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A new China: using sport to expose a multi-class race through the 1923 Chinese soccer tour of Australia

Nick Guoth*

School of Sociology, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

In the early 1920s, the perceptions by Australians of the Chinese race was one of a single culture and single class. Chinese Australians continuously attempted to break from the shackles of this monolithic construction. A soccer tour in late 1923 provided the local Chinese with an opportunity to alter these stereotypes. Through the performances both on the field and off, through the persistence of the organisers to promote a ‘different type’ of Chinese and through the development of this alternative image in the Western press, the Australian public were afforded a view of Chinese they had not experienced prior, one which included well-educated, middle-class and athletic individuals. The paper investigates the projection of a multi-class society within China to white Australians as portrayed by the soccer tour and how it challenged the entrenched negative perceptions imposed on Australians through the White Australia Policy.

From all the cabbage-gardens, from desk and chop suey restaurants the Chinese came in excited armies to the Showground, and with them jostled all the soccer enthusiasts of Sydney, until the game itself had melted all into a common factor in sportsmanship. And it will be safe to prophesy that from this day forth, the metropolis will order lettuces with a new-found reverence, and look at Chinese visitors with an expression of esteem.1

In his history of Association football in Australia, Thompson observed that the 1920s witnessed the internationalization of Australian soccer.2 After an Australian side travelled to New Zealand for the nation’s first international test match in 1922, the Australian public got its first opportunity to watch international soccer when the New Zealand team toured in June of 1923. Quickly following on from the New Zealanders, a second international soccer side arrived in Australia in early July. The team came from the most unlikely of places – China. The 16 players and their manager toured Australia for over three months, playing matches in all states except Western Australia. A total of 24 games were played, 5 of which were classified as ‘Internationals’. The Chinese results were more than satisfactory; they won eight matches, drew seven and lost nine. More important than their results, however, was the team’s reception by the Australian public and the media. Everywhere the Chinese went, press reports suggested that they were enthusiastically welcomed.

The opening game on Saturday 11 August 1923 clearly defined the approach that the Australian public and the media took in relation to the visiting Chinese players. In front of more than 40,000 spectators, a representative team from New South Wales was held to a three-all draw. The positive media coverage of the match challenged the anti-Chinese
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sentiment that had characterized Australian opinion in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It appeared that these soccer players had compelled Australians to rethink their ideas about the Chinese:

For the Chinese athletes who composed the soccer-team were utterly unlike the Chinese of the comic-papers. They were tall and muscular men, quick on their feet and filled with football-cunning. They were as different from the usual market-gardeners as a giant from a pygmy. Australia has learned that China is not entirely composed of vegetable-horticulturalists.3

It was not only the soccer player’s stature and physicality that challenged the monolithic construction of the Chinese as ‘coolies’. The tour afforded Australians an opportunity to further reflect on the class distinctions that existed within this racial grouping.4 The Melbourne Sun News Pictorial observed that the players presented themselves as ‘dapper, with sticks and canes, but most of them are quietly and inconspicuously dressed’.5 There was a sense of surprise among the sporting journalists at seeing well-educated, middle-class, athletic Chinese in their midst. That surprise may have been attributed to an inquisitiveness about the Chinese players combined with the knowledge that, historically, a greater portion of Australian footballers, of all codes, were from a working-class background.6 The press explained that the players were ‘highly educated and refined, and unlike the vast majority of their countrymen, will be able to mingle in the best of circles’, and ‘they are athletes of a type far and above the class that we imagined them to be’.7

Throughout the tour such observations were repeated in the press. Further, the Australian public which these Chinese visitors encountered appeared welcoming, enthusiastic and non-racist. The response by the Australian public, press and government to the 1923 Chinese soccer tour is the central focus of this article.

Despite having been forgotten in the popular memory of Australian soccer, the 1923 tour has been discussed by a number of Australian sport historians.8 Notable among these studies are the works of Honey, Cashman and Mosely. All attempted to reconcile the popular success of the tour and the reception of its athletes with the received wisdom that in the early twentieth century the Chinese were victims of entrenched racial hatred as manifested in the so-called White Australia Policy. Building on Honey, Cashman and Mosely have constructed an orthodoxy that suggests that the Australian public’s embrace of the tour was driven by the exoticism and novelty of the spectacle mixed with successful marketing.9

Such observations for its success notwithstanding, Honey pondered how the tour conformed to the racialized atmosphere of the period. Were the Chinese ‘treated as exceptional and exotic thereby avoiding the negative stereotyping of the resident Chinese Australian community? Or, did such images represent a shift in Australian attitudes towards the Chinese?’ His tentative conclusion was that the success of the tour ‘may have acted as a critique of existing representations of Asians if not of the White Australia Policy’.10

The fusion of sport and race in discussing tours of individuals or teams of non-white sportsmen during the early twentieth century has received some attention by Australian historians. Such work has tended to centre on the extent to which these events either confirmed existing racialized categories or accommodated non-white achievement in essentially assimilationist understandings. Honey’s examination of the Fijian cricket tour of Australia in 1907–1908; the visit of the African-American pugilist Jack Johnson in 1908; and the West Indian cricket tour of 1930–1931, led him to conclude that the visitors were attributed identities by the media that ensured they in no way challenged an ideal of an inherently separate white identity. These sportsmen were ‘coloured’ (Johnson),
‘blackfellows’ (Fijian Indian cricketers) and ‘natives’ (West Indian cricketers). Even in those instances in which a more suitable version of exoticism could be accommodated in the representation of a visiting sportsman [gender emphasis intended], ways were found to ensure no established orthodoxies of racial division were disturbed. Osmond and Phillips’ discussion of the swimmer Alick Wickham of the Solomon Islands, for example, notes that he was credited with the racing stroke of swimming and was considered a socially acceptable ‘black’ sportsman. But such reception of visiting non-white athletes, they conclude, ‘was determined less by their ability and more by perceptions of their behaviour and assessments of how well they socially assimilated’.

