



**UNIVERSITY OF PELOPONNESE  
FACULTY OF HUMAN MOVEMENT AND QUALITY OF  
LIFE SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF SPORTS ORGANIZATION AND  
MANAGEMENT**

**MASTERS THESIS**

**“OLYMPIC STUDIES, OLYMPIC EDUCATION,  
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF OLYMPIC  
EVENTS”**

**Title of the thesis**

**Olympic Study and Mega Events.**

***A Study of Sport cricket History from 1977 to 2013 for peace between India  
and Pakistan***

**SPORTS AS A TOOL FOR PEACE DEVELOPMENT**

**Shakeel Ahmad Shahid (PAKISTAN)**

**SPARTA 2014**

## **THESIS SUPERVISERS COMMITTEE**

PROF DR GEORGIADAS KOSTAS

IOA DEAN Department of Olympic Education, Organization and Management of Olympic Events Organization and Management Faculty of Human Movement and Life Sciences University of Peloponnese & International Olympic Academy, Athens, Greece.

PROF DR MOUNTAKIS

PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT IN UOP SPARTA Department of Olympic Education, Organization and Management of Olympic Events Organization and Management Faculty of Human Movement and Life Sciences University of Peloponnese & International Olympic Academy, Athens, Greece.

DR LIOUMPI

Department of Olympic Education, Organization and Management of Olympic Events Organization and Management Faculty of Human Movement and Life Sciences University of Peloponnese & International Olympic Academy, Athens, Greece.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my Thesis Committee **PROF DR GEORGIADAS KOSTAS IOA DEAN,**  
**PROF DR MOUNTAKIS PRESIDENT OF THE DEPARTMENT IN UOP SPARTA**  
**DR PARASKEVI LIOUMPI UOP SPARTA GREECE** for their valuable advice and criticism during the development of this thesis.

## **Abstract.**

Was cricket diplomacy between India and Pakistan been successful? That is the point for this thesis. The man appointed special envoy by Pakistan Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif to improve relations with India also narrowed down a three-pronged strategy for revival of ties between the two sub-continental neighbours. The aims of this work is three-pronged. First, it discusses the connection between sport and politics, and the relationship between sport and diplomacy. Second, it situates the case of cricket diplomacy in relation to other cases of sport diplomacy. And, finally, it identifies and discusses the particularities of the relationship between India and Pakistan and cricket diplomacy. Sport's potential for peace has achieved an increasing amount of attention in recent years. It is considered as having 'the power to bring people together, bridge differences, and promote communication and understanding,' and not the least contribute to 'lasting peace,' in the United Nations Secretary-General's 2006 report Sport for Development and Peace: the way forward. Sport then, or certain sports such as cricket at certain times, clearly has a significant place in contemporary social life. Cricket is a sport that permeates practically every layer of South Asian societies, and the game has occupied 'a central place in a range of emerging positions and identities' in the years after the countries achieved independence in the late 1940s. The term cricket diplomacy was born in 1987 as President of Islamic Republic of Pakistan's Zia-ul-Haq launches "cricket diplomacy" by watching a cricket Test match between India and Pakistan with then Indian Prime minister Rajiv Gandhi, defusing tension as both countries mass troops on their borders. Sports diplomacy describes the use of sport as a means to influence diplomatic, social, and political relations. Experts suggest that sports diplomacy may transcend cultural differences and bring people together. In a statement<sup>9</sup> on 18 July 2012 at Islamabad, Pakistan

President Asif Ali Zardari referred to the resumption of cricketing ties with India as a formidable confidence building measure and a way forward to encouraging people-to-people contact for Peace.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

	Page
<b>PART 1.....</b>	
<b>CHAPTER 1<sup>st</sup> .....</b>	
1. Introduction .....	7
2. Research goal .....	10
<b>3. 1.2.Research importance</b>	10
<b>4. Research Hypothesis</b>	11
<b>5. Theories</b>	13
<b>6. Limitations</b>	15
<b>7. Definitions</b>	17- 25
PART II Chapter 2	26
8. Research Review	
9.Method	26
10. Procedure	27
CHAPTER III	29
10.Sample	
11.Tools	31- 34
Chapter 4	35-
12. Results	39
Part III CHAPTER 5	40-
13.Discussion	82
Chapter 6	84
14. Conclusion	
15. References	95

## PART I

### CHAPTER 1<sup>st</sup>

#### 1.1 Introduction

I will discuss about cricket history which was used as a sport tool in the *Cricket History from 1977 to 2013 for the development of peace between India and Pakistan*. I have chosen this topic because cricket has been an important part of the peace process between two Nations since partition and especially from 1977 to 2013. The United Nations declared 2005 as the International Year of Sport and Physical Education, which saw the both national cricket teams of India and Pakistan appointed as spokespersons to promote the objectives of the Year. They were appointed in recognition of their efforts at overcoming regional tension and encouraging peaceful relations between their countries (United Nations, 2006:6). Sport's potential for peace has undeniably achieved an increasing amount of attention in recent years. It is considered as having 'the power to bring people together, bridge differences, and promote communication and understanding,' and not the least contribute to 'lasting peace,' in the United Nations Secretary-General's report *Sport for Development and Peace: the way forward* (Ibid. 20). Cricket has been used as Diplomacy for the peace process between the two nations in the history.

Therefore, I will discuss whether cricket has played such a role. Sport, or certain sports at certain times, has a significant place in contemporary social life (Levermore & Budd, 2004:9). Cricket certainly fits such a description in South Asia as I have had the opportunity to experience first-hand while travelling in cricket-crazy India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. Cricket permeates practically every layer of these South Asian nations, including Pakistan, and the game has occupied 'a central place in a range of emerging positions and identities' in the years after the countries achieved independence in the late 1940s (Sengupta, 2004:600).

It is obvious, but often understated, that sport has an important role for the development of the social life and economic life including the relations between states specially these south Asian countries Thus, the relationship between sport and politics is important, although under-researched. The 'myth of autonomy' that suggested sport should and did have little effect on other human activities has largely been undermined (Allison & Monnington, 2002:106), and Houlihan (in Beacom, 2000:14) refers to this intertwining of politics and sport at different levels, among them the potential of sport acting as 'a vehicle for diplomacy.' Researchers in the field of Swiss tennis ace Roger Federer was also appointed as spokesperson for the Year.

Diplomacy can broadly be defined as 'the conduct of business between states by peaceful means' (Satow, 2004:25). Professional sport is conversely inherently competitive. George Orwell (1953:195) famously characterized serious sport as 'war minus the shooting,' and argued that 'sport is an unfailing cause of ill-will between states.' In other words, the concept of sport diplomacy may seem contradictory to some critics. At the same time, sport is considered to have the power to bring people together and bridge differences, and the appointment of the Indian and Pakistani national cricket teams as United Nations spokespersons highlights the fact that in a world where conflict and war is 'everybody's tragedy and everybody's nightmare, diplomacy is everybody's business' (Jönsson & Langhorne, 2004:xiii). Some might suspect the UN of expecting too much of sport in the way of creating peace where other attempts have failed. Critics would suggest that those who make the fundamental, hard and carefully calculated decisions about war and peace are found in the foreign policy and security establishments of their respective countries, and that the role of cricket diplomacy as a form of soft power should be played down. Nevertheless, even though cricket diplomacy's exact impact can be difficult to assess, it does not mean that it is not an important an interesting topic for research. Shaharyar M. Khan, former chairman of the Pakistan Cricket Board, contends that cricket more than any other sport can help build 'bridges of peace and harmony both across frontiers as in India and Pakistan or within a country, as in South Africa' (Khan,

2005:179). This master thesis will build on that statement as well as elaborate on the theme of sport diplomacy in the context of a diplomacy framework, in an attempt to add to an under-studied field of research. The main question is straightforward: *Has cricket diplomacy between India and Pakistan been successful in the history?*

In order to assess if it has been successful, two more questions need to be asked concerning the timing and durability of cricket diplomacy:

1. Has cricket diplomacy been used to initiate rapprochement, or has it been used in a climate of gradually thawing relations?
2. If bilateral relations deteriorate, can cricket diplomacy survive and help maintain the precarious India-Pakistan relationship?

## **1.2. Research Goal**

Purpose and structure of this thesis is three-pronged. First, I will discuss the connection between sport and politics, and then will discuss the relationship between sport and diplomacy. Furthermore, this involves making an account of the theoretic framework on diplomacy, and how sport diplomacy relates to this framework. Second, having established sport diplomacy as a part of the diplomacy framework, I will situate cricket diplomacy in relation to other cases of sport diplomacy. This provides the context for moving on to the third part, which is directly connected to the main research question. That includes identifying and discussing the particularities of the case of cricket diplomacy, and to discuss whether it has been successful or not.

## **1.3. Research Importance.**

Building lasting peace in the SAARC Region will substantially contribute to improved health among India and Pakistan populations, as the ongoing conflict has many negative impacts on public health. Sport for Peace programs, such as Cricket as a tool for Peace, utilize a unique tool to teach conflict resolution and

leadership skills. These skills will ideally be transferred to participants' families and communities, eventually leading to more peaceful societies. This research will provide an opportunity to the future researcher to do more work on sports as a tool for research including completing the projects of organizations, researcher and institutions.

