Malcolm, Dominic. "Introduction: Globalizing cricket." *Globalizing Cricket: Englishness, Empire and Identity*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013. 1–13. Globalizing Sport Studies. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849665605.0005>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 12:01 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.

Introduction

Globalizing cricket

*I have often thought of how much better a life I would have had,
what a better man I would have been, how much healthier
an existence I would have led, had I been a cricketer.*

Sir Laurence Olivier

*Cricket civilizes people and creates good gentlemen. I want
everyone to play cricket in Zimbabwe; I want ours
to be a nation of gentlemen.*

Robert Mugabe

*It is not true that the English invented cricket as a way of making
all other human endeavours look interesting and lively; that was
merely an unintended side effect. I don't wish to denigrate
a sport that is enjoyed by millions, some of them awake
and facing the right way, but it is an odd game.*

Bill Bryson

*If everything else in this nation of ours was lost but cricket ... it
would be possible to reconstruct from the theory and practice
of cricket all the eternal Englishness which has gone to the
establishment of that constitution and the laws aforesaid.*

Neville Cardus

Cricket polarizes opinion. To some it holds quasi-religious status; to others it is a point of fun. Despite their obvious devotion, some (particularly English) cricket spectators are remarkably impassive. Inextricably linked to what defines Englishness, cricket is also venerated by those who have publicly and vigorously fought against imperial oppression. It has the aura of a genteel game which builds character, yet it is amongst the most injurious sports played in the United Kingdom (Sports Council 1991). Suicide rates among England's test cricketers are almost double that of the UK male population as a whole (Frith 2001). The mythology of cricket enables some to make rather far-fetched statements about the consequences of playing cricket and its effect on cultural life, while for others the game is simply unfathomable. Cricket is seen as the quintessential English game but also the sport, *par excellence*, of the *British* Empire. Such a paradoxical beast is ripe for sociological investigation.

On one level it is difficult to see why cricket divides opinion so deeply. At its most basic cricket is a bat and ball game. It was 'invented' in England, though others have claimed that it has Celtic origins (Bowen 1970), and that it was played by the Dalraid Scots from northern Ireland around 500 AD (Lang 1912, cited in Bateman 2009: 5). An alternative account is that it was invented in France and that its name derives from the French word 'criquet', meaning wooden gate (Altham and Swanton 1948: 19). Ashis Nandy famously describes cricket as 'an Indian game, invented accidentally by the English' (1989: 1). But it could also be argued that bat and ball pastimes of this type are culturally universal, as evidenced by the many similarly structured games around the world, such as Brännboll (Sweden), Danish Longball, Gilli-danda (India), Kilikiti (Samoa), Lapta (Russia), La Lippa (Italy), Oină (Romania), Pesäpallo (Finland), Syatong (Philippines) and, of course, baseball.

One reason why cricket divides opinion so sharply is that it contains some peculiar rules and esoteric customs. A game of cricket can take an incredibly long time to complete. A 'timeless test' played between South Africa and England in 1939 lasted twelve days (including three rest days) and was concluded without a result because England's players needed to catch a boat home. In traditional forms of the game the two sides wear near identical white clothes which make it difficult for the casual viewer to tell the teams apart. The umpire can only give a batter out if the fielding side 'appeals', and specifically asks whether, in the umpire's opinion, the player was legally dismissed. To be given out 'leg before wicket' (LBW) the ball must not simply be blocked from hitting the wicket by the batter's leg, but the umpire must also consider where the ball pitched (bounced) and whether the batter was playing a shot. Leg byes (where a batter runs when the ball hits his/her legs but not the bat) can only be awarded if the batter attempted but failed to hit the ball (or avoid being hit by the ball). Four runs are awarded if the ball crosses the boundary, but also in cases where in stopping the ball the fielder touches the boundary his/herself. A batter may be out if caught over the boundary as long as the fielder returns to the playing area before his/her feet touch the ground. The fielding side can 'improve' but not deliberately deteriorate the condition of the ball. Cricket is a team game but only sixty per cent of players compete at any one time and for long periods players essentially perform as individuals. In no other sport is the captain so important in making decisions which are material to the outcome of the game. While many claim that cricket builds moral character, the game has an increasingly active anti-corruption unit. It is the only game (although golf comes close) for which the 'spirit' in which it should be played is explicitly laid down in the laws.

