

# More than a game: globalization and the post-Westernization of world cricket

CHRIS RUMFORD

*Department of Politics and International Relations, Royal Holloway,  
University of London, Egham, Surrey, TW20 0EX, UK  
chris.rumford@rhul.ac.uk*

**Abstract** *In this article I argue that, rather than focusing on the global diffusion of cricket and the reasons why it has been adopted in some countries but not others, the relationship between globalization and cricket is better understood in terms of the post-Westernization of the international game. The post-Westernization of cricket is associated with the rise to prominence of the One-Day International (ODI) vis-à-vis the more traditional Test match format and this, in turn, is associated with a shift in the balance of administrative power away from Lord's (in London) towards Asian cricket, centred on India, and the relocation of the ICC to Dubai. In this shift, the ODI has been utilized by India as the means to prise power away from the traditional centres.*

**Keywords** CRICKET, GLOBALIZATION, POST-WESTERNIZATION

---

Consider these two images of cricket as a global sport. First, the announcement by the International Cricket Council (ICC) that it will open a global cricket academy in Dubai. Facilities will include, 'a 30,000-capacity stadium, three other cricket grounds, indoor training and fitness facilities. The project will open in 2007 and will be available to all of the ICC's 92 member countries' (BBC News 29 September 2004). Second, the Taliban seeking ICC recognition for cricket in Afghanistan (back in 2001), a country with little tradition of domestic cricket and where the majority of current players have lived in exile in Pakistan for many years (McCarthy 2001). Afghanistan is now an affiliate member of the ICC and in 2006 its national team completed a first tour of England (BBC News 11 June 2006).

The first image conforms to a familiar pattern associated with the globalization of sport: a world governing body; a high proportion of the world's nation-states being members; location of the administrative centre in a global city – Dubai (for commercial rather than sporting reasons); the professionalization and standardization of the game – the global academy 'will be a focal point for the training and development of cricket players, coaches, umpires, curators and administrators' (Long 2005). The

second image points to the importance of global culture in shaping national expectations (Lechner and Boli 2005). For the Taliban, sporting participation was viewed as a vehicle for wider international diplomatic recognition. The conventional interpretation of Islamic fundamentalism poses it in opposition to globalization. The Taliban's policies have certainly been viewed in this way, with its efforts to ban recorded music, preventing its people from watching TV, and outlawing the education of women, for example. But the Taliban did not attempt to avoid global modernity, rather it sought to create a space for itself within global culture. As Beyer points out, writing about Islam and globalization more generally rather than the Taliban, 'the central thrust is to make Islam and Muslims more determinate in the world system, not to reverse globalization. The intent is to shape global reality, not to negate it' (Beyer, quoted in Robins 1997: 42). For the Taliban, cricket was considered a sport that could be compatible with both Islam *and* its global aspirations, and therefore a port of entry into the wider world of international relations. Cricket benefited from this global cultural imperative in large part because it satisfied the Taliban's strict interpretation of the Islamic dress code; 'Mullah Omar had decreed that, unlike athletics, football or swimming, playing cricket did not require any part of the body to be revealed to the public' (Guha 2001).

Both images point to an important aspect of the globalization of cricket, namely its post-Westernization. Recent years have seen a power shift in cricket administration away from the traditional 'Western' centres of power towards the Asian countries (symbolized by the relocation of the ICC headquarters from London to Dubai) fuelled by the increasing importance of one-day cricket and the prominence of the one-day international match (ODI) as both a televisual cricketing spectacular and a major revenue generator. If globalization has its 'winners and losers' then India has emerged as a winner in recent years, while places such as South Africa and the West Indies can be considered losers (Gupta 2004). In many ways, India is the focal point for both the globalization of cricket – a new focus for generating cricket finance through massive TV audiences and administrative leadership – and for the post-Westernization of the game. As the themes of globalization and post-Westernization are central to the account in this article it is to these theoretical constructs to which we must first turn.

### **Globalization and post-Westernization**

The relationship between globalization and sport is often seen as contradictory. On the one hand, a world championship competition is pivotal to most major sports (football, rugby, boxing) and the Olympic Games is still the pre-eminent tournament for many other sports, especially track and field athletics. However, it is worth noting that two of the most 'global' sports, golf and tennis, manage quite nicely without a world championship as such, organized instead around four 'major' tournaments. World Cups can be considered a key vehicle for globalization in the Robertsonian sense, namely the 'compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole' (Robertson 2002: 8). During a World Cup competition the world becomes a single space of competition within which competitors and supporters aim

for their team to be the world's best, acknowledged as such by the rest of the world. World championships and world cups thereby reinforce globalization; the world becomes more interconnected and is viewed in organizational terms as a single place.

