

**CAN CRICKET BE USED AS MULTI-TRACK DIPLOMACY IN  
THE CONTEXT OF INDO-PAKISTANI RELATIONS? WITH  
PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE PERIOD BETWEEN 1999  
AND 2005**

BY EMILY CRICK

Academic Year: 2005/6

Word Count:

*'This dissertation is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of MSc in Development and Security';*

*'This dissertation contains no plagiarism, has not been submitted in whole or in part for the award of another degree, and is solely the work of Emily Crick.'*

## **DEDICATION**

This dissertation is dedicated to all the cricket fans, journalists, administrators and players that helped or encouraged me write to it. Those that deserve a special mention are Anisa Khan, Rahul Bhattacharya, Osman Samiuddin, Andrew Miller, Shaharyar Khan, Mike Selvey and Steve McVeagh.

Further thanks must go to Mike McGuire whose help has been invaluable and to Hazel Zanelli and Hannah Parrott who reminded me how close the deadlines were.

Emily Crick, 20<sup>th</sup> September 2006

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BCCI – Board of Cricket Control in India

BJP – Bharatiya Janata Party

CBM's – Confidence-Building Measures

ECB – England and Wales Cricket Board

ICC – International Cricket Council

MNC's – Multi-national corporations

ODI – One Day International cricket matches

PCB – Pakistan Cricket Board

SAARC – South Asian Association of Regional Co-operation

## CONTENTS:

Introduction	pg. 5
Chapter One: Theoretical Analysis of Confidence Building Measures	pg. 10
Chapter Two: Sport is war minus the shooting	pg. 24
• Sport and International Relations	pg. 24
• Cricket in Asia	pg. 25
• Indo-Pakistani Cricketing Ties and Indo-Pak relations	pg. 29
• Cricket and National Consciousness	pg. 37
Chapter Three: Cricket as a bridge of peace	pg. 43
• Cricket as Track II Diplomacy	pg. 49
• Cricket as Track III Diplomacy	pg. 50
• Interaction between Tracks I and III diplomacy through cricket	pg. 56
Conclusion	pg. 59
Appendices:	
• Indo-Pakistani Relations: A timeline	pg. 72
• Indo-Pakistan Bilateral Cricketing Relations: A timeline	pg. 74
• Interview with Shaharyar Khan, Chairman of the PCB	pg. 75
• Interview with Bob Woolmer, Pakistan cricket coach	pg. 80
• Interview with Rahul Bhattacharya, Indian cricket journalist	pg. 83
• Interview with Professor Shetty, BCCI board member	pg. 84
• Interview with Rameez Raja, former CEO of the PCB	pg. 85
• Interview with David Morgan, Chairman of the ECB	pg. 86
• Interview with Nasser Hussain, former England cricket captain	pg. 88

**CAN CRICKET BE USED AS MULTI-TRACK DIPLOMACY IN  
THE CONTEXT OF INDO-PAKISTANI RELATIONS? WITH  
PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE PERIOD BETWEEN 1999  
AND 2005**

**INTRODUCTION:**

It is the contention of this thesis that the role of cricket in Indo-Pakistan relations between 1999 and 2005 both reflects, and is used to further, diplomatic relations between India and Pakistan in particular within the ‘multi-track’ system. Two opposing theories regarding the benefits or costs of the relationship between sporting and international relations will be examined in order to analyse this hypothesis.

One position would hold that cricket can help unite divided groups of people. This argument is typified by Chairman of the Pakistan Cricket Board and former Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, Shaharyar Khan who contends that cricket can be used as a way to connect fractured nations, regions and peoples.

‘Cricket can form the perfect bridge of internal and inter-state peace between peoples...’<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Shaharyar Khan, ‘*Cricket; A Bridge for Peace*’, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005, pg. 181

An alternative view suggests that sport highlights nationalist tensions within and between countries and therefore has a negative impact on international relations. George Orwell took a similar stance in a regularly cited article written in 1945 entitled 'The Sporting Spirit'.

'Serious sport has nothing to do with fair play. It is bound up with hatred, jealousy... and sadistic pleasure in witnessing violence: in other words it is war minus the shooting.'<sup>2</sup>

These two opinions will be reviewed within the context of India/Pakistan cricket matches with particular emphasis on the period between 1999 and 2005.

In order to consider the premise that 'sport is war minus shooting' an analysis will be made of the links between cricket and national consciousness in inter-state and intra-state situations. This argument will then be contrasted with the way in which cricket has been used as a Confidence-Building Measure (CBM) between India and Pakistan. The mode through which this operates is Track II and Track III diplomacy. This thesis will investigate of the role that cricket has played between India and Pakistan, and try to establish whether cricket can be used as a form of 'multi-track' diplomacy and whether it harms relations between India and Pakistan or has no affect at all.

---

<sup>2</sup> George Orwell, 'The Sporting Spirit' in (eds.) Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell Volumes 1-4*, Penguin Books, London , 1994, pg. 323

**Background:** The term ‘cricket diplomacy’ was first coined by General Zia, President of Pakistan in 1987 after he watched an India/Pakistan Test match in Jaipur during a period of high tension between the two countries. Zia used the cricket match as a pretext for meeting members of the Indian government, which helped lay the groundwork for explaining misunderstandings, and therefore improving relations between the South Asian neighbours. Shortly after this however, cricketing relations were broken off and the two countries did not play each other again in bilateral matches on home soil until 1999 when the Pakistan team toured India and Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee visited Pakistan to sign the Lahore Declaration. This cordiality was short-lived; India broke off sporting ties after the Kargil incident in May 1999. Cricketing ties were not re-established again until January 2004. Between 1999 and 2004 the two nuclear neighbours came close to fighting another war. In March 2005 General Musharraf, President of Pakistan visited Delhi on the pretext of watching an ODI match between India and Pakistan, and he stayed three days for informal talks. This thesis aims to analyse the extent to which cricket is able to not only overcome the political tensions between India and Pakistan but also act as a positive force in reducing them.

Whilst this may not be a generalizable phenomenon; within South Asia it is between only India and Pakistan that cricket is held to be so closely tied to national and international relations – India and Sri Lanka have not broken off cricketing ties despite Indian involvement in the civil war and the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi by a suspected Tamil separatist; Pakistan and Bangladesh also have no history of cricket being used a diplomatic tool despite their relationships. This suggests that there is something special about the relations between cricket and Indo-Pakistani relations.

**Data Sources:**

In order to carry out this investigation I travelled to Indian and Pakistan and interviewed a variety of cricket administrators, former players and journalists from the sub-continent. These interviews form the basis of the primary research with academic articles, news articles and books on cricket in India and Pakistan used to supplement to the argument. Neither the primary qualitative data, nor the secondary theoretical evidence, can provide a definitive explanation of the complex interaction between cricket and diplomatic relations in the Indo-Pakistani situation; however they are a useful indication of the prevailing trends.

**Contents:**

Chapter One will review the theoretical literature regarding Confidence-Building measures in general and Track II and Track III initiatives in particular.

Chapter Two analyses the negative aspects of cricket and both internal and international relations. It starts with a general review of sport and international relations, discussing the way the Olympics have been used on occasion to highlight political points. The relationship between cricket and Asia is then considered with a deeper analysis of the way Indo-Pakistan relations has been reflected in their cricketing relations. Finally a review of the way cricket connects to national consciousness and more importantly religious divisions in India.

Chapter Three looks at the way cricket can be a unifying force within countries and regions. By using short case studies of two cricket series – Pakistan’s trip to India in



1999 and India's return trip to Pakistan in 2004 – this chapter focuses on the way cricket can act as Track II and Track III diplomacy. Interviews with Indian and Pakistani cricket administrators, journalists and former players carried out by the author have been used to contribute to the academic studies regarding multi-track diplomacy. These interviews point towards the positive contribution cricket can make by increasing people-to-people contact.

The final chapter will review the various arguments made in this study and then draw broad conclusions about the way in which cricket can be used as multi-track diplomacy. It will highlight some fundamental differences in the ways in which India and Pakistan use 'cricket diplomacy' and assess whether it can really make any difference on the protracted conflict between the two nations.

## **CHAPTER ONE – THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES**

This chapter will examine the theoretical basis of Confidence-Building Measures (CBM's) with particular focus on 'tracked' diplomacy in the realm of international relations. The discipline of international relations is largely centred on notions of power, military security, strategic studies<sup>3</sup> and conflict. Within this discipline there are various schools of thought: realists and neo-realists; liberals; structuralists; critical theorists; constructivists; and postmodernists.

Realists argue that conflict is inevitable due to competition between states and that 'the balance of power' is the way to regulate world affairs<sup>4</sup>. Neo-realists take this idea one step further; they suggest that the anarchic international system is responsible for war and violence<sup>5</sup>. Both realists and neo-realists accept the world as they find it and do not promote alternative and critical thinking on peace, conflict and security<sup>6</sup>.

As with realism, liberalism applies rationalist economic theory to the field of international relations<sup>7</sup>. It argues for limited government, scientific rationality and democratic freedoms<sup>8</sup>. Liberals claim that democratic societies that protect civil liberties and have free-market economies can help contribute to a peaceful global society<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup>Farhan Hanif Siddiqi, 'Conflict Resolution and Peace: Conceptual and Theoretical Concerns' in *Paradigms of Conflict Resolution*, ed. Moonis Ahmar, University Press Ltd. Dhaka, 2003, pg. 32

<sup>4</sup> Francisco Rojas Aravena, '*Human Security: emerging concept of security in the twenty-first century*', United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, 2002, pg. 5 [www.unidir.org](http://www.unidir.org)

<sup>5</sup> Siddiqi, pg. 32

<sup>6</sup> Siddiqi, pg. 33

<sup>7</sup> Christian Reus-Smith, 'Constructivism' in Burchill, Devetak, Linklater, Paterson, Reus-Smith & True, '*Theories of International Relations*', Palgrave Macmillian, Basingstoke, 2001, pg.209

<sup>8</sup> Scott Burchill, in Burchill, Devetak, Linklater, Paterson, Reus-Smith & True, pg. 29

<sup>9</sup> Burchill, pg. 63

The structuralists maintain that conflict is associated with certain power structures that are sources of direct and indirect violence<sup>10</sup>. The critical theory school does not assume that institutions, social and power relations should be taken for granted, but questions their roles within power relations and conflict. It looks at the origins of these structures and analyses how they might change<sup>11</sup>.

Postmodernism takes these ideas even further by challenging the role modernity has played in producing an 'inhumane and materialist ethos in the name of Enlightenment'<sup>12</sup>.

The constructivist approach challenged both the rationalism of the neo-realists and neo-liberals and the meta-theoretical analysis of the critical theorists<sup>13</sup>. Constructivism focuses on the importance of normative and ideational structures, such as identity or religion in creating political consciousness<sup>14</sup>. Constructivists look beyond the confines of the nation state in order to understand political and social action.

Whilst realism and neo-realism assume that wars will continue as a natural matter of course; structuralists, constructivists, critical theorists and postmodernists try to analyse the ways in which political and social structures contribute to conflict. CBMs require a move away from the idea of competition and conflict towards co-operation and community.

---

<sup>10</sup> Siddiqi, pg. 36

<sup>11</sup> Siddiqi, pg. 41

<sup>12</sup> Siddiqi, pg. 41

<sup>13</sup> Reus-Smith, pg. 209

<sup>14</sup> Reus-Smith, pg 209

## **Theories of Conflict:**

*Moonis Ahmar* suggests that there are five paradigms that shape conflict: the international system; state structures; society; the group; and individuals<sup>15</sup>. Traditional methods of conflict resolution, such as diplomacy, focus largely on state structures and the international system. Non-traditional methodologies, such as peacemaking and peacekeeping, the media, economic incentives, the role of NGOs, Tracks I, II and III diplomacy – including CBM's - and gender emancipation<sup>16</sup>, work within all five paradigms in order to promote peace or conflict.

*Johan Galtung* proposed a triangular model of conflict, where the vertices are C – contradiction; A – attitude; and B- behaviour<sup>17</sup>. He argues that all three elements must be present for a 'full conflict'<sup>18</sup>. In order for resolution to take place, the conflict must be de-escalated, there must be a transformation of attitudes and the relationships or interests that are at the base of the conflict must be changed<sup>19</sup>.

*Galtung* argues that there are two definitions of peace: negative peace – an absence of violence; and positive peace – a system in which conflict can be resolved without recourse to violence<sup>20</sup>. During the peace process there are four distinct stages: the creation of conditions for the cessations of hostilities; negotiations; the signing of agreements; dealing with post-settlement challenges. Within the South Asian region the first two stages have largely been reached, however moving to the next stage is difficult when mistrust continues on all sides and when the stronger party – in the South Asian

---

<sup>15</sup> Ahmar, pg. 18

<sup>16</sup> Ahmar, pg. 24

<sup>17</sup> Oliver Ramsbotham & Tom Woodhouse, '*Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts*', Polity Press, Malden, MA. 2005, pg. 14

<sup>18</sup> Ramsbotham & Woodhouse, pg. 15

<sup>19</sup> Ramsbotham & Woodhouse, pg. 15

<sup>20</sup> Siddiqi pg. 38

context, India – tries to implement peace on it's own terms, with scant regard for the weaker party<sup>21</sup>. This is where CBM's can be used to breakdown the mistrust.

The geopolitical situation in South Asia is such that India dominates the region in most attributes of national power, for example: in terms of population; size; natural resources; and GDP<sup>22</sup>. India poses a further threat in that none of the other countries in South Asia share borders except with India, however India has land or maritime borders with them all - this leads to a deep-seated insecurity complex regarding India's hegemonic desires and the fear that it may want to impose its own version of the Monroe Doctrine<sup>23</sup>. Political relations between South Asian countries are governed largely by realist and neo-realist theories; diplomacy is carried out through official channels and is influenced by ideas of 'national interest', 'national identity' and 'national security'<sup>24</sup>.

Within conflict resolution theory there is a now an emphasis on the 'bottom-up' process of peace-making as well as the traditional 'top-down' networks<sup>25</sup>. This has led to an increased sensitivity of culture and an understanding of the important role to be played by grassroots organisations in multi-track diplomacy<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>21</sup> Siddiqi, pg. 39

<sup>22</sup> P.R. Chari, 'The Need for Confidence-Building Measures' in (eds.) Monique Mekenkamp, Paul van Tongeren & Hans van de Veen 'Searching for Peace in Central and South Asia', Lynne Reiner Pubs, Boulder 2002, pg. 237

<sup>23</sup> Chari, pg. 237

<sup>24</sup> Navnita Chadha Behera, 'Forging New Solidarities: Nonofficial Dialogues' in (eds.) Monique Mekenkamp, Paul van Tongeren & Hans van de Veen 'Searching for Peace in Central and South Asia', Lynne Reiner Pubs, Boulder 2002, pg. 210

<sup>25</sup> Ramsbotham & Woodhouse, pg. 18

<sup>26</sup> Ramsbotham & Woodhouse, pg. 19

### **Confidence-Building Measures:**

The US State Department defines CBM's as 'Agreements between countries to increase openness, mutual understanding and communication designed to reduce the possibility of conflict....'<sup>27</sup>

CBM's are practical actions aimed at creating co-operation and breaking down mistrust. It is suggested that national interests can be boosted when countries use political and diplomatic means to defuse mutual tension and help create the atmosphere for the resolution of existing conflicts<sup>28</sup>. They can be used to construct new forms of both military and civilian relationships in order to change the nature hostility and mutual perceptions<sup>29</sup>.

CBM's are 'arrangements designed to enhance assurance of mind and belief in the trust-worthiness of states... confidence is the product of much broader patterns of relations than those which relate to military strategy. In fact the latter have to be woven into a complex texture of economic, cultural, technical and social relations.'<sup>30</sup>

In the 1990's there was a significant psychological change in the mindset of the South Asian political elite; conflict resolution, formally seen as an irrelevant Western paradigm,

---

<sup>27</sup> US State Dept. definition in 1985 in Mussarat Qadeem, 'The Debate on Non-Nuclear CBM's in South Asia' in *Paradigms of Conflict Resolution*, ed. Moonis Ahmar, University Press Ltd. Dhaka, 2003, pg. 160

<sup>28</sup> A.Z. Hilali, 'Confidence- and Security-Building Measures for India and Pakistan', in *Alternatives: Global, Local and Political*, Vol 30. 2005, pg. 191

<sup>29</sup> Hilali, pg. 191

<sup>30</sup> Johan Jorgen Holst, 'Confidence Building Measures: A Conceptual Framework', *Survival* 25 (1) Jan-Feb 1983, in P.R Chari, pg. 237

became more fashionable<sup>31</sup>. It was realised that if a positive peace was to be established within the asymmetric situation of South Asia, the issue of mistrust must be addressed. CBM's have been used throughout the world as a starting point for the rebuilding of trust between nations and groups<sup>32</sup>.

