Sir Stanley Rous and the Growth of World Football

Sir Stanley Rous and the Growth of World Football:

An Englishman Abroad

By

Alan Tomlinson

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Sir Stanley Rous and the Growth of World Football:
An Englishman Abroad

By Alan Tomlinson

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-5887-8
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-5887-8

Dedicated to Rose-Marie Breitenstein

CONTENTS

List of illustrations ix

Preface xi

Acknowledgements xiii

List of abbreviations xv

Part One: The Rules of the Game

Chapter I 3
Shaping modern football: Stanley Rous's three 'R's

Chapter II 15
Raising Rous: Religion, education, sport

Chapter III 37
War games

Chapter IV 55
Schoolmaster and referee

Part Two: Running the Show

Chapter V 73
The keys to the gate: Moderniser and internationalist

Chapter VI 87
War and peace: Forces football, the Home Front and the Olympic Games

Chapter VII 103
Rous in Europe: 1946-1962

Chapter VIII 119
Mutford to Zurich

Part Three: Going Global

Chapter IX 143
Cultivating the confederations: Post-colonial football development and FIFA diplomacy

Chapter X 157
World Cup diplomat: Rous at the 1966 World Cup Finals

Chapter XI 179
Apartheid, football and the South Africa question

Chapter XII 193
A continent withdraws: The African boycott of World Cup '66

Chapter XIII 205
A Chile encounter

Chapter XIV 219
Rous and the end of English hegemony in world football

Part Four: Back Home: Rous's Legacy Home and Away

Chapter XV 235
Not just football: A man for all seasons?

Chapter XVI 253
Reflections on Stanley Rous, English football and global football governance

Chapter XVII 267
Finding Rous

Endnotes 273

Bibliography 309

Index 323

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 9.1. *Schedule for Christmas and New Year 1963-1964*

Figure 9.2. *Schedule for Christmas and New Year 1963-1964 Continued*

PREFACE

Sir Stanley Ford Rous was born on 25 April 1895 and died on 18 July 1986. This book explores his contribution to English football, British public life and world football (soccer) development.

I first wrote about Stanley Rous in a short chapter in *Off the Ball: The Football World Cup* (1986), co-edited with Garry Whannel. My chapter was called "Going global: The FIFA story", and Rous was a bit player in my piece. He was pictured, as football legend Stanley Matthews recalled things, handing out cash expenses to England's players before an international match against Wales in the 1934-35 season. He was noted to have built up a good working relationship with Jules Rimet, president of FIFA, one which helped the 'British Associations' rejoin FIFA in 1947. And I quoted from a BBC Radio 4 feature on Rous broadcast in April 1985 in which he spoke of his defeat in the FIFA presidential election of 1974. These snapshots did scant justice to Rous's massive contribution to the growth of the game, nationally and internationally. There was much more to be said on this contribution and, in between other projects and work and family commitments, I have now been researching and writing about Sir Stanley Rous and English and world football development for 35 years.

When *Off the Ball* came out a few months before the 1986 men's World Cup in Mexico–staged 31 May to 29 June–Stanley Rous was still alive. The World Cup event was to have been hosted by Colombia, but political and economic circumstances made this impossible. Mexico was especially memorable to the England football public for Garry Lineker's goal-scoring and for Diego Maradona's outrageous gamesmanship in his 'Hand of God' goal, followed by his equally outrageous football genius in his second, slaloming solo goal. Stanley Rous lived to see the Argentina side win the World Cup and would have been proud of the young Englishman's achievement in winning the Golden Boot as the tournament's top goalscorer. There is no record of any views that he might have expressed on the subject of Maradona; but views he would most certainly have had, not least on the referee's incapacity to spot the raised arm and hand of the cunning Argentinean opportunist. His courteous diplomatic style would no doubt have tempered his more visceral reactions. And three weeks later, Rous died.