At the same time, sport is often seen as reinforcing national identification; the biggest championships are competed for by national teams, or are organized in such a way that individuals represent their nation-states. This has led to interpretations that emphasize the potential for resisting globalization inherent in organized sport (Rowe 2003), or that more commonly assert the necessity of nationalist sentiment for the success of global competition. It is fair to say that one of the central issues in the literature on globalization and sport is the tension between the nationalist dimension of competitive sport and its globalization, the first dimension not necessarily constituting a barrier to the second. For example, for Scholte, 'global spectacles like the Olympic Games and various World Cups have also thrived on nationalist sentiment' (Scholte 2000: 163). For Hedetoft (2003), that sport can easily be utilized as a vehicle for national identity is due to its competitive nature. International competition can take on an importance symbolic dimension: 'in this world of competing sovereigns, the playing-field is much more level than in the reality of military, political or economic competitive processes. Here all stand a chance, even the smaller nation-states, who can occasionally enjoy the compensatory pleasure of defeating their bigger brothers' (Hedetoft 2003: 71–2).

However, it would be a mistake not to interrogate the national–global nexus a little further. In recent years national sport has also developed a marked post-national dimension. For example, in England premiership football has become post-national in many respects: leading clubs have fielded teams containing 11 'foreign' players (in other words, players not qualified to play for the national team); top premiership teams play in the European Champions League, which has created a strong non-national focus for domestic football; foreign ownership of leading clubs is increasing; the Bosman ruling has created a greater, EU-derived, mobility for players; leading clubs such as Manchester United and Chelsea promote themselves as global brands (Roche 2007). Thus, globalization is not only to be equated with the global scope of the game, or the fact that the World Cup is a global televisual event, or that footballers can become global icons. The structure and orientation of the domestic game has also been transformed by globalization.

English cricket has been subject to the same global forces and the domestic game has experienced a similar form of 'globalization from within', and a post-national game has emerged as one consequence of globalization. More so than in the case of football, cricketers are tempted to qualify to play for a country other than that of their birth (in the current England team that is true of several players, Andrew Strauss and Kevin Pietersen – both South African born – and Geraint Jones – born in Papua New Guinea, raised in Australia), although this is certainly not just a recent phenomenon. Cricket also has its equivalent of the 'Bosman affair' and 'Kolpak' players are an increasing feature of the English game. Maros Kolpak was a Slovakian handball player in the German league who lost his place in the team because of a league quota

on non-EU players. He disputed the ruling as unfair and won his case at the European Court of Justice. The implication of the decision for English cricket is that players from non-European countries that possess trade agreements with the EU are now protected by EU employment law. This means that in England a foreign player with a work permit must, if coming from a 'Kolpak' country (such as South Africa, Zimbabwe, and the Caribbean islands), be treated the same as a domestic-qualified player and not be subject to the quota of overseas players (currently two per team) that applies in the English domestic game. In this sense, English cricket, like football before it, demonstrates a strong post-national dimension, although this situation is by no means replicated in other cricket-playing countries to anything like the same extent (in Australia rugby has a much stronger post-national dimension than cricket). 'In theory county teams in the future could have no England-qualified players' (Mark Newton, chief executive of Worcestershire County Cricket Club, quoted in Gough 2004).

The idea of post-Westernization has become an important one in recent years (Delanty 2003, 2006), and cannot simply be equated with the ending of the cold war, the bipolar world order, and the decreasing salience of the idea of the 'West' as a reference point for political identification and global leadership. Post-Westernization is a process or series of processes with a number of key dimensions. First, post-Westernization signals the increasing lack of unity within those countries formerly considered to have a common 'Western' world view (such as divisions over the invasion of Iraq in 2003, or action on climate change). In the cricketing context this can be related to the divisions between the ICC and England over playing matches in Zimbabwe during the 2003 World Cup. Against a background of domestic political protest urging England not to play in Mugabe's Zimbabwe the England team chose to frame its concerns in terms of security, and England's players, backed by the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB), refused to travel to Zimbabwe. 'The ECB had hoped that the death-threat letter they received from an organization called Sons and Daughters of Zimbabwe, would act as the key evidence to support their case' (BBC News, 15 February 2003). However, the ICC ruled that the venue was safe and that England should play. England forfeited the match and, in the process, seriously reduced its chances of qualifying for the next stage of the competition. During the same tournament New Zealand forfeited a match scheduled to be played in Nairobi, Kenya, also citing security concerns. Significantly, Sri Lanka took a different approach and played its match in Nairobi as scheduled.