For the Chinese soccer players of 1923, their reception was different. From the first gestation of the idea of a Chinese sporting tour by New Zealand-based Australian journalist Harry Millard, great care was taken in the selection and presentation of a team that would rise above familiar stereotypes of the Chinese but do so in ways that were not so much about processes of assimilation as the recognition of equality in status and attainment.

There has also been a recent resurgence of interest in Australian racial history, as Australian academics return to one of the established themes of Australian historiography. They seek to rehabilitate its capacity to explain the persistence and depth of anxiety and idealism surrounding ‘the race question’, and to reclaim experiences and identities that have been obscured by simplistic models of unchanging Australian racism. In his book Big White Lie, Fitzgerald dismisses the myth that all Chinese in early Australia were servile and degraded. Instead, Chinese Australian communities demonstrated a class structure and hierarchy that included educated middle-class individuals. Further, the educated Chinese in these communities won from their Australian equivalents respect that might seem surprising today.

The question advanced by Honey, the conclusions of Osmond and Phillips, and the wider historical discourse on race in Australia inform this article. Within Australia’s Asian context, events must be given both a context and a time, because the colour line was drawn and redrawn. By focusing so specifically on a series of sporting events, however, it is the aim of this article to take this context and time out from the history of ideas and place it firmly in the mundane world of the tour; among publicists and promoters, journalists and investors, cartoonists and crowds, and the players themselves. The tour was a single packaged event, yet during its three-month duration the Chinese soccer players’ visit challenged the old reliable ideas about the White Australia Policy and anti-Chinese sentiment in early twentieth-century Australia.

One of the most significant challenges the tour posed to received orthodoxies related to class. The Chinese soccer tour helped to expose the myth that Chinese Australians were of a singular class or type. Australian perceptions of the Chinese had been conditioned on a belief that Chinese were all the same. ‘Chineseness’ invoked images and stereotypes of those who were ‘inherently and immutably inferior’ to whites and ‘peculiar, dirty, morally depraved, prone to disease and unassimilable to the Australian way of life’ – including sport. Economically, they were seen to occupy a rung below the white working-class as ‘coolies’ who were not far removed from a ‘slave class’. The reality, however, was somewhat different. While the majority of Chinese in Australia occupied lower paying occupations – market gardeners, agricultural labourers, furniture makers, miners and shopkeepers – there were Chinese in Australia who occupied higher economic and status positions in their respective societies. As Yong notes, despite the fact the Chinese community worked towards common goals (around community formation and nationalist
aspirations for their homeland) in the 1920s, this unity existed despite the presence of a distinct class system.18

**Emergence of a concept**

Harry Millard can be best described as a man who had an entrepreneurial streak that was shaped by a heightened sense of altruism. The seed for the tour was sewn some years before when, while serving with the New Zealand Expeditionary Force in France during the Great War, he saw one of the Chinese Labour Corps which had been recruited by both Britain and France to provide extra manpower in the war-zone.19 Millard’s gaze was conditioned by the well-established Antipodean racial stereotypes of Chinese ‘coolies’. The Chinese labourers he saw in the trenches, however, were different. Mainly recruited from the Shandong province of northern China, Millard was surprised by their muscular builds. They appeared athletic and this challenged his preconceptions. ‘[H]aving been influenced by the splendid physique of the Chinese Labour Corps Battalions’, Millard became convinced he could lure these athletic Chinese into competition with the young athletes of the Antipodes.20

Australasian society, however, did not share Millard’s new-found regard for the physical prowess of the Chinese. They remained a threat to national vitality, ‘undesirable immigrants’ who would ‘prejudice seriously the social and industrial conditions of the country and its people’.21 It was partly his desire to challenge long-standing perceptions of the Chinese and prove the negative stereotypes as falsehoods that would eventually lead Millard to organize the 1923 tour.

Believing that the Chinese community would itself wish to demolish the racial stereotypes, Millard, through his contacts as a journalist, approached a group of Chinese merchants in New Zealand. In Auckland he contacted Chee Ah Chan who had just returned from a 10-month trip to China. At a talk in late July 1922, Chee described what he had seen of a country that had changed significantly in the 13 years since his last visit. Through the influence of Sun Yatsen, Chee believed western ideas had been assimilated into Chinese culture such that dress, education, sanitation and working conditions had all altered along western lines.22 This westernization of the nationalist south was creating stronger class distinctions that absorbed western ideals and culture.

Chee presented to the white New Zealand public a stronger, more sophisticated view of China, a society that was rapidly advancing along the path of westernization. Millard met Chee in October 1922. Chee acknowledged that the changes taking place extended to the sporting interests and abilities of the Chinese. Further, Chee then informed the public that Chinese played rugby union and had conducted successful tours of California and the Straits Settlements (Malay Peninsula). The ‘young men who played the game were of good standing and belonged to the advanced school of Chinese who had assimilated the most progressive ideas of western civilisation’.23

With the evidence of Chee to support him, and rugby’s prominence as the national sport of New Zealand, Millard set about convincing local sporting entrepreneurs to fund a possible visit by a Chinese rugby team. For reasons that remain unclear, he decided that he would secure a rugby league rather than a rugby union team. While union was the dominate football code in New Zealand, league had just enjoyed its most successful season since it had first challenged the amateur code.24 This success had included a very profitable visit from the Australian rugby league team (the ‘Kangaroos’) which some pundits claimed had revealed the weaknesses of Union in New Zealand and its susceptibility to being ‘smashed up’ by the professional code.25 Millard may have also had his eye on the possibilities of
extending the tour to Australia where League was the dominant football code in New South Wales and Queensland. Further, he could have envisaged that the Chinese team might play an ‘Australasian Team’, similar to the team that had toured the United Kingdom in 1921–22. An Australasian tour would bring a greater return to the tour’s backers.