This book is about much more than Rous himself, as all individuals are both made by and makers of places and times. It is an arousing story to follow Rous from his modest East Anglian birthplace to his positions at the top of national and international football institutions. It is a narrative of social mobility, educational and religious legacies, war and peace and most of all, the global growth of football. Writing such a story has its challenges, and I reflect upon some of these in the final chapter of the book. Here, though, it would be remiss not to acknowledge the central subject of this work. I never met the man, but this book is testimony to the significance of Sir Stanley Rous and his undeniable contribution to the growth of global football.

Professor Alan Tomlinson
Brighton, East Sussex
United Kingdom
June 2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to all who have supported my research on Stanley Rous since it began in the mid-1980s. Around a decade ago, I planned to develop this work into a project to cover his whole life and career, and special thanks go to those who have encouraged me in that time. My previous research on Rous was anchored in the history and politics of FIFA, in particular during Rous's tenure as FIFA president. Taking on a life-history has broadened the exploratory and investigative brief enormously, and I am grateful to all who have supported me in doing this.

My academic colleagues at the University of Brighton have given me consistent support over several decades. In particular I am grateful to Professor John Sugden with whom I have worked on several books on FIFA's sociology, history and politics. Dr Dan Burdsey has been unstinting in his enthusiasm for the project. Away from Brighton, Dr Lincoln Allison has provided stimulating insights and materials; Dr Garry Whannel has been a responsive friend and always an enthusiast; Dr Simon Rofe has been a hugely informed co-writer on diplomatic dimensions of Rous's professional life; Professor Chris Young has been a constant source of discussion on the minutiae of project planning and the importance of narrative in cultural history; Dr Teddy Brett has provided sharp, critical and no-holds-barred responses to drafts of selected chapters.

In the journalistic world I have been encouraged, across the range of my Rous-related work, by Mike Collett, David Conn, David Goldblatt, Andrew Jennings, and Brian Oliver. Interviews with Patrick Barclay, Patrick Collins, and Norman Giller have provided perspectives on Rous that I could not have otherwise encountered. Piers Edwards at the BBC World Service has kindly made available transcripts of interviews that he conducted with people in relation to some of Rous's decisions and actions concerning the African football confederation, in the making of programmes based in my Rous research.

It is extraordinary how welcoming gatekeepers have been. At The Football Association Jane Bateman has been generous beyond expectation in securing access to documents and sources. At the Sport & Recreation Alliance (the former Central Council of Physical Recreation), Kate Lawrenson left me alone in a comfortable room with a mountain of original minute books and a constant source of coffee. Melina Greensmith at Sport

England enabled access to surviving historical sources. At the National Football Museum (England), Dr Alex Jackson and his colleagues were exceptionally informative guides to the museum's collection. Guy Oliver, consultant to the FIFA World Football Museum, has facilitated access to files and archives at FIFA. Michael Schmalholz, Librarian, Archivist, and Team Leader for Heritage has been the perfect host at the FIFA Museum. Nicolas Bouchet has in the most efficient of ways opened up the UEFA archives to me. Alex Philips, formerly of UEFA and the AFC, has been a long-term supporter of research on football and sport governance.

The Rous family itself–on the side of Stanley Rous's youngest sister Audrey Fern–has been interested, generous and responsive to my queries on Uncle Stanley. I had the great pleasure of interviewing Audrey née Rous a little before her 100th birthday, and I am indebted to the Fern family for allowing me access to documents, cuttings, and clippings.

Closer to home, my wife Bernie has tolerated my close to obsessive concern with studying Rous and his times. We have nevertheless enjoyed walks on the wonderful beaches of East Anglia after my morning in a local records office (and her parkrun along a local cliff-top). Thanks as ever to Alys and Rowan, Jo and Sinead, who have asked sometimes with a grin: "How is Rous doing?" Nick, Andrea and Josh have asked after Rous too when they appeared on the scene, and Nick has provided mock-ups for the cover of this book.

In the run-in, Helen Edwards and her team at Cambridge Scholars Publishing (CSP) have combined expertise and efficiency in admirable fashion, and Dr Alex Golding has been assiduous in the task of formatting the manuscript to meet CSP standards.