Second, post-Westernization involves the recognition that there is no one single global modernity. What we have instead is a *mélange* of different modernities – Western, post-communist, Islamic – rather than the expansion of a singular Western modernity (Karagiannis and Wagner 2006; Therborn 2003). When applied to cricket this calls into question the assumption that what needs to be explained, in relation to globalization, is the global diffusion of the sport and the reasons why the game has been more successfully transplanted/adopted in some countries than others. Thus, while cricket is rightfully associated with British colonialist expansion and was successfully 'exported' to many colonies (Australia, India, South Africa) it did not

become established in Canada and the USA, for example, at least not after the end of the nineteenth century (Kaufman and Patterson 2005). Third, post-Westernization alerts us to the emergence of a new East capable of shaping global affairs, previously seen as the preserve of the West. In cricketing terms, the balance within ICC membership has shifted, 'non-Western nations now prevail and their numbers continue to grow with Bangladesh already a new Test playing nation' (Gupta 2004: 268).

The post-Westernization of cricket is closely related to the growing tensions between the two versions of the game. The traditional 'first class' version played over three, four and, in the case of international or 'Test' matches, five days, exists alongside the newer, and in many ways more marketable and therefore revenue-generating, 'one-day' or limited-overs version of the game (it should be noted that the same professional players participate in both versions of the game). The two formats, while existing to a certain extent in a state of tension (in the sense of competing for space within busy schedules), are organized in parallel by a common governing body, the ICC. The growth of the ODI has been dramatic (after a slow start – the first ODI was played in 1971, the second not until 18 months later). In 1976 there were 6 ODIs, by 1986 this figure had risen to 62, by 1996 127, and in 2006 159 ODIs were played. There are also more Test matches scheduled nowadays: in 1976 there were 23 Tests, 30 in 1986, and 28 in 1996. In recent years the figures have increased sharply with 46 in 2006. The figures were even higher in 2005 (48) and 2004 (51).

It is argued that the existence of two formats for the game of cricket, and the rapid expansion of ODIs in recent years (assisted by the establishment of major one-day tournaments – especially the World Cup and Champions Trophy – which have also permitted a greater range of counties to play international cricket, for example Hong Kong, Ireland, the Netherlands, Canada and Kenya) has allowed for the globalization of the game and, of particular importance, has allowed for the former British colonies, in Asia especially, to become more equal players in this nascent global sport; a crucial aspect of what I have termed post-Westernization. It could be argued that the globalization of cricket consists in the struggle between the Asian cricketing countries (especially India) and the traditional centres for control of the game, the crux of which is the issue of the balance between Test matches and ODIs.

### **Rethinking globalization and cricket**

Cricket is a sport not normally thought of as having a strong global dimension, despite being played on five continents. It is played mainly in the countries of the British Commonwealth but because it is not an Olympic sport it maintains a low profile outside of the circuit of cricket playing nations. Cricket does have a world governing body, the ICC, and a World Cup competition every four years, a key marker of global aspirations, as in other sports but does not possess global superstars, players known widely outside the game, although the exploits of great players such as Don Bradman, Garry Sobers, and Imran Khan have eventually filtered through to a wider public. Current cricketing greats such as Shane Warne, Sachin Tendulkar and Brian Lara will

never achieve the global recognition of leading figures from other sports: Tiger Woods, Ronaldinho, Roger Federer. Thus, cricket cannot easily claim to capture the global sporting imagination and because of its many peculiarities, not least of which is that a match can be played over five days without necessarily producing a winner, it is commonly seen as a sport for aficionados rather than a sport with mass appeal. The rules can seem complex, the progression of play incomprehensible: it is not always possible easily to answer the question 'who's winning?', a definite turn-off for the casual spectator. There are other apparent limitations: cricket is conventionally thought of as a quintessentially English summer sport, a game of the upper-classes exported around the world through colonialism, and limited to a few countries that have little claim to international sporting excellence (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka). For all of these reasons it is easy to conclude that it will never 'go global'.