#### **1.4. Hypothesis**

In peace research and social psychology many see 'contact hypotheses as a way to reduce prejudices. One of the most heavily studied techniques for prejudice reduction is intergroup contact (Hewstone & Brown, 1986). In *The Nature of Prejudice*, Gordon Allport (1954, p. 281).

Contact hypothesis works on the basic premise that prolonged conflict creates stereotypes and prejudices and dehumanizes the other because of ignorance and the communication gap between people in conflict. According to this theory, contact among people in conflict will improve relations by reducing prejudices and stereotypes. However, later studies reveal that contact hypothesis cannot be accepted at face value and that in some instances increased intergroup contact may even damage relationships. Social psychology researchers say contact which is competitive in nature may damage ties rather than help the cause of peace.

According to peace research and the contact hypothesis theory, cricket and other sports can indeed be a uniting factor if the game is played with a sporting spirit but at the same time it can be a dividing factor if emotions spill over. Cricketers, officials and the media in India and Pakistan have to be extra careful when referring to the matches otherwise, a single controversial remark, like Afridi's when he said that "Indians were not as large-hearted as Pakistanis" on his return from the 2011 world cup, can destroy the whole purpose.

The contact hypothesis holds that positive inter group contact can be used to promote better inter group relations and thereby reduce prejudice. First posited by biologist Robin Williams in 1947, it was later made famous by social psychologist Gordon Allport in 1954 (Hewstone et al, 2011:374). Allport held that

positive effects of intergroup contact occur in contexts where four essential conditions are present: equal group status within the situation; super ordinate goals; intergroup cooperation; and the support of authorities, law, or custom (Pettigrew, 1998:66). These four conditions are here explored in more depth. Equal status: All groups must expect and perceive they have equal status within the contact situation. Some writers insist on equal status of groups outside the exercise, and Jackman & Crane (1986) believe there are negative effects from contact with out group members of a lower status. However, writers are split between the importance of equal status solely within the contact, or a need for broader equality between groups if contact is to be positive. Super ordinate goals: Pettigrew argues, "Prejudice reduction through contact requires an active, goal oriented effort," and believes "athletic teams furnish a prime example" (1998:66). This desire to win as a team creates interdependence and furthers the process of friendship and lessening of prejudice. Intergroup cooperation: These goals must be achieved through an interdependent effort without competition within the group. This condition was experimented upon in many contexts, with positive results in Australia, Germany, Japan, and with Mexican Americans (1998:66).

Many writers discuss its potential for use with ethnic minorities. Binder et al focused their research on Western societies and relationships between members of ethnic majorities and members of ethnic minorities. They sought to answer the question:

*Does Contact Reduce Prejudice or Does Prejudice Reduce Contact?*

The authors follow the path of most research projects in focusing on positive forms of contact, "we therefore regard the conventional term "contact" as synonymous with the terms "friendship contact" and "out group friendships" (2008:843). Their findings support existing research, where "longitudinal effects emerged for both friendship contact on prejudice and for prejudice on contact using two different measures of prejudice" and "majority members showed

stronger contact effects than members of ethnic minorities, for whom such effects were actually nonexistent” (2009:852). This finding is interesting given its potential to be generalized: the effect of contact on majority members is stronger than for members of minorities. Applying this idea to East Africa, it suggests that majority groups may reduce prejudice, but the behavior of minority groups is not affected.

In a similar vein, Jens Thomsen’s research (*How does Intergroup Contact Generate Ethnic Tolerance? The Contact hypothesis in a Scandinavian Context*)

Examines whether intergroup contact influences attitudes toward ethnic minority rights. He believes that “few scholars have examined the political implications of intergroup contact” with the key question “Does intergroup contact increase support for ethnic minority rights – commonly conceptualized as ethnic tolerance?” (2012:160).

### **1.5. Theory**

Thomas Pettigrew (1998) joins Hewstone and Swart in asserting the success of the hypothesis, calling it ‘intergroup contact theory.’ However, his argument for a reformulation of the hypothesis principally focuses on the lack of ‘processes’ involved in Allport’s hypothesis. Whilst Allport’s thesis predicts when contact might lead to positive change, Pettigrew believes it is lacking by not stating, “How and why the change occurs” (1998:70). Therefore, he suggests the following five inter related processes are present:

First, learning about the out group. This covers cognitive change through new learning. In the initial stage, this was held to be “the major way that intergroup contact has effects”, but later “cognitive research has uncovered a host of mechanisms that limit learning material that counters our attitudes and stereotypes” (1998:71). This new research suggests that cognitive analyses are still part of the equation, but other processes are equally important.

Second: Positive contact between groups can result in a change in behavior. This often has the consequential effect of changing attitudes, as new situations require a change in expectations. If these expectations encourage acceptance of 'others', the behavior change may produce a change in attitude. This is most likely where there is repeated contact in a variety of settings.

Third, by creating affective ties. This process involves changed emotions, and can compliment the first process. Emotional ties are important in overcoming the "anxiety [which] is common in initial encounters between groups" (1998:72).

Sports may be particularly applicable here with their potential to excite, arouse and sadden.

Fourth, through in-group reappraisal: Where positive intergroup contact occurs, there may be a reshaping of ones view of ones own group. This process can be catalyzed by "having less contact with the in-group as a result of more contact with the out-group" (1998:72). Positive contact with others makes one reassess the stereotypes communicated by ones own group, leading one to reassess ones understanding and membership of that in-group.

Fifth, an essential condition which Pettigrew adds: "The contact situation must provide the participants with the opportunity to become friends"(1998:76). This furthers the argument of Thomsen that superficial contact does not suffice. Pettigrew asserts: "constructive contact relates more closely to long term close relationships than to initial acquaintanceship," because "optimal intergroup contact requires time for cross group friendships to develop" (1998:76). Forbes (*Ethnic Conflict and the Contact Hypothesis*) delivers a strong critique. Reflecting upon Pettigrew's assertion that "the world is experiencing two major

intergroup trends—massive migration and increased group conflict" (2004:69), he questions the theory: "Aren't high levels of contact often associated with high levels of prejudice and discrimination in the parts of the world where different racial and ethnic groups live in close proximity and come into contact most frequently?" (2004:70). He cites examples of conflict between France and Germany, the Balkans, India and Pakistan. Forbes believes the hypothesis was

shown to be false fifty years ago, focusing on the inability to “promote true acquaintance without increasing casual contacts”(2004:86).

Barlow et al (*The Contact Caveat: Negative Contact Predicts Increased Prejudice More Than Positive Contact Predicts Reduced Prejudice*), focus their research on the flip side of the Contact hypothesis: the potential for negative contact to increase prejudice. In a similar vein to Forbes, they discuss racially diverse areas “in which contact is presumably common” which “often show the highest levels of intergroup antipathy” (2012:1629). However, unlike Forbes, they do not believe this shows the theory to have failed, but instead focuses on the importance of creating ‘positive’ contact. They suggest that prejudiced people may actively behave “to *ensure* that intergroup contact will confirm their expectations and be negative”, and therefore “it is likely that bidirectional is at play” (2012:1640).

The authors insist: “factors that curb contact’s ability to reduce prejudice are now the most problematic theoretically, yet the least understood. These negative factors... deserve to become a major focus of future contact research” (2012:1630). Specific questions for researchers suggested are: “what factors predict negative contact? When will negative contact emerge as opposed to positive contact? If negative contact increases prejudice, how does it do so?” (2012:1640).

Having reviewed the praise, criticism and reformulations of the contact hypothesis, the next chapter will proceed to match it with programs in the SDP world, where the essential conditions and processes will be used as a framework to analyse whether SDP programs are suitable for creating positive contact, and *Sport and Peace in South Asia*.

