Malcolm, Dominic. "Cricket, the English and the Process of 'Othering'." *Globalizing Cricket: Englishness, Empire and Identity*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013. 141–156. Globalizing Sport Studies. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849665605.ch-009>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 09:21 UTC.

Copyright © Dominic Malcolm 2013. You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Cricket, the English and the Process of 'Othering'

From its very inception as the national game, English 'ownership' of cricket has been bolstered by the concomitant belief that others have failed to embrace, and indeed are incapable of understanding, the sport. Given their geographical closeness and status competition, Anglo-French rivalry has traditionally been 'in a class of its own' (Paxman 1999: 26) and thus predictably manifest in perceptions of the quintessential English game. Consequently we see the terms French cut and French drive used to describe miss-hit shots. French cricket is used to describe a simplified form of the game, played mainly by children and always in informal settings. While it is a point of pride for the English that the French do not play cricket, more importantly, the French are portrayed as being *unable* to play cricket. For instance cricket historians have keenly seized on evidence which suggests that an English cricket team was about to depart for a game in Paris in 1789, but had to return home when revolution broke out (Goulstone and Swanton 1989). G.M. Trevelyan, Regius Professor of Modern English at Cambridge University would subsequently write, 'if the French *noblesse* had been capable of playing cricket with their peasants, their *chateaux* would never have been burnt' (cited in Holt 1989: 268). A brief examination of two examples of the way the English seek to demonstrate their (assumed) distinction from the French through cricket illustrates some of the broader points which underpin this chapter.

In 1889 the satirical magazine *Punch* responded to developments in France which would culminate in Pierre de Coubertin's establishment of the Modern Olympic Games by publishing a piece about 'Le Cricquette' and 'How he will be played shortly'. The article portrayed a match between 'ALL OF FRANCE V AN ENGLAND 'OME-TEAM'. The French team is dismissed for no runs with many of the players either paralysed with fear or injured. Three Frenchmen challenge the umpire (who is implicitly assumed to be English) to a duel. England score 6,333 runs in response but the game concludes when the umpire, 'with chivalrous generosity', declares a draw. Consequently it is decided that cricket in France should be played with a soft ball (to compensate for a lack of courage), that the wickets should be enlarged (to compensate for a lack of skill) and that 'the umpire, a grave anomaly in a game cherished by a liberty-loving people, should be instantly suppressed' (cited in Rayvern Allen 1985: 61).

A century later, marking the 2005 death of Jacques Derrida, a Miles Kingston (2005) column in the *Independent* humorously juxtaposed the game and the French philosopher's ideas through a series of letters from fictional English cricketers. The first addresses Derrida's critique of essentialism. 'George "Gubby" Trotter' recalls Derrida questioning whether players can be said to be the same people at the beginning of a match as they are at the end: "they are five days older. They may have changed their opinions, may have undergone significant experiences in the field. I think they may be different people". To this, Trotter responds, "Jacques, you never change. You are an idiot" ... and he laughed.' In the second 'Lord Wilderspoon' portrays Derrida using a cricket example to formulate his critique of logocentrism based on binary oppositions: "You know everything is relative" he [Derrida] told me one day in the slips. "You bowl medium-fast, with the occasional slow ball. I bowl slow and slip in the occasional quick one. Yet your slow ball is faster than my quick one! What does that tell us?" The third lampoon's the French philosophic tradition more generally. 'Sir Ronald Cashew' asks Derrida to explain his philosophy to him and how it relates to cricket: "An Englishman would never understand it ... The only true cricket is French cricket ... A bat, a ball, a pair of trousers. It is cricket reduced to its irreducible elements. Understand French cricket, and you can understand anything."

These accounts draw on stereotypes which the English believe distinguish themselves from the French and which can be traced back to the conception of an English national character (see Chapter 2). French desire for liberty is contrasted with the ability of the English to achieve it. French intolerance of physical hardship leads them to respond with excessive violence (duelling), while the English, who possess the bravery to tolerate the violent aspects of cricket are paradoxically peaceable. The mocking of Derrida's ideas continues an English tradition of championing the practical over the abstract, the particular over the theoretical (Colls 2002). By invoking the imagery of French cricket, French philosophic traditions are portrayed as obfuscation rather than insight. Derrida is subject to the typically English insult of being 'too clever by half' (Haseler 1996: 21), while the English just get on with things and so get them done.

If, as Easthope (1999) argues, English national culture treats only cricket and its own sense of humour as transcendental, then jokes about cricket which reveal how the English contrast themselves with others must hold considerable social significance. But the use of comedy as a vehicle to delineate competing identities serves an additional function. As we saw in relation to 'New Laddism', the use of humour 'at once permits, legitimates and exonerates an insult' (Pickering and Lockyer 2009, cited in Burdsey 2011: 269). Using humour enables people to distance themselves from the negative connotations of their identity construction practices and thus, for example, retain a benign rather than malign sense of national character.