My debt to Rose-Marie Breitenstein is deep indeed. Rose-Marie first gave me access to the Private Papers of Sir Stanley Rous when I was researching (with John Sugden) for the book *FIFA and the Contest for World Football* (1998). So for close to a quarter of a century, I have had the privilege of knowing Rose-Marie, whose facilitation of my access to this source has provided me with a unique opportunity to enlighten our understanding of the life and times of one of the most influential figures in the history of world football. Working too with Guy Oliver, I hope to have assisted the process whereby the Rous collection of documents and materials will find a permanent home in the FIFA World Football Museum in Zurich.

Professor Alan Tomlinson
Brighton, East Sussex
United Kingdom
June 2020

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AFC	Asian Football Confederation
ASF	Australian Soccer Federation
BOA	British Olympic Association
CAF	Confederation of African Football
CBE	Commander of the Order of the British Empire
CCPR	Central Council of Physical Recreation
CONCACAF	Confederation of North, Central American and Caribbean Association Football
CONMEBOL	South American Football Confederation
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea
ExCo	Executive Committee (of FIFA)
FA	The Football Association
FASA	Football Association of South Africa (formerly South African Football Association)
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
FIFA	Fédération Internationale de Football Association
GDR	German Democratic Republic
IFAB	International Football Association Board
IOC	International Olympic Committee

JIPGD	Joint Information Policy and Guidance Department
NFFSC	National Federation of Football Supporters' Clubs
OBE	Officer of the Order of the British Empire
OFC	Oceania Football Confederation
OG	Organized Games
RAF	Royal Air Force
SASF	South Africa Soccer Federation
UEFA	Union of European Football Associations
UDI	Unilateral Declaration of Independence
WEC	War Emergency Committee
WGS	Watford Grammar School

PART ONE

THE RULES OF THE GAME

CHAPTER I

SHAPING MODERN FOOTBALL: STANLEY ROUS'S THREE 'R'S

I

"Who's the tall bloke standing next to Queen Elizabeth?", countless football fans and observers have wondered when they see the picture of England captain Bobby Moore receiving the World Cup from the monarch. In iconic photographs of that quintessential English moment in July 1966, shot by Gerry Cranham and published by the *Illustrated London News*, football's capacity to unite and bond people from widely varied backgrounds, in however transient a form, was incontestable. Shooting in colour, the young photographer caught the young Queen, resplendent in matching yellow hat and coat, and the youthful-looking England team captain, in glowing scarlet jersey and muddied white shorts, in an extraordinarily tranquil moment of mutual and smiling respect. And the tall bloke leaning towards Moore and the Queen was not Prince Philip. It was Sir Stanley Ford Rous, President of FIFA, and former Secretary of The FA (The Football Association). This was not Rous's first starring role at the stadium; in 1934, he had refereed the FA Cup Final. From the following year, he would oversee all the FA Cup finals at Wembley for the next quarter of a century.

This book explores the social and cultural context of Rous's rise to the higher echelons of the British social hierarchy and his *entrée* into the English social elite, in a narrative of social mobility for which his refereeing pedigree provided his first international profile. Born in 1895, Rous died in 1986, his name and accomplishments embedded in the histories of the growth of the English game and the FIFA-led expansion of football across the world. It is a story crossing two World Wars, many governments and all continents, the Cold War, post-colonial politics, globalisation of media and consumption, and seismic cultural shifts in sporting and leisure tastes. He would be called upon time and time again to adjudicate, negotiate, mediate upon and between national rivalries and political issues. This study analyses the influences and factors that drove Rous the referee to such levels of eminence, influence and power.