Accounts of cricket as a global game, or more commonly why cricket must fail in an attempt to globalize, tend to centre on the extent to which it has become 'indigenized' and accepted in different settings (or not). Thus, the key to globalization is thought to be the ability of recipient countries to nationalize, naturalize and otherwise make the sport culturally authentic in a colonial/post-colonial setting. In countries where it has become embedded as a national sport, cricket is no longer 'an English mystery. It is an Australian game and as much at home in Africa or Asia or the Caribbean as in Canterbury and Hove' (Reynolds 1975: 242). It has been said that 'Indians have indigenized cricket and that it is more Indian than English' (Sethi 2004). Nandy expresses this sentiment more strongly, opening his book *The Tao of cricket* with the provocative assertion that 'Cricket is an Indian game accidentally discovered by the English' (Nandy 2000: 1). This section will critically evaluate a number of approaches to understanding the spread of cricket in various parts of the world before elaborating on the central issue in relation to the globalization of cricket: the emergence of India as one of 'cricket's superpowers' (Runciman 2005), and the shifting balance in the world game between Test and one-day cricket.

In their historical account of the global spread of cricket, Kaufman and Patterson argue that cricket became 'successfully diffused to most but not all countries with close cultural ties to England' (Kaufman and Patterson 2005: 82). They focus on the cases of Canada and the United States and aim to explain the failure of cricket to become properly established in these countries. Their account emphasizes the role of cricket in the diffusion of colonial values from England to its colonies and highlights the role of local elites and cultural entrepreneurs in popularizing and indigenizing the sport. In the case of Canada and the USA, despite early successes in establishing the game in the 1800s, 'cricket became a marker of high social status, and the game was not promoted among the population at large (Kaufman and Patterson 2005: 99). A key element in the global cultural diffusion of cricket is the 'ability of some groups of recipients to dominate or otherwise limit access to cultural imports, thereby "capturing" such imports for themselves' (Kaufman and Patterson 2005: 106). In the USA and Canada access was 'overprotected' by elites, thus preventing cricket from becoming part of the cultural landscape. In contrast, in many other colonial societies cricket became attractive to all major social strata: 'In India, for example, love for the

game was spread through the organization of matches between ethno-religious groups, each of which welcomed talented players from within their communities regardless of rank' (Kaufman and Patterson 2005: 99).

The ability of cricket to become part of the 'national patrimony', to use a phrase employed by Kaufman and Patterson, has been remarked upon by many commentators in the case of India. The work of Arjun Appadurai (1996) is important in this regard, and the best (perhaps only) example of a leading theorist of globalization turning his attention to cricket. He is drawn to question how cricket has become 'Indian'. This question has been 'answered' in different ways, including the explanation associated with Ashis Nandy that was alluded to above and that is inherent in the idea that there is a 'mythical structure beneath the surface of the sport that makes it profoundly Indian in spite of its Western historical origins' (Appadurai 1996: 90). Appadurai's own explanation proceeds from the idea that indigenization is the result of nationalist experimentation with modernity (entry into the wider community of nation-states), rather than the adoption of imported cultural norms *per se*. For Appadurai a key moment in Indian cricket was the transcendence of traditional cricketing norms and values – the primacy of Test matches, traditional codes of on-field behaviour associated with amateur or 'Victorian values', nationalist struggles against former colonial masters – when cricket 'moved into yet another, post-national phase, in which entertainment value, media coverage, and the commercialization of players' (Appadurai 1996: 108) would dominate. In this new world of one-day cricket (ushered in by Australian media magnate Kerry Packer's 'World Series Cricket' in the late 1970s) 'the Victorian code and nationalist concerns are subordinated to the transnational flow of talent, celebrity, and money' (Appadurai 1996: 108).

While this development certainly helps us to understand the pivotal role of one-day cricket in transforming the world game in a way that the argument by Kaufman and Patterson does not, Appadurai recognizes that it does not by itself account for the Indian passion for cricket, or why, in his words, 'it is not just indigenized but the very symbol of a sporting practice that seems to embody India' (Appadurai 1996: 110). The answer to the question of why cricket became 'so profoundly Indianized' (Appadurai 1996: 111) is complex, but consists of several key components. It became an emblem of Indian nationhood and allowed many different groups within Indian society to experiment with the 'means of modernity': state bureaucrats could manipulate nationalist sentiment, entrepreneurs could master the media through advertising, the viewing public could engage with national competition, the working classes could exercise group belonging. In sum, the 'producers and consumers of cricket can share the excitement of Indianness without its many, divisive scars' (Appadurai 1996: 112–13).