### **Military CBMs:**

There are two forms of CBM – military and non-military. Military CBM's can promote trust by providing tangible assurances that weapons will not be misused, however they are ultimately negative in character because all they can do is aim to prevent conflict rather than reduce the causes for it.

Military CBM's were used in Europe during the Cold War in order to increase trust between the Eastern Bloc countries and the West.<sup>33</sup> Some of these have been used as models for Indo-Pakistani CBM's. Hotlines between political and military leaders have been established; these were initially set up during the Brass-Tacks Crisis of 1986-87, and have been expanded to cover sections of the Line of Control (LoC). They were used when Kashmiri militants attempted to cross the LoC from Pakistani Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK) into Indian Jammu and Kashmir (J&K)<sup>34</sup>. The main objective of these hotlines is to inform both parties of military exercises, airspace violations and defuse

---

<sup>31</sup> Sundeep Waslekar, '*Track-Two Diplomacy in South Asia*', Arms Control, Disarmament and International Security (ACDIS) occasional paper, October, 1995, pg. 8, [www.acdis.uiuc.edu](http://www.acdis.uiuc.edu)

<sup>32</sup> P.R. Chari, pg. 237

<sup>33</sup> Examples include the Helsinki Act (1975) which established the idea of observers monitoring military exercises; the Stockholm Accord (1986) which mandated NATO-Warsaw Pact observers and required that military exercises should be given in advance; The Vienna Agreements (1990, 1992) called for information to be shared on military deployments, weapons programmes and military budgets. See P.R. Chari pg. 239

<sup>34</sup> Hilali, pg. 200

tensions along borders<sup>35</sup>. Since the nuclear tests by both countries in 1998, Nuclear CBM's have been enacted in order to reduce the threat of nuclear war<sup>36</sup>.

### **Non-military CBMs:**

Non-military CBM's are more positive in tone than their military counterparts, as they are designed to diminish mutual suspicion by expanding areas of co-operation and increase interactions between antagonistic nations<sup>37</sup>. Non-military CBM's are far more wide expansive and can range from solving territorial and water disputes such as the Indus Water Treaty (1960), the Tashkent Agreement (1966); to more wide ranging CBM's such as the Simla Accord (1972) and the Lahore Declaration (1999)<sup>38</sup>; agreements have also been established on cultural exchanges such as music, movies<sup>39</sup>; free movement of people including the easing of visa restrictions and the establishment of trans-border bus services<sup>40</sup>; increasing commerce and trade; the exchange of information through the media; and collaboration in science and technology<sup>41</sup>. The re-establishment of cricketing ties between the two countries can also be seen as a non-military CBM.

Non-military CBM's can be carried out by non-state actors as well as through official channels. Non-state mechanisms for change can include trade, the private sector,

---

<sup>35</sup> Hilali, pg. 200

<sup>36</sup> Examples of Nuclear CBM's include the establishment of lines of communication to warn of accidental, unauthorised or unexplained nuclear incidents. Pakistan has also offered a nonaggression pact and suggested discussing a nuclear test-ban. See Hilali, pg. 200

<sup>37</sup> Qadeem, pg. 160

<sup>38</sup> Hilali, pg.199 & Qadeem pg. 166.

<sup>39</sup> Indian 'Bollywood' movies were banned in Pakistan until 2006 but in April this year President Musharraf lifted the ban. This allowed some Indian films to be seen in Pakistani cinemas. *Reuters News Agency*, April 26, 2006

<sup>40</sup> The opening of a bus services between Delhi and Lahore was established during the Lahore Summit of 1999 and more recent bus services have been set up between Srinagar and Muzaffarabad (the capitals of J&K and AJK respectively) and between Poonch and Rawalkot. BBC News 'Second bus service begins' [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/5097230.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/5097230.stm) (20/06/06)

<sup>41</sup> Qadeem, pg. 160-161



increased communications<sup>42</sup> and NGO's. The non-authorized flow of people across borders, such as refugees and smugglers has highlighted the tribes, communities and ethnic groups that have been divided by state boundaries<sup>43</sup>. This has also increased the need for non-military CBM's.

Whilst both military and non-military CBM's can contribute to improving relations between India and Pakistan, there are as many criticisms of such measures as there are benefits.

Critics of the CBM paradigm argue that they cannot bring about dramatic breakthroughs in the fundamental issues.<sup>44</sup> *Sheen Rajmaira* notes that while there are theoretical potentials for CBM's to reduce both perceived and surprise attacks; it is unlikely that they can actually prevent war. He suggests that they have a limited utility in the subcontinent because the political-security regime is such that recourse to conventional and nuclear war is politically viable. Whilst he argues against expecting too much from CBM's until the political environment changes; he points out that they do have a role in changing the situation and could help reduce the severity and frequency of conflict<sup>45</sup>.

Although CBM's are designed to reduce suspicion and mistrust, if they are not implemented fully this aim can be negated<sup>46</sup>. An example of this is the failure to hold to the agreements in the Simla Accord – one of the clauses was that there should be no unilateral changes to the LoC, however this has been broken many times, not least the Kargil incident in 1999<sup>47</sup>.

---

<sup>42</sup> Satellite technology has challenged the states' monopolies on the flow of information, as satellite TV and radio stations are able to be seen across borders. See Behera, pg. 211

<sup>43</sup> Behera pg. 211-2

<sup>44</sup> Behara, pg. 226

<sup>45</sup> Hilali, pg. 205-06

<sup>46</sup> Chari, pg. 245 & Qadeem, pg. 162

<sup>47</sup> Chari, pg. 245

Lines of communication that have been established as CBM's can be subject to suspicion. The information shared during the Brass-tacks crisis of 1986-87 was not regarded as reliable because of mutual mistrust. Therefore some conclude that CBM's work better in times of peace than heightening tensions<sup>48</sup>.

Ultimately if the two sides are not sincere in their desires to resolve the conflicts CBM's can do little<sup>49</sup>. It might be assumed that national leaders want to reduce military expenditure and prevent conflict; however in India and Pakistan there are powerful domestic constraints that erode the impact of CBM's – this 'strategic enclave' in India consists of retired civil and military officials politicians, scientists and journalists who share faith in a militaristic or realist approach to national security<sup>50</sup> and therefore are suspicious of CBM's.

Hostile propaganda in the media and school books, as well as street politics in both countries can also impinge on the ability of leaders to enact CBM's. Rajiv Gandhi and Benazir Bhutto wanted to improve relations in the late 1980's but were held back by domestic constituencies<sup>51</sup>. Relations between India and Pakistan have also been negatively affected by provocative statements by politicians, frequently made during elections in order to prove they are not 'soft' on national security issues<sup>52</sup>.

Other actors that have a major impact on Indo-Pakistani relations are extremist pressure groups whether religious or political. Shiva Sena, the Hindu fundamentalist group has opposed sporting ties between the neighbours – going as far as digging up the cricket pitch in Delhi before the Pakistani tour to India in 1999; Pakistani-Islamists have argued

---

<sup>48</sup> Chari, pg. 242

<sup>49</sup> Hilali, pg. 217

<sup>50</sup> Chari pg. 238 and footnote 4

<sup>51</sup> Qadeem, pg. 167

<sup>52</sup> Qadeem, pg. 167

that there is not point in re-establishing economic relations until the Kashmir issue is resolved<sup>53</sup>; and terrorist acts such as the attack on the Indian parliament in December 2001 or the Mumbai train bombings in July 2006 can create strain on bilateral relations.

### **Multi-track Diplomacy:**

Lederach describes a ‘holistic peace-building framework’ with a variety of contact points that can encourage constituencies for peace more effectively than traditional diplomatic processes<sup>54</sup>.

As mentioned earlier, CBM’s can be carried out by non-state actors as well as governments. Diplomacy generally follows along various ‘tracks’. *Navnita Chadha Behera* describes the various ‘tracks’ as follows:

- Track I diplomacy consists of officially sanctioned dialogue such as the Simla Accord (1972) or the Lahore Declaration (1999).
- Track II diplomacy consists of policy-related discussions that are informal and unofficial in nature but are connected to government agendas and often involve the participation of government officials in their private capacity. It is also known as ‘shadow’ diplomacy and aims to influence or inform public policy.
- Track III diplomacy relates to ‘people-to-people’ contact. It is entirely separate from government and aims to build new constituencies for peace. Its aim is to change

---

<sup>53</sup> Hilali, pg. 214-25

<sup>54</sup> Sean Byrne & Loreleigh Keashly, ‘Working with Ethno-political Conflict: A Multi-modal Approach’, in *Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution*, (eds.) Ramsbotham & Woodhouse, Frank Cass, London, 2000, pg. 98

public attitudes and mobilize public pressure on respective governments to resolve disputes.<sup>55</sup>

Multi-track systems can bring together different groups that all have their own approaches to peace-building that can help contribute to a wider effort of reducing conflict<sup>56</sup>. *Byrne and Keashly* note that alternate groups can promote the peace process, 'It is our perception that private citizens are looking for opportunities for how they can become involved and make a difference'<sup>57</sup>.

*Louise Diamond and John McDonald* devised the multi-track diplomacy paradigm in which they noted nine 'tracks'.

- Government
- NGO/professionals
- Business
- Private citizens
- Research, training & education
- Activism
- Religion
- Funding
- Communications & the media<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Behera, pg. 212

<sup>56</sup> Byrne & Keashly, pg. 104

<sup>57</sup> Byrne & Keashly, pg. 112

<sup>58</sup> Louise Diamond & John McDonald, '*Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace*', as referred to in Byrne & Keashly, pg. 98

For the purpose of this research these ‘tracks’ will be merged into *Behera’s* three track process. So ‘government’ will become Track I; ‘NGOs and professionals’ will become Track II; and the other groups will come under Track III.

There are many objectives of ‘non-official dialogues’ such as Track II and Track III diplomacy; firstly, they aim to build upon the personal connections between retired businessmen, army officers and policymakers; they try to capitalize upon the rich intellectual resources in the region in order to create a body of knowledge to help policymakers become better informed; finally, since Partition an almost an entire generation has grown up with little or no direct knowledge of each other’s society, therefore non-official dialogues aim to rebuild communications between Indians and Pakistanis<sup>59</sup>. The premise of Track III diplomacy is that peace must be built from the bottom-up as well as from the top-down and that building social capital is essential for peace<sup>60</sup>.

Such dialogues can attempt to change public perceptions of the ‘other’ in order to breakdown suspicions and mistrust however ultimately they are still vulnerable to political crises – the Kargil incident of 1999 dealt a sever blow to both official and non-official diplomatic efforts, at this stage it looks as if the Mumbai train bombings of July 2006 will not badly damage relations between India and Pakistan<sup>61</sup>. Changing the image of ‘the other’ involves building trust. To do this communication channels must be

---

<sup>59</sup> Behera, pg. 215

<sup>60</sup> Diane Chigas, Track II (Citizen Diplomacy), in (Eds.) Guy Burgess & Heidi Burgess, *Beyond Intractability*, Conflict Research Consortium, Uni of Colorado, Boulder, Aug 2003, pg. 4, [www.beyondintractability.org/essay/track2\\_diplomacy/](http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/track2_diplomacy/)

<sup>61</sup> BBC News, ‘South Asia rivals resume talks’, (16/09/06) [http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/south\\_asia/5353054.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/south_asia/5353054.stm)

opened, the 'enemy' must be re-humanized and perceptions of the conflict must be altered<sup>62</sup>.

*Diane Chigas* argues that Track II and Track III diplomacy can open the way for more moderate voices who often become marginalized during protracted conflict. An infrastructure for peace needs to be built at the middle- and grassroots levels in order to support peace-making. If these constituencies for peace are not encouraged then 'spoilers' – such terrorists or religious extremists – can carry out acts of violence that can derail the positive approaches to peace<sup>63</sup>.

Criticisms of Track II and Track III diplomacy note that it is very difficult to assess that impact of unofficial dialogue as they do not produce agreements or policy shifts; they work on less tangible factors such as attitudes and relationships<sup>64</sup>.

Track II and Track III initiatives are harder to instate when conflict is taking place and they can never be completely isolated from political events, especially 'strategic surprises'<sup>65</sup>. Track II diplomacy in the Middle East has been hailed as contributing to the Oslo Agreement between Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO)<sup>66</sup>.

However *Nimer* argues that whilst Palestinians attended joint Israel-Palestine Track II and III initiatives in order to change attitudes, Israelis were more likely to join in order to keep channels of communication open and build social connections<sup>67</sup>. This imbalance in goals can make the weaker parties feel their grievances are not being addressed<sup>68</sup>.

---

<sup>62</sup> Chigas, pg. 5-6

<sup>63</sup> Chigas, pg. 7

<sup>64</sup> Chigas, pg. 5 & Behera, pg. 226

<sup>65</sup> Chigas, pg. 8

<sup>66</sup> Waslekar, pg. 10

<sup>67</sup> Mohammed Abu-Nimer, '*Dialogue, Conflict, Resolution and Change: Arab-Jewish encounters in Israel*', SUNY Press, 1999 in Chigas, pg. 9

<sup>68</sup> Chigas 9

Byrne and Keashly conclude that for protracted conflict to move towards peace there needs to be an understanding that complex situations must be handled with flexibility and sensitivity; peace-building needs a multi-modal approach at all levels; a variety of actors should be used; and that local and external agencies are required in order to co-ordinate these approaches<sup>69</sup>.

It is the contention of this thesis that cricket can act as Track II and Track III diplomacy. Cricket can encompass Track II diplomacy partly because there are contacts between officials in the game and politicians. High level former politicians such as Sharad Pawar and Shaharyar Khan<sup>70</sup> are the chairmen of the Indian and Pakistani cricket boards respectively. Cricket has also been used by Pakistani leaders as an excuse for non-official meetings with their Indian counterparts<sup>71</sup>. For Track III diplomacy, cricket can work even more effectively. It gives Indians and Pakistanis the chance to meet one another, and therefore can help break down negative stereotypes regarding 'the other'.

---

<sup>69</sup> Byrne and Keashly, pg 116

<sup>70</sup> Sharad Pawar is former Chief Minister of Maharashtra and Defence Minister under the Congress party and Shaharyar Khan was Pakistani Foreign Minister under Nawaz Sharif.

<sup>71</sup> General Zia ul-Haq, who coined the term 'cricket diplomacy', watched an Indo/Pakistan cricket match in Jaipur during the Brass-tacks crisis of 1987 and General Musharraf visited to Delhi to watch an India/Pakistan One Day International in April 2005.

**CHAPTER TWO: ‘SERIOUS SPORT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH FAIR PLAY. IT IS BOUND UP WITH HATRED, JEALOUSY... AND SADISTIC PLEASURE IN WITNESSING VIOLENCE: IN OTHER WORDS IT IS WAR MINUS THE SHOOTING.’ (GEORGE ORWELL)**

**Sport & International Relations:**

Since the turn of the twentieth century it has been acknowledged that there are close links between sport and politics<sup>72</sup>. From the Romans who used gladiatorial contests as a way of distracting the public from criticising their leaders<sup>73</sup>, through the Olympic Games, to football and cricket World Cups; sport has often been political. Sporting events have caused conflict throughout the ages; the often cited ‘Football war’ between El Salvador and Honduras in 1969 that was sparked by a controversial football match<sup>74</sup> is just one example. The Olympic Games, revived at a time of expanding international trade can be seen as an manifestation of global capitalism<sup>75</sup>, however they have also been used to express political statements: the Munich Olympics of 1936 were used by Hitler to highlight his belief in German racial superiority<sup>76</sup>; during the Mexico Olympics of 1968, two African-Americans raised their fists in the Black Power salute and were consequently

---

<sup>72</sup> Allen Guttman, ‘Sport, Politics and the Engaged Historian’, *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 38: 3, 2003, pg. 383

<sup>73</sup> Jayanta Sengupta, ‘Globalizing Patriotism? Some Lessons from the Cricket World Cup of 2003’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 21, No’s 3-4 June 2004, pg. 585

<sup>74</sup> Rahul, Bhattacharya, ‘*Pundits from Pakistan: on tour with India 2003-4*’, Picdaor, London 2005, pg. 17

<sup>75</sup> Sengupta, pg. 586

<sup>76</sup> Sengupta, pg. 585 & Guttman, pg. 364



banned from representing the USA again<sup>77</sup>; in the 1980's America boycotted the Moscow Olympics to protest at the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and in return the Warsaw Pact countries boycotted the Los Angeles Olympics<sup>78</sup>. Even within cricket sporting boycotts have occurred, most importantly against the South African apartheid regime. It is interesting to note that there are only two reasons accepted by the International Cricket Council (ICC) for cancelling a cricket tour – security and a governmental proscription<sup>79</sup>. The political consciousness most affected by sport is nationalism, and vice versa. Sport can reflect and shape national consciousness just as national consciousness can reflect sporting character<sup>80</sup>. Sporting nationalism peaks when a nation feels insecure or threatened<sup>81</sup>. Competitive sports can reflect or maintain a collective psychology; the mythic structures within sport can help give rise to collective identities; sport can also be used as a means of political motivation<sup>82</sup>. It is not therefore surprising that cricket has been used as a tool for political engagement and disengagement between India and Pakistan.

