of Spain Gazette, September 4, 12, 1951).

Table 4
Selected British Newspaper Representations of Bailey, 1945-1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Daily Express</th>
<th>Daily Mirror</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td>Daily Express</td>
<td>11.3 (15)</td>
<td>3.3 (3)</td>
<td>18 (8.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>22.0 (20)</td>
<td>16.5 (15)</td>
<td>36 (16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidadian</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>31.8 (42)</td>
<td>41.7 (38)</td>
<td>80 (36.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9 (21)</td>
<td>16.5 (15)</td>
<td>36 (16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.8 (42)</td>
<td>41.7 (38)</td>
<td>80 (36.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 (2)</td>
<td>5.5 (5)</td>
<td>7 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 (7)</td>
<td>2.2 (2)</td>
<td>9 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1 (12)</td>
<td>8.8 (8)</td>
<td>20 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards the selected Trinidadian newspapers examined, their largely foreign derived reports also revealed that Bailey was presented in terms of several identities but there were significant differences. As regards the combined data for both newspapers (Table 5), these showed that the identities of Bailey which assumed greater prominence were in descending order, Trinidadian (51.2%), British (21.8%) and West Indian (15.5%) followed by Coloured (4.6%), Other (3.6%) and Club (3.2%).
### Table 5
Selected Trinidad Newspaper Representations of Bailey, 1945-1953

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Trinidad Guardian</th>
<th>Port of Spain Gazette</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td>17.6 (47)</td>
<td>13.2 (34)</td>
<td>81 (15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidadian</td>
<td>51.5 (137)</td>
<td>50.9 (131)</td>
<td>268 (51.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>4.5 (12)</td>
<td>4.6 (12)</td>
<td>24 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>21.1 (56)</td>
<td>22.5 (58)</td>
<td>114 (21.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>5.2 (14)</td>
<td>1.2 (3)</td>
<td>17 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.4 (19)</td>
<td>19 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When each Trinidad newspaper is examined separately, the same general patterns obtained as with the combined figures for both although there were some minor numerical variations in certain categories of representation (Table 5). As regards the *Trinidad Guardian* for instance, the two prominent representations of Bailey were as Trinidadian (51.5%) and British (21.1%) followed by West Indian (17.6%), Club affiliation (5.2%), and coloured (4.5%). The corresponding figures for the *Port of Spain Gazette* were Trinidadian (50.9%), British (22.5%), followed by West Indian (13.2%), Other (7.4%), coloured (4.6%) and Club affiliation (1.2%).

Three observations can be made with respect to these findings. Firstly, like the reports in the selected British newspapers, the two more prominent representations of Bailey in the reports in the Trinidad press were his British and Trinidadian connections but their proportions and ranking differed. In the latter respect for instance, it was his identification as Trinidadian which assumed leading prominence in the Trinidad newspapers for it represented around half of all such reports (51.2%) compared to the 23.9 per cent in the selected British newspapers combined- followed by his identification as British which accounted for 21.8 per cent, compared to 36 per cent in the British newspapers selected. However, in spite of this finding, in an editorial in the *Port of Spain*
Gazette before the 1952 Helsinki Olympic Games, while commending Bailey for keeping “... this island’s name on the athletic map of the world”, the author complained of “the passing reference” given to his “birthplace”. The editorial stated inter alia that “… everyone knows he is on the British team and Trinidad barely gets passing reference as his birthplace” (Port of Spain Gazette, June 26 1952). Secondly, we note that representations of Bailey as West Indian assumed relatively more prominence in selected Trinidad newspaper reports compared to their selected British counterparts: 15.5 per cent (Trinidad newspapers) vs. 8.1 percent (British newspapers). While one may argue that the numerical difference and the numbers themselves are negligible and of little import, it can also be argued that they still serve to show the slight nuances and variations that can occur in media representations of identity across different actors, media and contexts. Thirdly, and relatedly, we also note that in the selected Trinidad newspapers, the representation of Bailey as “coloured” (4.6%) received even less attention compared to the British finding (16.1%), where it received relatively more attention although the issue of race assumed as much centrality in both societies.

At first glance thus, British and Trinidad media representations of Bailey’s racial background or the lack thereof did not reflect the apparent centrality that “race” assumed in the social relations of the respective societies at the time although it is noted that there was still marginally greater attention shown to this in the British media. However, there is an important caveat in this respect for a plethora of superlatives or colourful expressions were often used by media reporters to describe Bailey which focused not only on his incredible speed but also his racial and, to a lesser extent, his geographical origin be it as West Indian or Trinidadian. Examples of these superlatives included the following: the “black bullet” (Daily Mirror, June 16 1947); “brown flash” (Daily Express, May 15 1951); “black jet” (Daily Express, November 23 1953; Daily Express,
December 17 1953); “the coloured wonder sprinter from Trinidad” (Daily Mirror, August 5 1947); “the coloured speed-king from Trinidad....” (Daily Express, July 16 1949); the “Trinidad Express” (Daily Mirror, June 16 1947); “the Trinidad flier” (Daily Express, July 8 1946, July 10 1948); “the Trinidad Tornado” (Daily Express, July 30 1953); “the Trinidad streak” (Daily Express, May 27 1947); “the West Indies flier” (Daily Express, July 28 1947), as well as “the flying West Indian” (Daily Express, July 3 1948). In addition, in other accounts, he was also referred to by the Greeks as “the Black Flash” and “Black Meteor” (Daily Express, August 30 1951); the French, as la flèche noire (the black arrow); “the panther of 7 continents” and the “black boomerang” (McCree, 2000, p. 12). And, in what might be perceived as a less elegant expression, to the author at least, both Bailey and the Jamaican Arthur Wint were also referred to as “Streaks of Ink” (Daily Express, July 20 1946), while in other reports we are told still of “… the black-velvet smoothness of Bailey’s running” (Daily Express, July 16 1949), “the flying black legs of Emmanuel McDonald Bailey… straining for the baton like a black jaguar on a leash” (Daily Express, September 11 1950) and “A flash of darkness called E. McDonald Bailey ..” (Express, July 12 1952). The relative lack or absence of counted reported references to Bailey’s colour or racial origin during his athletic career therefore, as shown by the numerical count of same in the tables presented, should not be construed to mean that this was not a source of attention if not fascination to many, combined with the interest in his speed.

The apparent fascination with Bailey’s athletic prowess and the prominence he assumed in the media and public imagination can also be gleaned from the number of headlines and photos relating to him. In this regard, it was found that between 1945 and 1953, there were 132 newspaper headlines of McDonald Bailey, of which 68 (51.5%) appeared in the Daily Express and 64 (48.5%) appeared in the Daily Mirror (Table
6). This contrasts with the number for fellow West Indian Arthur Wint (Jamaican Olympic gold medallist and British 400 and 800 metre champion), 40 and those for several of the top white male British athletes taken together, 117.66 And, in relation to photos, there were 44 of Bailey counted for the same period (Table 7), of which 17 (38.6%) appeared in the Daily Mirror and 27 (61.4%) in the Daily Express. This contrasts with the total number of photos for Arthur Wint, 7, and several top white male British athletes combined, 39.67 In addition, it should be noted that there were also four cartoon like sketches of Bailey appearing in the Express highlighting his sprinting ability (July 21 1947, July 13, 27 1953; December 16 1953), but these were not included in the count of photos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Daily Express</th>
<th>Daily Mirror</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68 (51.5)</td>
<td>64 (48.5)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total number of headline articles on Bailey in the Daily Express for 1952 exclude the 24 instalments of a column which he wrote in the Daily Express in that year. When this is done it is seen that the total number of headlines dealing with Bailey in both the Express and the Guardian are almost the same, though varying by year.

66These athletes included middle and long distance runners Sydney Wooderson, Gordon Pirie, Roger Bannister and Chris Chataway, whose individual headlines amounted to 28, 41,35 and 13, respectively.
67These athletes also included Sydney Wooderson, Gordon Pirie, Roger Bannister and Chris Chataway, whose photos amounted to 10, 15, 6, and 8, respectively.
It is suggested that this focus on and apparent fascination with Bailey’s speed and the “colourful” descriptors used to characterize it has to be seen in the broader context of the times and the dominant images and ideas surrounding black people as a whole. As was noted in Chapter 4, although present in Britain since the 16th century in varying numbers, blacks were still generally perceived as dark, curious, exotic “strangers” who were “closer to nature” than anyone else. Relatedly, black athleticism was seen as an expression of their natural, physical superiority, and consistent with this reasoning, speed and blackness therefore, went hand in hand. In light of the above, it is suggested here that these “colourful” descriptions of Bailey can be seen as reflecting the stereotypical association of blacks in general with natural speed which American sprinters before him, such as Jesse Owens had previously highlighted and symbolized. Interestingly, the Daily Express sport reporter, Frank Butler, as early as 1946, had even described Bailey as “this British Jesse Owens” after he had equalled Eric Liddell’s 23-year old British record for the 100 yards (Daily Express, August 6 1946), while in another later report he was described as “the black-jaguar” (Daily Express, September 11 1950). In addition, in 1953 Bailey agreed to run against a
mechanical hare used in grey-round racing at White City (*Trinidad Guardian*, February 11 1953; *Port of Spain Gazette* February 11 1953), reminiscent of Jesse Owens’ race against a horse. While Bailey reportedly saw this event as “an experiment and ... not a stunt... “ and “as training for athletics” (*Trinidad Guardian*, February 11, 1953) symbolically, it has the potential for feeding into the dominant images or ideas of the time that saw blacks as being closer to nature and having animal like speed.

Furthermore, not only did the language used to describe Bailey’s speed articulate with dominant racial stereotypes but the explanation of his speed and that of black athletes generally was clearly racist. This is revealed in a 1948 report carried by the *Daily Express* entitled, “Coloured Racers Lack Stamina” (March 23 1948) some four months before the start of the London Olympics. The subject of the report was the absence of black runners, then, in the longer running (e.g., marathon) and walking events compared to their predominance in the shorter events (e.g., 100,200,400,800 metres). The problematic was posed thus by *Daily Express* journalist John Macadam: “Why don’t all these coloured athletes run for more than half a mile? The MacBaileys, the Herb McKinleys, the Wints, to say nothing of the Jesse Owens, are all short-distance men- not one of them more than a half-miler. Whoever heard of a coloured obstacle-racer, or marathon runner, or ten-mile road-walker? Not me.” The resolution of the problematic was provided by, of all persons, a coloured sprinter and ex- British Olympian, Jack London68 who reportedly stated that: “We are closer to the primitive ... When you are moving through a jungle, every nerve is a-tingle with apprehension. Your life depends not on stamina but on speed of detection and of movement when

68London was born in British Guiana of a white Scottish mother and unnamed coloured father, but came to Britain when he was just “three months old.” Like his father he was a graduate of Kings College, London, but unlike his father he “he forsook the arts and the sciences for music.” (*Daily Express*, March 23 1948). As shown also in Chapter 4, for some, education had little ameliorative impact on racist ideas of the day and their internalization even by some coloureds themselves.
you have [sic] detected.” (ibid.). In what appears to be a non-verbatim quote, the article continued: “With a racial background like that, a coloured man, says Jack London, is a natural for quickness of movement over a short distance.” And, while not questioning London’s explanation, Macadam wrote further: “He is qualified to talk for having been England’s first string sprinter from 1925 till 1931, equaller of the 100 metres record at the Amsterdam Olympics with 10.3-5sec., and AAA sprint champion in 1929…” (ibid.). Echoing London’s comments and, as if reading from the same script, an American track coach is also quoted as saying around the same time that

The Negro excels in the events he does because he is closer to the primitive than the white man. It was not long ago that his ability to sprint and jump was a life-and-death matter to him in the jungle. (cited in Polley, 1998, p. 153)

It is suggested therefore, that the media focus on Bailey, the general language used to describe him together with the explanation of his speed dovetailed or articulated with not just a human and universal fascination for speed, but also a discourse on racial stereotyping and racism that was very much prevalent at the time in Europe and North America. In addition, the nature of media reporting of Bailey was also consistent with one of the main features of the established-outsider configuration which is the ability of powerful groups to create powerful identities/images of themselves based on particular notions of superiority/inferiority which are generated, deployed and sustained based on exclusionary strategies as well as through negative stigmatization of the subordinate (see Chapter 1). Although Bailey’s speed was a source of athletic superiority on the track, the racist stereotyping of his speed can be seen as an example of such “negative stigmatization” and the very role of the media in helping to generate and deploy such images although it is also argued here that there
were also inclusionary tendencies shown towards Bailey by members of the established white group.

The media discourse surrounding McDonald Bailey therefore, was reflective of broader discourses surrounding race, sport and nation in post-war Britain in which he not only emerged as an athlete but in which he became enveloped. His depiction as “British” and “as our own”, however, was not just a reflection of nationalist sentiment but more fundamentally, the important role sport assumed in the construction and representation of British national culture and identity in a period marked by significant change and challenges. This can be highlighted further through a closer examination of the media discourses that preceded and followed British performance at both the 1948 and 1952 Olympic games. As we noted in Chapter 1, representations of nation, national culture and national identity can be effected through a range of oral and literary strategies. In this regard, informed by Colls (1986) and Dodd (1986), Maguire (1993, p. 296) noted that “The representation of national culture is imagined through the telling and retelling of stories in history books, novels, plays, poems, the media and popular culture ... Central in this regard are the recounting of shared experiences, sorrows, triumphs and disasters. It is these that give meaning to the notion of nation and national identity.” In addition, “National culture and identity are also represented by an emphasis on origins, continuity, tradition and timelessness” (ibid., p. 296).

In the build up to the 1948 Games, amidst concerns over the lack of necessary resources and the general decline in British sport, the British outlook was generally pessimistic but the importance of the Games to Britain was still emphasized. In this regard, Frank Butler of the Daily Express reported:
THE A.A.A. yesterday warned us of the depressing outlook for Britain in next year’s Olympic Games at Wembley unless there is a national effort to secure tracks and equipment for training. ...Something must be done or else the gloomy procession of British defeats since the end of the war will reach the humiliating climax of the Olympics being staged in London without a single British victory. The national conscience must be shaken as to the importance of the 1948 Olympics to Britain [Emphasis added]. (Daily Express, May 23 1947)

While the staging of the Games in London so soon after the war, in spite of internal division over its staging, may have contributed to the process of reconstruction and renewal by contributing to a sense of stability and return to normalcy, the failure of the British to gain “a single ... victory” would not have helped the crisis in which British sport and people generally had found themselves during this period. The crisis is perhaps best summed up in the Daily Express headline, “Can Britain Win at Sports” (Daily Express, December 31 1948). One letter writer to the Daily Express Editor in 1949 also captured and bemoaned this crisis in British sport when he stated in a rather cynical tone, that:

I’m British-and almost ashamed of it. Sport? We haven’t the faintest clue to getting back to our old time superiority [Emphasis added]. We excel in nothing but Soccer and Rugby League, chiefly because in these sports we have paid highly trained athletes competing against amateurs from other countries. Let’s admit it and say we are inferior to the rest of the world.

Here is my forecast, Americans will win both singles events at Wimbledon. An American will win the open golf title. Another foreigner (probably an American again) will win the Diamond Sculls at Henley. America also will win the Walker and Ryder Cups.

A 1947 poll conducted by the Daily Express found that the country was closely split over the holding of the Games as 42 per cent wanted it postponed, 45 per cent supported it while 14 per cent did not know (Daily Express, February 24 1947). However, the size of the sample of this Express poll was not provided. The Games made a reported profit of £29,850 and while securing no gold medal, Doris Manley won silver in the women’s 100 metres won by the “flying Dutch”, Fanny Blankers-Koen (Daily Express, August 3 1948).
And New Zealand, even if they don’t win the Test rubber, certainly won’t lose it. It’s a darned good job other countries haven’t taken up darts or we’d lose at that, too. (*Daily Mirror*, June 28 1949).

At the 1952 Helsinki Games, although Britain managed one gold medal (in the equestrian event) (*Daily Mirror*, August 9 1952), this still fell below expectations which had projected around “five” (*Daily Express*, July 15 1952) and “seven gold medals for Britain” (*Daily Mirror*, June 25 1952). Consequently, as can be expected, disappointment and criticism followed, with one journalist referring to it as “the shambles at Helsinki” (*Daily Mirror*, August 9 1952). One headline in the *Daily Mirror* (July 28 1952) stated bluntly, “Save us from Another Flooperoo” although in defence, another read, more positively, “We have world’s best material, says coach” (*Daily Mirror*, August 2 1952). Furthermore, in the *Daily Mirror*, there was a mixed bag of letters from the public condemning as well as commending the performance of the British team (*Daily Mirror*, July 30, 31 1952; August 1, 2, 9 1952). Reflecting the general concern over British decline and standing in world sport, one writer recommended that “The State should finance and provide the necessary facilities to put Britain back on the map in the sporting world” (*Daily Mirror*, August 2 1952). Long before the games, however, in 1951, journalist John Macadam of the *Daily Express* had gone further to call for a “Minister of Sport” to serve as a sort of “Big Boss and Big Stick” to help arrest the decline in British sport. He wrote thus:

It seems a long, long time since we were young and foolish enough to make the suggestion that Britain’s prestige at home and abroad would be safer in the hands of a Minister of Sport than in the present maze of associations and boards and committees and what not. … but it becomes increasingly obvious that what British sport needs and needs badly, is a Big Boss and a Big Stick. …when British athletes move out into the world scheme, what do we get but a succession of dismal flops that do little more than convince foreigners that we are finished in sport as they already think we are finished politically. (*Daily Express*, September 25 1951)
Through the collective concern over the British decline in sport, and the harking back to and yearning for the glory days of “old time superiority”, the idea of the British nation and national identity were continuously being expressed or imagined in this period. Put differently, this media discourse surrounding British performance in sport can be seen as an expression of “the national conscience” which one journalist had virtually summoned to the fore. The emergence and focus on McDonald Bailey in post-war Britain therefore has to be situated in the context of this discourse surrounding nation of which he became a significant symbolic part. The construction of his identity as partly British was intimately woven into the (re)construction and imagination of the British nation after the war.

In examining the media representations of Bailey, however, another objective was to ascertain the extent to which they may have portrayed him as an “outsider” consistent with the dominant conception of coloured people at the time, or as an accepted part of British society. Here, we seek to probe the theoretical postulate that the status of or definition as “outsider” in relation to the established group can change given the dynamic of social interaction and that this transition can assume either an incipient/emergent or accommodating character (see Chapter 1). In this regard, there are two observations. Firstly, soon after the war, before Bailey was controversially selected for Britain at the 1948 Olympics, he was referred to as a “foreigner” (Daily Mirror, July 21 1947) consistent with his “outsider” status. Secondly, however, from the 1948 Olympic Games onward, one detected a more frequent tendency to use a more possessive and familiar language in referring to Bailey through expressions such as “our own coloured flyer” (Daily Mirror, July 21 1947), “our best sprinter” (Daily Mirror, June 6 1949), “our’ McDonald Bailey” (Daily Express, May 12 1951), “our own McDonald Bailey” (Daily Mirror, June 9 1951), and “our great hope” (Daily Express, July 24 1952). In some instances he was also referred to in terms of the first
person plural, “we” (Daily Express, July 4 1952; Daily Mirror, July 23 1952). Additionally, in their report of the 1950 AAA championships, The Sporting Life even classified Bailey as a “home athlete” (The Sporting Life, July 17 1950). These expressions and the contrasting and changing presentation of Bailey as “foreigner”, (Daily Express, July 1 1946) and “our own” can be seen in the following newspaper citations below. All expressions placed in bold are those of the author.