The key theme to emerge from Appadurai's account is the changing nature of cricket during the 1970s – the onset of one-day cricket, commercialization, professionalization – and the way in which these changes allowed for a shift in power, away from the traditional cricket establishment towards both commercial concerns and the Asian cricketing nations, especially India. Writing in the mid-1990s Appadurai could discern the emerging patterns in world cricket but was not able to

witness their full development; a decade further on, the new world order of cricket has crystallized around the increasingly global image of the ODI.

Gupta makes the point that for most sports globalization has typically followed the patterns witnessed in most areas of international relations – control of wealth, technology and marketing leading to the domination of ‘Western’ nations over the rest. Cricket is different: ‘it is a game where the non-Western countries have begun to dominate not just on the field, but more importantly, in shaping the economies and politics of the game’ (Gupta 2004: 257). Central to this argument is the idea that while cricket is on the rise in the traditional peripheries of the game, it is in decline in the core countries. This aspect of cricket’s transformation can be overstated. For example, Gupta argues that the power shift has been aided by the fact that cricket ‘has a diminishing status as a sport in the country of its origin – England’ (Gupta 2004: 274) and is very much second to football as a national game. It is worth noting that the idea that English cricket (stereotyped as an upper middle-class or elitist sport) never enjoyed the mass appeal of football (with its working-class associations) can easily be challenged. According to John Arlott (1975: 29–30) cricket enjoyed its ‘pop’ age in the immediate postwar period, filled with glamorous sporting figures and national heroes (Hutton, Compton, Trueman, Laker). However, the next generation of players had less mass appeal. According to Arlott, ‘Cricket fell upon hard times. In 1966, when England’s footballers won the World Cup, soccer finally superseded cricket in the majority public imagination’ (Arlott 1975: 29). It is true that English cricket lost ground against other sports in the 1970s and 1980s due to its perception as a tradition-bound relic of a former age coupled with the often woeful performances of the national team, but has since enjoyed a period of stability, even prosperity. This has been made possible by stronger financial foundations throughout the county game (through the revenues generated by the one-day game), the professionalization of coaching and administration of the national team, and the multiculturalism of the domestic game (the current England team contains one player from a Sikh background, Monty Panesar, and another from a Muslim community, Sajid Mahmood). In the past few years the England team has become one of the best in the world (at the time of writing ranked the second best Test team in the world by the ICC). Moreover, England has pioneered a new cricket format, 20/20, an even shorter version of the one-day game that has proved to be very popular (and financially lucrative) at both domestic and international level since its introduction in 2003. International 20/20 matches are becoming a significant part of the ODI calendar and 20/20 looks set to become an even more important component of the globalization of the game: inclusion at the 2010 Commonwealth Games in Delhi has already been mooted.

Gupta makes a strong case for the transformation of cricket under conditions of globalization, particularly the non-Western countries shaping the economics and politics of the game. Television and modern information and communication of technology have created the possibility for cricket to be a global game, feeding ‘diaporas that support their team across frontiers [through] technology that provides real-time global coverage of the sport’ (Gupta 2002). What is clear from this account is that the central feature of the globalization of cricket has been the shift of decision-

making power to the non-Western, former peripheries of the game. The Asian cricketing nations, led by India, have managed to wrest much control from the traditional centres. This power shift has been driven by political ambition, new communication and media technologies, and the market power of large TV audiences, and has only been held back by the political tensions between India and Pakistan, which prevent a 'common front' being constructed among Asian cricketing countries.

Despite this lack of unity, 'South Asia, with its tens of millions of enthusiastic supporters, its super-rich internationals, its strong financial base and its over-compensating administrators, has gradually begun to replace Western control with Eastern control' (Majumdar 2006). One reason for this is that TV audiences for cricket (both domestic and among expatriates) is huge. According to Marqusee, 'cricket in the subcontinent is an ideal vehicle for multinational corporations seeking to penetrate "emerging markets"'. And, thanks to satellite television, subcontinental cricket can be used to sell goods in Europe, North America, the Middle East and South-East Asia' (Marqusee 2004, quoted in Gupta 2004: 265). India alone 'produces 60 per cent of world cricket's income' (Bose 2005) and draws the largest TV audiences. Moreover, India has emerged as a major superpower in world cricket, in both the sense that its national team is among the world's best and also because India, through its financial and media influence on the game, has shifted the centre of gravity of cricket from Test matches to ODIs. Not everyone sees this as a positive development. From Runciman's (2005) point of view, 'the rise of India as the centre of the cricketing world does not bode well for test cricket, for the simple reason that in India the one-day game remains much more popular. Most Indian cricket fans would far rather their team win the next World Cup than that they become the number one team in test cricket'.