### **Cricket in Asia:**

It is worth briefly analysing the relationship between cricket and some of the former British colonies that have taken it up. Unlike the USA, who once they gained independence rejected all British sports – hence American football and baseball rather

---

<sup>77</sup> Sengupta, pg. 585

<sup>78</sup> Kingshuk Chatterjee, 'To Play or Not To Play: Fabricating Consent over the Indo-Pak Cricket Series', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 21, No's 3-4 June 2004, pg. 619 & Guttmann, pg. 373

<sup>79</sup> See informal interview with David Morgan of the ECB & ICC in Appendices.

<sup>80</sup> Sengupta, pg. 586

<sup>81</sup> Ramachandra Guha, 'A Corner of a Foreign Field: The Indian History of a British Sport', Picador, 2002, pg. 350

<sup>82</sup> Sengupta, pg. 586 & Guha, pg. 339

than soccer and rounders or cricket: cricket is still played in many former colonies<sup>83</sup>. On the Indian sub-continent, once India gained Test status in 1932 beating the colonial rulers at their own game would cause articles to be written claiming that if Indians were capable of sporting equality, they should also be given political equality<sup>84</sup>. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, philosopher and President of India said:

'like other symbols of British civilisation – the ballot box, the limited liability company and the revised version of the Bible – cricket has come to stay in India.'<sup>85</sup>

It has also been argued that cricket the suits way of life on the Indian sub-continent. Some say that the long form of the game can be more appreciated by Hindus who are used to understanding the world through a cosmic timescale rather than clock time<sup>86</sup>. It also reflects agrarian society: there are long periods of the game when one must watch the weather and wait for it to alter; one must also prepare for adversity; the boredom that can accompany a game, allows one to plan ahead<sup>87</sup>.

Some have suggested that although cricket reflects pre-industrial society, it was also promoted throughout the British Empire as a means of preparing the indigenous societies for the requirements of capitalism because it emphasises the need to work together under one captain, the observance of rules, timekeeping, the importance of boundaries, fair play

---

<sup>83</sup> Guha, pg. 335-6

<sup>84</sup> Guha, pg. 341

<sup>85</sup> Guha, pg. 337

<sup>86</sup> Guha, pg. 337-8

<sup>87</sup> Sengupta, pg. 586

and most controversially, the superiority of the white man<sup>88</sup>. Some Marxist historians regard all sport as a mirror image of the ‘exploitative, achievement-oriented world of work’<sup>89</sup>.

The length of time that a Test match takes – seven hours a day for five days – allows the spectators to interact not only with each other but also with the players<sup>90</sup>; there is often communication between the fielders at the boundary and spectators and also between the players on opposing teams. The structure of the match is such that there are periods of intense excitement followed by lulls in the passage of play, this encourages debate and disputation, chatter and gossip<sup>91</sup>, all of which helps create the opportunity for friendship-building unusual in other sports.

After Independence, cricketing prowess on the sub-continent became associated with patriotism<sup>92</sup> – being a good cricketer meant that one was a ‘good’ Indian, Pakistani or Sri Lankan. By the 1990’s, cricket had lost its association with colonialism and became a way to develop national and masculine identities<sup>93</sup>.

Cricket is the only sport on the sub-continent that has this ability to unite diverse peoples into distinct nations. In Pakistan and India where there is great ethnic, tribal, linguistic and class diversity, it could be argued that cricket is one of the few things that can unite all. Perhaps this is partly due to the fact that it is one sport that India, Sri Lanka and Pakistan are all relatively consistently good at<sup>94</sup>, indeed all three countries have won the

---

<sup>88</sup> Sengupta, pg. 586

<sup>89</sup> Guttman, pg. 374

<sup>90</sup> Guha, pg. 338

<sup>91</sup> Guha, pg. 339

<sup>92</sup> Guha, pg. 341

<sup>93</sup> Sengupta, pg. 601

<sup>94</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 613

cricket World Cup<sup>95</sup>. Cricket and Bollywood movies seem to be able to transcend class and religion in South Asia unlike anything else, as Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh said ‘I must say... nothing brings the people of the sub-continent together more than our love for cricket and Bollywood’<sup>96</sup>. The reverse of this can also be seen in the way in which cricket can fan the flames of nationalism. The West Indian Marxist cricket writer *C. L. R. James* argued that cricket in the West Indies gave young men pride and national identity; however there are some that would argue that this same feeling has more negative connotations in its interactions with Hindu nationalism<sup>97</sup>.

Bollywood exploited the links between nationalism and cricket with the movie *Lagaan*; a story of a group of plucky Indian villagers who beat their British rulers at cricket in order to rid themselves of the cruel colonisers<sup>98</sup>. It went on to be nominated for an Oscar and become one of the largest grossing movies in Bollywood history<sup>99</sup>.

Multinational Corporations (MNC’s) also exploit the sub-continent’s love of cricket, and Bollywood. Using movie stars and cricketers to advertise their products, MNC’s can gain an extraordinary reach on the sub-continent – everywhere you travel in India or Pakistan, you will see billboards with cricketers Sachin Tendulkar, Shoaib Akhtar or movie star Shah Rukh Khan holding an ice cold Pepsi or Coca Cola. This also allows the poor to interact with global capitalism<sup>100</sup> and forget their situation for a while.

---

<sup>95</sup> Chatterjee, pg 600

<sup>96</sup> Guha, pg. 329, and Prime Minister of India, Manmohan Singh, see ‘Musharraf accepts cricket invite’, BBC News, (11/03/05) [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/4339043.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4339043.stm)

<sup>97</sup> Sengupta, pg. 604

<sup>98</sup> Sengupta, pg. 603 & Guha, pg 354

<sup>99</sup> Sengupta, pg. 603 & Guha, pg 354

<sup>100</sup> Sengupta, pg. 603

'India will never be a tiger [in terms of economic power] to match the other Asian tigers [e.g. South Korea, Malaysia]. India ranks about 150 in the World Development Report, just below Namibia and above Haiti. It is the cricketers and they alone, who are asked to redeem these failures, to make one forget, at least temporarily, the harsh realities of endemic poverty and corrupt and brutal politicians.'<sup>101</sup>

### **Indo-Pakistani Cricketing Ties and Indo-Pak Relations:**

The relationship between India and Pakistan has always been fractious. The two countries have fought three wars and a number of near-wars in their 59 year history<sup>102</sup>. Their cricketing relationship mirrors the state of their political relationship very closely, whilst this may not sound revelatory, it is far more explicit than any other cricket playing countries. India-Sri Lanka cricket tours were not affected by Indian involvement in Sri Lanka or the assassination of former Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi by a suspected Tamil Tiger suicide bomber<sup>103</sup> and Pakistan-Bangladesh cricketing relations have not been soured by their former relationship<sup>104</sup>. However India/Pakistan cricket tours are influenced by every nuance of Indo-Pak relations.

---

<sup>101</sup> Ramachandra Guha in Sengupta, pg. 604

<sup>102</sup> The first two wars, of 1948 and 1965 were over Kashmir, the third in 1971 was due to India's support for the breakaway of East Pakistan, now Bangladesh. See timeline in Appendices for more detail on Indo-Pak relations.

<sup>103</sup> See informal interviews with Rahul Bhattacharya and Professor Shetty in Appendices

<sup>104</sup> See interview with Shaharyar Khan in Appendices

It is interesting to note that even before Partition, India's most successful domestic tournaments ever were communal<sup>105</sup>. The Quadrangular tournaments of Bombay consisted of English, Hindu, Parsi, and Muslim teams; later another team under the banner 'All the Rest' consisting of Indian Christians, Buddhists and Jews joined to make the Pentangular tournaments<sup>106</sup>. They were eventually halted in 1945 because it was believed that they harmed national unity<sup>107</sup>.

India was given Test match status – i.e. it was accepted as an international team – in 1932<sup>108</sup>, Pakistan did not get separate Test status until 1952. Pakistan's first overseas tour was to India in the same year; the pain and bloodshed of Partition was still fresh in the minds of all and there was some trouble between supporters<sup>109</sup>. However in 1955 India toured Pakistan, and for once the Wagah border crossing was left open and 10,000 Indian fans travelled to watch the Lahore Test match; those that lived in Amritsar were allowed to cross back each night<sup>110</sup> to their homes.

The wars of 1965 and 1971 caused such enmity that bilateral Indo-Pak matches were halted but by 1978 with new governments in both India and Pakistan, matches recommenced<sup>111</sup>. It is perhaps pertinent to note that Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Indian Prime Minister during a later rapprochement, was the Indian Foreign Minister who presided over this thawing of tensions<sup>112</sup>.

Despite another period of strained relations during the 1980's caused in part by Pakistani support for the Khalistan movement to create a national homeland in the Punjab for Sikhs

---

<sup>105</sup> Bhattacharya, pg. 15

<sup>106</sup> Guha, pg. 123, pg. 248

<sup>107</sup> Bhattacharya, pg. 15

<sup>108</sup> Guha, pg. 340

<sup>109</sup> Guha, pg. 369

<sup>110</sup> Guha, pg. 384

<sup>111</sup> Guha, pg. 393-4

<sup>112</sup> Guha, pg. 414 & Bhattacharya, pg. 11

and the Brass-tacks military exercises, India and Pakistan jointly hosted the 1987 cricket World Cup<sup>113</sup>. It was during this period that General Zia ul-Haq, military ruler of Pakistan, first coined the term ‘cricket diplomacy’ when he travelled to India to watch Pakistan play<sup>114</sup>. Zia’s cricket diplomacy suggested a more positive future for India and Pakistan; however after his death Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif, Pakistan’s two democratic leaders during the 1990’s, vied for power using more and more hostile language towards India<sup>115</sup>.

India won the 1987 World Cup and in 1992 Pakistan won it; during both these tournaments there were celebrations for an ‘Asian’ win in both Pakistan and India<sup>116</sup>. This suggest that there was still some form of South Asian ‘solidarity’ even though relations between India and Pakistan had been badly hit by the 1989 destruction of the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya, the start of the Kashmir insurgency in 1990 and the Bombay riots and bombing of 1992-3<sup>117</sup>. These incidents were communal in nature and served to exacerbate the tensions between Muslims and Hindus in India and further impact on Indo-Pakistan relations. During this period India again broke off bilateral cricketing ties with Pakistan.

The 1996 cricket World Cup was jointly hosted by India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka despite Indo-Pak relations being at their lowest ebb for some time<sup>118</sup>. In the group stages India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka played only in their own countries. However the first serious

---

<sup>113</sup> Guha, pg. 400

<sup>114</sup> Stuart Croft, ‘South Asian arms control: cricket diplomacy and the composite dialogue’, *International Affairs*, 81:5, 2005, pg 1040.

<sup>115</sup> Stephen Philip Cohen, ‘India, Pakistan and Kashmir’, *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 25: 4, Dec 2002, pg. 43

<sup>116</sup> Sengupta, pg. 606 & Guha, pg. 427

<sup>117</sup> Guha, pg. 398, 428 & Bhattacharya, pg. 10

<sup>118</sup> Guha, pg. 400

spectator violence in cricket occurred during an India/Pakistan match in India and later during a Sri Lanka/India match, also held in India<sup>119</sup>.

In spite of the violence during these matches an attempt was made to renew cricketing relations shortly after. A brief tour of one day internationals (ODIs) by India to Pakistan and the 'Friendship Series' between India and Pakistan in Canada was announced to be a success and cricket was cited by some as a 'tool of diplomacy [which] had led ordinary Indians and Pakistanis to see and appreciate each other's cricketers as gifted human beings rather than cold, ruthless figures from an alien land'<sup>120</sup>.

By 1999 relations were warming again and it was decided that Pakistan should tour India in January and February. This series was put in jeopardy by a right wing Hindu party, Shiv Sena. Bal Thackeray, leader of Shiv Sena in Mumbai announced his opposition, saying that India should not play Pakistan because 'Pakistani terrorists are killing our people in Kashmir. Women and children are mercilessly slaughtered every day'<sup>121</sup>. Far from being an un-influential group, Shiv Sena were part of the ruling coalition that governed India and intimated that they could withdraw their support if the series went ahead<sup>122</sup>. The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) refused to be cowed by such threats, even after Shiv Sena dug up the cricket pitch in Delhi where the match was due to be played, ransacked the offices of the Mumbai Cricket Board and threatened to release live snakes into the grounds during the matches<sup>123</sup>.

---

<sup>119</sup> Guha, pg. 402-4 & Mike Marqusee, *War Minus The Shooting: A Journey through South Asia during Cricket's World Cup*, Heinemann, London, 1996

<sup>120</sup> 'A Pitch for Diplomacy' *India Today* 6 October 1997, in Guha pg. 408

<sup>121</sup> *The Telegraph*, 4 November 1998, *The Hindu*, 21 November 1998, in Guha, pg. 409

<sup>122</sup> Guha, pg. 409

<sup>123</sup> Guha, pg. 411 & Bhattacharya, pg. 11



The tour was regarded as a great success and was matched by Indian Prime Minister, Vajpayee's journey by bus to Lahore for a bilateral summit. The one dark stain on the tour was the third Test match in Calcutta. After a controversial run-out of India's Sachin Tendulkar by Pakistan's fast bowler Shoaib Akhtar, the crowd was so hostile that the match had to be finished in an empty stadium<sup>124</sup>. This incident occurred at the same time as the Lahore Summit and Shaharyar Khan, manager of the Pakistan cricket team during the tour, feared that this confrontation on the field could harm Indo-Pak relations<sup>125</sup>.

In reality the episode at Calcutta did little to dampen the positive sentiments that came out of the Lahore Summit in February 1999. However only a few months later the relationship was in tatters again as Pakistani militia, aided by the Pakistan Army crossed the Line of Control (LoC) in Kashmir and held a sensitive vantage point overlooking Highway One running between Srinagar and Leh<sup>126</sup>. The Kargil conflict in April 1999 was a serious blow to those that desired peace in South Asia; the hijacking of an Indian Airlines plane and the bloodless coup in October of the same year when Pakistan's military chief, General Musharraf, seized power from Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, further damaged relations<sup>127</sup>. After Kargil, the Indian Government decided that bilateral matches would again be prohibited until Pakistan stopped supporting the insurgency in Kashmir<sup>128</sup>.

*Ramachandra Guha* suggests that a loss to Pakistan at cricket hurts even more than a loss on the battlefield and that this was partly why the government wanted the matches

---

<sup>124</sup> Khan, pg.73-8

<sup>125</sup> Khan, pg, 74-8

<sup>126</sup> Guha, pg. 414, Michael Krepon, Khurshid Khoja & Michael Newbill, 'Confidence-Building Measures in South Asia: New Dangers, Missed Opportunities and Future Impreatives' in Michael Krepon, Michael Newbill, Khurshid Khoja & Jenny S. Denzin, '*Global Confidence Building: New Tools for Troubled Regions*', Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, 2000

<sup>127</sup> Cohen, pg. 42

<sup>128</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 613, Sengupta, pg. 605, Guha, pg. 398, 428 & Bhattacharya, pg. 10

stopped<sup>129</sup>. This is debatable in part because India has ‘won’ most military conflicts with Pakistan, but also because successive Indian governments did not prevent India and Pakistan playing each other in World Cup matches which arguably heighten tensions more than a long drawn-out Test match. When India and Pakistan played a World Cup match in England during the Kargil clash, extra police were drafted in because there were fears that the match might cause the first riots at a cricket match in England<sup>130</sup>. In the end there was very little trouble but the English and Asian newspapers in Britain contrasted the match with the battle that was being fought in the Himalayas<sup>131</sup>. It has been argued that Kargil destroyed any sub-continental ‘solidarity’ that had existed previously<sup>132</sup>.

It has been questioned whether the decision to stop bilateral matches was an attempt to put diplomatic pressure on Pakistan or as a result of the aggressive Hindu chauvinism that was sweeping India in the 1990’s<sup>133</sup>. Former Indian cricketer Kapil Dev argued that cricket should be played against Pakistan until they stopped supporting the Kashmiri insurgency<sup>134</sup>. Right-wing Hindu politicians such as Thackeray, Uma Bharati and various BJP leaders supported this argument<sup>135</sup>. It should however be noted that these politicians are all associated with Hindu chauvinism so perhaps the two reasons are connected. Sporting boycotts are not unusual, as has been mentioned earlier; and there was little criticism of the governmental proscription, indeed *Chatterjee* notes that ‘it was

---

<sup>129</sup> Guha, pg. 414

<sup>130</sup> Guha, pg. 419

<sup>131</sup> Guha, pg. 426

<sup>132</sup> Sengupta, pg. 606

<sup>133</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 614

<sup>134</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 615

<sup>135</sup> Sengupta, pg. 605 & Chatterjee, pg. 613

suggested that such practices [sporting boycotts] were both regular in occurrence and constituted standard diplomatic bargaining counters in international politics',<sup>136</sup>.