These characteristics could be dismissed as a series of ad-hoc quirks but there is a more systematic rationale underpinning the peculiarity of cricket. This can perhaps best be illustrated through a comparison of the game with the characteristics that have been identified as distinguishing *modern* sports from

their pre-modern counterparts. In a classic statement on this, Guttman (1978) identified seven interdependent characteristics which distinguish the sports developed in Europe (and latterly North America) from c. 1750. These are:

- 1) secularism – modern sports are rarely related to formal aspects of religious worship;
- 2) equality – in modern sports considerable stress is placed on the importance of equal opportunity for participation (in the sense that nobody is formally excluded) and on literally and metaphorically providing participants with a ‘level playing field’;
- 3) specialization – in modern sports we clearly distinguish between game forms and increasingly expect elite participants to specialize in a particular role within one sport;
- 4) bureaucratization – modern sports are not *ad hoc* or spontaneously organized, but are administered centrally, often by people who are not themselves participants;
- 5) rationalization – modern sports are structured according to an instrumental rationality which leads events to be staged in purpose-built venues with increasing human control over environmental conditions, equipment which is standardized and regulated, and participants who are prepared using the latest scientific techniques and knowledge;
- 6) quantification – in modern sport actions are translated into numerical data and participants’ performances are measured, recorded and compared; and
- 7) the quest for records – participants in modern sports are expected to produce increasingly advanced performances by which the progression of humanity can be seen.

Cricket, of course, exhibits many of the characteristics of a modern sport. While religious terminology is often used to exalt the game – for instance, the annual publication *Wisden Cricketers’ Almanack* (hereafter *Wisden*) is often described as the ‘bible’ of cricket, Lord’s cricket ground as the game’s ‘spiritual home’ – cricket is a secular game in the sense that it is not formally played in honour, or with the blessing, of Gods. Few sports are as widely accredited as being infused with an ethos of equality and no sport has provided as many phrases to the English language which encapsulate honour and fairness (for example, ‘it’s not cricket’, ‘playing with a straight bat’). Cricket has a long history of bureaucratic control starting with the formation of the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC) in 1787 and the Imperial Cricket Conference in 1909. The latter’s successor, the International Cricket Council (ICC), currently has 105 members, divided between Full (10), Associate (36) and Affiliated (59) status.¹

The game's rules are notoriously elaborate and complex. Its 42 Laws (and five appendices) currently encompass 116 pages (MCC 2010), and are periodically reviewed by a panel of non-playing experts. Cricket also exhibits extreme forms of quantification, with perhaps only baseball fostering a similar veneration of statistics and records. The average edition of Wisden contains approximately 1,000 pages of numerical data and fifty pages of text. Records are kept not only of highest scores or seasonal averages, but of the minutiae of the game (for example the highest partnership for a particular wicket against a particular team at a particular venue). The act of 'scoring' in cricket is thought of as an art and those who do it, like the late Bill Frindall, become celebrities. Cricket websites are packed with statistics, showing the contemporary relevance and cross-cultural appeal of this aspect of the game.

Yet in other respects cricket is peculiarly *unmodern*. Cricket defies the modernist rationalization of team sports. For instance, whereas football teams represent towns, cities or nation-states, cricket teams often represent rural entities and sub- or supra-nation-states. In Britain domestic cricket is based upon 'counties'. One of these, Glamorgan, is seen by many as the representative of a nation (namely Wales), although an entity called 'Wales' competes in the 'minor counties' competition. While most international sports federations only recognize and grant membership to nation-states, two of the ICC's ten full members would fail to meet such criteria. The West Indies, for instance, is a multi-state confederation, parts of which (the ten English-speaking territories) have only briefly been politically united (as the Federation of the West Indies between 1958 and 1962). The other – which the ICC lists as 'England' – is a nation submerged within a nation-state (the United Kingdom). While always referred to as 'England', the side actually represents the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB), and has historically drawn players from Scotland and Ireland which are ICC associate members in their own right.