Having secured local support Millard crossed the Tasman to interest the Australian rugby league authorities. In attempting to convince his Australian audience Millard did much to differentiate the members of his proposed team from the perceived Chinese residents of Australia. Despite rugby league being identified as working-class, Millard sold his tourists as middle-class sportsmen. Rather than the coolies of gold mining era, these Chinese were well-educated and progressive individuals who were physically capable of competing at an international level. What Millard put to the rugby league officials was that there were different Chinese in China than those who lived in Australia, and that these ‘other’ Chinese were of a more refined type. While they may have been considered ‘exceptional and exotic’ as Honey suggests in his conclusions, what Millard portrayed was a different physical specimen, one refined, through class distinction, to provide adequate competition to Australians.

Seeing an opportunity and accepting Millard’s assurances, the New South Wales Rugby League agreed to support the venture. The only thing lacking was a Chinese rugby league team. In late November 1922, Millard departed Sydney for Hong Kong with his journalist partner Jack Shaw. Les Cubitt, a past Australian rugby league international and captain of the ‘Australasian’ side that had recently returned from the tour of the United Kingdom, followed in mid-December with the intention of coaching the union players in the league rules.

The suggestion by Chee that there were Chinese rugby players was soon proved false. When confronted by this Millard replied: ‘All we want is a score of fast players – not coolies of course – and we shall teach them to play’. In a letter sent to the socialist-based New Zealand Truth, Shaw summarized the situation: ‘It did not take long for myself and my associates, Mr H. Millard and Mr L. Cubitt to realise that our difficulty in China would not be in getting a team of Rugby players, but to get one good enough to win a match or two . . . It was quite evident that the Chinese preferred Soccer . . .’

In the same article Shaw felt compelled ‘to disabuse from the minds of New Zealanders the general impression that all except the wealthy Chinese are associated with a bamboo rod, on the ends of which hang baskets of vegetables’. He continued:

But far above the coolie and considered inferior to the wealthy, is a very fine class of Chinese. These are students, clerks in commercial houses, etc, and it is from these that the sporting fraternity emerges. Almost without exception they speak English fluently, dress well, have their up-to-date clubs and recreation grounds, and from all viewpoints are REALLY GOOD CITIZENS.

Having viewed this ‘very fine class of Chinese’, Millard was not prepared to give up on his dream. His first thought was to convince the best Chinese soccer players to switch codes and play rugby league. In this aim he received some support from the editor of the South China Morning Post (SCMP). Rockhampton-born Henry ‘Harry’ Ching had, a few months before, become the first ethnic Chinese editor of the SCMP, replacing the long-serving Scotsman Thomas Petrie.

As a Chinese Australian, Ching, more than many others, had a firm conviction that Chinese were capable of participating in the elite British sports and supported Millard’s motivations: ‘In the view of the real aptitude which the Chinese have shown for the Association game, there seems to be no valid reason why they should not shape equally well at rugby football’.
Ching also saw the tour as an excellent opportunity to improve relations between China and Australia. This aim was not one that Millard had initially considered, but it would become increasingly significant through the tour’s development. Ching insisted that it ‘must be evident that a tour of this sort, properly handled, would do a great deal to cement Anglo-Chinese friendship and particularly friendship and a greater respect for China in Australia’.38

Unconvinced that he would succeed in finding his rugby players, and prior to seeing any potential aspirants, Millard headed north to Shanghai on 18 January. Three days later, the one and only trial held in Hong Kong took place at the Queen’s College Grounds.39 Unfortunately, only a ‘score or two of young Chinese turned out, but all of small physique and not at all suitable to be pitted against the stalwarts of Australasia’. Those Millard hoped to attract, the soccer players of good physique he had previously witnessed, were uninterested in participating in a different sport. Cubitt was soon to follow Millard to Shanghai. Shaw, though, was sent back home believing that there was no choice but to ‘abandon the proposition’ and lamenting: ‘Had it been possible to organise a team of Rugby players with a chance of winning matches in Australia and New Zealand I am sure their smart appearance, athletic build, and general demeanor would have been an eye-opener of the colonials’.40 In the offices of the SCMP, however, Ching had one last suggestion for Millard and his partners: ‘If so, possibly more success would attend an effort to send a soccer team’.41

A different kind of Chinese

When Millard arrived in Shanghai he encountered an organized college system. He realized that the colleges could provide him with the type of Chinese he required; young, educated, virile and similar to the bourgeoisie he came in contact with in Hong Kong. The Shanghai education system was not the centuries-old Confucian Chinese system, but a westernized system that had followed the nation’s western engagement from the mid-nineteenth century.42 By the 1920s most colleges and schools in Shanghai were teaching with a strong reliance on English texts. For example, Nanyang College, a state-sponsored university, used English as the language of instruction in engineering and natural sciences.43