To millions of fans of association football throughout the world the most obvious–and easily accessible–target of abuse is the match official, the referee. For the most extreme and prejudiced football supporters, the figure of the referee often provides an easy target, a focus for humour, mockery, abusive anti-social sentiments and more. Referees have, generally speaking, faded from the public eye once their refereeing days are over. But in 1961, Stanley Ford Rous, an Englishman from the rural backwaters of Suffolk in East Anglia, England, and former international football referee, gained the presidency of FIFA (La Fédération Internationale de Football Association). Once in that position, he could test initiatives at the international level; one of these was the "red card" system used by the referee. Rous recalled watching a match at the Olympic Games and observing communication problems between referee and linesmen, and between the officials and the players. To get over what he saw as a language difficulty, he "was attracted to the idea of coloured cards–yellow for a caution, red for a dismissal–to show beyond doubt that a player had been warned or dismissed from the field".[1] As FIFA president he could trial this initiative at the 1968 Olympic Games and the 1970 men's World Cup, both in Mexico. It was soon recognised, he wrote, as standard practice by FIFA. The idea was not completely new, if an alternative account is to be believed. Koe Ewe Teik, born in Thailand, worked in Malaysia for much of his life in football development and administration. An educationalist, he worked closely with Stanley Rous on FIFA refereeing committees and the International Football Association Board (IFAB), the body that controlled the laws of the game. Ewe Teik, his biographer relates, "came up with" the "colour card system", suggesting a red card for a foul and a green card for a dismissal–a traffic-light model, red for stop and green for go.[2] He did the committee work to float this idea and get it tested in qualifying games for the Olympic football competition, and accepted with modifications in 1966. Rous was a generous mentor, but holding the FIFA presidency allowed him to claim the credit for the success of schemes such as Eik's colour card system. How Rous got to such a powerful position from his modest roots is the focus of this study.

Rous's administrative abilities had been proven during his time, 1934 to 1962, as secretary of The Football Association (The FA), the first such association in history. His more individual contribution in an expansive phase of the game's development in the period between World War I and World War II had been to rise to the peak of an amateur career as a football referee, undertaken alongside his full-time occupation as a physical education master at a boys' grammar school in Watford. This refereeing profile helped him gain the position at The FA from which base he cultivated international networks and huge worldwide influence to such an

extent that when he was voted in as FIFA's sixth president (the third Englishman to hold the position) few disputed that he was the best man in the right place at the right time to steer FIFA through its own most expansionist phase as the passion for football swept the world. When he died in July 1986, obituaries flowed in across the world praising his contribution to football.

In the UK, *The Daily Telegraph* anointed Rous "football's greatest administrator, the man who having forced the FA to face reality then guided FIFA safely through their most difficult period".[3] This obituary typifies the dominant narrative on Rous, his time and the national and then international development of association football. But there was more to Rous than just football. He was knighted for his contribution to the staging of London's 1948 Summer Olympics; and from the mid-1930s through to the early 1970s he was, through the work of the Central Council of Physical Recreation (CCPR), a major force in national debates across the UK concerning the increasing recognition of the place of sport and leisure in social policy and planning. The *Telegraph* obituary made no mention of these two monumental contributions to British cultural life of the twentieth century. If Rous has been lionised for his FA and FIFA roles, he has been marginalised and all but forgotten for his contributions in other associated and complementary spheres of sport and leisure. This study provides a corrective to partial or randomly selective accounts of Rous's extraordinary life.

Sir Stanley Rous may have shaped much of the modern version of football, but he did not invent the game. His contribution was to take what was there already, with its own institutional base and cultural identity, and to shape it for new constituencies in a volatile, changing, and post-colonial world. In his life story Rous opens his chapter on 'Refereeing Reminiscence' with a bold and pithy, even stern, assertion: "A football referee has to be regarded as a judge."[4] The use of the noun is evocative. Rous writes not just about a process of making judgements; he is *the* judge, the authoritative figure whose interpretation counts, whose knowledge of the laws of the game allows him to interpret situations correctly. He would not be averse to a flexible, pragmatic judgement. In 1962 in Chile Rous announced–on behalf of FIFA's disciplinary committee–that the Brazilian player Garrincha would be cautioned rather than suspended, so enabling him to play in the World Cup Final. A telegram from Brazil's President Tancredo Neves could well have swayed the decision for leniency.[5] Right or wrong, independent or over-influenced, wherever he went in a globetrotting life of public service and football development, Rous would adopt the tone of the judge along with doses of football evangelism.