Furthermore, cricket has multiple and co-existing game forms; that is to say, 'test' or 'first class' matches, the so-called one-day game consisting of one innings per side of approximately fifty overs,² and most recently Twenty20 cricket. Whilst other sports have alternative game forms ('five-a-side' football, rugby 'sevens', Pee wee [American] football), their respective relationships to the 'main' game are qualitatively different. First, the hierarchy of game forms in other sports is much clearer. Whereas the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) produce (for each sex) a single table ranking the football playing nations of the world, the ICC produce three, one each for test matches, one-day internationals (ODIs) and Twenty20. It is an anomaly that the premier cricketing competition – the ICC Cricket World Cup – is based on the one-day format and thus formally defined in cricket nomenclature as the secondary form of the game (i.e. not first class). Second, equipment is not standardized between the different forms of cricket. One-day cricket may be played at night under artificial lights, by teams wearing coloured outfits, and using a white ball

which many believe behaves differently to the red ball used in the longer version of the game; all anathema to devotees of test cricket.

Cricket is also peculiarly *unmodern* in terms of the rationalization of the duration of play. As noted, the prolonged nature of cricket is a source of bemusement for the uninitiated, but compounding this *unmodern*-ness is the *flexibility* of time which cricket may fill. Association and American football matches are scheduled for 90 and 60 minutes respectively, but test matches are scheduled for *up to* five days, and they may end at any point before that. Other sports require that certain components be completed (3/5 sets in tennis, 18/72 holes in golf) but the ‘declaration’ and ‘forfeit’ in cricket enables matches to end after any number of innings of any duration or number of wickets. Given this flexibility, it is ironic that no other game so completely embraces the possibility of contests having no clear outcome. A dead heat is possible in many sports but only in cricket are two words – tie and draw – used to differentiate between the ways in which a match can finish without a clear winner. A draw has traditionally been the most likely outcome in test match cricket (Steen 2010), but a tie is incredibly rare, with only two in almost 150 years of this form of the game. Paradoxically, in shorter versions of the game (which are temporally fixed to last between 20 and 50 overs per side) the cricketing authorities employ a complex set of equations to enable a result to be calculated based on the performance of the respective sides prior to the curtailment of play (known as the Duckworth-Lewis system). No such mechanism exists for longer versions of the game in which undecided contests are obviously more frequent.

Cricket, moreover, has not been subject to the same degree of spatial rationalization as other sports. Though the dimensions of the wicket are specified within the laws of the game, the maximum and minimum sizes of the playing area are not regulated. Not only does cricket embrace a greater variation of playing conditions than any other modern sport, but such diversity is positively celebrated. That the pitch at the WACA in Perth, Australia will provide pace and bounce, the Headingley pitch in Leeds will help seam bowlers, and spin bowlers will dominate at Galle, Sri Lanka merely adds to the interest for cricket officianados. The valuation of such diversity can be seen in relation to recent ground developments in England. When a 200-year-old lime tree within the playing area of the St Lawrence ground, Canterbury was damaged by high winds in 2005, rather than embrace the spatial standardization forced upon them, the ground’s owners planted a new tree (albeit adjacent to the playing area) to replace it. When the playing surface at Lord’s was excavated to enable the installation of a new drainage system in 2002 the traditional slope was restored to its original form when the ground was re-laid (the south-east side of the playing surface had been 2.5 metres lower than the north-west). Ironically therefore, the owners of the most revered cricket ground and the guardians of the spirit of the sport most directly linked to the notion of fair play, literally chose to *not* have a level playing field.