1947

(i) “Foreigners won fifteen of our A.A.A. championships at the White City, London, but eleven young Englishmen, battling bravely against the cream of a dozen other nations, gladdened our hearts … Star of the meeting was, of course, McDonald Bailey, who ran the 100 in 9.9s (twice) and 9.7s., and the furlong in 22.1s., 21.6s and 21.7s.” (Daily Mirror, July 21 1947)

1949

(i). “Two of the best sprinters at present in this country run at the White City Stadium today in the British Games. But the paying public will be irritated because they are not matched against each other.

Bill Dwyer-the American indoor sprint champion-will be running the sprints in the six-cornered international match, while our best sprinter, McDonald Bailey is in the invitation hundred…. (Daily Mirror, June 6 1949)

1951

(i) “… the clash of the day will be in the 220 yards between ‘our’ McDonald Bailey and Herb McKenley, from Jamaica. The two “Macs” are both capable of beating the British record of 21.1 secs. put up by Mac Bailey a year ago.” British Games (Daily Express, May 12 1951-Peter Wilson)

(ii) “… The city is Glasgow, where every year some fifty or sixty thousands fans scramble for tickets for the Glasgow Police Sports at Hampden Park. The race I want to see will be the sprint in which our own McDonald Bailey clashes with Ed Conwell of New York.” (James Stagg, Daily Mirror, June 9 1951)
(i) “Others of our stars-McDonald Bailey in the sprints, Roland Hardy in the 10,000 metres walk; John Savidge in the weight- will do well.” (James Stagg, *Daily Mirror*, June 25 1952). **Build up to 1952 Olympic Games.**

(ii) “WE had a good day today, Gordon Pirie, Alan Parker and Chris Chataway all reached the final of the 5,000 metres without much trouble. McDonald Bailey and Nick Stacey qualified for tomorrow’s semi-finals of the 200 metres.” (James Stagg, *Daily Mirror*, July 23 1952)

(iii) “…Regrettably, it was “no medals for Mac” for our great hope, E. McDonald Bailey, was beaten into fourth place with all three Americans, Stanfield, Walter Baker, and Jim Gathers, ahead of him.” (Peter Wilson, *Daily Express*, July 24 1952). **Comment after 1952 Olympic 200 metre finals.**

It was previously noted that language, in that case the use of personal pronouns, can be used to demarcate as well as activate particular collective identities by distinguishing ‘us’ or ‘we’ from ‘them’ (Chapter 1, pp. 43-44), and in the process help connect or disconnect people. Indeed, the same can also apply to the use of possessive pronouns such as ‘our’ in this case, as it related to Bailey. However, in pointing to a linguistic shift in references to Bailey one is cautious in making inferences as to its possible significance to the process of identity formation and the social acceptance of Bailey. There are four points to note in this regard. Firstly, it is not being suggested that this apparent linguistic shift meant that Bailey was now seen and firmly accepted as part of British society since he was now “our own boy” so to speak. The use of ‘our’ in this sense can simply be seen as establishing the common identity that both Bailey and the journalists shared; being British [at least *de jure*] and members of the same political and cultural space which was the British Empire. Bailey’s own self-definition as British is captured in his comments in relation to British team preparation for the 1952 Helsinki Olympics when he
reportedly stated: “It’s a pity we British can’t have training camps like the Americans. Even the Russians, I believe, are hard at it in the Caucasus.” *(Daily Mirror, June 13 1952).* Secondly, the linguistic shift can also be seen to represent the extent of respect for, fondness and popularity of Bailey in the media and public imagination, which does not necessarily or automatically translate into more social acceptance and the evaporation of the ‘outsider’ status assigned to coloureds in general. However, thirdly, and notwithstanding the above, I am still suggesting that the linguistic shift, while not representing or symbolic of any deeper change in power relations between blacks and whites or colony and metropole, represented the emergence or start of a process of greater social acceptance by the established white group, which was initiated from the time he started to compete in Britain. In this process, the perception as “stranger,” “foreigner,” “outsider” was being modified to accommodate Bailey as he gradually became more ‘familiar’ through media exposure, public adulation and, as the length of his residency in Britain increased. Nevertheless, and fourthly, one advances these suggestions cautiously because we really do not know what the journalists themselves may have meant or intended in their reference to Bailey in collective or possessive terms, although the expected riposte to this, as has been already argued, is that the unintended can be as important as the intended in the study of social processes. In this regard, it is also noted that one journalist, Peter Wilson had even used inverted commas in his use of the term ‘our’ in relation to Bailey (see citation (i) for 1951, p. 221), which adds to the uncertainty of its usage or possible significance. It also problematizes further the process of drawing inferences based on such language. It should be noted however that Peter Wilson, dubbed “the man they cannot gag” because of his outspokenness *(Daily Mirror, May 26, 27, 29 1953)* appeared to have developed a more than journalistic fondness of and friendship with Bailey, which will be developed further in Chapter 7.
But, apart from the language used here to refer to Bailey and because of its limitations, I wish to suggest that this increasing or emerging social acceptance of him in post-war Britain can also be measured in relation to the actual patterns of social interaction he had on the ground so to speak. Apart from his relationship with journalist Peter Wilson, alluded to above, I offer two more examples in this respect. Firstly, one notes that in the run up to the 1952 Olympic Games, he was an invited guest of the Royal Canoe Club at Teddington with respect to which a photo of him canoeing along the River Thames appeared in the *Daily Express* under the caption, “McBailey Paddles Along” (*Daily Express*, April 9, 1952). This apparent adulation and acceptance is also shown on his return to Britain following the 1952 Helsinki Olympics, when a relatively large “posed” photo of Bailey serving his 11 month old daughter, as his wife looked on, appeared on the front page of the *Daily Express*, under the caption, “Caviare for the Baby” (August 4 1952). Secondly, in interview with this author, Bailey revealed that he was recommended and accepted for membership at the Royal Albany club, one of the famous elite social clubs of the time in London, from which many whites were restricted themselves. In addition, in honour of Bailey, in 1952 the Albany Club was to offer a trophy to be given to the outstanding sportsman of the year in Trinidad (*Trinidad Guardian*, October 15, 17, 26, 1952). The type of relationships that Bailey developed thus with certain individuals and institutions, combined with an apparent linguistic shift in references to him in the media, suggest that Bailey had increasingly become more accepted by some as part of British society, which he had entered as a stranger and foreigner consistent with the dominant conception of the ethnic group to which he belonged. However, it is also suggested here that this process of acceptance by those from the

---

70Since Bailey’s wife was a white Briton, whom he met in the RAF and married in 1946, the novelty and attention grabbing nature of having such a front page photo in a newspaper with a readership of over 10m cannot be discounted since such interracial marriage was highly taboo then.
established white group was more of an incipient, emergent and accommodating character.

6.3 Summary-Conclusion

As now, so then, the media can play a crucial role in the process of identity formation through the images and messages that it conveys or does not convey of individuals and collectivities whether directly, indirectly, intended or unintended. Relatedly, through their images and messages the media can also play a crucial role in not just reflecting but sustaining particular values, ideas, social relationships and changes related thereto, although there may not always be a one to one correspondence between the imagination of those in the media, the public and the social realities that exist. As it relates to this study, it was found that the selected British (Daily Mirror, Daily Express) and Trinidadian newspapers (Port of Spain Gazette, Trinidad Guardian), presented Bailey as having several identities with some assuming more media prominence than others. While there were variations across the various newspapers, those that generally assumed more prominence were his British and Trinidadian identities and, to a lesser extent, those of his ethnic, West Indian and club origins. It is suggested that the latter two might be considered as examples of residual or miscellaneous identities, which refer to identities that may characterize individuals or groups but which do not assume critical importance or salience in shaping public conception and attitudes towards them or even their own self-conception, although over time and in certain situations they may become more prominent. One variation that needs pointing out however is that whereas in the reports appearing in both British selected newspapers, Bailey’s representation as British assumed prominence over his Trinidadian origin, the reports appearing in the Trinidadian newspapers, the bulk of which emanated from Britain, gave much greater salience to his Trinidadian identity. This serves to show that much like the
proverbial beauty, the identity of an individual may lie in the eyes of the beholder or, in this case, the reporter, which further suggests that the image or understanding one has of Bailey's identity between 1945-1953 may depend on the newspaper one reads or does not read. Media generated representations of identity, however, may not only vary amongst different media entities but they may also be at odds with non-media generated representations of such identity. The latter applies to the finding that although the representations of Bailey in the selected Trinidad press gave prominence to his Trinidadian identity, in spite of or perhaps because of their largely foreign origin, it was at variance with a persistent public perception of him as anti-Trinidadian because he decided to run for Britain instead of Trinidad at the Olympics. This can serve to illustrate that while the media can reflect reality, it can also distort it or fail to capture its shifting vagaries or subtleties at the level of "practical consciousness." In addition, on this score, it is interesting to note that Bailey's prominence in the media, based on the large number of headlines and photos of him compared to his white British counterparts who received less, is also inconsistent with the general conditions of marginality, exclusion and discrimination faced by coloureds generally in the society, although his early emergence was tainted with allegations of "colour bar" which he discounted. However, this can also be seen as representing the triumph of achievement over ascriptive values in a society where racism had become as endemic as classism and sexism. In this vein, Bailey's rise to athletic prominence in post-war Britain can also serve to symbolize the egalitarian mystique and ideal around which modern sport, modern Britain and modern western society have been constructed.

However, while Bailey's ethnic identity did not assume as much modal frequency in the media as those assumed by his national identities, the description and explanation of his athletic prowess, while reflecting a universal human fascination for speed, also reflected prevailing racial
stereotypes and racism surrounding the exoticness, physicality and naturalness of blacks that were dominant at the time. Such a view however has persisted since it still tends to be applied to black athletes up to today in both Britain (Maguire, 1991; Parry and Parry, 1991; Polley, 1998; Gouldbourne, 2002; St. Louis, 2000) and the USA (Davis and Harris, 1998; Andrews, 2001; Coakley, 2001). Inadvertently, through such stereotypical reporting of Bailey the media were helping to sustain the dominant or powerful image of the established white group, which rested in part on such “negative stigmatization”, and invariably, the subordinate image of non-whites or “outsiders” as initially symbolized by Bailey. In addition, Bailey’s race against a mechanical hare, while it might be seen to some and him as neither here nor there, can be construed as feeding into the dominant negative stereotypes above. But, while the ethnic vocabulary of media reporting on Bailey tended to direct attention to difference or his “otherness”, another directed attention to his increasing acceptance by and interconnectedness with the established white group by such terms as “our own” and “our best” as opposed to “foreigner.” (His “Britishness” which stood out in references to him in the selected British newspapers, together with his own self definition as British, had also provided a common source of connection.) While this apparent linguistic shift in reference to Bailey might be just indicative of his popularity, media visibility, and so be of limited inferential value for probing the theoretical objective at hand (i.e, the nature of the established-outsider dyad and its dynamic), it is suggested that this shift, combined with Bailey’s social interaction with certain institutions and individuals point to an emerging process of greater acceptance by members of the established white group. In spite of the dominant perceptions surrounding coloureds as “strangers”, and “outsiders”, the emerging acceptance of Bailey is seen as a sign of accommodation on the part of members of the dominant white group. This process was facilitated further by the decline of British sport since Bailey, by sheer dint of his athletic prowess, became
a source of nationalist sentiment who had offered a symbolic hope of helping to restore British pride and prestige on and off the field of sport which were greatly affected by the ravages of war. In addition, through the media discourse that erupted over this decline and the collective desire expressed by the athletic authorities, certain journalists and members of the public to get back “to our old superiority” or “to put Britain back on the map in the sporting world...” the idea of the British nation and national habitus was being continuously represented and sustained. At the risk of being repetitive, Bailey emerged in the context of and became part of this representation which showed in the process, the indissoluble link between individual and collective identities. Furthermore, the media discourse can illustrate how the construction and representation of national identities often involves a tug between reminiscences of past glories and present and future aspirations. As Maguire notes, “It pulls in at least two directions” (Maguire, 1993, pp. 297-298). Bailey’s identity had also pulled in “at least two directions” over the 1948 Olympics: Britain and Trinidad.

The media discourses surrounding McDonald Bailey and Britain in the period 1945-1953, in the selected British and Trinidadian newspapers, and particularly surrounding the 1948 and 1952 Olympics, help to reflect the intimate connections and fissures that exist between sport, nation, nationalism and race in the process of identity formation. It was a discourse characterized by expressions of difference or “otherness” (e.g. black, Trinidadian), as well as sameness or commonality (e.g., British, “our own”) which can help illustrate the view that “the sports media” play “a key role ... in the simultaneous articulation of national unity and difference...” (Rowe, McKay, Miller, 1998, p. 125). Thus, while it has been acknowledged that there is no necessary isomorphic relationship between media representations of identity, ‘reality’ and public perceptions of same, and while it can be problematic to ascertain the public effect of
such media representations, our examination of the media discourse
surrounding Bailey and British sport after WWII is telling. This is so for it
helps to show the role that the media can play in the process of identity
formation at both individual and related collective levels; a process which
has been shown to be of a plural, homogenizing, inclusive and divisive
nature. Its divisive tendency was to express itself more boldly over
Bailey’s confrontation with the British athletic authorities in his challenge
of the dominant amateur code at the time, to which we now turn.
CHAPTER 7

AMATEUR AND PROFESSIONAL ATHLETICS IN POST-WAR BRITAIN

After 1945, the apparent certainties over the traditions of amateurism were increasingly under attack in British athletics.- Polley, 2000, p. 83

7.1 Introduction

Towards the end of McDonald Bailey’s career in the early 1950s, he had a couple of conflictual encounters with the British athletic establishment surrounding the issue of amateurism, which precipitated his eventual decision to become a professional rugby player in 1953. The principal objective of this chapter therefore is to examine these developments and their possible significance as it relates to three major related theoretical issues that are the focus of this study: (1) the dynamic nature of established-outsider group relations; (2) the contested, exclusive and inclusive nature of identity formation and (3) the varying nature of human action or motives. To these ends, the chapter is divided into two broad related sections: the first provides the broader context of the amateur-professional divide in the period after the war, while the second examines the significance of Bailey’s own experiences with respect to this divide as they relate to the aforementioned objectives.

7.2 Amateur and Professional Athletics After the War

The end of World War II in 1945, ironically enough, saw the continuation of a different war of sorts, which it had merely temporarily halted: the “war” between the adherents of amateur and professional sports. Following the war, the conflict returned to the front burner of international sport in general and British sport in particular. Within
Britain, and also internationally, the middle class adherents of amateurism who dominated the organization of sport sought to re-impose it as the dominant normative framework for the conduct of sporting activity after it was inadvertently relaxed during the war (Baker, 1995, pp. 102-103; Daily Express, January 25 1946). In this regard, in several sports, both popular and elite, there were attempts either to introduce formal definitions of amateurism or to reassert traditional ones (Baker, 1995, pp. 103-111). For instance, in late 1946, the International Yacht Racing Union stated that "A person who has not at any time received payment for being a helmsman or member of a crew of a sailing yacht shall be regarded as an amateur" (ibid., p. 109). And, in 1947 the Royal and Ancient Club of St. Andrews defined an amateur golfer as "one who plays the game solely as an unremunerative or non-profit making sport or past-time" (Baker, 1995, p. 109; The Times, July 8 1947). The proscriptions also applied to a wide range of situations that included media advertising, the use of personal photos, sponsorship, publishing, receipt of gifts and reimbursement for expenses (The Times, July 8 1947; June 13 1949). In other sports such as rugby, football, cricket, cycling, boxing, swimming, rowing, and ice hockey the cleavage and tension between amateur and professional sport also reared its head (Baker, 1995; Daily Express, January 23, 25, 29 1946; Daily Mirror, July 12 1947). The sport of table tennis was the only known sport that had abolished the distinction between amateur and professionals, and this before the war (Daily Express, December 13 1951; Baker, 1995, pp. 115-116). At the same time however, in many sports, compromises were eventually made in relation to amateurism which have been linked more to concerns over the lack of British competitiveness in international sport and its "sporting prestige" than to concerns over traditional elitist practices in a period marked by a greater expectation for change along egalitarian and meritocratic lines (Baker, 1995).
The sport of track and field was another sport where the amateur-professional conflict became sharply expressed after the war and so much so that Baker (ibid., p. 112) can state that “Some of the most heated post-war debates on amateurism focused on track and field and particularly its world governing body, the International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF).” A major issue that brought this divide to a head in peace time was the question of “broken time” payments, the idea that athletes should be compensated for income lost through time off from work to represent their countries. At the first post-war congress of the International Amateur Athletics Federation (IAAF) held in 1946 during the European Championships in Oslo, the matter was raised but not resolved, at least in the interests of those who favoured “broken-time payments” and material rewards in general for athletes. In the latter regard, the Scandinavian countries were among the principal advocates of change (The Sporting Life, August 14, 28 1946; The Times, August 27 1946) but, in spite of their opposition, the internal committee which had been set up by the IAAF to examine the amateur rules in general and was chaired by Mr. E.J. Holt of Britain, “had come to the conclusion that compensation should not be paid for wages lost by athletes in contests” (The Times, August 27 1946). Commenting on their decision, the representative from the USA (Avery Brundage) stated in part that “… I may point to our amateur laws and say that to give such compensation is the same thing as to encourage professionalism” (The Times, August 27 1946). One of the Swedish delegates however (one Mr. Lindmann) became so incensed over the decision that, in open violation of the IAAF position, he stated during the Congress: “I will now tell you what Sweden intends to do. We propose to continue to pay compensation to certain athletes. This is against the rules, but we shall do it.” (Daily Express, August 27 1946; see also Sporting Life, August 28 1946). Ignoring a call to withdraw his statement, Lindmann stated further that “the present amateur rules are not
Expressing his own disappointment over Lindmann’s statements, British representative and amateur devotee, Harold Abrahams, commented: “The amateur rule requires rejuvenation but not annihilation. I think this statement is the most regrettable thing in the whole Congress.” (ibid.). As a result of this dissensus or deadlock together with the fact that “only 50 per cent of the members” of the IAAF were present at the Oslo meeting, the matter was deferred to the next congress of the IAAF in 1948, the year of the London Olympic Games (ibid.). The nature of this divide, however, led one Daily Express reporter to suggest the possibility of “a split” in athletics similar to the one that took place in 1895 in the sport of rugby when the professional oriented Rugby League was formed in opposition to the then amateur Rugby Union (Daily Express, February 26 1947). Although this “split” in athletics did not materialize, the divide and tensions persisted.

In 1947, however, subsequent to this first post-war congress, the British AAA showed signs of adopting a more compromising stance toward the issue of broken-time payments. In this regard, at a meeting on October 4 1947, it made the following recommendations:

1. That no athlete should be prevented by possible financial embarrassment arising from loss of earnings, from accepting an invitation to represent his country in a genuine International Match.