Consequently this chapter seeks to develop our understanding of English national identity through an examination of the role of cricket in the 'Othering'

of non-English peoples. Due to the influence of the colonial experience on Britain in general and cricket in particular, the Othering of Black and Asian populations is more frequent than, for example, the Othering of Americans or Europeans. Like the humorous accounts described above, these depictions demonstrate that English and 'Other' national characters are constructed relationally. But in addition to this, the very frequency and commonplace nature of such accounts makes them particularly influential and revealing. In contrast, for instance, to overtly political acts, they may not be subject to the same degree of critical reflection and thus illustrate in greater detail subconscious attitudes and beliefs. In contrast to humorous accounts, however, there is rather less ambiguity over their meaning.

Following a critical discussion of Said's concept of orientalism, this chapter presents an account of the media speculation over the death of former England cricketer and Pakistan coach during the 2007 ICC World Cup in the Caribbean, dubbed 'Woolmergate'. This, it is suggested, illustrates the way in which cricket acts as a vehicle for the juxtaposition of beliefs about English and 'Other' societies and people. The chapter concludes by arguing that a coherent set of ideas about self and other, about 'us and 'them', are consistently applied to frame a broad range of global cricketing issues, from allegations of match-fixing to the rise (and potential demise) of the IPL.

Orientalism

Edward Said's *Orientalism* is 'the classical framework in understanding relationships between the "West" (and the "Rest") and Muslims in particular' (Saeed 2007: 447). 'Orientalism' initially referred simply to the study of the social and cultural life of the East but latter day anti-colonial movements led to a questioning of the consequences of this genre of work. Said (2003: 2) argued that many orientalists had 'accepted the basic distinction between the East and the West as the starting point for elaborate theories', and thus one of the most significant achievements of orientalism is to construct *an* Orient, a single homogenized place which is believed to constitute a cohesive whole. Consequently a 'Them' and 'Us' is 'constructed as naturalized, binary oppositions' (Poole 2002: 18) in which Western cultures and societies are depicted as inherently superior to their 'alien' Eastern counterparts.

Orientalism constructs notions of an absolute and systematic difference between the East and West based on cultural generalizations or stereotypes that depict the Orient as 'irrational, aberrant, backward, crude, despotic, inauthentic, passive, feminine and sexually corrupt' (Macfie, 2000: 4). Conversely, in using antonyms such as rational, humane, developed and modern to depict the West, orientalism reveals inward self-reflection. Thus modernist Western identity – capitalist, secular, scientific – is logically dependent upon comparison with,

and the establishment of difference from, non-Western cultures more broadly (Hall 1992). In this way European political and economic domination was/ is augmented by cultural domination. This process can also be described as *Unthinking Eurocentrism* (Shohat and Stam 1994).

Said's (1997: xii) claim that, 'malicious generalizations about Islam have become the last acceptable form of denigration of foreign culture in the West' seems more pertinent post-9/11 than ever. Since 9/11 newspaper coverage of Muslims has increased dramatically (Whittaker 2002). Qualitatively, Richardson (2004: 75) suggests that the reporting of Islam and Muslims has been characterized by 'negative references' such as 'cultural backwardness', 'incivility', 'extremism', 'fundamentalism', 'barbarity' and 'intolerance', and he concludes that the similarities with 'Orientalist paternalism ... are quite striking'. While British media representations of Black people have long focussed on an essential difference based on notions of the exotic, primitive and violent (Carrington 2010; van Dijk 1991), Asian males have come to replace Black males as the new 'folk devils' of British society. For Carrington (2008: 116) the 'Asian Muslim – a deliberate and powerful conflation of race, ethnicity and religion – becomes the new Other, against which British liberal democracy must stand'. Given the relational way in which identities are formed, it is perhaps not entirely coincidental that a benign nationalism entered the public consciousness of the English in 2005, for that was also the year of the 7/7 London bombings and thus a time when the events of 9/11 assumed a heightened level of significance for many in Britain.

Orientalism is a much debated text. It has been argued that Said was selective in his evidence, falsely presented Western scholarship as monolithic, ignored the role of the 'native' in developing the discipline, and failed to account for the way Westerners (as we saw in the previous chapter) have been affected by their own colonial experiences (Poole 2002; Richardson 2004). Consequently, in simplifying, homogenizing and dismissing the West, 'anti-orientalism' risks being as reductionist as the orientalist discourse Said set out to de-construct. Further questions centre on Said's ontological position; if orientalism portrays a falsehood – for instance Said (2003: 1–2) describes the Orient as both 'almost a European invention', yet not 'merely imaginative' – what is the relationship between orientalist discourse and reality?

The enduring relevance of orientalism lies in the connection Said makes between historical specificity, knowledge and power (Poole 2002: 31); that is to say, people in particular contexts generate particular beliefs and their (in)ability to sustain those beliefs depend on the broader structure of power relations. In this respect orientalism shares a number of notable similarities with Elias's sociology of knowledge more generally, and theory of civilizing processes in particular (these will be discussed further in the Conclusion). For present purposes, however, we merely need to recognize that a critical application of Said's ideas enables us to see that Western representations of the East form a

'saturating hegemonic system' (Macfie 2000: 4), and that the broader principles of such a framework can be useful in helping us understand how (and why) the English 'Other' various social groups. Consequently, the next section illustrates how, despite apparent changes to English self-conceptions, orientalism has continued, and perhaps become even more intense, in structuring jingoistic and nationalistic caricatures in recent years. As will be seen, the stereotyping of post-colonial peoples and societies is a more general feature of how contemporary English people engage with cricket.