Thus despite the rhetoric linking cricket with fair play, a prominent feature of the game is a relative indifference towards equality. For instance, no sport is quite as subject to the vagaries of the weather as cricket. Other sports may stop due to rain (baseball, golf), or even because the light is poor (tennis), but the competitors in other sports normally expect that, when they return to play, conditions will either be approximate to what they were before and/or that their opponents will be similarly (dis)advantaged by the new environmental conditions. But in cricket rainfall can affect the speed with which the ball runs over of the outfield, humidity can affect the extent to which the ball 'swings' (moves laterally in the air), and dampness can increase 'seam' movement (deviation when the ball bounces on the pitch), all of which may disadvantage the batting side. Conversely, when the sun shines players will feel that it is a good time to bat. As the light is rarely artificially enhanced, players must accept that, within limits, they will be advantaged/disadvantaged by having to bat in light of differing quality. While artificial lighting is gradually being introduced, cricket administrators have not sought to regulate for the provision of equal playing conditions with the same vigour as their counterparts in other sports. Wembley and Wimbledon have retractable roofs but Lord's does not.

Almost regardless of weather conditions, however, longer games of cricket have the in-built inequality of a pitch which (generally) deteriorates over time and thus presents different challenges to each team at different stages of the match. Invariably the fewest runs are scored in the fourth and final innings of a first class match. Conventionally the pitch initially favours fast bowlers and comes to favour spin bowling as the game progresses. As in other sports a coin is tossed at the beginning of a game and the winning captain gains an advantage (through choice of ends, first possession of the ball, etc.), but in cricket there are no subsequent mechanisms for the equalization of playing chances, such as swapping ends or giving the other team possession at the start of the second half. Rather, in cricket the advantages of this initial success may exert a significant influence over the entire match. Only cricketers talk of a 'good toss to win' because only in cricket is this chance element potentially so central to the outcome of the game. Only cricketers talk of a 'good toss to lose' because only in cricket are the environmental conditions so difficult to predict. The relative reluctance to use non-grass pitches illustrates the lack of enthusiasm to investigate equality-enhancing measures in cricket compared to many other sports.

Cricket's laws are again unusual in paying scant regard to equalizing individuals' and teams' playing chances. In one-day cricket there is no limit to the contribution of each batter but bowlers contribute no more than twenty per cent of the overs bowled. While most modern team sports allow injured and unfit players to be substituted, substitutes for injured cricketers are uniquely barred from the central aspects of the game; namely batting, bowling, and the specialist fielding position of wicketkeeper. An injured batter may, however, have a substitute to run for him/her, meaning that some injured players

(bowlers and wicketkeepers) are treated differently to others (batters). Unlike most other team games, tactical substitutions are not allowed in cricket. Teams must be selected prior to the toss and personnel cannot be altered to adjust for the conditions that teams subsequently face.

A final *unmodern* characteristic of cricket regards what Guttman calls specialization. While the advent of the IPL has marked the emergence of specialist ‘portfolio players’ (Rumford 2011) who travel the world only playing Twenty20 cricket, most cricketers play all of the game’s multiple forms. Moreover, fielding positions in cricket are remarkably fluid, with players expected to fill a variety of roles during the game, potentially changing after each ball bowled. Conversely, North American sports in particular have rules facilitating the participation of those with specialist skills – the NFL kicker, the ‘designated hitter’ in baseball’s American League, the ‘enforcer’ in ice hockey – but the restriction of substitutes in cricket ensures that players must contribute to all aspects of the game. The cricketing all-rounder is often the linchpin of the side, whereas ‘utility players’ in other sports are often valued for the backup they provide.

Thus cricket contains a number of features which stand in contrast to the developmental trends of modern sport. Cricket followers revel in these peculiarities. Conversely, neophytes find them a barrier to gaining an understanding of the game. But the specific structure of cricket cannot entirely account for the deification and disinterest the game seems to evoke in equal measure. Indeed, these peculiarities should be seen as the *outcome* of who plays the game, not the cause of its differential popularity. These peculiarities provide part of the stimulus for writing this book, but they are not the central problem which the book seeks to address.

