

STATE LIBRARY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**J. D. SOMERVILLE ORAL HISTORY
COLLECTION**

OH 677

Full transcript of an interview with

JOHN A. DALY

on 22 & 29 October 2003

by Peter Donovan

for the

**EMINENT AUSTRALIANS ORAL HISTORY
PROJECT**

Recording available on CD

Access for research: Unrestricted

Right to photocopy: Copies may be made for research and study

Right to quote or publish: Publication only with written permission from the
State Library

NOTES TO THE TRANSCRIPT

This transcript was created by the J. D. Somerville Oral History Collection of the State Library. It conforms to the Somerville Collection's policies for transcription which are explained below.

Readers of this oral history transcript should bear in mind that it is a record of the spoken word and reflects the informal, conversational style that is inherent in such historical sources. The State Library is not responsible for the factual accuracy of the interview, nor for the views expressed therein. As with any historical source, these are for the reader to judge.

It is the Somerville Collection's policy to produce a transcript that is, so far as possible, a verbatim transcript that preserves the interviewee's manner of speaking and the conversational style of the interview. Certain conventions of transcription have been applied (ie. the omission of meaningless noises, false starts and a percentage of the interviewee's crutch words). Where the interviewee has had the opportunity to read the transcript, their suggested alterations have been incorporated in the text (see below). On the whole, the document can be regarded as a raw transcript.

Abbreviations: The interviewee's alterations may be identified by their initials in insertions in the transcript.

Punctuation: Square bracket [] indicate material in the transcript that does not occur on the original tape recording. This is usually words, phrases or sentences which the interviewee has inserted to clarify or correct meaning. These are not necessarily differentiated from insertions the interviewer or by Somerville Collection staff which are either minor (a linking word for clarification) or clearly editorial. Relatively insignificant word substitutions or additions by the interviewee as well as minor deletions of words or phrases are often not indicated in the interest of readability. Extensive additional material supplied by the interviewee is usually placed in footnotes at the bottom of the relevant page rather than in square brackets within the text.

A series of dots, indicates an untranscribable word or phrase.

Sentences that were left unfinished in the normal manner of conversation are shown ending in three dashes, - - -.

Spelling: Wherever possible the spelling of proper names and unusual terms has been verified. A parenthesised question mark (?) indicates a word that it has not been possible to verify to date.

Typeface: The interviewer's questions are shown in **bold print**.

Discrepancies between transcript and tape: This proofread transcript represents the authoritative version of this oral history interview. Researchers using the original tape recording of this interview are cautioned to check this transcript for corrections, additions or deletions which have been made by the interviewer or the interviewee but which will not occur on the tape. (See the Punctuation section above.) Minor discrepancies of grammar and sentence structure made in the interest of readability can be ignored but significant changes such as deletion of information or correction of fact should be, respectively, duplicated or acknowledged when the tape recorded version of this interview is used for broadcast or any other form of audio publication.

Interview with John Daly AO recorded by Peter Donovan on 22nd and 29th October 2003 for The State Library of South Australia. (Frequently in the course of the first interview there is the sound of a dog barking in the background.)

TAPE 1 SIDE A

This is tape one of an interview with Professor John Daly. Professor John Daly has followed a distinguished career in physical education and athletics and related fields, and is currently retired. John Daly will be speaking to me, Peter Donovan, for the Eminent Australians Oral History Project conducted by the National Library of Australia and the State Library of South Australia. On behalf of the Director General of the National Library and the Director of the State Library of South Australia, I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this program. John, you do understand that copyright is shared by you and the libraries?

I do.

This being so, may we have your permission to make a transcript of this recording should the libraries decide to make one?

Yes.

We hope you will speak as frankly as possible, knowing that neither the tapes nor any transcripts produced from them will be released without your authority. This interview is taking place today, the 22nd October 2003, at John Daly's home at 81 Onkaparinga Road, Bridgewater, South Australia 5155.

Righto, John, we'll begin right at the very beginning: when were you born?

I was born in 1936, the Centenary of South Australia, 7th August.

And what generation Australian are you?

Well, I'm a second generation Australian. My father was born in Australia but his brothers were born in Ireland. My grandfather and grandmother on his side, obviously, were Irish and they went back to Ireland, but my father was born here in Adelaide and he went back – his brothers and sisters, large family, large Irish family, were born in Ireland then came back to Adelaide. But I'm a second generation of an Irish background.

Tell me a little bit about your parents. What did they do, how did they meet?

My father was a fitter and turner. He initially worked during his apprenticeship and early working life with the South Australian Railways and was located in the Mid-North and met my mother there, at Peterborough. And then came down to Adelaide. My mother was, as was the tradition in those days – I was going to say ‘simply’ a housewife, and I guess that’s how she’d describe herself, a housewife and mother.

Mother to how many? And where do you fit into the list?

Right. Three boys. I’m the middle brother. I have an older brother, Peter, who was a carpenter, apprenticed as a carpenter, finished his life – and by that I mean he retired – with the West Torrens Council. I have a younger brother, Brian, who was a motor mechanic, ran his own business, and is also retired and quite prosperous these days. But I guess in summary I came from a working-class family, and I’d indicate now in case you don’t ask the question I was the first one in my family ever to go to university, which was really unheard of, I guess, in those days.

Where did the family live? Was your father still in the Railways when you were born?

No. My early recollection of my father was him working at Holden’s, I think during the War years, so that would have been my early childhood. Then his last job was with the Electricity Trust of South Australia. But always as a fitter and turner, a fine tradesman and craftsman. We lived at Stonehaven Street in Pennington, which is in the Port Adelaide Council area. Pennington was located between Rosewater and Cheltenham. My early recollections are of the Cheltenham racecourse and of Rosewater and Port Adelaide. We were located fairly close.

Where was the centre? If you talk in terms of ‘town’, what was town – Port Adelaide rather than Adelaide?

Yes, it was. Whenever we went shopping I guess the shopping was done locally, usually on Addison Road or at Rosewater, but if we had to do anything significant like buying shoes in those days we would go to Port Adelaide rather than town. I never thought of town being the centre of my early life, it was always Port Adelaide. Going to town was something we did during the school holidays or Christmas holidays, and it was really quite a treat to go to town.

Did your father have a car, or the family have a car?

No. No. They're good questions, because I'm remembering now that no, we used public transport. My father owned a car, I think, probably when he was in his late fifties, early sixties, and the reason he bought it – it was a utility – was that my mother by that time was running a very little business of catering for weddings and twenty-first birthdays. She did it very well, did all of the cooking herself and then waiting on tables, and we often helped Mum and Dad. But Dad in fact bought a car towards the end of his working life so he could load up and get the materials and some of the foodstuffs to the function.

How long did they survive? Were they still around while you were growing up?

Yes, they were. They both died in the early part of my professional career. My mother died first, probably in her late fifties – she died of leukaemia. It was a very short illness, devastating to the family because we never thought of her ever being ill. Although when I think back she was a bit different from other mothers in that she had a club foot – was always very embarrassed about it. *We weren't*; in fact I was very fond of my mother, spent a lot of time with her – she probably was the one who encouraged me, I think, more than Dad to go into teaching and to go to university and to do whatever I thought I wanted to do. But she died, as I say, in her late fifties – probably close to sixty, I'm not sure of the exact date. My father retired and then died in his mid-sixties, so neither of them are around now. But both of them had seen me go to university and have a teaching career.

When you think of yourself and your personality, who dominates – your father or your mother? Or what is the mixture?

My own personality? I think my mother. My father was a sportsman who was an outstanding sprinter, professional sprinter – had to be a professional, I think, in those days, because it, to use his words, 'provided a few bob' during the Depression and after the Depression – but apparently he *was* a very good sprinter and I followed him in that. And in fact he was my first and early coach and he was quite an influence on my athletic career in the early days. But in terms of values and aspirations and so on, it would be my mother. I spent a lot of time with her when I was first teaching – I taught at LeFevre Boys' Tech and lived in the city – I used to call in and see her every day after school and spend perhaps half an hour or an hour over a cup of coffee just talking. And we became very close.

You've half-answered this question previously, but what did you gain from each of them?

We had a very happy childhood, I think. Not great expectations. As I say, we came from a working-class family, we lived in a working-class district, the people who were our neighbours did exactly the same kind of things that we did. The only difference, I guess, from our neighbours was that the three boys went to a Catholic boys' college – Marist Brothers College at Alberton. We either walked or rode our bikes over to Newcastle Street in Alberton, that marked us as being different from the rest of the community, in that all of the kids that I can remember that we played with – played sport with, street cricket, street tennis, street football, all of those kind of games – were kids who went to state schools. But we were fond of our parents. Family life I think was focused on us, I think, if I have to reflect. My mother went without to provide us with blazers and all the right uniform. I can still recall to this day the fact that my mother had given up an enormous amount to buy me a new blazer – I think I was Head Prefect at the school – but I was interested in sport, and I think coming out from school some kids kicking a footy and I, with my new blazer, marked the ball but tore the blazer. Went home that day, the blazer was repaired, she was devastated because she'd given up so much, really, and I felt so bad about it.

Tell us about your school days.

I liked school. I liked school because it was a typical Catholic school where, if you were reasonably bright – and I guess I was, I was at the top of the class from the time I went to school. When I say top of the class, the top two or three, not always *the* top, although fairly frequently. If you went to a Catholic boys' school, if you were good at school, good at sport, you fitted in very easily, and I did. I loved sport, I seemed to be pretty good at it so I was in the school cricket team and football team, and I was the best athlete in the school – state champion, in fact. I moved from being the fastest youngster in the school to being the state champion in the senior school and – yes, and from that point of view I fitted in really quite easily. The monks at the school or the Brothers, as I should call them, the Brothers encouraged me. I liked them. I was a little fearful of them because in typical Catholic school fashion in those days they wore cassocks with a cross around the neck that suggested their Christianity but with a cane in their pocket to suggest their function in ruling a generation of boys, and they used the stick quite frequently. And I can still remember large classes doing

things like Latin, having tests of Latin vocab in the morning: we had the monk walk around the class calling out instructions, having to respond and, if we didn't respond correctly, getting a crack across the hands or whatever [part of the body] was nearest with a stick.

You say they were big classes – how big were the classes, and how many in the school? Any lay teachers?

Yes, there were [lay teachers]. When I went to school most of the teachers were Marist Brothers, but I think from memory there were one or two lay teachers. Classes were between forty and fifty, so fairly large. When I think back it was a system whereby the monks sat at the front in a big monitorial kind of desk and viewed us from the front, taught lessons and then went back to the desk and sat while we did our work, so it was a very teacher-dominated kind of class right through school. And I stayed there [for most of my schooling]. I went to the convent, I should have said that. I went to a convent Grades One, Two and Three, because that was the way, and then the Brothers started their education for boys at Grade Four, so I went directly to the Marist Brothers at Alberton, started Grade Four and finished as Head Prefect in Leaving Honours, which was Matriculation year. You mentioned about the size of classes, reasonable-sized classes in the junior school, midway through high school forty-five, fifty – fairly large classes. Certainly before the age of fourteen or fifteen in those days most of the youngsters I went to school with, most of my school friends, left school at fourteen or fifteen to take on apprenticeships. A lot of them ended up working on the wharves, most of them ended up working in Port Adelaide, and I lost contact with the whole lot of them. By the time I got to Leaving Honours I think there were only four in the class. I kept contact with those four, they were really quite bright, and of those four, I think three went to university. One, who was really quite bright, had to leave school, was required to leave school and work in a grocer's shop which I thought was terrible at the time because we all had these great ambitions of going on and being – I think we all ended up being school teachers, because there was a system of getting a university education that was paid for.

What subjects did you take, what ones interested you most?

I've already mentioned Latin, which began quite early in the piece. I can't say that I liked Latin – although it was a constant education because whenever I went to

church, went to Mass, the Mass was said in Latin in those days so it was part of our life. I did the usual subjects. Some subjects I found didn't really help me much later on. For example, we'll be talking later about history. I did Catholic History at school, and it was very black and white. And when I went to university and did university History and Philosophy I found it very difficult at first to look for alternative causes and try and reason through an argument, and it deterred me for some time. But my favourite subjects, in answer to your earlier question, would have been the Humanities. Loved English – in fact, probably, in retrospect, I ought really to have done English at university. Humanities, I guess, English, History, those sort of subjects. Going to a Catholic boys' school we did French, so we did a language, I enjoyed that, but we never did anything in terms of Music or Art, none at all. There were none of the so-called 'frill' subjects at a Catholic boys' school in those days, as far as I know. Certainly not at Alberton. Alberton was the traditional English, Maths, Catholic History, Latin, French.

You probably had a half-day off for sport.

Yes, I think we probably did. Although I'm not sure. We had a half-day off for sport when I went to the Teachers' College and I remember thinking that was rather splendid, so I'm not sure that I did have a half-day off for sport. Sport was pretty important. We never had any physical education or anything like that, as I said, that would have been considered a frill. But there were school teams and the school teams met after school and had practices twice a week. No, we didn't have a half-day for sport.

So you were able to get good coaching? Was there an emphasis on coaching, or was it just –

No.

– a team and play? And whom did you play against?

We played against other Catholic schools. So I can remember, for example, playing against Rostrevor and CBC¹ and Sacred Heart, so we must have been in a Catholic sports organization. And they took it seriously. We only had one team, there was one football team and one cricket team, we went out to practise, we were chosen,

¹ Christian Brothers College.

usually the monks coached us – I had some very good coaches, football coaches, they loved their sport. And yes, so I practised for football and cricket and athletics. My first athletics coach was one of the monks – Brother Noel, who had a tremendous influence on me. I said [earlier] my father [was my coach], but I suppose it was my father and Brother Noel who were my athletics coaches. But our sport was played after school hours. We took it very seriously. We played Saturday mornings. And, as I say, I played against CBC, Rostrevor, Sacred Heart. When they came down they played us on the Rosewater Reserve and when we went to play them we played them on their posh ovals.

You mentioned the fact that you went to a Catholic school. How Catholic was your family? And you've mentioned the fact that you went to Mass.

Yes, we did. When you say how Catholic were they, my parents didn't go to church – I don't remember them going to church on the weekend, but being quite adamant that we would, and the three boys would troop off to one of the Masses, usually eight o'clock on a Sunday morning, and we went right through school. Yes, I can remember that we would not have missed, but my parents didn't go. We didn't say prayers in the home, but it was expected that we would have a good Catholic education and I continued that until I left school.

Have you got any Catholic vestiges?

Hard to talk about that without thinking too deeply. Every now and again I'm surprised at some things that remind me of my school days. This is going to sound terribly trivial, but I find Latin is of great value when [my wife] Judy asks me a question about a crossword. I do a bit of language enquiry and I can often remember a Latin word. I think if I said anything about the Catholic school system for me, it was aspiring to be the best. And I was certainly encouraged. I was seen to be a bright kid at school, an able kid. I brought a little bit of local fame to the school by winning the state schoolboy championships against kids that went to Saints and Princes and others. It was publicised in the newspapers and it made me, in retrospect, a bit of an identity in the school. And I was encouraged – certainly encouraged – by the Brothers, yes.

You were born just before the War, do you remember anything about the War years?

Yes, I do. I remember playing with my brother at home at Pennington. For some reason we had tin hats that were real. I don't know where we got them, but we played at being soldiers – at being British soldiers, I have to say. And I can also remember being told that the War was over and people celebrated in the streets. I would have been about nine. And I can remember us marching: as little boys we used to march down the street with wooden staves over our shoulders for rifles – as I said, we were British soldiers. Don't remember being an Australian soldier, I remember being a British soldier, but I guess they were British helmets. I suppose Australians wore British helmets as well. But that's pretty much what I can remember. I just remember only little things. I can remember my uncles going to war. I had an uncle who was a major, and he was my mother's brother and we were very proud of him. I can always remember him being a kind of remote figure, he always stood very straight and he was among that group of people who stood very well. We were always in great awe of him. His younger brother, my mother's younger brother, Uncle Mervyn, was a soldier with a slouch hat and brought home a Japanese knife from the War – he fought in the islands – and I loved him, he was fantastic, he used to tell me stories about the War and I saw him as a hero.

So who were some of the – you've mentioned your father and a Brother Noel – any other major influences in your formative years?

We had a headmaster who was imperious and dominating and apparently a scholar. I should look up what he did, but his name was Brother Romuald. He was the Principal of the school, I think his name was Kelly, his family name. As I say, imperious, demanding, scholarly, and he spent a lot of time with the four boys in Leaving Honours and he was definitely an influence. There was never going to be any doubt that I would go to university, and in fact I think he made it fairly clear to my parents, who had never even thought of the possibility that I would not do what other boys in the district had done. [My parents] thought with me it would be an office job, and I can remember working in the Christmas holidays. I worked for Gordon and Gotch, I guess, as an office boy. I did this most Christmas holidays to earn money to buy football boots, things my parents couldn't afford, and whenever I went away with the state athletic team I had to pay and my parents didn't have the money. My brother sometimes helped. But I worked every Christmas holidays and I worked for Gordon and Gotch. At the end of it all the person who was in charge of

Gordon and Gotch spoke to me and said, ‘We would like to offer you a job.’ I think I was in third or fourth year. And they came down and spoke to my parents and said, ‘We can offer him a good career.’ Brother Romuald was devastated because my father thought it a good career, somebody wanted me, in an office, clean job, white collar job, wore a tie and a suit, fantastic. And so I was going to leave school and go and work at Gordon and Gotch for the rest of my life. Brother Romuald was devastated and made it quite clear to my parents that he thought it would be the wrong move. They respected Brother Romuald so I stayed at school, and went on to teachers’ college and university.