### **The ICC as global entrepreneur**

The ICC has recently moved its headquarters from Lord's (in London) to Dubai. It has calculated that this move will bring benefits other than tax concessions. According to Malcolm Speed, chief executive, cricket's biggest audiences are in the Indian sub-continent: 'In those four countries [India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh] there is a great passion for cricket. That is 22 per cent of the world's population. They are huge economies that are growing rapidly. ... Much of our revenue now comes from that region. ... We moved to Asia. It was a deliberate move' (*Cricinfo News*, 17 June 2006). For most of its existence the ICC has not had anything like this level of global awareness.

The International Cricket Council, established in 1907 as the Imperial Cricket Conference, has until recently been 'dominated by the white nations of the Commonwealth. Thus it was England, Australia, South Africa and even tiny New Zealand that set the rules for the game and guided its economics and marketing' (Gupta 2004: 260). For most of its existence it has acted as traditionalist and gate-keeper, promoting a conservative view of the game (ODIs were not played until 1971, with the first World Cup staged in 1975, despite the fact that competitive one-day

cricket had been part of the English domestic game since 1963), and restricting access to new Test playing nations, keeping Sri Lanka out of the Test arena until the 1980s, for example (Gupta 2004: 261). Indeed, Marqusee argues that it was a combination of the amateurism and parochialism of the ICC, subsumed as it was to the imperialistic MCC, that prevented cricket from developing as a truly global sport during the twentieth century, 'unlike football, cricket's spread remained confined to societies under the direct rule of the British Empire' (Marqusee 2005).

Until recently the ICC has been anything but a force for the globalization of the game. It failed to encourage Test playing nations to play against each other, leaving matches to be organized bilaterally. For example, it allowed apartheid-era South Africa to avoid playing the West Indies, India or Pakistan (Marqusee 2005). However, recent years have seen important changes. The modernization of the game, which has accelerated since the 1980s (as Marqusee points out, neutral umpires did not stand in Test matches until the late 1980s when they were introduced by Pakistan) has created new divisions within the game. Put simply, 'the ICC has been riven by conflict between the South Asian and Anglo-Australian blocs. The South Asian bloc's economic and political clout is formidable and the Anglo-Australians have found that reality hard to swallow' (Marqusee 2005). The 'power shift' has encountered further problems – allegations of match-fixing and corruption, particularly surrounding matches played in Sharjah (United Arab Emirates), and political tensions between India and Pakistan, which have limited sporting contacts between the two nations.

Earlier, it was commented that cricket has been incapable of producing globally-recognized sportsmen, even from the ranks of the truly great performers. It has, however, recently thrown up a major figure who has earned a global reputation. Jagmohan Dalmiya has had a huge impact on world cricket over the past two decades both in terms of placing India at the forefront of the global game and in the wider sense of modernizing cricket and its finances to an unprecedented degree. He has been recognized by the *International Journal of the History of Sport* as one of its three 'foremost statesmen of modern sport in the last quarter century' (Taylor & Francis press release, undated), the others being Sepp Blatter (football) and Juan Samaranch (Olympic movement). He was thus recognized for having 'helped to change the face of the world in the last 25 years through sport', his 'lead in making South Asia the hub of cricketing activity', and for playing a 'substantial role in ensuring the shift of power, prestige and prominence of the sport to South Asia from where it was before' (*The Hindu*, 17 July 2005). Although he was a controversial ICC president (and continues to be a controversial cricket administrator in India) Dalmiya shaped the game decisively during his term of office between 1997 and 2000. In particular, he was instrumental in expanding the ICC's programmes around the world – the globalization of the game, as it became known in ICC parlance – and generated greater revenue from sponsorship and television rights. One key to achieving this was to create a coherent programme of international cricket. As Malik (2006) writes:

One of Dalmiya's gifts to cricket was the five-year international cricket calendar. Till the early 1990s, cricket matches were negotiated bilaterally. The Indian cricket board met the Pakistani board and agreed to tour in month X; then it met the New Zealand board and agreed to host their team in month Y. Gaps were filled in with *ad hoc* tournaments, and tours conceived or cancelled at short notice. A certainly hierarchy was built into this. England, for instance, toured the subcontinent on sufferance. Australia gave India a series down under once a decade. ... The ICC calendar changed all that. It made it incumbent for every team to play every other at regular intervals, home and away.