2. That if an athlete can establish to the satisfaction of his National Governing Body that he will suffer financial embarrassment by reason of loss of earnings, that Governing Body should have power after full investigation to come to his aid.

3. Such aid shall be limited to the actual loss deemed to be suffered or £1 a day whichever is the less; that such payment should be limited to period occupied by travel or competition.

71The anti-amateur orientation of the Swedish delegate is ironic or curious since it was the Swedish AAA which, in 1945, suspended its two leading middle-distance runners, Gunner Haeg and Arne Anderson, because they were rewarded financially for competing (Baker, 1995, p. 112).
4. That the number of days in respect of which such payments may be made by the Governing Body shall be limited to 28 in any one calendar year. (The I.A.A.F can extend in case of Olympic Games and such other fixtures as I.A.A.F may approve).

5. That only genuine International competitions between teams chosen to represent countries be recognized as occasions for such grants to be allowable. (AAA, 1947)

At a subsequent meeting between the AAA and the National Cyclists Union (NCU), this compromising position was again expressed when the AAA’s representative, “Mr. A.S. Turk explained that the Association was in favour of some modified form of broken time for athletes representing their country in an International Match but that nothing could be done about this until after the International Federation had made a decision.” (AAA, October 14 1947). However, at the same time that the AAA were making a concession, they were also reasserting their general policy on amateurism and professional sport. Thus at this same meeting, the AAA also rejected a request by the NCU “… to have both professional and amateur cyclists competing” at an athletics and cycling meeting staged by them. The AAA representative, “Mr. Jewell pointed out that under the rules of the International Amateur Athletic Federation, the Association could not agree to such a meeting and in reply to a further question it was stated that the Association would have no objection whatever to a Combined Cycling and Athletic meeting, providing all the cyclists were amateurs.” (ibid.). The mixture of professionals and amateurs, while permitted in some sports, such as cricket, football, lawn tennis and equestrianism (after the war in case of the latter two), was generally prohibited by amateur oriented sport bodies for fear of “professional contamination by contact” (Baker, 1995, pp. 106-107).

At the 1948 congress of the IAAF, the Amateur Status Commission, which had been set up to examine the issue of broken-time
and professionalism generally, “made a decision”. While it generally rejected the idea of broken-time and any form of monetary payments to athletes or individuals whether to perform, broadcast, write or lecture on sport, as well as for advertising, it allowed broken-time payments where the athlete was “… the SOLE support of his family…” but only when representing his/her country in international competition (IAAF, 1948; Polley, 2000, p. 94). The view expressed by Polley (2000, p. 94) therefore, that “… the AAA chose not to accept this dilution, and requesting or receiving reimbursement for broken time remained an offence” appears to be inconsistent with the AAA’s more accommodating stance on the issue as contained in its own 1947 Recommendations, which had already meant some measure of “dilution.” Baker (1995, p. 114) had also pointed to this “moderating trend” within the British athletic establishment toward the issue of broken-time. However, in making this statement, it is instructive to note that Polley did not cite any AAA or other documentary sources. In addition, it is also instructive to note that the IAAF’s concession on broken time took place under a President (Lord Burghley) and Secretary (E.J. Holt), who were both British, elected at its 1946 congress (Daily Express, August 27 1946). In addition, both men also held the same positions within the British AAA (AAA, 1948, 1949). Furthermore, we need to recognize also that not everyone among the elites had subscribed to the broken-time rule. In this regard for instance, former middle distance Olympian, Phillip Noel-Baker, who served as Minister of State at the time, appeared quite compromising. In this regard, he was quoted in 1946 as stating that “… a man ought not to be prevented from competing because he has not a large salary” and further that “Participation in sports events should not be reserved for those who are rich enough to afford the necessary time, and the wife and children of poorer athletes should not suffer.” (Sporting Life, August 26 1946). Not surprisingly thus, Noel-Baker was known to have offered material assistance to certain British national athletes in the 1950s (Polley, 2000, p.
and had even written the foreword to Bailey’s 1952 book, *If It’s Speed You’re After* (Bailey, 1952). In other sports there was also compromise on the question of broken time payments after the war, which included namely, swimming, lawn tennis and rowing (Baker, 1995, pp. 107-109, 120-122), linked to concerns over the lack of British competitiveness in international sport and its “sporting prestige” (*ibid.*).

In spite of this official concession, however, which for all intents and purposes was really minor, the attacks on the amateur ethos persisted in the build up to both the 1948 and 1952 Olympics. Therefore, not surprisingly, the Swedes who had long openly practiced a more professional approach to sport, continued their attacks. Just three months before the 1948 Olympics, they called for the Olympic Oath (see Appendix III) to be modified in order to be brought in line with the reality that many athletes received monetary payments whether direct or indirect for performing (*Daily Express*, May 24 1948). In concurring with the Swedes, John Macadam of the *Daily Express*, suggested that “....the Olympic Oath needs spring cleaning” and, as for amateurism generally, he more or less suggested the garbage bin. In the latter regard, he opined that “... it is impossible to define amateur status in general terms and the only way out of an endlessly troublesome problem is to scratch the word altogether, admit broken-time payments, and let the de’il take the hindmost” (*Daily Express*, February 24 1948). Macadam also attacked what he dubbed “the ascetic amateurism” practiced by the IAAF and the AAA, which he rechristened the “Amateur Athletic Ascetics” (*Daily Express*, May 24 1948).

---

*The athletes in question were Angus Scott (hurdler and 400 metre runner) and Arthur Rowe (shot-puter). Scott worked for a company with which Noel-Baker had familial contact and after the 1950 European championships Baker offered to ask the company’s chairman (his nephew) to assist him in his athletic training. At the time, Noel-Baker served as Minister of Fuel and Power in the Attlee led Labour Government. In 1958, Noel-Baker used his connection in the coal industry to secure broken time payments for Rowe (Polley, 2000, p. 96).*
The attacks on amateurism were to be renewed again with the approach of the 1952 Helsinki Olympics. One major critic this time was Peter Wilson, also of the Daily Express who, similar to Macadam earlier, called for the abolishment of the “very word amateur.” After describing as “hooey” the lofty Coubertinian Olympic ideals of participation contained in the Olympic oath (honour of country, glory of sport etc.), he stated thus: “Much as I regret to say this, I believe the time has come to abolish the very word “amateur.” It has lost all its original meaning, and I do not believe that one athlete in ten from some of the Continental countries-and I suspect from Russia-could put their hands on their hearts and swear that they were deriving no financial benefit from their status as Olympic stars....” The day of the amateur apart from friendly garden party or village green sport, is over.” (Daily Express, December 13 1951). The Daily Herald was another source of media attacks against the amateur establishment. As early as 1945, one of its writers, shared in Swedish criticism which attacked “the sham and snobbery ... associated with so-called” amateurism for which the English were seen as “particularly responsible for maintaining” (cited in Polley, 2000, p. 115). However, while some media attacked the amateur ideology, The Times was generally perceived as its defender, and so much so that it was described as “the anxious guardian of amateurism” (ibid., p. 110).

Apart from the issues of broken-time and mixing with professionals, another major issue faced by the amateur athletic establishment related to athletes’ involvement in publishing, lecturing and advertising. The matter was raised following the war as early as December 1945 (AAA, December 19 1945) and then in consecutive meetings of the AAA in 1950 (AAA, February 4 1950), 1951 (AAA, May 5 1951) and 1952 (AAA, February 2, May 3 1952. At one of its early 1952 meetings, the AAA expressed the following position on the matter:
(a) ... an active athlete must not allow his athletic distinctions to be referred to in any advertisement, heading or in any other way in connection with a business or in articles or publications written by him.

(b) ... Procedure for granting approval to write: ...

(i) approval to be given to active athletes who are bona fide professional journalists (i.e.) those taking up journalism as their first job after leaving school, or following National Service, or being employed by a newspaper proprietor, is transferred from an indoor job to that of journalist. Permission not to be granted to an athlete who takes up full-time journalism from another occupation, writing on sports matters only.

(ii) Permission for an active athlete to write on athletics or sports matters without payment to be given only to write in journals, magazines, etc. produced by or for athletic clubs or associations.

(iii) Permission for an active athlete to broadcast or lecture to be given only if no fee is paid, other than payment to cover out of pocket expenses. Such payments must be notified to the Area Committee. (AAA, February 2 1952, p. 1)

In addition, the rules prohibited “ghosting” and reporting on the particular events in which the athlete participated though comment was allowed on the meeting in general (AAA, May 3 1952).

In spite of the official exaltation of amateur sport, however, “shamateurism,” the practice of participants in amateur sport receiving material rewards contrary to its vaunted tenets, was known to be entrenched in British sport. In this regard for instance, Polley (2000, p. 95), referred to “the practice employed by individuals and clubs in many sports whereby purely nominal jobs were created either within clubs or through patron’s companies for talented individuals, who were thereby enabled to train full-time while legally holding a non-sporting job.” In track and field, in particular, shamateurism also expressed itself through the existence of illegal or “under the table payments” to amateur athletes (Polley, 2000, pp. 104-106) and the receipt of payments for writing,
broadcasting and lecturing by certain senior officials of the AAA, who included most notably Messrs. Jack Crump and Harold Abrahams (Polley 2000; Baker 1995). This latter situation was opposed by certain members of the AAA but a formal attempt to stop this practice in 1952 by making such persons ineligible “for appointment or to hold office as an honorary officer of the association, as secretary of any committee or sub-committee of a committee of the association, or as an honorary officer of any area association ... was defeated by 173 votes to 49.” (The Times, March 17 1952). Rather, and in order to protect this practice, the General Committee of the AAA recommended at the same meeting the amendment of “… the amateur definition so as to prohibit writing, lecturing, or broadcasting for payment upon athletics and athletic competitions without the prior permission of the A.A.A. [which] was passed by a large majority” (ibid.). Polley (2000, p. 104) suggests however, that this requirement of “prior permission” was still not adhered to by the officials in question. In addition, he also noted that the double standard with respect to amateurism among some athletic officials also expressed itself on foreign tours “in such areas as travel arrangements, accommodation and entertainment” which differed from that afforded athletes (ibid., p. 104). However, it is interesting to note that Bailey himself was granted permission to publish articles together with such athletes as Doug Wilson, A.R. McWhirter and Norris McWhirter (AAA, 1952, p. 3; AAA, May 2 1953). And, in interview, Bailey revealed that he “wrote professionally in England between 1949 and 1953”, beginning in 1949 with the Empire

---

73 While he makes no reference to this 1952 initiative, Polley (2000, p. 104) revealed that in 1957 there was another attempt to bring officials in line with the amateur regulations, which succeeded on this occasion. However, while the 1952 motion came from a club official, this time it came from an athlete representative, but the “inconsistencies and abuses” still persisted.

74 From April-December 1952, Bailey wrote a 24 part series of articles in the Daily Express, under the caption “Running around the world with E. McDonald Bailey”, in which he dealt primarily with his experiences while travelling across the world to compete.
News, which was his major source of income. When asked this, he commented thus:

Yes. But don’t forget, they paid you well! In England a hundred guineas for an article! They paid you for your name and, in my case, they knew I was doing my own writing. So there was no problem there. Oh yes! Don’t talk about magazines, a lot of magazine articles I wrote. They paid you more. (Interview with author, April 4 1996)

He also revealed in interview with this author that he was granted permission to write after it was learnt that he was a *bona fide* journalist and an Associate Member of the London Institute of Journalists, which was one of the conditions that had to be met by active athletes. In addition, in 1952, Bailey authored a book published by Stanley Paul entitled, *If Its Speed You’re After*, which was part biography and part training guide. These actions, however, were apparently not construed as compromising the amateur code.

It is in the context of the veritable crackdown on professional sport and the (re)assertion of amateurism after the war, together with its inherent inconsistencies that one has to situate Bailey’s confrontations with the British AAA in 1952 and 1953.

### 7.3 Bailey and British Athletic Officialdom

Bailey had two major brushes with British athletic officialdom over the question of professional athletics before his decision to become a professional rugby player with Leigh United in July of 1953. The first took place in 1952 following the publication of a “Daily Express Exclusive” interview he had with renowned sport journalist, Peter Wilson,
dubbed “the man they cannot gag” (Daily Express, February 21 1952). In the article entitled “Hypocrisy in Sport”, Bailey made several comments which, in the context of the times, were not just strong but could have been construed as heretical to the adherents of the dominant amateur ideology. In the published interview, he (1) condemned the practice of “shamateurism” in athletics; (2) opposed the general separation of amateurs from professionals and (3) called for the AAA championships as well as the Olympics to be opened up to both professional and amateur athletes, this on the eve of the 1952 Olympic Games. In effect what Bailey’s comments amounted to was a call to legalize professional athletics among the athletic officialdom by removing the existing constraints and punishments. Given its significance, and consistent with the methodology of this study that seeks to privilege the voice of the athlete albeit critically, the Peter Wilson interview with Bailey is reproduced here at length:

Bailey: So many officials have expressed athletes’ views, it’s about time that the active athlete had a chance to put his own point of view.

Wilson: What points have you in mind?

Bailey: Field-Marshall Montgomery has said: “Whether the Olympic Games should or should not be amateur is a question of opinion. That they have ceased to be amateur is a question of fact.” I want to see honesty in the Games, without any competitor pretending to be what he isn’t.

Wilson: Do you think you are alone in this?

Bailey: Obviously I can only speak for myself, and I don’t want to implicate anyone else, but I am sure that if my fellow athletes could

---

75Bailey was interviewed as part of a special feature by Peter Wilson entitled “Hypocrisy in Sport.” Another athlete interviewed as part of this series was lawn tennis player Paddy Roberts, Britain’s No. 3 at the time, who left amateur tennis for the more rewarding possibilities in the professional game (Daily Express, March 15 1952).
speak without any restrictions, they would like to see an open championship and an open Olympics.

Wilson: You know that certain officials are very much opposed to this?

Bailey: I know that it has been said that no amateur athletes would like to turn professional. I believe that if there were as efficient a body as the Football Association, which controls both the amateur and professional sides of the game, a number of athletes would contemplate switching their status.

Wilson: Well, would you think it “degrading”, for instance, to run against Cumming, winner of this year’s Powderhall?\(^76\)

Bailey: Why on earth should the question of “degradation” come into athletics at all? There are other sports in which amateurs and professional compete side by side, and both benefit.

Wilson: Indeed, there are. You get Warwickshire, last year’s county cricket champions, captained by a professional. This year, as last, Middlesex is going to share the captaincy between Bill Edrich, the amateur-who used to be a professional anyway-and Denis Compton who still is one. There is an Open golf championship, and amateurs can play in a professional soccer side. But you still haven’t answered my question. How would you like to run against Cumming?

Bailey: There’s nothing I would like more—but I’m prevented by the amateur regulations. Look here! I’m lucky enough to be the amateur champion-I hold the joint world record for the 100 metres and also the joint British all comers 100 and 220 yards records. Naturally, I’d like to know which one of us is really the best. There’s no fun in being a champion in name only. Everyone wants to know who is THE best. …

Wilson: Do you think any sport over here has got the right lines on this “open” business?

Bailey: Yes. table tennis. There, they don’t distinguish between the amateur and the professional-everyone is just a player. No one gets any monetary reward for playing in the British or the World’s Championship. But if a player is a credit to the game, he can be licensed to coach or give exhibitions, and he can write or broadcast on the game-and no one persecutes him (or her) for it. And who, I should

---

\(^{76}\) In interview with respondents McWhirter, Wilson, and Bailey himself, it was learnt that Powderhall referred to an unsanctioned athletic competition, which took place in Scotland in early winter, in which athletes were paid for competing.
Wilson: Well, Mac, as this is Olympic year, let’s pin this thing down to the Games. Would you like to see competitors getting cash rewards?

Bailey: Absolutely not. There should be no monetary reward for competing in the Games. The amateur can compete for the honour and the glory—and incidentally, the indirect benefits which he gets out of his triumphs. The professional track men would be more than content with the publicity which would accrue to them as “World Champions.” What I want to do away with is the hypocrisy whereby athletes take an oath which implies that they are getting nothing out of competing—when we all know that for the vast majority that just isn’t true. I don’t want to excuse anyone but I, and every experienced athlete, know what “perks” can be made out of being an international. Don’t make it a “disgrace” for a man to make his profession an athletic one—not every one can be a lawyer or a doctor—and don’t make him hide under the counter where he gets his money from.

Not surprisingly, Bailey’s remarks in relation to professional sport caught the attention of the amateur oriented British AAA, who summoned him subsequently to a meeting “to clarify certain statements attributed to you…”. He was also advised that “If you wish you maybe accompanied by a friend.” (Daily Express, March 22 1952). Bailey’s accompanying “friend” turned out to be then Daily Express sport journalist, Peter Wilson, the person who had conducted the interview in the first place. Wilson himself was an outspoken and relentless critic of the AAA’s amateur ideology. However, having a practicing journalist as his friend, and more so one of the stature of Peter Wilson, appeared to have stumped the members of the AAA. It created a dilemma of sorts for presumably, the presence of a public media representative was at variance with the supposedly internal and disciplinary nature of the proceedings. Reflecting their dismay, discomfort and perhaps disapproval of Bailey’s “friend”, the officials of the AAA reacted by first asking Bailey to confirm whether Wilson was indeed his friend and then by asking Wilson “to give an undertaking that…” he “… would not divulge anything that took place.”
Wilson however did not oblige. In a subsequent front page *Daily Express* story entitled, “MacBailey’s Friend Gives No Sealed-Lips Promises”, and accompanied by “posed” photos of both men smiling, Peter Wilson recounted the episode as follows:

... So Mac and I appeared before the Southern General Purposes Sub-Committee of the AAA. He had asked me to go with him and I flew back, early, from Copenhagen. We presented ourselves as required, as requested, at the Polytechnic. Time: 5.45 pm.

After 20 minutes of heel-cooling we were permitted to enter. Then the chairman of the sub-committee-Sydney Abrahams, brother of Harold Abrahams, one-time Olympic sprinter-required me to give an undertaking that I would not divulge anything that took place. .. This undertaking I was not, of course, prepared to give as I did not know what might be said. Various members of the committee tried to bring pressure to bear on me to say nothing would be reported.

I still refused to be muzzled and MacBailey, in virtually the only question put to him, said that I was indeed a friend of his and as such entitled-by the letter sent to him by the AAA- to be present.

The chairman appeared to agree that Mac was permitted to choose his own friends-I think there is no AAA regulation governing this- but the committee was unwilling to question the fastest human being alive, who is also one of our main hopes for this year’s Olympics, unless I promised not to report what questions they asked and what answers he gave.

Finally, after various protestations, a member moved that the meeting be adjourned as the proceedings were a waste of time for the committee. I cannot of course speak for the committee. It was most certainly a waste of time for us. (*Daily Express*, March 22 1952)

It would appear however, that following this aborted meeting, Bailey was summoned to another with the AAA, this time accompanied by fellow athlete, Jamaican Olympian Arthur Wint, in which he apologized.