Did you go away on family holidays at all as a youngster?

No. We never did. Working-class family, [during school] holidays our life was at home, and no, I can’t recall ever going away for a holiday. I stayed with my grandmother sometimes during the holidays. We might have a week there – my grandmother lived at Croydon, that was my mother’s mother. We didn’t stay with my other grandparents because they were so Irish. I can remember my grandmother Daly resorting to Gaelic, and the older she got the more Gaelic she spoke, and as she became decrepit and bed-bound and things like that, she *only* spoke in Gaelic, and to me she was a foreigner. But we sometimes stayed with my grandmother – Nana – she was a Sumner, my mother was a Sumner, and so we’d stay there for a week. That was a holiday. But we didn’t even do anything with her, we just simply stayed in a different house. But we never went away for holidays, we never had the money.

Didn’t go down to Semaphore swimming now and then?

Oh, okay. When you say a holiday, I was thinking of times away like we would have now, where you’d go off for a week.

That’s what I meant in the first instance.

Yes. But you’re right about going down to Semaphore. A fantastic day – well, for my brothers it would be a fantastic day; I had red hair, freckles and burned badly. And whenever we went down to Semaphore, as we did probably two or three times, we’d catch the bus at Pennington and go down to Semaphore and spent the day down there because it was a big trip to go down there and so on, we’d stay there and my mother would take a basket down with lunch – we didn’t buy lunch, none of that fast

food kind of thing, we took our lunch with us, perhaps bought a bottle of lemonade that we'd share, Woodroffe's lemonade, that we'd share around – and so on. But I spent much of the day under the jetty because I was easily sunburnt. And every time I went I seemed to get burnt. To this day I have no ambition to go to the beach for a day. It just does not appeal at all. I just think of those days when I burned, so it didn't appeal that much.

So there wasn't much else of an extended family, you didn't spend a week with other uncles or aunts or –

No.

– anyone in the bush?

No, no, not at all. We had one or two aunties who would visit us, but essentially we were very self-sufficient as a family. I can always think of us as a family of five, three boys and Mum and Dad. We spent some time at Cheltenham with my grandfather, my Irish grandfather – Papa Daly, we used to call him Papa. He used to talk to me a lot about Ireland and I used to sit there and listen. He had a big garden and we'd sit out under the grapevines and I loved his stories of Ireland. We came from a little place [in Ireland] called Moragh, he came from Lisdoonvarna. I've been back to visit those areas. I found the cottages that my great-grandparents lived in, two-room cottages that are now cow barns or dairies. It was rather touching to go back there and find out where he came from, and it all slotted into place when I went back there. I could remember his stories about being able to see the Isles of Aran and living near Galway Bay. But again, poor folk in Ireland, tenant farmers – a great-grandfather came to Australia [for a better life]. He farmed a small strip – which is still there – a small strip of land for the local lord who gave the land to his driver, his coach driver, and my grandfather was 'pissed off' and thought, 'No point in staying here,' and thought either to go to America, Canada, South Africa or Australia, and he came to Australia for all the traditional reasons that others left Ireland.

END OF TAPE 1 SIDE A: TAPE 1 SIDE B

Just sort of rounding this out, is there still much of the Port Adelaide fellow in John Daly?

I don't think so. In fact that was tested when we had a reunion with the Marist Brothers. The Brothers had moved away from – the Marist Brothers, I meant, not my

own brothers – the Marist Brothers moved away, for some reason they closed the school down. The school has reopened as Mount Carmel College but it's no longer a Marist Brothers school. But there've been a couple of reunions and we've gone back, and people knew me because of my sport and academic background, being on the press and being on television and so on, and I had recollections – I could remember names, and people came up and spoke to me. But they spoke a different way to me – I don't mean that unkindly – but I've had no contact with them since I left school, and I doubt that there's very much of the Port Adelaide [fellow in me], to answer your question, except that I'm really quite pleased and proud of the fact that I come from working-class people. I mean, that's been enduring, and my mother was always a little afraid that once I moved away the values that had been established would be lost and they'd be somehow materialistic and different values. So in answer to your question – I guess the values are there, in terms of aspiration, making it, I'm as good as anybody else regardless of where they come from, that side of it – in fact, I'm not sure what *you're* getting at. What are you looking for?

Oh, just thinking more about your personality, the sort of person you are, and –

Yes.

– the values that you treasure, I suppose.

Yes, I mean I still barrack for Port Power. My brother and I used to ride our bikes across to Alberton Oval. Our great entertainment in the winter was to go across and go to the Alberton Oval. We used to go to the Alberton Ozone as early kids, we'd be given just enough to get in with a few pennies to buy something at half time, so we'd go to the movies. But we'd also go to the football, Peter and I. Didn't have a lot to do with my younger brother who's much younger than me, but Peter and I are fairly close. We'd ride a bike over. And so I still barrack for the equivalent of Port in the AFL², so there is that. There's never been any thought of not being a Port man, so there's that side of it. But it's very difficult to answer that question because I'm not sure if there's anything – I haven't thought enough about it. I don't go back there and, as I said, I found myself very different from the people I met at that reunion, and I was saddened by it but I didn't quite understand why – other than, I suppose, that

² Australian Football League.

I've had an education and moved away. I've travelled overseas, as we'll mention later, with sporting teams and for academic conferences and so on, and my life just was really very different from the other lives. The guys I met tended to remind me in many ways (laughs) of my parents – same values, same structure, they spoke about their families and kids, wanted to know about mine, a bit surprised I'd been divorced. We were friendly and liked one another and could probably remember the good old days of being at the Brothers, and we mentioned things about two Brothers that we disliked and who hit hardest, and they would say to me things like, 'Oh, you wouldn't know what it was like to get a six because you were one of the good kids, but we did that.' So I found myself very different from them. But I think the values, I think if I wanted to explore deeply enough, I think the values that my parents had that Brother Romuald set for me had a lot to do with aspiration and achievement, I think. So that hasn't changed.

Let's move on a bit, in fact move away from Port Adelaide and Pennington. When you first moved away you probably did so physically when you went to university, and you probably moved out of the family presumably when you got married – how did all that come about? Who was the person you married, what was her background, how long did it last?

Right. In a way I was almost not going to go to university, because in my final year of Matriculation, everyone thought – even the kids at school, the Brothers, the relatives and so on – thought that I would go to university. My mother wanted me to be a doctor – God knows how I would have got into Medicine, and I didn't have a Science background. But in my last year at school, in my Matriculation year, I had an opportunity to rethink that because my father had polio during one of the great polio outbreaks and had twelve months off work and we lived on our savings – well, my parents lived on their savings. And if I had got a scholarship perhaps I could have gone to university but I didn't know how to apply for any of those, and my mother kept thinking, she kept saying to me, 'We'll find the money no matter what, you must do what you want to do,' and she kept talking Medicine. And I kept talking Medicine – God knows, I would have been an awful doctor, I think. But eventually we had people talk about careers to this group of four, and a couple of my friends, including Bill Slaytor, were going to go to the Teachers' College to become teachers. And when I found out there was a scholarship and they would pay you – they'd pay you to go to university and so on – that seemed the appropriate thing to do. And so I

made a decision that I would go and become a teacher, primary school teacher – loved kids and enjoyed school, so I thought, ‘What a great career.’ So I applied for Teachers’ College, got a scholarship and was paid each fortnight. We had to sign a bond to say that we would teach. That worried [a lot of people but it] didn’t worry me: I thought, ‘This is fine, I’m going to teach anyway.’ And so I went to Teachers’ College, lived at home, caught either the train from Cheltenham Railway Station or the tram from Cheltenham outside the racecourse, and went up to the city, walked down North Terrace and went to Adelaide Teachers’ College. I stayed there for four years. Normally primary school preparation was two years of Teachers’ College. I discovered for the first time Physical Education – I’d never heard of it before – and –

Can we just stick with your personal life rather than the –

Okay, without the Teachers’ College bit.

– graduate studies. We’ll get on to that in a little while.

Okay. So I lived at home, went to the Teachers’ College each day and applied for, as I said, to do primary school teaching.

Now, leading up to marriage and –

Oh, okay.

– as I say, when you were metaphorically leaving home for someone else. Start your family.

Yes. I’ve been married twice. I met my first wife, Christine Byron Scott, in the same class. She was doing Primary Education. An English girl who’d come out to Australia with her mother. Her father was an academic, her mother was a graduate and a bit of a bluestocking. The mother and daughter and son settled in Gawler. The son went to Adelaide University and became a mathematician and finally a reader at Flinders University in Oceanography. The daughter went to Teachers’ College, as I say, in the same class as me and she was doing Primary Education. I’d hardly been out with girls – well, one or two from the convent, but hadn’t had too many of those experiences before I got to Teachers’ College, and to mix in a class, to be in a class of young men and young women, I found that a bit deterring at first. But enjoyed it, and we had dates. I think she was the only one that I had dates with and went out and

finally married, and then moved away, as you say, moved away from home, made my own home in Walkerville, shifted away from Port Adelaide and moved towards the city.

It's a long way to Walkerville.

It is (laughs) – yes, it is. Well, to me it was a very different suburb. We actually had a flat in the home of a Miss Butler, who was the daughter of one of the premiers of South Australia. It was a very posh house. Posh location – Smith Street, Walkerville, yes.

So when were you married, and how did that fit in with your professional career at this stage?

Married in, I think, about 1960. When you say 'fitted in with my professional career' – – –?

Well, you were both teaching, presumably, was that easy?

Fairly straightforward.

Were you married as students or married afterwards?

No, we were married afterwards. By that time – I said we both met in a class of primary school teacher students, that's the term, teacher educators – and Christine went, she moved into Secondary Education and I moved into Physical Education, so neither of us graduated in two years with a diploma and went teaching. Both of us in fact stayed on. Christine did a degree, she was very good at Arts – History, English, same kind of subjects, we did the same subjects. We did History together and worked together, History, Geography. She ended up teaching in the secondary schools. I think she might have even been appointed to Gawler in her first year, and – in her first year of teaching. '60-61 she and I both were married. I was appointed to LeFevre Boys' Tech. By that time it was always expected that we would get married and we did.

What was the wedding like? People from Gawler and people from Pennington?

We were married in a Catholic church, so in answer to your question about Catholic upbringing Christine was a church-going Anglican and her mother the same. For some reason the influence of the Brothers was strong in that I just assumed that she would change. And she did, and she took instruction in the Catholic religion and we

were married at Mount Carmel. So we weren't married at *her* church, we were married at *my* church, which says something, I suppose. We were married at Mount Carmel. I can remember the wedding, mainly for the trepidation I think I felt and wondering whether I was doing the right thing. Everything I'd done up until that particular point of time I thought was right and was destined and so on; I had this uneasy feeling, it was strange. But we were married, because by that time we'd been going together for a while and the expectation of my parents, her mother, everybody else, was that we would get married, and so we did.

Who was your best man, an old mate or one of your brothers?

One of my brothers, I think. I think – this is going back a long way, '60, thirty, forty years. Yes, I think we had a wedding party of about three, and I think it was her brother, Roland Byron Scott and it might have been one of my brothers or two of my brothers, I think. But they weren't old mates, they were family. My mother catered for the wedding – by that time she was actually running a little catering business, she catered for the wedding – very much a home affair.

Now, how long did the marriage last? You've had two children.

Yes, we had two children by that first marriage, two daughters, Amanda and Siobhan – there's an Irish name for you, going back. I was divorced in 1976, so sixteen years. At that stage we were growing apart, for a variety of reasons, and it wasn't a very amicable divorce. You probably don't want to go into any of that, but it wasn't – – –.

Not in detail, but why? Was she able to keep her profession going, or did she – – –?

No, she didn't, and I think that was part of the problem. We'd moved even further by then, by the time we were married we were living at Wattle Park on the side of the hill overlooking Adelaide. Things were moving up, we had a lovely home that overlooked the city. Christine stayed at home, had aspirations I think to do post-graduate work but didn't. Might have just started, I think, when we were getting a divorce, but we were growing apart. I was involved in more than, not only in Teachers' College as a lecturer but also in athletics and going overseas a lot. I didn't spend very much time at home, coaching every day, would get home late at night. We grew apart, and I ended up marrying one of the athletes I coached, which I guess suggests proximity and a number of other things. It was very bitter, a bitter divorce.

Christine found it very difficult to accept – she was quite right, I think – she found it difficult to accept because I'd done everything that I wanted to do and was doing everything I wanted to do, whereas I think she had plans to go on and do post-graduate work, which ultimately she did. We divorced, she went back to teaching, she went to the South-East, took the two girls with her. And then, like my mother, she died of leukaemia. She'd remarried. She tried to keep the girls apart from me but I was determined to retain links with them, and now we're as close as we've ever been. We were very close when they were very small children, and it's taken a while to get that back, but we are very close as a group of three, the two girls and myself.

So in a sense, I guess, one of the issues about this interview was your interest – obsession – with sport. Did this Christine share your interest in sport?

No. No, in fact I think that was part of the problem. When I first started going out with her – and there were a number of other girls who I took out, I suppose – they all came out to watch me compete. I was the state champion sprinter, well-known in the state, written up in the newspapers and so on as the outstanding sprinter, one of the outstanding athletes in the state. She only occasionally would come out and she'd sleep in the car while I was competing. So it really wasn't very much interest. And when I became a lecturer at the Teachers' College her mother – who, as I mentioned before, was an academic woman with a degree, typical bluestocking, English woman, was very outspoken. She frightened me a bit. She made it quite clear that she thought that sport was something that young people did but I should pursue a career as an academic like her son did, like Roland. Roland became an outstanding oceanographer and scientist. And so they didn't share any interest in my sport and I began, I suppose later, coaching and it was something I did that was quite separate, quite separate activity. Took me away from home, as I said, a lot and so on. But she didn't share any interest, had no interest at all in sport.

How does that first marriage compare with your current one?

(laughs) Well, the great difference is that we both – Judy and me tried harder the second time because there are weaknesses that contributed, personal weaknesses, that contributed to the first divorce. But the difference with Judy is I married her in the 1970s. She was a sportswoman, I coached her as an athlete but she was an older athlete. She was married, and so that suggests that we both broke up our marriages to

be together, which we did. The difference between the first one and the second one is that Judy is completely fascinated with sport. She's still competing as a fifty-seven year-old. She still coaches – well, she's taken up coaching; as I've retired from coaching she's taken up coaching of young people. I'm not sure she's as committed to coaching as I am, I think she finds it much harder – I think she'd probably like to give it up. She's more concerned about her own personal sport. But she had certainly a great interest in what I did in terms of sport. She wasn't an academic. She was trained – went to high school, to a state school, became a secretary, became a Phys Ed teacher when they were short of Phys Ed teachers and they had a year training course. She became a teacher but without any qualifications, and always thought of herself as being a sporting girl but not academic. She's really quite bright and I keep telling her that, and the difference between the first marriage and the second is that we [each] encourage the other one to do exactly what we want to do and to reach goals. And we're still doing that, we're still applauding one another if we do something of achievement, and saying to one another, 'You can do that,' and we do. And so she's accomplished, really, quite a lot, and I think I've probably contributed to her development of her self-esteem about her intellectual capacity and all of those kind of things. She's written a couple of books. She worked with Wendy Eyland writing a book on menopause and women in sport, and has really done quite well.

(pause) Continue just a little bit with your children and their careers and how you might have contributed to them.

Well, there was a break when I got divorced – they lived away from me. But I encouraged both of them to have a good education. They went to state schools and not private schools. We lived on the eastern side of the city, as I said. We lived at Wattle Park, they went to Norwood High. Amanda, my eldest girl, went then to Wattle Park Teachers' College and did a degree in Education. She's a junior primary teacher. And still teaching. She lives in the South-East. She married a local farmer, the son of a squatter in many ways. She married into the Ferguson family. They've three big sheep stations and she lives on one of those with her husband, Douglas. She's got a small child, Hamish, my first and only grandson. She married into a family where the boys went to Saint's, but weren't expected to do a university education. They were expected to go back on the land, as they both have. And

Amanda taught until she got married, taught after she got married until Hamish came along, and she's now gone back to teaching a couple of days a week.

Siobhan is my youngest one – as I said before, there's an Irish name for you. She went to the same schools as Amanda, went to Flinders University and did drama. Difficult childhood because when my wife died she came and lived with us and found it very difficult. Lived here at Bridgewater, didn't like Judy, saw her as an outsider, made it very difficult for Judy but now they're great friends. She went on to Flinders University to do Drama. Six months short of her Drama degree she dropped out, which was disappointing. Since then she's run a restaurant that she owned in Mount Barker, and I think she'll go back and complete her education, but her education will be hotel management, food, that kind of thing. Fantastic girl with a great personality. You can see her drama ability coming out in the way she reacts with customers and things like that. She's really been quite successful.

When did you move to Bridgewater?

Judy and I, when we were married, lived in apartments for a period of time. We moved here in 1980. We were looking for land, found this block. It's nearly an acre, heavily-treed. Judy loves gardening, as you can see from the surroundings, and we moved here in 1980 and created this place and have stayed here ever since. We've been here twenty-three years.