Another of Dalmiya's achievements prior to his stint at the ICC was to bring the 1987 and 1996 World Cups to the subcontinent, and in doing so start to unsettle the balance of power between the traditional centres and the subcontinent. This also helped to consolidate the important status of the ODI in India (following on from their World Cup triumph in 1983) and generate the economic power base that has done so much to shift the balance of power. In the case of the 1996 World Cup Dalmiya, negotiating on behalf of India, managed to out-manoeuvre England and Australia by winning the support of the ICC associate members (non-Test playing members) by promising them a greater share of the financial rewards from the event.

### **Concluding comments: cricket – more than a game**

One of my favourite cricket books when I was a teenager was entitled *Cricket: more than a game* (Sheppard 1975). The subtitle refers to the way sporting values associated with cricket transcend the status of mere 'games' and can offer guidelines for 'playing by the rules' in life more generally. It also alludes to the way in which an understanding of cricket – how it is played and by whom – can help us understand the complexities of English, Australian, or Indian society, for example. The book appears quite dated now, especially since it was 'designed to be published on the eve of the first-ever one day series between international teams for the Prudential Cup' (jacket blurb) – the first World Cup, in other words – and yet it fails to devote a single section to one-day cricket. This neglect is ironic because the intervening 30 or so years have indeed shown international cricket to be 'more than a game'. In fact, it is two games – Test matches and ODIs. Globalization has driven the two formats further apart and created two circuits of international cricket, both of which are so heavily scheduled that there is barely enough time in the calendar year to fit some 50 Test matches and 150 ODIs.

In this article I have highlighted the important developments associated with the post-Westernization of cricket, a series of developments that point to more than the reorganization of the administration of the game away from the imperial centres of cricket. The shift in the balance of power towards the Asian cricketing countries has helped to keep within bounds major disputes that have upset the smooth operation of the global game over the past decade or so and helps us understand how a game that

could have been riven by colonial and post-colonial suspicions and inequalities has survived into the twenty-first century. One such point of contention surrounds accusations of ‘chucking’ (an infringement of the rules whereby the bowler throws rather than bowls the ball, this being a difficult accusation to prove or disprove). Several leading players from Asian countries have found it extremely difficult to remove the stigma of ‘chucking’, including two of the world’s leading bowlers, Shoaib Akhtar of Pakistan and Muttiah Muralitharan of Sri Lanka. There is suspicion in the Asian cricketing world that the authorities have unfairly singled out Asian cricketers, while non-Asian bowlers have had their actions approved much more readily. At the same time, the Anglo-Australian cricketing world remains suspicious of the motives of the ICC in relaxing the rules concerning the straightening of the arm so central to allegations of ‘chucking’.

Other disputes have the ability to drive further a wedge between West and East. One such incident took place during the series between England and Pakistan in August 2006. Pakistan forfeited the fourth and final Test of the series (the first time a forfeiture had occurred in 129 years of Test cricket) as a result of its players’ unwillingness to retake the field of play following a ruling by the match umpires that they had ‘tampered’ with the ball (namely changed its condition intentionally and for their own advantage). The Pakistan team’s refusal to take to the field was designed to register a protest against the allegation of cheating. An ICC hearing subsequently cleared the Pakistan captain Inzamam-Ul-Haq of ball-tampering but he was banned for four matches for ‘bringing the game into disrepute’.

The success of cricket in transcending the East–West divide is often underestimated, according to Andrew Miller. In his reflections on the ‘ball-tampering incident’ (Miller 2006) he makes a valuable point:

But I’ll tell you what cricket really is. It’s a bridge between cultures that might otherwise have drifted apart with scarcely a backwards glance. OK, so it’s rooted in its colonial heritage, which is right at the crux of the issue that is eating the game this morning, but how grateful is the world right now for even the slightest insight into the psyche of the other?