## **1.6. Limitations.**

Sport and politics is a relatively under-researched theoretical field. The challenge in writing that part of the theory is therefore to piece together relevant parts of existing literature. Even though it is no longer necessary to justify research on

sport and politics, it is still a widely ignored field in International Relations theory. Thus, one aim of this thesis is to rectify this lack of attention towards the role of sport in international relations. Furthermore, in relation to cricket diplomacy, I will use the framework of sport *and* politics, as opposed to politics *in* sport. The former, according to Houlihan (2004:214), relates to 'the use made by governments of sport and the process by which public policy is made and implemented,' thus the study of politics *and* sport is 'concerned largely with an examination of the relationship of politics to sport in the public domain defined by recognized institutions of state. Politics *in* sport, on the other hand, involves a consideration of the ways in which 'organizations use power to pursue their own sectional interests.' Literature on diplomacy is a vast theoretical area, with many variations and classifications. I have chosen to focus in the coming chapters on the aspects of diplomacy most relevant for sport diplomacy, specifically those aspects concerning representation and communication, confidence-building measures and multi-track diplomacy. This implies leaving out topics that are regarded as important in other parts of the literature. One strain of diplomacy theory concerns the evolution of modern diplomacy, which can be traced to the fifteenth century (Keens-Soper, 2004:3). The evolution of diplomacy is not important for the purpose of studying cricket diplomacy, however. I have therefore chosen to disregard this aspect. Furthermore, other writers discuss at length the tasks and players of diplomacy. Barston (1997:2), for instance, argues that the work of diplomacy can be broken down into 6 broad areas or tasks, and that even within these there are a number of subdivisions. 'The players in diplomacy' then carry out these tasks (Ibid. 4). I will limit this discussion to the difference between official and unofficial types of representatives because it is the most helpful when using a multi-track framework of diplomacy. I will limit the discussion on broad versus narrow conceptions for the same reason. The distinction between official and unofficial diplomacy naturally entails elements of broad and narrow notions of diplomacy but the discussion in Jönsson (2002a), among others, is not needed in order to answer the research question. Finally, in the literature on confidence-building measures (CBMs), a distinction is made

between military and non-military varieties. According to Qadeem (2003:160-1) non-military CBMs usually focus on human interaction. Because I only look at cricket, which is a purely non-military CBM, I will exclude the military versus non-military CBM discussion from the theory chapter. Finally, there is also the question of how comparable India and Pakistan are as countries. An important distinction between the two is that India is a full-fledged participatory democracy with a secular basis, whereas Pakistan was founded on the basis of Muslim identity, and the country has more often than not been ruled by military regimes (Paul, 2005:19). These domestic settings will obviously have consequences for the respective citizenry's voice on matters of war and peace, and possibly for the success of cricket diplomacy.

### **1.7. Definitions of Sport and peace**

#### ***Definition of Sport.***

Sport is an athletic activity requiring skill or physical prowess and often of a competitive nature, as racing, baseball, tennis, golf, bowling, wrestling, boxing, hunting, fishing, etc. all forms of physical activities that contribute to physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction. These include: play; recreation; organized, casual or competitive sport; and indigenous sports or games." - (United Nations Inter-agency Taskforce on Sport for Development and Peace)

#### ***Definition of Peace.***

Peace is a state or period in which there is no war or a war has ended (oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/peace)

### **1.8. Sport for Peace as a Tool.**

A set of interventions and field of study in which sport is used as a tool for teaching peace building and conflict resolution skills through its "intrinsic values such as teamwork, fairness, discipline and respect for the opponent." ("Sport and Peace," 2012)

The International Platform for Sport and Development calls sport in peace-building —one of the most hotly-debated areas in Sport & Development (International Platform on Sport and Development, Sport and Peace-Building). Still, it is important to remember that the —slow child is not the youngest in the litter. The UN International Labor Organization and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) signed an agreement to collaborate back in 1922, and UN humanitarian aid workers have used sport in trying to comfort victims of conflict and natural disasters for years (United Nations, e). By that time, the IOC and the intrepid founder of the modern Olympic Movement, Pierre de Coubertin, had already been preaching the sport-peace connection for more than two decades:

It was with these thoughts in mind that I sought to revive the Olympic Games. I have succeeded after many efforts. Should the institution prosper, as I am persuaded, all civilized nations aiding, that it will, it may be a potent, if indirect, factor in securing universal peace. Wars break out because nations misunderstand each other. We shall not have peace until the prejudices which now separate the different races shall have been outlived. To attain this end, what better means than to bring the youth of all countries periodically together for amicable trials of muscular strength and agility? The Olympic Games, with the ancients, controlled athletics and promoted peace. It is not visionary to look to them for similar benefactions in the future (Coubertin, 1896).

Peace-building is still a young field, but there is growing agreement that certain principles are essential to peace-building processes across contexts. These include: *Specificity of peace building*: because each context is unique and stages of conflict are non-linear, peace building strategies have to be context-specific and address the sources of conflict. *Holistic approach*: peace building encompasses multiple dimensions including security, socio-economic development, and political stability, rule of law, human rights, and humanitarian assistance. *National ownership*: the primary responsibility for peace building rests with national actors. *Role of external actors*: given the legacy of conflict and weakened national capacities, external actors can contribute in important ways to

peace building. *Coordination and mutual accountability*: national and international actors need to act in a coherent manner and share mutual accountability. *Importance of monitoring, evaluation and continual learning*: as a relatively new field involving constant experimentation and innovation, peace building requires cumulative and comparative learning from successes as well as failures (Tschirgi, 2011). It is no mistake that these attributes mesh with peace-building efforts in sporting contexts. The next section considers how unique sport is toward addressing peace-building goals.

### **1.9. Understanding the Uniqueness of Sport**

Sport has many attributes that contemporary peace-builders, or conflict transformers, want to leverage. It fosters social integration. It requires, in most cases, direct physical contact or at least direct communication. It can be, and often is, a collective experience. It can (depending on the context) transcend class divisions, either in the act of participating or watching (International Platform on Sport and Development, 2009). Lederach has suggested a —web approach<sup>11</sup> to peace-building that creates interdependent connections that strengthen and can withstand isolated breaches at other points on the web. National governing organizations and other agencies of development are well-suited to weave these webs (SDP IWG, 2008a). Sport has a checkered history as being considered either valuable preparation for war or a socially acceptable alternative to war. However, if administered well, the cooperative aspects of sport (e.g., teamwork, agreement with an opponent as to the rules) and the competitive aspects (e.g., appealing to aggressive tendencies in a controlled setting) can be enormous benefits to improving hostile attitudes. Sport/physical activity isn't the only domain where these elements are at play, but the combination of these elements along with the great interest in sport and play by most populations and media are indicators of why sport in a peace-building role has gained traction. This combination of seeing peace-building as a broad-based effort, and looking for multi-faceted solutions to lessening conflict rather than a panacea, further illuminates sport as an influential domain to seek conflict

transformation. It is easy to put sport front and center of such efforts, especially when the media get interested. But researchers and SDP program developers and implementers should not be lulled into overstating the importance of sport initiatives. Sport's value in peace-building, like a key player coming off the bench, is linked to knowing your limitations – and your potential to contribute. To date, in my opinion, evaluation measures have too often been limited to descriptive accounts, resulting in a lack of acceptance for sport-based initiatives by the wider development field. SDP should be considered in a nuanced manner as part of a larger strategy, and evaluated based on performance compared to other development tools (Levermore, 2008a).

Reintegrating child soldiers into their old communities or new ones is one of the specific goals where sport and peace-building is considered a candidate to play a meaningful part. This population, estimated to be in the tens of thousands over the past 30 years by the UN Study on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Children (Machel, 1996), is difficult to reintegrate because of distrust among other societal members and the deep trauma they experience. The hope is that sport provides new normalizing structures in education and other opportunities. But even among those who have researched such efforts and advocate for them, they caution against expectations 16

That are too high and acknowledge that sport programs' effectiveness is speculative (Richards, 1997, in Sierra Leone; Armstrong, 2004, in Liberia, e.g.).

#### Building relationships

Sport works primarily by bridging relationships across social, economic and cultural divides within society, and by building a sense of shared identity and fellowship among groups that might otherwise be inclined to treat each other with distrust, hostility or violence. One peace researcher views relationship-building as the central component of peace-building and highlights the importance of interventions that explicitly focus on strategic networking to build relationships.<sup>10</sup> Ideally, peace-building establishes a web of relationships that can sustain local damage without loss of the whole. This means that relationships are not all linked

to, or dependent on, a single individual or small number of individuals. This includes horizontal connections at the community level across groups and institutions, as well as vertical links to influential leaders and decision-makers outside the community. NGOs are well positioned to facilitate the process of relationship-building by bringing people together and engaging them in dialogue and programs that cross diverse boundaries. When properly supported, sport programs can play a contributing role in this process, creating more opportunities for social contact. Establishing community sport organizations and the participation of community sport volunteers generates social ties and community infrastructure that help to build peace and stability.

### **1.9.1 Connecting individuals to communities**

Community sport programs can provide shared experiences between people that

“Re-humanize” opposing groups in the eyes of their enemies. By sharing sport experiences, sport participants from conflicting groups increasingly grow to feel that they are alike, rather than different. This shared “ritual identity,” or sense of belonging to the same group on the basis of a shared ritual experience, helps to erase the dehumanizing effects of persistent negative characterizations of opposing groups. Sport can serve as a tool to advance demobilization and disarmament efforts and to support the often difficult reintegration of ex-combatants, particularly former child combatants, into their communities. Regular sport activities can also help to address war-related trauma and promote healing by providing safe spaces for activities that enable victims of war to regain a sense of security and normalcy. Within safe spaces, victims are able to build positive relationships and, in the case of those newly disabled, to rebuild a sense of confidence in their own abilities. Through its nearly universal reach and popularity, sport also offers an important means of reaching out to and engaging socially excluded groups. In these cases, sport programs are often the initial “hook” that opens the door to other opportunities to connect people to a wider

range of services and supports that can assist them. Using sport as a communications platform The profile and influence of elite athletes and sporting events can shine a light on the structural causes of social exclusion and help to promote solutions. The global popularity of elite sport makes it an ideal and extremely powerful mass communication platform that can be used to promote a culture of peace. Celebrity athletes, in particular, can be extremely influential as role models and spokespeople for peace and serve, at times, as intermediaries between hostile nations, creating openings for dialogue. While these moments generally occur spontaneously at the international level, the same effect can be generated at the local level through carefully designed programs that work in a sustained way to build bridges between antagonistic groups.