Woolmergate

In Jamaica on 17 March 2007 Pakistan was unexpectedly eliminated from the ICC Cricket World Cup after losing to Ireland. Bob Woolmer described the result as one of his worst experiences in cricket. He told reporters that he would 'sleep on his future' as Pakistan coach and went to his room on the twelfth floor of Kingston's Pegasus Hotel. He ordered lasagne from room service. During the night he sent an email to his wife Gill in Cape Town, South Africa, and told her that he was shocked and depressed by events.

The next morning Woolmer's dead body was found lying against the inside of his bathroom door. The majority of reports stated that the room was not disturbed and that there were no signs of forced entry. Whilst there was vomit, blood and faeces on the bathroom floor and walls, there were no external cuts or bruises on Woolmer's body. Woolmer was pronounced dead at a local hospital at 12.00pm on 18 March.

Woolmer had been suffering from stress, had Type II diabetes and sometimes slept with an oxygen mask. Given this background it was thought that he may have suffered a heart attack or stroke. Others speculated that he may have died from food poisoning. The initial post-mortem conducted by Dr Ere Sheshaiah was 'inconclusive' but on 22 March, following further toxicology and histology tests, Jamaican police commissioner Lucius Thomas announced that it was believed that Woolmer died from 'asphyxia as a result of manual strangulation'.

Mark Shields, an English-born, former London Metropolitan Police detective led the Jamaican investigation. The high profile multinational inquiry was closed on 12 June 2007 with the conclusion that Woolmer had not been murdered but had died from natural causes. In the intervening weeks, however, a range of theories about Woolmer's death were mooted by the Jamaican police, cricketers, cricket administrators and journalists. Woolmer's murder, it was speculated, had been committed: by a Pakistan player; by an angry Pakistan supporter; by Muslim radicals; by bookmakers who feared Woolmer might expose their match-fixing operations; following a bungled burglary attempt. The uncertainty over Woolmer's death enabled British journalists considerable

scope to speculate. In so doing particular narratives emerged which both conformed to the perceptions of Englishness charted in the previous chapter, and revealed 'a reservoir of ideas, or core images' (Richardson 2004: 230) about Caribbean societies and 'the Orient'.

Woolmergate and cultural representations of the West

Posthumous tributes portrayed Woolmer as 'essentially' rational, humane and modern. Such positive and generous reflections are, of course, not unusual in obituaries, but the *particular* attributes to which writers drew attention reveal a broader set of underlying assumptions about the defining characteristics and thus inherent 'superiority' of the West, and the English in particular. The prominent narratives mirror those discussed in the previous chapter in relation to benign Englishness, and epitomized in the Flintoff celebrity.

Woolmer's rational character was elucidated by the former South African player Allan Donald who said that Woolmer 'never became flustered' and had a 'calm way' which was 'brilliant at diffusing potentially difficult situations' (*Sun*, 23 March 2007). Woolmer was accredited for 'the unusual period of calm' which the Pakistan team experienced under his stewardship (*Daily Mail*, 22 March 2007), and *Eastern Eye* (23 March 2007) spoke of Woolmer's 'calming influence on a team full of eccentrics'. The *Daily Mirror* (24 March 2007) stated that 'despite the vitriol' which followed Pakistan's defeat to Ireland, 'Woolmer handled the upset with typical dignity'.

A sense of humanity underpinned Woolmer's rationality. Not only had Woolmer 'done such a great service to international cricket' (*Daily Star*, 23 March 2007), his motivation had been largely altruistic. John Etheridge described Woolmer as 'a cricket man to his soul and (someone) who cared so much' (*Sun*, 22 March 2007). Others noted that despite the international demand for his coaching skills, he had accumulated relatively little wealth from his involvement in the game. Greater significance was attached to his experience of coaching in South Africa's townships than to his participation on a 'rebel tour' to South Africa in 1981 or his involvement with Kerry Packer cricket in the 1970s (*Observer*, 25 March 2007). For former England captain David Gower, 'nobody ... better represented the high principles of sportsmanship that have been traditionally associated with cricket' (*The Sunday Times*, 25 March 2007). The *Daily Mail* (22 March 2007) suggested that whilst 'sometimes frustrated by the vagaries of coaching Pakistan, Woolmer had a love for the country and its people'. Allan Donald, David Gower and Colin Crompton (*Independent*, 19 March 2007), all explicitly linked Woolmer's tolerance and benevolence to his Englishness.