The aims of *Globalizing Cricket*

To understand why cricket has these peculiarities, and therefore why it is both revered and ridiculed in equal measure, it needs to be understood in its historical and social context. As noted, the game stems from, or at least was first codified in, *England*. A glance at the list of countries which currently play cricket shows the degree to which colonization as part of the British *Empire* was responsible for its diffusion around the globe. The game’s contemporary social significance rests on the meaning which people attach to cricketing contests. For many people in cricket playing nations, no other sport delivers such meaningful contests which resonate so closely with their historically generated sense of *identity*. Conversely, in many non-cricket playing countries the game has little bearing on the way people conceive of their ‘self’.

Consequently this is a book about the development of cricket. The story starts around the time when a particular group of human beings decided that it would be useful to write down a set of rules for the game and examines

who these people were, and why they behaved as they did. The book charts how cricket became defined as the 'national game', how a particular set of rules became adopted by a broader range of groups within England, and how it simultaneously diffused to various places around the globe. It examines how cricket was adopted, adapted and rejected in different countries. The journey concludes by looking at the role of cricket in contemporary society; in particular, the way in which the game influences the lives of post-colonial migrants to the United Kingdom, the effect of the game on the way in which the English perceive themselves, and the way in which the English use cricket to frame their understanding of 'Others'.

While this book inevitably offers a history of cricket, it is a specific type of history. This book does *not* primarily attempt to *describe* the development of cricket. A number of these more 'conventional' or 're-constructionist' histories (Booth 2005) of cricket exist which fulfil this task. For instance, Altham and Swanton's *A History of Cricket* (1948) and Wynne Thomas's *From Weald to World* (1997) represent histories of cricket which mainly focus on key matches and personalities in an attempt to re-present the past as it 'actually was'. Nor is this book quite like those written by what Booth calls academic or 'constructionist' historians. Examples of this genre include Birley's *A History of English Cricket* (1999) and Stoddart and Sandiford's *The Imperial Game* (1998) which seek to interpret such events by developing a narrative which locates and gives meaning to them within the broader context. Birley, for instance, looks to examine how 'the English took this game and made it into one of their most cherished institutions' (1999: ix), while Sandiford argues that the playing of cricket within the former British Empire 'is really ... [a story] about the colonial quest for identity in the face of the colonisers' search for authority' (Sandiford 1998a: 1).

Rather, this book is a *historical sociological* analysis of cricket. This approach is based on the belief that the most adequate way to analyse human societies is as an amalgam of processes rather than a series of separate events, and that the commonsense distinction made between past and present fatally severs our ability to understand the contemporary manifestation of those processes. The particular type of historical sociological approach which guides this book relies on some particular theoretical assumptions which are spelt out later, but for now it is sufficient to note that in terms of their 'fundamental pre-occupations, history and sociology are and always have been the same thing' (Abrams 1982: x). Their divorce, moreover, 'makes historians needlessly allergic to the very idea of structures, and sociologists afraid of dealing with single events' (Goudsblom 1977: 136). 'We need the variety provided by history in order even to ask sociological questions, much less to answer them' (Wright Mills 1970: 146). Thus, while this book describes various key phases and processes in the development of cricket, it is more centrally guided by an attempt to *explain* how and why the role and social significance of cricket has changed over time.