Sport also played an important role in the development of the individual within the schools and colleges. In the early years of the Chinese Republic, ideas around the development of the body provided much debate among scholars within the Chinese education system. Physical education was analysed in relation to both human physiology and social life.44 Further, ‘it developed alongside efforts to turn a dynastic realm into a modern nation state’.45 Thus by 1923 physical education ‘marked a more sophisticated approach to the relationship between the bodies of Chinese individuals and the Chinese nation’.46 These Chinese were ‘prepared’ for encounters outside the realm of China. While the sportsmen had not travelled further afield than other countries in the region, they were sufficiently accustomed to the West through the education system, and also exposed to westerners from the Treaty ports. The Chinese educated in the schools where western languages and customs were taught could be expected to ‘represent their country in a worthy manner’.47

Millard had again found the ‘right kind’ of Chinese but, unfortunately for the tour, they were not prepared to switch codes despite such inducements as ‘first-class transport, full hotel and travelling expenses and a shilling a day for minor expenses’.48 Millard, thus, accepted the reality of the situation. If a Chinese football team was to ever tour Australia it
would have to play the round-ball code. On 31 January, a week after Ching made his suggestion, Millard cabled the Australian soccer authorities to state ‘that he will bring a Chinese team to play their own game, soccer football . . . ’49 Further, even though New Zealand had only recently hosted an Australian team for its first international, Millard chose to limit the tour to Australia.50

With the code changed the possibility of making the tour a reality increased dramatically. The wider ramifications for the tour were made clear and the local Shanghai press acknowledged Millard as ‘a strong advocate for an opportunity to be given the Chinese to establish themselves as an athletic race in what he terms the world of sport’.51 His views ‘that athletics are an essential in the makeup of a successful career, and the building of a national character’ further resonated with local opinion.52 The national significance of the tour was taken further by Cubitt: ‘a visit to Australia and competing against Australians before an Australian crowd, will ensure for the Chinese a place on the sporting map of the Pacific and possibly further afield’.53

Millard’s interaction with the college system also brought him into contact with the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA). As well as playing a ‘pivotal role in China’s modern sports development’ the American-dominated organization had helped develop engagement with modern western sports throughout Asia.54 It was the YMCA which developed the first national games in China at Nanjing in 1910. These events ‘played an important role in the transformation of perceptions of the body that occurred under Western influence’.55 By 1920, modernized sport was well entrenched in Chinese society and, under the leadership of ‘Physical Director’ J.H. Gray, the YMCA (with the assistance of the China Christian Education Association) continued to foster the physical education programmes developed from 1908 to 1920.56 Gray played a significant role in the selection process for Millard.57

Concerned with building national pride and modern national cohesion within China and wanting to convey to the world an image of the new China, Gray sought to ensure that any tour was not only about sport. The team had to present the image of hygienic, physically fit, well-educated, rounded men that fitted within the earlier ‘bourgeois YMCA-type notions of a complete modern individual’.58 The team therefore would need to come from that strata of Chinese society with the appropriate class, character and educational qualities. Therefore, when Gray spoke of his desire to make the team ‘as representative as possible’, he was only speaking geographically and ethnically.59

As plans for the tour continued, it attracted the attention of trade and commercial organizations in China that recognized that a tour to Australia might open up new markets which had, for so long, appeared denied by Australia’s restrictive policies.60 The tour could support the efforts of the recently established Chinese Chambers of Commerce in Sydney and Melbourne ‘petitioning Australian authorities to ease discriminatory immigration restrictions’.61 This new source of interest placed another layer of expectation on the tour. Not only would the team be displaying Millard’s ideas on Chinese physicality and the YMCA’s image of the new China, there would be an argument for the end of racial discrimination in Australia.62

With so many national aspirations and expectations now being placed on the team, Millard came to the realization that rather than simply representing an abstract notion of race, the team would be the personification of the modern Chinese Republic. Individually, the players would have to be athletic and educated, but collectively they would need to be the ‘strongest possible team’.63 The Australian’s search now took him to Japan.

At Gray’s invitation, Millard travelled to Osaka in May 1923 to watch the Chinese participate in the 6th Far Eastern Championship (originally known as the ‘Far Eastern
Olympics’). The Chinese soccer team was composed of players from the South China Athletic Association (SCAA). They had won the right to represent China after defeating the Shanghai-based Nanyang team in an inter-port series held in Hong Kong in March. At the games, the Chinese team were victorious in both their matches, defeating Japan 5–1 and the Philippines 3–0.

To display China’s geographical and ethnic diversity, Millard and Gray had originally decided that the touring party would include 17 players. Four would come from North China, seven from Central China and six from South China. Through evidence from the inter-port series and the games in Osaka, the best soccer team in China, however, was not nationally representative. It was one that represented South China. Thus, rather than displaying regional and ethnic diversity to their Australian hosts that Millard aimed to do, the team would be made up of the Chinese geographic and ethnic type most represented in Australia.

Returning from Osaka, Millard announced that ‘loath to break up the combination gained by (the SCAA) lads’ the 11 players who represented their country at the Championships would be automatically chosen. Gaining some geographical and ethnic diversity, the remaining six members (later reduced to five) would come from Central and North China.

The problem with Millard’s announcement was that no one had consulted the SCAA or the Hong Kong Football Association. Upon his return to Hong Kong at the beginning of July 1923, he found that they had chosen not to release their players for the tour. A crisis meeting took place between Millard and the Hong Kong bodies. A major concern of the SCAA was the weakening of the team’s strength by the inclusion of other players. They held the view that South China had the best team and it was reported they ‘were anxious for the reputation of China in sport, that the team should be successful’. There was also concern among those in South China that any players from the North may not hold the same political sympathies as the players of the South. A compromise was reached that if any players from the North were unable to travel, the replacements would be obtained from the South.