Woolmer was also depicted as a modern cosmopolitan. He was described as 'truly a citizen of the world' (*Daily Mail*, 22 March 2007) on account of

the variety of appointments he had held in international cricket, including an ICC post with responsibility for developing the game in emerging nations. For Derek Pringle, Woolmer was 'an enthusiast ... (who) liked a challenge', but also 'a man of the world' (*Daily Telegraph*, 22 March 2007). Crompton mused that, 'It always seemed odd that he was prepared to coach in so many bizarre places but he was so deeply enamoured of the game' (*Independent*, 19 March 2007). At the heart of 'Woolmergate', therefore, was a 'victim' who was depicted as an embodiment of many of the positive characteristics the English attribute to themselves, and by extension to the West more generally. Where many orientalist implied that 'colonialism brought tranquility' to colonized lands (Said 1997: liv), so Woolmer was represented as an English cricket philanthropist, who used typically English traits to bring order to a hostile and chaotic environment.

Woolmergate and cultural representations of the Caribbean

The media's depiction of the Caribbean, and Jamaica in particular, focused on three inter-related themes. Centrally the English press portrayed Jamaica as a society heavily reliant on Britain; a society which, despite political independence, could only function with the former colonizer's continued support. This dependence, stemmed from the second and third themes: the violent character of Jamaican society and its relatively underdeveloped infrastructure.

Many of the early reports on Woolmer's death contextualized the suspected killing with reference to the commonplace nature of violence in Jamaican society. *The Times* (22 March 2007), for instance, spoke of 'endemic gun crime, Yardie gangs and drug culture', the *Independent* (1 April 2007) referred to Jamaica's 'soaring murder rate', and the *Daily Mail* (31 March 2007) substantiated such claims by identifying Jamaica as having the world's third highest murder rate per capita. Barbadian cricket journalist Tony Cozier provided a more emotive backdrop:

Two days after his [Woolmer's] death, a gang shot dead the two-year-old daughter of a policeman and seriously injured her six-year-old sister and other young family members in a rough Kingston area known as Vietnam. 'Evil' was the headline over the report in *The Daily Observer* but, as heinous as it was, it was simply another statistic to add to the 1,000 or so killed every year. (*Independent on Sunday*, 25 March 2009)

Police comments, designed to counter suggestions that the murderer may have been Jamaican did little to counter this motif of violence. On 27 March the *Daily Mirror* quoted Mark Shields, leading the Jamaican investigation, as stating that, 'Most murders in Jamaica are internal affairs. Manual strangulation

doesn't fit a local profile. Firearms or knives are the favoured weapons here.' Similarly the *Guardian* (30 March 2007) cited Shields' view that,

It's so important that people realise that Jamaica is, by and large, a safe country for outsiders. Jamaicans kill Jamaicans for a whole array of reasons ... but Jamaicans do not murder tourists. They might rob them as they do in Rome or London, but they don't go around killing visitors to the island.

The paper went on to underscore the Jamaica-violence narrative by noting that Shields initially transferred from London to investigate an alleged 'shoot-to-kill' policy in some sections of the Jamaican police (see also *The Times* 22 March 2007).

The violence portrayed as endemic in Jamaica was viewed as partly a cause, and partly a consequence, of the dysfunctional aspects of a 'backward' society. The *Daily Mail* (20 March 2007) argued that 'the chaotic preparation for the World Cup has meant much-needed medical equipment, including MRI scanners, had not yet arrived in Kingston hospitals in time for the start of the event'. Although *The Times* (31 March 2007) reported that Shields 'prided himself on bringing modern investigative technology and techniques to the Jamaican force', others referred to the 'maelstrom of policing that is Jamaica', and suggested that there was 'corruption at all levels which has resulted in public mistrust' (*Daily Mail*, 6 April 2007). As early as the beginning of April, the *Daily Telegraph* (2 April 2007) suggested that the inquiry was 'in danger of becoming mired in Jamaican bureaucracy, a system so plagued by inefficiencies that some cases dating back 10 years remain unresolved'. The coroners court – which *The Times* (31 March 2007) described as 'a tiny wooden, one-room venue', located 'amid the chaos of central Kingston', staffed by assistants who 'appeared to be doing nothing. Their desks were devoid of paperwork' – was reported to have a backlog of almost 4,000 cases.

The Times (31 March 2007) was equally critical of the Jamaican pathology service, citing 'antediluvian scenes' and 'a creaky and antiquated Jamaican infrastructure poorly equipped to deal with such a high-profile and complex case'. In similar vein the *Daily Mail* (31 March 2007) reported that, 'post mortems that should take two hours or more are rushed through in 30 minutes'. The paper further cited a UK pathologist with experience of working in Jamaica who recalled that examinations 'did not meet the basic requirements ... hands were not bagged to prevent contamination; the bodies were piled up on each other on trolleys ... body fluids mingle, bullets aren't "noticed"'. The *Observer* (15 April 2007) and *The Times* (31 March 2007) drew attention to the Jamaicans' rapid embalming of Woolmer's body which complicated re-examination. The *Daily Mail* inferred that such practices were a natural extension of Jamaican culture. Not only did the paper cite the Jamaicans for Justice (JFJ) pressure group's claims that 'bribes are routinely offered to change autopsy reports', but concluded that, 'It was in this chronically ill-equipped and flyblown hospital – whose patients must

endure reggae music pumping out night and day, and the fug of ganja wafting around the wards – that Dr Sheshaiah conducted his widely questioned post-mortem.'