---

77In January 1952, Wilson had also taken up the case of June Foulds. Foulds, then 17 year old British sprint champion, was summoned to the Southern Committee of the Women’s Amateur Athletic Association concerning the receipt of money for appearing on air (i.e., radio) (*Daily Express*, January 1 1952). Adherence to the amateur ideals thus was not restricted to males or gender specific.
for his statements (AAA, May 3 1952). He was forced therefore to eat the proverbial humble pie. But, while his apology was accepted, it was not unanimous since there was a rejected call for him to be banned from representing the AAA and Britain. In this regard, the minutes of the General Committee Meeting of Saturday May 3 1952, read in part:

The Honorary Secretary stated that since the Southern Committee Meeting Mr. Tomlinson had received a letter from Mr. Bailey withdrawing without reservation all the allegations and implications contained in the interview to which the Committee had taken exception, and saying that he wished to apologise to the A.A.A. and to any athlete or any other person who might have been affronted by anything which he said. A proposal made during discussion by Mr. Gale, that Mr. Bailey should not be selected for A.A.A. or International matches was not accepted.

But, while the attempt to have Bailey banned was rejected, he did receive a stern warning from the AAA that this was likely if there was any reoccurrence of same. In this regard, in an *Express* report entitled, “No further action against McBailey”, we read as follows:

E. McDonald Bailey, British sprint champion has been reproved by the Amateur Athletic Association for statements concerning the amateur status of athletes made by him in an interview with Peter Wilson in the *Daily Express* of February 21. The association state that McDonald Bailey has apologized and that no further action need be taken “beyond expressing the strongest disapproval of his conduct and informing him that any repetition will result in his omission from any British athletic team.” (*Daily Express*, May 6 1952).

Bailey’s newspaper interview had raised the thorny issue of shamateurism in general, which was known to be rampant in British sport, and the issue of financial payments in particular. Bailey’s declaration, however, that there were athletes who were receiving material rewards contrary to their amateur status was also borne out of his own experience
with same. For instance, in a 1996 interview, Bailey admitted what he had basically stated around 44 years earlier in 1952:

Everybody knew there were people receiving perks. But not the sort of perks that meant anything you could live off. ... Instead of giving you crockery, the promoter would come quietly and say, well, instead of giving you all of these things, we would give you the equivalent in money. That use to go on a lot! I have no problem with stating that. That is a fact! The only money that was paid, and I say big in relative terms, was when you were invited to the Glasgow Rangers Sports Meeting. The promoters would come into the dressing rooms and decide who they wanted to go up there, whether it be Bannister, whether it was Wint, all the top names, and they would come and say- a “blue note” for you, meaning a hundred pounds, under the table. Everybody knew that! I am not ashamed to say but you couldn’t live on that! It isn’t like today where [Lindford] Christie is a millionaire, and all these top fellas who are running now demanding twenty and ten thousand dollars before they even go out on the track; what they call appearance fees. I was born too early. I don’t begrudge them. In fact I am happy for them, because I was one of those who felt very strongly about people bringing crowds into the stadium and not getting anything back for it. I felt very strongly about that ... (Interview with author, April 4 1996)

It is interesting to note however, that in August 1950, just under two years before the interview with Peter Wilson, news had surfaced in certain “athletic quarters” which questioned whether Bailey was a “genuine amateur.” In defence of Bailey, and apparently oblivious to the facts, Peter Wilson condemned what he called a “rumour campaign” and “witch hunt” aimed at smearing Bailey. He also noted further that “... a great many outstanding athletes have taken more than the third-class fares allowed by the Amateur Athletic Association” and, in other sports such as golf and cricket some players also benefited financially, signalling out for special mention Sir Don Bradman (Daily Express, August 18 1950). Due perhaps to a lack of evidence, nothing apparently resulted from this 1950 newspaper report.
The receipt of “perks” or “under the table payments” to athletes which Bailey first admitted to publicly in 1952 has been described as “the worst-kept secret of the sport” (Polley, 2000, pp. 104-105). And, although some officials were aware of the practice, the difficulty in obtaining proof pre-empted taking the necessary action (ibid.). Bailey appeared to have been one of the first prominent British athletes to have publicly admitted to this practice around that time. While other athletes were to do so, this happened much later from the 1960s onward and usually after they had retired from the sport (ibid.). For instance, Gordon Pirie was another prominent athlete who was to admit openly to this practice. In his 1961 biography, he openly admitted receiving payments for running while he was still competing but the subsequent AAA investigation turned up no evidence (ibid.). The existence of this practice has been seen as an indicator of a more “assertive culture” among athletes in post-war Britain in opposition to the constraints posed by the cult of amateurism. This “assertive culture” among athletes, which I prefer to name a culture of resistance, was also evident in Bailey’s second major confrontation with the British AAA, in 1953.

Following what might be considered a minor brush with the athletic authorities in 1952, just over a year later in March 1953, Bailey again drew the ire of the AAA when he appeared to have infringed the rules concerning advertising at an Oxbridge vs Cambridge athletic meeting. The purported infringement concerned an advertisement which appeared in the programme of the above athletic meeting which read:

These athletes included distance runners Gordon Pirie and David Moorcroft, as well as pentathlete Mary Peters. A couple athletes also admitted to receiving broken-time payments from their employers (Polley, 2000, pp. 105-108).
INTRODUCING LILLYWHITES “COMET” STARTING BLOCK

Made to the requirements of E. McDonald Bailey, Ltd. and exclusive to Lillywhites. Similar to the type used in the Olympic Games 1952. (Letter to Mc Donald Bailey, 25 April 1953)

In a front page story in the *Daily Express* concerning this development, it was reported that Bailey was also the “managing director and chief shareholder of the firm” (*Daily Express*, April 27 1953; *Athletics Weekly*, May 2 1953). Bailey was subsequently summoned to a meeting of the AAA’s Investigation Committee, “accompanied by his Solicitor,” where he was found guilty of infringing its definition of amateur and suspended *sine die* (AAA, 1953; *Daily Express*, April 27 1953). Bailey was notified thus:

> After consideration the Southern Committee have decided that you have infringed the Amateur Definition set out in A.A.A. Law 2(1) and have therefore lost your amateur status. The Committee further decided to suspend you *sine die* from competing as an amateur athlete under A.A.A. Laws as from the date of this letter. (Letter to Mc Donald Bailey, 25 April 1953).

In his initial response and in defence of his own actions Bailey reportedly stated:

> I have heard rumours that the decision is not favourable. If that is true, I will appeal, just to show I have a fighting spirit, and do not take things lying down. If the decision is to take away my amateur status, it might affect the public more than me … apart from the fact that I will be deprived of a sport I have enjoyed for 17 years, and to which I can claim to have given something.

But let’s get this straight—I make no money from it. I might even gain by such a decision. After all, I turned down a professional offer from Australia after the Olympics. The A.A.A. says I am not allowed to put my name on advertisements, even though E. McDonald Bailey Ltd. is the name of my firm. My name was there as that of a businessman, and not as a sportsman. I am not exploiting my athletic ability. I am exploiting my knowledge of the design of sport goods. The starting
block is only one of the items my firm deals with … (Daily Express, April 27 1953)

The AAA’s decision to suspend Bailey also brought negative reaction from certain members of the media, and the political establishment. In coming to the defence of Bailey, Desmond Hackett of the Daily Express, not only attacked the decision of the AAA but even suggested that it may have had ulterior motives. In an article entitled, “Don’t shoot Mac… he’s doing his best for Britain”, Hackett wrote:

If there has been a murkier sports verdict than that of the Amateur Athletic Association in banning indefinitely McDonald Bailey, British and Empire No. 1 sprinter, then I have no wish to hear of it. The blood pressure will stand little more.

What in the good name of sport is the McDonald Bailey crime? He tries to give sprinters a new-style starting block which, he hopes, will propel future Britons beyond his own pace shattering records. If there is a more able person to think up a better idea in starting blocks, then let him appear.

... McBailey, having done the deep thinking, is proud of the idea and, like the honest chap he is states that the starting block is made to his requirements.

There is no secret about the A.A.A. having been gunning for Meteoric Mac over the past five years ... and not with a starting gun, either. If the A.A.A. are so sure that he has burst the slight barrier that lies flimsily between the amateur and the professionals why the indefinite ban? Why not the big decision: Don’t you come back McBailey.

I can tell you. The A.A.A. are huddling down more than somewhat, waiting for the blast of public reaction for the crisp questions in Parliament, questions that will be even more penetrating than the snores that are alleged to boom over Westminster. (Daily Express, April 28 1953)

In supporting Bailey, Hackett also pointed to the double standard that existed in relation to the practice of amateurism among some of the very officials who were its most vociferous advocates. In this regard, he
signalled out leading AAA officials Harold Abrahams and Jack Crump who published articles in newspapers and magazines for money (Daily Express, April 28 1953), as was previously noted. Writing in the Daily Mirror, James Stagg, in an article entitled “Why Axe Mac”, also pointed to this double standard and described it as “a beautiful example of “Don’t do as I do, do as I say.” Both Hackett and Stagg also pointed further to several other British athletes who published in sport for pecuniary rewards and Stagg even identified one who worked as “a sports goods salesman” (Daily Mirror, April 28 1953). For Stagg, the suspension of Bailey “... was needed to bring the sizzling cauldron of amateurism to the boil...” (ibid.). It is curious though that there was no reference to the fact that Bailey also published for money and, with the approval of the AAA. While the AAA had a compromising stance with respect to publishing, it seems that in his foray into product endorsement, Bailey had crossed the fuzzy line between amateurism and professionalism.

The suspension also drew editorial comment from Athletics Weekly, the main publication for track and field at the time. While not wanting to appear to be condoning Bailey’s actions, the tone and language of the editorial can be considered very sympathetic if not supportive of Bailey’s plight particularly in view of “… the more flagrant breaches of the amateur rules [which] take place in many other countries.” Consequently, while on the one hand, it asserted “… the necessity to stand by the rules of the governing body”, on the other, it also held the view that “… only the gravest of breaches of the amateur rules should bear the penalty of ‘life suspension’”. (Athletics Weekly, May 2 1953, p. 3). But, apart from the support offered by certain segments of the media, Bailey also found support among other important social elements. For instance, these included the M.P. for Eton and Slough, Mr. Fenner Brockway, who had first planned to raise his suspension in the House of Commons (Daily Express, April 29 1953), but then “agreed not to do so until after the
appeal” according to Bailey in a press interview (Trinidad Guardian, April 30 1953). In the latter interview, Bailey also revealed that “Lady Molly Huggins ... also offered to give me any assistance she can” (ibid.). In addition, Bailey found even more critical support from former Labour Attorney General and MP, Sir Frank Soskice, who led his legal team during his appeal. In the latter respect, Bailey was reportedly “… represented by an array of legal experts headed by Sir Frank Soskice, Q.C., M.P., the former Attorney General ...” (The Sporting Life, May 4 1953). In addition, reflecting further the seriousness of the matter, the appeal took the form of “two hearings in separate places” and reportedly lasted “more than 5 ½ hours” on the same day (ibid.). The meeting with the Appeals Committee lasted “three hours” while the deliberations of the General Committee lasted “a further two and a half hours.” The Appeals Committee eventually decided in favour of Bailey which was supported by the General Committee by 27 votes to 9 on the main ground that he did not agree for “his name to appear as an athlete in the advertisement” (AAA, May 2 1953, p. 4). In interview with Bailey it was further revealed that he won the appeal based on the technical argument adopted by his legal team that in law, Bailey the athlete was different from “E. McDonald Bailey Ltd.”, the company. Providing further background to the advertisement and his recollection of the appeal process, Bailey stated recently in a 2003 interview with the author:

As far as I was concerned I got advice that I was not breaking the rules. “Well, you should have consulted us.” I said well, I am sorry. I did not break the rules. You see it was the first time once again that anyone had challenged them. And, ironically, as a result of this challenge and as a result of the temporary ill will I would have thought by these Southern 3 As officials, not all of them, some of them, I opened the door for other athletes because they had to change that rule. And you see they really believed that I was trying a fast one and tried to get away with it. They didn’t know that I had actually registered McDonald Bailey Limited in Bush House, London, where you registered companies. So, when Sir Frank Soskice confronted them with that they were startled. They felt stupid. And his brilliant
articulation of the situation was so great. Representing the AAA was Sir Sydney Abrahams of the Abraham brothers, very famous name in athletics. Sir Sydney, incidentally, was the man who arranged for me and Wint to go to Ghana, West Africa and Nigeria to run. He regarded me as a friend and I regarded him as a friend too. Very often when my wife and I went to White City we would have tea and Sir Sydney and his wife would sit and have tea with us. He was always a very nice man and very friendly towards me but I think he was disappointed and in fact he said so at the end of it: that I did not consult with him, but I did not think it was necessary to consult with him. I wasn’t doing anything deliberate. The Fred Perry Organization through one of their Directors, T.B. Wagner, said to me one day, “Mac, why don’t you market things?” I said “no, I can’t do that, it would infringe my status, my amateur status.” He said “surely if you form a company”. I say “well I don’t know about that”. He says “well we could arrange to find out.” And they arranged. They spoke with the lawyers and said, “once it is McDonald Bailey Limited” and this is what Sir Frank Soskice said: “McDonald Bailey Limited and McDonald Bailey the athlete are two separate entities in law and if this were a court of law”, I am almost quoting him here now, if this were a court of law, you wouldn’t have a leg to stand on. Well, fortunately, the National Committee were a more generous type of people who accepted the principle of what Sir Frank Soskice said and they threw the case out. (Interview with author, October 20 2003)

What is of particular relevance to my objectives is the level of support that Bailey received from what can be considered white upper class elements of British society among both the media and the political establishment. This assumes significance at two related levels. Firstly, it is being suggested here that this supportive reaction to Bailey’s dilemma does not only confirm the extent of his athletic achievements and its impact on the public and media imagination, but is also an expression of the slow and gradual process of his transition from being perceived as an outsider to being accepted or considered as a part of British society by certain members of the established white group. Their reaction marked another stage in this unfolding process of his emergence, and his accommodation by elements of the latter, although as a coloured person, this did not necessarily mean that he was now considered a status equal. In addition, it should be noted that this reaction was also taking place at
the same time that one witnessed the increasing tendency on the part of certain journalists to refer to Bailey using more possessive and familiar language, such as “our own” and “our best”, which was previously examined in Chapter 6. Secondly, the supportive reaction of certain whites both within the media and without can also be seen as an expression of the inclusionary tendency within the process of identity formation be it in relation to group or national identity and, in spite of the prevalence of the pernicious colour bar, which was grounded in exclusion. Thus, while ethnicity has historically served to circumscribe the acceptance of many in Britain and their horizons of mobility, it never completely blocked or eliminated the possibility.

The controversy initiated by the starting blocks advertisement, however, was the precursor to Bailey’s eventual decision to become a professional rugby player in July 1953 with Leigh of Lancashire just over three months since his virtual run in with the AAA (*Daily Express*, July 27 1953).79 In coming to this decision, Bailey suggests that he was courted by a prominent member of Leigh and media commentator, for when asked if Leigh was the only Rugby Club to have approached him, he responded: “Yes. Yes. Leigh was the first. You see it was through Eddie Waring. Eddie Waring was a great Leigh, North of England man, and he was the commentator ... popular commentator on the BBC and things like that. [He was] very prominent in the signing up.” (Interview with author, March 19 1996). This decision meant that Bailey had automatically lost his “amateur” status and would no longer be qualified to run in amateur competition. Writing in the *Daily Express*, Sydney Hulls described the move thus: “McBailey has changed from amateur to professional, from gentleman to player” (*Daily Express*, July 27 1953). The decision and its implication for Bailey again brought to the fore the enduring amateur-

79 It is interesting to note that the athlete tipped to replace Bailey on the British athletic team, Welsh man Ken Jones, also played rugby but the amateur version (*The Sporting Life*, July 27 1953).
professional divide in sport. In defence of Bailey and in another attack on this divide, which it called ‘repugnant’ and ‘indefensible’ because of the reality of shamateurism, the *Daily Express* editorialized as follows:

McDONALD BAILEY, one of our fastest men on earth, will sprint for Britain no more.

He is perfectly fit, he is running as fast as ever. But he is barred from pursuing his career because he has decided to play Rugby League football as a professional. Because he presumes to make a living by using his natural talent.

This distinction between amateur and professional in the athletic world is repugnant. In logic it is indefensible. And morally it is bad-for in almost every sport where amateur status is important the top men are subsidized in some way or another.

They are supported-and sometimes even enriched- in a roundabout and furtive manner, which the authorities pretend to know nothing about. Yet if they are honest enough to come out in the open, to take money in a direct service, then they are no longer considered fit to consort with amateurs.

McDonald Bailey has often let it be known that he disliked this humbug world. As a result he has often been rebuked by the men of the Amateur Athletic Association.

He is well out of it all. The rest of the athletes should follow his example. They should make their livings openly as they choose. That would be a benefit not a disservice to sport. And if it did the A.A.A. out of business-why, no one would be any worse. (*Daily Express*, July 27 1953)

Peter Wilson, in an article entitled “Brass is Better Than Cutlery”, in the *Daily Mirror*, while supporting Bailey’s decision, used the opportunity to restate his criticism of amateurism and the double standards of the AAA whom he had accused of having a personal agenda against Bailey (*Daily Mirror*, July 27 1953). He had made the same accusation in 1950 when

---

80 In what was a major media development then, Peter Wilson left the *Daily Express* in May 1953 to join the *Daily Mirror* (*Daily Mirror*, May 26 1953), the reasons for which are still not clear to this author.
questions arose as to whether Bailey was ‘a genuine amateur’ (Daily Express, August 18 1950). As regards the double standard of the AAA, he stated that “Their attitude towards the most consistently great sprinter of our generation has been the old Army game of “Don’t do as I do, do as I say.” (Daily Mirror, July 27 1953). And in very disparaging language, opined further: “What a sad and sordid farrago of fatuity it is when officials are more concerned with quenching an established star than finding new ones. Because a man does one job for bread and butter can anyone tell me why he shouldn’t compete in another for fun? Many people have tried to give me a satisfactory answer but all have failed.” (ibid.). Athletics Weekly, the sole national athletic magazine of the day, while seeing the wisdom of Bailey’s decision “...as a matter for Mac alone” responded with a mixture of sympathy and regret over his decision. As it editorialized, “None but the extreme purists will blame Mac for ‘cashing-in’ as he quite frankly describes it....but his going will leave a gap which will be difficult to bridge” (Athletics Weekly, August 1 1953).

For his own part Bailey, as if expressing liberation from the constraints of amateurism, reportedly remarked after his decision: “Freedom is a wonderful thing.” His motive, however, was not just democratic but also economic, for he openly stated: “Now I can cash in on the talents I have given freely to Trinidad and Great Britain for the past 14 years.” (Daily Express, July 27 1953). And “cash in”, he did, for in interview with this author (March 19 1996), he admitted to receiving £10,000.00, before even setting foot on the field. “That’s right. Yes. That was without playing. That was in hand ... cash in hand. And I was able to buy a house in North of England area.”81 He also reportedly received a

81Since Bailey had never played any form of rugby in his life, the decision was met with much scepticism and doubt among Rugby League fans, with some describing it as “a stunt” and as “comic.” Given his speed however, Bailey was optimistic that he had “what it takes.” The Chairman of Leigh was equally
signing on fee estimated around “£1,000” (Daily Mirror, July 27 1953, December 16 1953; Daily Express, December 1 1953) but, in a recent interview with author (July 2 2005), he had no specific recollection of this fee. In a previous interview, Bailey was probed further on the reasons for his decision. While restating the economic motive, Bailey identified other related considerations such as the unfairness of amateurism, family responsibilities, and “the hassle” he experienced from certain “petty officials” of the AAA, which shaped his decision.