When selected players from Beijing and Tientsin chose not to participate ‘as they would not be back in time for their College term’, they were replaced by South Chinese. In the end only three players from outside Hong Kong would eventually join the team, all from Shanghai. Two were from Fuh Tan College and one from Nanyang College. With the endorsement of the President of China, Li Yuan-hung, the seventeen Chinese (including a manager), plus Millard, departed Hong Kong via the Yoshino Maru on Wednesday, 18 July 1923.

Australian understanding and reaction
Early interest by the press in a visit to Australia by Chinese sportsmen was sporadic, with only a few articles devoted to a possible tour in the Sydney and Brisbane press. In early 1923, however, one Sydney evening newspaper, the Sun, published a series of letters from China, written by Cubitt. These letters dealt more with Cubitt’s experience and observations on his travels than with the plans for the tour itself. The reports, however, did much to provide the sort of background for the tour that met Millard’s overall aims. Cubitt’s articles created an engaging and unexpected impression of China. He wrote of a complex, multi-class social structure that existed within a diverse race, society and nation. This preparatory discussion was syndicated and thus taken up by the other newspapers in Australia as the tour’s start date neared.
In publishing Cubitt’s letters, the press operated under two imperatives – economic and cultural. While the media are required, per existence, to secure sufficient audiences, they also ‘offer sites for ritual confirmations of the legitimacy of the social order’.77 In Australia at the time of the Chinese tour, the normalized social order followed the hierarchy created by the White Australia Policy. Within this dominant hierarchy, normal media practices were to ‘reinforce the existing relations of power between and within groups’.78 As Millard had always hoped, the Chinese tour challenged this practice, although at a very low level. The Chinese soccer players rarely provoked racist sentiment in the media or among the masses. Instead new categories were found in which to accommodate the challenge of the tour and the opportunities it presented. The tour was a singularly packaged event and one in which the touring sportsmen provided an alternate view of the Chinese. Thus without the lingering perceptions of Chinese inferiority, issues such as immigration barriers and trade opportunities could be investigated.

By the time of their arrival the Australian public had been informed about many aspects of the impending tour and the tourists.79 Thanks to Cubitt, interested readers had been given a rudimentary understanding of Chinese society and where these visiting soccer players fitted within it. All that was left was for the players to prove themselves as the ‘right type’ of Chinese both on and off the field. Thus the tour, and its participants, created for the public an inquisitiveness that went beyond the notion of novelty professed by Mosely and Cashman. The tour invited Australians to interrogate the relationship between these sportsmen and ‘Chineseness’. The public understood these were different Chinese to those in the Australian community, yet they were also intrigued about why this was the case. The press exploited this search, developing an image of the soccer players that carried positive overtones capable of advancing more general causes. Above all, the tour, and its press coverage, re-generated essentially colonial questions about a culture of Chinese diaspora that was disappearing within an Australian national imagination, infusing it with fresh questions relating to relations with the modern Chinese nation in the very different circumstances of the inter-war years.

Upon arrival in Sydney on 6 August 1923, descriptions of the players emphasized less their physical qualities rather than their social class. Despite Cubitt’s briefings, there remained a sense of surprise among the sporting journalists at seeing well-educated, middle-class, athletic Chinese in their midst. The press attempted to extract the players from the overall perceptions of Chinese, singling them out as part of a separate packaged entity. These Chinese were ‘highly educated and refined, and unlike the vast majority of their countrymen, will be able to mingle in the best of circles’ and ‘athletes of a type far and above the class that we imagined them to be’.80

The opening match quelled the inquisitiveness that had, through the influence of the press in pre-match discussions, attracted a bumper crowd for the organizers. The three-all result was seen by the Australian public as proof that the Chinese were equals to Europeans on the sporting field. The press had not been confident of a favourable result for the Chinese, but upon viewing their performance in the opening match, the reporters enhanced their earlier positive commentary. One journalist observed ‘(f)rom the start they played high-class football, and the difference in race was soon forgotten’.81 For the white Australians, and their press, the game opened up a new image of the Chinese. It showed that sport could break down the racial barriers on the field. The game created images of uncertainty about the Chinese race for those who were at the game and those who read the newspaper reports. After viewing the Chinese, another journalist asserted ‘there is that unknown quality about them which we have learnt to believe emanates from the East, which holds the interest’.82
The Chinese players were, after the opening match, considered by the press as equals with Europeans. Henceforth, during the tour, they were to be afforded this equality as match after match was described in neutral tones, as if it were two local teams in contest. By the end of August the *Daily Guardian* was convinced of the abilities of the players: ‘Even supposing the arrangement of the tour was suggested in the first place as a novelty to advance the cause of Soccer, the fact remains that the Chinese students have delivered’.83 While astonishment was observed in the rare article, the general press commentary revealed a sense of an appreciative sentiment towards the Chinese players. They were congratulated upon success and encouraged upon defeat. Further, as the tour proceeded, the emphasis within the press moved from relating the Chinese soccer players to athleticism and their competency on the field, to a discussion of the commercial and political precedents suggested by the tour.