Partly as a consequence of the uncertainty in the initial autopsy findings, but partly because the diagnosis of manual asphyxiation seemed inconsistent with other evidence from the case,¹ the media reported a number of 'authorities' who questioned the coroner's report. The *Daily Mail* (30 March 2007) first reported the concerns of Dr Garfield Blake, past president of the Jamaican Association of Clinical Pathologists, whilst two days later (1 April 2007) *The Sunday Times* and *Sunday Express* (in nearly identical reports) noted that, 'Some of Britain's leading forensic pathologists have called for a second autopsy to examine Bob Woolmer's death after expressing doubts about the evidence suggesting he was strangled'. *The Sunday Times* (1 April 2007) claimed to have spoken to five leading British pathologists who agreed that if strangulation had been the cause of death, one would expect to have found marks on Woolmer's neck. *The Sunday Times* (8 April 2007) repeated these claims a week later, this time citing Derrick Pounder, Professor of Pathology at the University of Dundee, in whose experience, Jamaican pathologists were 'hackers, not cutters ... I would be more comfortable if these findings were reviewed'.

In addition to the post-mortem, journalists highlighted the relatively unsophisticated nature of CCTV security equipment. The *Daily Mirror* (29 March 2007) reported that no cameras pointed directly at Woolmer's door, that recordings were made on VHS tapes rather than digitally, and that 'it is also thought the tapes were worn out from years of reuse'. *The Times* (30 March 2007) further reported Pakistani discontent at the progress of the investigation. Inspector General Malik, of Karachi's Anti-Corruption Establishment, was reported as saying, 'To my assessment, the investigation is not very sharp. How many days was it before they were looking at the CCTV footage? Almost a week. I don't know why. I am astonished that they do not know yet who visited every room.'

The combined portrayal of a violent and disordered society which was technologically and organizationally backward led to a narrative which both underscored Jamaica's deficiencies and its continued dependence on other countries, and the former colonial power in particular. On 1 April, the *Independent* reported that Scotland Yard, London would send three senior detectives to review the case. On 7 April the *Guardian* reported that a Scotland Yard 'forensic expert' had arrived in Jamaica, and on 15 April the *Observer* said that Scotland Yard detectives were flying home having made 'no apparent progress'. Nearly a week later the *Daily Telegraph* (21 April 2007) stated that it understood that London Metropolitan police detectives had reviewed the investigation and had made a number of recommendations. The United Kingdom had supplied analysis of toxicology samples (*Daily Express*, 16 April 2007) and 'closer scrutiny' (*The Times*, 16 April 2007) and 'digital

enhancement' (*Independent*, 21 April 2007) of CCTV images. The United States supplied a pathologist to conduct the second post-mortem (*The Times*, 23 March 2007), FBI assistance (*Sunday Star*, 1 April 2007), and further toxicology tests (*Daily Telegraph*, 21 April 2007). According to the *Guardian* (7 April 2007), the arrival of an Interpol forensic expert, 'renewed conjecture that the postmortem examination was bungled'.

Woolmergate and cultural representations of the Orient

Despite the death occurring in Jamaica, a greater proportion of the British press coverage of Woolmergate focused on Pakistan. In part this might have been a consequence of Mark Shields' conviction that the *modus operandi* of Woolmer's murderer was not that of a Jamaican killer. More importantly for present purposes however, there were some interesting similarities and differences between the depiction of Jamaican and Pakistani societies in the Woolmergate coverage. Whilst Pakistan(is), like Jamaica(ns), was portrayed as both violent and backward, the overriding narrative of Pakistan(is) was not one of the continued dependence, but rather of inherent and unbridgeable difference.

The violent character of Pakistani society was initially depicted through descriptions of the behaviour of Pakistan supporters. Defeat to Ireland 'sparked riots in Pakistan' (*Daily Mirror*, 19 March 2007), 'sent angry fans wild ... Pakistanis (are) fervent about their national side' (*Daily Mail*, 19 March 2007). According to the *Daily Telegraph* (22 March 2007), Pakistan's defeats had led 'mobs' to stone Woolmers' Pakistan apartment and burn effigies of Woolmer and the captain Inzamam-ul-Haq, 'to chants of "Death to Bob Woolmer, Death to Inzamam"'. The *Sun* (22 March 2007) told its readers that what occurred was quite normal; not only were players' effigies 'burned when the team loses ... their houses are frequently attacked'.