McCree: Why you decided to play pro-rugby?

Bailey: Well for more reasons than one. One of the reasons was I was getting a little tired of the amateur business and I had an innate feeling that all this was unfair. I wasn’t about to change the rules deliberately but somehow or the other, I thought this can’t be right. And I thought when I was approached, nothing ventured, nothing gained. I was able to gain some ready cash. And that basically was the reason. I really felt I reached the end of my tether now—from 1945 to 1953, that was long enough.

McCree: So what was unfair about amateurism?

Bailey: If somebody has talent and that person is able to make money for other people, why shouldn’t the person get something out of it? I am not a hundred percent in favour of professionalism, particularly as it is today, where the win at all cost syndrome is so apparent that drugs are what matter to those people who are only after money. I don’t think I can entertain that.

McCree: You said there was more reason than one that influenced your decision to take up the pro. rugby offer. What are some of the other reasons or considerations: family, age?

optimistic about his new signing and stated that: “I’m convinced he will succeed as a Rugby player.” (Daily Express, July 27 1953), but succeed he did not.

82 In a 1949 report, it is revealed that the average weekly salary of a rugby professional was in the region of £8 to £13 and that the average signing on fee was between £1000-£2,500 (Daily Express, September 29 1949).
Bailey: I can encapsulate all of this by more or less saying that I had reached the end of my tether. I was on top for all those number of years. ... What else does one want?

McCree: Was there a concern about seeing bout your family, you just started a family;\textsuperscript{83} was there a question about age?

Bailey: Well, obviously, one has to think of family. ... And therefore when this offer was made to me, I am not one of those who scoffed at the idea of playing professional rugby. The whole thing at that time was so ridiculous it wasn’t even funny and we know today how ridiculous it is. People now respect rugby players who are professionals. In my time they didn’t. Look at cricket for example, amateur cricketers came out of one gate and the professionals came out of another. You want anything more ridiculous than that.

McCree: Was your age a consideration to you?

Bailey: Well I was fit man. I was quite fit. I didn’t think I could have gone on forever but at least I had another year and I am sure if I didn’t have all this hassle I would have attempted another go at the Olympics. I didn’t think I was old at 32. I was as fit as ever and I was stronger. ‘Am telling you my decision was based on the disgust I began to feel with these petty officials who... I will give you an example. I come out to run a race; I come out from the underground tunnel to go out on the White City track. An official puts his hand out to tell me I can’t warm up until ten minutes before the race and I said “I beg your pardon, it takes me at least 20 to 25 minutes to warm up,” and I defied him....His reason why I shouldn’t come out now is because I would mess up the inside of the cinder track... So I said “excuse me, I can take lane six” and I pushed his hand away. But I didn’t feel good about it but I said I am not going to run 10 minutes before my final. That is inviting a pull muscle. ...So I circled the track and spoke to Jack Crump, who was the team manager and one of the leading lights at the time ... So he went and spoke to the official but that didn’t endear me to the official or some of the people in the Southern 3 As under whose jurisdiction I came. So, all of that went towards my making this decision. I wasn’t bitter. I was disgusted. (Interview with author, October 28 2004)

However, the rugby experiment failed.\textsuperscript{84} After reportedly incurring an injury after his much publicized first game in December 1953, Bailey

\textsuperscript{83}Bailey got married in 1946 and had three children at the time of his move to Leigh in 1953.
was ruled out of playing for the rest of the year (*Daily Mirror*, December 18 1953; *Daily Express*, December 18 1953) but he was never to return. In interview, he stated that “It came to an end because it couldn’t work. I got injured and it couldn’t work. And both parties agreed well [there] is no point in persevering ... You couldn’t use somebody whose physical capability was no longer conducive to Rugby. And it was a gentleman’s agreement. There was no acrimony or anything like that. We parted and that was that.” (Interview with author, March 19 1996). In 1954, Bailey formally announced his retirement from athletics (*The Times*, March 16 1954) and proceeded to take up an appointment in the personnel department at Bookers Sugar Company in then British Guiana.

However, it is interesting to note that following the 1952 Olympics Bailey had reportedly turned down an offer by the Victorian Athletic League “to make a professional tour of Australia” from December 1953 (*Daily Express*, October 9 1952), to which he previously alluded in reaction to his suspension *sine die* (see p. 248). And this took place some ten months before his decision to become a rugby professional. 85 The offer included “a guarantee of ... £540” plus travel and accommodation (*ibid.*). While the 1952 newspaper report did not indicate why Bailey had rejected the offer, in a recent interview with author (October 28 2004), he revealed that he did so when he learnt that it would have involved “betting” and asking him “to throw races.”

---

84 Around four months after his turn to pro-rugby and just over two weeks before his first major game on December 16 1953, in the form of a friendly against Wigan, Bailey had to deny suggestions that he was seeking reinstatement as an amateur (*Daily Mirror*, December 1, 4 1953). Bailey’s wife also reportedly telephoned Leigh’s club chairman to deny the reinstatement rumour (*Daily Express*, December 1 1953). Under the rules of the AAA, an athlete could have been reinstated as an amateur depending on the particular circumstances of their case (AAA, 1948, p. 5).

85 While not suggesting in any way that he was involved in any “race fixing”, we note that in December 1953, Jamaican Herb McKenley, Olympic champion and world 400m record holder, accepted an offer to run professionally in Australia for 3 months. He reportedly received £1,000 plus expenses and “£10 a week spending money.” (*Daily Express*, December 23 1953). Like Bailey thus, McKenley did not subscribe to “ascetic amateurism.”
For our purpose however, what is important is not so much the eventual outcome of Bailey’s professional rugby experiment but the wider sociological significance of his decision as it pertains to the related issues of human agency, the nature of human action, and identity formation. Bailey’s decision to become a rugby professional can be seen as marking the culmination of the conflictual encounters which he had with the athletic establishment in 1952 and then in 1953, which had brought to a head the contentious issue of professional and amateur sport. His decision however was not shaped solely by material considerations narrowly defined, but by a confluence of related factors that included money, providing for his family, the unfairness inherent in amateurism which enabled others to benefit more financially from their talent, together with his negative experiences with elements of the British athletic establishment that had left him “disgusted.” While it is difficult to establish the “relative strength” of each factor and so establish “the real driving force of his action”, the available evidence does suggest that economic considerations played a very important role in his decision, although it is not reducible solely to this factor.

These developments, together with his admitted acceptance of “under the table payments” for running, clearly reveal that Bailey never subscribed fully to the prescriptions and proscriptions imposed by the adherents of the idyllic amateur ethos like others in his time which included athletes and administrators. As a human agent, he still exercised or sought to exercise some measure of agency but the imbalances in the relations of power and authority between athletes and amateur minded officials effectively placed limits on the potential success of such agency. Several of the British interviewees commented on the leadership style within the AAA in particular, and the imbalances that were inherent in the hierarchical nature of athlete-official relationships which determined the parameters and outcome of their action. In this respect, former British
athlete, Douglas Wilson, as previously noted (see Chapter 5, p. 157), stated in interview that “There were only two officials who were virtual dictators in those days: Crump and Abrahams. ... Nobody else mattered that much. That’s the way it was.” (Interview with author, June 18 2003). Norris McWhirter also noted that “Usually sports administrators make the rules and they are not too interested in athletes.” (Interview with author, June 20 2003). Former journalist, Terry O’Connor, also stated that “at that particular time what officials said was accepted” (Interview with author, June 22 2003) although the evidence indicates that this did not mean total acceptance. In his 1961 biography, following his retirement, former distance runner, Gordon Pirie was even more critical of the AAA leadership, whom he referred to as the “elderly dictators of British athletics” whose adherence to amateurism was grounded on “the Old School Tie and the Old Pals Act” (cited in Polley, 2000, p. 101). Pirie who also favoured professionalism, more state investment in and a more scientific approach to sport, noted further that, “Every British amateur athlete wears an invisible gag. He dare not break into print, even if he could get his views printed, because he would be branded as a professional.” (ibid., p. 99). However, whereas Pirie’s open criticism of amateurism and the AAA came after his retirement in 1961, that of Bailey’s took place around 8-9 years earlier, while he was still an active athlete, which showed that he had refused to wear the “invisible gag” much earlier. In this respect, O’Connor had described him as “a natural rebel” in interview with author (June 22 2003), while Peter Wilson had also described him as “the stormy petrel of amateur athletics” (Daily Express, October 9 1952). The structure and culture of the AAA, however, did not allow for “rebels” with or without a cause, which forced Bailey eventually to break with the organization all together by joining Leigh.
Bailey’s actions, however, while not reducible only to same, need to be seen not only as the expression of a broader pecuniary instrumental tendency within British sport. Equally important, it has to be also seen as part of a deeper culture of resistance or opposition to amateurism within sport on the whole and athletics in particular, which had expressed itself in events like Powderhall, and “under the table payments.” This resistance however was noteworthy in several related respects. Firstly, and generally, it lacked the necessary leadership, organization, and resources to pose an effective challenge to the amateur driven status quo. Secondly, one contends that in light of his conflicts with the AAA, Bailey’s emergence as an athlete in Britain assumed an oppositional character in so far as he had challenged the dominant amateur ethos, which was going through a period of resurgence following the war. Thirdly, and even more fundamental, to the extent that the amateur-professional divide had also coincided with the basic class cleavages in British society, it can be said that Bailey’s oppositional emergence formed part of a deeper process of internal class formation and conflict, which had heightened in British sport following the war. In this regard, it is interesting to note that Bailey himself was of middle class origin in Trinidad and was merely continuing abroad the challenge that had also been made to amateurism in Trinidad (see Chapter 2) following the end of war. Fourthly, in this context, Bailey’s conflict or “troubles” cannot be seen as a personal one between him and the British AAA, but as one between two fundamental and diametrically opposed approaches to sport (amateurism and professionalism), and their particular adherents in the post-war world. Fifthly, it is also suggested that Bailey’s experiences served not just to mirror but to reinforce this conflict as they provided an opportunity for the establishment to reassert and reinforce amateurism which was to remain the dominant normative framework within athletics for a considerable time thereafter, in spite of the inconsistencies and compromises within the ranks of the AAA in relation to broken-time and publishing. It was only
following Bailey’s retirement in 1954, that athlete opposition to amateurism and the AAA was to intensify and become more organized through the formation of the International Athletes Club (IAC) in 1958 by Peter Hildreth and Derek Johnson (Polley, 2000, p. 102). What Bailey had tried to do on his own, others now tried to do together.

Historian Martin Polley has sought to explain the increasing assertiveness of British athletes after the war in terms of their changing class composition. He suggests that this development was aided by the growth of the welfare state and the opportunities provided for secondary and tertiary education together with the effects of sport media coverage (Polley, 2000, pp. 100-101). As a result, this period saw more persons of working class and lower middle class backgrounds taking part in athletics although “university athletes” still dominated. He wrote thus:

In the post-war period, the sport began to attract more people from lower middle and working class backgrounds than in previous periods, with the relative improvements in opportunities and resources (particularly through the armed forces, and educational institutions after 1944), and the increased popularity of and accessibility to the Olympic Games and other major tournaments through media coverage, bringing in new people. While university athletes continued to dominate in the 1950s, more top class athletes were from less privileged backgrounds. (ibid., p. 100)

The increased opportunities and possibilities offered the new post-war generation “... created a culture of expectation and aspiration very different from that of athletics administrators” (ibid., p. 101). Polley’s class decomposition thesis to explain this “assertive culture” among British athletes in the post-war period, surely, may have some merit. However, what we also need to point out is that this “assertive culture” was very much part of elements of the middle classes themselves as expressed in the strong and continuous criticism of amateurism and the AAA by certain sections of the British media. In explaining the greater
post-war assertiveness among British athletes therefore, we need to consider not just the decomposition of middle class involvement in athletics but the differentiated nature of the middle class itself, some of whom had continuously attacked the AAA and amateurism following the war. Moreover, it is suggested further, that a culture of resistance to the ideologically dominant amateur ethos as expressed in the existence of Powderhall predated the war although it assumed a more covert and pre-emergent character. What the economic and social changes after the war seem to have done was to intensify it and facilitate its emergence which became expressed in more open and organized opposition to the AAA. In any case, in conditions of increased poverty and hardship in mid-20th century Britain, the adherence to “ascetic amateurism” would have done little to address their concerns as well as the concerns over British competitiveness in sport, which became a major preoccupation after the war.

7.4 Summary-Conclusion

Following the end of world war two, the world of sport simmered over the conflict between amateur and professional sport. As if they were just waiting for the war to finish, the middle class elements who dominated the national and international organization of sport, and who favoured amateurism, went on a literal crusade against what was then considered by some the curse of professional sport. To deal with this curse many sport organizations formulated formal and explicit rules concerning amateurism as the qualifying condition for participating in their activities although there were those which showed or attempted to show a more open and accommodating position on the question linked chiefly to concerns over the lack of British competitiveness in sport and to a lesser extent to concerns over traditional elitism and exclusivism. Bailey’s struggles thus were part of a deeper, longstanding chasm in
British society, that of class and its identity correlates which, in sport, meant the amateur-professional divide.

One of the major issues that gave prominence to the amateur-professional divide after the war and caused it to reach a boil was the question of broken-time payments to athletes. In the context of track and field, initial attempts by the IAAF to resolve this question immediately after the war in 1946 and 1947 proved futile. While eventually making concessions, however, both the British AAA and IAAF still adhered to the principle of amateurism as the basic normative framework for the conduct of sporting activity. The amateur strictures also applied to lecturing, writing and broadcasting in sport for pecuniary gain although this was allowed under certain conditions. The citadel of amateurism however came under heavy attack both within Britain, especially the media, and without, in particular from the continental countries who pointed to the inequalities, inconsistencies and hypocrisy it bred through the existence of shamateurism among both athletes and officials. Shamateurism took several forms, which included the provision of employment to athletes under some guise or the other, the provision of material assistance for training, the acceptance of money for publishing (among both officials and athletes) and the existence of illegal payments to athletes.

It was in the context of this post-war national and international middle class crackdown on professional sport and their (re) assertion of amateurism that Bailey had emerged as a top international athlete and had sought to challenge the amateur orthodoxy directly, by speaking out against it publicly in 1952 and by establishing a company to produce his own brand name starting blocks in 1953. These developments met with strong opposition from the ruling British AAA and although Bailey had won the starting blocks affair, by having his 1953 suspension lifted, he still felt constrained by the strictures of the amateur code. And, so much
so, that he eventually broke completely from its chains in 1953, by turning not to professional athletics, but to professional rugby. While he was previously content to rocking the amateur boat, he now decided that the time had come to jump ship. In the context of the times, however, it was a suicidal act for it invariably meant the end of his “amateur” career as he was automatically disqualified from not just running in amateur competition but from representing Britain and his former club, Polytechnic Harriers. The move to pro-rugby, however, while proving financially rewarding, was short lived which was due mainly to the fact that Bailey was not prepared for the rigours of a game which he had never played before. After joining Leigh in July 1953, for what was considered then a princely sum, the move ended in December 1953, no sooner than it had started, after sustaining an injury in his first major game. In 1954, Bailey formally announced his retirement from athletics. In his decision to try pro-rugby thus, he had met his Waterloo.

The actions and experiences of Bailey in relation to the amateur-professional divide in post-war Britain and the nature of reaction to them has offered a veritable window through which to peer as well as probe several theoretical issues relating to human agency, the dynamic nature of the outsider-established configuration and identity formation generally. As regards the latter issues, it is suggested that the supportive reaction received by Bailey from certain white upper class elements within the media, the judiciary and political establishment assumed significance at three broad related levels. Firstly, it can be seen as an expression of the gradual process of his transition from being considered an “outsider” or “foreigner” to being considered a part of British society akin to the use of a more possessive language to describe him which was also occurring around the same time (see Chapter 6). In this respect, it was merely continuing further a process which may have started during Bailey's privileged stay in the RAF (see Chapter 5). Secondly, this transition
process had certain chief characteristics which relate mainly to its incipient, emergent and oppositional nature. Bailey’s emergence was seen to be oppositional for he had challenged the dominant amateur orthodoxy to which the middle class elements of the AAA had subscribed but, because the middle class was not monolithic on the amateur question, his opposition did not prevent him from receiving the support of other middle class elements (Interestingly, Bailey himself was of middle class origin in Trinidad.). Thirdly, the supportive reaction he received from middle class elements outside of the AAA, as well the negative reaction he received from similar class elements within the AAA can also serve to illustrate the contested, exclusionary and inclusionary characteristic of identity formation, be it in relation to group, national or sporting identity. While this inclusionary tendency did not necessarily mean that Bailey was considered a status equal, it assumes even more significance in his case given the prominence of, and restrictions associated with, the colour bar at the time. As regards the latter, while ethnicity has historically imposed a ceiling on the acceptance and mobility aspirations of certain groups in Britain, Bailey’s experience shows that there were still windows of possibility created out of meritocratic and egalitarian predispositions or practices in the same society and even during what can possibly be described as the golden era of colour bar.

With respect to the issue of human agency, Bailey’s actions had formed part of a wider historical culture of pecuniary instrumentality and resistance in British sport on the whole and athletics in particular. However, the basis of Bailey’s decision to try professional rugby was tied into several intimately connected material, personal and democratic concerns relating to provision for his young family, the unfairness of amateurism which allowed others to benefit more from his talents than him, together with the “hassle” which he claims to have been subjected to by the AAA both on and off the track. Bailey’s decision to join Leigh thus
is not easily reducible to material factors *per se* although they played an important role since sport was his major source of livelihood. Rather, it is more helpful to view Bailey’s actions as being driven by “a complex” of related motives of a monetary, familial, democratic and organizational nature. As Weber had suggested, the nature and “actual outcome of [his] conflict” with the AAA “gives a solid basis of judgment” (see Chapter 2).

It has been noted that the challenge that Bailey posed to the ruling British AAA formed part of a deeper culture of resistance or opposition to amateurism in British sport generally and athletics in particular, which bore certain characteristics. Firstly, it was generally covert and lacked the necessary leadership, organization and resources to change the dominant amateur establishment and the asymmetries of power between official and athlete. Secondly, while some of Bailey’s own acts of resistance can be considered more overt, radical and pioneering as it relates for instance to the manufacture and endorsement of sport products, the hierarchical structure and culture of the AAA, did not allow for rebels, revolutionaries or pioneers. Consequently, it stymied the exercise of human agency geared to changing the amateur status quo after the war in the sport of track and field. Thirdly, given the class-based nature of the conflict, Bailey’s opposition and struggle cannot be narrowly construed as a personal one between himself and the AAA but as one between two fundamentally different ways of playing sport (professionalism and amateurism) and its adherents, which was feverishly contested mid 20th century Britain. Fourthly, Bailey’s struggles were not just symbolic of a deeper class conflict within British society but served to reinforce that conflict by providing an opportunity for the reassertion of amateurism as the dominant legitimizing framework for sport. For the British AAA, however, to be amateur or not to be amateur never assumed the proportion of its Shakespearean equivalent. Consequently, to them, it was never a question though it invited much criticism. It was only following Bailey’s
retirement in 1954, that there developed a more open and organized attempt among British athletes to challenge the citadel of amateurism and build on what Bailey and others had earlier attempted on their own.