### **1.9.2 Creating a space for dialogue**

Elite sport has been used to open the door to peaceful dialogue and to defuse political tensions between nations. The famous “ping pong diplomacy” between the People’s Republic of China and the United States was launched in 1971 when an American national table tennis player missed his bus after a practice and was invited onto the Chinese team’s bus. One of the Chinese players offered a silkscreen portrait to his American counterpart in greeting. The American later presented the Chinese player with a T-shirt containing the peace symbol and the words “Let it be.” The media attention that followed this incident led to an invitation for an American government delegation to visit China. More recently, the term “cricket diplomacy” has been used to describe the improvement of relations between India and Pakistan resulting from an informal invitation from Prime Minister Singh to General Musharraf to watch an international cricket match between the two nations. Sport, at the elite or community level, is increasingly being used in a wide variety of ways to promote social inclusion, prevent conflict, and build peace in developed and developing countries. Whether the aim is to promote peace at the elite or community level, it is important to consider the limitations that may be involved.

### **1.9.3 Can Sport Create Peace?**

Examples of sport diplomacy are far between, but they show a great deal of variety as table illustrates. Cricket diplomacy, involving a sport both countries are passionate about and administered at a state-to-state level, is but one of seven cases mentioned in this thesis. Add to that the particularities of the India-Pakistan relationship, and the question whether the findings here are applicable to other cases materializes. Case findings must in any case always be considered to be of a provisional character (George & Bennett, 2004:90), and Punch (2005:146) therefore suggests two main ways in which a case study such as this can produce results that 'at least suggest generalizability:' by conceptualizing, and by developing propositions. Based on the case studied, is possible to put forward propositions that can be asserted for their applicability and transferability to other situations.

Two general propositions emerge from the discussion about cricket diplomacy from 1977 to 2013. First, a thaw in relations between adversarial states seems to be a prerequisite for successful sport diplomacy. In other words, sport diplomacy when applied under circumstances conducive to rapprochement will have the greatest chance of succeeding. Second, sport diplomacy's ability to survive deteriorating state-to-state relations can be vital for maintaining channels of communication even in periods of dire political climates. The question is however how severe a deterioration sport diplomacy is able to withstand, something that probably will vary from case to case. This could and should be a question for future research.

Sources.

Two problems have been most important when it comes to the collection of theory and data. On the one hand, there is the aforementioned lack of research in the field of sport and politics. On the other, the recent nature of the peace process has provided its own set of challenges. My sources have therefore mainly consisted of two types. First, a literary review of different books has provided most of the content for the background and theory chapters, and a few books have even traced the recent cricket diplomacy. Second, newspaper and

journal articles, UN documents and Internet sources have provided the additional bulk of collected data. Such sources have been necessary because many of the developments in the India-Pakistan relationship are so recent that they have only been covered by the different news media. In addition, I have used interviews conducted by Crick (2006).

Language has proved no barrier, as all the sources I have consulted have been in English. Furthermore, English is commonly spoken across South Asia, so not much can get lost in translation. Another potential pitfall is grasping the cultural differences between India and Pakistan on the one hand and Norway on the other, both when it comes to understanding the region and cricket. I have lived and travelled extensively in South Asia, providing me with a basic understanding of South Asian culture. As for cricket, a marginal sport in Norway, time spent in India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka has nourished both my interest in the sport and equipped me with some modest knowledge necessary to understand the sport and to consider its impact in the region.

## **SPORT AS A TOOL TO PREVENT CONFLICT AND BUILD PEACE**

### **1.9.4 Building relationships**

Sport works primarily by bridging relationships across social, economic and cultural divides within society, and by building a sense of shared identity and fellowship among groups that might otherwise be inclined to treat each other with distrust, hostility or violence. One peace researcher views relationship-building as the central component of peace-building and highlights the importance of interventions that explicitly focus on strategic networking to build relationships.<sup>10</sup> Ideally, peace-building establishes a web of relationships that can sustain local damage without loss of the whole. This means that relationships are not all linked to, or dependent on, a single individual or small number of individuals. This includes horizontal connections at the community level across groups and institutions, as well as vertical links to influential leaders and decision-makers outside the community. NGOs are well positioned to facilitate the process of relationship-building by bringing people together and engaging them in dialogue

and programs that cross diverse boundaries. When properly supported, sport programs can play a contributing role in this process, creating more opportunities for social contact. Establishing community sport organizations and the participation of community sport volunteers generates social ties and community infrastructure that help to build peace and stability.

Connecting individuals to communities Community sport programs can provide shared experiences between people that “re-humanize” opposing groups in the eyes of their enemies. By sharing sport experiences, sport participants from conflicting groups increasingly grow to feel that they are alike, rather than different. This shared “ritual identity,” or sense of belonging to the same group on the basis of a shared ritual experience, helps to erase the dehumanizing effects of persistent negative characterizations of opposing groups. Sport can serve as a tool to advance demobilization and disarmament efforts and to support the often difficult reintegration of ex-combatants, particularly former child combatants, into their communities. Regular sport activities can also help to address war-related trauma and promote healing by providing safe spaces for activities that enable victims of war to regain a sense of security and normalcy. Within safe spaces, victims are able to build positive relationships and, in the case of those newly disabled, to rebuild a sense of confidence in their own abilities. Through its nearly universal reach and popularity, sport also offers an important means of reaching out to and engaging socially excluded groups. In these cases, sport programs are often the initial “hook” that opens the door to other opportunities to connect people to a wider range of services and supports that can assist them.

## **CHAPTER 2<sup>nd</sup>**

### **Review of the literature**

#### **2.1 Literature review**

The literature reviewed is also sourced from articles in both academic, popular and sport and development journals and conference proceedings. The role of sport in peace building is one of the pillars in the sport, development and peace (SDP) field of study. It is an emerging concept which has been highly utilized by international and local governmental and nongovernmental organizations including the United Nations. Although this literature review has covered the main concepts, it is not exhaustive. However, many of the authors appear to have sourced material from one another and the sources cited here have captured most of the current arguments on the subject of sport and peace-building to a large extent.

#### **2.2 Methodological Approach**

The discussion about sport and diplomacy will provide the framework for analyzing cricket as a tool for development of peace between two nations including diplomacy between India and Pakistan since 1977. For the purpose of the latter, I will use a case study approach. George and Bennett (2004:17-18) define a case as 'an instance of a class of events.' The term class of events refers to

'a phenomenon of scientific interest, such as revolutions, types of governmental regimes, kinds of economic systems, or personality types that the investigator chooses to study with the aim of developing theory (or 'generic knowledge') regarding the causes of similarities or differences among instances (cases) of that class of events.'

Thus, a case study is a well-defined aspect of a historical episode that the investigator selects for analysis, rather than the historical event itself (Ibid. 18). In other words, this case study deals with cricket diplomacy in the time-span from

1987 to 2007. The relationship between India and Pakistan is complex, and a case study approach is therefore useful because the aim is to understand the case in depth, and 'in its natural setting, recognizing its complexity and context' (Punch, 2005:144). Using this kind of approach for assessing the success of cricket diplomacy is regarded as 'an opportunity to learn more about the complexity of the problem studied, to develop further the existing explanatory framework, and to refine and elaborate the initially available theory' (George, 1979:51).

Case study methods are 'generally strong precisely where statistical methods and formal models are weak,' and four strong advantages can be identified, which makes a case study approach ideal for studying cricket as a tool for peace building including the cricket diplomacy (George & Bennett: 2004:19-22). First, case studies allow a researcher to achieve high levels of conceptual validity. Case studies allow for conceptual refinements with a higher level of validity over a smaller number of cases. Second, case studies have powerful advantages in deriving new hypotheses, in the course of the research process. Third, case studies examine the operation of causal mechanisms in individual cases in detail. It is therefore possible to look at a large number of intervening variables within a single case. And finally, case studies have the ability to accommodate complex causal relations such as equifinality, complex interaction effects, and path dependency. This requires process tracing evidence to document complex interactions. Process tracing is something that I will return to later. There are trades-offs and potential pitfalls of case studies as well, according to George and Bennett (2004:22-33), among them: Case selection bias, which is the problem of selecting relevant cases. In other words, the question is whether cricket as a tool for peace diplomacy is the most relevant case of sport diplomacy; identifying the scope conditions and necessity of a case study as case studies remains much stronger at assessing *whether* and *how* a variable mattered to the outcome than at assessing *how much* it mattered. Thus, it may not be possible to determine the exact impact or success of cricket diplomacy; the 'degrees of freedom problem,' which means that within a single

case there are many possible process-tracing observations along the hypothesized causal paths between independent and dependent variables. That means that cricket could not be the only intervening variable in the India-Pakistan case; and, the sometimes lack of representatives or independence of cases, in this case to a certain extent represented by the overall lack of cases of sport diplomacy.