It was widely speculated that the murderer might be 'a Pakistani supporter, angry at their abject performance', 'a mad fan' (*Daily Mirror*, 24 March 2007), or that Woolmer had been the 'victim of a supporter with a grudge' (*Guardian* 30 April 2007). Newspapers reported that the team feared for their lives in the 'lawlessness' of Pakistan (*The Times*, 28 March 2007), and thus would stay in London to delay their return to Pakistan (*Daily Star* 23 March 2007). *The Times* (29 March 2007) reported that in an attempt to protect the players, the Pakistan Cricket Board (PCB) had decided that the squad would not travel back together, and circulated misinformation which concealed players' return journeys. The paper further described how players on a flight arriving in Islamabad at 2.30am had been 'jostled angrily' and had their cars surrounded by crowds of fans; 'You wondered what it would have been like if Woolmer was alive. Because this was a country showing a sensitive approach.' Before the

murder investigation, by contrast, 'the public were openly talking of attending the team's return with sticks'.

In the same way that it was mooted that Woolmer's death might have been linked to organized crime in Jamaica, the British press speculated over the involvement of gangs of 'Asian bookmakers'. There were claims that Pakistan players had told police that Woolmer had a 'blazing row' with an 'Indian bookie' (*Daily Mail*, 29 March 2007), whilst former Pakistan player, Sarfraz Nawaz, was quoted as saying that 'at least 5 bookies from Pakistan are in the West Indies and had been in touch with Pakistani players in attempts to fix matches' (*Sun*, 22 March 2007). These individuals were depicted as frontmen for more sinister networks, or "'vague, shady" Asian syndicates' (*Daily Telegraph*, 24 March 2007).

Violence, organized crime and corruption were therefore depicted as pervasive features of Pakistani society and Asia more generally. The *Sun* (22 March 2007) suggested that there were 'illegal betting markets in Pakistan and India', *The Times* (30 March 2007) reported that, 'In Karachi they may gamble on cricket, but the industry is controlled from Dubai and Bombay', and the *Guardian* (24 March 2007) claimed that much of the finance came 'from overseas, mostly in the middle east'. Crucially, however, such gambling was seen as a 'major earner for criminal elements in Asia' (*Daily Mail*, 22 March 2007) and consequently largely controlled by 'Triad gangs' (*Daily Express*, 23 March 2007). On the basis that 'it is not unknown for those involved [in these illegal betting markets] to meet an unfortunate end' (*Sun*, 22 March 2007), it was speculated that Woolmer may have been killed in a 'Mafia style "hit"' (*Sun*, 30 March 2007).

The media extended the description of organized violence by further extrapolating from the involvement of bookmakers to links with international terrorism. The bookmaker with whom Woolmer was said to have argued was reported to be 'linked to one of India's most notorious godfathers who is himself said to have links to Al Qaeda' (*Daily Mail*, 29 March 2007). The *Daily Mail* (22 March 2007) claimed that the 'godfather', Dawood Ibrahim, was 'on Interpol's wanted list for terrorism, organised crime and counterfeiting and is accused of funding Al Qaeda-linked groups'. He was 'rumoured to have links with Osama Bin Laden'. Using the headline 'Al-Qaeda link to Woolmer murder', the *Sun* (29 March 2007) also reported this case, though they identified the bookmaker to be Dawood Ibrahim's 'Pakistan-based' brother, Anees. Though not explicitly connecting him to Woolmer's death, the *Independent* (26 March 2007), *News of the World* (25 March 2007), *Observer* (25 March 2007), and *Sunday Telegraph* (25 March 2007) all published accounts of Ibrahim Dawood's cricketing-gambling-terrorist connections. The *Independent*, for example, stated that Ibrahim was 'linked with a 1993 terrorist bombing in Mumbai which killed 200 people', that he lived 'in Pakistan, under the patronage of that country's intelligence agencies', and that 'allegations of Ibrahim's involvement

with cricket-fixing and other crimes have become so commonly accepted in the Subcontinent, that few now question it'. The violence pervading Pakistani society therefore ranged from fanatical supporters and illegal bookmakers to state-tolerated terrorism.

As with Jamaica, violence was seen to be both a cause and a consequence of the irrational organization of the Pakistan state and Pakistani society more generally. Former Pakistan cricketer turned politician, Imran Khan, pointed to nepotism within Pakistan, arguing that the 'only qualification' of the Chairman of the PCB 'is that the President likes him'. Broadsheet newspapers supported such claims by citing Richard Pybus, a Westerner who had coached the Pakistan men's national side prior to Woolmer: 'Pybus revealed how making plans proved futile as the present was always being overthrown' (*Daily Telegraph*, 23 March 2007). The *Guardian* (20 March 2007) referred to governmental influence over cricket by quoting Pybus: 'you're always sitting there waiting for someone to lob a hand grenade and waiting for it to go off'. As a consequence, the Pakistan side were labelled, 'one of the most dysfunctional groups in world sport' (*The Times*, 23 March 2007), plagued by 'constant infighting' (*Daily Mail*, 22 March 2007), and whose 'ability to ambush themselves is legendary' (*Daily Telegraph*, 23 March 2007). Such was 'the chaotic world of Pakistan cricket' (*Guardian*, 20 March 2007), that Woolmer's death was just 'the latest and saddest chapter ... [Pakistan cricket] has always been a web of intrigue' (*Daily Express*, 22 March 2007).