It is also worth bearing in mind that it is likely that a dispute such as this can be resolved more easily, any injustice felt by Pakistan addressed more convincingly, and any lingering resentment of prejudicial treatment ameliorated by a global cricketing context in which, until 2006, the president of the ICC was a Pakistani, Ehsan Mani. Cricket now operates within a global frame, and its success in ‘bridging East and West’ pointed to by Miller is in reality evidence of the post-Westernization of the sport. Cricket could not have become a global sport while it was structured according to the hierarchies of imperial legacy. Divisions in the game arising from ‘chucking’, ball-tampering, match fixing, sledging, walking, time-wasting, and the balance between Test cricket and ODIs, all of which have been issues central to the running or the playing of the game in recent years are thus best understood, not in a post-colonial context, but in a post-Western one.

## References

- Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arlott, J. (1975) 'England', in J. Sheppard (ed.) *Cricket: more than a game*, London: Angus & Robertson, 19–36.
- Bose, M. (2005) 'Coming of age' [review of 'Twenty-two yards to freedom: a social history of Indian cricket' by Boria Majumdar], *The Wisden Cricketer*, 18 March.
- Delanty, G. (2003) 'The making of a post-Western Europe: a civilizational analysis', *Thesis Eleven*, 72, 8–25.
- Delanty, G. (2006) 'Introduction: the idea of a post-Western Europe', in G. Delanty (ed.) *Europe and Asia beyond East and West*, London: Routledge, 1–7.
- Gough, M. (2004) 'Counties fear Kolpak', BBC News, 3 March.
- Guha, R. (2001) 'A man from Kabul', *The Hindu*, 2 September.
- Gupta, A. (2002) 'South Asia dominates cricket', *Daily Times*, 13 December.
- Gupta, A. (2004) 'The globalization of cricket: the rise of the non-West', *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 21, 257–76.
- Hedetoft, U. (2003) *The global turn: national encounters with the world*, Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.
- Karagiannis, N. and P. Wagner (2006) 'Introduction: globalization or world-making', in N. Karagiannis and P. Wagner (eds) *Varieties of world-making: beyond globalization*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Kaufman, J. and O. Patterson (2005) 'Cross-national cultural diffusion: the global spread of cricket', *American Sociological Review*, 70, February, 82–110.
- Lechner, F. and J. Boli (2005) *World culture: origins and consequences*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Long, J. (2005) 'Rod Marsh appointed a Director of Coaching at ICC Global Cricket Academy', [www.icc-cricket.com/icc-media/content/story/218368.html](http://www.icc-cricket.com/icc-media/content/story/218368.html)
- McCarthy, R. (2001) 'Afghan applause just isn't cricket', *Guardian*, 18 May.
- Majumdar, B. (2006) 'Cricket cultures in conflict', BBC News, 28 February.
- Malik, A. (2006) 'Of money and muscle', *Cricinfo Magazine*, February.
- Marqusee, M. (2004) 'A magnet for long-distance nationalism', *The Hindu*, 17 September.
- Marqusee, M. (2005) 'The ambush clause: globalization, corporate power and the governance of world cricket', in S. Wagg (ed.) *Following on: cricket and national identity in the postcolonial age*, London: Routledge.
- Miller, A. (2006) 'What a horrible mess', *Cricinfo Magazine*, 21 August.
- Nandy, A. (2000) *The Tao of cricket*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reynolds, S. (1975) 'The grand old limey game', in J. Sheppard (ed.) *Cricket: more than a game*, London: Angus & Robertson, 241–7.
- Robertson, R. (2002) *Globalization: social theory and global culture*, London: Sage.
- Robins, K. (1997) 'What in the world's going on?', in P. Du Gay (ed.) *Production of culture/ cultures of production*, London: Sage, 11–47.
- Roche, M. (2007, forthcoming) 'Europe, the "cosmopolitan condition" and European sport', in C. Rumford (ed.) *Cosmopolitanism and Europe*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Rowe, D. (2003) 'Sport and the repudiation of the global', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 38, 281–94.
- Runciman, D. (2005) 'Cricket's superpowers', *London Review of Books*, 27(18), 22 September.
- Scholte, J. A. (2000) *Globalization: a critical introduction*, Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Sethi, R. (2004) 'Diaspora and the global market', *Tribune*, 28 November.
- Sheppard, J. (ed.) (1975) *Cricket: more than a game*, London: Angus & Robertson.
- Therborn, G. (2003) 'Entangled modernities', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6, 293–305.