END OF TAPE 1 SIDE B: TAPE 2 SIDE A

Peter Donovan talking to John Daly. This is tape two. (break in recording) You do a lot of painting now – when did you get into painting, and how did you get into painting? Who influenced you?

I think I indicated earlier that there was no Art at Marist Brothers at Alberton. I drew as a kid, I was not too bad at it and loved it. My father thought I'd be an architect because of my great love of drawing. Drew all the time at home, that was my great passion. I had lots of drawing books. I just drew and drew. Copied drawings. I actually even went to Art School, would you believe, as a kid, probably when thirteen or fourteen. Went to Art School, used to catch the tram and go up to the Art School which was in the old Exhibition Building on North Terrace. I remember doing Design and Colour and a couple of other things. The monks came over and spoke to my parents and said, 'John is required for the school football team,' and that was the

end of my art. And I never went back to it. So I always had this interest in art, without realising it, and when I went away with the national team we would go to some of the great centres of Europe – we'd be in Paris, for example – and I thought what a great opportunity to go to places like the Louvre or the D'Orsay Museum and places like that, and so I would be coaching all of the week and then the athletes would rest before a Grand Prix meet for a day or two, usually one day. I would see them early in the morning, find out if they needed anything and then say to everybody concerned, 'I'll be away for the day, I'm taking a day off, I'm going to the Gallery.' And so, over a matter of twenty-five years, I kept going to these very famous galleries and just looking at art. And I didn't realise I was preparing for a (laughs) career in art. In my latter years as an associate professor and professor I thought, 'I wonder what I'll do when I retire. I wouldn't mind dabbling in a bit of paint or something – I wonder if I can do it.' And my mother-in-law, Judy's mother, was a great painter and she said, 'Well, why don't you come and I'll show you how to start.' I had a morning and loved it. I wasn't really ready to retire because I loved my career at the university and I would have stayed as long as I could have, but then I thought, 'Well, if I'm going to paint, I'd better get started,' and so I took early retirement and joined a painting group with a mentor at Panorama and began painting. I discovered a few friends who I had through sport who were interested in art, and one notable individual, Robert Hannaford, who's probably Australia's foremost portrait painter. I rang him and said, 'Can I come and talk to you?' And he said, 'Sure, bring some of your work down.' I went down, I wanted to talk art, he wanted to talk sport, and so between the two of us I gave him the answers to sport that he wanted to know about – the Olympic team and all of that sort of thing – and then in between he would give me answers to what I wanted to know about art and so on. But I decided I'd take early retirement to begin this career of painting, which has given me enormous pleasure.

So you've spoken of Robert Hannaford.

Yes.

He's obviously an influence there. Why do you paint what you paint? For instance, I think you tend to concentrate on portraits rather than landscapes or abstracts or Impressionists.

Yes. I think I've got a style which has been described as soft and Impressionistic, but it's Realist, and I decided that if I was going to learn to paint – and I've said this to people who've been my mentors – I really want to know how to do it well, not to sell paintings or anything, I'm interested in the process. But I really want to know how to paint well so that I can break a few rules and I can be Impressionistic, painterly, rather than too studied and too tight and so on. And so I've developed a particular style. I guess people have said – mainly Judy – 'You're very good at portraits,' or 'you're very good at figure painting.' My training in being a coach and being analytical of movement I think has helped in terms of observation, particularly of the human body. I paint all of the things that you've just suggested. I paint landscapes and I paint still lifes and I try and paint a wide range of things, but my preference is to paint the human figure and to paint portraits. I guess portraits because I'm really interested in people and their characters, and portrait painting demands a structure kind of – yes, a kind of rigid discipline of looking and putting down only what you see – part of my Catholic upbringing I think, in many ways, but certainly a part of my background in coaching. So yes, I paint but my emphasis is on painting figures and portraits.

Where are you on the continuum of novice painter to master painter to acknowledged painter?

Not acknowledged, so a long way away from that. I'm not even working towards that. I'm no longer a beginner; in fact, when I use the word 'dabbler' or 'Sunday painter' people like Robert Hannaford correct me in a firm way and say, 'Well, no, you're better than that.' I've had a few artists who are really quite good – I've done courses with them – and they've said, 'You've got talent but you need to get mileage in your brushes.' That's why I retired early, to get mileage in my brushes. I think I'm a competent painter. I enjoy the process. I've got stacks of paintings that I finish then put away. Some I frame. My two girls come in and like what I do, usually what they mean is, 'Dad, if you get that framed in a very expensive frame and if you hang it on the wall I'll have it, thank you very much.' So I've given a number away. But I'm probably at the stage where I'm a good painter without being anything more than that. I've won three awards of merit from the Royal South Australian Society of the Arts. I won a first prize in the Blackwood Art Show, so I suppose that says

something, someone has made a judgment and said, 'That's good.' So that's fine. Yes, I'm happy with that.

With your portraiture, do you paint live subjects or are they from photographs and things like that?

I am now. The one on the wall behind me of Germaine Greer that people tend to like received an award of merit from the Royal South Australian Society of the Arts. That was painted from a black and white photograph in *The Australian*. She was in Australia and so I watched a number of interviews and peered very closely at the colour TV to get colour of eyes and colour of skin and hair and things like that. But at the moment I'm painting on weekends with a small group of friends and we pay and bring in a model. The model comes in and sits for three hours and we just paint, so it's a three-hour sketch of somebody. So I'm practising painting from life, which I think is the preference. In fact, Hannaford would say I should always paint from life and not from studies or photographs.

What medium do you prefer?

I paint in oils. I've done a little bit of watercolour but not very much. Judy has a preference for watercolour. She'd like me to be a watercolour painter because it's very delicate and light and so on, but I started painting in oils with my mother-in-law, and it seems to me that all of these crafts are hard enough to do and to master without me dabbling in a whole range of them. I draw each week. I go to life drawing, which is very good discipline. Again, Hannaford demanded that I do that and so I do. I go every Thursday night and I draw for three hours: draw the human body, quick sketches and longer sketches, I love doing that. But essentially I draw with pencil and I paint with oils.

So this is – question's probably going to be a little repetitious but it was just to put a bookend to this part of your life, the private part of your life. What's your philosophy on life? What sort of motivates you and where did you learn this? Who have been the key influences?

I haven't reflected much on it, but I guess in terms of the reading I'm doing at the moment I'd have to say that I'm a humanist. I'm interested in people. In terms of what drives me I'm a perfectionist – annoyingly so, I think. I want to know. Somebody said to me the other day, 'You're like a truth serum, you say exactly what you think and it's unusual. I don't mean to hurt people, but I do, in fact, want the

truth, I want to know what they're about. I want to be the best I possibly can and this doesn't surprise people who know me. In terms of art I say to Judy, my wife, that I'm passionate about art. She corrects me and says I'm 'obsessional' about art. I'm obsessional about most things that I do. When I coached I was driven to ask questions about what was going on and what needed to be going on, and I was keen to do the right thing by the athletes who had talent. I was driven to be the best, to have the right answers. So I guess that comes from my schooling. I mean, I was like that at school. I couldn't leave things alone until they were complete and perfect and finished. Everything I've done in life tends to mark me as that kind of a person – who won't leave things undone, unperfected.

When I first started painting, for example, I used to drive Judy mad because I couldn't leave a painting alone. I couldn't go to bed at night because I hadn't finished it and she kept saying, 'Look, you're not going to die tomorrow, it'll still be there tomorrow, you can do some more tomorrow. But leave it be.' I'm a bit more relaxed about it now, I think, but I'm still a perfectionist and when I go to an art group, as I will today to the Panorama Art Group, some people say to me, 'Why do you come here?', you know, 'because you're good –' (laughs) 'you're better than the rest of us.' Which is a compliment, I know. And when they say, you know, 'I like what you're painting and you've done that very quickly today and I can't believe that you had a blank canvas and you've got that on it now, that's fantastic – are you going to finish?' 'No, I'm not finished,' and 'Oh, well, it's not quite what I want.' They keep growling at me saying I should be happy to accept the compliment or I should be happy to accept the fact that it's reasonable or good or whatever. It's not a kind of humility – it probably sounds like being humble, but when I paint I have a picture in my head of what I want to do, I never quite get there. Sometimes I get close to it and I'm pleased, but it's a drive to be, I guess, perfect, and I do it in everything I do. I've done it in my studies – not early, because I was too interested in sport, but in the books I write. So it's a quest for excellence, that's what it is. Yes, in fact, summarising what – I hope it summarises the question you've asked: I have this driving quest for excellence in all that I do, and I don't quite know where it comes from but it's certainly there.

Well, let's move on a bit, John.

Okay.

We'll reiterate lots of things and go back, but look at your professional career, your academic career. So back a few years again, now, how did you get into it –

Okay.

– what have you done, what have you achieved?

Right.

Oh, they'll come out over the next few minutes, I suppose.

Okay. You can remember me saying that I was the first in my family to go to university, and in fact it was almost like an accident. Went to school, liked school, top of the class, loved learning, loved reading, didn't have a lot of books in the house. I mean, no hard-cover books that I can remember, other than the Bible. My mother read and my father read. My father read Westerns, novels, my mother read novels, paperbacks, those sorts of things. My brother was interested in history – that was interesting – he used to buy second-hand books from the Port. But I was the only one in the family to go on. And once I got to Leaving Honours and in a class of four with Brother Romuald aspired to do well, I made the decision about not going to the university as a medical student but going to university *via* the Teachers' College because it was convenient – I guess the way a working-class boy could get to university. So I went to university, did my degree, Diploma of Teaching and a Diploma of Physical Education, went out teaching after four years, taught at LeFevre Boys' Tech. So I went back to Port Adelaide, which was a bit of a surprise.

I was due to go to Adelaide High, which was the top school in the state – I was given a very high ranking as a potential teacher. And Adelaide High in those days, when I was due to be appointed, was a school that selected their staff very carefully. I was told before the appointments came out that I in fact would be appointed to Adelaide High. I went out to the school. The Physical Education teacher was going to England and I was due to replace him. The Headmaster was Wybert Simmons, who determined who the staff would be that went to Adelaide High. The school's very different now, but in those days it was almost a kind of private school – well, they thought they were – and I was quite happy about that. And [when] the guy who was due to go to England delayed it by six months and I was appointed to LeFevre Boys' Tech, I was a bit devastated. And I thought, 'Going back to the Port,' and

thoughts about, 'Is that where I'm going to end my career, in teaching down [at the Port]?' Didn't mind, I suppose, but it was a bit surprising. I really did want to go to Adelaide High.

Anyway, I went to LeFevre Boys' Tech, enjoyed it, set up Physical Education at the school, set up a sporting system within that perfectionist kind of approach. It had to be done *right*. And the Headmaster recognised, I guess, in me that I was somebody who was determined to work my butt off and get this system working. He gave me *enormous* encouragement – Fred Vickery, who was influential. I loved teaching, classroom teaching. I thought, 'Great career, enjoy it.' Had no problem about being a doctor or anything, just loved teaching. [And after I'd been there six months Vickery came round and got me from my class] and said, 'Wybert Simmons from Adelaide High is on the 'phone, he wants to talk to you.' So I went to the office and Fred Vickery, the Headmaster, stood outside listening, and Simmons said, 'Time has come, Phys Ed teacher's going to England, want you to come to the school, I'll make arrangements, okay?' And I said, 'I'll call you back,' because I knew the Headmaster was [listening]. And he sat me down and said, 'I'd like you to stay here.' He said, 'Adelaide High gets all the teachers they want. This school is in a poor area, the boys here need you.' And that afternoon – as I said to you before, I drove home, I called in on my mother at Pennington, told her what had happened, Adelaide High, great appointment, that sort of thing. My mother said, 'I think Mr Vickery's been good to you, the boys do need you, why don't you stay there?' So I went back the next day and said, 'Yes, sure, I'll stay.' He said, 'You won't be sorry,' and the usual kind of things.

I stayed there, didn't think any more about it, I was enjoying it, and I think at the end of two years or three years – I was in my third year – – –. Oh, first of all there was a teaching scholarship, travelling scholarship, came up and Fred Vickery the Head came round and said, 'The Teachers' Institute have got a travelling scholarship to go overseas, I think you should apply.'

Can I just stop you there and take you back to your studies?

Yes.

Why did you do Physical Education? If you're going to Teachers' College that's sort of on the side rather than in the main stream.

Yes, I guess it was. I was greatly interested in sport, and again I was competing as an athlete trying to find out how I could be a better athlete. I was reading texts on anatomy and physiology and training methods for myself. We all had to [take] Physical Education as teachers in training, and there was an influential guy there who took Phys Ed, Howard Mutton. He encouraged me. And I thought, 'I wouldn't mind becoming a Phys Ed student and doing this if I'm going to teach in a secondary school,' because if you taught in a secondary school you could teach Phys Ed and other subjects. You didn't have to teach only Phys Ed. And so I did it because of an interest in sport, I guess. It worried my father. My father thought that Physical Education and sport wasn't a real subject – remember I'd gone to a Catholic school, they didn't teach those kind of things – so if I was going to teach why wouldn't I teach a *real* subject, you know, not sport. Well, I know it worried him when I said, 'I'm going to become a Phys Ed student.' They thought it was a drastic step and the wrong step to make. But that's the reason I took it on.

Anyway, to go back to the other bit, I applied for this travelling scholarship and got it. I then had to work out what I was going to do with it. I ended up going to America and went to the University of Illinois and did a Master's. And while I was there I loved it, loved being a post-graduate student.

What did you go to study?

Well, initially it was Physical Education. But while I was there – it wasn't the Physical Education I was used to, because they just assumed that if you're going to do Physical Education you do Exercise Physiology, and I wasn't a scientist. Remember, I said my interest at school had been Humanities. But I discovered that people who did Physical Education could do the Humanities, they could do subjects like Philosophy and History and Sociology and those kind of subjects, and so I ended up doing those and doing a Master's in that. I had to do some Science – I ended up with an MSc of all things, but mainly doing it in Humanities, which seems rather strange. But at the University of Illinois, the Master's degrees in that school were Masters in Science.

So I then came back with a Master's degree because – well, it was just something to do. And then, six months later or twelve months later, the Headmaster came round to my class – I was class teacher for a First Year group – and he said, 'They're

looking for a young assistant lecturer at the Teachers' College, I've told them that you're the man.' I said, 'Oh, that's very nice.' So he said, 'You should apply.' So after three years I applied to become an assistant lecturer. The original idea was they would get young staff in who were enthusiastic – and I certainly was that – get them in for a couple of years, then turf them out and bring somebody else in who's young, because all of the staff at the Teachers' College were elderly and had been there for ages. I went in as an assistant lecturer and stayed, they kept me on. And while I was there I did some post-graduate work – I'd loved it at Illinois so I decided I'd do some more work.

While I was at Illinois I found that there were people who had PhD's who were in the same class as me. I revered people, really, who had 'Dr' before their name, and I thought there was something about them. You know, they were just the font of knowledge. They were just fantastic. And Illinois didn't have a lot of Americans but they had foreign students from all over the world there in their post-graduate classes – a lot of Brits and Europeans and so on, and they had come with the idea that they were going to go and do a Master's and a PhD. They stayed. They couldn't understand why I was going back, but my scholarship was just for a year. And I just thought, 'I'm as good as these people.' I made statements that people listened to. Instructors said things like, 'I like that idea.' I got A's for my papers and I thought, 'Hmm, I might come back and do a PhD.'

So I went back to Adelaide, lectured, did work in the History Department.

What are we talking, you're lecturing at the Teachers' College?

I'm lecturing at the Teachers' College but doing some post-graduate work at Adelaide University.

They're virtually on the same campus.

They are, exactly. Teachers' College, Kintore Avenue, teaching there, just walking through the grounds to the History Department and doing some post-graduate work with people like John Tregenza.

Was this formal work or was it just interest work?

No, I sat in – well, by that time of course I had a degree and a Master's degree. I joined – I'm not sure how they did it, but I joined a post-graduate group who met

once a week for an afternoon and took it in turns in delivering a paper. I guess they were people who were going to either go on and do a Master's in History or a PhD in History or were doing Honours degrees. It would have been a group of about a dozen or fifteen and I was included in the group. And so I stayed in that particular group. Nothing was formalised, I didn't do examinations or anything like that. I presented some papers. And then I went back and I took study leave – I guess I'd been lecturing for six or seven years so I could get study leave – and so I went back to Illinois and did my PhD in History and Sociology. There was a very famous German sports sociologist who went to Illinois for six months and then went back to Germany for six months. He was the world's top sports sociologist, a guy called Professor Gunther Lüschen. He and I got on well, I liked him, he was very different. The Americans tended to prefer papers that allowed them to tick answers or boxes and things like that. He demanded that they write, and write a very deliberative paper with a real argument in it, and that appealed to me. He got me to teach his other graduate Sociology class which I did with him. I developed a relationship with him and a friendship with him, and did the PhD under him – with him and a cluster of History professors. And so I worked on material that I'd been gathering up in Adelaide. I'd been writing about sport, class and community at Adelaide University in the History Department. I took all that material with me and assembled it and developed it, and Illinois was quite prepared to get anything on Australian History, even rare books – they would bring them in from Adelaide, they were amazing. And so I was able to do that. I spent a fair bit of the year just simply sitting in a library reading and writing and thinking and working with these particular people.