Rous's life took him away from Mutford, the village of his birth, to the town of Beccles for a schooling that was to shape his worldview, and on to a teaching position in England's most easterly town, Lowestoft. World War 1 took him to France, Egypt and Palestine, and after the war a teacher-training course at St. Luke's College (Exeter) in England's West Country took him the breadth of the country away from his home county of East Suffolk. Watford, a few miles north of London, then provided an opportunity to both teach and take on an ambitious refereeing career, after which forty years in football and sport development and administration crowned a life of overflowing accomplishments and multiple challenges. Throughout all the phases of this twentieth-century life football was the dominant theme, understood through the interpretive lens of the referee's rulebook and the wider moral framework of the games ethic implanted into the psyche of a pupil in the changing educational landscape of Edwardian England.

II

Football has had a prominent cultural profile in the history of British sports and games. Joseph Strutt, chronicler of the pastimes of the people in mediaeval and early modern England/Britain, included football as one of his "games of ball".[6] His general description of "a match of football" identified recognisable elements of the modern game. Competitors "take the field" and stand between two goals that are placed 80 or 100 yards apart. A usual design of the goal is simplicity itself, two sticks driven into the ground around two or three feet apart. The round ball is commonly made of a blown bladder. The objective of the game is to drive the ball, using your feet, through the goal of the opposing party, or team. In many cases–understandable given the narrowness of the goal itself, and the large numbers that often made up the sides and could adopt block defences–the game was won as soon as one side succeeded in this objective, which could take many hours to achieve.

Strutt noted too how the activity could become "exceeding violent", players kicking out at each other's shins and physically attacking one another. The sport had been banned by Royal edict in earlier centuries, seen as one of the popular activities that jeopardised the archery skills so necessary to the military of the time. The rough-and-ready nature of the sport called for little in the way of rules or constraints, and Strutt claimed that its widespread popularity among the common people had faded or been undermined in the later years of the eighteenth century. Evidence does exist though of the sustained popularity of the sport in its rudimentary form well

into the nineteenth century, at least in the holiday calendar of rituals in some communities.

In Derby, for instance, a half-day Shrovetide match was held annually, and in 1827 this took the form of a large-scale encounter between two parishes in the town, with "teams" of 500-1,000 a side. In this case, the goals were a mile outside the town, and means of the moving the ball could include swimming with it in the River Derwent. Local customs and distinct playing arrangements, as Robert Malcolmson observes, meant that no case of the football match could be seen to be *the* typical case.[7] In some parts of the country, some matches specified that the teams should comprise ten to fifteen a side. One thing is certain though. Large or small, the matches were not regulated by any neutral figure. They remained essentially local customs and rituals practiced in accordance with oral traditions and regional idiosyncrasies. In East Anglia, a version of "football" that remained popular into the later years of the eighteenth century was "camping", though this involved catching and holding a smaller ball than the typical football, and accounts read like a template for modern rugby football rather than a variant of what would become the globally popular kicking game.[8] A century before the birth of Sir Stanley Rous, the dominant form of football in the county and region into which he was born–one account is of the pastimes of the village of Hawsted, just 50 miles to the south-west of his birthplace–was more of a handling practice, and two types of camping or camp-ball could be distinguished: rough play and civil play. If the village of Rous's birth, Mutford, similar in population to Hawsted, had its version of camping and its chronicler, it is highly likely s/he would have chronicled the distinctive characteristics separating the conception and model of football as played in the two villages.

If the predecessors of modern football had been consigned to history, or regulated out of existence by the authorities of their times, a global culture of sport and games might well exist without football. What we see though in the historical evolution of football is the increasing regulation of the activity, the defining of its core character in rules of conduct, and the framing of laws of the game. For this to happen, the subservience of the local to the emerging dominance of the national was essential. And it was not the players in the villages, the community teams that played the early forms of the game, who were to bring this about. It was the pupils of the elite British public schools, many of whom went on to play sports and compete athletically at the "ancient" universities of Oxford and Cambridge, who set in motion the standardisation of the game, on the basis of shared understanding of how the game might, and increasingly should, be played.