In a recent essay, historian Martin Polley (2000) has attempted to explain the increasing assertiveness of British athletes after the war in terms of the decomposition of the middle class nature of participation in athletics occasioned by the growth of the welfare state, the provision of more education opportunities for those of working class origin together with the effects of media coverage of sport. It is argued further that these developments produced an outlook and expectations among the new generation of athletes that diverged from those of athletic administrators and led to greater demands. While the merit of this explanation was not discounted, it was noted that opposition to amateurism had also existed among elements of the middle classes and had predated the war as evident in the covert existence of professional athletics as symbolized by Powderhall. In the post-war period, however, in a period of drastic change, this more assertive athletic culture was to become more overt and more organized as it moved from what can be considered a pre-emergent phase to one that was more emergent as a counter to the dominant amateur orthodoxy.

In spite of the challenges faced by the British AAA after the war, however, through athlete and non-athlete opposition, Powderhall, the issue of broken-time, under the table payments and shamateurism generally, amateurism still maintained its ideological ascendancy as the normative framework for the conduct of sporting activity. As Baker (1995, p. 116) has also noted: "... the establishment displayed great resilience and the influence of its ideals particularly those centering on amateurism, while beginning to wane in this period were not replaced by any alternative sporting code." However, the various challenges were to have long term
consequences for they had laid the early foundation for the eventual rise of professional and commercial sport in the last decades of the 20th century.
CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY-CONCLUSION

The processes of migration, globalization and identity formation continue to occupy a prominent place in the academic and political arenas of contemporary society. This has been no less so in the context of sport where these processes have historically expressed themselves or played themselves out at almost all levels: locally, nationally, regionally and internationally. Etched around the life history of Emmanuel McDonald Bailey, who resided for around ten years in England (1944-1954) and represented Britain in international athletic competition between 1945 and 1953, inclusive, this study examined several related issues in relation to the study of sport migration, the global diffusion of sport and identity formation while focusing particularly on the latter. The explanation of these processes has been hotly contested since they have involved competing theories and theorists with varying insights and empirical emphases linked to their particular interests and developmental concerns. For instance, these explanations include such notions as (i) modernization with its focus on the development and spread of particular values (e.g., amateur-gentleman, character formation) and the rationalization of sport (e.g., bureaucratization, regulation, standardization etc.); (ii) imperialism with its focus on coercion and destruction of indigenous sport forms; (iii) cultural hegemony à la Gramsci which focuses on domination, as well as consent, resistance/reinterpretation/indigenization, and the two-way, albeit asymmetrical nature of the cultural diffusion process; (iv) capitalism, its expansionist dynamics as part of the commodification of sport and (v) globalization, with its focus on the interdependent, plural and hybridized character of international cultural contact and relations. In addition, in order to avoid what was seen as the "monocausal, unidirectional and reductionist" quality of some of these approaches in their analysis of sport
processes, the proponents of figurational sociology suggest the use of a more comprehensive, dynamic approach that recognizes the multivariable (e.g., economic, political, cultural, ideological), multilevel (e.g., individual, group, nation etc.), multidirectional, albeit asymmetrical, and long term nature of the processes at work while grounded in the limits and possibilities of human agency. Critically informed by this discourse, this study sought to apply some of the above theoretical approaches to an examination of the following related issues/questions: (i) the meaning(s) of sport migration and the classification of sport migrants; (ii) the factors motivating McDonald Bailey to migrate to Britain in 1944; (iii) the conditions that facilitated the emergence of Bailey as a top and popular athlete in post-war Britain; (iv) the significance and consequences of Bailey’s decision to represent Britain at the 1948 Olympic Games in particular and generally, in the period 1945-1953, for him, the people of Britain and Trinidad; (v) the nature of hegemony as consistent with consent, resistance and domination; (vi) the nature or workings of imperialism (can it be intentional as well as unintentional?); (vii) the asymmetrical and reciprocal nature of dominant-subordinate relations; (viii) the dynamic, exclusive, inclusive and plural nature of the process of identity formation as well as (ix) the processual, circuitous nature of established-outsider relations together with (x) the role of discursive practices such as the media and practical consciousness in these processes.

The examination of these issues was based on the edited topical life history of McDonald Bailey which involved the combined use of interviews, historical documents and content analysis, particularly of newspaper reports, during the period of his athletic career. While the life history method has its particular advantages as a mode of enquiry (e.g., empowering, privileging actor’s voice, better insight into their experiences; macro processes can be conveniently examined on micro scale), it poses particular problems of validity. In order to deal with the
problem of validity in general and those of internal validity in particular which it poses (i.e., poor memory, maturation, reactivity, revisionism/reinterpretation), we were guided by a range of strategies or guidelines which related to the use of methodological triangulation, verstehen, the sociological imagination and sensitivity to the problematic and variable nature of human action or motives through a recourse to some of Weber’s classical albeit problematic prescriptions. In addition, given the historical and life history nature of the study, the approach to determing validity was based not on analytical induction or generalizability to populations or universes but on the generalizability of the case to the particular theoretical propositions that formed the crux of the study in relation to the nature of hegemony, imperialism, the role of sport in the process of identity formation, the inclusive/exclusive, unplanned nature of this process and relatedly, the dynamic and circuitous nature of established-outsider relationships.

With respect to the issue of sport migration, attempts to define its nature and classify the experiences of sport migrants have focused on three major related issues: its direction, duration and the nature of migrant motives. With respect to its direction Bailey’s movement to the UK in 1944 was described as representing a form of inter-continental migration from the Americas to Europe, but in the context of an Empire, it was also seen as a form of internal migration between colony and metropole. In terms of duration however, it was noted that the various terms used in the sport migration literature to describe this process such as “temporary”, “transitory”, “seasonal”, “long term” and “permanent” lacked conceptual clarity at best and were confusing at worst. In order to avoid or reduce the terminological ambiguity associated with these terms and enable a better understanding of the processes at work, a migration continuum was proposed which contained temporary migration at one pole, sub-divided into transient and seasonal migration, and permanent migration at the
other, sub-divided into quasi-permanent migration and fully permanent forms of migration. In addition, a similar attempt was made to enhance the conceptual clarity and heuristic utility of the sport migration model offered by Maguire in which he identified 5 major categories of sport migrants: pioneers, settlers, mercenaries, nomads and returnees. While novel and pioneering in the context of sport, one contended that there was a certain measure of overlap in the various migrant categories advanced in relation to both the duration of their stay and their motives, which blurred the distinctions between them and invariably undermined the model’s utility (see Chapter 1, Table 1, p. 19). In order to reduce this source of muddle in the model, and further enhance its heuristic utility, it was suggested that the definition of those criteria on which the typology rested could have been more clearly delineated and defined in terms of four major dimensions: **duration** (temporary/permanent/short-term/long-term); **motives** (economic, political, cultural, educational, developmental etc.); **context** (colonialism, independence, commercialization etc.) and **type of sport** (amateur/professional, individual/team) [see Table 2, p. 20]. It was argued that by identifying these core dimensions of the sport migration process we would then be able to discern more clearly and easily the level of convergence (similarities) and divergence (differences) in the migrant categories proposed and the range of experiences or processes to which they direct attention. Based on these proposed refinements to defining and classifying sport migrants it was suggested that the study of McDonald Bailey can be seen as a particular case of inter-continental/intra empire migration of both the short term settler and return migrant type, occurring in a particular national and international context of social dislocation and change in the post-war West Indies and Europe in which amateur sport was the dominant normative framework for involvement in sporting activity. It was this particular social and sporting context of the post-war world that was to shape and give meaning to some of the conflicts and
experiences of Bailey during the course of his ten year stay in the United Kingdom.

As it relates to his motives for migrating to the UK in 1944, it was learnt that these were driven by both sporting and cultural factors that related to certain desires he harboured as a child and young man to become a world athlete and see more of London, which had been awakened after his first visit there in 1939 to take part in the annual championships of the British AAA. It was in order to realize these desires that Bailey took the conscious decision to join the RAF in 1944. Put differently, it was found that Bailey’s decision to migrate to the UK in 1944 was driven by multiple motives of an instrumental (viz., developing athletic ability, realizing childhood dreams, experience adventure of war), affective (viz., love for London and England) and traditional nature (viz., love for sport). In addition, an important element that formed part of Bailey’s motivating context was the lack of competitive athletic opportunities in Trinidad compared to Britain, together with the absence of modern athletic infrastructure in the form of cinder tracks. As a result, Bailey’s movement to the UK in 1944 was not the product of any exploitation or imperialist machination but the workings of his own ambition and restricted opportunities to develop as an athlete in Trinidad. However, while the above sporting and cultural factors formed the initial bedrock of Bailey’s decision, during any migration process new motives, interests and opportunities can emerge that were not previously envisaged by the migrant. While the new motives and interests may reinforce or represent extensions of the original motivational factors, they may also depart fundamentally from it. It is such changes overtime that can make the task of classifying sport migrants in terms of their motives difficult since motives do not only vary and criss-cross each other but may also change. As it relates to Bailey, his exposure to professional athletics and professional sport generally, presented new opportunities and challenges
that surely he had never envisaged or planned when joining the RAF in 1944, but which he had embraced all the same together with all the conflicts and tensions that it generated between himself and the British AAA. As an athlete thus, Bailey’s motives were not just to develop and become the best in the world, but also to benefit materially from his sporting ability. This statement may appear trite today but, in the context of the 1940s and 1950s, it was a risky political act of self-assertion and defiance of the dominant amateur ethos which formed part of a deeper conflict surrounding class and sporting identities in post-war Britain and the world at large.

When we examine Bailey’s experience as an athletic migrant over time therefore, he appears to fit several other possible categories in addition to those of short-term settler and returnee previously suggested (see Figure 3, p. 190). Firstly, Bailey can be considered a pioneer but this is not in the sense used by Maguire to refer to the early historical agents of the international diffusion of sport (e.g., 19th century missionaries). His pioneer status here derives from five main sources as follows: (i) his efforts at product endorsement through the establishment of a company to manufacture his own brand of running shoes at a time when this was frowned upon by some amateur purists given the relatively undeveloped nature of professional sport; (ii) being among the early elite athletes who was contracted to publish a book (by Stanley Paul) at a time when the idea of sport publishing was still in its formative stages; (iii) his record of 14 athletic titles set at the annual championships of the British AAA between 1946-1953; (iv) being among the first blacks to represent Britain in international sport in general and athletics in particular and (v) being among the first group of West Indian born athletes to migrate to Britain. As it relates to the sport of track and field in particular, Bailey can be considered one of the early pioneers in the process of its commodification in the areas of both publishing and product endorsement, which was a
source of much conflict and which was only officially accepted by athletic
authorities in the early 1980s as the commercialization of sport on the
whole entered a new era. Secondly, given his apparent affection for
London and England as a whole, Bailey approaches more closely
Maguire’s category of “cosmopolitan” although without the nomadic label
given the length of time he stayed in Britain and its generally
uninterrupted character. In the latter respect, we should note that Bailey
only returned to Trinidad twice during his ten year stay in the UK: the first
in 1946 on the way to represent Trinidad at the 1946 Central American
Games and the second time in 1947 to visit his family (Trinidad
Guardian, December 6 1947). While one may argue that the infrequency
of his visits can be linked to the technological and economic limitations of
foreign commercial travel then, one also has to factor in the possible role
played by public dissatisfaction with his decision to represent Britain at
the 1948 and 1952 Olympics. As a variant of this category, however, and
to capture the nature of the historical period in question, I would suggest
use of the terms colonial cultural connoisseur or colonial cosmopolitan to
describe Bailey. Thirdly, given Bailey’s multiple identities and in
particular, his dual allegiance as part-British and part-Trinidadian, it is
suggested that he can fit the category of cultural hybrid. Such a category
tries to capture the plural nature of athletic migrant identities and direct
attention to the tensions and conflicts that this can potentially generate in
particular relation to representation in sporting competition. As an athletic
migrant therefore, Bailey appears to have fit several categories: short term
settler, returnee, pioneer, colonial cosmopolitan and cultural hybrid as
illustrated in Figure 4.
Whatever his migratory hue, however, it was found that Bailey’s emergence as an athlete in post-war Britain, the varying reaction to and consequences of his representation of this country, together with his other experiences as an athlete, were grounded in the process of identity formation as it expressed itself at the related personal, group and national levels in both the UK, as well as in the then colony of Trinidad in the immediate post-war period. In examining this process (i.e., identity formation), the aim was to show how Bailey’s experiences can help to highlight its political, contested, exclusive, inclusive, plural and contradictory nature as it found expression in the selection or representation issue, media reporting of him, his encounters with the
British AAA over the amateur-professional divide and the peculiarities of the established-outsider group relations.

It was shown that the major key or cue to understanding these developments and, as they affected Bailey, lay in understanding the peculiar conditions and processes that prevailed in both Britain and Trinidad during the historical period in question, together with Bailey's own motives for certain decisions he made (e.g., to go to the UK in 1944, to represent Britain at 1948 Olympics, to try professional rugby). As previously noted that historical period spanned the years 1944-1954, which fell squarely into the 4th period in the historical development and globalization of sport identified by Maguire as roughly spanning from the 1920s to the 1960s. For our purposes, attention is drawn to five major related features of the period in which Bailey was an active athlete in Europe: (1) the decline and changes experienced by the British people after the war in almost all areas of social life including sport; (2) the nature of the prevailing hierarchy of social relations and the location of coloureds and minorities in general within this hierarchy; (3) the dominance of amateurism as the normative framework for the conduct of sport activity; (4) the nature of metropole-colony relations and (5) the development of nascent nationalist sentiments in Trinidad.

In the aftermath of two successive world wars, the entire world was confronted with the challenge of recovery from the general havoc it had wreaked on social and international life. As a major player in the war and international politics due to the position it had occupied in the hierarchy of nations as an imperial power for over 300 years, the British leaders and people had to deal with more than the basic needs and demands for food, clothing, shelter and health services which were in very short supply following the war and of dubious quality where they were
An equally important concern during the "hard rock and grey period of austerity" and beyond was the restoration of its pride, prestige and power consistent with its historical standing and image as a foremost imperial power which had gone into decline due to the ravages of war and the gradual upsurge of nationalist movements in its colonial territories. The independence of India in 1948 had served to symbolize and accelerate further the incipient decline of this Empire after the war. In the field of sport, this decline was also experienced through successive defeats in several of its major sports but particularly in the sports of football and cricket which were and still are to many, both within Britain and without, the jewels in the English sporting crown and symbols of English national identity.

However, in spite of its declining status as a world power there was still a tendency within Britain, aided by the media, to see itself as the mighty imperial nation it once was. In this regard, Norbert Elias has noted that the leaders and members of established groups and nations that were once powerful may find it difficult to 'shed' this powerful image (see Chapter 1) and, as a result, may continue to believe this is so although the reality may suggest otherwise. Furthermore, in order to maintain this reality-incongruent self-image or "fantasy shield" of their past greatness, such persons may have recourse to a range of strategies one of which can involve the use of sport. Historically, sport represented an important "invented tradition" within British society which became inextricably woven into the construction of class identities (e.g., through the concept of the amateur-gentleman), the British imagiNation or national identity and its imperial mission civilatrice. However, in the aftermath of war, it was now being used to sustain a particular imperial image of itself that had gradually become at variance with the reality of its changing position in the international changing power balances in the post-war world. In other words, the imperial and national image that sport had helped to create and
came to reflect for British people, it was now being used to help sustain notwithstanding its “reality-incongruent nature.” And, in a different context of crisis and change sport was perhaps needed more than ever before to help restore stability and sense of normalcy in the society, functions which Hobsbawm notes represent part of the raison d’être of “invented traditions” (see Chapter 1).

While the sport of track and field never held a similar pride of place in defining and symbolizing the British nation as cricket and football (due primarily to its low international standing in the discipline and the greater focus placed on team sports as a symbol of sport’s collectivist ideals), the various initiatives to revive and develop the sport after the war were still clearly motivated by two related concerns: (i) British pride, prestige and international standing within athletics and sport generally and (ii) the broader process of reconstruction, restoration and renewal following the war. Britain’s generally low ranking in international athletics, together with the void created with the departure of its leading sprinter then, Cyril Holmes, after the war would also have greatly augmented Bailey’s value to them in this process of recovery and revival. Based on sheer athletic ability thus, the man dubbed the “greatest sprinter ever produced by the British Empire”, emerged and became popular in post-war Britain because he appeared to have resonated with their collective needs, hopes and development objectives at the time. Relatedly, it was further suggested that Bailey’s emergence and popularity in post-war Britain was connected to the use of sport as a “fantasy shield” of its past greatness and international standing which was going through a process of decline. While it can be argued that the British imperialist infrastructure remained basically intact after the war, serious cracks now existed in its foundation, a foreboding of the long term process of decline that had set in. Although Bailey’s performances at both the 1948 and 1952 Olympic Games did not satisfy general expectations, this did not
appear to have taken away much from his symbolic and practical value as a sporting icon to many British people in the general process of recovery following the war and particularly those who administered the sport of athletics and some sport journalists.

Borrowing from Weber, in order to capture the range of motivations involved among the various actors and so avoid any reductionism which is associated with the sociology of sport literature particularly in relation to ludic diffusion, it was suggested that in post-war Britain, the actions of those involved in the sport of athletics (officials, journalists, public) and sport generally, together with their reaction to Bailey were informed by a complex of motives of a traditional and instrumental nature. These motives included the development of athletics within Britain; concerns over their international image and standing both in sport and outside of it, the quest for excitement and recreation following the ravages of war, together with the historical British interest in or love for sport which had come to define their sense of identity.

In the debate that exists surrounding the explanation of ludic diffusion and general dominant-subordinate relations, the imperialist perspective has focused on the coercive and even violent nature of this process. In addition, it has been argued that for any action or process to qualify as imperialist and hegemonic such control, dominance or influence must have been intentional and not an unintended by product of the dominant actor’s actions. This I choose to call conscious or active imperialism. While it is readily admitted that human action and interaction can produce unscripted results, it is argued here that the unintended may assume relevance in this process since it may produce effects that inadvertently serve the interests of the dominant. The latter I choose to name unconscious or passive imperialism. As a further
consequence, it was argued that the point on the intentional or unintentional nature of human action raised by Guttmann, in his critique of the notions of “cultural imperialism” and “cultural hegemony” is a mute one. This is so for the fact that a particular action is unintended is not at variance with an imperialist analysis, for what is equally important is the effect, both short term and long term, upon the dominant and the subordinate. In any event, as it applied to Bailey it was suggested that both points of view assume a certain measure of validity. Firstly, in this regard, it was shown that British interest in having Bailey represent them was directly linked to their expressed intentions to enhance their international standing and image in the sport of athletics in particular and, relatedly, help sustain their declining image as a dominant imperial power however reality-incongruent it had become. Secondly, it was argued that even if British interest in Bailey was devoid of any imperialist intent, the effect of his athletic stature and achievements may still have been welcomed by the British athletic establishment, the media, its people and leaders concerned about Britain’s place and image in the new post-war world both in the field of sport and generally. Based on this, it is contended that Bailey’s experience help to confirm the theoretical proposition that imperialism can be consistent with both intentionality and unintentionality which should help to give the concept of imperialism broader applicability and relevance than if it were to focus solely on conscious intentions.