After Kargil the Indian government decided to carryout sporting sanctions against Pakistan and the two countries did not play a full series against each other again until 2004. It is reasonable to argue these sanctions constituted an attempt by India to 'securitize'<sup>137</sup> bilateral Indo-Pak cricket matches by preventing the Indian team from touring Pakistan<sup>138</sup>. By 2001-2 all forms of diplomacy including Track II initiatives had been broken off by India so a proscription on cricket matches is not out of kilter with the prevailing trends<sup>139</sup>.

After 1998 when both India and Pakistan carried out nuclear missile tests, the rest of the world became increasingly concerned about the state of Indo-Pak relations, the high point of tensions coming in 2002 when there were fears that nuclear war could be imminent. The United States, traditionally an ally of Pakistan, took responsibility to put pressure on both sides to ease the tension<sup>140</sup>. Peace initiatives were carried out through Track III diplomacy by non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the media and people-to-people contact<sup>141</sup>.

By 2003 the relationship between India and Pakistan was thawing so Vajpayee took the decision to lift the ban on bilateral matches and suggested that India should tour in early

---

<sup>136</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 619

<sup>137</sup> Securitization is the act of making something a security issue; it involves identifying an existential threat and making a speech act that justifies extraordinary measures. See Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde, '*Security: A New Framework for Analysis*', Boulder, Lynne Rienner, 1998

<sup>138</sup> Varun Sahni, 'The protean *polis* and strategic surprises: do changes within India affect South Asian strategic stability?', *Contemporary South Asia*, Vol 14: 2, June 2005, pg. 225

<sup>139</sup> Sahni, pg.227

<sup>140</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 621

<sup>141</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 621

2004<sup>142</sup>. Two close assassination attempts on Pakistan's President, General Musharraf, in December 2003 sent shock waves through the Indian camp and the Indian cricket team wrote a letter explaining their fear of visiting Pakistan<sup>143</sup>.

Members of the Indian government, including Prime Minister Vajpayee, travelled to Pakistan for a regional summit in January 2004 that was widely regarded as far more positive than the previous one at Agra in 2001<sup>144</sup>. The success of this South Asian Association of Regional Co-operation (SAARC) meeting led to further discussions about a tour taking place<sup>145</sup>. However there was much debate in the Indian media about whether it was a good idea or not: some raised the spectre of the Munich Olympics in 1972 when Palestinian terrorists kidnapped and killed Israeli athletes – something of this nature would destroy Indo-Pak relations; others said not to go would be an affront to Pakistan and that would harm relations. Eventually after sending the same security team that had scouted out Vajpayee's visit to Pakistan and a promise from General Musharraf that the Indian team would be provided with presidential level security, the Prime Minister took the decision that the tour would go ahead<sup>146</sup>.

The tour was a huge success and when India won their ODI match in Karachi the Pakistan crowd stood and cheered<sup>147</sup>. This series was historic in that it was the first time an Indian team had won in Pakistan and despite all doomsayers, there was no violence or trouble<sup>148</sup>. Those Indian fans, journalists and cricketers that crossed the border were

---

<sup>142</sup> Bhattacharya informal interview, see Appendices

<sup>143</sup> Bhattacharya, pg. 7

<sup>144</sup> Reuters News Agency, 'No breakthrough seen in cricket diplomacy', (16/04/05) [www.expressindia.com/fullstory.php?newsid=45013](http://www.expressindia.com/fullstory.php?newsid=45013)

<sup>145</sup> Bhattacharya, pg. 7-8

<sup>146</sup> Bhattacharya, pg 11 and informal interview with Professor Shetty – see Appendices

<sup>147</sup> Rahul Bhattachayra describes the whole tour in detail in '*Pundits from Pakistan: On Tour with India 2003-4*', Picador, 2005 pg. 71-2

<sup>148</sup> Chatterjee footnote 1 & Bhattacharya, whole book

overwhelmed by Pakistani hospitality and returned to India praising their erstwhile enemies<sup>149</sup>.

Bilateral cricket matches have been held hostage to the political tensions between Indian and Pakistani governments. Whilst there is little suggestion that cricket matches have harmed Indo-Pakistan relations; they have been used as a tool of diplomacy either to create an opportunity for meetings or as a form of sanctions.

### **Cricket and national consciousness:**

India and Pakistan are both cricket crazy nations; for both countries cricket is a way of expressing national pride and consciousness. Both countries take accusations of cheating as a slur on the nation. In 2001 Mike Denness, the match referee, penalised Indian hero Sachin Tendulkar for ball tampering - he was banned for one match. Throughout India effigies of Denness were burned in the streets and the Board of Cricket Control in India (BCCI) threatened to withdraw from the International Cricket Council (ICC), an act that could have split the cricketing world<sup>150</sup>. This situation has recently been played out again as the Pakistan team have been accused of ball tampering in their 2006 series against England. The umpire in question was accused of being a 'mini-Hitler' by former cricketer, turned politician, Imran Khan<sup>151</sup>. Even General Musharraf has waded in to the row<sup>152</sup>.

---

<sup>149</sup> Bhattacharya, Shaharyar Khan, pg. 183-98 and interviews with both in Appendices

<sup>150</sup> Guha, pg. 354

<sup>151</sup> 'Pakistan backs cricket team in ball row', BBC News, (21/08/06)

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south\\_asia/5270880.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/5270880.stm)

<sup>152</sup> 'Pakistan backs cricket team in ball row', BBC News, 21/08/06)

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south\\_asia/5270880.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/5270880.stm)

Such passion and fervour is shown for cricket in India and Pakistan that it is perhaps of no surprise that politicians have always felt the need to show an interest in cricket. In Pakistan, General Musharraf is patron of the Pakistan Cricket Board (PCB) and the current chairman is Shaharyar Khan, a high ranking former diplomat who was Foreign Secretary under PM Nawaz Sharif, UN Special Representative to Rwanda and Pakistan's Ambassador to France and Jordan. In India the history of politicians in cricket goes back a long way. India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru played cricket and his daughter Indira Gandhi used photos of him striding out to bat, dressed in his cricket whites, on political pamphlets during the Emergency of 1975<sup>153</sup>. The cricket boards of Mumbai and Bihar have been run by former Chief Ministers<sup>154</sup> and one of them, Sharad Pawar, a former Defence Minister, is now head of the BCCI. Indian team selections are even debated in parliament<sup>155</sup>.

It has been suggested that the rise of cricket nationalism in India during the 1990's can be linked to the rise of Hindu chauvinism seen at the same time<sup>156</sup>. In 1990 Norman Tebbit, a British Conservative minister, argued that South Asian immigrants in the UK should support the English cricket team rather than the Indian or Pakistani teams as proof of their commitment to the UK<sup>157</sup>. During the 1990's Bal Thackeray, leader of Shiv Sena, devised his own Indian version of the 'Tebbit Test'. He claimed that Indian Muslims must prove that they were not Pakistani sympathisers and not anti-national by supporting India in cricket rather than Pakistan, 'I want them with tears in their eyes every time India

---

<sup>153</sup> Guha, pg. 332

<sup>154</sup> Guha, pg. 332

<sup>155</sup> 'India outrage at Ganguly axing', BBC News, (16/12/05)  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south\\_asia/4533942.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/4533942.stm)

<sup>156</sup> Guha, pg. 352 & Sengupta, pg. 605

<sup>157</sup> 'Can British Asians be England cricket fans?', BBC News, (31/08/06)  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/cricket/england/5296056.stm>

loses to Pakistan'<sup>158</sup>. There have been many occasions when Muslims have supported Pakistan rather than India in matches – and conversations I had with Indian Kashmiri Muslims support this view<sup>159</sup>.

Muslims in India are often seen as suspected supporters of Pakistan; there arises a dichotomy in Indian consciousness – the 'good' Muslim/'bad' Muslim representation. Bal Thackeray and Deputy Prime Minister, L. K. Advani, have praised 'good' Muslims such as former Indian cricket captain, Mohammed Azharuddin or the composer A. R. Rahman as role models for the Muslim population of India<sup>160</sup>. For Azharuddin, this view was reversed when he was banned for life from cricket for his part in the match fixing scandals of the 1990's; some went as far as suggesting that this proved he was a 'bad' Muslim and a traitor<sup>161</sup>. There have been a number of studies on sport as a means to assert contested ethnic identities; sport can give ethnic minorities the chance to participate in society whilst maintaining their individual ethnicity<sup>162</sup>.

In Pakistan national identity is somewhat hindered by years of military dictatorship, attempts to make it a theocratic state, the imposition of Urdu on the population and the unitary system of government (as opposed to India's federal government)<sup>163</sup>. Confusion over national identity is compounded by sharp distinction between class, regional and religious identities<sup>164</sup>; few things can unite this fractious nation. Hostility to India and

---

<sup>158</sup> Jishnu Dasgupta, 'Manufacturing Unison: Muslims, Hindus and Indians during the India-Pakistan Match', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 21, No's 3-4, 2004, pg. 576 & Guha, pg. 410

<sup>159</sup> Speaking to Kashmiri Muslims in Delhi in April 2006, they said they were accused of being Pakistani supporters whenever India and Pakistan played. They also mentioned their unease during celebrations which they felt expressed Hindu chauvinistic attitudes.

<sup>160</sup> Guha, pg. 421 & Dasgupta, pg. 576, 580

<sup>161</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 580

<sup>162</sup> Guttman, pg. 369

<sup>163</sup> Cohen, pg. 37

<sup>164</sup> Cohen, pg. 54

support for Kashmir are unifiers<sup>165</sup>; cricket is another<sup>166</sup> - this area will be discussed in the next chapter.

During the 1990's India saw a rise in Hindu chauvinism; this was shaped in part by the Hindutva consciousness proposed by the BJP<sup>167</sup>. This consciousness was connected with support for the reconstruction of the Rama temple - the remains of which were said to lie under the Babri Mosque at Ayodhya - as promoted by L. K. Advani. The mosque's eventual destruction caused much communal bloodshed and unrest<sup>168</sup>.

India was founded as a secular nation, in contrast to Pakistan's religious basis; by the 1990's the Hindu 'self' saw itself as directly opposed to the Pakistani theocratic religious 'other'<sup>169</sup>. This opposition helped strengthen Hindu consciousness and in turn threatened the security of Muslims in the so-called 'secular' republic. As the communal riots of Mumbai in 1992 and the Godhra riots of 2002 show, this tension has never completely dissipated.

Cricket, particularly India/Pakistan cricket matches tend to bring these feelings to the fore. The World Cup of 2003 is an interesting case study, because unlike during previous matches, there was little or no support for Pakistan from Indian Muslims<sup>170</sup>. In the run-up to the India/Pakistan match in the quarter finals of the World Cup, the media went into overdrive portraying this as 'mimic warfare'<sup>171</sup>: a Bengali newspaper represented the

---

<sup>165</sup> Cohen, pg. 54

<sup>166</sup> Khan, pg. 32

<sup>167</sup> Hindutva was defined by the BJP as a way to 'bridge our present to our glorious past and pave the way for an equally glorious future: it will guide the transition from swaraja to surajya', BJP Manifesto 1998, see Chatterjee, pg. 623

<sup>168</sup> 'Advani charged with Ayodhya riots', BBC News, (28/07/05)  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south\\_asia/4723409.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/4723409.stm)

<sup>169</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 623, 625

<sup>170</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 575

<sup>171</sup> Orwell, pg. 322



match as war, with the cricket pitch as the battleground<sup>172</sup>; a Gujarati newspaper used computer generated imagery to turn the Indian and Pakistani cricket teams into soldiers, complete with military uniform and guns<sup>173</sup>.

In Calcutta a discussion was had within the police force that Muslims should be prevented from supporting Pakistan during the match. Whilst this proposal was not carried out, it suggests that the authorities were sufficiently concerned both that some would support Pakistan and that this support was against the 'national interest'<sup>174</sup>. India went on to win the match and there were wide-scale celebrations throughout the country. On the whole, Indian Muslims joined in these celebrations, however in some areas they were actively prevented from doing so. In Ahmedabad this caused rioting and one Muslim man was killed<sup>175</sup>. Similar violence occurred during the 1996 World Cup<sup>176</sup>.

After the match was won, the Indian Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister phoned the Indian cricket team to congratulate them; this was unusual as normally such phone calls would only be made if the team won the tournament<sup>177</sup>. The Indian Finance Minister, Jaswant Singh, took the extraordinary move of announcing that the Indian team would not have to pay income tax on their earnings from the match, this is in stark contrast to the Pakistan team who had their tournament fees slashed by 50 percent for losing to India<sup>178</sup>. The BJP used the win to assert their communalist, Hindu ideology and highlight India's hegemonic aspirations<sup>179</sup>.

---

<sup>172</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 625

<sup>173</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 577

<sup>174</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 579

<sup>175</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 581-2

<sup>176</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 582

<sup>177</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 626

<sup>178</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 577

<sup>179</sup> Sengupta, pg. 606

When, later in 2003, the issue of bilateral India/Pakistan matches was raised, very few argued against the governments ban<sup>180</sup>. A survey of English language newspapers in India in 2003 reviewed 60 articles, only one of which argued against the government's stance that sport and politics should be inextricably linked – it was written by Ramiz Raja, a former Pakistani cricketer and Chief Executive of the PCB<sup>181</sup>. During the run-up to the 2005 tour of India by Pakistan there were fears that violence might occur during the matches; Professor Shetty of the BCCI said 'It is one thing to say that sport and politics shouldn't mix but another to ensure that they don't'<sup>182</sup>. The fear obviously was that as Orwell said, 'serious sport has nothing to do with fair play. It is bound up with hatred, jealousy... and sadistic pleasure in witnessing violence: in other words it is war minus the shooting'<sup>183</sup>.

Within India cricket has often been divisive – with Hindus accusing Muslims of being Pakistani supporters. This may now be changing; wide-scale support for the Indian team in the 2003 World Cup from both Muslims and Hindus suggests that this is the case. Whilst the 2003 World Cup match brought about some form of unity within India; between India and Pakistan is was still largely divisive. The match was portrayed as a battle on the cricket pitch and India's victorious cricketers were rewarded in contrast to the Pakistani team who were punished financially. The recent bilateral series since that match have been held in a more positive spirit as the next chapter will see.

---

<sup>180</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 618

<sup>181</sup> Chatterjee, pg. 618

<sup>182</sup> Chatterjee, pg 619 & Guha, pg. 411

<sup>183</sup> Orwell, pg. 323

**CHAPTER THREE: CRICKET CAN FORM THE PERFECT  
BRIDGE OF INTERNAL AND INTER-STATE PEACE BETWEEN  
PEOPLES' (SHAHARYAR KHAN).**

As the previous chapter has shown cricket can exacerbate national and regional divisions on the sub-continent, however it can also be used as a way of uniting diverse groups. This chapter aims to explore the idea that cricket can be used as a 'bridge of peace'<sup>184</sup> with particular reference to three cricket tours: Pakistan's tour to India in 1999; India's tour to Pakistan in 2004; and Pakistan's return tour in 2005. The first two tours have a number of strong parallels and the third one was seized upon by General Musharraf as an opportunity to meet the new Indian Prime Minister. They follow the idea expressed by *Levinson and Christensen* that sport can create connections.

'Sports bring peoples and nations together. They create a shared language; shared passions; they highlight our aspirations and values, our ways of interacting with one another, and our appreciation of competition, achievement and adventure.'<sup>185</sup>

---

<sup>184</sup> Khan, pg. 180

<sup>185</sup> David Levinson & Karen Christensen (eds.) '*Encyclopaedia of World Sport: From Ancient Times to the Present*', Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999 in Sengupta, pg. 587

### **Pakistan's tour to India in 1999:**

This was the first full tour undertaken by Pakistan to India in twelve years but at first the omens were not good. Before the series was confirmed, Shiv Sena threatened the Pakistani cricket team if they travelled to India. Bal Thackeray called out for 'Hindus [to] rise up against the Pakistan cricket team'<sup>186</sup>; he also encouraged his followers to go on the rampage. They dug up the cricket pitch at the Ferozeshah Kotla ground in Delhi, ransacked the Mumbai Cricket Board offices, threw bricks at the Pakistan High Commission in Delhi and announced that they would release live snakes into the crowd if the tour went ahead<sup>187</sup>.