An alternative image

Overseas Chinese first arrived in Australia during the Qing Daoguang era [1820–1850], followed by more and more arrivals. From the end of the Tongzhi era [1861–1875] until the beginning of the Guangxu era [1875–1908], more than 100,000 came to Australia. By the end of the Guangxu era the Australian government passed a law, banning Chinese from entering Australia. After this, the elderly Chinese returned home and the sick passed away such that at this time there are only 20,000 or so Chinese left in the 6 Australian states. Of the Chinese who arrived, peasant workers made up the vast majority. Merchants were very few and there were even less scholars. When the quality of the Chinese peasant labourers is compared to the civilized nature of the Australians, it is no wonder that they looked down on us so much. Talking about the expulsion of the visitors, there are many reasons why Australians looked down on us Chinese. We only surmise that the peasant workers and merchants among the overseas Chinese lacked a fighting spirit. But this is ridiculous. In their spare time, foreigners entertain themselves with sporting activities while for Chinese, life consists of smoking and gambling. Chinese are ignorant and uninquisitive about the various equipment for artistry and pastimes and as far as hygiene is concerned, they still haven’t made any progress. They are therefore not very observant. But now a South China soccer team has arrived for the first time to try their luck against the westerners. You will notice that the South China soccer team consists of young and ambitious university students. Some of the visitors have won matches in Japan and we hope that they will bring glory to the motherland and win fame for the overseas Chinese on the Sydney battleground.84

For the Chinese community in Australia, the 1923 soccer tour provided an opportunity to confront white Australian prejudice. This community had long understood its position within the nation’s racial hierarchy. It had been hoped, however, that the tour might provide an opportunity to challenge the dominant orthodoxy. Like Millard, they hoped the sporting contests would champion an alternative Chinese image that might eventually deliver them greater acceptance within Australian society. In doing so, these local middle-class Chinese leaders had two aspirations. First, they hoped that the appearance of middle-class Chinese would destroy the enduring Australian perception that all Chinese were shopkeepers, laundymen or market gardeners. Second, the ethnic and geographical connection between the players and the local community was seen as an opportunity to further publicize the cause of the local representatives of the new nationalist movement in China. The players, these leaders believed, could provide important role models for what the new ‘westernized’ China represented.

The possibility of using the tour to ensure continuing Australian support of the Republican movement in China had also not escaped the team’s manager Mok Hing. A student of a high pedigree with connections to Oxford, Mok was a part of the bourgeois elite of Hong Kong. He was the founder of the Chinese Football Team in Hong Kong which
later became the SCAA. Mok played a crucial part in shaping the meaning of the tour for Chinese Australians – a meaning which was often not understood by European Australians.

The Chinese press in Australia embraced the tour and saw it as an opportunity to further political and social ambitions both within Australia and China. Chinese newspapers such as the Tung Wah Times and the Chinese Republic News provided insights into the tour not seen in the mainstream English language press. Reports on the tour often connected events on the football field in Australia back to the internal situation in China. A clear desire existed to ensure the tour gave Australians a sense that under Sun Yatsen China was a modern progressive nation and not the old dynastic middle kingdom.

Less concerned by issues of race, the Chinese language press concentrated on the qualities of the modern citizen. It had been hoped that the tourists would not only be one of good physique and playing ability, but also of good social stature. Higher status Chinese Australians, including merchantmen and journalists, were able to report back from official receptions that the tourists met this standard.

As well as reflecting positively on the new China, Chinese Australians were hopeful that the tour could be used as a weapon in their continuing campaign against Australian prejudice as exemplified by the White Australia Policy. When the Australian colonies had originally federated in 1901 the Chinese–Australian press had welcomed the new nation and expected to be ‘counted equal’. Very quickly, however, they saw that the new Commonwealth would perpetuate their marginalization. This alienation saw the community maintain and invigorate its ‘Chineseness’ and its connections back to the homeland – connections which had been impinged upon by the operation of restrictive immigration policies.

If the tour was to act as a fillip in the Chinese community’s continuing agitation against the White Australia Policy, all Chinese Australians would need to play their part. Continuing tensions between middle-class and working-class Chinese bubbled to the surface. The higher status Chinese (editors, journalists, merchantmen and others) impressed on the workers (the laundrymen, the market gardeners and the miners), the need to actively participate in and support the tour if it was to achieve its potential as a force for championing racial equality.

As well as engaging working-class Chinese with the tour, the Chinese middle-class also saw the opportunity to demonstrate their cultural bonafides to the wider community. Receptions and other civic functions associated with the tour gave local middle-class Chinese fresh opportunities to display their social credentials before white Australians. ‘Mixing’ between the tourists, and the European and Chinese communities became an important feature of the tour’s social calendar. At one of the earliest functions, held at a Chinese restaurant in Sydney, ‘a lot of members of Western clubs were invited to sit together with the various local Sydney Chinese in order to convey a warm welcome’. Throughout the tour Mok, in particular, recognized ‘what a good opportunity [such functions were] and what its education values were’. He noted the ‘bounteous hospitality’ of all Australians and hoped that ‘from herein afterwards, the relationship between Australians and Chinese will be closer’.

Like their Shanghai colleagues, the local Australian–Chinese business elite saw the Australian prejudice which found voice in immigration restriction as the single biggest impediment to bilateral trade. Having been introduced to the seriousness of the issue during his stay in China, Millard, along with Mok Hing, became a vocal advocate for immigration reform during the course of the tour.