Speculation over the possible poisoning of Woolmer further revealed journalists' implicit assumptions about the traditional and pre-modern character of Pakistan society. According to a number of newspapers (*Mail on Sunday*, 22 March 2007; *Daily Star*, 23 March 2007; *Daily Express*, 29 March 2007; *Daily Mail*, 30 March 2007), Woolmer was killed by a 'Deadly snake venom'. Other reports suggested that the poison might have been aconite. The poison narrative had the effect of reinforcing perceptions of Pakistan as a violent and lawless society for it was claimed that the substance had been used 'in several high-profile assassinations in Pakistan' (*Sun*, 20 March 2007). More than this though, aconite was identified as a natural and thus primitive substance, 'used in herbal medicine across Asia' (*Independent*, 21 March 2007) and 'derived from the wolfsbane plant' (*Independent on Sunday*, 22 March 2007). The name wolfsbane was attributed to the belief in the Middle Ages that touching the plant would turn a person into a werewolf (*The Times*, 20 March 2007). This was 'an ancient poison' (*The Independent*, 21 April 2007), which had been 'used for centuries as a means of assassination' (*Daily Express*, 20 March 2007).

Rather than leading to a notion of dependence (as in the case with Jamaica), this press narrative concluded with the assertion that there was an absolute and systematic difference between Britain and Pakistan, and perhaps the East and West more broadly. Woolmer, it was claimed, failed to come to terms with, 'the most impenetrable ... international outfit in the whole of sport' (*Daily Mail*,

23 March 2007) due to the 'constant bickering within Pakistani cricket' (*The Times*, 22 March 2007). Other reports suggested that there was 'a bitter feud between murdered coach Bob Woolmer and senior Pakistan officials', that Woolmer had been close to resigning due to 'continuous sniping and harassment' from unnamed cricket administrators, and had 'faced constant verbal battles' with the team captain, which ended in the player's 'brooding silence' (*Daily Express*, 28 March 2007). Woolmer, said the *Daily Telegraph* (23 March 2007), could be excused: 'some challenges are insurmountable and Pakistan cricket, with its shifting agendas and personnel, proved beyond even him'.

Religion was identified to be at the heart of this difference. Woolmer was said to have been 'an outsider walking into a different world ... not part of the deeply religious Muslim culture' (*Daily Express*, 22 March 2007). He was excluded from the team meetings held in Urdu (*Daily Express*, 28 March 2007). According to the *Daily Telegraph* (23 March 2007), 'the impression is that many of the players, are a law unto themselves with allegiance only to Islam'. Under a headline which claimed that, 'Woolmer "clashed with his team over prayer time"', it was argued that some of the team were 'more interested in praying not playing' (*Daily Telegraph*, 30 April 2007).

In the latter stages of the investigation, the press increasingly began to suggest that Woolmer may have been murdered by 'radical Muslims' (*Daily Mail*, 30 April 2007) or 'Islamic fanatics' (*Daily Star*, 30 April 2007). References to religion were regularly conjoined with adjectives which conveyed extremism. According to the *Daily Mail* (22 March 2007), the team had followed Inzamam and become 'strict adherents to Islam'. P.J. Mir, the team's former media manager, argued that Woolmer agreed with his view that 'some senior members of the squad, who were members of the strict Muslim movement Tablighi Jamaat, were more focused on religion than cricket' (*The Independent*, 1 May 2007). Indeed, on 30 April, three newspapers (*Daily Telegraph*, *Daily Mail*, and *Guardian*) repeated the claims of the *Daily Mirror* a month earlier (30 March 2007) that a fatwa had been issued against Woolmer because of his stance against religion in the team.²

This cultural representation of the Orient was most explicitly encapsulated by John Etheridge in an article written prior to the launch of the police investigation. Under the headline "Killed by the Mad, Mad World of Pakistan cricket" a link was drawn between the supposed violent and irrational nature of Pakistan and the dangers inherent in attempting to bridge the cultural differences. Etheridge wrote that,

Whatever the rumours, conspiracy theories or sheer lies about his tragic demise, Woolmer would almost certainly still be alive if he had not taken the job of Pakistan coach. He found a culture of love and hate, ball-tampering and match-fixing, divisions and togetherness, falsehoods and withering truths, sackings and reprieves. (*Sun*, 22 March 2007)

Conclusion

In relaying these representations of the Caribbean and Pakistan my intention is not to enter into a debate about their truth or falsity, merely to demonstrate the existence of a 'saturating hegemonic system' (Macfie 2000: 4) which frames the way in which the English 'Other' postcolonial peoples. Yes, Jamaica does have a relatively high murder rate. Yes, Al Qaeda has strong roots in Pakistan. But just as cricket continues to perform a unique role in the maintenance of postcolonial relations, so it is also an important sphere in which attempts at ideological dominance continue to be played out. Such is the influence of this set of ideas that they are also present within the cultures which they caricature. For instance, the *Independent on Sunday* (25 March 2007) cited Kingston's *The Daily Observer* which wrote: 'While the world watched and waited, we appeared to be a little Third World country which could not even carry out an autopsy without overseas assistance. But then maybe that's exactly what we are.' Citation of the criticisms of Pakistanis such as Imran Khan and Sarfraz Nawaz lend an air of authenticity to the views expressed in the English press.