In the run-up to the tour there was an ongoing debate in Pakistan about whether undertaking such a trip was a good or bad idea. Those who supported the tour argued that cricket should not be held hostage to a bunch of extremists and that if the series went ahead it could help reduce tensions between India and Pakistan<sup>188</sup>. Those who were against touring feared that violence would follow the team and that this would impact negatively on Indo-Pak relations; Islamic extremist parties said Pakistan should have no contact with India until the Kashmir issue was settled<sup>189</sup>. Eventually Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif took the decisions that the tour should go ahead. *Shaharyar Khan* records that the Prime Minister was well aware of the political implications but decided that the benefits could outweigh the negatives<sup>190</sup>.

The tour ended up being a huge success and the team was welcomed almost everywhere they went, bar one nasty incident in Calcutta when the stadium had to be emptied due to

---

<sup>186</sup> Bhattacharya, pg. 11

<sup>187</sup> Khan, pg. 3-4, Bhattacharya, pg. 11 & Guha, pg. 411

<sup>188</sup> Khan, pg. 4

<sup>189</sup> Khan, pg. 4

<sup>190</sup> Khan, pg. 5

crowd trouble. This match, the opening one in an inaugural Tri-Series between India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, took place at the same time as Indian PM Vajpayee's ground-breaking bus trip to Lahore at which the Lahore Declaration was signed. In *Shaharyar Khan's* book recounting his experiences as manager of the tour, he argues that the positive sentiments from the Indian people towards the Pakistani team encouraged Vajpayee to make that journey<sup>191</sup>, this idea will be explored further later in this chapter.

#### **India's tour to Pakistan in 2004:**

Despite the successes for Track III diplomacy of the 1999 tour, shortly after Indo-Pak relations took a turn for the worse due to the Kargil invasion by the Pakistani Army. General Musharraf's bloodless coup in October of that year and various other incidents including an attack on the Indian parliament in December 2001 served to damage Indo-Pak relations so badly that by 2002 the two nuclear-armed countries were threatening war again. Contacts between the governments were resumed again in 2003 and in January 2004, Vajpayee travelled to Pakistan for a successful regional summit. Eventually talk turned to re-establishing bilateral cricketing ties again. As with the run-up to the tour of India by Pakistan, when it was suggested that the Indian team should travel to Pakistan, there was much debate about whether this was a good idea or a bad one.

In December 2003 there were two assassination attempts on General Musharraf, which unsettled the Indian camp<sup>192</sup>. Some said that touring was a huge risk; if something happened to the Indian team the impact on Indo-Pak relations would be disastrous<sup>193</sup>. Others argued that not touring would send out the wrong signals and could destroy the

---

<sup>191</sup> Khan, pg. viii

<sup>192</sup> Bhattacharya, pg. 7

<sup>193</sup> Bhattacharya, pg. 13

nascent peace process<sup>194</sup>. Indian Deputy Prime Minister, L. K. Advani, went as far as to suggest that the tour should be held after India's forthcoming general election in case the result of the tour impacted on the BJP's chance of winning<sup>195</sup>.

In the end Prime Minister Vajpayee took the decision himself that India should tour in April of 2004<sup>196</sup>. The Indian tour was a huge success, with about 20,000 Indian fans travelling to Pakistan<sup>197</sup>. Indian cricket fans and journalists were amazed by the reception they received from their erstwhile 'enemies' and the impact was hugely positive. As a CBM then, cricket appeared to have outstripped the negative political implications.

#### **Pakistan's tour of India in 2005:**

With the success of the 2004 tour fresh in people's minds, a decision was made to cash in on this positivity and the Pakistani team made a return tour in April 2005. President Musharraf mentioned that he would like to watch a match, though only if invited – Indian officials quickly issued an invitation to one of the matches<sup>198</sup>. Musharraf attended the ODI between India and Pakistan in Delhi. He watched the match side-by-side with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh. Photos of the two leaders watching the match together were broadcast throughout the world. Cricket provided the context for these photos to be taken.

---

<sup>194</sup> Bhattacharya, pg. 13

<sup>195</sup> Bhattacharya pg. 9

<sup>196</sup> Bhattacharya, pg. pg. 11 & interview with Professor Shetty, see Appendices

<sup>197</sup> Khan, pg. 187 & interview, see Appendices

<sup>198</sup> 'Musharraf accepts cricket invite' BBC website [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/4339043.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4339043.stm)



199

The Pakistani president stayed on in Delhi for three days of unofficial talks after the match. Indian Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh told the Indian parliament that ‘nothing brings the people of the subcontinent together more than our love for cricket and Bollywood.’<sup>200</sup> In a joint press conference after the talks the two leaders announced that ‘the peace process was irreversible’<sup>201</sup>.

*Mike Marqusee* who watched the 1996 World Cup on the sub-continent and returned to watch Pakistan’s tour of India in 2005, argues that the atmosphere had totally changed. He says that in 1996 the Bangalore match between India and Pakistan was ‘hate-filled chauvinism with communal overtones’<sup>202</sup>. In 2005 in Bangalore, *Marqusee* saw hand written signs welcoming the tourists, praising Indo-Pak friendship and declaring that cricket is the path to peace<sup>203</sup>.

### **Multi-track diplomacy:**

Trying to locate events such as the above mentioned cricket matches in the context of multi-track diplomacy is complex since this is a multifaceted concept. *Diamond and McDonald* (1996) identify nine ‘tracks’ or actors, ranging from government to private

---

<sup>199</sup> This photo was taken for Associated Press News Agency

<sup>200</sup> ‘Musharraf accepts cricket invite’ BBC website [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/4339043.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4339043.stm)

<sup>201</sup> Croft, pg. 1041

<sup>202</sup> Marqusee, ‘Changing face of South Asian cricket’, 01/05/05, [www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?p=122](http://www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?p=122)

<sup>203</sup> Marqusee, ‘Changing face of South Asian cricket’, 01/05/05, [www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?p=122](http://www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?p=122)

citizens; from religion to the media<sup>204</sup>. *Byrne and Keashly* taxonomise this differently, focussing their attentions on functional government; middle-tier elites; public opinion and communication; funding and business; research, training and education; religious groups, professional conflict resolution groups; private citizen activism; and exogenous actors<sup>205</sup>.

The themes they discuss that are most relevant to cricket diplomacy are the workings of middle-tier elites; public opinion; business; and private citizen activism. Many members of the Indian and Pakistani cricket boards are from the middle- or upper-tier elites: PCB Chairman, Shaharyar Khan, is a former diplomat and Foreign Secretary of Pakistan; BCCI Chairman, Sharad Pawar is former Chief Minister of Maharashtra and a former Defence Minister. *Byrne and Keashly* emphasise the importance of middle-ranking political, economic and bureaucratic elites working together<sup>206</sup>.

Cricket can help influence public opinion which is important for reconstructing a common history and preventing ‘enemy imaging’<sup>207</sup>. Business can also help conflict de-escalation because economic development, or the lack of it, can be linked to the economic and social competition that is associated with much ethno-political conflict<sup>208</sup>. MNC’s have closely allied themselves with cricket sponsorship in order to reach out to the wider population on the sub-continent.

Finally, *Byrne and Keashly* highlight private citizen activism, suggesting that ‘Citizen Diplomats are important activists who intervene and transform conflict and act as

---

<sup>204</sup> Diamond & McDonald as referenced in Byrne & Keashly, pg. 98

<sup>205</sup> Byrne & Keashly, pg. 105-111

<sup>206</sup> Byrne & Keashly, pg. 106

<sup>207</sup> Byrne & Keashly, pg. 107

<sup>208</sup> Byrne & Keashly, pg 110



catalysts for social change'<sup>209</sup>. It is the contention of this thesis that cricket fans can be such 'citizen diplomats'.

### **Track II diplomacy:**

It was a Pakistani leader, General Zia, who first coined the term 'cricket diplomacy' in 1987 when he used a match between India and Pakistan as a pretext for unofficial Indo-Pak talks<sup>210</sup>. In 2005, it was another of Pakistan's military dictators that seized on a cricket match to generate new talks with India. The India/Pakistan cricket match in Delhi came at a time when Pakistan felt that India was preventing the peace process from moving forward, except by offering CBM's<sup>211</sup>. For Musharraf, the cricket match gave him an opportunity for high level, unofficial talks aimed at moving the process onwards. After watching the match with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh there were three days of talks and at the end the leaders gave a joint press conference in which they announced that 'the peace process was now irreversible'<sup>212</sup>. The talks were the first time the new Indian Prime Minister had met the Pakistani leader and were widely regarded as positive<sup>213</sup>.

The fact that Pakistani leaders have consciously used cricket matches as way of engaging with Indian leaders suggested that they believe cricket can be used as Track II diplomacy. The governmental controls on India/Pakistan cricket matches on both sides of the border also suggests the bilateral cricket matches are taken seriously as a tool of diplomacy. PCB Chairman Shaharyar Khan has highlighted the import attached to India/Pakistan

---

<sup>209</sup> Byrne & Keashly, pg. 111

<sup>210</sup> Croft, pg. 1040

<sup>211</sup> Croft, pg. 1055

<sup>212</sup> Croft, pg. 1041

<sup>213</sup> Bhattacharya interview, see Appendices

matches, 'knowing that this is a political event when you're talking India and Pakistan, we had to seek our government's approval for these tours...'

'...obviously a tour of India has political ramifications. Therefore only in the India and Pakistan context do we [the PCB] have to seek approval. Not only on tour but also of the thorny issues like when we were asked to play in Ahmedabad, you know – a city that has seen so much bloodshed - that had political connotations. I suppose India also hesitated over Karachi, the problem was security there. And therefore we have to keep consulting our governments where sensitive political issues are in play.'<sup>214</sup>

### **Track III diplomacy:**

People-to-people contact is a major factor in boosting the chances for peace. Since the late 1990's European and American organisations have been encouraging Track II and Track III diplomacy, believing that increased contacts between Indians and Pakistanis can help breakdown the stereotypes that are barriers to peace<sup>215</sup>. Cricket provides an opportunity for such interaction. It has been used in South Africa to help heal a fractured nation; race selection policies are used in many major sports in South Africa<sup>216</sup>. It can also help to build a South Asian solidarity, albeit of cricket fans.

---

<sup>214</sup> Interview with Shaharyar Khan. See Appendices

<sup>215</sup> Sahni, pg. 55

<sup>216</sup> Khan pg. viii & interview with Bob Woolmer by author. See Appendices

'From the Quetta camel-driver to the Chennai professor, from the Lahore shopkeeper to the Bombay housewife, from the Dhaka student to the Colombo hotel waiter, cricket has become an overwhelming passion... ready to be channelled towards peace and harmony.'<sup>217</sup>

*Diane Chigas* notes that 'demonic images of the enemy and virtuous images of self develop on both sides, and reinforce stalemate by intensifying distrusts, de-humanization, and de-individuation of the other party'<sup>218</sup>. This is especially true in India and Pakistan. Since Partition there has been little chance for Indians and Pakistanis to integrate and a whole generation has grown up with little or no knowledge of 'the other' except what propaganda the media and politicians churn out<sup>219</sup>. The pre-Partition generation have an ambiguous view of Pakistan or India whereas some commentators suggest that the post-Partition generation more easily sees the other side as 'the enemy'<sup>220</sup> others however

---

<sup>217</sup> Khan, pg. viii

<sup>218</sup> Chigas, pg. 2

<sup>219</sup> Khan, pg. 181 and for example The[Indian] Tribune, 24 July 2006

'Do what you say; Begin by handing over Dawood, Salahuddin' - 'PAKISTAN'S involvement in promoting terrorism in India is a well-established fact. What happened in Mumbai on July 11 is the latest example of the use of terrorism for achieving its unholy objectives. There is no dearth of evidence to prove that the Mumbai train blasts were the handiwork of ISI-controlled outfits... New Delhi does not have to rush to Islamabad to prove the latter's crime. Pakistan has not only been aiding and abetting terrorism in India but also providing shelter to US-designated global terrorist Dawood Ibrahim, who lives there under the protection of the state machinery.' <http://www.tribuneindia.com/2006/20060724/edit.htm#1>

The [Pakistan] News, 22 July 2006 - 'Indian allegations baseless' "The fact that after 10 days of the Mumbai blasts the Indian spokesman has little to say other than to mention Dawood Ibrahim or Hizbul Mujahideen chief demonstrates that there was nothing to warrant the irresponsible act of finger-pointing at Pakistan immediately after the Mumbai attack. This has become a routine with India," the Foreign Office (FO) said here on Friday...' [http://www.thenews.com.pk/arc\\_default.asp](http://www.thenews.com.pk/arc_default.asp)

<sup>220</sup> Sahni, pg. 221

argue that the younger generation can move beyond such stark views and desire peace and development more than hostility<sup>221</sup>.

These images of ‘the other’ are of alien and terrifying peoples, but cricket brings a chance to breakdown such stereotypes. One Indian journal argued that cricket is a ‘tool of diplomacy [which] has led ordinary Indians and Pakistanis to see and appreciate each other’s cricketers as gifted human beings rather than cold, ruthless figures from an alien land’<sup>222</sup>.

The rapturous applause given to the Pakistanis in Chennai in 1999 and the Indians in Karachi in 2004 was beamed across both countries on TV. These occasions showed another face of Indo-Pak relations than the one portrayed in the media – one of friendship and harmony; the positive goodwill ‘that they Chennai crowd emitted surpassed anything that had happened at the popular level in fifty years of Pakistan-India relations’<sup>223</sup>. Whilst there was a hiatus in Indo-Pak relations between these two matches, since 2004 bilateral matches have continued on an annual basis and perhaps now cricket can help retain these positive images.

‘Cricket can be used as a diplomatic tool and SHOULD be used as a diplomatic tool in the case of Pakistan and India. Both countries are absolutely mad on it.’<sup>224</sup>

---

<sup>221</sup> Behera, pg. 230

<sup>222</sup> ‘A Pitch for Diplomacy’, *India Today* (6/10/97) in Guha, pg. 408

<sup>223</sup> Khan, pg 40

<sup>224</sup> Interview with Bob Woolmer. See Appendices

Just as cricket can help bolster regional solidarity, it also boosts national unity in Pakistan. During a cricket match Pakistanis from all classes, generations and religious persuasions are likely to be following the match<sup>225</sup>, in fact it has been argued that, ‘It brings a unity in peacetime only achieved in times of war’<sup>226</sup>.

It has been discussed in the previous chapter that cricket can highlight religious divisions in India, however recently it has become more of a unifier. *Dasgupta* argues that for India during the World Cup 2003 ‘cricket has finally achieved, for the nation, the level of unity that (s)he had dreamt of for so long’<sup>227</sup>. What is even more impressive is that this world cup was only one year after horrendous anti-Muslim pogroms in Gujarat and yet for the first time cricket was able to attain some sort of national unity<sup>228</sup>.

### **Cultural Interaction:**

As noted above, cricket tours bring with them the chance to cross the border and experience another land. It has even been the cause for a brief waiving of visa restrictions in the past<sup>229</sup>. Although there have been incidents of crowd trouble at matches in the past, the 1999, 2004 and 2005 series have all been conducted in a spirit of cordiality. *Mike Marqusee* records some of the signs spotted at the Mohali Test in March 2005, such as ‘bat and ball is a lot better than assault rifle and grenade’, ‘Indo-Pak Friendship Forever’ and chants of ‘Dil dil Pakistan, jaan jaan Hindustan’<sup>230</sup>.

---

<sup>225</sup> Khan, pg. 179

<sup>226</sup> Khan, pg. viii

<sup>227</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 575

<sup>228</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 576

<sup>229</sup> In the 1955 series, Indians from Amritsar were allowed to cross to Lahore to watch the match and then return home each day. Guha, pg. 384

<sup>230</sup> Mike Marqusee, ‘The future of the cricket crowd’, <http://www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?p=118>

*Shaharyar Khan* claims that he first noticed the potential power of a cricket crowd in Chennai when the Indian supporters cheered as the Pakistani team did a lap of honour after winning the match<sup>231</sup>. The match was broadcast throughout Pakistan; afterwards *Khan* said that he received many telephone calls from friends and colleagues in Pakistan, all overwhelmed by the positive emotions displayed by the crowd<sup>232</sup>. This may have been ‘just a cricket match’ but if the two countries can not even play cricket against each other, what chance is there for them to reach a lasting peace?

During the 2004 tour to Pakistan, it is estimated that 20,000 Indian fans crossed the border; some who had been born in Pakistan visited their former homes; others were given such generous hospitality that, they return home as ambassadors for Pakistan.