However, although Bailey’s stature and exploits as an athlete were relevant to British sporting and non-sporting interests whether intentional/conscious or unintentional/unconscious, it was held that the orthodox notion of imperialism is limited by its inability to illuminate the interactive dynamic and significance of his impact within Britain. Because of its focus on the negative expression of power, through the exercise of force, in the examination of dominant-subordinate relations,
together with its unidimensional and non-dynamic representation of those relations, the imperialist perspective has been generally superseded by alternate approaches as exemplified by hegemony and figurational theory which seek to avoid these pitfalls. In this respect, there were four major findings. Firstly, it was noted that the orthodox imperialist perspective lacked applicability to Bailey because his decision to represent Britain whether at the Olympics or generally was not based in any way on the use of either force, coercion or even persuasion by the British although they had expressed a clear interest in him representing Britain at the 1948 Olympics since 1946, some 2 years before it began. Secondly, because Bailey’s decision to represent Britain at the 1948 Olympics was based on his own consent after being given the choice as to which country to represent, it seemed more consistent with the fundamental argument of hegemony theory which recognizes that the interests of the dominant can be equally served through the consent as well as the coercion of the subordinate. In this context, the interests of the dominant relate to Britain’s international standing in track and field, its image as a world power and the internal processes of reconstruction, restoration and renewal with which it was confronted following the war. Thirdly, while it can be said that in the initial protests over his omission from the British team for the 1948 Olympics and in making his own eventual decision, Bailey exercised some measure of human agency, this was done largely within the parameters established by the British athletic authorities, which reflected the asymmetrical nature of the relations of power in which he and athletes in general were embedded. In these parameters, Bailey was allowed to run for either Trinidad or Britain, but if he chose the latter, his participation would have been restricted to one event (the 100m). What one British newspaper described thus as Bailey’s “own choice” was not so much an exercise of free will but of relative autonomy. The asymmetrical relations of power with which Bailey had to contend and the effective limits that they placed on his exercise of agency were expressed not only
in the selection practices of the British AAA but also in his open challenges to the dominant amateur ethos which led to his reprimand and temporary suspension in one instance and his eventual retirement from amateur athletics. Fourthly, the effects of Bailey’s athletic exploits in Britain between 1945-1953 were seen as an expression and confirmation of the asymmetrical, as well as the reciprocal nature of relations between the dominant and the subordinate whether constituted as groups or nations. This was based on the view that as a colonial subject then, Bailey could be seen to have made a significant and lasting contribution to the post-war development, popularity and renewal of athletics of an imperial power as well as aiding symbolically in its general process of reconstruction and renewal. Through his exploits, Bailey appeared to have left an indelible mark not just on British athletic record books and tracks but on the British media and public imagination. So much so that after the war, he became “a household name”, “a byword in Britain’s sporting culture” and, with others, part of “the face” and “the Holy Trinity of post-war British athletics.” In addition, his general selection to represent Britain, his county (Middlesex), his club (Polytechnic Harriers), and the various awards he received could be seen as both a blow to the infamous colour bar and symbolic of the meritocratic and democratic ideals around which modern sport and western society in general have been constructed. We can also add to this his representation of the RAF and the preferential treatment he received therein to train and obtain proper nutrition. At the same time, however, it was also noted that this view has to be tempered by the fact that the controversy that erupted over his (non)selection for Britain at the 1948 Olympics and the apparent delays in recognizing his equalling of the British sprint record formerly held by Eric Liddlde have also been questionably haunted by the spectre of the colour bar itself. In addition, media reporting of Bailey reflected and helped to sustain certain stereotypical and racist ideas surrounding coloured athletes and coloureds generally, which were dominant at the time. Needless to say, the colour
bar never impeded his eventual emergence, success and popularity as an athlete in post-war Britain. Moreover, his impact helps confirm the theoretical postulate that in spite of the asymmetry that characterizes dominant-subordinate relations, the influences that one may have over the other is never a one way street, for cultural and other traffic can flow in both directions though its speed, intensity and volume may vary.

Bailey’s decision to represent Britain at the 1948 Olympics, however, while generally welcomed by many within Britain was met with a more mixed response in Trinidad and was to have significant negative consequences of both a short term and long term nature for himself and possibly the local development of the sport. While Bailey did receive some measure of support and sympathy at the time of his decision then, and now, from some members of the Trinidad athletic establishment, the media and public, the findings of this study strongly suggest that there was significant public disappointment and opposition to his decision which has persisted to this day. To many Bailey was seen as “a traitor” because he had betrayed his native land at a crucial time after the war when nationalist sentiments, though incipient and fragmented, were starting to regain some of its pre-war momentum in the fledgling Trinidadian imagiNation. The development of nationalist sentiments and calls for independence from Britain had received considerable impetus from the labour revolts that had gripped the West Indies in the mid to late 1930s, but were invariably slowed by the exigencies of war.86 The end of the war thus in 1945 would have served to rekindle the issues of democracy, nationalism and independence which it had temporarily halted. It was in this milieu in the West Indies that the 1948 Olympics was taking place and it is in this milieu that one has to situate oppositional responses to Bailey’s

---

86Even the publication of the findings of the Royal Commission of Enquiry set up in 1938 to investigate the labour disturbances was withheld until the end of the war although it has been suggested that this was more out of security concerns.
decision together with its other negative consequences. In such a milieu, and to use the language of today, Bailey's 1948 decision was not seen as politically correct. In addition to the label as "traitor", these negative consequences were also manifested in the apparent failure or perhaps refusal (i) to nominate him as a candidate for sportsman of the year in 1951; (ii) to congratulate him on equalling the world 100m record also in 1951; (iii) to nominate him for a Coronation medal in 1953 which was given to 390 other individuals of much lesser renown; (iv) to invite him to run in Trinidad post-1948 and (v) his general marginalization and exclusion from the organization and development of track and field in Trinidad since his return to the island in 1963. So strong was the public opposition to Bailey's decision that well over half a century later, the categorization of him as a "traitor" to his native land still lingers among some and continues to be a source of anger and anguish to him to this very day, even prompting public calls for his forgiveness. In order to dismiss such categorization, and bring it in line with his own admitted nationalist inclinations, it has been suggested that over the years he has deliberately engaged in a form of revisionism or false causal attribution surrounding the events of 1948. His attitude was seen as revisionist because he has held that his decision to represent Britain at the 1948 Olympics resulted from the uncertainty surrounding Trinidad's participation in the games and was not of his own making although he was given the choice, albeit constrained, by both the British and Trinidad athletic authorities to select the country he wished to represent just days before the Games commenced. In order to account for this revisionism, it was linked to his need not only to remove the historical label as "traitor" or anti-nationalist but also to protect his sporting legacy although generations in both Britain and Trinidad are generally ignorant of his athletic exploits. In spite of his own efforts, however, at what might be described as athletic "spinning" or

87 After his formal retirement from athletics in 1954, Bailey took up an appointment in the personnel department of the Booker Sugar Company in British Guiana, where he spent around 10 years before returning to Trinidad and Tobago in 1963.
a sporting sexing up of the historical record, the negative label as “traitor”
and anti-hero has persisted in a period when nationalist sentiments, though
not as aggressive as during the pre- and early post-independence periods
(Trinidad gained independence from Britain in 1962), are still prevalent.

Methodologically, the case of Bailey highlights one of the more
serious problems of internal validity (i.e., revisionism) that any interview
based research has to confront but more so life history research, where the
subject is not only still alive but whose stature and fame may produce a
greater sensitivity to concerns over their image and legacy which can
invariably colour their responses.

Bailey’s still contentious decision and his general representation of
Britain serve to illustrate the contested, contradictory, and the multiple
nature of human identities together with the intimate connections between
their expression at the individual and collective levels. Undoubtedly
linked to its history as a British colonial possession, and its patterns of
immigration, Trinidad, then, like now, was a conundrum of national, race,
religion, and class identities. However, in spite of the emergence of
nationalist sentiments and a fledgling nationalist movement during the
historical period under review, there also existed a relatively strong level
of loyalty to Britain and its monarchy. This was vividly revealed in the
local contribution to the war effort, unsuccessful attempts to celebrate the
150th anniversary of British rule in 1947, public reaction to the deaths of
King George VI in 1952, and Queen Mary in 1953 together with the
Coronation of Queen Elizabeth in 1953. One local newspaper had even
editorialized that in spite of the problems many had with “British colonial
policy”, they still “treasured their British heritage.” British colonialism
therefore had resulted in a basic duality of identity: one that was British
oriented and another that was centred around the island society. In the
latter regard, it had resulted further in the creation of a series of island nationalisms (e.g., Jamaican, Barbadian etc.) in the different territories held by Britain in the West Indies and, at a regional level, it had also laid the basis for the emergence of a more collective West Indian identity, which has historically existed in tension with these many island nationalisms. In view of the above and drawing on the work of Elias, it was suggested that in colonial Trinidad during the time of Bailey, the social or national *habitus* can be described as multi-layered (multi-textured) in nature since it was constituted by several major and overlapping identities: British, Trinidadian, West Indian and those derived from ones particular social background (e.g., ethnic and class). These related layers of identity formed the core of “a flexible lattice work” of a person’s and nation’s *habitus*, a flexibility which was evident in the varied privileging of one over the other depending on the existing situation and the nature of the actor’s perceived interests and motives. However, while multiple identities were the order of the day in colonial Trinidad, they did not necessarily exist in any fixed, unchanging hierarchical order. Thus, in the context of imperial mourning and celebration, it was the sense of British identity that held sway, but in the context of sport and certain international sport competitions in particular, such as the Olympic Games or the Central American Games, it was the sense of island identity, in this case that of Trinidad. Lacking the political, military and economic wherewithal and independence to challenge effectively British dominance, sport offered a major opportunity to express such a challenge and develop a visible sense of nationalism. Moreover, in a period when that sense of nationalism was still of a nascent character, Bailey’s decision to run for Britain at the Olympics, while consistent with the multiple identities and allegiances of colonial society appeared to have constituted a symbolic blow to its early existence and emergence. At the same time, however, in what might appear curious and confusing but merely consistent with the prevalence and nature of multiple identities, there was still a sense of
honour felt by Bailey and some within Trinidad over his representation of Britain in spite of the problems and asymmetries of power that characterized relations between colony and metropole. In an attempt to exemplify further the isomorphic link between collective and individual identity, it was suggested that this sense of being honoured, linked to Britain's pristine, albeit changing position as a mighty world power, can be seen as a further expression of how the image of a collectivity (viz., Britain) can shape not just the self-image of the individual (i.e., Bailey) but that of another collectivity (viz., Trinidad) in the context of a hierarchical metropole-colony figuration, in which the former was not only dominant but valorised more than the latter which was represented as backward and inferior. What the study of Bailey helps illustrate therefore is how sport can activate and demarcate the boundary between competing collective identities, in this case being British and Trinidadian, while showing the indissoluble link between them and individual identities. In this process, the media were also shown to play a crucial role.

In the examination of the selected British and Trinidad media (mainly the press), there were two principal related aims. The first was to show the media’s role as a discursive practice in reflecting and shaping the process of identity formation through the images and messages that it conveys [or does not convey] of individuals and collectivities whether constituted as groups, regions or nations. Relatedly, the second was to examine its role in shaping or reflecting the dynamic nature of established-outsider group relations through those images and messages that they convey. In these respects, it was found that media discourses surrounding McDonald Bailey, though relative and variable, reflected and sustained broader related discourses surrounding race, class, nation and sport in post-war Britain and Trinidad, which were both divisive and cohesive in character. Firstly, for instance, the media were found to have represented Bailey in terms of multiple identities such as British, Trinidadian, West
Indian, coloured, identities which in large measure were the by-product of the encounter between Europe and Africa in the Americas. However, in spite of this plurality of identities, it was the British and Trinidadian identities which were found to have assumed greater prominence in the major newspapers examined with the former assuming prominence among the British media (Daily Express, Daily Mirror) and the latter among their Trinidad counterparts (Trinidad Guardian, Port of Spain Gazette) although the selected Trinidad newspapers contained many reports from British and other foreign sources as well. Secondly, while Bailey’s British identity received greater mention numerically than his “ethnicity” in both British newspapers examined, the description and explanation of his athletic prowess was seen to reflect existing racial stereotypes and racism surrounding the supposed exoticness, physicality and naturalness of blacks that were dominant at the time. Bailey’s elite status as an athlete thus did not spare him of racist stereotyping but may have facilitated it because of his high visibility as a popular public figure. Thirdly, through the media discourse that erupted over the British decline in sport which had heightened around the 1948 and 1952 Olympic Games, and the collective desire expressed by the British athletic authorities, journalists, and members of the public “to put Britain back on the map in the sporting world…” the idea of the British nation was continuously being invoked, imagined and sustained by the media, which was even more warranted in a context of sporting and non-sporting decline. Fourthly, through (i) presenting negative and racist stereotypes of subordinate minority groups and (ii) through the focus on their past glories, the media were helping the established or dominant white groups within Britain and perhaps without, to sustain their powerful collective identity or “l/we/they/them” image, which had been seriously shaken by war, in spite of sentiments noted by Marwick to the effect that “we had won the war.” However, while the media can generate, reflect as well as help sustain particular images/values/identities, as a caution, it was noted that there is no
necessary isomorphic relationship between media reporting, public perception and the social processes to which they relate. In this respect for instance, it was noted that while Bailey was presented as Trinidadian by the Trinidadian media he was perceived as anti-Trinidadian by many Trinidadians, while the greater level of media attention received by him in the British press, based on headlines and photos, compared with white British athletes was generally inconsistent with the general condition of exclusion, marginalization and discrimination faced by coloureds in the wider society. On the other hand, this media attention can also be seen as consistent with the meritocratic and egalitarian ideals within the same society and within sport, whether this was intended or unintended.

The examination of established-outsider group relations which is another facet of the issue of identity formation had three major objectives. Firstly, we sought to probe the theoretical postulate that one’s status or definition as “outsider” in relation to the established group can change given the dynamic of social interaction. Secondly, however, and influenced by the ideas of Raymond Williams, it was suggested that this transition could have assumed different forms and should be examined to ascertain its incipient, emergent, oppositional and accommodating character as well. Thirdly, we examined the circuitous nature of this transition process which refers to a situation where moving from outsider to established in one context is accompanied or paralleled by the reverse process in another. Our findings generally reveal that while Bailey was initially represented by the British media as a “foreigner” and “outsider” by members of the established white group, consistent with the dominant conception of coloureds in the society, from around the 1948 Olympics onward, he gradually started to shed this image as he became more and more accepted as part of British society. It was suggested that this process was evident in several major ways which included: (i) a shift in the language of media reporting that moved from presenting him as a
“foreigner” to more possessive and familiar terms such as “our best sprinter” or “our own McDonald Bailey”; (ii) his interaction with certain institutions (such as the Canoe Club and the Albany Club of which he became a member) and (iii) the strong support he received from several prominent individuals from the upper echelons of British society in the media, the legal fraternity, and government during his conflicts with the British AAA, particularly during his suspension in 1953. However, it was also noted that this gradual process of inclusion and acceptance might have first started in the RAF where he received privileged treatment to train and nourish himself based primarily on his athletic ability. In addition, while these developments were not construed to mean that Bailey had now become a status equal with whites in British society and now formed part of the established group, it was suggested that they pointed to a gradual and emerging process of greater social acceptance and accommodation by some of its elements, a process whose further development was thwarted or pre-empted by his departure from Britain in 1954. It was suggested further that this process was possibly facilitated not only by his exploits as an athlete but, relatedly, the decline of post-war British sport and Britain, the increasing duration of his residency, together with the meritocratic and egalitarian ideological tendencies in British society which sport was supposed to have symbolized. However, while Bailey was undergoing this process of inclusion into British society, at the same time, he was becoming alienated from his native Trinidad, at least among those whom had seen his representation of Britain as an act of betrayal to his native land and their nascent nationalist yearnings. Like others before and after him therefore, Bailey had become somewhat rejected at home while becoming more accepted and valued abroad which helps to capture the circuitous and dynamic nature of the transition from outsider status to acceptance by the established group.
Bailey’s emergence as an athlete within Britain, however, was not only characterized by acceptance and accommodation but also by opposition and conflict. While this was previously shown with respect to his selection for Britain at the 1948 Olympics and his non-selection for the 1950 Empire Games, it also included his open challenge to the dominant amateur ethos and its official guardians, the British AAA. This was first expressed through his public approval of professional athletics in 1952 then the establishment of a company to produce his own brand name starting blocks in 1953, which had resulted in his temporary suspension from the sport. The post-war period had seen a veritable crackdown on professional sports by the adherents of the dominant amateur ethos for whom amateurism represented not just a way of playing but a way of life, a means through which a particular social class identity and relations were generated and sustained. This crackdown took place in spite of the existence of shamateurism in which some of them were implicated and the concessions that were forced by the issues of broken-time, concerns over British decline in sport and, to a lesser extent, the existence of exclusivism/elitism in British sport. In light of this, Bailey’s conflicts with the British AAA, somewhat akin to Mozart’s struggles with the court aristocrats of his day, cannot be atomized and construed narrowly as a personal one between himself and the organization but as one between two fundamentally different ways of playing sport and its class adherents. Put differently, Bailey’s struggles were symbolic and formed part of a deeper and longstanding class chasm in British society which had found expression in the amateur-professional divide. As someone of middle class origin himself, Bailey served to symbolize the internal and international divisions within this class over the amateur-professional question, a division which had also existed in his native Trinidad. Given the nature of these struggles, it is argued that the meaning of amateurism is not reducible to some idealistic notion of intrinsic motivation (i.e., “sport for sport sake”) as official and dictionary definitions have historically
suggested, for it served a deliberate and conscious instrumental purpose linked to class identity formation in 19th and 20th century Britain, as it did elsewhere. For instance, as Gruneau (1983, p. 109) noted in the case of Canada, it was a “conscious strategy of exclusion in class relations.” What this serves to show, is that traditional values can be used for instrumental purposes which they may mask. Similarly, the ideology of amateurism inadvertently helped to mask the pursuit of income generation among certain officials at the expense of athletes like Bailey who had helped generate such income in the first place, and which was one of the grounds of his disenchantment and eventual failed move to professional rugby. Consequently, a broader and more realistic understanding of amateurism is to see it as corresponding to an interesting mix of instrumental (e.g., class identity), value oriented and traditional type action, which shows the problematic and messy nature of trying to straight jacket human behaviour into particular categories of action/meaning since human action may contain elements of all. Weber (1978, p. 26) had noted this much when he stated that “It would be very unusual to find concrete cases of action, especially of social action, which were oriented only in one or another of these ways” (see Chapter 2).