Eric Dunning and Kenneth Sheard argue that in the public schools there was an explicit attempt to develop the football game in ways clearly differentiating it from the folk forms. In doing this, public school authorities sought to retain a quality of "manliness" in the sport, but alongside a more "gentle" form of the game. This involved reducing forms of violence in the game, in effect subjecting the young players "to both specific and diffuse pressure to 'civilize' their football".[9] Rules, regulations, and referees were the essential ingredients in the mix that was to generate the modern form of association football.

III

It is arguable that the world's first football club was established in 1824 by a University of Edinburgh trainee lawyer John Hope who went on to list some rules in a handwritten note of 1833, and he published a set of rules in 1854. The formation of The Football Association in London in 1863 was, though, to obscure Scotland's place in the history of the formal development of the game.[10] Rous himself co-authored FIFA's publication *A History of the Laws of Association Football*, published in the last year of his final term of office as FIFA president.[11] The importance of key moments in the standardisation of the game are acknowledged by Rous and his co-author Donald Ford, with particular attention paid to a meeting of male undergraduates at Cambridge in 1848. The genesis of this meeting was the formation two years previously of a University Football Club, set up in 1846 by some "old boys" of Shrewsbury School and Eton College. Relatively informal matches were played in the public space in south Cambridge, Parker's Piece, and a trial game was arranged for the incoming football enthusiasts in the 1848 intake:

> And because every player adopted his own school rules the result was dire confusion. It was obvious that something had to be done to regularise the situation, and a meeting took place in Trinity College in October of that year. It lasted nearly eight hours, but was probably the most significant meeting in the history of football.[12]

At this meeting, a neutral figure chaired discussions between representatives from each school, and a basic agreement was arrived at on a new, written set of rules retaining as far as possible the principles of each individual school but constituting a common ground based upon practicality, fairness and reasonableness. The successful achievement of this consensus-seeking process ensured that any new arrival at the University, from whatever school, could adapt his playing experience to the new rules. The codification

of the game was under way, and by 1863 the Cambridge Rules numbered fourteen, and would be the primary influence in the formulation and acceptance by the new body The Football Association, in December 1863, of a standardised set of rules for all clubs and all competitions. The Cambridge laws were also influential upon the Sheffield Committee that had a few years earlier, in 1857, "laid down its code in a succinct set of eleven laws", though for "a game in which the hands still played a fairly large part".[13]

The figure of the referee is notable by his absence from both the 1848 Cambridge Rules and the FA Rules of 1863. The common practice in early forms of organised football was to have two umpires, one in each half of the field, both of them appointed by the respective teams. Neutrality and objectivity could hardly be guaranteed in such circumstances, and third-party figures began to be consulted–"referred to"–on disputed decisions or interpretations. Accordingly, this became the officiating norm for matches, and in season 1880-81, The FA introduced the first Law to acknowledge and describe the role of the referee:

> By mutual consent of the competing clubs in matches, a referee shall be appointed whose duty shall be to decide in all cases of dispute between its umpires. He shall also keep a record of the game and act as time-keeper, and in the event of ungentlemanly behaviour on the part of any of the contestants, the offender or offenders shall be cautioned, and in the case of violent conduct the referee shall have power to rule the offending player or players out of play, and order him or them off the ground.[14]

Law 5 of the rules of the game is now an extended list of demands on the referee, but this original Law is in spirit fully preserved in modern conditions and circumstances. The appeal to "ungentlemanly behaviour" no longer survives in the pages of the 2018-2019 Laws of the Game.[15] There is though mention of extremely offending, insulting or abusive gestures, and the spirit of the game in which the Laws must be applied is still a cornerstone of the moral dimension as opposed to the purely regulatory aspect of the Laws.