Completed my PhD, came back to Adelaide. By that time I was a senior lecturer and ran the Department of Physical Education because the Martin Report had earlier said that diplomas had to move from Adelaide University and from Flinders to Teachers' Colleges. Physical Education came from Adelaide University to the Teachers' College and I became the Head of the Department. I worked with Howard Mutton – he was the Head for a while, then he retired and I took over as Head and designed the degree, and we became a degree-granting institution after a diploma-granting institution.

It almost seems, from what you've spoken, that most of your learning, in a formal sense, is basically History, from a post-graduate point of view.

Yes, it is.

Where was your formal learning in Physical Education or Sociology?

Okay. Sociology was late. Sociology, when I first began, was linked with History at Illinois. It was a separate subject with [Professor Gunther] Lüschen. But, in answer to your question, I did my Physical Education – for want of a better term – at Adelaide University. There was a Department of Physical Education under a guy called Bert Apps, and linked with the Science Department at Adelaide University. People there were expected to do either a diploma and teach in the private schools – what they call an AUA, an Associate of the University of Adelaide, with a specialist study in Physical Education – or, if you were a teacher, you were expected to do a Diploma of Physical Education and a degree. And it was the latter course that I took. I decided that I would be a Physical Education teacher in a secondary school and I would teach History, Social Studies, Geography, those kind of subjects, in school. So I enrolled in an Arts degree while I was doing the Diploma of Physical Education. The Diploma of Physical Education was a two-year diploma, almost full-time, enormous amount of time devoted to practice and theory – a lot of skill work, a lot of anatomy and physiology. We did our anatomy at medical school with the medical students – did our physiology there as well. While we weren't involved in any dissections of human bodies, the professor – Professor Abbey was a very famous professor at Adelaide University – would probably have one of his Honours students or post-graduate students dissect a body if we were going to look at limbs, and he would march us all in and stand by the body, the cadaver, and pull back skin and tissue and describe it, and we would stand there in awe and take in all that information. So it was done at Adelaide University. It was a full-time Phys Ed, part-time Arts, degree. I finished my Arts degree actually when I was out teaching because I didn't have time to finish [at uni while doing PE]. I started, remember, as a primary school teacher in training, and so a lot of the courses were internal Teachers' College courses that prepared a primary school teacher in a range of subjects from Maths to English to Social Studies, all of those, we were expected to do all of those.

END OF TAPE 2 SIDE A: TAPE 2 SIDE B

Primary school people didn't do Arts degrees [– not while they were at uni. Not enough time]. So as soon as I transferred to Physical Education I enrolled in an Arts

degree and I finished the Arts degree in my first couple of years of teaching. And the subject I did was History. I majored in History and Geography. But you're right, I think I seemed to be developing an interest in History.

So your career in the – we'll just go back: while you were in Illinois – and this is perhaps interposing something from the next part we're going to talk about – were you involved in any of the college athletic programs over there?

Yes, when I went there I was coaching. I didn't know a lot about the American sports system, but it seemed to be active and flourishing and very professional. When I first went there to do my Master's, I was on a scholarship, and I offered my services to the Athletic Department, which was a big department. They looked after all the sport and they had a track and field program and so on, and they said, 'Thank you very much, would you like some tickets to come and see us,' and, you know, that kind of thing. But they really weren't interested. Who was this Australian post-graduate student who wasn't American? What would he know about track and field? And so the first time I went there I wasn't involved. I went to see their track and field. I watched their sport and simply focused on being a student – that would have been in 1970, I guess – so I wasn't involved in their program. Second time I went back, I was an Olympic coach and I arrived in Illinois after the 1976 Olympics where I was Head Coach of the Australian team. I went and offered my services again. And I must have been more forceful, and they [accepted] me. Would I please turn up each day. What could they offer me, that was the first thing. And I said, 'Well, I'm here on a scholarship, I'm being paid my university salary, all I want to do is coach.' And they said, 'Well, we'll pay for your education,' and I said, 'Well, thanks very much but it's being paid for, I'm doing some teaching while I'm here and I don't want it to be an athletics scholarship.' And they said, 'Oh, well, we have to pay you something,' and I said, 'Well, no – I'll come and coach.' And so they said, 'Well, you'll arrive here at two o'clock in the afternoon,' and I said, 'I beg your pardon?' I said, 'I'm a student, post-graduate student, I'm here to do a PhD. What time's training start?' They said, 'Well, training starts at four, but the coaches get together at two and we talk about this and that and so on.' I said, 'I'll see you at four o'clock,' and they said, 'That's not the way it works.' And I said, 'Well, if you want me, I'll see you at four o'clock.' And so, to cut a long story short, I was really quite successful. They didn't have a clue. They had lots of talent but their coaching

wasn't as good as Australian coaching [which] was based on British methods of taking limited talent and developing the talent in a clinical, systematic way, and that's the way I approach coaching. So I had all of these Black sprinters and hurdlers who thrived on my training. I changed their training immediately which they loved, because the coach that was there before liked them doing lots of long-distance running, which I thought wasn't very specific, and the hurdlers suddenly found they were developing skills with me and made comments to the coach. They kept trying to get me to arrive earlier so I could talk to them about what I knew and so on, but I would turn up at four o'clock after the day's [studies] were over and I'd worked in the library – and I'd coach from four o'clock until about five-thirty and then go home and forget about it until the next day. I worked at night as a student, through the day as a student – it's very much like what I did at the University and the Teachers' College, I coached at the end of the day, the British system. The Americans weren't used to that at all. But whenever they travelled they took me with them and they paid all my expenses, and they kept giving me money like cinema money and meal money and I'd go home and I'd have a pocketful of dollars that somebody had given me for this or that or whatever, so it was interesting³.

While I was there the University of Illinois won the Big Ten, which is the sporting competition in the Mid-West – they won the Big Ten indoor and outdoor, track and field, and I contributed with my coaching to a lot of that. The athletes were very successful. When I finished my PhD I then said to them, 'Well, I'm going home now.' They offered me a job and I said, 'No thanks, I'm going home.' They said, 'It would be a coaching job,' and I said, 'I don't want a coaching job.' They were astounded. They offered the kind of money that senior staff get and I said, 'Oh no, I want to be a teacher. If you offered me a job as a university professor part-time, coach part-time, I might be interested in that.' And they said, 'Oh no, that's not the way it works,' and I said, 'Well, I'm going home.' So I went home. The athletes were devastated about suddenly losing this Australian Olympic coach but it was part of the deal.

So back home, your career from there.

From the time I had my PhD?

³ And profitable! – JD

Teachers' colleges changed to CAE's, changed to universities. Were you involved in that, were you a contributor to any of that, or were you ---?

Yes, I was. I went back and it became a College of Advanced Education, a College of Arts and Education. I missed the academic life overseas and the frequency of having people come and give key papers. Australia is a bit, as you would know, isolated, and so I kept up my contacts and I wrote papers for overseas journals. Friends who I'd gone through my PhD with sent me copies of their papers and gathered up others and so on. People in the Humanities who I knew quite well were located right across America in key universities and so on and I wrote to them. I said to them, 'Don't be surprised if there's a change of name because we're going through this identity crisis.' I kept thinking of our letterhead we should write it in pencil because we were constantly changed. It went from Teachers' College to the College of Advanced Education, as I say, Arts and Education, and then under Dawkin's revisions it became the University of South Australia. And I was involved. At some stage we were talking about amalgamation with Adelaide University. I was on the committee for that. Yes, there were several abortive tries, I think, at linking a group of teachers' colleges with Flinders University and with Adelaide University, and at one stage it got very close to us becoming part of Adelaide University. We were on the grounds, as you know, of Adelaide University or on our own grounds but now Adelaide University's actually taken over the old Teachers' College on Kintore Avenue. I was on those committees, and that was really quite interesting. I became involved very much in the administration, for a period of time I was a Dean – an Acting Dean – and so on. I could have moved on and people constantly asked the question, 'Why are you in Physical Education, why aren't you in a *real* discipline like History or something like that?' And 'Why aren't you ambitious enough to become either a Dean', in those days, 'or', later, 'a Pro-Vice-Chancellor, or move in the direction of administration?' But I always loved lecturing and loved teaching so it was never a question about me not staying where I stayed. And I stayed in Physical Education because it seemed to complement a lot of skills I had in terms of coaching. Even in the early days, when it was a teachers' college, I used to play the role of an academic really in terms of writing and researching, right from the early days, and it astonished people because I was the only one in the Phys Ed Department who had a PhD – [indeed] one of the few in the Teachers' College to have a PhD. People asked

the question, 'Why would you bother? You're a senior lecturer, why would you go and get a PhD? You were a senior lecturer before you got your PhD.' It was just again – going back to the question you asked, Peter, before, about what drives you – well, if you're going to be an academic why don't you be the best academic, and if academics require a PhD as part of scholarship and so on, why wouldn't you? So I did.

How did the Department develop under you?

I think I made a very real contribution in looking back – that doesn't sound very humble, but I designed the first degree. I gathered up all the material from the major institutions around the world. The main influences came from England, I think, from the point of view of designing the degree, but I gathered up all of the handbooks and corresponded with various people and so on, and designed a degree in Physical Education that I thought was going to be worthwhile, involve some scholarship and not just a how to teach and how to umpire games and those kinds of things. And so, both from the time when it was a diploma in the Teachers' College and the time it was a degree in the University of South Australia, that particular structure was my structure. We developed a reputation for excellence because I demanded it – of staff as well as students. After a period of time we became one of the premier institutions for training secondary school physical educators in Australia. And with a great deal of pride, when I was Head of the School, School of Physical Education, I can remember people as far away as New Zealand – a Headmistress of a girls' private school ringing me and saying, 'We're losing So-and-so, who was one of your students, and she's going on to England. Can you please replace her, can you suggest a nomination?' And I constantly got 'phone calls from private schools where they had our graduates, and from Queensland and Western Australia asking us to suggest names. Or they would ring and say, 'We have four people applying, I notice that we've got one of your graduates who impresses us, would you like to make a comment?' And so we had people located all the way round the country. Had people [from Australia and overseas] come in to look at our course, interested in what we did. I think the contribution I made – in retrospect, because it's now changed – was that I added subjects like Philosophy and History and Sociology to what had traditionally been considered to be a Science subject. I think it's rather unfortunate

that what has happened now is that the degree at the University of South Australia is a degree in Sports Science with very little, if any, Humanities. The subjects that I taught – they still teach Sociology of Sport, they're teaching a little bit of Philosophy – are very secondary. And they're losing good staff. And when I was there I taught the Philosophy and Sociology course and we had a reputation for excellence in those areas with research being done and so on, but that's not there now.

What research had you done in Physical Education or Sports Psychology, Sociology?

My main interest has been the playing patterns of people, and I guess that's why I moved from History to Sociology, because it's more about the interactions. A lot of people in my field had been interested in the history of sport [but were] interested [simply] in the scores and who kicked how many goals and those kind of things. That never interested me at all. I'm not a great one for who won the Grand Final in such-and-such a year: I really don't care and I think you can look it up. I was always interested in who played what and why. And it seemed to me that games – some games – tended to reflect positions in society. For example, I discovered the Adelaide Hunt Club went back to the 1840s, and a description of who went to the Adelaide Hunt Club on a weekend was often a description of who the so-called 'Adelaide gentry' were. Now, if you happened to be someone like me and you came from the working-class (laughs) area down at Port Adelaide, you wouldn't be included in a list in the Adelaide Hunt Club. I mean, you wouldn't be given *entry*, you wouldn't become a *member*. I didn't know anything about horses anyway, but there's no way *I* could have become a member of the Adelaide Hunt Club. So I was interested in what games were being played, who played them, why they played them, because a number of people joined the Adelaide Hunt Club because it was like joining the Adelaide Club. It indicated a kind of gentry acceptance, and to be included on the list suggested you were 'somebody' in Adelaide. And again it appeared to me to be, in looking at various lists of people, that some sports were inclusive whereas other sports were exclusive. Some sports were definitely lower class, like football, and other sports were so-called gentry sports, like polo, cricket even. Cricket was an inclusive sport because, in a country town, the local lord and his sons couldn't make up a cricket team. They'd have to find a couple of quick bowlers. And so, in true English tradition, they'd find the local blacksmith could

throw the ball fairly quickly and would stand up close to the stumps and so on. So I found myself becoming more and more fascinated with those kinds of things and so I started writing articles that, in Australia, people have described as seminal because they'd never been written before. I wrote for Phys Ed journals and so on, and people seemed to like what I was doing. I continued in that way.

My interest in history with my interest in physical education, sport and so on suggested that there was a lot more to it, a lot more to playing the games, that in fact games often mirrored what was going on in terms of what were the values in society and so on. So I quite liked that, and while it might be a superficial way of describing it I don't think it is. I think it was the great French sociologist, Caillois, who said, 'Tell me what you play and I'll tell you who you are,' and I think to a certain extent that's true. People still – probably to a lesser extent, because you can have a lot of money and you can buy your way into things – but in the earlier days, the games people played suggested who they were in the community.

How did you get on with what I'll call 'regular' historians?

Not very well early. In fact, when I first began at Adelaide University doing post-graduate History, people were often amused, I think, about the fact that the kind of papers I gave. The topics were 'trivial', in inverted commas. I mean, they were more concerned about foreign policy, the view from Government House – or Parliament House, rather than from Government House. I was more interested in social history in a time when social history wasn't very popular. You know, 'what did the ordinary people do?' And I guess in many ways History itself has caught up with me. (laughs) But the kind of things I write about now are of interest to other historians.

And then I discovered there were some historians in the other states, people like Richard Cashman and others, who were writing about sport as well as me. They were professional historians working in History departments, and they would teach the traditional courses in History but they would offer an option in Sport History or something like that. I would go to conferences and find these guys and they would encourage me. I'd sit in their papers, they'd sit in mine, and so – yes. I wasn't put off by it. I think I said to you earlier that when I went to Adelaide, when Adelaide Teachers' College became the University of South Australia, I actually had better qualifications in history than the history staff. And so when they had to teach

Australian History they looked around in their specialties, none of them had specialties in Australian Studies or Australian History, they were more concerned with European History and so on. So it gave me an 'in' and I did a bit of teaching [in the History Department]. Later on I actually taught Australian History at the University of South Australia and enjoyed it.

Just coming to a close on this one there, John, you've been retired now for seven years – what do you miss about the academic life? Do you miss anything?

I miss the teaching – in fact, I'll be teaching tomorrow, I've got a two-hour guest lecture. I've prepared it and spent a lot more time in getting ready for this, and I'm looking forward to a debate with a group of students. I hope to have it, but my friends, my colleagues, suggest I may not have – they're first year students and I might not have the debate I want. But I think I miss that more than anything, the day-to-day interaction. The School of Physical Education [at Uni SA] was very insular. They had their lunches in their office, they didn't meet in a staff room. The old days of the Adelaide Teachers' College everyone went to the staff room and everyone debated a whole range of things, and I would not have missed morning tea, afternoon tea or lunch for anything. The give and take of argument and so on was good. At the University of South Australia that wasn't present because they divided the staff and put them in schools and separated them widely, and I thought they were too insular. And in fact the last ten years of my life I was the only member of the staff who walked across the river to go to the staff room and have lunch every day in the staff room because I just liked the mix of other disciplines and other minds. I've missed that kind of interaction, but I've built up a group of friends who meet on a regular basis. The Chief Librarian, for example, from the University of South Australia retired at the time I did. We meet once a week, we debate books that we've read, we lend one another books, we engage in the kind of banter we used to in the staff room so there's a little bit of that. I still write articles. I write chapters of books on request. I still do a lot of the academic kind of things, but of course I've got a bit more time. I take a lot longer over reading the paper of a morning so that, whereas before I'd skip through it very quickly, I read it from cover to cover, particularly *The Australian*, read the articles and so on. And I paint. I do a tremendous amount of reading and so on.

But the thing I miss, I guess, is the contact with students, particularly post-graduate students. I'm still advising one or two, and so when they ask if they can work with me I'm happy to do that. So it's essentially I miss lecturing and post-graduate students, I think.

You don't miss administration? Do you have much administration?

I did, and I was very good at it because I did it as quickly as I possibly could. ... I took on a fairly heavy teaching load and research load because I enjoyed that. The administration I would sort through fairly quickly, and stuff that I didn't think was of interest or, if it was really of interest, people would chase me up again about it. I just simply had a filing box underneath my desk called a rubbish bin and I used to move stuff there fairly frequently. I'd respond very quickly – they thought I was a good administrator because I'd respond quickly. I'd bring it home and draft stuff up and send it back. Some people love that, I didn't. So I was a good administrator in terms of being efficient about what I needed to be efficient about, and things that counted I would do but other things I didn't bother. And it was interesting, that a lot of stuff that came through was never followed up, and so I hadn't wasted any time. And if it was important they'd get in touch with me again and say, you know, 'We want an answer to that,' so I'd say, 'Well, you'd better send me another copy,' and I'd respond that way. But I didn't like administration, that's why I wasn't ambitious about becoming a Pro-Vice-Chancellor or moving into administration, I just loved teaching.

Were you any good at attracting grants, research grants, and things like that?

No.

Was that part of your – – –?

No, it wasn't, but in fact it's come in now. It's become very much the measure of success of a university lecturer. But in the days of being a Teachers' College lecturer – and much of my life was spent in a department and so on where we didn't need to do that, I didn't have to do it – and so it was a fairly new skill, and the person who replaced me as professor, Kevin Norton, was very good at doing that and very good at doing scientific research and getting those kind of grants. By the time I left I was one of the men of yesterday in many ways, and he was the kind of person who the

university was looking for as they simulated what occurred in universities and determined the worth of one's involvement in the university by the number of grants brought in. But in many ways I guess I was lucky in that I preceded that.