However, Bailey’s struggles were not only symbolic of a deeper class cleavage within British society in which he had become caught. Relatedly, it was reflective of a historical culture of pecuniary instrumentality and resistance to amateurism in British sport, a resistance which in the case of athletics was generally covert, lacked the necessary organization, leadership and resources to pose an effective challenge to amateurism and the asymmetries of power that governed relations between officials and athletes. While Bailey’s actions as an athlete can be considered more open and radical by the standards of the day, he also highlighted the general weakness of that culture of resistance—which only became more overt and organized after his departure from athletics in
1953- and the effective limits that were placed on the exercise of human agency in a context where the ideology of “ascetic amateurism” was ascendant. In addition, his decision to try professional rugby in 1953, while it can be read as an expression of human agency, can also be read as an expression of the amateur-derived constraints imposed by the institutional guardians of amateurism, the British AAA, from whose chains and strains he sought to break free since they were acting as a fetter on his livelihood. It has been noted however that his actions were not driven solely by economic motives although these surely played some role in his decision. Rather, it was suggested that they were driven by a complex of related motives that included providing for himself and his young family, the unfairness of amateurism, dissatisfaction with the British AAA and sustaining a particular lifestyle or social image consistent with his status as an elite athlete.

Within the colony of Trinidad, where the ideology of amateurism was also dominant consistent with its “British heritage”, it was shown that the amateur-professional divide had also expressed itself in the sport of athletics in the period following the war although not with the same ferocity and long term consequences. Also, as in Britain, the challenge posed to the local official guardians of amateur athletics in Trinidad (i.e., Trinidad AAA) also suffered from a lack of sufficiently organized and financed opposition. However, and unlike the case in Britain, it was suggested that amateurism did not assume the same class distinction function among Trinidad’s elites due to the peculiar nature of its social structure. In this context, for instance, class distinctions were strongly demarcated by such factors as colour and ethnicity since the elites were generally associated with whites or their mixed offspring, while the working and poorer classes were generally associated with blacks and Asians mainly of Indian origin. In addition, the local professional and proprietary classes who were the main agents and guardians of amateurism
were already well placed and distinguished in the extant social hierarchy which did not warrant the construction or adoption of any sport ideology either to distinguish them from their subordinates or to facilitate their acceptance by the dominant elites as obtained in 19\textsuperscript{th} century Britain and North America since it was they who constituted the dominant elites. On the contrary, it was suggested that far from being used as a mark of class distinction or separation, and consistent with the double bind effect, amateurism created a common sport identity among the various social groups on the island that served as both a source of conflict and unity, however ephemeral or unplanned. But, while not serving as a class marker in the Trinidad context, the possible "hegemonic" value of amateurism to maintaining elite dominance was not discounted since as a common identity, it facilitated not just a connection with the subordinate classes, but their consensual acceptance of the authority of the dominant elites, particularly those who ran the sport of athletics. By extension, this was also the function it served for the British rulers in the context of metropole-colony relations.

The examination of some of Bailey's experiences as an athlete and the historical period to which they corresponded has also had several implications for the related discourses surrounding the nature and consequences of the global diffusion of sport. More specifically, these relate to the issue of multiple identities, the distinction between globalization and imperialism, and the very nature of the diffusion of sport. While in the original conception of this study, the global diffusion of sport or ludic globalization did not figure prominently as an objective, some of the issues to which it has given rise are still examined because Bailey's experiences bear some relevance to them.
The historical diffusion of modern sport internationally has been generally seen as an expression of a process of westernization in general and modernization in particular. And given the historical period within which this study is located (1944-1954), these related processes have been seen as an expression of Europeanization in general and for want of a word, Britainnization in particular. One of the issues that exist surrounding these global processes is the extent to which they were characterized by either homogeneity, plurality or hybridity. It is suggested however that the very process of diffusion of sport admitted a certain measure of diversity in the existence of two different and oppositional approaches to involvement in sporting activity, namely: amateurism and professionalism, although one was more ideologically ascendant than the other. The early global diffusion of modern sport forms therefore was characterized by an internal diversity of approaches and did not represent an all rampant homogeneity although one can argue this is a thin edge of the wedge since these approaches can be classified as western all the same and so stamp it with the mark of homogeneity. However, although amateurism and professionalism were diffused to Trinidad as well as the conflict they spawned, the form and function this conflict assumed deviated considerably from its expression in Britain due mainly to the peculiarities of the hierarchy of social relations in Trinidad.

The issue of multiple identities to which this study has directed attention also has direct implications for the idea that the migration and mingling of peoples and cultures due to the process of globalization can result in diminishing contrasts and increased varieties of cultural forms and identities. While the idea of an increasing variety of identities is not rejected, based on the findings of this study, one suggests that an increasing contrast is more logically consistent with an increasing variety of identities as opposed to a diminishing contrast as suggested by Maguire (1999). In this respect, for instance, in the African-European encounter
that had expressed itself within the colonies and within Britain itself, the
issues of race and ethnicity became a crucial source of difference or
contrast between the respective groupings. Apart from race, and in
particular relation to the West Indies, this contrast developed further
through the emergence of other island and regional identities which, in the
case of Bailey, included those of being Trinidadian and West Indian.
While Bailey's British identity and involvement in a sport form which
formed part of the British sport culture can be seen as constituting a source
of commonality and connection between whites and blacks, and the basis
for diminishing contrasts between both, the facts of his ethnicity,
Trinidadianess and West Indianness constituted sources of differentiation
that served to increase the contrasts between both groups. It ought to
follow therefore, that a greater variety of identities, since they constitute
sources of difference, invariably lead to increased contrasts between
individuals and groups who do not share the same range of identities and
not to its diminution. The movement of Bailey to the British metropole
therefore, consistent with the movement of coloureds generally, was
characterized by an increase in contrasts corresponding to the variety of
identities he possessed: as coloured, Trinidadian, West Indian, which
media reporting highlighted further. In other words, while being British
and participating in a sport with which many British people identified
created a basis of homogeneity between him and his hosts, his racial and
island identities were sources of difference that increased the contrasts
between both. Applied to the case of Bailey therefore, which can extend
to coloureds in general, it is contended that the notion of diminishing
contrasts and increasing varieties is at best misleading and, at worst,
counter-empirical and counter intuitive for, an increase in contrasts is the
logical corollary of a greater variety of identities. In addition, while the
diffusion of amateurism to this colony may have served to diminish
contrasts between dominant and subordinate social groups and serve as a
source of symbolic unity among them, this did not eliminate their social
differences based on class, colour, race, ethnicity, income and education and occupation. Rather, it became a medium for the very reinforcement of these differences as participation in sport generally reflected the ascriptive character of social relations.

Additionally, the existence of multiple identities show that the plural and hybrid character of identity, together with its accompanying tensions and ambivalence, are not unique to the contemporary stage of globalization or post-modernism as some seem to think or suggest. On the contrary, based on the experiences of McDonald Bailey who was part-British and part-Trinidadian among other identities, it was shown that these issues were very much present in the earlier post-war stage of globalization and modernization. In the context of metropole-colony relations, however, a defining characteristic of this period was the general prominence and valorisation of the culture of the colonizer together with the subordination and devalorisation of the culture and identity of the colonized even within their own territory. This meant that the identities that constituted the hybrid were generally not valued equally. However, the changing power balances among and within nations since the end of World War II, which have intensified in the contemporary period of globalization, have served to give this diversity of cultural identities more visibility, salience, and legitimacy, although issues of cultural imperialism or conflict still remain.

The historical nature of the issue of multiple identities thus, reinforces further the importance of conceptualizing globalization over a long period of time, or as a dynamic long term process rather than as a sudden late 20th century eruption or occurrence associated with McDonalization, Coca Colalization or Americanization. Seeing globalization in general and the globalization of sport in particular as a long term
historical process and not as some recent occurrence enables you to see that the multiple cultural effects associated with it are not unique to its contemporary phase but existed almost in all its phases albeit in varying forms and degrees. The signal differences lie in their present intensity together with the quantitative and qualitative nature of contemporary political, economic, cultural and technological changes. Adopting such a diachronic approach also has implications for the conceptual distinction between "imperialism" and "globalization." This is so for the distinction between "imperialism" and globalization as hybridization and diversity is a false or misleading one since imperialism, whether of American or European vintage, was merely an expression of globalization and was also associated with pluralization/hybridity to which Bailey's multiple identities and the existence of different approaches to sport can attest. Moreover, at the time of Bailey, and the period of British imperialism what could have been more global in nature and reach than the British Empire? An examination of Bailey's experiences therefore directs attention to the problematic nature of defining and distinguishing such concepts as imperialism and globalization.

McDonald Bailey emerged as a top athlete in post war-Britain therefore, when several related and overlapping social processes were underway in sport, the economy, the polity, and civil society. These processes in which he emerged generated particular discourses in relation to nation, race, class and sport which the media played a significant role in both reflecting and sustaining. His experiences serve to highlight that as individuals and as members of collectivities, we often have to deal with multiple discourses of an oppositional or contested nature in daily life, the negotiation and outcome of which may vary according to the individual, the situation in question and overtime. Capturing the plural, oppositional and negotiated nature of the discourses that we face almost daily, Tucker noted:
What is important to remember here is that discourses do not inhere in people; rather, we inhabit different discourses which frequently overlap or are in conflict with each other. The translation, integration, and hybridization our involvement in multiple discourse demands is something each individual must negotiate. .... The process of translation and negotiation takes place in [a] variety of sites in our lives. These sites constitute the contexts of culture creation. The struggle to create meaning takes place in the context of particular historic configurations. Different public cultures selectively emphasize certain ideas and forms of representation while repressing others that are struggling against current hegemony. (Tucker, 2000, pp. 16-17).

Writing in relation to the negotiated nature of social relations and offering a broader conception of “negotiation,” Bhabha stated that “... we do negotiate even when we don’t know that we are negotiating: we are always negotiating in any situation of political opposition or antagonism. Subversion is negotiation, transgression is negotiation; negotiation is not just some kind of compromise or ‘selling out’ which people too easily understand it to be” (cited in Tucker 2000, p. 17). In Bailey’s case negotiation took several forms: challenging the British decision to omit him from the 1948 British Olympic team, eventually making his own decision to represent them, criticizing shamateurism and calling for more official acceptance of professional athletics for which he was reprimanded and had to apologize; establishing his own athletic company, for which he was briefly suspended and eventually leaving amateur sport, all of which had their varying short and long term personal consequences.

Surely, in his emergence and experience as an athlete in post–war Britain and Trinidad, Bailey did not only “inhabit different discourses.” They also inhabited him. And, through the examination of these discourses or processes, a major aim was not only to show the nexus between “the intimate realities of ourselves...” and the “larger social
realities” in which we live but to advance as well the development of the sociology of sport.
APPENDIX I

NEWSPAPER HEADLINES, BAILEY AND THE 1948 OLYMPIC GAMES

A. Trinidad and Tobago

I. Trinidad Guardian

1948

2. “Bailey Not To Run For Trinidad” (Sun. January 18 1948)
3. “MacBailey May Run For Britain” (Tues. January 20 1948)
4. “Britain Appreciates Trinidad Allowing Mc Bailey To Run For UK At Olympics” (Tues. January 27 1948)
5. “Bailey’s Hopes Of Running At Olympics Slim” (Tues. April 20 1948)
6. “McD. Bailey Suffers From Bone Disease” (Sun. April 18 1948)
7. “Bailey May Yet Run For Trinidad” (Weds. May 5 1948)
8. “Bailey Hopes To Be Fit For Olympics” (Thurs. May 13 1948)
9. “Bailey Says Will Be Fit For Olympics” (Weds. May 19 1948)
10. “McBailey’s Dad To See Him Run At Games” (Thurs. May 20 1948)
12. “Bailey Does 100 In 10 Flat” (Friday June 4 1948)
14. “Bailey Beaten For 2nd Time In 7 Days” (Sun. June 20 1948)
15. “Bailey Lacks Old Finishing Burst” (June 22 1948-Possibly useful for capturing the ongoing doubts over Bailey’s fitness)
16. “McBailey Out To Win A.A.A. Title July 3” (Tuesday June 29 1948)
17. “Bailey Runs 220 Yards In Near Record Time” (Sun. July 4 1948)
18. “Bailey, Wint Beaten Into Third Place” (Sun. July 4 1948)
20. “Bailey May Run For Trinidad If Fit” (Thurs. July 8 1948)
23. “Bailey To Run For Britain” (Weds. July 14 1948)
24. “Bailey Runs For Britain On Principle” (Fri. July 16 1948)
25. “Wint Sets 440 Mark; Bailey returns 9.7” (Fri, July 23 1948)
   “Caribbean Eyes Turn To Wembley For Olympics” (Sun. July 25 1948)
27. “MacBailey Beaten in 100 Final” (August 1 1948)
28. “MacDonald Bailey’s Services As Trinidad Coach For 1952 Olympic Games Called Invaluable” (Tues. August 17 1948)
29. “Bailey Reported For Post” (Thurs. August 19 1948)
30. “Lack of Equipment, Coaching Blamed For Showing At Games” (Weds. Sept. 1 1948)
31. “MacDonald Bailey To Visit Norway” (Weds. December 29 1948)

II. Port of Spain Gazette

1. “Mac To Train For Olympics With Soccer Team” (Weds. January 7 1948)
5. “Olympic Team May Yet Be Increased” (Weds. January 21 1948)
6. “Britain Glad To Have MacBailey” (Tues. January 27 1948)
7. “Thanks From Britain For McD. Bailey” (Sun. March 14 1948)
8. “Mac May Take 100 Metres Title” (Tues. April 13 1948)
9. “MacBailey May Have To Miss Olympics” (Sat. April 17 1948)
10. “Britain Gloomy At Prospect Of Loss of Bailey” (Weds. April 28 1948)
11. “Bailey Is Still Hopeful For Olympics” (Tues. May 4 1948)
13. “Bailey To Have Crucial Test Next Saturday” (Weds. May 12 1948)
14. “MacBailey Is Defeated In 100 Yards” (Sun. June 20 1948)
15. “McDonald Bailey Beaten Again” (Sun. June 27 1948)
16. “Wint and Bailey Both Beaten At White City” (Sun. July 4 1948)
17. “Britain Asks Trinidad To Use MacBailey” (July 8 1948)
18. “Colour Bar On Bailey Denied” (Friday July 9 1948)
19. “Britain Doubtful As To Fitness Of D. Finley” (Friday July 9 1948)
20. “Bailey To Run For Britain In Games; Own Choice” (Weds. July 14 1948)
21. “Opinions Are Divided On Bailey’s Decision To Run For Great Britain” (Sunday July 18 1948)
22. “Wint Sets Up New Record; Bailey Does 100 Yards In 9.7” (Friday July 23 1948)
24. “Lewis Eliminated From 100 Metres After Fine First Heat Run; Tull Fails; Bailey Places” (Saturday July 31 1948)
25. “US Runner Equals World Record In Olympic 100 Metres; Bailey Fails” (Sun. August 1 1948)
27. “Bailey Joins London Firm” (Friday November 5 1948)
“MacBailey Off To Two Cold Countries” (Thursday December 30 1948)

B. BRITAIN

I. Daily Mirror

1. “Bailey Must Forget Leg to Improve” (Mon. May 17 1948)
2. “Britain’s Olympic Hopes are Far From Being Dead” (Mon. May 24 1948)
4. “Mac’s Even 100” (June 3 1948)
5. “Mac Does Evens” (Mon. June 14 1948)
6. “Bailey Wanted to Race-But Only Home To His Family” (Mon. June 14 1948)

7. “McDonald Bailey wins a sprint alone” (Sat. July 3 1948)

8. “Olympic Games Team Surprise: Mac Bailey Surprise” (Weds. July 7 1948)

9. “Bailey offered to Trinidad, Wants To Run For Britain” (Thurs. July 8 1948)

10. “1,2,3 slaps for our Olympic selectors” (Mon. July 12 1948)

11. “McDonald Bailey Equals Irish Record” (Thurs. July 15 1948)

12. “Olympic hope collapses in train after race” (Mon. July 19 1948)

13. “48, But He Kept Striding Out For Britain” (Mon. August 2 1948)

II. Daily Express

1. “Bailey may race for Britain” (Tues. January 20 1948)

2. “McDonald Bailey May Miss Games” (Fri. April 16 1948)

3. “McD. Bailey: I’ll Be Fit For the Olympics” (Mon. May 17 1948)

4. “MacBailey wins in Iceland” (Mon. May 31 1948)

5. “MacBailey Back to His Best” (Sat. July 3 1948)

6. “AAA Chiefs Have To Think Hard” (Mon. July 5 1948)


8. “Trinidad consider Mc D. Bailey” (Sat. July 10 1948)

9. “McDonald Bailey in AAA team” (Tues. July 13 1948)


12. “Paterson Jumps Back to Form” (Mon. July 23 1948)

13. “Wint breaks 440 record” (Fri. July 23 1948)


15. “I am mighty proud of them” (Sat. July 31 1948)

16. “His Olympic Title Won Promotion” (Mon. August 2 1948)
APPENDIX II


1946

-Bailey has outstanding athletic season by equalling 23 year old British 100 yard record and winning sprint double at British national athletic championships
-British media and athletic officials, with some reservation, start to eye Bailey as a possible British medal prospect at 1948 Olympic Games

-Bailey reportedly delighted over prospect of representing Britain

1947

May

-Bailey again denies media reports that he is running for Britain at Olympics and expresses desire to run for Trinidad

August

-Bailey sustains injury and ceases running for rest of season
-Bailey denies media reports that he is running for Britain at Olympics and expresses desire to run for Trinidad

October

-British athletic authorities announce provisional team for Olympics and Bailey not included

November

-Bailey visits Trinidad and announces that he wants to run for Trinidad

1948

January

-Trinidad Olympic Committee (TOC) gives OK for Bailey to represent Britain
-Bailey accepts decision of TOC
March

-British Amateur Athletic Board (BAAB) cautiously welcomes decision of TOC

April

-Owing to injury, doubts expressed over Bailey’s selection by British medical doctor (Sir Adolph Abrahams) and BAAB secretary and Olympic team manager, Jack Crump
-British journalists saddened over possible consequences of Bailey’s injury for his career and for British chances at Olympics

May

-BAAB publicly indicate interest in selecting Bailey
-AAA leaves matter of Bailey’s eligibility/selection to BAAB

June/July

-Final British Olympic team announced but Bailey only selected to take part in 100 metres and excluded from 200 metres and 4 x 100m relay. However BAAB also suggests that Bailey could run for Trinidad instead.
-Bailey outraged over turn of events and charges ‘colour bar’, later denied
-Bailey receives sympathy of British press
-Events unfold while Trinidad Olympic team was sailing to England for Games for which they departed on June 29 (POSG June 13, 30 1948)
-Trinidad/British athletic officials meet over issue
-Bailey allowed to make own decision over which country to represent announced at a special news conference called for this purpose on July 13 1948 just over two weeks days before opening of Olympic Games on July 29.
APPENDIX III

THE OLYMPIC OATH

I, the undersigned, declare on my honour that I am an amateur according to the rules of the International Federation governing my sport, that I have never knowingly transgressed such rules, and that I have participated in sport solely for pleasure and for the physical, mental, or social benefits I derive there from; that sport to me is nothing more than a recreation without material gain of any kind, direct or indirect, and that I am eligible in all respects for participation in the Olympic Games. (*Daily Express*, May 24 1948).
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