‘an Indian diplomat said last time, that 20,000 Indian fans came here; you can convert them to ambassadors for Pakistan. So 20,000 went back saying ‘we’ve seen Pakistani hospitality. It’s not what you’ve seen in the papers, on the television, the hostilities spewed out by the parliamentarians at each other, or taken up by various Prime Ministers...’<sup>233</sup>

*Khan* also argues that in a country without democracy, such as Pakistan, cricket gives the chance for ‘the real public opinion’ to be shown. He said, ‘the common man expressing silent majority – saying ‘I want peace’. 20,000 Indian fans in a city, where the match was

---

<sup>231</sup> Khan, pg. vii, 40

<sup>232</sup> Khan, pg. 41

<sup>233</sup> Interview with Khan, see Appendices & Khan, pg. 187

taking place, and they came with their families, their mothers and grandfathers and so on. And the way they [the Indian fans] reacted, the way our public reacted, in the streets, in the bazaars, in the restaurants, on aircraft, in waiting rooms, in my opinion is the real public opinion. Not the manufactured public opinion that you see from speeches and editorials and television broadcasts and people saying this is what public opinion is.... the Indian tour to Pakistan was the real public opinion - just the common man who expressed himself, in my opinion, on Indian and Pakistani policies.’<sup>234</sup> *Varun Sahni* carried out a review of opinions polls in India in the print and television media between 1996 and 2004: he concluded that poverty, unemployment and education were consistently ranked as the highest issues of concern; Indo-Pak or Hindu-Muslim relations were rarely mentioned<sup>235</sup>. This echoes Shaharyar Khan’s assertion that ‘the common man wants peace. They want to be able to have a house, have a school, to have clean water. And he regrets that so much is being spent on both sides on futile confrontation and hostility’<sup>236</sup> For many Indians and Pakistanis, cricket offers them the chance to explore a country they would never normally get the chance to visit. ‘The way you warm to the people, you warm to the society, you warm to the country because of their hospitality and that’s all because of cricket really – it’s all cricket related.’<sup>237</sup>

The management of Indian and Pakistani cricket teams have taken the view that not only is positive receptions at cricket grounds important, but also the interaction the fans can have with the players themselves. *Khan* notes how he arranged visits for Pakistani players to orphanages and schools for disabled children on the 1999 tour. He argued that

---

<sup>234</sup> Interview with Khan, see Appendices

<sup>235</sup> Sahni, pg 221-2

<sup>236</sup> Interview with Khan, see Appendices

<sup>237</sup> Interview with Bob Woolmer, see Appendices

this was ‘good public relations’<sup>238</sup>. Professor Shetty, manager of the 2004 Indian tour to Pakistan also recounted how the Indian team visited villages, advertised a Polio eradication programme and Rahul Dravid met students in Lahore<sup>239</sup>. This sort of cultural interaction is seen as important for bettering relations between the two countries by giving local people the chance to meet their heroes.

‘...it [sport] is engagement of the very best and most competitive kind and it does bring different creeds, races and classes together.’<sup>240</sup>

### **Interaction between Track I and Track III diplomacy:**

This section will examine how the three tracks interact within the context of cricket. *Shaharyar Khan* argues that the recent positive relations between Indian and Pakistani cricket fans have forced the governments to work harder towards peace. ‘you see when public opinion lifts you up to a level, then Ganguly and Inzamam walk back after a hard day, arm in arm, you know it sends messages and here you are talking of the poor man in the south, the rich man in Bombay or the business man in Calcutta. Everyone is watching and it’s a very important benchmark. Now this benchmark is there for everyone to see. Musharraf and Manmohan Singh have to be within this benchmark, they can’t do

---

<sup>238</sup> Khan, pg 26

<sup>239</sup> Interview with Professor Shetty, see Appendices

<sup>240</sup> Interview with David Morgan of the England & Wales Cricket Board (ECB) and member of the ICC executive board, see Appendices



otherwise. We are setting benchmarks you see, political benchmarks. So I reckon if you, if you have this political benchmark through public opinion openly expressing itself, the Establishment, the Government, will have to follow suit. They can't go below the benchmark.'<sup>241</sup>

*Khan* met with Indian cricketers, politicians and newspaper editors during the 1999 tour and they discussed the benefits of a successful tour; he said 'The foundation of bus diplomacy [referring to the forthcoming trip to Pakistan by Vajpayee] has been laid and a new era of people to people contact was being discussed in the media and by intellectuals on both sides of the border'<sup>242</sup>. It is this very interaction that India and Pakistan has been lacking since Partition. If cricket can bring it about then there can be no doubt that 'cricket diplomacy' has some benefits – even if it is just to get people talking.

During the 1999 tour to India cricket and formal diplomacy collided. At the same time as the Indian Prime Minister was making his historic trip to Pakistan by bus, India and Pakistan were engaged in an intense cricket match in Calcutta. The match turned ugly after Shoaib Akhtar accidentally ran out Sachin Tendulkar and it threatened to turn into a diplomatic incident. Some commentators and spectators suggested that Pakistan call Tendulkar back to the pitch 'in the interest of inter-state relations'<sup>243</sup>. *Khan* admits that he feared the incident could impact on 'bus diplomacy' if the crowd thought Akhtar had purposely knocked Tendulkar out of his ground<sup>244</sup>. In actuality, the match was finished in an empty stadium after the crowd was evicted but there was no negative fall-out. Perhaps the potential impact was overblown, but there is no doubt that in India and

---

<sup>241</sup> Interview with Khan, see Appendices

<sup>242</sup> Khan, pg. 58

<sup>243</sup> Khan, pg. 75

<sup>244</sup> Khan, pg. 74

Pakistan it is felt that at each match any incident could impact in diplomatic relations between the two countries.

It is possible to question whether cricket can have any influence on relations between the two countries especially when the 1999 tour was so successful and less than two months later vitriol was spilling over the border again. However it can be argued that one series in twelve years is not enough to rebuild the shattered relations; a sustained period of bilateral cricketing ties, as there has been since 2004, has a far better chance of bringing some success. Track III diplomacy needs time in order to bring about changes in attitude and build trust in order for a constituency for peace to be established.

**CONCLUSION: CAN CRICKET BE USED AS MULTI-TRACK  
DIPLOMACY IN THE CONTEXT OF INDO-PAKISTANI  
RELATIONS? WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE  
PERIOD BETWEEN 1999 AND 2005**

This study has aimed to review the complex relationship that cricket has with how different nations view themselves and their various ethnic and religious components, and how this can be used by polities as a form of multi-track diplomacy. In this closing chapter the main points of the argument will be summarised and some conclusions drawn about how and in what ways India and Pakistan use cricket diplomacy.

A brief outline of Confidence-Building Measures follows. CBM's can be used to keep the channels of communication open and help build trust where suspicion and enmity define the relationship between nations. Official CBMs are practical by nature; they involve military and non-military agreements such as establishing hotlines between the opposing military structures or treaties formalising borders and co-operation; the Indus Water Treaty is one such example between India and Pakistan. Unofficial CBMs are far more nebulous; they are harder to define but no less important in breaking down mistrust. Examples of unofficial CBMs between India and Pakistan include the Neemrama Project, the Pakistan-India People's Forum and SIMORGH, an organisation that focuses on women's rights in South Asia<sup>245</sup>.

---

<sup>245</sup> For an explanation of unofficial CBMs between India and Pakistan see Waslekar, pg. 1-17 & Krepon et al. pg. 182

Unofficial CBMs are carried out through Track II and Track III diplomatic channels. The actors involved in such discussions can be government members in an informal capacity or retired military, diplomatic and bureaucratic officials in the context of Track II diplomacy; and business, people-to-people contact or NGOs in Track III diplomacy. This thesis has attempted to present evidence that bilateral cricket matches between India and Pakistan operate through both these channels; matches have been used as Track II diplomacy by Pakistan and they engender people-to-people contacts which helps breakdown negative enemy imaging.

A key finding of this study is that Pakistan and India use cricket diplomacy in differing ways. Pakistani leaders have seized upon cricket matches on two occasions to force high level but unofficial meetings with their Indian counterparts<sup>246</sup>. It is argued here that this is a form of Track II diplomacy because whilst it involved top level leaders, it was carried out unofficially in the context of watching cricket so there was little or no expectation of agreements being reached. General Zia's cricket diplomacy helped resolve the misunderstandings caused by the Brass-tacks crisis of 1987<sup>247</sup>. General Musharraf's attempt at cricket diplomacy has provided little of a substantial nature but it did give the Indian and Pakistani leaders a chance to meet and the joint press conference given after their three days of meetings, in which they announced that 'that peace process now is irreversible'<sup>248</sup> gives some hope for the future.

---

<sup>246</sup> General Zia's cricket diplomacy is discussed in Croft, pg. 1040 Cohen, pg. 43 & Sahni, pg. 227. Musharraf's cricket diplomacy is reported in Reuters 'Musharraf Seeks Peace in India on Cricket' (16/4/05) [www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&StoryID=8200996.stm](http://www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&StoryID=8200996) and BBC News 'Musharraf accepts cricket invite', (11/3/05), [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/4339043.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4339043.stm)

<sup>247</sup> Croft, pg. 1040

<sup>248</sup> Croft, pg. 1041

Primary data gathered from Shaharyar Khan, former Foreign Secretary of Pakistan and PCB Chairman, provides evidence that Pakistan is also conscious of the ways in which cricket can be used as Track III diplomacy. The positive sentiments expressed by the Pakistani people when up to 20,000 Indian fans visited the country in 2004, he suggests, are a far more optimistic view of ‘the real public opinion’<sup>249</sup> than that which is reported in the media and articulated by politicians. The policy of Pakistan, it seems, is to use cricket as a way to keep the door open on talks and build trust.

India, by contrast, seems more likely to use cricket as a form of diplomatic sanction – arguing that cricket can not be played whilst Pakistan supports the insurgency in Kashmir<sup>250</sup>. *Chatterjee* suggests that the proscription against playing Pakistan that was enacted after the Kargil war represented a sporting boycott or an expression of Hindu chauvinism; it is likely that it was a mixture of the two as many who called for the sporting boycott came from right-wing Hindu groups. *Sahni* notes that India ‘securitized’ cricket by not allowing bilateral matches to be played on the sub-continent between 1999 and 2004<sup>251</sup>. This diplomatic pressure does not seem to be consistent however; India is now playing cricket matches in Pakistan but still accuses them of supporting and aiding terrorists – most recently the bombers of the Mumbai trains in July of this year<sup>252</sup>.

It is relevant to also look at how cricket interacts with national consciousness in both India and Pakistan. Whilst in Pakistan it has always been a somewhat unifying force – *Khan* claiming that it can gloss over the internal divisions between class, ethnic groupings and religious persuasion; in India it has been far more divisive. Until the 2003

---

<sup>249</sup> Khan, interview and pg. 181

<sup>250</sup> Chatterjee, pg 617

<sup>251</sup> Sahni, pg. 225

<sup>252</sup> BBC News, ‘Pakistan criticises talks delay’, (17/7/06)  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south\\_asia/5188462.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/5188462.stm)

cricket World Cup, during each India/Pakistan cricket match, there was evidence that many Indian Muslims would support Pakistan<sup>253</sup>. There is also evidence that this support was disapproved of<sup>254</sup>, however when Muslims tried to celebrate an Indian win over Pakistan, they were actively prevented, sometimes ending in violence<sup>255</sup>. These contradictory reactions point to a dichotomy in Indian national consciousness about the role of Muslims in the country.

The evidence suggests that whilst India and Pakistan both use cricket diplomacy differently, crucially for this study, all indicators point to the fact that both countries do use it as a diplomatic tool. The question then arises: do these forms of diplomacy have any impact? This study considers bilateral cricket matches played by India and Pakistan since in 1999 as a way of evaluating this. The first and most obvious issue to be raised is that between the first two series of this period – the 1999 tour to India and the 2004 tour to Pakistan – there was a gap of five years, enforced due to the Kargil war, the military coup in Pakistan, the 2001 terrorist attack on the Indian parliament and near-nuclear war in 2002. Both series were played in a positive spirit and engendered a huge amount of goodwill. During the first series Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee took an historic journey by bus to Pakistan the result of which was the Lahore Declaration. This agreement was then largely discredited only months later when Pakistani-supported militia crossed into Indian territory in Kargil. From the following period of animosity one could draw two conclusions: one, that cricket diplomacy means nothing; or two that cricket diplomacy, like all other forms of diplomacy between India and Pakistan, is vulnerable to strategic surprises enacted by ‘spoilers’ for whom peace is an anathema.

---

<sup>253</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 576

<sup>254</sup> Dasgupta, pg. 579

<sup>255</sup> Dasgupta. Pg. 581-2

The more recent cricket series of 2004, 2005 and 2006 have also stimulated goodwill between countries, and the unofficial talks after the Delhi ODI in April 2005 ended in a positive statement from Musharraf and Manmohan Singh. An obvious conclusion to be drawn here is that the longer India and Pakistan play each at cricket, the more chance that the people-to-people contact instigated by such matches could have an impact on breaking down the stereotypes that reinforce the negative relationship.

There has been a shift in approach between India and Pakistan since the late 1990's – Confidence-Building Measures are now acknowledged as an important tool of the diplomatic process<sup>256</sup>. The new attitudes towards peace-building and conflict reduction could in part be put down to pressure from external actors such as the United States and Europe; however globalisation also has a role to play.

For India, a new rising power in the global economy, issues such as the high levels of defence spending<sup>257</sup> and the fact that threat of conflict can scare off external investors, may have contributed to a greater willingness to talk to Pakistan. The global revolution in technology may also contribute to a desire to resolve difference. Governments no longer have a monopoly on communication: satellite TV, 24-hour news channels, mobile phones and the internet have made the world a smaller place and allowed people a greater understanding of issues outside their locale<sup>258</sup>. These developments have contributed to an atmosphere whereby Track III diplomacy can flourish and new constituencies for peace can be built.

---

<sup>256</sup> Waslekar, pg. 8

<sup>257</sup> India spends the equivalent of 65% of its education and health budget on defence (about 3.1% of GDP). Pakistan spends roughly 125% or 6.5% of GDP. Hilali, pg. 193

<sup>258</sup> Behera, pg. 211

In conclusion it has been argued here that cricket has been and can continue to act as a form of multi-track diplomacy but the situation is complex. As *Mike Marqusee* points out it 'has served as both a symbol of South Asian harmony and a prime example of what George Orwell called 'war minus shooting',<sup>259</sup>. However since bilateral cricketing ties were re-established in 2004 they have become 'a bridge of peace'<sup>260</sup> more than an example of 'an unfailing cause of ill-will'<sup>261</sup>. It should be noted that both official forms of diplomacy and unofficial, Track II & Track III channels between India and Pakistan are always vulnerable to 'strategic surprises' such as terrorist attacks or the Kargil incident. However if cricket can help breakdown the hatred and mistrust through increasing people-to-people contact then the constituencies that support such acts will shrink. The experiences of cricket fans during the 1999, 2004 and 2005 series are very different from the rhetoric promulgated by the media and politicians on both sides of the border. Unofficial dialogues ranging from cricket diplomacy to people's forums can 'promote an environment through the education of public opinion, that would make it safer for political leaders to take risks for peace.'<sup>262</sup>

---

<sup>259</sup> Mike Marqusee, 'War minus shooting', (10/03/04), [www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=30](http://www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=30)

<sup>260</sup> Khan, pg. 181

<sup>261</sup> Orwell, pg. 321

<sup>262</sup> Joseph Montville in Krepon et al. pg. 182



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources:

BBC News article, 'Musharraf accepts cricket invite', 11 March 2005,

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/4339043.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4339043.stm)

BBC News article, 'Advani charged with Ayodhya riots', 28 July 2005,

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south\\_asia/4723409.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/4723409.stm)

BBC News article, 'India outrage at Ganguly axing', 16 December 2005,

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south\\_asia/4533942.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/4533942.stm)

BBC News article, 'Second Kashmir bus services begins' 20 June 2006,

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/5097230.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/5097230.stm)

BBC News article, 'Pakistan criticises talks delay', 17 July 2006,

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/south\\_asia/5188462.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/south_asia/5188462.stm)

BBC News article, 'India, Pakistan in peace pledge', 1 August 2006,

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/5233626.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/5233626.stm)

BBC News article, 'India and Pakistan in expulsions', 5 August 2006,

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/5248774.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/5248774.stm)

BBC News article, 'Pakistan plays down diplomat row', 7 August 2006,

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/5253478.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/5253478.stm)

BBC News article, 'Pakistan backs cricket team in ball row', - 21 August 2006,

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south\\_asia/5270880.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/5270880.stm)

BBC News article, 'Can British Asians be England cricket fans?', 31 August 2006,  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/cricket/england/5296056.stm>

BBC News article, 'South Asia rivals to resume talks', 16 September 2006,  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/south\\_asia/5353054.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/south_asia/5353054.stm)

BBC News article, 'Optimism for South Asia talks', 16 September 2006,  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/south\\_asia/5352244.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/south_asia/5352244.stm)

Bhattacharya, Rahul, '*Pundits from Pakistan: on tour with India 2003-04*', Picador, London, 2005