### ***2.3 Methodological Choices and Limitations***

Yin (1994:1) argues that ‘case studies are the preferred strategy when “how” or “why” questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context.’ When assessing the contemporary phenomenon known as cricket diplomacy, I will focus on bilateral cricket contests between India and Pakistan as well as their political relationship. Focusing on bilateral cricket matches alone is relevant because these events are directly related to the countries’ political relationship. I will therefore not include cricket matches at neutral venues, because the political relationship between the two states is better measured by looking at bilateral cricketing ties. Furthermore, the time scope I have.

#### **Process Tracing**

Process tracing is a part of the case study approach. It is well suited to ‘testing theories in a world marked by multiple interaction effects’ (George & Bennett, 2004:206). The India-Pakistan case is definitely a case marked by such multiplicity, and process tracing will therefore be employed in later chapters in order to uncover the complexities of Indo-Pakistani relations and cricket diplomacy. Furthermore, process tracing is considered an ‘indispensable tool for theory testing and theory development not only because it generates numerous observations within a case, but because these observations must be linked in particular ways to constitute an explanation of the case’ (Ibid. 207).

Process tracing in this case will involve looking at the cricketing and political relationships between India and Pakistan in the time period stretching from the birth of the term cricket diplomacy in 1987, and until 2007. In short, the process tracing method attempts to identify the intervening causal process – the causal chain and mechanism – between an independent variable and the outcome of the dependent variable (George & Bennett, 2004: 206). In other words, process tracing in the cricket diplomacy case involves searching for the intervening factors between an initial given situation in India-Pakistan relations, and whether it has been successful or not. Process tracing will according to King, Keohane and Verba (1994:227) then involve searching for evidence about the political decisional process by which the outcome was produced.

# CHAPTER 3<sup>RD</sup>

## **3.1 Sample.**

Sampling is an act, process or technique of selecting a suitable sample, or a representative part of a population for the purpose of determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population.

To achieve a wide variation of data, sample was collected from the various types of articles, research conferences, sports seminars, News Papers of Sports, sports for peace projects interviews and different sports thesis written on sports for peace building.

## **Limitations**

Sport and politics is a relatively under-researched theoretical field. The challenge in writing that part of the theory is therefore to piece together relevant parts of existing literature. Even though it is no longer necessary to justify research on sport and politics, it is still a widely ignored field in International Relations theory. Thus, one aim of this thesis is to rectify this lack of attention towards the role of sport in international relations. Furthermore, in relation to cricket diplomacy, I will use the framework of sport and politics, as opposed to politics in sport. The former, according to Houlihan

(2004:214), relates to 'the use made by governments of sport and the process by which public policy is made and implemented,' thus the study of politics and sport is 'concerned largely with an examination of the relationship of politics to sport in the public domain defined by recognized institutions of state. Politics in sport, on the other hand, involves a consideration of the ways in which 'organizations use power to pursue their own sectional interests.'

Literature on diplomacy is a vast theoretical area, with many variations and classifications. I have chosen to focus in the coming chapters on the aspects of diplomacy most relevant for sport diplomacy, specifically those aspects concerning representation and communication, confidence-building measures and multi-track diplomacy. This implies leaving out topics that are regarded as important in other parts of the literature. One strain of diplomacy theory concerns the evolution of modern diplomacy, which can be traced to the fifteenth century (Keens-Soper, 2004:3). The evolution of diplomacy is not important for the purpose of studying cricket diplomacy, however. I have therefore chosen to disregard this aspect. Furthermore, other writers discuss at length the tasks and players of diplomacy. Barston (1997:2), for instance, argues that the work of diplomacy can be broken down into 6 broad areas or tasks, and that even within these there are a number of subdivisions. 'The players in diplomacy' then carry out these tasks (Ibid. 4). I will limit this discussion to the difference between official and unofficial types of representatives because it is the most helpful when using a multi-track framework of diplomacy. I will limit the discussion on broad versus narrow conceptions for the same reason. The distinction between official and unofficial diplomacy naturally entails elements of broad and narrow notions of diplomacy but the discussion in Jönsson (2002a), among others, is not needed in order to answer the research question. Finally, in the literature on confidence-building measures (CBMs), a distinction is made between military and non-military varieties. According to Qadeem (2003:160-1) non-military CBMs usually focus on human interaction. Because I only look at cricket, which is a purely non-military CBM, I will exclude the military versus non-military CBM discussion from the theory chapter.

Finally, there is also the question of how comparable India and Pakistan are as countries. An important distinction between the two is that India is a full-fledged participatory democracy with a secular basis, whereas Pakistan was founded on the basis of Muslim identity, and the country has Army Govt. most of the time since partition of Pakistan (Paul, 2005:19). Most of the governments presidents were from military peoples and these domestic settings will obviously have

consequences for the respective citizenry's voice on matters of war and peace, and possibly for the success of cricket diplomacy.

### **3.2 Cricket an Appropriate Diplomatic Tool?**

The traumas of Partition, the outbreak of war over Kashmir under a year after independence, as well as the very foundation for the state of Pakistan as a Muslim homeland in South Asia, meant that the relations between the two neighbors were strained from the outset, a relationship characterized by layered complexity. Cricket, as a unifying force in two countries beset by diversity, has taken on such importance for Indians and Pakistanis, and in a way so that the underlying rivalry off the field has virtually been projected onto the field. Thus, cricket matches has to some extent come to mimic the conflict that is taking place in the sphere of politics and diplomacy. The cricketing rivalry, which was once played out between Hindu and Muslim teams within British India, has simply been transferred to an inter-state competition between secular – albeit overwhelmingly in the Hindu mould – India and Muslim Pakistan. Thus, the antagonism has in a certain way been centralized and strengthened, adding to and feeding off the complexities of the strained relationship between India and Pakistan, the 'terrible twins of world politics' (Khwaja, 2004).

Cricket, to use Allison's (2004:348) words, is considered to 'exemplify the spirit' of the nation. It follows that a defeat for the national team can be considered to reflect the state of the nation. Defeat for India or Pakistan at the hands of their rivals has been felt as a collective sense of national humiliation, followed by public outrage. In the case of Indo-Pakistani cricket, the nationalist sentiments attached to the game have mostly made it resemble a battlefield since as early as the 1960s (Lal, 2003:207). Using a sport that both nations are passionate about can therefore be risky business for the involved parties as too much prestige can be put into winning (Selliaas, 2006b). Nevertheless, the case has been made for cricket to contribute to an improved relationship between the two countries on account of it being their common love, thereby providing a possible 'bridge of peace.' Coakley (2004:454) points out that a longstanding

ideal underlying international sport has been achieving peace and friendship among nations. Sport has therefore been added as a tool for diplomacy, for possessing the capacity to help ease tensions and contribute to rapprochement between enemies. However, events such as the Football War in 1969 (Kapuscinski, 1992), and the fervor and nationalist passion often considered part and parcel of competitive sports, somewhat negates this positive outlook. In some cases, sport functions as a vehicle for rivalry. This may not lead to war, but it stirs up a lot of emotion and enmity towards the 'enemy.' Chenabi (2004:239) similarly argues that 'the idea of improving people-to-people relations through athletic competition seems somewhat counter-intuitive, as international sports events more than not crystallize nationalistic passions.' On the other hand, Chenabi notes, when sporting contests take place 'that are accompanied by mutual signaling of goodwill and friendly cheering spectators, a shift in attitudes can be inferred from that.' Considering the history of cricket in South Asia, one would hardly consider it the most appropriate of means with which to promote peace and rapprochement. Varney (1999:560) has observed that 'the clashes between India and Pakistan, whose politics pitches them close to war across their shared border, often take on an extra and quite heated dimension in the spectator stands if not on the cricket ground itself.' Thus, in the past cricket has sometimes come close to igniting a state of hostility between the parties. On the other hand, cricket is close to being the only real unifying force, both within and between India and Pakistan. As mentioned earlier, cricket is the common love of the subcontinent, and hence a powerful diplomatic tool. In addition, making peace is a process by multiple means, according to Lederach (2001:841). This implies that conflict resolution and diplomatic efforts should not be confined to the official level, known as track-one. Peace building must be undertaken at different levels of society, Lederach argues. In other words, the activity of peace building 'has multiple activities, at multiple levels, carried on by different sets of people at the same time' (Ibid. 841). In the case of India and Pakistan, cricket has constituted such an avenue for conflict resolution. The cricket tours of recent years have provided venues for 'conversational space,' and have helped the

easing of tensions and reduction of mutual mistrust between Pakistanis and Indians. As such, cricket diplomacy has followed the second and third tracks in the multi-track diplomacy paradigm, complementing and backing up the developments at the official, track-one level. The efforts at the second and third tracks of diplomacy are 'supposed to feed into official diplomacy by serving as a "testing ground" for new policy initiatives and in creating a public peace constituency,' and the varied range of such initiatives over the years trying to build bridges between India and Pakistan is extensive (Behera, 2003). Thus, there is no doubt that cricket has been an appropriate diplomatic tool for easing tensions between India and Pakistan.

### ***3.3 Case Studies and Generalization.***

Cricket diplomacy is one of a limited number of cases of sport diplomacy, a practice with many varieties nonetheless. That makes the study of sport diplomacy relatively manageable, but the limited number of cases raises questions about generalization. More to the point, it raises the question of whether just the one case of cricket diplomacy is good enough for generalizing the results to other cases, and how applicable the results presented in this thesis will be to other cases of sport diplomacy?