For Tony Mason, it was a "stiffening of competition", in particular the increase in cup matches, that exposed the fragility of the two-umpire system. This intensification of the competitive element of the game led to increased levels of appeals from the players, disputing decisions concerning foul play, offside and whether the ball had actually passed between the posts. Mason argues that this escalation of player appeals "did more than any other single factor to undermine the idea that control of the game by two umpires, one appointed by each side, with a referee to decide on knotty points, was sufficient".[16] So by the mid-1880s, the neutral referee had become

the most powerful figure in the regulation of match play: "The growth in competitive play, both cup and league, made the referee as objective arbiter, divorced from direct connection with the competing clubs, essential."[17] Mason cites an *Athletic News* article reporting that in the Lancashire derby game between Blackburn Rovers and Darwen, in November 1879, the clubs agreed to the appointment of a neutral referee in a game without umpires, and as the journalist observed, the "result was one of the most friendly games Rovers and Darwen have ever played". The evidence was clear, and over the next decade the roles and responsibilities of the referee, and the two linesmen–all neutral with no club connections–were clarified. The Football League had been established in 1888, just three years after The FA accepted the commercial realities of professionalism, and the professional game was thus legalised. Gordon Thomson calls this "the inevitable erosion of nepotism in officialdom", as professional clubs, the Football League and The FA looked to recruit a new breed of football official/referee no longer anchored in the Old Boys' networks of the public school and University amateurs.[18]

IV

The then FIFA general-secretary Joseph S. Blatter co-authored a FIFA publication in which he hailed the importance of the referee during a year, 1986, declared by FIFA to be "the international year of the Referee".[19] Blatter picked up on Rous's metaphor of the referee as judge, a figure of pretty much absolute power "so to speak in a summary trial, equipped with a large authority whose verdicts are final … The referee is consequently not only director of the match but acts at the same time as prosecutor, judge and executor. A man thus who is often little liked but whose authority is respected all over the world."[20] Refereeing superstar Pierluigi Collina, of Italy, recalls a conversation in San Remo with Dutch superstar Edgar Davids in which the competitively-driven player asked the referee what he goes out on to the pitch for. Collina's response was that he and other referees of his ilk enter the pitch "to try and help the real competitors, the players, to play in full respect of the rules and therefore to play in the best possible way. Usually people play best when the rules are respected … The referee's role is therefore one of 'service' … to let the players best display their abilities as footballers".[21]

Slick epithets can seem attractive as a way of capturing the essence of a cultural form or practice. J. C. Thring was one of the young Cambridge enthusiasts who played the game on Parker's Piece in the mid-1840s, and he went on to teach at Uppingham School, where in a pamphlet proposing

the rules of 'foot-ball', he described his rule-based version as "the simplest game". Of course, the game can be described in a myriad of ways, depending upon the analytical focus of the commentator or researcher. Thring's perception though rings true throughout the history of the game. UK television presenter Michael Parkinson writes of this persisting simplicity of the genre, in the context of taking a couple of his grandchildren to watch a Reading Football Club game: "I look at them and observe the way the game, for all its changes, still continues to enchant succeeding generations. The genius of football is its simplicity. All you need is something resembling a ball and a patch of spare ground and you have a game".[22] Stanley Rous himself, writing in his book *Football Worlds: A Lifetime in Sport*, expressed the same view. In a piece for a Chicago publication, he looked back to his "boyhood days" and praised the "comparative simplicity" of soccer: "A lot of the fun was forthcoming by kicking a tennis or even a rag ball about. It did not require elaborate equipment and could be played on any open space without proper goalposts, or nets, or field markings. Improvised goals were made with any article available, such as coats, sticks, or stones".[23] Rous saw the simplicity of the association football code as a major reason for the game's worldwide adoption and popularity. He added that as the young player learns to "play the game" this provides a model for the daily life of a "law-abiding citizen", and that respecting and accepting the authority and decisions of the referee without dissent is a vital lesson.

In the later decades of the nineteenth century, an increasing consensus had been achieved over the laws of 'the simplest game', including the preference for an empowered and neutral single referee. The game had become sufficiently standardised through the mutual recognition of commonly understood laws of the game to support the first international football match, a 0-0 stalemate between England and Scotland played in Partick, Glasgow (Scotland), in November 1872. As more football associations were formed–in Scotland in 1872, Wales in 1876 and Ireland in 1880–and competitive leagues were established by those associations, the British 'nations' inaugurated the International Football Association Board (IFAB) in 1886. This introduced an annual commitment to review the Laws of the Game, and to intervene wherever necessary on matters of interpretation of the laws.