Using the trade potential between the two countries as his starting point, Mok Hing made the argument that an expanding trade relationship would require more Chinese
merchants to be permitted entry to Australia.\textsuperscript{94} Returning to the notion of a multi-class community, he observed: ‘(O)ne mistake, I think, that has been made is by Australia excluding all Chinese … In keeping the Chinese merchants and better class of people out you do not give us any idea of trade here’.\textsuperscript{95} This said, Mok did return to an old justification for open immigration from China which Australians led by the labour movement had long since rejected. The cost of Australian manufacturing was too high. If the White Australia Policy was ended, Australians could attract menial labour from China which could help to reduce the price of Australian commodities and therefore make them more attractive for international trade.\textsuperscript{96}

Such was the publicity the tour generated through Millard and Mok Hing’s comments on immigration reform, some Australian politicians were compelled to respond. At a dinner to welcome the Chinese players in Hobart, Senator J.E. Ogden said in response to comments made by Millard about immigration restrictions and trade, that he hoped that as the result of the visit a better spirit would be cultivated between the two nations which would lead to a better understanding as regards trade relationship. The immigration restrictions were not the result of racial prejudice, but a pardonable national sentiment, which must not be taken as offence.\textsuperscript{97}

**Conclusion**

Australian soccer in the early 1920s took big strides towards internationalization. The 1923 Chinese tour provided an event that was to assist with this change. Not only did the tour show that Chinese could be competitors as athletic sportsmen, but it also challenged other entrenched negative perceptions. Having embraced the Chinese soccer team, the Australian public, however, seemed incapable of projecting the lessons learnt onto the wider canvas of Chinese-Australia. The media, and by extension the public, treated the tour as a packaged event. Once the tour was completed, and all formalities ended at the wharf in Sydney, the tour’s consequences were also soon out of sight. One explanation may be that the Chinese visitors, as seen through Australian eyes, were considered separate from, and possibly above, the local community. The Chinese soccer players may have been viewed as equals but this did not necessitate a need or desire among white Australians to question existing ideas about the local community. Thus, on one level Millard had succeeded. Australians had seen the multi-class nature of the Chinese as a racial group. But ultimately this realization had done little beyond the confines of the tour.

If we return to Honey’s questions relating to the tour, they are both answered in the affirmative, at least for the period of the tour. The Chinese soccer players were treated differently – as exceptional and, perhaps, exotic – which drew white Australians to view them as an alternate image to that of the resident Chinese Australian. Yet, the tour also promoted better relationships, both socially and commercially, between Australia and China thus facilitating a shift in Australian attitudes towards the Chinese. The tour, however, left no legacy in perpetuating such new relations and understandings. Examining Australian perceptions of the Chinese in the 1930s, for example, Strahan argues that the monolithic construction of Chinese as ‘coolie’ remained the dominant if not exclusive point of reference: ‘Yet, even when the occupational structure of the Chinese community in Australia diversified, Chinese were frozen in timeless roles …’.\textsuperscript{98}

There are other research questions relating to this topic that are worth further scrutiny. First, an Australian-born Chinese businessman, K.L. Kwong, attempted, unsuccessfully, to emulate the successes of the 1923 event when he organized a tour in 1927.\textsuperscript{99} The reasons why this tour was not as profitable, in all senses, as the first deserves examination.
Was it the case that Australians were no longer inquisitive of the Chinese as in 1923? Was it that the novelty, Mosely and Cashman suggested for the 1923 event, had worn off? Or, could the failure in 1927 be attributed to a lack of sufficient marketing and administration? Certainly, the opportunity to consolidate on the gains of 1923 was lost? Second, there are other Australian–Chinese sporting encounters which can be examined in the period. For example, in July and August of 1924, Australia and China competed in their first Davis Cup tie. A team of Pat O’Hara-Wood and Gerald Patterson dismissed the Chinese team 5–0 at the Crescent Athletic Club in Brooklyn, New York, USA.100

Within Australia’s Asian sporting context, the tour has provided a small window into China’s engagement with Australia. Yet, while the tour had been, of its essence, a carefully circumscribed programme – a set three-month event – its contribution imparts, specifically during that period, more than just a passing spectacle. Australians were exposed to a new and different face of China and that assisted in its management. But the essence of the tour went well beyond the sporting field and all its trappings. The tour, and its elements, sat above the White Australia Policy. Thus for those three months, the tour developed a range of concerns for Australians relating to intersections between race, cultural, economic and political development, over which the element of class stood prominently.

Notes
1. “Shoo” Laddie!, *Sun*, 12 August 1923.
2. Thompson, *One Fantastic Goal*, 32.
4. Despite the fact that class was often used as an argument for Chinese exclusion by the labour movement, and has been examined accordingly, the study of class as it pertains to Australian perceptions of Asia and Asians is an area that has been under-examined. The usefulness of such an approach has been highlighted by the work of Americans historians, such as Calavita, who have demonstrated how race and class (and in her study also gender) were entangled producing ‘significant incoherences and self-contradictions’. See Calavita, ‘Collisions at the Intersection of Gender, Race, and Class’. For discussions of class in the advocacy of a White Australia, see Price, *The Great White Walls are Built*; Markus, *Fear and Hatred*.
6. There were some clear exceptions to this at the time of the tour, especially given the university-based teams. For a discussion of the working-class roots of the football codes, see the chapters: Mosely and Murray, ‘Soccer’; Wimpress, ‘Australian Football’; Phillips, ‘Rugby’.
11. Ibid., 31, 38, 42.
15. This ‘colour line’ was significantly affected by many factors – ‘transnational in its inspiration and identifications but nationalist in its methods and goals’ Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line*, 4.
16. Tan, ‘Living with “Difference”, 101. The perception of Chinese disinterest to sport was challenged by commentators then and by recent historical examinations. See, for example, Tart, *Life of Quong Tart*, 58; Hess ‘A Death Blow to the White Australia Policy’.
17. McNair, *Chinese Abroad*, 72.
It is not clear if these were some of the original French enlisted Chinese labourers or the English who employed their own battalions which, in total, numbered just under 100,000. Summerskill, *China on the Western Front*, 27; Fawcett, ‘The Chinese Labour Corps in France 1917–1921*, 50.

‘Soccer Tour of Australia by Chinese Athletes will be Supported all over Country’, *China Press*, 2 February 1923.