Punch (2005:146) argues that 'whether a case study should even seek to generalize, and claim to be representative, depends on the context and purposes of the particular object.' He suggests two main ways that a case study can produce results that at least suggest generalizability: by conceptualizing, and by developing propositions. Based on the case studied, it is possible to put forward one or more propositions, which links concepts or factors within the case. These can then be asserted for their applicability and transferability to other situations. What is highlighted is the uniqueness of the case studied, and what would be common. Whether the results from my discussion on the success of cricket diplomacy are representative and applicable to other cases of sport diplomacy poses one such challenge. However, in both instances mentioned by Punch, the

findings from a case study can be put forward as being potentially applicable to other cases.

Case explanations must in any case always be considered to be of a provisional character (George & Bennett, 2004:90). Therefore, the theoretical conclusions drawn from case study findings will also be provisional. Any propositions posed in this thesis will not be proven facts, but may provide material for future research.

case studies was also used by these scientist for their research  
*such as Yin, 1994, Hamel et al., 1993, Eaton, 1992, Gomm, 2000, Perry, 1998, and Saunders et al., 2000 but seeks to distil key aspects of case study research in such a way as to encourage new researchers to grapple with and apply some of the key principles of this research approach.*

# CHAPTER 4<sup>TH</sup>

## **4.1 Results.**

The role of sport in peace building is one of the pillars in the sport, development and peace (SDP) field of study. It is an emerging concept which has been highly utilized by international and local governmental and nongovernmental organizations including the United Nations for peace.

Sport for Development and Peace is an emerging concept which endorses the view that sport initiatives can be “powerful, practical, and cost-effective tools» for peace. This is evident from the activities of many governments and NGOs that utilize sport as a tool to achieve development goals such as Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and resolve social conflicts and bring about peace. Tsuchiya S, Sport as an International Tool for Development and Peace-building (2009 University for Peace in Costa Rica [http://www.monitor.upeace.org/archive.cfm?id\\_article=621](http://www.monitor.upeace.org/archive.cfm?id_article=621), Retrieved on 10/10/2012

## **4.2 PEACE-BUILDING INTERVENTIONS**

The purpose of sport for peace initiatives is to harness the power of sport to support the four types of peace-building activities. Sport alone cannot prevent conflict or build peace. However, it can contribute to broader, more comprehensive efforts in a range of important ways.

- Humanitarian mine action
- Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of Adult combatants
- Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of Child combatants
- Security sector reform
- Small arms and light weapons reduction

- Physical reconstruction
- Economic infrastructure
- Health and education infrastructure
- Repatriation and return of refugees and internally

Displaced persons

- Food security

- Democratization (parties, media, NGOs, democratic culture)

- Strengthening governance (accountability, rule of law, Justice System)

- Institution building

- Human rights enforcement (monitoring laws, Justice System)

- Dialogue between leaders of opposing groups

- Grassroots dialogue

- Other bridge-building activities

- Truth and reconciliation commissions

- Trauma therapy and healing

*Source: Adapted from The Peace building Palette (Utstein Report)<sup>9</sup>*

#### **4.3 SPORT AND PEACE: SOCIAL INCLUSION, CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACE-BUILDING**

Using sport as a communications platform The profile and influence of elite athletes and sporting events can shine a light on the structural causes of social exclusion and help to promote solutions. The global popularity of elite sport makes it an ideal and extremely powerful mass communication platform that can be used to promote a culture of peace. Celebrity athletes, in particular, can be extremely influential as role models and spokespeople for peace and serve, at times, as intermediaries between hostile nations, creating openings for dialogue. While these moments generally occur spontaneously at the international level,

the same effect can be generated at the local level through carefully designed programs that work in a sustained way to build bridges between antagonistic groups. Creating a space for dialogue Elite sport has been used to open the door to peaceful dialogue and to defuse political tensions between nations. The famous “ping pong diplomacy” between the People’s Republic of China and the United States was launched in 1971 when an American national table tennis player missed his bus after a practice and was invited onto the Chinese team’s bus. One of the Chinese players offered a silkscreen portrait to his American counterpart in greeting. The American later presented the Chinese player with a T-shirt containing the peace symbol and the words “Let it be.” The media attention that followed this incident led to an invitation for an American government delegation to visit China. More recently, the term “cricket diplomacy” has been used to describe the improvement of relations between India and Pakistan resulting from an informal invitation from Prime Minister Singh to General Musharaf to watch an international cricket match between the two nations. Sport, at the elite or community level, is increasingly being used in a wide variety of ways to promote social inclusion, prevent conflict, and build peace in developed and developing countries. Whether the aim is to promote peace at the elite or community level, it is important to consider the limitations that may be involved.

There is the potential in South Africa for major and professional and spectator sporting events (e.g., the soccer World Cup) to act as a powerful tool for community-building and peace building; Keim (2006) calls for sport to be put back on the agenda for national transformation with regard to children and youth. In other words, if South Africa is committed to post-apartheid reconciliation among young populations and future generations, sport offers a means to this end and should be part of the plan (Keim, 2006).

Recent research suggests that sport-based programs focused on children and youth in areas of conflict offer a means of both resolution and, in turn, reconciliation. Richards (1997, cited by Giulianotti, 1999), for example, found that sport can facilitate positive social opportunities in post-war Africa, where violence and child-soldiering have severely restricted or foreclosed the health and welfare of children and youth. Similarly, Gasser & Levinsen (2004, p.179) documented the success of Open Fun Football Schools in reintegrating ethnic communities in the post-war Balkans, although they caution that “football is something like frontline farmland: fertile, but likely to be mined.” When war leads to limited avenues for social and personal development, the importance of physical activity for children and youth may be thought to increase, and participation opportunities become paramount, in the contributions such opportunities afford to children impacted by conflict (Richards, 1997). These results suggest that, if sport-focused projects are locally grounded, carefully thought out, and professionally managed, they can make a modest contribution to conflict resolution and peaceful coexistence in regions of violence (Sugden, 2006).

Willis' (2000) case study of the Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) suggests that MYSA and programs of its kind appear to provide hope that grassroots development may make a difference, that children and youth may own their development, that gender stereotypes can be successfully challenged through sport programs, that the objects of development can become its subjects. Furthermore, MYSA's Letting Girls Play program afforded girls a safe and supportive environment in which they are treated with dignity and taught new skills. The report suggests that adolescence is a key time to introduce such programs given that transitions from childhood to adulthood are generally the time when boys establish more autonomy, mobility, privilege and opportunity than girls (CABOS Report, 2006).

In addition to the notion of community-building in geopolitical areas of conflict, and the idea that sport facilitates the building of local communities, there is also evidence to suggest that child/youth participation in sport aids in facilitating pro-social behavior in peer relations. O'Callaghan, et al. (2003) found

that, when coupled with additional behaviors, sport-based programs were successful in promoting social skills generalization among children diagnosed with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). Given that social skills generalization is unlikely to take place without active efforts, evidence suggests that sport offers one tool to be used to promote pro-social behavior (O'Callaghan, et al., 2003, p.327).

Research also suggests that sport may provide an opportunity for positive peer interaction and healthy competition for and among youth (Weiss & Stuntz, 2004, cited by Hedstrom & Gould, 2004). Recent research suggests that peer relationships are a key part of young people's experiences in sport, and that social acceptance and affiliation are important components in determining the extent to which children and youth enjoy participating in sport (Smith, 2003). As young people mature, they increasingly rely on peers for information and feedback regarding physical competence; therefore, sport as a context of physical activity, serves as a key site of child and youth development (Smith, 2003).

# PART III

## CHAPTER 5<sup>TH</sup>

Circling in Sport Diplomacy.

This chapter will discuss the relationship between sport and diplomacy. Sport diplomacy has not been established firmly within academic literature on diplomacy, this will therefore be addressed in coming sections. To discuss sport diplomacy implies taking into account how sport and politics are connected, something to which I will turn the attention to first. Then I will move on to give an account of diplomacy, before I commence with the discussion of sport as a tool including sport diplomacy. Combined, this will in addition to establishing sport diplomacy as a part of diplomacy theory, provide the framework for discussing the research questions in later chapters in relation to the case of cricket diplomacy.

### ***5.1 Sport and International Relations***

Cricket diplomacy is an example of how sport plays a role in relations between states. The relationship between sport and politics as a subject for research has nevertheless long been neglected, especially in theory on International Relations (Levermore & Budd, 2004:6). However, it is no longer necessary to justify the academic study of sport, according to Allison (2000:1). Houlihan (in Beacom, 2000:4) adds to the argument by referring to the intertwining of sport and politics at different levels, and identifies as themes for discussion sport as a vehicle for diplomacy, nation building and access into the international arena. In the following paragraphs, I will illustrate why sport and politics is an important field of study, because of sport's enduring and powerful symbolic value, and it's potential for creating a national identity, thus constituting a potentially powerful diplomatic tool.