Righto, John, we'd better leave it there and we'll get onto the real heady stuff next time.

Okay.

Thank you.

END OF TAPE 2 SIDE B: TAPE 3 SIDE A

This is tape number three of Peter Donovan speaking with Professor John Daly. The interview is continuing, in this instance focusing on John's public life and work as a coach. This interview is taking place at his home on the 29th October 2003. John, we're going to start talking about your coaching athletic career. You touched on that there in the first tape, the fact that you were into athletics at school. Could you elaborate on that, and in effect how your athletic career, I guess, as an athlete progressed and how it developed and who were the influences on you?

Okay. I found very early on in life that when we played games in the school yard like rounders and base, which is a game we played at the Marist Brothers, I was faster than anyone else in the school. It was a pleasant surprise to find that, and so when teams were picked I was often the first one picked. And I enjoyed running fast. I went to picnics with my relatives, with my father and with my uncles, the usual kind of insurance – Goodfellows – union picnics and so on, and because they handicapped kids according to size, I was a little kid and I was always put up the front and I always won the races. I can remember looking forward each year to the picnic meetings because I usually cleaned up and brought home some rather good prizes. My father had been an athlete and had competed for the Port Adelaide Athletic Club, and we had photographs of him around the house and some rather splendid trophies. And so it seemed natural that, if I was going to be involved in a sport – I don't think my father played football or cricket, but certainly he'd been an athlete and so it was going to be natural that, knowing I could run fast, that I would be an athlete.

And while I was at school, the school participated in football and cricket, which I took part in, and of course athletics once a year. The school athletic contest I was always quite successful at that. We had a monk at the school, a Brother Noel, who was very interested in my athletic career and for some reason he told me about the

state schools championships, open to all schools including private schools. He took me, he must have entered me for this contest, and took me to the contest and I won the state championship. So I used to go each year after that and I became state champion. When they picked a commemorative state team while I was still at school I was a member of that state team, and went away. I was one of the few kids from Catholic schools, most of them came from Princes and Saints, couple of kids from Rostrevor I think, from memory. Unley High – there were a few high schools. But I went away with that team.

So I was very successful at school and then it seemed very natural that my father would put me into a club and I joined Adelaide Harriers initially, ended up competing for quite a number of clubs, Adelaide Harriers, Port Adelaide. When I went to university, I formed the Teachers' College club – well, not formed it, but was very instrumental in its development – and then finally the Adelaide University club. So I competed for a number of clubs.

Why pick athletics? You said you were also captain of the football team, and in effect you could have had a career *possibly* in football – lots of people, and that was a professional sport.

That's true, I was captain of the school football team and captain of the school cricket team, I was a fast bowler as you would expect, I played reasonable football, played at centre. Yes, it's interesting you should say that because I never really thought of football as a career in those days. It was always thought – and I guess my father put the idea into my head. He wasn't really that keen on me playing football and neither was my mother. I think my father suggested that football – kept implying that football and athletics didn't go very well together because of injuries. And so when I left school I competed as an athlete, trained full-time, even in the winter, and never gave football a thought again until I went to the Teachers' College. I explained I went to the Teachers' College as a young lecturer and I coached one of the sides and played with one of the sides. So by the time my athletic career was over I was back to playing football again and playing in the Amateur League.

A couple of times you've sort of hinted at your athletic career being over. To when did it extend, and then why did you give away participation when in effect we still have masters who can compete?

That's true. But when I competed it was expected that the sporting career would be short. Now, I don't know why, but I guess I put on a bit of weight, I was interested in girls by that time and not training as regularly. But I competed until I was about twenty-five or twenty-six. And then I married – I think at age twenty-four – and it didn't seem appropriate to go on competing for much longer than that. At that stage I was a Phys Ed teacher and I just – drifted is the wrong word because I planned it – went into coaching. So I retired by what would now seem to be a very early age, because nowadays people with my ability would have gone through until they were in their early thirties, I suppose, and as you say a lot of people continue on.

It's been my experience that the people who go on [in the Masters] aren't always the people who have very successful sporting careers. It's very difficult to move from being at the top of your sport. I suppose you can still be top of your sport in the various age groups. But when I retired the masters level wasn't around so it wasn't an option. In fact, I'm just thinking now there was no other option. You either competed or you didn't compete, and so when I got to about age twenty-five, twenty-six, I retired, but I went straight into coaching.

You've suggested you were pretty good at the state level – how were you on the national scene?

I usually made the final of the national. I went to the nationals each year and I competed in the sprints, the one hundred and the two hundred. I was fairly short, stocky in those days, a pretty solid sprinter. The best result I ever achieved was I think about fourth in the final of the Australian titles. I came up against some very good sprinters – Hec Hogan, who was a very famous Queensland sprinter and one of Australia's *great* sprinters, competed in the Olympic Games, I knew Hec well and he usually won the national title. I guess if it had been years later I would have always been included in a national relay team because I was in the first four usually. I certainly competed for Australian Universities, again in the sprints and the relays, but that was a competition against New Zealand, so the only national success I had was in the university championship. But normally a finalist – in fact, I'd say almost always a finalist – but usually fourth, fifth, about that level. I think it was probably because I didn't train as hard. I thought I trained hard at the time, but in comparison with others and so on I probably didn't train hard enough and I probably wasn't

ascetic enough, I didn't watch my weight and – yes, I probably needed to be, yes, a bit more ascetic in terms of preparation for championships.

What supports did you have as a promising state athlete?

I certainly had the support of family. My father took a great interest in my athletic career. In fact, with Brother Noel, he was my early coach. I think at that time he worked in the Electricity Trust, and he'd get off the bus in Rosewater and walk down to the Rosewater Reserve and I would meet him there after school about five o'clock and Dad would coach me, and then we would walk home from there. I'd have a bike and I'd just simply balance my bag on my bike and walk alongside Dad and we would talk, and it was often about athletics and sport and so on. So he was a very good support. At the school, the school was a great support as well. I don't remember really getting very much support from Athletics South Australia. It was the Amateur Athletic Association then. It was a men's group, boys' group. Genders were separated. There was a women's group and a men's group, but I don't remember getting very much support from them. But as I left school there were other coaches that came on the scene, and I was coached by Jess Jarver who was a Latvian trained in physical education, had been a great athlete himself – in fact, his name was Lempit Jarver and he was called 'Jess' after Jesse Owens because he was such a good athlete, his nickname among the kids in Latvia was Jess. So Jess was a great coach and really quite an inspiration to me. It's one of the reasons why I think I moved – *one* of the reasons why I moved on to coaching.

Was that unusual? How many of your contemporaries would have moved on to coaching and not simply given it away totally?

Very few. Thinking back then I can't think of anyone who moved into coaching on completion of their athletic career. I think they all just simply drifted away from the sport. And the people who were the coaches when I began coaching were people who were probably in their late sixties. They coached at Adelaide Harriers and at Western Districts. They'd been former athletes. I didn't know a great deal about them. Very unscientific. You could hardly tell the difference in those days between a professional, so-called, coach of the professional athletes who had gone through the ranks and who persisted in the methods of the '20s and the '30s and the amateur

coaches. The amateur coaches tended to be old, tended to be associated with clubs. I was pretty 'young on the block' and scientific and very different, I think.

How did you get started as a coach? How did you attract athletes and what were your methods and policies?

Well, I learnt my coaching, as I said, from Jess Jarver, but also from two coaches at St Peter's College – a guy called Bob Volugi, who coached all of the Saints athletes and was a very successful coach. He had people like Ian Bruce and Bill Bruce. Bill Bruce represented Australia in the London Olympics and he'd been coached by Bob. And there was a guy called Ken Peake-Jones who was a Geography teacher at Saints. And between the two of them they coached, Jones looked after the field events and Bob looked after the hurdles and sprints. And during the summer holidays, in an effort to try and improve coaching, they would run a coaching seminar at Roseworthy College or Saints, and I went to them. I was one of the youngsters who went to them, and I loved that kind of analysis and description of what happens when somebody is performing. And they didn't talk very much about training methods, they talked more about the mechanics, techniques and things like that, and I loved that. And then moving into Physical Education it just seemed the obvious thing to do because Physical Education is the study of movement and this was a practical application of that. And so, having done those courses, having been coached at the end of my career by Jess Jarver who was an excellent, very technical coach – – –. He had a squad of the best athletes in the state. Essentially the state team was coached by Jess Jarver. He coached pole vaulters with great success, including John Pfitzner, an Australian representative and Australian champion, he coached the discus throwers and shot-putter, he had a mixture of athletes who he coached very proficiently. And I was the star sprinter in the squad. He had some women in the squad as well, and we were a very successful group of athletes, and it seemed natural for me to go on and to coach. And I adopted some of the techniques that I'd learnt from Jess but then began to study coaching through my physical education.

And you said how did I attract athletes. I guess at that stage Jess may have stopped coaching and a number of athletes who I'd known hadn't retired, they were younger than me, they just came over, wanted to be coached by me, and fairly quickly I had rapid success. In the first few years of my coaching I produced the Australian junior sprint champion, Alan Bradshaw, who was a university student; and a girl, Lynne

Silkstone, who became the Australian junior sprint champion. So within four or five years I'd produced the two top juniors in the country. They won the national title, and other people were attracted by that and then came over [to my squad], and so I began coaching a squad of probably ten or a dozen quite talented athletes.

I was pretty tough in those days. I said to them if they wanted to work with me they had to work with me every day. I wrote training schedules for them, made them keep diaries – the kind of things that were never done in those days – and made them apply themselves. They seemed to like it. But I was very demanding of them and consequently, as we became more and more successful, I produced a few more champions. Had a guy called Ivone Kirkpatrick in South Australia who was a finalist in the four hundred metres, ranked in the top two or three [in the country]. David Stokes became Australian sprint champion. I coached him as well, and we were producing some very good athletes in Adelaide – *I* was. I can think of one year when I coached when, of the final eight in the hundred metre national title three of the athletes were my athletes. So I was successful from a very early stage, I think, and attracted the best in the state⁴.

I didn't coach just anybody. They had to be a reasonable standard and had to be committed. These were the people who came over and asked me if I would coach them. I didn't take them from any other squad. They were just athletes who were younger than me and who came into the group, stayed. They did a lot of the recruiting – if there was a talented kid they'd say, 'You'd better come out with JD and work with him,' so that's how it happened. The largest group I had, I think, at any one stage was twenty-five, which was getting pretty large at that stage – not all sprinters. I began coaching hurdles and middle distance running, but mainly it was sprints, hurdles, up to the four hundred metres. No field events, I didn't coach field events.

I suppose what I'm getting at is how you moved from a local coach to a national coach. So what are the steps, how did you do that?

Well, it was interesting because it was a bit of a surprise. I was becoming quite successful and noticed, I think, at the national titles because I'd go to the national titles and I'd have a squad of athletes and certainly in the sprints my athletes would

⁴ Even some from interstate! – JD

be athletes that you'd need to take note of. I wasn't aware that there were any national coaching positions really, as such. The National President of Athletics Australia lived in Adelaide – Ron Aitken – and in 1974 Ron Aitken was a very imperious kind of an individual. He *ran* athletics in Australia. He was Managing Director of the brewery in Adelaide, his boy went to Prince Alfred College, he had a Melbourne background, he'd gone to a private school, I think, in Melbourne, was well-known in Australia in business circles and so on, but really quite a dominating and domineering figure in Australian athletics. As I say, he ran Australian athletics. I can recall – because it gave me enormous pleasure – getting a 'phone call from Ron Aitken which was not something I'd ever had before. I mean, people like Ron Aitken didn't ring me. He rang me and said, 'I want you to know that you've been appointed Head Coach of the Australian team to go to the Commonwealth Games in Christchurch in 1974.' Well, that's wonderful. Because there'd been a group of coaches – they used to have a system whereby all the states voted for all of the positions, and usually what happened was Victoria would vote against New South Wales and *vice versa*, and I think in the 1972 Olympics the coaches who had gone – I won't mention names, I don't mean them any disrespect – but the coaches who ended up going came from Tasmania and according to the athletes didn't have a clue. But it was the kind of voting 'We won't vote a Sydney coach in, we won't vote a Victorian coach in', and so they went. And so, Australian athletes having had complaints, decided they would appoint the coaches and they'd call for nominations, but in the first instance they appointed coaches. And they appointed me and two other coaches in Victoria who'd been very successful. But I was appointed Head Coach. First coaching appointment, so young⁵.

I went to Christchurch and I didn't quite know how to tackle it and nobody in South Australia had had that experience. I was by that time a teacher, might have been at the Teachers' College by then, so I'm fairly confident and articulate – the first meeting we had with the team, in that team were all of the what were a lot of the greats of Australian athletics, people like Phil May and Laurie Peckham – I mean, people that had been competing in the Olympics very successfully – and I can remember at the first meeting I stood up and introduced myself and said to them,

⁵ I was 38 years of age. – JD

‘You don’t know who I am, I know that, and you don’t know what I can do, but I’m here and I’m prepared to do anything you want me to do. If you want me to shift hurdles, I’ll shift hurdles. I’ll suggest some advice if you want some advice, you listen to it and weigh it up and if you think it’s worthwhile that’s fine, but I won’t intrude. You’ve got your own coaches, you’re great athletes, you’ve got your own coaches back home, you’ve got your own training programs, I’m not going to impose mine. But I’m here, I’m a pair of eyes, I think I know what I’m about, but you’ve got to work it out.’ And so a few of the athletes tried me and I think one of the athletes had problems, a very good hurdler had problems with getting to the hurdle and it was because of the synthetic track. I made a suggestion and fortunately it worked. And the word got around, ‘This guy knows what he’s talking about,’ and so other people would then start to say, ‘When you’ve finished with those will you come over and have a look and see what I’m doing?’ A long jumper would come over and say, ‘Do you mind having a look at my run-up,’ and I’d made a comment, and I probably said more positive, correct, things than wrong things. We had a very good Games, did very well. I trained the relay teams for the first time. We had good athletes, I mean, that was the first Games for Raelene Boyle, Denise Robertson, Greg Lewis, a whole number of other people – but I spent a lot of time with the relays and had them performing. They were really, really slick. Australia wasn’t expected to win the relays and they won both the men’s and the women’s. And so that again contributed to my reputation.

After those Games I don’t think I applied for any other Games. The athletes required that I should go to the Games as a coach. Very different from what happens now, you apply for a coaching position. But I can honestly say that, after the first Games after Ron Aitken told me I’d be with the team, the athletes in their report obviously – well, *did* – make a comment that I had to go with the team. And so I was just informed that I was to be Head Coach of the 1976 Olympic Team in Montreal two years later, was pretty successful at that. And then I took one of my own athletes, a girl from Western Districts, who ran in the four hundred metres and was quite bewildered about the whole thing – went from little old Adelaide to running in front of a hundred thousand people – her name now is Verna West [*née* Burnard] – but Verna was very successful and made the semi-final of the four hundred metres – amazing – and turned to eight hundred, ran close to two minutes. I thought she’d be

one of Australia's greatest eight hundred metre runners, and then she retired. She discovered boys and so on. It was a disappointment.

But, in answer to your question, I just went with every team and was successful, with my own athletes and with the Australian athletes, and so they seemed to want me. Again, it was an approach of – I think I've said to you before – I respect excellence, I respected Australian athletes, I didn't dominate them and – very different from Australian swimming coaches who said, 'Once you're in the team you're under me and you'll do what I say,' and that sort of thing. I didn't agree with that kind of approach. I think having athletes who'd spent years with their own coach and their coach had got them to that level, all I could do was really enhance their skill, try and correct faults if they crept in, but treat them [and their coach] with respect. And it became reciprocal. A lot of coaches, I think, who felt threatened by a young, academic kind of coach, then started contacting me. It happened on a number of occasions, coaches would ring me and say, 'Look, sure, I've got the athlete to this particular level but you're there, you're on the scene, you look them over, you make decisions about the kind of work they need to do. I'll give them a basic training schedule but you change it as you want,' which was rather nice. So athletes would turn up and say, 'My coach asked me to give you these training notes,' and just say, 'It's up to you.' So it was – I was pretty lucky, I think. But I worked at being respectful of their ability.

We'll just suspend your career a little bit there because you've now moved on to the national scene. Let's just clear up something about South Australia.

Right.

You were instrumental in assisting, facilitating, the amalgamation of the Men's and Women's Association.

Yes, I was. That was interesting.

I hope you'll tell me about that – why it took place, when it took place, what were the difficulties and how were they overcome? And sort of perhaps add a little bit about your involvement in South Australian athletics at that sort of administration type level.