The focus of this book is also geographically and temporally distinct. Like most accounts of the development of cricket, this book is focused on a particular territory. 'Constructionist' histories of cricket tend to relate to particular places such as India (Majumdar 2008), New Zealand (Ryan 2004), the Caribbean (Beckles 1998a; 1998b; Beckles and Stoddart 1995) and South Africa (Gemmell 2004). There are even some very good academic histories of cricket in the United States (Kirsch 1989; Melville 1998). This book has a similar geographic bias, but whether that is towards England, Britain or the United Kingdom is a more debatable point. Such precision is easier when the temporal focus of a book was more limited. Underdowns' *Start of Play: Cricket and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (2000), Sandiford's *Cricket and the Victorians* (1994) and Williams' *Cricket and England: A Cultural and Social History of the Inter-War Years* (1999) illustrate how a shorter time period lends itself to a more clearly defined geography.

In attempting a broader developmental sweep this book must necessarily be sensitive towards, and go beyond the narrow confines of, socially constructed national borders. In so doing this book addresses the way in which the game has globally expanded, and the effects of that global expansion on the identities of those who now inhabit the place in which the game was originally developed. But this book is *not* about the globalization of cricket *per se*. It does not, for instance, seek to comment on debates about the homogenizing, creolizing or glocalizing consequences of these developments. It does not explore the transnational movement of finance, mediatized images or personnel. Rather, this text is a sociological analysis of the historical and contemporary social significance of what is widely described as the quintessential English game, and how this has changed as the game has globally diffused.

A framework for understanding the development of cricket

While no other text has attempted to examine cricket in this way, a number of (historical) sociological texts have scrutinized the development of other sports. A comparison with four similar texts provides some indication of the approach taken here. The first such text was Dunning and Sheard's *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players: a sociological study of the development of rugby football* (1979/2005). The title conveys what are seen as the key developmental phases of the game; namely the social control of violence and conflicts over amateurism and professionalism. In addition to this, *Barbarians* was concerned to examine the worldwide trend towards the growing seriousness or commercialization of sport, and the relationship between this process and 'the alleged trend towards greater violence in modern sport' (2005: 15). Gruneau and Whitson's *Hockey Night in Canada* (1993) is an attempt to 'examine the changing character of hockey in Canada as one small part of

the making of modern sports, of commercial entertainment, and indeed of modern experience itself' (1993: 4). They chart how (ice) hockey developed out of a tradition of Victorian moral entrepreneurship, embraced consumer culture and national branding through the emergence of the NHL, and has more recently engaged with post-national capitalism. At each stage, there is a degree of contestation and negotiation over the ideological meanings and the social practices associated with the game. Significantly, however, Gruneau and Whitson's interest in hockey stems from the sport's 'powerful grip on the imaginations and collective memories of Canadians' (1993: 3). The cultural politics of the conceptualization of national identity is infused with debates about 'locality, consumerism, ethnicity, class, race and gender' (1993: 7). Third is Giulianotti's *Football: A Sociology of the Global Game* (1999). Arguing that the game's global appeal owes something to its simplicity and plasticity, Giulianotti seeks to examine cross-cultural differences in the way the game is interpreted and practiced. Following analyses of the development of the game in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, chapters focus on themes such as supporter cultures, stadia, business, aesthetics and cultural politics. Giulianotti argues that the development of football can be seen through a continuum of 'traditional', 'modern' and 'post-modern stages', and that a cross-cultural comparison shows that 'the game's valued characteristics tells (sic) us something fundamental about the cultures in which it is performed' (1999: xii). Finally, Sugden's *Boxing and Society: An International Analysis* (1996) locates the 'noble art' in its broader social, economic and political context. Sugden combines chapters on the history and political economy of boxing with ethnographic case studies of its practice in three cultural settings (the United States, Northern Ireland and Cuba) which together 'provide a balanced view of the submerged world that exists beneath the ring' (1996: 7).