Sports are more than just reflections of society. They can also 'create interests, principles and meanings which do not exist if there is no sport and

which have an effect on other aspects of society' (Allison, 2000:54). Sport is even to some 'able to sum up life, able to strip it bare and put it under a drama-filled magnifying glass' (Bhattacharya, 2005:17). General definitions emphasize that 'sports are institutionalized competitive

Houlihan (2004:215-219) lists a number of modern forms of policy intervention in sport, both for domestic purposes and on the international stage. I have focused on those forms directly connected to state-to-state relations. Activities that involve rigorous physical exertion or the use of relatively complex physical skills by participants motivated by internal and external rewards' (Coakley, 2004:21). Sport is therefore inherently competitive, and could as Orwell so pessimistically put it amount to 'war minus the shooting.' On the other hand, Ronald Reagan once remarked regarding the US-Soviet relationship that 'if we must compete, let it be on the playing fields and not the battlefield,' suggesting more sporting exchanges in the process (Saunders, 1991:55). Furthermore, it is possible to point to a number of significant factors that make sport a potential vehicle for political action, or at least link sporting institutions to political processes, including: the club as a point of congregation for communities; the way in which rivalries enhance ideas of difference; how teams mark out boundaries of who belongs and who is 'other'; politicians' opportunities to exploit the successes and/or failures of teams as symbols of community aspiration; and, that 'imagined communities' become more real, visible and tangible (Dimeo, 2003:379-380). Cricket in India and Pakistan certainly has involved several of these factors to make it a potential and actual vehicle for political action. Sport and politics have as abovementioned intersected in several ways (Houlihan, 2004:213).<sup>2</sup> States have used sport principally in two ways: 'to sell themselves and enhance their image and to penalize international behavior of which they disapprove' (Allison & Monnington, 2002:107). Sport and sporting events have been 'used to propagate everything: from fascist regimes to multi-national commercial interests; from national identities to racial stereotypes; from colonialism to cultural imperialism' (Mills, 2005:3). Government involvement in

sport is often linked to promoting the prestige and power of a group community or nation, for example through the participation in or holding of international sporting events. In that respect, sport can be used solely for the promotion of individual state interests, or specific foreign policy goals, in the way certain Eastern Bloc countries sought to use sport in order to assert the superiority of their ideology, or to claim regional or global diplomatic leadership. Similarly, Francoist Spain used football both as 'a diversion from reality and a medium to unite the nation behind the regime,' as well as a medium to 'reintegrate the regime into the international community,' and in Péronist Argentina, football was exploited to 'mobilize the masses support and divert their attention from the regime's less pleasant aspects' (Martin, 2004:215-216). Similarly, sport is also seen in many instances as promoting a sense of identity, belonging and unity, which becomes especially important for governments with diverse populations (Coakley, 2004:449-450), as is the case in India and Pakistan.

### **5.2 Sport, Symbols, Identity and Nationalism**

The one aspect of politics that has been perhaps singularly most affected by sport is nationalism and national identities (Sengupta, 2004:586). Sport occupies an important role in relations between people and nations and it has been identified as 'a very prominent social institution in almost every society because it combines the characteristics found in any institution with a unique appeal only duplicated by, perhaps, religion' (Frey & Eitzen, 1991:503). In a similar vein, the relationship between sport and national identity has been described as being 'complex and multifaceted' (Smith & Porter, 2004:1). Sports have the ability above all to tell us about who we are, and even who we want to be, and as for promoting a sense of national identity, Sengupta (2004:585) claims that 'sports bring people and nations together' as they create a shared language and shared passions. International Relations theory has as mentioned earlier tended to pay little attention to sport, but this is true also for theoretical accounts of nationalism (Allison, 2004:351). Nonetheless, sport has an important symbolic function as carrier of national prestige and unity. In addition, the fact that some sports attract a substantial following has the implication that 'the

spectator's participation converts the game into a spectacle rather than simply a contest between active participants, meaning that the significance of defeat on the field can reverberate far beyond the confines of the pitch or stadium' (Mills, 2005:3). Sport takes on symbolic value at different levels. Individuals identify themselves with a team and its individual players, as are cities and regions symbolized by 'their' teams. At the same time, sport also provides a 'number of emotionally charged occasions for citizens to be made aware of and express their common identity within the nation' (Houlihan, 2000:86). In this way, the FC Barcelona football players are not only the point of identification for many an inhabitant of the city of Barcelona, but the team is also a symbol for the uniqueness, and history of opposition towards the old Franco regime, of the region of Catalonia (Foer, 2004:190). More important still is the fact that the national team carries great symbolic value as a metaphor for the nation (Houlihan, 2000:87). Thus, its fate is linked to the fate of the national team since 'athletic prowess is equated with the health of the nation' (Carter, 1999:583). Mills (2005:3) extends on this line of thought, arguing that 'victory at sporting events can be used to carry triumphal messages about the superiority of the group represented by the winning competitors, or more subtle ideas about the benefits of a certain way of life or mode of behavior.' The national teams in cricket in both India and Pakistan can be said to carry this symbolic value, as they also play the role of national unifier to perfection (Dasgupta, 2004:576).

A symbol, according to Kaufmann (2001:16), is an 'emotionally charged shorthand reference to a myth,' and a myth is 'a belief held in common by a large group of people that gives events and actions a particular meaning.' Some sports it would seem are more effective than others in serving as cultural signifiers of national identity (Smith & Porter, 2004:3). This is evident from the myriad of rivalries in the world of football, cricket, and other sports. One prominent example of sporting rivalry with this kind of symbolic value is known as the 'Old Firm,' the derby matches played between top Scottish football teams Glasgow Celtic and Glasgow Rangers. Their rivalry represents something more than 'the enmity of proximity,' it contains strong sectarian overtones as well as the two clubs

traditionally are considered Catholic and Protestant, respectively (Foer, 2004:35). Symbolic value is inextricably linked to the fact that national self-esteem and prestige can be achieved through sporting success. In many cases, in the 'quest to maintain legitimacy, political officials and ruling government parties may use sports' (Coakley, 2004:452). Prestige that can be exploited by politicians domestically and abroad can come cheaply, but that does not prevent it from reaping significant benefits. On the other hand, if politicians associate themselves too closely with sports this can have damaging consequences as well. It can result in embarrassment for the politician, bringing identification with failure connected to sporting defeat, evidence of a lack of leadership skills, and at worst gross incompetence (Allison & Monnington, 2002:126-129). Although politicians may be unwilling to risk reputation and status on an activity they are increasingly unable to control, party officials have been known to identify with sports to reap the possible benefits of sporting success. This has also been an aspect in the case of the cricketing rivalry between India and Pakistan, exemplified by the two most popular politicians of the Indian Congress Party travelling to Pakistan to attend the Test series between the two neighboring countries in 2004, just a few months before the parliamentary elections in their home country (Stoddart, 2005). Both India and Pakistan are internally divided countries along lines of religion as well as ethnicity. Eriksen (1991:191) points out that virtually every modern nation-state is ethnically divided to a greater or lesser extent, thus emphasizing the importance of developing a set of unifying national symbols. As mentioned, perceptions of the symbolic value of sport are shared by individuals and groups in relation to individual players and club teams. Sport can also be viewed as representing common symbols for the population at the national level as well. Sport in this context is considered to be an important part of the images of nations and states (Allison & Monnington, 2002:106). Similarly, Allison (2004:351) argues that sport can act in a 'catalytic way with respect to nationalism,' while Houlihan (2000:88) writes that 'sport, and particularly elite sport, is used to provide the focus for the definition of national identity.' As with many sports, though, the expression of nationality lies more in the choice of a

specific sport than in the support of a specific team. It follows that specific sports can be, and has indeed been, used to build a sense of national identity and national unity. Cricket has been this sport in the case of India and Pakistan. Sport's potential for promoting national unity involves the notion that sport in general, or one sport in particular such as cricket, 'creates or fosters a sense of nationhood,' which is important, 'not least because international competition generates a seemingly endless number of occasions when nations are embodied in something manifestly real and visible' (Smith & Porter, 2004:1). Particular sports can in this way be considered to 'exemplify the spirit of a nation' (Allison, 2004:348). This sense of identification is at the core of the relationship between sport and nationalism. It follows that there can be a 'collective sense of national humiliation' when the national team is defeated. The defeat is taken to reflect the state of the nation as a whole apart from sport, and as mentioned earlier, even potentially on the standing of the nation's government and politicians (Allison, 2004:345). On the other hand, sports can provide a 'healthy outlet to nationalism' if, even in defeat, the sporting heroes of other countries are celebrated and if the achievements of these athletes contribute to the replacement of dominant stereotypes on both sides (Goldberg, 2000:66). The nationalist sentiments attached to cricket in India and Pakistan has nonetheless mostly made the game resemble a battlefield between India and Pakistan. This was at least the situation up until the resumption of bilateral test matches between the two countries in 2004. Recently, cricket has proved itself to have a conflict-dampening effect, and if this effect prevails, then a sport with such a powerful symbolic value attached to the national team, can be a very valuable diplomatic tool indeed.