Okay. Peter, I'm not sure I can remember the year. It was certainly in the '70s. But there was a requirement from government, who were by this time funding sport. And they had far too many organizations to deal with. There was men's hockey and

women's hockey, junior hockey, schoolboy hockey; there was men's athletics, women's athletics, professional athletics, little athletics. And so there was a plethora of organizations who all applied to the federal government for funding. I remember at that stage I think I was on the Sports Council in Canberra, and a decision was made by the bureaucrats, by the administrators in Canberra, that they would deal with one sport only. And so the statement went out to the sports – to hockey, for example – 'Get your act together, combine men's and women's hockey, men's and women's cricket, then apply for a grant and we'll fund one body. You work out which body it's going to be.' Men's athletics and women's athletics didn't get on very terribly well. The men's athletics tended to be – well, patriarchal is the obvious word, isn't it? – but they tended to dominate, they determined the program for the year. The women didn't like the form of inter-club that was run and they made a number of changes. And so on Saturday afternoons women's athletics was run very differently from men's athletics – they ran graded competitions for the first time. They put the best athletes against the best athletes. They had a quite outspoken, articulate woman who was a good friend of mine, Wendy Ey, who was running athletics at that particular time and she wasn't going to take a backward step to the men. They would have run their own competition if they could have – in fact, in Melbourne that happened, women's athletics wouldn't have anything to do with men's athletics in Melbourne, and they ran on their own grounds, they just didn't combine. At least we ran at the same ground. And so when this came out, men's athletics took the dominant role and virtually announced how the organization would happen. People like Wendy Ey were appalled and said, 'No, it's not going to happen that way at all. And in fact, perhaps in the first instance there ought to be two Presidents, a male and a female.' And the men's athletics said, 'No, no, that won't happen.' I think there were more men, more competing male athletes than female athletes, the women would have been outvoted. There was a real standoff. So it got to the crunch, I think, and the government said, 'Get your act together or don't apply for funding.' And the men, in many ways, then had to approach the women with a different kind of demeanour. The women were very suspicious of the men, thinking that they would be overpowered, overrun, in all the major positions. These were statements made, in the press, not only quietly. All the positions would go to men, President, Vice-President. And the men in their gracious style said, 'Oh no, no, no, the Vice-

President could be a woman.’ Wendy Ey said, ‘Well, why wouldn’t the President be a woman?’ And so they said, ‘Whatever is the gender of the President the Vice-President can be the opposite.’ There was a sense of suspicion and caution about it all. Wendy suggested that they needed not an outsider, somebody inside, somebody who didn’t have a position. [They asked me to chair a combined meeting] because I didn’t have any official position with men’s athletics. I was simply a coach, a very outspoken one. When things didn’t work I informed Athletics. I was on coaching committees and things like that. I often was coach of the state team and went away and things like that, but very outspoken – anyway, they asked me if I would conduct a meeting. I had it at the Teachers’ College, which was *my* domain. So it was the Teachers’ College in Kintore Avenue, they met there. And they came in with all their heavies – both men and women – organised. I can still remember the meeting to this day. They sat on opposite sides, in the Library, opposite sides of long tables, and I sat at the head and tried to talk it through. I had an agenda and said to them, ‘At the end of this meeting – we’ll work through the agenda in such a way that at the end of this meeting it will be the South Australian Athletic Association. That’s what I’ve got in mind.’ The first hour was terrible. I mean, they were – – –.

END OF TAPE 3 SIDE A: TAPE 3 SIDE B

[That’s what I’ve got in mind.’ The first hour was terrible. I mean, they were] suspicious of one another, and it began politely but after a while the gloves were off. And I think we’d been going for about an hour and a half and it wasn’t going anywhere at all. I was furious, and I spoke quite harshly to both groups and said, ‘What I want you to do is to go away and talk this through [in your separate groups]. This is going to look ridiculous to the government in terms of funding and so on. You know you have to combine and the sooner you accept that the better it’s going to be. But this kind of animosity is not going to work.’ So I said, ‘I’m going to take a break, I’m going to have a cup of coffee, and what I want you to do is for the two groups to meet independently, work out what you want to do, then come back and then let’s start talking positively.’ And it worked. I went and had a cup of coffee, they went and had a meeting, and realised that I was angry and the whole business was so childish. It really was. It was just ridiculous, and I told them. And so I went away and made a cup of coffee in the staff room – remember this is *my* domain, so I

just sent them off to different rooms – they came back and I really thought it would be a disaster. They came back much chastened and asked me to set the agenda and determine how they would do it and could they put some provisos in. It was all very civilized, by the [time] we finished the meeting at ten o'clock they were combined. So it worked. Amazing.

Did you have any vestigial role to play?

No. No. In fact, I said to them that I was the third party and I didn't think – I think some people had even suggested that I adopt the role of President or something like that, but no. I didn't want that. I mean, I'm not really an administrator of sport. I've never wanted to be, and – no, I thought it was better, and I wanted them to come up with some rules. And in fact one of the rules, I think, from memory, was that whoever was appointed President the opposite gender would become Vice-President. They even talked about having two Presidents in the first instance. But then people saw sense and thought, 'Well, we're just going to continue this battling. You know, we really ought to bite the bullet.' They started speaking very nicely to one another, and by the time we finished the meeting it was [civil, even friendly and co-operative]. There were a few people on the men's side – Murray Aitken, for example ... – who spoke in a very conciliatory way and were arguing, really, on the side of the women. So there were some key people who suddenly started to talk sense at their compatriots, and it all worked. I thanked them for the meeting and they thanked me for doing all of that and we went our way and off they went. Yes, it was good. Interesting.

Now we've cleared that up –

Right.

– let's get back to the coaching.

Right.

You're also a facilitator of the coaches' accreditation system. How were you involved in that, how did it develop, what did you draw upon from elsewhere?

Well, we formed a Track and Field Coaches' Association before the national accreditation scheme [was conceived]. Jess Jarver was involved in this with me and Rothman's National Sports Foundation, Marlene Matthews. I went in my Australian

blazer at that time to see the Rothman's National Sports Foundation and said that we needed to form a national coaching body and I thought it was appropriate, would they fund it? They said yes, they would. I held some national meetings which I chaired – I think the national meetings were held in Melbourne – and we got as many coaches together as possible. We talked about how it would be done. There would be coaching courses, accreditation – this is before the national scheme came up. Again, a lot of the coaches, as I indicated to you before, were in their late years, late fifties, early sixties – which doesn't seem very old now, because I'm there – but in those days, these were the people who were very successful in coaching, particularly in the eastern states. They were worried about accreditation and said, 'Look, I'm too old to go back to school, and we've got all these young bucks coming through. You're a new vintage, you know. You've got a degree and you're a Teachers' College lecturer. We don't come from that [background] and we don't want to be doing exams and things like that.' Again, to placate that group of people, I talked it over with Jess and a number of other people and said, 'Look, why don't we have a grandfather clause that says, "All the people that have recognition in Australia are given automatic qualification"?' And we talked that through with them. Some people didn't like that, they thought we ought to be using accreditation methods straight away. And I said, 'Look, in five years' time, ten years' time, all these people will have gone and it's not going to make any difference.' And they accepted that, and so when the coaches were aware of the fact that they weren't going to be threatened they came into it. So we had a national track and field coaches' association formed. I went to the Athletics Australia, thinking that Athletics Australia would recognize us and have us on the board. I could not believe it. I went with this, must have been in the early '70s – I think Ron Aitken was still national president then – and I went to the board, told them what we'd done, they thanked me for coming to the meeting and said, 'Good luck.' And I said, 'Um, will you not recognize us?' And they said, 'I don't think we need to recognize you, just good luck.' And I said, 'Does that mean we won't have a place on the board?' 'Of course not.' And so we weren't written into the constitution of Athletics Australia. We were – in inverted commas – 'recognized', whatever that meant. We weren't funded, we weren't supported. If coaches were appointed to the national team they didn't necessarily have to come from the coaching association which we thought they

would. We thought we'd nominate coaches, the best coaches in the country, to the Athletics board. None of that, thanks very much. So I came away with my leg between my tail – sorry, my tail between my legs – and yes, it made me realise that [coaches didn't really count in Athletics Australia]. I really did think when I went there that we would be accepted, congratulated, given membership of the board and we would have a voice in Australian athletics, but none of that.

What happened after that was that, as a result of the poor performance of Australia in the Olympic Games, particularly in 1976, the Australian Government was forced to do something about sport and the Sports. They weren't the Sports Commission in those days, but the group who ran sport, funded sport in the country, decided that coaching accreditation would be the only way that sport would improve in the country. So they formed a Coaching Council, and because I'd been outspoken [I was involved]. I'd written a letter after 1976, I wrote from the Games in Montreal, I wrote an open letter to the Australian sporting public about the lack of success of Australians, and in – – –.

We'll come back to that.

Okay. Yes.

Just keep on the coaching for a little longer.

Well, on the coaching, when we had a meeting of all the coaches from the various sports in the country, [it was] decided that there would be a coaching accreditation scheme. They put a number of people who'd been involved in coaching accreditation like Jess Jarver and myself on that Coaching Council. We helped design and establish the national coaching accreditation scheme for Australia. We copied the Canadian one. Canada had been very successful in developing sport, and so I read all of their reports and so the Coaching Accreditation Scheme [they had] – Level 1, Level 2, Level 3 – we redesigned it and then we asked each sport to become organised that way. The government, holding the purse strings, did what they did with men's and women's sport. Said, you know, 'If you want funding for coaching, your sport will have to organise an accreditation system,' and it forced a lot of sports to develop their accreditation systems. Some sports had accreditation systems and didn't want to change. Tennis was one of those, and what they did was they really

licensed professional coaches in the country. They didn't want to have amateur coaches involved. It was going to be a closed shop. Well, after a bit – a bit of debate and a bit of give and take and a bit of threatening and so on – they eventually came up with their accreditation system. And Jess and I both went on a technical committee to look at the applications of the sports and their schemes, and we suggested changes and alterations. Practically all the coaches that hold any rank in the country are accredited. I think, as far as I know, most of the sports have got accreditation systems, not all up to Level 3, but certainly the bulk of them are part of the national Coaching Accreditation Scheme.

And nowadays it would be unusual for you to find an advertisement in a paper asking for a coach to go, for example, to the Institute of Sport that doesn't require a national accreditation certificate, probably at Level 3. So we went from being a poor relative of other countries in the Commonwealth – England, Canada, even New Zealand – to being now the country that sets the pattern for those countries. In fact you find many of the coaches of those countries in a variety of sports come from Australia under the Coaching Accreditation Scheme here. So it's been very successful, was very successful.

Has there been much change since the '70s, or since the implementation of this national accreditation scheme?

Not a great deal, except that they have now required – and I think it was a good move – they've now required people to re-accredit. I achieved my Level 3 very quickly. I actually did the exams and I was accredited at Level 2 – that was kind of the grandfather clause, I think, and most of us were given Level 2 but not Level 3. And I did my Level 3 and so on, and I could have gone on coaching for life with a Level 3, the top qualification. But one of the things they brought in was this system of re-accreditation, you know, because science is changing, methodology is changing. So it lasts for a period of time then people have to show, by application again, that they've been to conferences, been to courses, that they've done particular things and either have gone back to do re-accreditation courses as they're conducted. I think that's a good idea. So there's a kind of coaching re-education scheme which is going on and I think it's been very successful. But the basic accreditation scheme of Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 that we set up is still there.

Now we'll get back to 1976.

Right.

It seems a pretty critical period in sort of South Australian sport in total, certainly as far as athletics and track and field are concerned.

Yes.

So how did that come about? What were the circumstances?

Well, I'll go back to the letter. I was appointed Head Coach of the athletic team that went to Montreal. The team was picked and we went to Montreal to the [Olympic] Village about six weeks before the Games. It's astonishing in retrospect, because now you'd never do that sort of thing. But I went back, I went as Head Coach, got to the Games, got to the Games Village. Very few people were there except minor countries like Fiji and – I don't mean it unkindly, but nobody to compete against. The Canadian athletes weren't around, the American athletes were in Europe – most of them – and we kept reading all these good performances, but they weren't going on in Canada in preparation for the Games or even in America. They were going on in Europe and that's where we should have been. So we trained and got ready and so on – and, by the way, on the way over, in the 'plane with the team, I was reading, I think, *The Bulletin*, and there was an article on sport, on the Australian Olympic team. And in it the person who wrote the article indicated who the gold medal hopes were in the Australian athletic team. Now, I couldn't believe it, because these people who were gold medal hopes weren't ranked, some of them weren't ranked in the top ten in the world. So I mean they were the best in Australia, but they weren't ranked in the top ten so there was no way they were going to get a gold medal.

So we went to the Games and I'll indicate very briefly what I did. I recognized that we needed some competition, and I said to Athletics Australia, the people who were there as Manager and Assistant Manager – they were good people – and I said to them, 'Look, this is doing us no good, we need competition. Now, we've either got to move' – we didn't have the money to move – 'or we've got to get athletes in here.' And so we talked about it for a while, and a lot of the people who were associated with the team had been officials in the eastern states – Ray Jury and Clive Lee, those sort of people Manager and Assistant Manager – and they said, 'Well, we could act as officials and why don't we get some of the Games officials to

act – why don't we run a competition?' So the Americans flew in to have a look at the facilities and I said to them, 'We're going to run two athletic meets, would you like to try the facilities out?' 'Oh yes, we'll be in it.' Spoke to the Canadians, the Canadians did the same. So what we did was Australia ran a meeting, a track and field meet, at the Olympics using the warm-up facilities, and a lot of our own officials and the Games officials, and it was a great success. The Yanks flew in a team, the Canadians flew in a team, there were some other people around the Village and so on, so it became an international competition. The Australians, of course, loved it and it went very, very well, it was very successful. And then I announced that there would be a second one, and to their credit the Canadian organization for the Games said, 'That's fine, but we'll run it. It'll be good experience for our officials.' And so they ran it. So we had a second meeting, the Americans flew in, and by that time the Canadians had announced that there was a pre-Games competition so people came back from Europe and came from other places so suddenly there were more athletes in the Village. So we had two competitions and that helped. But we shouldn't have been there, we should have been in Europe. And that's the way the pattern followed after that while I was Head Coach. We would go to Europe and we'd end up at the Games and so on. So we did that.

Athletics was one of the last sports on. Swimming, which was one of Australia's most important sports, was on first and [Australia] didn't win a medal. Think we might have got one bronze. But Australians didn't figure in the place-getting, the Americans did and the Eastern Europeans, the East Germans and so on. And before we ever went on the track there was so much criticism in the newspapers back home that Malcolm Fraser, who was the Prime Minister of the country at the time, was under a lot of pressure as to why the Australians weren't doing well. Australians were complaining about the fact they didn't have the lead-up kind of competitions that they required. He announced that there would be a public inquiry into why the Australian team had not done well. Now, we had not even been on the track. So before we actually went on the Olympic track we were deemed a failure – the whole Olympic team had been deemed a failure – and there was to be a public inquiry. The athletes were very upset about this because they saw these reports. Fraser came to the Village and got a mouthful from some very outspoken Australian athletes about what was required. What was required was funding, travelling overseas, athletes needed to

be prepared for major events, there needed to be a sports institute – a whole range of things. He wasn't expecting it but he certainly got it. He went into the Village and had lunch with the athletes and then got a real hammering from them. Athletes can be very articulate and passionate about what's right and what's wrong.

Anyway, when [the Games] finished, the athletes had a couple of meetings. The athletes were very disappointed, and I said, 'Look, I've been thinking of writing a letter suggesting what Australia needs.' So the athletes said, 'Yeah, you do that, you do that.' So I wrote an open letter to the sporting public and sent it to *The Australian*. I didn't know what was going to happen to it, but it was published with my photograph as an open letter. And in effect the letter said, 'Look, if you want us to come over here and just compete, so be it, but don't expect anything more.' And I quoted the Prime Minister as saying – he saw us off at Melbourne Airport saying things like, 'Australians have always done well but all we require is you to take part,' you know, the Olympic stuff, you know, 'the important thing is the struggle not the winning.' I said, 'Well, if that's what you want that's fine, we'll do that, we'll do that well, but if you want medals you've got to buy them.' It was publicised and apparently – I stayed in America to do my PhD and didn't go back – it was quite controversial. And a lot of people wrote supporting what I'd written, and Fraser had a pretty tough time, so there was a lead-on to 1980 to the formation of the Australian Institute of Sport – not only a result of my letter, but a lot of the pressure that was going [on], but my letter did help, I think – well, there's a book that's come out on it, explaining Australia's sporting success, and they actually mention the letter in that as being a catalyst to the development. Plus a number of other reports.

That also gave your career a bit of a boost on the national scene, particularly with the Sports Commission.

Yes, it did, I think, yes.

Sorry, the Institute of Sport rather than the Commission.

Yes, it did. I'd been on the Coaching Council but certainly yes, I have a say with some humility. I became a public figure, I think, in terms of sport. Whenever there was a conference going on I certainly was invited. I was at the Teachers' College in those days, and I would have been going to Canberra – oh, twice a month, easily twice a month, and I was going and sitting in on meetings and things. And Bob

Ellicott – he was a minister in Fraser’s Government – decided that there should be an Institute of Sport. He’d seen the Institute of Sport in China. A number of people had contacted him and he decided that we’d establish a sports institute in Canberra, and Fraser was quite keen because this was one of the things that the athletes demanded. So they formed a group to get it going and I was one of the people invited. There were people like John Newcombe and Neil Fraser – some very prominent people, outspoken people and some well-known sporting people. So I was on that. And we sort of organised this thing with Ellicott. Everything had to cost less than two million dollars because Ellicott could spend two million dollars without taking it to Cabinet. And so everything was broken down into two million dollar lots. And we eventually got Don Talbot to come back as Head of the Institute and it went from there. I was made a member of the Board and stayed on the Board for I think about five years and wrote the code of ethics for the Institute of Sport. I also wrote their history, *Quest for excellence*, after ten years, so I was very involved in the Sports Institute. Loved it, was offered a job there as Head of it on several occasions but decided to stay in Adelaide. But you’re right, the letter plus the coaching and some coaching success, all of that contributed.