Khan, Shaharyar, M. '*Cricket: A Bridge of Peace*', Oxford University Press, Oxford, Karachi, 2005

Marqusee, Mike, '*War Minus Shooting: A journey through South Asia during Cricket's World Cup*', Heinemann, London, 1996

Marqusee, Mike, 'War minus the shooting', *The Guardian*, 10 March 2004,  
[www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=30](http://www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=30)

Marqusee, Mike, 'The future of the cricket crowd', *Sportstar*, 26 March 2005,  
[www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=118](http://www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=118)

Marqusee, Mike, 'A committed neutral speaks', *Outlook*, 17 March 2005,  
[www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=117](http://www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=117)

Marqusee, Mike, 'Changing face of the south Asian cricket', *Wisden Cricket Asia*, May 2005,  
[www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=122](http://www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=122)

Marqusee, Mike, 'Level Playing Field', *The Hindu*, 8 January 2006,  
[www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=165](http://www.mikemarqusee.com/index.php?=165)

Rediff.com, 'The Rediff Cricket Interview: Pakistan Cricket Board Chairman Shaharyar Khan', 6 April 2005, <http://in.rediff.com/cricket/2005/apr/06cinter.htm>

Reuters News Agency, 'Musharraf Seeks Peace in India on Cricket Diplomacy', 16 April 2005, [www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&storyID==8200996](http://www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&storyID==8200996)

Reuters News Agency, 'No breakthrough seen in cricket diplomacy', 16 April 2005, [www.expressindia.com/fullstory.php?newsid=45013](http://www.expressindia.com/fullstory.php?newsid=45013)

The News, 'Indian allegations baseless', 22 July 2006, [http://www.thenews.com.pk/arc\\_default.asp](http://www.thenews.com.pk/arc_default.asp)

The Tribune, 'Do what you say: Begin by handing over Dawood, Salahuddin', 24 July 2006, <http://www.tribuneindia.com/2006/20060724/edit.htm#1>

### **Secondary Sources:**

Abu-Nimer, Mohammed, *'Dialogue, Conflict, Resolution and Change: Arab-Jewish encounters in Israel'*, SUNY Press, 1999

Ahmar, Moonis, 'Why Rethink the Paradigms of Conflict Resolution?', in (ed.) Moonis Ahmar, *Paradigms of Conflict Resolution in South Asia*, University Press Ltd. Dhaka, 2003

Aravena, Fransisco Rojas, *'Human Security: emerging concept of security in the twenty-first century'*, United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, 2002, [www.unidir.org](http://www.unidir.org)

Behera, Navnita Chadha, 'Forging New Solidarities: Nonofficial Dialogues', in (eds.)

Monique Mekenkamp, Paul van Tongeren & Hands van de Veen, *'Searching for Peace and Central and South Asia'* Lynne Reiner Pubs, Boulder, 2002

Burchill, Scott, Devetak, Richard, Linklater, Andrew, Paterson, Matthew, Reus-Smith, Christian & True, Jacqui, *'Theories of International Relations'*, Palgrave Macmillian, Basingstoke, 2001

Buzan, Barry, Waever, Ole and de Wilde, Jaap, *'Security: A New Framework for Analysis'*, Boulder, Lynne Reinner, 1998

Byrne, Sean & Keashly, Loreleigh, 'Work with Ethno-political Conflict: A Multi-modal Approach', in (eds.) Woodhouse, Tom & Ramsbotham, Oliver, *'Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution'*, Frank Cass, London, 2000

Chari, P.R. 'The Need for Confidence-Building Measures', in (eds.) Monique Mekenkamp, Paul van Tongeren & Hands van de Veen, *'Searching for Peace and Central and South Asia'* Lynne Reiner Pubs, Boulder, 2002

Chatterjee, Kingshuk 'To Play Or Not To Play: Fabricating Consent over the Indo-Pak Cricket Series', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 21, No's 3-4, 2004, pg. 613-628

Chigas, Diane, Track II (Citizen Diplomacy)', in (eds.) Guy Burgess & Heidi Burgess, *'Beyond Intractability'*, Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder, August, 2003, [www.beyondintractability.org/essay/track2\\_diplomacy/](http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/track2_diplomacy/)

Cohen, Stephen Philip, 'India, Pakistan and Kashmir', *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol 24, No 4, December 2002, pg. 32-60

Croft, Stuart, 'South Asia's arms control process: cricket diplomacy and the composite dialogue', *International Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 5, 2005 pg. 1039-1060

Dasgupta, Jishnu, 'Manufacturing Unison: Muslims, Hindus and Indians during the India-Pakistan Match', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 21, No's 3-4, 2004, pg 575-584

Diamond, Louise & McDonald, John, '*Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace*', Kumarian Press, West Hartford, 1996

Guha, Ramachandra, '*A Corner of A Foreign Field: The Indian History of a British Sport*', Picador, London, 2002

Guttmann, Allen, 'Sport, Politics and the Engaged Historian', *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol 38, No 3, 2003, pg. 363-375

Holst, Johan Jorgen, 'Confidence Building Measures: A Conceptual Framework', *Survival* Vol 25, No 1 Jan-Feb 1983

Hilali, A.Z. 'Confidence- and Security-Building Measures for India and Pakistan', *Alternatives: Global, Local and Political*, Vol. 30, 2005, pg. 191-221

James, C.L. R. '*Beyond a Boundary*', Hutchinson, London, 1963

Krepon, Michael, 'Conflict Avoidance, Confidence Building and Peacemaking' in Krepon, Michael, Newbill, Michael, Khoja, Khushid & Drezin, Jenny, S. (eds.) '*Global Confidence Building: New Tools for Troubled Regions*', Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, 2000

Krepon, Michael, Khoja, Khurshid & Newbill, Michael, 'Confidence-Building Measures: New Dangers, Missed Opportunities and Future Imperatives', in Krepon, Michael, Newbill, Michael, Khoja, Khushid & Drezin, Jenny, S. (eds.) '*Global Confidence Building: New Tools for Troubled Regions*', Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, 2000

- Levinson, David & Christensen, Karen (eds.) *'Encyclopaedia of World Sport: From Ancient Times to the Present'*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999
- Miall, Hugh, Ramsbothan, Oliver & Woodhouse, Tom, (eds.) *'Contemporary Conflict Resolution: The prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts'*, Polity Press, Malden, MA. 2005
- Orwell, George, 'The Sporting Spirit' in *Essays*, Penguin Books, London, 1968, pg. 321-24
- Qadeem, Mussarat, 'The Debate on Non-nuclear CBM's in South Asia', in (ed.) Moonis Ahmar, *Paradigms of Conflict Resolution in South Asia'*, University Press Ltd. Dhaka, 2003
- Rajmaira, Sheen, 'Indo-Pakistani Relations: Reciprocity in Long-Term Perspective', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol 41, No 4, 1997
- Sahni, Varun,' The protean *polis* and strategic surprises: do changes within India affect South Asian strategic stability?', *Contemporary South Asia*, Vol 14, No 2, June 2005, pg. 219-231
- Sengupta, Jayanta, 'Globalizing Patriotism? Some Lessons from the Cricket World Cup of 2003', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 21, No's 3-4, 2004, pg 585-612
- Siddiqi, Farhan Hanif, 'Conflict Resolution and Peace: Conceptual and Theoretical Concerns', in (ed.) Moonis Ahmar, *Paradigms of Conflict Resolution in South Asia'*, University Press Ltd. Dhaka, 2003
- Singh, Jaswant, *'Defending India'*, Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, 1999

Talbott, Strobe, '*Engaging India: diplomacy, democracy and the bomb*', The Brookings Institute, Washington D.C. 2004

Waslekar, Sundeep, '*Track-Two Diplomacy in South Asia*', Arms Control, Disarmament and International Security (ACDIS) occasional paper, October, 1995, [www.acdis.uiuc.edu](http://www.acdis.uiuc.edu)

## APPENDICES

### **INDO-PAK RELATIONS: A TIMELINE**

- 1947 – Independence
- 1948 – 1st war with India. Over Kashmir
- 1958 – Gen Ayub Khan takes over in Pakistan
- 1960 – Indus Water Treaty between India and Pakistan
- 1962 – Sino-Indian war. India loses.
- 1965 – 2<sup>nd</sup> war with India over Kashmir
- 1966 – Indira Gandhi wins power
- 1966 – Tashkent Agreement signed after third party mediation from the USSR
- 1971 – 3<sup>rd</sup> war over East Pakistan breaking away with India's help
- 1971 – India signs Twenty Year friendship treaty with USSR
- 1972 – Shimla agreement over Kashmir
- 1973 – Zulfikar Ali Bhutto wins election
- 1974 – India explodes first underground nuclear device
- 1975 – Indira Gandhi announces State of Emergency after being accused of electoral malpractice
- 1977 – General Zia takes over in coup
- 1984 – Indian troops storm the Golden Temple
- 1984 – OCTOBER – Sikh body guards kill Indira Gandhi
- 1987 – Ind/Pak on verge of war, India conducts full military exercise - 'Brass-tacks' military exercise.
- 1987 - Gen. Zia watches Ind/Pak cricket match in Jaipur
- 1988 – General Zia dies & Benazir Bhutto wins elections
- 1989/90 – Kashmiri separatists start campaign against Indian rule
- 1990 – 'Compound crisis' between Ind/Pak
- 1990 – Bhutto dismissed, Sharif wins elections
- 1991 – Rajiv Gandhi assassinated by Tamil Tiger
- 1992 – Hindu extremists demolish Babri Mosque causing Muslim-Hindu riots
- 1993 – Sharif & President Khan resign, Bhutto wins elections
- 1996 – Bhutto dismissed, Sharif back
- 1996 – Congress loses election with mass defeat, BJP (Rao) form government
- 1998- BJP-led coalition collapses, more elections, BJP (Vajpayee) wins again
- 1998 – MAY – India explodes nuclear device.
- 1998 – Pakistan explodes nuclear device
- 1999 - FEBRUARY – Vajpayee travels to Pak on bus for talks – Lahore Accord, Delhi-Lahore bus route opens briefly
- 1999 – MAY – Kargil incident
- 1999 – OCTOBER – Musharraf takes control in bloodless coup. Expelled from Commonwealth
- 2001 – JULY – Disastrous Agra Summit
- 2001 – OCTOBER – US lifts sanctions against Ind/Pak imposed after 1998 nuclear explosions



2001 – DECEMBER – Attack on Lok Sabha blamed on Pak militants. India fires at Pakistan over LoC. Growing fears of war.

2002 – JANUARY – Pak bans militant groups. India demands Pak hands over militants. Also deploy troops along Pak border. Operation Parakram (2001-02). Pak matches deployment.

2002 – FEBRUARY – worst communal violence in Gujarat in a decade

2002 – MAY – War of words between Ind/Pak so bad that (nuclear) war seems imminent threat. Terrorists attack Indian army camp in Kashmir. Pakistan does not rule out ‘first strike’ use of nuclear weapons. Pak fires surface-to-surface missiles.

2002 – JUNE – UK, US recommend citizens leave Ind/Pak. International efforts to calm tensions

2002 – JULY – retired nuclear scientist Abdul Kalam becomes (Muslim) President of India

2002 – OCTOBER – First Pak general elections since 1999 coup

2003 – MAY – India announces bus between Delhi & Lahore to resume.

2003 – AUGUST – First time Ind/Pak shares independence celebrations on same day

2003 – OCTOBER – India announces measures to improve relations with Pak

2003 – NOVEMBER – Pak declares Kashmir cease fire, India swiftly follows

2003 – DECEMBER – Pak/Ind resume air links

2004 – JANUARY – Regional Summit (SAARC) in Islamabad, Musharraf & Vajpayee first meeting in three years. India & moderate Kashmiri parties hold meeting

2004 – FEBRUARY – Lahore. First formal talks for three years. Aim to pave the way for full peace talks

2004 – MAY – Pak Re-admitted to Commonwealth

2004 – MAY – Surprise defeat for BJP, Congress wins

2004 – NOVEMBER – India pulls some troops out of Kashmir

2005 – MARCH – Musharraf watches ODI in Delhi with Manmohan Singh

2005 - APRIL – First bus service since Partition to run between Muzaffarabad and Srinagar

Key –

Indian political events

Pakistani political events

Crisis points between India and Pakistan

Other events including CBMs

## **INDO-PAK BILATERAL CRICKET MATCHES: A TIMELINE**

Bilateral matches:

1952/53 – in India – 5 Tests

1954/55 – in Pak – 5 Tests

1960/61 – in India – 5 Tests

### **'65 & '71 WARS**

1978/79 – in Pak – 3 Tests, 3 ODIs

1979/80 – in India – 6 Tests

1982/83 – in Pak – 6 Tests, 4 ODIs

1983/84 – in India – 3 Tests, 2 ODIs

1984/85 – in Pak – 3 Tests, 3 ODIs

1986/87 – in India – 5 Tests, 6 ODIs

1989/90 – in Pak – 4 Tests, 4 ODIs

### **BABRI MOSQUE DEMOLITION**

### **KASHMIR INSURGENCY**

### **BOMBAY RIOTS & BOMBINGS**

1997/98 – in Pak – 3 ODIs only (28<sup>th</sup> Sept – 2<sup>nd</sup> Oct, Hyderabad, Karachi & Lahore)

1998/99 – in India – 3 Tests (one of which was part of the Tri-Series between India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka (Calcutta match between Ind/Pak the ground was emptied due to fears of fan violence))

### **KARGIL CRISIS**

### **MUSHARRAF TAKES CONTROL**

### **GODHRA VIOLENCE**

2003/04 – in Pak – 3 Tests, 5 ODIs

2004/05 – in India – 3 Tests, 6 ODIs

2005/06 – in Pak – 3 Tests, some ODIs

Source cricinfo.com

**INTERVIEW WITH SHAHARYAR KHAN, CHAIRMAN, PAKISTAN CRICKET BOARD,** Lahore 2/12/05

**QUESTION ONE**

**WHY IS CRICKET DIPLOMACY SO IMPORTANT?**

I think certainly for Pakistan, I can't speak for India, where we have a very limited experience of democracy here that if we are looking at gauging public opinion, then we can gauge it on the basis of speeches made by the Establishment, papers given, in newspaper editorials, diplomats talking at the United Nations, various other places, this is seen as reflecting public opinion. I worked for nearly 40 years as a diplomat, I have already been a member of the Establishment. I have grave reservations that we were articulating public opinions when we wrote our papers, because public opinion, genuine public opinion, is very important factor.

And really without any real democratic base, we have no way of assessing how the common man felt about the issues, India, Pakistan or global issues whatever. Now other countries do have outlets, you have peaceful street demonstrations. I'm talking of the democracies in the world.

You have them in England, America, France and all that, but here there is practically no outlet for such and therefore I recommend to you that 20,000 or 30,000 people at a stadium, and not only 20/30,000 in the stadiums - in the case of India, 20,000 Indian fans in a city, where the match was taking place, and they came with their families, their mothers and grandfathers and so on.

And the way they reacted, the way our public reacted, in the streets, in the bazaars, in the restaurants, on aircraft, in waiting rooms, in my opinion is the real public opinion. Not the manufactured public opinion that you seen from speeches and editorials and television broadcasts and people saying this is what public opinion is. No, that's not what public opinion is, this is what you assume public opinion is, but this public opinion is the real public opinion by the people who are the real political thinkers you know - who are just ordinary people.

And I reckon that during this tour, I've spoken to Indians, the tour, the book that you've read about, the Indian tour to Pakistan was the real public opinion - just the

common man who expressed himself, in my opinion, on Indian and Pakistani policies. It was what we called 'the silent majority'. These were simple, straightforward people from the underprivileged or privileged classes, who are all saying 'we want peace; we know we have problems with Kashmir, with water. OK. Let's not resolve it right now, let's not go to war on the issues, we have no hostility between the people, we share culture, we share a history, we share so much.'

So when they come to us, we welcome them with open arms, despite, despite, the issues that are there, that one accepts, but there's no hostility between the people. I think this will encourage people to have greater interaction because the Indians don't know enough about us, since Partition, and we don't know enough about them, since Partition. So let people sit down, let them have arguments, let them look at each other, in a civilized manor. Let them drop the baggage of Partition. You know, sort of triumphalism in Pakistan, a great regret in India about the partition. This is the way the two sides look at it. Let's sit down, we are now sovereign people.

Let's not go on saying 'Oh if we had one team...' that's what the Indians say by the way. No sorry mate, you're a sovereign country, you produce your team, we're a sovereign country, and we'll produce ours. We will not be a joint team, why should we play a joint team? This is the typical mindset of the Indian - 'Oh, Partition is terrible, we are all one anyway. Why did we have to break up? We have 140 million Muslims, more than Pakistan does anyway.'