Globalizing Cricket has parallels with each of the above. A key similarity with both *Barbarians* and *Hockey Night* is that this book is structured in a broadly chronological way. *Globalizing Cricket* shares *Barbarians*' underlying theoretical framework (the figurational sociology of Norbert Elias), but the empirical themes addressed here are more similar to those discussed in *Hockey Night*. Gruneau and Whitson see the link between hockey and Canadian identity as historical, ubiquitous, natural, unique, quintessential, oft-stated, and commonsensical. Here, therefore, are obvious similarities with the way the relationship between cricket and the English is typically viewed. While aspects of *Hockey Night* locate the development of Canadian ice hockey in the context of globalization, as noted above, the analysis undertaken here is not an exploration of globalization *per se*, but similar to Giulianotti's and Sugden's emphasis on discussing cultural comparisons in the meaning and practice of a particular sport. Like Giulianotti, I consider why a particular sport appeals to diverse communities. Like *Boxing and Society*, this book provides case study chapters focussed on the sport's cultural meaning in specific settings.

Like *Barbarians* and *Football* this text is underpinned by the view that sport can be seen to have passed through distinct phases and that these phases relate the broader social structure of societies in which the game is played. Like all of the above, *Globalizing Cricket* is centrally about a sport which is a 'male preserve' (Sheard and Dunning 1973) and thus says relatively little about female sporting experiences. Uniquely, however, *Globalizing Cricket* focuses not only on the cultural diffusion of a sport, but the ramifications of this diffusion on the 'diffusers'.

While a more detailed discussion of sociological theory will be deferred to the Conclusion, some core ideas need to be introduced here. At its heart, this work is informed by Elias's conception of human beings as both inherently social and interdependent animals (Elias 1978). Consequently, people's thoughts and actions are determined by the relations that they form with other humans. As the organization of societies becomes more complex – in line with technological developments in travel and communication, for instance – so the context in which humans think and act becomes more complex, with individuals both influencing, and being influenced by, a greater range of people. Human action may have an initial purpose but the consequences of human actions may not be wholly intended; like ripples in a small pool, they re-bounce, and directly or tangentially intermingle with other intended actions and unintended outcomes. Human actions have consequences that extend beyond the life of the individual such that the context in which today's cricketers play the game is shaped by the actions of all kinds of historical figures: the eighteenth century Duke of Richmond; William Lillywhite; Harry Wright; Frank Worrell and Charles Lawrence.

As Liston (2011: 161) rightly observes, Elias's most well known and arguably most significant book, *The Civilizing Process*, 'has become synonymous with Elias's figurational sociology'. According to Elias human groups typically seek to define their behaviour as distinct and distanced from animals and those humans they see as inferior to themselves; in other words, as 'civilized'. While *The Civilizing Process*, and indeed much of the figurational research on sport and leisure, has been viewed through a substantive focus on violence and its social control, an arguably more nuanced view is that Elias undertook an 'analysis of the historical development of emotions and psychological life ... in relation to the connections ... with larger scale processes such as state formation, urbanisation and economic development' (van Krieken 1998: 353). Within the context of sport, emotions and psychological life are most evident in relation to two interconnected factors – social identities and the rules and customs by which sports are played. The former is an expression of the relationships which people consider to be significant, the latter an expression of the norms by which people expect, and expect others to expect, their social lives to be lived. As the content of *Globalizing Cricket* amply demonstrates, these two things are radically interdependent. Yet because people rarely reflect on either – who they

are, why they play/watch certain sports – because they are so deeply ingrained in humans due to socialization processes, they become part of *habitus*, or second nature. Within the context of twenty-first century western sport, the larger scale processes which affect *habitus* go beyond state formation, urbanization and post-Fordist economic development, and include colonialism, postcolonialism and the formation and movement of diasporas; processes which are fundamentally more global in scope.

While this book is not about imperialism, the role of cricket in the British Empire is inescapable. While this book is not about race, it speaks to and of British race relations. While this book is not about English national identity, inevitably it discusses how such self-perceptions change as a consequence of cricket's global spread: *Englishness, Empire, Identity*.