In 1984 I was Head Coach of the Olympics again, so ’80 I went to Moscow – that’s the first time we ever left the country in civilian costume and changed in Singapore into Australian uniforms because we were told by the government not to go. We did go. I went because I had a meeting with Australian athletes in Melbourne and said, ‘It’s your decision, you’re the athletes, I happen to be the coach, if you decide to go’ – I was under pressure, by the way, not to go as a senior official and a well-known coach, national coach – I said, ‘If you decide to go I’m going.’ And I did. Had some dreadful letters delivered to the Teachers’ College telling me what I should be doing and shouldn’t be doing and damning me for what I was doing – should be providing leadership to the athletes and so on. But we went.

What was your mental justification for going?

It was simple. If the athletes had decided they did not want to go I would not go. I was in a service role with the team, and if the athletes decided [not to go then I would not]. In those days a number of them made naïve statements about sport and politics shouldn’t mix – well, of course, *all* elements of a society influence one another and

so to say ‘sport and politics shouldn’t mix and thanks very much, government, give us money’ – I mean, it *did* mix. They made those kind of statements and felt the pressures. Australia had been at every Games since 1896 and why would you break it, and that sort of thing. There were editorials came out in the newspapers suggesting that – starting with bullets in Afghanistan to athletes competing in Moscow, the link between the two – deaths and competition and so on – there was a lot of pressure, and it was a nasty time in sport. That was one of the reasons, also, why the Institute was established. The sporting community was really put off by what had happened with government and they were very disillusioned with the Fraser Government, and I think the Sports Institute was a kind of forced payback to the sporting community to say, ‘All is well and we’re doing the right thing now.’ It became a political issue – a voting issue, really – and a lot of people were very upset about Fraser. Kevin Gosper [of the IOC⁶] at the time siding with government. All of that. ...

Did you lose any friends over the Moscow Olympics?

No, I don’t think so. No, no. Even at Teachers’ College with the Principal of the College and so on. He asked me had I thought it through and I told him I had, I explained it in terms – and it really was as simple as that for me: if the team decided to go I’d go, if the team decided not to go I wouldn’t be unhappy about not going. Now, it seems as if I’ve divorced myself from Afghanistan and that kind of commitment and it’s true, I had. I really was focusing on my role with the team, a service role with the team, and if the athletes decided not to go [then I would not]. People would say to me, ‘But the athletes shouldn’t have to make that kind of decision, people like you should make that decision.’ Well, not people like me, Athletics Australia should. And some sports did. I mean, the so-called ‘silver spoon’ sports like yachting, equestrian events and so on, pulled out and were paid handsomely by the government for doing it. Raelene Boyle was so upset by the whole business she withdrew from the team and got a grant of, I think, ten thousand dollars. But Raelene Boyle was injured and may not have made the Olympics anyway. Now, I don’t think people knew that. I mean, *I* knew that, and it provided Raelene with an opportunity to make a decision that was as related to her physical

⁶ IOC – International Olympic Committee.

condition as it was to the politics of the whole thing. So one or two people pulled out of the team, but the bulk of the team decided that they were going to go and I went with them.

END OF TAPE 3 SIDE B: TAPE 4 SIDE A

This is continuing the interview of Professor John Daly. This is tape number four, the date is the 29th October 2003. Now, John, you've spoken of the Institute of Sport and its development – how did that change the manner in which you went away with teams? Does it make it any easier for you as a coach?

I guess it did, because many of the athletes including the national team were scholarship holders at the Sports Institute in Canberra. Sport changed, though, from that time on because we had people in the team who were at the Institute and well-funded and even got pocket money from the Institute while they were away with the national team, and other athletes who in fact didn't have access to the kind of external competition that they did. But from the point of view of acceptance – I'd always been accepted by the athletes in the national team, but now I probably knew them better, and whenever a coach was injured or away [from the AIS⁷] they would often ask me if I would put in a stint as coach. Gary Noake was a quite famous Australian athlete who was employed full-time as an athletics coach at the Institute in Canberra. He had suffered from cancer and died and they asked me if I would come in and take his place for a period of time, so I took leave from the Teachers' College – or University at that stage – and went in and coached the hurdlers and the people he'd taken, and they accepted me straight away. I was there for a period of time.

So moving on to 1984, obviously better circumstances than 1976. They were still under a cloud, like Moscow was, because the Russians didn't turn up –

Exactly.

– to Los Angeles.

Right. Well, yes – we went to Los Angeles and I was coaching Glynis Nunn, who was my personal athlete, and she would have been ranked in the world in the top ten, probably five, six, seven, round about that particular mark. Then, because of the boycott of the 1980 Games by the United States and a number of other countries, as you know, the Russians and the Eastern Bloc did not go to Los Angeles in 1984.

Now, that took out the top two or three athletes. By the time we got to the Games and the Games Village, Glynis would have been ranked, I think, about fourth – not expected to win a medal, but certainly close to winning a medal. And so, with the Eastern Bloc countries out, the Australians did really very well. We picked up a number of golds. There were swimmers who did well. At that time swimming was back, and the Institute had been going for four years then and we had some very competent and very professional athletes, and some of the best coaches in the world. The Institute attracted the best coaches. They brought in an American swimming coach – yes, there were a number of outstanding coaches and athletes, so we were likely to do pretty well. But from my point of view the success of Glynis was remarkable, and I still recall it – I mean, it’s such a long time ago – what is it, sixteen years ago – – –.

Well, go through it, step by step, how you felt as the coach.

Okay. Well, I was Head Coach of the team and so had the responsibility of coaching all of the other athletes or supervising their training, and I certainly coached the sprinters and the relay teams. By that time we had an outstanding four by four hundred relay team – so all of the hurdlers, the sprinters, the quarter-milers were my responsibility, and of course Glynis was included in that. So she came out with the squad and, as we got closer – we weren’t thinking of a medal, we were thinking that she would do well, she wanted to get a personal best score, she’d been overseas, a very good competitor – a *great* competitor, you know, and a nice girl. Quiet, gentle, but very aggressive on the track. And she did very well. I remember working through it with her. It was a two-day competition and I had to keep an eye on her, and she was doing pretty well. After the first day and a number of personal bests, things looked really, really good. At the end of the first day I think she was ranked either first or second but certainly looked like getting a medal, and – I got pretty excited about it. The next day I turned up, met her on the track at ten o’clock in the morning before the second day started and I said to her, ‘You notice that I’m wearing my yellow, my gold shirt – this is the colour of the medal you’re going to win today.’ And she said, ‘Oh, JD,’ and just laughed. But I just had a feeling about it. And she went through and performed very well. The further it went in the day the more

⁷ AIS – Australian Institute of Sport.

nervous I became, which she said really worried her a bit, she had to walk away from me at one stage because I was babbling on – but she did very well, and of course completed the events, won the gold medal. The gold medal was presented later that night, she had won – I didn't see her until after the gold medal had been presented, and we were very excited and overjoyed for one another, and yes, it was a great time. I asked the Manager of the team if I could have that night off and go out and we'd celebrate, and Glynis and her husband and me – I think we were only just the three of us – yes. We went out and celebrated, had dinner together and a few drinks. And I went back and I was really ready to go home (laughs) but we had the rest of the Games to go on, because it was pretty much the first event. But I can recall watching her get the gold medal and sort of thinking, 'What's that wet feeling on my face?', and I was weeping. And it got very emotional – it was a *fantastic* result. I mean, to be a coach of an athlete who wins a gold medal is, you know, you're destined to be considered a great coach (laughs) from then on, and that's certainly what happened.

Well, it doesn't happen to many Australian coaches. I think over the last couple of years –

No, it doesn't.

Peter Fortune, for one.

Yes, it is. I mean, it is very exciting, and that year, of course, in the coaching awards I was nominated as one of the Coaches of the Year – I didn't win it, but I was certainly a finalist in Coach of the Year and got a certificate to indicate they thought that. And we travelled round the country, Glynys talking and me talking, where they invited me as well. So it was a pretty good time, yes. And so I was flown all over the place to link up with her and – yes, it was exciting.

Remember I said to you that I'd never had to apply for any positions? The next Games were 1988 in Seoul and I was appointed Manager, and I thought, 'Manager? Why aren't I the Head Coach?' I mean, you've got a Head Coach whose athlete wins a gold medal at the previous Games – why would you demote him? So I rang Athletics Australia and said, 'What's going on? Why am I the Manager?' And they said, 'Well, you know how you'd made a comment about the fact that the Managers who've gone away with you haven't always known what the game was all about, that the best people to manage teams really would be a coach who knew where everything

was directed at team performance – well, you’re the first of them.’ And so, (laughs) because I’d been a successful coach they assumed I’d be a successful manager and would manage the team as a kind of Manager-Head Coach, overall Head Coach. And it worked out pretty well.

The reason for me being critical was that I’d been away with managers before and managers would come back and announce to the team ... that we were visiting and having afternoon tea with the Australian Ambassador and buses would be there after lunch and we’d be at the Ambassadorial Residence at three o’clock in the afternoon and that sort of thing. And I’d say to them, ‘How can we be there, because we’re out at the track at four o’clock?’ They’d say, ‘Oh no, no, no, no, we’re going to the Ambassador’s Residence for afternoon tea at three o’clock this afternoon.’ I’d say, ‘No, we’ve got training, because we train twice a day.’ So I became very critical of managers that did those kind of things. And they said, ‘Well, awfully sorry, JD, but we’re going to have to go.’ And I said, ‘No, will you ring the Ambassador and change it? If you don’t, I will – I’m sure he’d understand.’ And I said, ‘You can take us from the track and we’ll go in tracksuits.’ ‘Oh no, no, no, the athletes have got to get ready and dressed up in their best.’ And actually the Ambassadors were quite happy when we rang them, they were happy to have athletes there in tracksuits as real people and coming and fitting it into their training. So we did that. So they turned it round and said, ‘Okay, you’ve been critical of managers for not doing things that fit in with the team, you’re it, you’re the Manager.’ So in 1988 and 1992 I went to this – Manager, but also with that role of running the coaches as well, so it was a kind of Managerial-Head Coach position, or overall Head Coach. And it worked out very well.

How long did you continue as a coach?

Until 1992, I went away with the Australian team again in that role to Barcelona, and had decided that my knees were getting very sore. I was finding the job harder and harder. And, for example, the life of a Head Coach or a Manager, you live in the Village with your athletes, you go to a meeting before the day starts with the overall Manager of the Australian Olympic team – all of the Head Coaches and all of the Managers go – and that’s normally at five-thirty, six o’clock in the morning, and that will run for an hour before the athletes get up and go to breakfast, and you’re given a

whole series of tasks to do. And then the athletes would compete late morning in the heats, because of television timing, and late afternoon, and then the finals would be at night. And I would be working with athletes and I'd come back on the last bus with the last athlete and that would be – I'd leave the stadium at about ten-thirty and I'd get back to the Village at twelve, check to see that things had to be done because I'd been out of the Village all day, probably get to bed at about one o'clock, sometimes two o'clock if there was a major problem. Alarm would go at five-thirty the next morning and this would go on for – well, the Olympics were sixteen days and the athletics would be a major proportion of that, and yes. So I found myself falling asleep in the bus on the way home. And, you know, the last athlete with me would shake me to say, 'JD, we're back at the Village.' I found it wearing. I'd come home and Judy would notice that it would take me a month to get over it. I was really exhausted, absolutely exhausted. I mean, people will say to you, 'Why do you give it up?', you know, 'What a great holiday and you see all the top athletes.' You do. But you work very hard. And I thought it ought to go to a younger man, my knees were getting very sore and having to run in and out and climb concrete stairs when athletes were working out the back and so on – I mean, you don't get the opportunity just sitting down and watching the Olympics. You're catch as catch can. You watch it on a small [TV screen] – I had a small, hand-held TV set so I wouldn't miss anything. It was becoming exhausting and I just thought it was time for a younger person to do it.

I had made the statement publicly. The athletes had always asked for me to go with the team, and I'd made the statement that when the athletes didn't want me I would retire. And I realised that when they didn't want me and I retired that would be one too many, so *I* should make the decision. It's been my experience in a lot of sports that a lot of people hang on to key positions for far too long, and people sort of think, 'Why doesn't he retire?' I could give you some classic illustrations, examples, in Australian sport of that but I don't need to. So I decided that it's – tough as the decision was – it was my decision and I should make it. So I informed Athletics Australia before I went away to the Games in 1992 that they would be my last, and they kept saying, 'Oh, no, no, we've got' ... 'Sydney coming up, certainly go to the next one, train another person to do what you're doing' – because I'd been very successful, had saved them a lot of money, had been a very efficient Manager and

Head Coach, apparently, and the athletes wanted me. So they wanted me to continue, but I decided that I should stop at that.

And there were other things. I wanted to finish as a professor at the university. The university had been very good to me. I'd leave for eight weeks pretty well every year to go away with the national team, either the World Championships, the Olympics, or for a touring European team. Four weeks of that would be my holiday time and the other four weeks the university would provide salary, so they were pretty good. And I just felt there were other things I wanted to do. So I decided that I'd retire from the Olympics and I'd also retire from coaching athletics at that stage. Because I'd got pretty tired of coaching and should have taken a break part-way through, but I continued from the mid-'60s until 1992, a period of over thirty years.

So when I announced to my squad – and they were people like Tania van Heer and others – that I was going to retire, I remember them saying to me, 'But what will you do? What will you do with your time?' And I said, 'Normally I come out at four-thirty and I stay until seven-thirty every day, and I get wet through twice or three times in that time. If you're out in the rain I stay out in the rain. You come, you go, other athletes come. I'm going to sit at home and have a brandy and dry and read. But I wish you well.' So I retired. And I didn't regret it.

So you still had squads –

I did.

– all through that latter period through the '80s.

Absolutely, absolutely. I had a squad right through, because I think people who are coaches of the national team should coach every day, I think, it's important. It's not an academic kind of – well, it *is* an academic kind of position, I suppose, and it's very different because you're problem-solving, you know, you're not really teaching athletes. At 'five to twelve' you can't go in and change an athlete's technique, you've got to do what you can. An Olympic athlete is not always brilliantly skilful. They sometimes have flaws in their technique, but you can't change a flaw in the technique five minutes before the event, and so you need to have a good eye, you need to be experienced.

I think my success as a coach was that I had a very good eye for movement. ... I think, if anything, my success as a coach has relied on the fact that I've got a very

good eye for movement. For some reason, I don't know what it is. I guess people who are choreographers and so on can do the same thing. But after you've watched two thousand hurdlers you've got all of that knowledge in the back of your head and you match it against a skilled movement, and I seem to be able to say to somebody, 'Just lift the head,' and it works. And for some reason I seem to be able to slow the movement down, it's almost like – hard to describe, it's like a slow-moving movie. You know, people see somebody run over a hurdle and it's just very quick and all of the movements blur into one another. I seem to be able to zero in on it very quickly and so, as I say, I've got a good eye. And I think the best coaches, just like the best sportsmen – I mean, they said about Bradman that Bradman had this ability to be in position early because he could see what was going to happen and anticipate it. I think with good coaches, I think they have the same ability. I think they see things, quickly analyse them – *very* rapidly analyse them – and then make a suggestion, and if that suggestion doesn't work they'll come up with an alternative and so on. So I think that's what the athletes, the Australian athletes, liked in me being able to say something that worked, and it was this ability to see movement, I think.

Did your coaching change much over that thirty-year period?

No, it probably became more and more [reliable and I became more confident]. I always thought that the people who were great coaches who I saw overseas would be people who, first of all, had enormous knowledge and I'd have to acquire this kind of knowledge. But not really. I really found the more I coached the more basic I became, the more fundamental – skills are based on mechanical principles and the principles don't change. And I used to try ideas out for myself. I think I became better at that, and more risk-taking. For example, with Glynis Nunn, I remember going to the World Championships in Helsinki. She was warming up for the event on the warm-up track and she was going to run the hurdles and I dropped the hurdles, made them lower, because I wanted her to finish with a very fast movement, and if the hurdles are lower you can run faster over them. And so we set out five hurdles and she would do over three, over four, over five and so on. And I did this, and she was (laughs) brilliant looking, she looked fantastic, really quick, which is what I wanted. The last movement with me I wanted her to go on the track travelling really fast. And as I finished I'd dropped them three inches, I hadn't seen anyone else do

this but this is just something I tried. I tried other ideas with her, like getting her to shorten her last step just before the hurdle to speed up forward rotation. In a long jump people try and prevent forward rotation by dropping the hips and doing a range of things. Now, forward rotation happens and so I thought, 'Well, in hurdling it would be good if we got the forward rotation, if we got the head to move quickly over the hurdles.' So I got her to do – and she was a great one, I'd come up with ideas, I'd just be thinking about something the night before training, I used to watch a lot of film on video and I'd say, 'I wonder if,' you know, constantly, 'wonder if this would work.' And I'd try it on Glynis. Glynis was a great performer, because she loved working with me and we'd try these ideas out and they usually worked. So I'd try them out on others and then they'd work as well. But anyway, this day I was working with her. She went out, and a Russian coach had been watching me, and he came over – and he spoke very limited English but he came over – and he said something like, 'Very good.' And I said, 'Ah, thank you very much.' And he pulled an interpreter over and said – he knew what I was doing – and he said, 'It is very good. You are' – he said, 'I've watched, watching you working, very good coach.' I said, 'Oh, that's very kind.' Next day he came back and handed me a little book written in Russian with lots of photographs and he was the Russian hurdles coach and he'd written in the front in Russian something to the effect, 'To John Daly,' which I thought was – being accepted by a peer group was just marvellous. I mean, somebody like that who was – he was an elderly man, obviously he had the same kind of thought processes as I had. He did what I did and suddenly noticed me doing the same thing for the same kind of reasons and thought, 'This guy knows what he's talking about.' So that gave me a lot of confidence.