‘Modern China’, *New Zealand Herald*, 24 July 1922.

‘Chinese Footballers’, *New Zealand Herald*, 9 October 1922.

*New Zealand Truth*, 14 October 1922.

*New Zealand Truth*, 21 October 1922.

Only one player in the 28-man squad was from New Zealand. See *Brisbane Courier*, 29 July 1921. Millard was later to offer that person, Bert Laing, as the coach of the Chinese team.

‘Chinese Footballers’, *Sun*, 24 November 1922.


‘Sport in China’, *Sun*, 6 February 1923.

‘Chinese Rugby Tour’, *South China Morning Post*, 28 December 1922.

The *New Zealand Truth* was described as a paper that disdained the rich and would commonly be found in the homes of the conservative working man. Griffith, ‘Popular Culture and Modernity’.

‘No Chink League Team’, *New Zealand Truth*, 3 March 1923.

Ibid. emphasis in original text.

‘Chinese Rugby Tour’, *South China Morning Post*, 28 December 1922.


‘Chinese Rugby Players’, *South China Morning Post*, 30 December 1922.

Hong Kong to the British was a colony and is treated as such in commercial documents by Australia. To the Chinese, Hong Kong was part of China and the editor’s views expressed this.

‘Chinese Rugby Tourists’, *South China Morning Post*, 17 January 1923.

*South China Morning Post*, 19 January 1923.

‘No Chink League Team’, *New Zealand Truth*, 3 March 1923.

‘Chinese Football Tourists’, *South China Morning Post*, 23 January 1923.

Peng, *Private Education in Modern China*, 19. Part of the drive for educational reform came through the need to speak foreign languages and understand modern technology; the need to catch up to the West. Following the Opium Wars, new schools were created that included training in the English language. Those who were exposed to this education system understood Western culture.

Yeh, *Alienated Academy*.

Morris, *Marrow of the Nation*, 47.


Ibid.

‘China Rugby Team Tour is Proposed’, *China Press*, 23 January 1923.

‘Soccer Tour of Australia is Now Plan’, *China Press*, 1 February 1923.

Millard, no doubt, believed that had he returned to New Zealand without a Rugby League team, the syndicate that had afforded him the finances would chase him for a return of their investment. This they did after they heard the news of the change of plan to play soccer. A solicitor was sent to Sydney, but returned empty handed. ‘Some Inside Information’, *Sydney Sportsman*, 10 October 923.

Soccer Tour of Australia by Chinese Athletes will be Supported all over Country, *China Press*, 2 February 1923.

Ibid.

‘Best Centre Three Quarter in Rugger’, *China Press*, 4 February 1923.


Brownell, *Training the Body for China*, 42.


Indeed in a rare and early mention of the tour, Kolatch claimed the Australian tour had taken place ‘under the auspices of the YMCA’. Kolatch, *Sports*, 28.


‘Australia to see Chinese Soccer Team’, *China Press*, 5 April 1923.
When Millard was in Hong Kong, initially in January and later in June and July, he was involved in a discussion with Australian and New Zealand ex-patriots discussing the merits of the tour. In the second period, these letters to the paper related eventually to trade and the immigration restrictions. See, e.g., Lin, ‘Correspondence’, South China Morning Post, 9 July 1923.

‘Fitzgerald’, Big White Lie, 186.


Ibid.

‘Committee to Select Chinese for Soccer Tour’, China Press, 4 March 1923.


‘Millard Picks Soccer XI for Australia Trip’, China Press, 3 June 1923.

‘Chinese Football Tourists’, South China Morning Post, 11 June 1923.

‘Chinese Footballers Visit to Australia’, South China Morning Post, 30 June 1923.

‘Football’, South China Morning Post, 5 July 1923.

‘Chinese Football Tour’, South China Morning Post, 9 July 1923.

‘Chinese Football Tourists’, South China Morning Post, 4 July 1923.

‘Chinese Football Tour’, South China Morning Post, 11 July 1923.

‘Chinese Soccer Tour’, South China Morning Post, 14 July 1923.


‘Chinese Football Tour’, South China Morning Post, 18 July 1923.

The Sydney Sun, for example, provided five articles in 1922 leading up to the departure of Millard and Shaw to Hong Kong, from 9 October to 24 November 1922.

Jakubowicz et al., Racism, Ethnicity and the Media, 48.

A few more articles were written in the days leading up to the players’ arrival in Sydney. Generally, they were positive in commentary. See, e.g., ‘Chinese Footballers’, Sun, 5 August 1923.

‘Soccer’, Daily Standard, 4 August 1923.

‘Soccer’, , 13 August 1923.

‘Chinese Make Good’, Sydney Sportsman, 14 August 1923.


‘Wish the South China Soccer Team Success’, Chinese Republic News, 4 August 1923.

‘Wrong Impressions’, News, 5 October 1923.


Fitzgerald, ‘Visions of Australian Federation, 114’.

Curthoys “‘Chineseness’ and Australian Identity’, 20.


At every opportunity Mok put forward the ideas of improving friendship and trade. This was generally done at receptions and dinners. For examples of their attacks on the policies, see ‘Wrong Impressions’, News, 5 October 1923; ‘Swept Like Epidemic’, News, 5 October 1923; ‘Australia’s Open Door’, Examiner, 23 October 1923.

See Jones, ‘What Happened to Australia’s Chinese Between the World Wars’, 222 for a discussion on the numbers of Chinese merchantmen allowed into and living in Australia.

‘Wrong Impressions’, News, 5 October 1923.

Ibid.


Strachan, Australia’s China, 100.

Honey, ‘Sport, Immigration’, 45.

Ibid.
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