Conclusion: Cricket and Englishness as a pleonasm

The empirical focus of this book is the way cricket both structures and is structured by local (English, sometimes British) and global relations. Yet drawing a link between cricket and the English is hardly a novel idea amongst social scientists who write about sport. Jack Williams (1999: 4) has argued that between the wars writers frequently 'praised cricket as the epitome of moral worth'. Leading sports geographer John Bale similarly argues that 'the landscapes of cricket are projected as not only being bucolic and rural but as being overwhelmingly English and Southern in location' (1994: 159). Literary historian Tony Bateman suggests that 'cricket and literature ... have played particularly privileged and significant roles in the historical construction of Englishness' (2003: 27), and Joseph Maguire (1993: 297), a sociologist of sport, has argued that 'Cricket is seen to represent what "England" is and gives meaning to the identity of being "English"'. The sport fixes "England" as a focus of identification in English emotions'.

A range of publications more directly focussed on Englishness and English national identity replicate such claims. Colls (2002), Easthope (1999), Fox (2005), Haselar (1996), Kumar (2003a) and Langford (2000) draw on cricket for ready-made examples of manifestations of English national identity. For instance, in *Englishness and National Culture*, Anthony Easthope argues that 'English national culture, profoundly secular as it is, seems to treat only two things as genuinely transcendental – cricket and its own sense of humour' (1999: 162). Similarly Stephen Haselar, in *The English Tribe*, argues that cricket is 'the most exalted icon' of what he calls 'theme park heritage Englishness', in which the game has become 'a metaphor for the celebration of the English and rural nostalgia' (1996: 59). More populist readers, like Jeremy Paxman's *The English* (1999), Clifford and King's *England in Particular* (2006), and Bill Bryson's *Icons of England* (2010) would also be incomplete without references

to cricket. Paxman refers to the ‘curiously passionless devotion’ that the English have to cricket (1999: 204), whilst Clifford and King cite cricket’s timeless character which evokes fair play and selflessness. For many, Clifford and King (2006) argue, cricket is the epitome of Englishness.

Cricket and Englishness therefore frequently appear as a couplet, but these two words are so frequently put together that their relationship has become a largely commonsense, and therefore unexamined, assumption. But while there is no shortage of people who recognize a relationship between cricket and Englishness, it is my contention that no one has yet fully explored how and why this relationship began, and what the enduring but changing consequences of this relationship have been (to date only one relatively brief publication has explicitly addressed ‘The “Englishness” of English cricket’ (Simons 1996)). For those examining changing conceptions of English national culture and identity, cricket is merely used to provide occasional illustration. Nothing approaching a sustained analysis exists. Indeed the ubiquity of cricket in these analyses is matched only by the superficiality with which these authors tend to engage with the sport. Kumar (2003a), for instance, whose work I draw on extensively, refers briefly to the ‘Tebbit cricket test’, and John Major’s citation of cricket in response to the (perceived) threat to British sovereignty posed by the expanding powers of the European Union, but does not see cricket as sufficiently important to include, for example, in his index. For most, perhaps all, of those who write about English national identity, cricket is a reflection of Englishness rather than an active agent in the production of the identity of English people. Their engagement with cricket is akin to what Carrington has called ‘the repetitive and perfunctory “Jamesian” nod’ (2010: 48), via which mention of *Beyond a Boundary* (James 1963) is deemed sufficient recognition of sport amongst postcolonial theorists. Indeed so interchangeable, so synonymous, are these words that ‘Englishness and cricket’ amounts to a pleonasm (the use of more words than is necessary to express an idea).

Globalizing Cricket is an attempt to correct that omission. Just as Gruneau and Whitson (1993: 25) argue in relation to the cultural analysis of hockey in Canada, an element of intellectual snobbery may account for the absence of analytic insight. It is probably also because the connection between cricket and the English is so widely made that no one has thought it necessary to subject it to sociological scrutiny. The task of this book is to put flesh on these bones, to provide an analysis of the development and global diffusion of cricket in order to contextualize the changing ways in which the game influences and intersects with contemporary English/British society. What characteristics of the development and structure of this society account for the development of a sport with the peculiar characteristics described at the beginning of this introduction?