So I think what you see there, was that in spite of all of this, that public opinion was expressing itself, the silent public opinion was expressing itself.

## **QUESTION TWO**

### **WHY IS IT SO IMPORTANT BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKSITAN?**

Two reasons. One is, both countries are mad on cricket, are if you like, supported by people who are fans of cricket. Add to which (?) levels are more mixed up (?) and from North to South... It's a great binding influence mostly. I'm sure in India also you do have your centres, Karachi, Lahore and all that but basically cricket unites. Cricket is immensely popular in this country, we've never before had this kind of popularity ever before in any sport. So cricket, in my opinion, it's not like polo, like

an elite sport, it's not one of several sports as you have in England – you've got rugby, football, cricket, you've got other sports. Here's there's one sport in India and Pakistan.

So I think that's the reason why cricket has a final place in bringing people together. Now we expect 20,000 Indian fans. An Indian diplomat said last time, that 20,000 Indian fans came here; you can convert them to ambassadors for Pakistan. So 20,000 went back saying 'we've seen Pakistani hospitality'. It's not what you've seen in the papers, on the television, the hostilities spewed out by the parliamentarians at each other, or taken up by various Prime Ministers, the common man wants peace. They want to be able to have a house, have a school, to have clean water. And he regrets that so much is being spent on both sides on futile confrontation and hostility.

### **QUESTION THREE**

#### **ARE THERE OTHER COUNTRIES THAT PAKISTAN HAS A SIMILAR RELATIONSHIP- BANGLADESH FOR EXAMPLE?**

No. I don't think in Bangladesh. No. I mean there was hostility but it's been swept away. Today, a Pakistani going to Bangladesh, doesn't feel any political hostility. You might get the odd politician, but basically the people are very friendly with each other, so we don't have this problem with Bangladesh.

Where the problem maybe does exist, where cricket can be seen to be a vehicle is what you are seeing now. People who have perceptions of Pakistan which are obviously wrong, but how do we put them right? You expect, when you ask about Pakistan/India (?), we say 'We are fine, we are normal' and you say 'ah ha, you have been saying this for a long time'. You know, this is not the case, but when you go back, when your fans go back and say this. And when you say this or your cricketers go back and say 'Karachi, we played there and didn't hear a sound'. Why have people been saying these things?

You get bomb blasts in London, in Chicago, in Sydney. So I mean, let's not exaggerate, there are hostilities here and there's a great deal of poverty, probably leads to this but it's not aimed at the British for god's sake. So I mean, I think this is

where cricket does play a role, if people can see for themselves and if they come and watch cricket, as you have, you can gradually breakdown these conceptions.

#### **QUESTION FOUR**

##### **HAVE THERE BEEN ANY EXAMPLES WHERE IT HAS BEEN NEGATIVE?**

In the past, yes. Because there was a time when we went and played the World Cup in India. I wasn't there myself, but I saw on the television, the crowds were very hostile to Pakistani fans at the time. The mood has changed a bit. And the fact that, I must say I have to give a lot of support if you like, to the two captains of the teams. If they played the match in the proper spirit, then it translates itself to the crowds and, through television, to the rest of the country.

If they have horrible tiffs, slanging each other on the field, nasty body language, that can have a negative effect, so a great deal of credit goes to the two captains. Always when there's rivalry, there are a few points of tension – someone bowling a bouncer; someone hitting somebody; some misunderstanding; this is part of the game. But it is really the captains that have control of this.

#### **QUESTION FIVE**

##### **WHEN PAKISTAN CAME TO INDIA AND MUSHARRAF CAME TO INDIA TO WATCH THE MATCH AND THERE WAS A PHOTO OF MUSHARRAF AND MANMOHAN SINGH WATCHING THE CRICKET TOGETHER, THAT'S A VERY POSITIVE STEP RIGHT?**

Yes of course it is. I think this is precisely what I, you see when public opinion lifts you up to a level, then Ganguly and Inzamam walk back after a hard day, arm in arm, you know it sends messages and here you are talking of the poor man in the south, the rich man in Bombay or the business man in Calcutta.

Everyone is watching and it's a very important benchmark. Now this benchmark is there for everyone to see. Musharraf and Manmohan Singh have to be within this benchmark, they can't do otherwise. We are setting benchmarks you see, political benchmarks. So I reckon if you, if you have this political benchmark through public

opinion openly expressing itself, the Establishment, the Government, will have to follow suit. They can't go below the benchmark.

### **QUESTION SIX**

**IN ENGLAND, THE ECB IS VERY INDEPENDENT OF GOVERNMENT, BUT I'VE NOTICED IN INDIA AND PAKISTAN THE DECISIONS TO TOUR ARE VERY MUCH POLITICAL DECISIONS MADE WITHIN GOVERNMENT AND I WONDERED WHO ACTUALLY MAKES THAT FINAL DECISION? THE CRICKET BOARD?**

No, I think it is very clear, in both India and Pakistan. India and Pakistan cricket boards have had a generally, have had a tradition of very good relations between them. Even during the bad times, when you know, they were eyeball to eyeball politically at a government level. Even at those times the cricket boards had a good relationship. Over these years, both boards wanted to tour each other. But knowing that this is a political event when you're talking India and Pakistan, we had to seek our government's approval for these tours.

Normally, if I'm touring the West Indies, I don't have to ask the government; I have it very clear, but obviously a tour of India has political ramifications. Therefore only in the India and Pakistan context do we have to seek our approval. Not only on tour but also of the thorny issues like when we were asked to play in Ahmedabad, you know – a city that has seen so much bloodshed - that had political connotations. I suppose India also hesitated over Karachi, the problem was security there. And therefore we have to keep consulting our governments where sensitive political issues are in play.

**INTERVIEW WITH BOB WOOLMER, PAKISTAN CRICKET COACH, Lahore**

4/12/05

**QUESTION ONE**

**DO YOU THINK DIPLOMACY HAS A PLACE IN CRICKET?**

I think that it has been used by politics in different spheres, in South Africa especially the politics of cricket mirror society as well so the simple answer is yes, cricket can be used as a diplomatic tool and SHOULD be used as a diplomatic tool in the case of Pakistan and India. Both countries are absolutely mad on it.

The strange thing I find about India and Pakistan is that once they separated they became completely different states and that is probably religious-based more than anything, in fact they are the same group of people, it's just a different country. I'm not politician but I think cricket has a role to play in mending bridges and all that sort of thing.

**QUESTION TWO**

**IS IT THE CULTURAL EXCHANGE? – CHECK QUESTION**

Sport generally helps you do that. Most people in cricket, maybe 99% will overwhelmingly be welcome to overseas visitors.

I find the hospitality here almost unbearable. The way you warm to the people, you warm to the society, you warm to the country because of their hospitality and that's all because of cricket really – it's all cricket related.

**QUESTION THREE**

**SHAHARYAR KHAN SAYS CRICKETERS MUST BE AMBASSADORS DO YOU AGREE?**

Ambassadors in their behaviour certainly, their public behaviour has to be beyond reproach and I think most cricket teams in the world, the way you are brought up in the world of cricket, is to understand that humility, cricket doesn't like you if you don't do things properly. You're very lucky, first of all you get paid to do a sport that you like, secondly cricket teaches you manners, it teaches you a lot about life and



therefore you get to meet a lot of people who love cricket, who get a lot of stimulation from the game and they're going to want your photograph, they're going to want this and that.

As a cricketer you learn very quickly that you are an ambassador even in the most frustrating of times you're going to have to smile and shake someone's hand. Just lost a test match, ODI, series, whatever, you have to act like you've won it. But yes, I've met the Queen, President Musharraf, apartheid leaders and that's interesting to talk to them.

Being a coach myself, part of that is to be a politician. In a funny sort of way you're having to politicise what you do purely because it requires it. As part of the role you're manager; a historian; a disciplinarian; a politician; you have to know how to speak to people to get things.

#### **QUESTION FOUR**

##### **IS THERE MORE PRESSURE DURING INDIA/PAKISTAN TOURS?**

Thank goodness I'm an outsider! I've never come across such pressure, such enthusiastic pressure: general pressures as with India. When we went to India recently it was incredible, I would try and stand away from it.

One thing I distinctly remember was 38 microphones, a flower type arrangement of them and cameras. Over 150-200 newspaper people sitting there almost awestruck by the fact that here was a game but really it was India versus Pakistan, depart and divide, that being brought together with everyone, I mean I get the impression they are not prepared to trust each other just yet.

But cricket will bring us together for a bit more, have a good time, we can write lots of good things about it. But there's always some mistrust. Hopefully the Kashmir situation is getting better because there has been that sort of tension for a long while.

#### **QUESTION FIVE**

##### **GEORGE ORWELL DESCRIBED SPORT AS 'WAR MINUS SHOOTING'. DO YOU AGREE?**

That's bollocks. That's not the sport, that's people's perceptions. God gave us a brain but he didn't tell us how to use it!

### **QUESTION SIX**

#### **SPORT HAS BEEN USED FOR POLITICAL AIMS IN SOUTH AFRICA TOO. HOW DO YOU THINK THIS DIFFERS FROM THE INDIA/PAKISTAN CASE?**

Yes, South Africa politics was based on bringing the black and coloureds, who were South Africans by the way. Make them mix very quickly and force their way into the team, that was being done with the quota systems, and school systems, and sometimes very badly. Not everyone is good at what they do and there would be some selectors who would be too pushy. When it was clear that they were going to intervene in the national side, I would say 'No' at this point, why jeopardise the national side just for the sake of politicians just to say that 'we are making headway in the world.'

The politicians were getting black people to play to show their voters, which I always thought was strange because the voters wouldn't have minded because once everyone got the vote it was always going to be ANC [African National Congress] and I just wondered where they thought all this pressure was coming from but there is a case where there was quite a lot of, certainly in some sports, good rugby players who weren't being looked at because it was a less black sport. The main centre was Cape Town, where there were many coloureds like Muslims and Hindus who loved their cricket. They felt marginalised by apartheid and they were, they hadn't played the standard of first class cricket, and it would take time. It would take longer for some to adapt than others...

Here [Pakistan] the politics are more based around... not in the team, there might have been selectorial politics in terms of 'We want X number from Karachi or Lahore' but it wasn't racially motivated. It was more sort of bits and pieces, empires, and the politics of it comes more from thinking politicians, they can do it better than the PCB or they can do it better than...

I suppose in a way it's a different sort of politics. We use the word politics too much. 'Oh it's just politics.'

**ROUGH NOTES OF INTERVIEW WITH RAHUL BHATTACHARYA, INDIAN CRICKET JOURNALIST, Mumbai 18/03/06**

- In the World Cup [sic – it was actually a tri-series tournament between India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka in 1999] Shoaib ran our Tendulkar by bumping into him. They had to empty the ground as there was so much hostility.
- No tension with Sri Lanka or Bangladesh, These countries are not seen as politically important enough, even after the Tamil Tigers were implicated in the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi.
- Pakistan is so important because India and Pakistan share the same history, and have so much in common.
- Karachi was a city born out of Partition, it's very violent but the Pakistani crowd gave a standing ovation when India won there which was very positive.
- India is not so positive when Pakistan tour, maybe this is because Pakistan has more to prove.
- People are losing their excitement about Indo-Pakistan matches now the novelty has worn off.
- Very hard for Indians to get a visa for Pakistan. Must check into a police station within 24 hours of arrival. Only limited (named) cities can be visited. But then in 2004, 20,000 visas were given for the tour.
- Cricket works as a cultural exchange.
- Big debate about whether the 2004 tour should be before or after the general elections – there was a fear that if the tour went wrong it could affect the result – ironically the BJP lost anyway even though the tour was a success.
- Positive politics before the 2004 tour allowed the cricket to go-ahead.
- Musharraf invited himself to Delhi for the One Day International and he had three days of talks, this was much more successful than the previous time the Indian PM (Vajpayee) and Musharraf met in Agra.

**ROUGH NOTES OF INTERVIEW WITH PROFESSOR SHETTY, BOARD OF CRICKET CONTROL OF INDIA, Mumbai 22/03/06**

- Prime Minister Vajpayee took the initiative to re-start cricketing relations in 2004.
- Relations were warming between the two countries after 2004.
- 8-9,000 Pakistani fans who came to Mohali were given free food in the city.
- Karachi was a much safer, more pleasant experience this time round (2006).
- We arranged several off-field activities for the team -
  1. In 2006, Rahul Dravid met students at the Lahore Institute.
  2. In 2004, Sachin Tendulkar and VVS Laxman did an advertisement for polio eradication in Pakistan.
  3. The whole team went to visit a village
  4. In 2006, the team went shopping
- Pakistan is more welcoming to India than the other way round.

**ROUGH NOTES OF INTERVIEW WITH RAMIZ RAJA, FORMER PAKISTAN CRICKET AND CEO OF THE PAKISTAN CRICKET BOARD,** Lahore 02/12/05

- Pakistan toured Indian in 1989/90 – there was a lot less hatred in South India than in the Punjab for example – the Punjab was more aggressive on both sides of the border.
- Pakistan tours to India always have a foreign services diplomat as the manager.
- Cricketers don't really think of the bigger picture, they just want to play cricket.
- In Ahmedabad the Pakistani team was pelted with stones so badly that the then captain, Imran Khan ordered the whole team to wear helmets whilst fielding.
- There has always been a lot of respect between Indian and Pakistani cricketers for their cricketing skills.
- Pakistan has always done well in India.
- In 2005 when Pakistan toured India, there was not much hostility or animosity unlike previous tours.

**ROUGH NOTES OF INTERVIEW WITH DAVID MORGAN, CHAIRMAN OF THE ECB AND MEMBER OF THE ICC EXECUTIVE BOARD,** London, 30/05/06

- Cricket is the major sport played between India and Pakistan. The decision not to play bilateral matches was taken by the Indian government. This was a great shame for the players and the fans.
- The ICC states that the only acceptable reasons for cancelling a tour are safety and security issues or government instruction.
- In the UK it was argued that democratic countries can prevent tours, however India is a democracy and they still refused to allow tours with Pakistan.
- In reference to Orwell's contention that 'sport is war minus shooting', Morgan said 'sport can be war for years but there's no shooting. But it is engagement of the very best and most competitive kind. And it does bring different creeds, colours and classes together.'
- Dealing with the PCB has become much easier since Shaharyar Khan become Chairman.
- Key issues when England went to play in Pakistan were: whether to play in Karachi – the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and independent safety consultants were asked to advise on security issues. If the FCO says it is safe then it is very difficult not to play there. However in this instance the FCO said that Karachi was dangerous but not so dangerous a match couldn't be played. It was then decided that an ODI would be played rather than a Test match.
- When the ECB raised concerns about playing in Karachi, the PCB mentioned the 7<sup>th</sup> July London bombings at a time when Australia was playing in London, to highlight that Pakistan is not the only place to have bombs attacks.
- In the ECB chairman's statement there was a mention of the England cricketers visit to the earthquake zone in Pakistan which was greatly appreciated.
- The England tour to Zimbabwe in 2004 became very contentious. Tim Lamb, the former CEO of the ECB met with Jack Straw (Foreign Secretary at the time) and Tessa Jowell, Minister for Sport and Culture and made it very clear to them that England did not tour because of security issues or government instruction, then

the ECB could be banned from the ICC for the period that included hosting the Ashes.

- The British government claimed they did not have the legal powers to prevent England from touring Zimbabwe so Straw and Morgan agreed to allow to tour to take place but in a low-key fashion.
- The ZCB (Zimbabwean Cricket Board) phoned up to inform the ECB that 13 journalists had not been given accreditation. The UK government and British Embassy helped resolve this issue so everyone got their accreditation in the end.

**ROUGH NOTES OF INTERVIEW WITH NASSER HUSSAIN, FORMER ENGLAND CRICKET CAPTAIN AND SKY SPORTS COMMENTATOR,** Goa,

05/04/06

- There should be an attempt to keep sport and politics apart, this is very difficult though as you see from issues arising in India/Pakistan, Zimbabwe or South Africa. Politicians try to further their own aims through sport.
- Cricketers are ambassadors for their country so they have to be diplomatic.
- However you wouldn't want to use sport to broker a deal.
- India and Pakistan are more desperate to play each other than some nations. As there's so much talk about it. It's a shame there haven't been more matches.
- India is not Number 1 in the cricketing world partly because of politics – politicians influence selection of teams, and partly due to money. The new BCCI chief – Sharad Pawar used to be Head of Agriculture [also Defence Minister and Chief Minister of Maharashtra]
- In the recent series that I commentated on [the India/Pakistan series 2006] – the crowd stood shoulder to shoulder, in certain venues many made the journey from India. They came to see family or previous homes in Pakistan. I didn't see any negative interactions in the crowd.
- Musharraf telling MS. Dhoni [the Indian wicketkeeper] not to cut his hair was a nice touch.