V

The growth of the association football code was incremental but solid and sustained, and the emergence and expansion of the professional game

represented a shift away from the dominance of the upper classes and the social elites with their public school backgrounds and privileged access to facilities and resources in the colleges of the ancient universities. At the same time, the bloated membership of The FA Council would protect the interests of the amateur game for generations. There was a clear regional and class-influenced profile to the professional game, which was dominated by the industrial towns of north-west England and the Midlands. These areas contributed all 12 founder members of the Football League in 1888: Accrington, Blackburn Rovers, Bolton Wanderers, Burnley, Everton and Preston North End from Lancashire; Aston Villa, West Bromwich Albion and Wolverhampton Wanderers from the West Midlands; and Derby County, Notts County and Stoke City from the east Midlands.

Southern teams formed by professional classes and military had dominated the founding membership of the Football Association in 1863, and the early years of The FA Cup. With the officials of the Southern counties of England deeply opposed to professionalism, the top southern teams were to form the Southern League in 1894, from which outstanding teams such as Southampton and Tottenham Hotspur demonstrated dramatic improvement in competitive quality when reaching the FA Cup finals of 1900, 1901 and 1902. Southampton lost twice, 4-0 to Bury at the turn of the century, and going down 2-1 to Sheffield United in a replay following a 1-1 stalemate in the 1902 final.

The presence in the Southampton side of right-back Charles Burgess (C. B.) Fry was a reminder of the former dominance of the amateur all-rounder: Fry had played on the wing at Rugby Union for Oxford University, represented England at cricket and hit ninety-four first-class centuries, and was a world long-jump record holder. He also wrote journalism, edited popular publications, studied and taught.[24] Fry's commitments included an editorial role for the publication *The Captain*, pitched at boys and Old Boys of the British public schools. The magazine, published monthly from 1899 to 1924, was substantial, averaging around 80 double-columned pages per issue. Fry was trumpeted as the world's first "athletic editor", and concentrated on coaching columns, bringing a "professional" edge to a readership that also devoured sport-based themes in the regular and public-school based adventure stories.[25]

In between Southampton's two losses, it was the Tottenham Hotspur side that brought the South back into the big picture of the game at the highest level, becoming the first southern team to win the FA Cup since the Old Etonians eighteen years earlier. At Crystal Palace in April 1901 Tottenham drew with Sheffield United, winning the trophy the following week in a replay at Bolton's Burnden Park. The London final drew 110,820

spectators, the first six-figure crowd in the history of the English game. That season Tottenham finished in fifth position in the Southern League, a competition which, no longer dominated by traditional amateurs, was being taken more and more seriously as professional players began to be recruited there during the 1890s when the Football League was regulating, and for many constraining, the work and pay conditions of players. Royal Arsenal had joined the Football League's second tier in 1893, changing its name to Woolwich Arsenal in 1896, and reaching the First Division in 1904.

Norwich City, a newcomer to the Southern League in season 1905-1906, finished in an honourable seventh spot, three points behind fifth-placed Tottenham. At this very time, Stanley Rous, aged 11, was leaving his young boyhood behind him. In his village community and schooling environment throughout his boyhood and youthful years the football enthusiast was becoming more and more aware that there was a booming newish sport in his part of the world, one which caught his eye and his attention and opened the gates wider to future possibilities in life and work. The sacrosanct amateurism of football's past was being openly challenged throughout the country; cultural and social change in education, sport and leisure was creating new prospects for new generations of Englishmen and, though on a lesser scale, women. Established rules, consistent regulation and, on the field of play, reliable refereeing would constitute the three 'R's of this incremental and cultural transformation of the rough and ready folk form of football. Stanley Ford Rous would be a beneficiary and in turn an architect of a cultural, economic and political phenomenon that would sweep the world.