So, in answer to your question, I don't think I changed a great deal. I think I was more prepared to take risks, a lot of the risks worked and so on. But essentially I loved working at that high level where you're really dealing with hundredths of a second and, you know, it's not like coaching a school kid to do hurdles where it's a kind of very basic crude skill. Working with Olympians is refining and finding the hundredth of a second. It's minute, the changes are minute, you have to have a very good eye and that sort of thing, and I just – I *loved* that, that was just fantastic. I just lived on that, that was great.

In the other sections of the interview, I've asked you for your – those who have influenced you, those from whom you've learnt. You might say something about that, but also have you any protégés? Have you handed on your skills or enthusiasm to others?

In answer to the last question, probably no, other than [my wife] Judy. Judy's a good coach, she's been a very good athlete and she's coaching school children now, and she coaches not the same way I do, but she has developed some of those coaching skills, and she'll often [ask me], 'What would you do?' and 'I'm going to give them these things to do, what do you think?' She'll often ask me questions, 'What about this training load as against that training load?' And I'd say to her, 'They're both good. I don't know – just make a decision, you know, but one is not better than the other. It depends on the energy system you're working on. If you're working on speed this is the kind of thing you have to do.' So she in a way is a kind of protégé. But people have been critical in Adelaide, I have to say, of me – what was the term used? Alan Launder used it at one stage, he said, 'It's like you're a tall tree in a forest and you don't allow growth around you. And in a way what you ought to be doing is' – because Alan, I think, encouraged a group of coaches to revolve around him and develop coaching experience. I operated very much as a loner on my own. I was criticised by that particular group for being always with the Australian team, always being successful. They thought that I was very privileged and favoured with the national team to go away as national coach, and there was a lot of resentment among the coaching fraternity. They felt it particularly, I think, with me – for some reason that I had some kind of hold over Athletics Australia, or that Athletics Australia favoured me. They certainly did favour me, but I think it was the result of the athletes asking for me. But in answer to your question, protégés, no. I didn't have assistant coaches. And that's the nature of me, very independent. Yes, very independent. So if anything, they would see that, and others would see that perhaps, as a weakness.

Any influences on your coaching in terms of people? You said your father and Brother Noel and Jess Jarver.

I think they've been the ones. I mean, the ones early in my career. I don't think any in my later career because I tended to experiment and operate on my own, and so I can't think of suddenly coming across people who really had an influence on me. No, those early influences were very powerful influences, and certainly I respected

them. No. No. I respected other coaches, I mean, you mentioned Peter Fortune earlier who coached Cathy Freeman. I've always had a lot of time for Peter Fortune, who coached Freeman. I recognize good coaches when I come across them. I don't come across many, I have to say, and that's probably again that would be – people would criticise me for that because they'd say, you know, I don't suffer fools gladly – and I recognize worth, but I recognize worth only in a few people. Fortune is one of those, and Ron Dewhurst – the guy who coached Raelene Boyle – was very good. He and I had a very good relationship. And Ray Boyd, who coached the hurdlers – good coach. I respect those people and they know it. But they're very few and far between, I think.

Have you written anything about coaching?

I've written articles on coaching and chapters of books, I've written about relay running, coaching the relay teams, and sprinting. Jess Jarver printed a lot of those books, and in fact he's been very successful in America with his coaching books and produced some really seminal kind of studies of coaching, and usually got me to write the articles in the coaching books on sprinting and hurdling and relay racing. So yes, I've been published, but I haven't written a particular text on coaching because I coached sprinters and hurdlers. I didn't coach the full gamut [field events as well as track] whereas Jess did. So Jess was able to write books, and he wrote books on coaching school athletics and coaching athletes and coaching elite athletes and usually got me to write the section on sprints and hurdles and relays.

Changing things quite a deal, more reflective questions, I suppose. Currently we've got a big issue about drugs in sport.

Yes.

You were pretty close to athletes –

Yes.

– and lots of our athletes grizzled about the Eastern Europeans in particular.

They did.

How endemic were drugs in sport? Without naming names –

No, no.

– were any Australians involved.

No. Peter, it was a question that towards the end of my coaching career with the Olympic team, when I came home from the Olympics the press would interview me about how the Australians did and all of that sort of thing, and invariably the media would say something about drugs like you're saying. And they would ask, 'Now, look, you're close to the Australian team, how many of the Australian team take drugs?' I didn't know, and I had to say to them, 'Look, I have no idea.' It would be naïve to say that some of the athletes didn't use drugs. In fact I had my suspicions about some, and in fact I can think of one occasion with an athlete who ultimately was pinged – and I won't mention her name – but I suggested that – she was training in Germany – that the Australian Sport Drug Agency who were testing overseas might call in to Germany and do a test there. Just really to make her aware of the fact that she was susceptible to testing while she was away. She was under enormous influence from coaches who I knew advocated [drugs] in field events, so she would be made very susceptible to using drugs to enhance her performance. I suspected a number of athletes, a number it was proven to be. There were occasions when athletes in the first four – and I won't mention names here – but athletes who make the first four in an Olympic Games are all tested. I have sat in a room waiting for an athlete to pass a specimen and be tested, and I can think of two occasions – and, you know, I won't mention the athlete, but I can think of two occasions – when I said to the athlete, 'Do I need to be worried?' Which suggested that I was probably a bit concerned, but I thought they might have been. But they were clear. But who knows? (laughs) I mean, there are a lot of athletes who are now being caught out because they were on drugs and it's only just being detected. And I'm disappointed to hear John Gormley who's just come back – he's been working with Tatiana and the Russian pole vaulters – and he was telling me that the disappointing thing about having gone away to Europe for the *Grand Prix* meets is that already there are alternatives to the drug that they've just discovered how to test for. There are alternatives to that already on the market. And so – – –. And we know that if you're looking at the Australian Olympic team, if you're going to be a successful – – –.

END OF TAPE 4 SIDE A: TAPE 4 SIDE B

[And we know that if you're looking at the Australian Olympic team, if you're going to be a successful] thrower, if you're going to be a successful weight lifter, probably ninety per cent of those people who perform at the international elite level are using performance enhancing drugs, and why wouldn't an Australian?

I'm pleased with Australia in that [this country] has decided that if you are caught taking drugs you will not represent the country at the Olympics. You will *not*. Now, there's a two-year ban by the International Athletics Federation, but the Australian Olympic Committee has said, 'If you're caught taking drugs, forget about representing your country at the Olympics.' Now, I think that's great, and I think drug takers, quite frankly, should be banned for life. And I think the major problem is with the United States, not with China and these other countries, but with the United States. But I can remember going to a meeting when [the Olympic ban for Australian athletes caught using drugs] was announced. I was in Canberra at the Institute of Sport and the Australian athletic team were there – in fact, *all* of the Olympians from recent teams went there – and John Coates, who was President of the Australian Olympic Committee, said, 'We're going to do something about it, and I'm telling you now, I'm telling you as a group, if you have a positive sample and your second sample proves positive you will not go away with the Australian Olympic team. Period. You can take us to court, I'm making it quite clear now.' And I can remember a South Australian athlete, a hammer thrower, who in fact put up his hand – and this is one of the Carlin boys, had a lot of respect for him, had a great ability, constantly under threat to have to take drugs, but as far as I knew never did – but Sean put up his hand and he said, 'All we want to do is make the Australian Olympic team. Now, the performances that you say we have to reach to be included in the Australian Olympic team are based on people who take drugs.' And John Coates admitted that was true. And he said, 'If you're really serious with us, what you'll do is you'll in fact make a judgment and the standard won't be as high, you'll discount the top two or three performances in the world.' And John Coates said, 'No, we're not prepared to do that.' So it's tough on the athlete. Because first of all they have to make – you know, the great ambition is to be an Olympian, and they set the standards and say, 'If you get that standard you'll be an Olympian,' and the standards are based on world performances, of which we know most are performed with using drugs. So I think it's tough. I think the athlete's got a very tough task. And it would be a

remarkable test of character – I mentioned Sean, I'm a great believer that Sean was clean and a good technique man, a fantastic technique man, and a lot of people I know in Europe said to him, 'Listen, you've just got to go to the next stage and you can be great.' And so he must have been constantly under pressure because he was a very good technician. And Russians and Germans admired him – big, strong man who threw well – and said, 'You've just got to do what's required.' And as far as I know he never did. He was certainly always clear and I believe that, so that's the answer to your question.

Another sort of retrospective type of question – your association with Athletics Australia, you were the Head Coach, Team Manager for athletics, did you have any other tasks, jobs, from time to time?

Not while I was Head Coach and Manager. I got on very well with [Athletics Australia]. Rick Purnell was the Executive Officer and he and I were really good friends, and there was a sense of trust and mutual respect between us. I developed a technique of when I went away with teams of managing the funds – I did most of the booking from here at Bridgewater, booked 'planes to go round the world. I've handled budgets of a quarter of a million dollars, several million dollars, and I've always brought change home because what I used to do was, when athletes moved out of their quarters, I'd close off the room and I'd go to promoters and I'd say, 'Well, you want one of our athletes, you've got to pay for accommodation – we're staying in Cologne or we're staying in London and so on,' so I did a lot of negotiating and got British Athletics to pay for a bus here and a bus there and pick up the tab. If they wanted us to compete in Birmingham we'd go up but they'd have to provide accommodation and so on. So we did pretty well and Athletics Australia were happy about that because they'd had managers in the past who usually ran out of money. And I remember my last Games in Barcelona I came home and I think I brought home sixty thousand dollars. And they rang up and said, 'You've done really, really well. As a reward we'd like to offer you and Judy an opportunity – we've sent over some brochures – for a week's holiday.' So we went to Port Douglas at the expense of Athletics Australia because they'd got – you know, I'd done so much haggling, I guess, really, for them. So they were really good to me. They did that very well.

When I retired, they were looking for a full-time National Coach of Australia, and they contacted me and said, 'Look, you've been away for thirty years, you must know all of the top coaches in the world,' and I said, 'Yes, I do, I know them by first name.' And they said, 'There's a coaching conference coming up in Paris – would you be interested in going and talking to some of these coaches?' And I said, 'Yes, I would.' And anyway, the upshot of all of that was that I went to the meeting in Paris, there was a *Grand Prix* meeting in Paris, there was a coaching conference in Paris, and then there was a big *Grand Prix* meet in London so I went to London. And I talked to – oh, dozens and dozens of coaches asking them would they be interested in coming out to Australia in preparation for 2000, and a lot of them would be. There were some great names. And so I came back and wrote a report, put down all the details and said, 'These coaches are interested.' But they didn't follow through on it, and what they did was first of all they appointed Phil King – which is fine, but then I couldn't believe it, I read in the paper that after Phil King they'd appointed this East German guy who'd been a drug abuser. I was out of athletics by then, but I was pleased to hear that some of the Australian athletes said they would not work – Erckhardt, I think it was, is that right? Yes, I think ---.

Arbeit, I think it was.

Arbeit, Arbeit, you're right, Arbeit was the name. Notorious as a drug user. And it would have been like taking Charlie Francis, who was Ben Johnson's coach – I mean, we used to call him 'the chemist' on circuit. We knew (laughs) what he was about. Used to worry me every time he sat down alongside an Australian athlete and I could hear the conversations going on and I was sort of thinking, 'I hope he's not advocating drugs to the Australian athletes.' But we knew who these people were. But I was pleased to think the Australian athletes said – some of them – said they would not work under him, and I thought, 'Well, that is pretty good if they do that.' So that's the only other task I've had, I think. No others.

Again, a reflective sort of question – you were part of a pretty successful revival in Australian athletics, say, after 1976 setting up of the Institute of Sport. How has it gone in that latter part of your period, or in the last few years?

I think it's gone very well. I think I said to you before it's interesting now that we've been so successful that countries like Canada, England, New Zealand are often looking for Australian coaches who've proved themselves to be so successful. I think

Australia enjoys an enormous reputation in terms of success in sport, and all of that really was developed in the '70s. And [in] the book that's just been written by John Bloomfield called *Australian success in sport* [which] has come out recently in the last six months – I'm about to review it – he pinpoints a whole range of those kinds of things. The development of the Sports Institute in Canberra, the local sports institutes that made it possible for young athletes in, say, gymnastics – they didn't have to leave home. I mean they were some of the problems, early problems, of the Institute in Canberra, that you'd have to send an eleven-year-old girl to Canberra to do gymnastics, so Dad would have to give up his job and the family would have to move if they wanted to keep the family together. So seeing sense in having local sports institutes where it wasn't so disruptive of family, all of that in fact has worked quite well. I think Australian sport – you're right, I think it goes back to the mid-'70s and the late '70s and the development of the Sports Institute. That period of time really, if we look back on it, was a very successful time – the establishment of the Coaching Accreditation Scheme, all of that was pretty good. The professionalisation of sport. I would never have become a professional athletic coach, but towards the end of my career I was being asked if I wanted to coach full-time at the Institute – I was asked to be Head of the Institute, but I would never have been a full-time professional coach. I just loved being an academic and I liked the old English approach of, 'Hey, this is my real job, but ---.' And everyone at the university knew, 'Four-thirty? John Daly is gone.' Four-thirty to seven-thirty was coaching time. And the university, fortunately, viewed it as my public service. We were all expected to do things in public service, my public service was committed to coaching. I didn't charge for coaching – [charging fees has] now become the practice with people that are very good. They charge so they're not out of pocket. In the early days they used to be out of pocket because they'd go to the Nationals and it would cost me to go there and be there and be accommodated. I remember Glynis Nunn in the early days saying to me – [the Nationals were] in Queensland, I think – and she said to me, 'JD, what day will you be at the Nationals?' And I said, like, 'I won't be there.' And she said, 'What?' And I said, 'Well, I can't afford to go this year,' so I didn't go that year. But I never had to pay to go to the Olympics. I was well provided for. I mean, I wasn't paid as a coach, but the university paid my salary and it was a good university salary, and all my accommodation and travel costs and

everything were met, and uniforms, all of that, were found, all expenses found by the Athletics Australia.

Okay, John, starting to wrap up now. I've got again a reflective type of question: what do you regard as your major achievements that make you – you know, give you a warm, fuzzy feeling? Any initiatives that weren't too successful? Do you have any regrets that something you could have carried on a bit longer and achieved something there and you decided not to?

No, I don't think so. In fact, it's been interesting doing this interview with you, that it's brought all of it together – you know, my early life, my professional life and my public life. They've all had an influence on one another. I think there's no single achievement. People would think, I know, that you'd look at, say, something like a gold medal of an athlete and say, 'Well, I helped Glynis to get that,' that in fact might be the major achievement. But it isn't, really, it's just one of them. And I think becoming a professor, I think writing books, completing my PhD, coaching successfully, being respected in public life as I have been, people knowing me when I go anywhere – all of those things suggest that my life has been full of achievement. I've got no regrets. I think I've tried to be the complete person, and that's why I take an interest in painting and writing and reading and all of those kind of things – I guess the kind of – yes, renaissance-type man, (laughs) I think, of having – being accomplished in all the things you do. When we first started this interview, you asked me, I think, what drove me, and I think it's the quest for excellence and I think it still is. And I think I've done my best in all the things I've done and so that's been very satisfying. So I've got no regrets, no.

How has this been recognized?

Well – – –.

The point of this interview is the fact that you have at least an Australian award, so what awards and distinctions have you got, and why were you appointed to the Order of Australia?

Well, I guess public recognition, there's certainly that. And that still happens, people still – when I mention my name or when I'm introduced people know who I am. And so (laughs) that gives me a warm, fuzzy feeling, I guess, I mean, being known. And people recognizing you for either sport or – usually for sport. I mean, the average guy who comes here to work on the property will suddenly say, 'Aren't you John

Daly and weren't you the Olympic Coach?' and that sort of thing, and I find that's rewarding. Again, it's not very humbling, is it, to say it? But I find that appealing. I was surprised to get the Order of Australia. I never really thought about it. It was never an ambition. But it was an award for achievement in sport, and I got the impression that it was an achievement not for producing somebody like Glynis Nunn or being a good athlete myself, or being a good coach, but in many ways contributing to the Australian system. I think it was because of the Institute of Sport, the Coaching Accreditation Scheme, a composite of all of those kind of things, and so the citation that went with it was not for achievement – no, it's 'for contribution to Australian sport'. And so I think the fact that Australian sport has been successful, I think I was one of many people in the '70s and '80s who contributed to that, who recognized that there were weaknesses and that we needed to do things, and it started with that letter to *The Australian* in 1976 and it just went from there, I think.

Righto, John, unless you've got anything else to contribute you think that we've overlooked, we'll leave it there. So thank you.

Well, no, I've appreciated it, Peter. I think it's been a talk through my life and yes, I'm rather pleasantly surprised that we've touched on so many things. But I've appreciated this, so it's been nice to talk with you. Thank you.

Well, thank you there, John.

END OF INTERVIEW.