Whilst the British press may no longer be pre-occupied with an inward looking, defensive nationalism when reporting cricket-related events, the portrayal of 'Others' suggests little by way of the tolerance of difference or mutual co-existence intrinsic to the kind of benign nationalism evident in the post-2005 reporting of English cricket. Whilst changes to the representation of Englishness may be enduring or transient, a consequence of economic exigency or moral self-reflection, heartfelt or merely public relations exercises, the postcolonial portrayal of the former territories of the British Empire is clearly not cosmopolitan and creative. Through Woolmergate, both Jamaica/the Caribbean and Pakistan/'the East' were seen to be 'dysfunctional'; societies infused with violence, irrationality and organizational incompetence. The selection of these themes is a continuation of the ideas which, as noted earlier, stem from the advent of modernity in Western Europe (Hall 1992), and thus the advent of modern sport in England.

One criticism that could be levelled at the kind of qualitative content analysis presented here is that it does not indicate how dominant such themes are, merely their presence. However, the depth to which these orientalist themes penetrated 'Woolmergate' can be illustrated by reflecting on the six main theories of how Woolmer died. Underpinning five of the six theories is a portrayal of the East as necessarily different and inferior to the West. If Woolmer was murdered by bookmakers, it was because the (Pan-Asian) bookmakers are more deviant, corrupt, evil and violent than they are elsewhere in the world, and have terrorist links. If Woolmer was murdered by a cricket fan, it was because Pakistanis have an irrational attachment to their national cricket team and a propensity towards violence. If Woolmer was murdered by a Pakistan player, or indeed 'Muslim radicals', it stemmed from a devotion to Islam which illustrates the

essential incompatibility of Eastern and Western cultures. Even if no other individual was involved, and Woolmer died from natural causes or committed suicide, he did so because of the untameable nature of Pakistani cricket/culture. The sixth theory, that Woolmer died during an attempted burglary, evokes different, but similarly negative stereotypes about Caribbean society.

These narratives of difference are so pervasive that they structure a whole range of diverse issues in contemporary cricket. For instance reactions to allegations that Hansie Cronje had been involved in match fixing in 2000 were initially met by incredulity, the argument that evidence may have been fabricated by Indian police, and the assertion that such actions were strictly against Cronje's religious commitments (Nauright 2005). For Sen (2001: 238) the South Africans, English and Australians' immediate denial that "they" could have been involved in something so heinous' soon turned to the implication that the 'innate immorality of the subcontinent ... had ensnared, seduced, and corrupted an erstwhile icon of white moral purity'. In contrast to this, the British media's response to allegations that Salman Butt, Mohammed Asif and Mohammed Amir had accepted money in order to facilitate spot-betting almost universally assumed guilt. Moreover, while Cronje's guilt was depicted as an individual's aberration, the case against the Pakistan players was taken as evidence of more systemic, society-wide, corruption and led to numerous calls for Pakistan to be banned from international cricket.

Similarly, these themes resurface in Gupta's (2010) analysis of the major threats to the Indianization of cricket and the continuation of the IPL. The three threats Gupta (2010: 56) identifies are: *administrative inefficiency* – the degree to which the Indian authorities are deemed capable of running international, commercial, entertainment events; *security* – fears over player safety; and *corruption* – whether the competition can be run with the sufficient degree of transparency. For each of these concerns there is, of course, supporting evidence. For instance, questions were raised about the organizational competence of the 2010 New Dehli Commonwealth Games Organizing Committee. The IPL has already been staged in South Africa due to security concerns and there was further debate about the viability of the tournament following a bombing at the Bangalore stadium prior to the 2010 IPL. Lalit Modi, Chairman of the IPL, was suspended by the BCCI in 2010, accused of being involved in match-fixing or, at least, of being ineffectual in monitoring or addressing corruption during the tournament in South Africa in which forty-odd players were involved in attempts to rig the results of matches. These are tangible threats, but their identification is also quite predictable in that it fits in to the broader structure of understanding and the overarching logic that can be seen in the 'Woolmergate' coverage. Through the prism of orientalism, as identified by Said, we can see how threats to the Indianization of cricket are not simply the commonsense identification of potential problems, but conform to a relatively coherent set of interconnected ideas that are based on a historical legacy of colonialism.

We can see therefore that not only does cricket play a central role in the identity construction of diaspora consciousness in Britain, and various and competing forms of English national identity, but also in the way the English understand 'Other' populations around the world. Before providing some theoretical reflections from this historical sociological study of *Globalizing Cricket*, the concluding chapter addresses the continuing social significance of the game in British society and seeks to explain why, despite such manifest changes, cricket remains the quintessential English game.