### ***5.3 Diplomacy***

The art and practice of diplomacy is considered an institution 'as old as social history' (Eban, 1983:332), and 'as old as the history of mankind' itself (Eban, 1998:27). It emerged from 'the related problems of settling disputes peacefully before they led to blows and of bringing about an end to war,' which have occupied the minds of statesmen 'since the days of Nineveh and Tyre' (Zartman & Berman, 1982:vii). Diplomacy has been characterized as 'the engine

room of international relations,' or as the 'master-institution' (Jönsson, 2002a:212). Furthermore, diplomacy has been described as 'an essential condition for the existence of a functioning society of states,' and in the absence of 'this continuing and pervasive activity, international life as we know it would simply be impossible' (Melissen, 1999:xiv).

Literature on diplomacy provides an 'abundance of taxonomies' and is 'generally long on typologies' (Jönsson, 2002a:215). Diplomacy is in essence, though, 'about the framework in which international relations take place, the medium that is both a necessary condition, and the lubricant, of international politics' (Melissen, 1999:xvii). The views and definitions of what diplomacy actually constitutes are numerous, and 'the study of diplomacy displays a variety of conceptualizations rather than scholarly consensus.' Some definitions are vague and virtually all-encompassing when it comes to relations between states, whereas others are concerned with specific aspects of diplomatic practice or diplomatic method. Thus, 'the very definition of diplomacy is a bone of contention' (Jönsson, 2002a:213). Melissen (1999:xvii) argues that a helpful way of conceptualizing diplomacy is to 'centre its definition around what is traditionally seen as its most important operational functions.' In short, diplomacy can better be approached through a 'consideration of its usages, rather than by an attempt to assert or capture a precise, fixed, or authoritative meaning' (Sharp, 2004a:211).

#### **5.4 The Limitations of Sport/Cricket Diplomacy**

Critics of track diplomacy argue that it can be difficult to gauge the impact of unofficial dialogues, as they do not produce binding agreements or policy shifts; instead they affect less tangible factors such as attitudes, perceptions and relationships (Behera, 2002:226; Chigas, 2003). This imposes a limit on what sport diplomacy can achieve as well, and it has been argued that sports cannot 'transcend deep-seeded suspicions, structural impediments and profound disagreements between nations' that are of too great a magnitude (DeLay, 1999). Sports are perhaps neither a foolproof cure for long-standing animosities

nor for conflicts of long duration, such as 50 years or more as in the India-Pakistan case, claims Goldberg (2000:69). Track-two and track-three initiatives have indeed proved harder to establish during conflicts, and they can never be fully isolated from political events (Chigas, 2003). Nevertheless, Byrne and Keashley (2000:116) conclude that for intractable conflicts, such as between India and Pakistan, to take steps toward peace there needs to be an appreciation of the fact that complex situations need to be handled with flexibility and sensibility. There basically is 'no problem which can be dealt with in bits. You have to try to put all the elements together' (Montville, 1991:174). In short, successful peace building requires combined efforts at all tracks that can help promote reconciliation in divided societies, such as South Asia (Lederach, 2001:844). The holistic approach that Lederach (2001:842) promotes entails that 'peace is a process by multiple means,' a variety of actors, and some co-ordination of the different approaches.

Consequently, sport exchanges can provide – and have done so in the past – an important diplomatic tool, especially in relation to the concept of conversational space. Sport diplomacy can be a necessary tool, but it is not sufficient by itself. Sports exchanges can help to 'melt the ice between officials on both sides. But sports contacts cannot, in and of themselves, lead to better relations,' argues Chenabi (2004:249). The ultimate decision to improve relations resides with the political establishments of states. Thus, sport diplomacy can have a positive influence on talks at state-to-state track-one level. But at the same time, the political leaders are the ones that have the ultimate responsibility as well as decision-power for improving relations and making sport diplomacy work.

### ***5.5 The World of Sport Diplomacy***

The theory on sport, politics and identity combine to make a claim for sport's role in relations both within and between states. Sport as a tool for diplomacy has been placed in the diplomacy theory framework in that it involves communication at mainly track-two and track-three levels, and athletes as symbolic representatives of their home countries. The conduct of sport diplomacy

is far from a uniform practice, and its particular usefulness lays precisely in the multiplicity of meanings and symbols that makes it one of the most ambiguous means of conducting diplomacy (Chenabi, 2004:239). Analyzing the case of cricket diplomacy between India and Pakistan properly therefore renders it necessary to contextualize cricket diplomacy in relation to other types of sport diplomacy. History has provided different situations where sport diplomacy in some form or another has been used. For this reason, it is interesting to compare the case of cricket diplomacy to other cases of sport diplomacy in order to highlight similarities and differences between them in terms of representation, communication and diplomatic track, and not the least to discover the particularities and circumstances relating to the use of cricket as a vehicle for diplomacy.

Traditionally, sport diplomacy between states has for the most part occurred in three ways (Selliaas, 2006b). First, it has taken place in form of matches or tournaments in which the opposing parties have an equally passionate relation to the sport in question. This kind of competitions can thus be risky, because both parties can put too much prestige into winning. The purpose of sport diplomacy should ideally be that all parties emerge as winners. Second, it can take the form of single matches or tournaments in at least two sports. The sports in this case are carefully chosen for diplomatic value, so that each country will win at least one each. Finally, sport diplomacy can take the form of annual competitions or championships in several disciplines, such as in track and field, where both parties have the opportunity to win some of the events. Furthermore, different levels of administering sport diplomacy can also be identified (Ibid.). In other words, that means differentiating between the political and diplomatic levels at which it is conducted. First, an impartial third party can take the initiative to initiate negotiations and then put pressure on the negotiations to go forward. Second, state governments can take the initiative. Sport could in this case be used a means both for maintaining ties between allies, and for building better relations with perceived enemies. Finally, national non-governmental

organizations (NGOs), such as national athletics federations, can take the initiative to arrange bilateral sport competitions.

### **5.5.1 Cases of Sport Diplomacy**

The categorizations outlined above are ideal types, and often cases of sport diplomacy have cut across the boundaries of what separates one type from another. Nevertheless, the categories provide a valuable framework for outlining the differences and similarities between cricket diplomacy and other examples of sport diplomacy. A selected number of cases will be discussed. These have been chosen because they are some of the most famous examples of the use of sport diplomacy, and because the universe of cases of sport diplomacy is limited to begin with. Furthermore, these cases display the variety of the practice, both in terms of different types of representational and communicational aspects of its conduct, and in terms of diplomatic tracks. The so-called ping-pong diplomacy between the United States and China in 1971, followed a year later by the visit of an American basketball team, is viewed by Goldberg (2000:67) as the most prominent example of the role sport exchanges as track-two and track-three diplomacy can play in breaking down barriers between enemies. It laid the groundwork for President Richard Nixon's visit to China in 1972 – labelled sometimes as 'the diplomatic coup of the century' – and eventually to the normalization of relations between the two countries (Time Magazine, 1971b). However, the process leading up to the Chinese invitation of the American table tennis players started as a conscious attempt on behalf of the American administration in order to reverse diplomatic signals in an effort to show the Chinese leaders that the US wanted to seek normalized relations (Ibid.). Thus, it was in a climate of changed perceptions and gradual thawing of relations that the Chinese government invited the American ping-pong team to visit China.

Time Magazine (1971a) commented at the time that 'probably never before in history has a sport been used so effectively as a tool of international diplomacy.' The sports were carefully chosen for diplomatic value. The US, as opposed to China, was not a highly ranked table tennis nation. In other words, the American team was not expected to win, and its defeat would not result in

any loss of prestige for the US. The Chinese basketball team, on the other hand, did not pose any threat to the American team. Defeat at the hands of the American team in the basketball court consequently implied no loss of dignity for the Chinese either (Houlihan, 2004:217). Ping-pong and basketball diplomacy therefore played an important part in the Sino-American rapprochement. There have hardly been any examples of sport diplomacy surviving tense political relations between states (Selliaas, 2006a). Nevertheless, the dual track and field meet series arranged between the United States and the Soviet Union from 1958 to 1985 provide an exception. The track and field meets started in 1958 notwithstanding the Cold War climate and the strained relations between the superpowers. The competitions survived the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, but experienced a temporary hiatus at the height of the Vietnam War in the late 1960s, when the Soviet Union wanted to state its opposition against the US role in Vietnam, and after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 (Turrini, 2001:434). Organizing the first USA-USSR track meet was a long and painstaking process, involving years of patient negotiations on a track-two diplomacy level between Soviet and American sport leaders (Ibid. 428). Hence, this form of sport diplomacy was born out of negotiations between athletic federations in the two countries. Internationally, both nations were recognized as leading in track and field, but the scoring system of the meets, for the separate events, ensured that each country could attain a winning score combined. As for the commitment of the participants, one American athlete commented that he 'would rather die than lose' (Ibid. 430). Furthermore, these dual track meets were first and foremost athletic competitions, but they functioned as foreign diplomacy tools as well, as they posed a venue for talks between the superpowers (Selliaas, 2006a). The use of sport diplomacy has included a range of both positive and negative sanctions. Among the negative sanctions, sporting boycotts have received the most attention. The American-led and Soviet-led boycotts, respectively, of the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow and of the Olympic Games in Los Angeles four years later, are perhaps the most famous examples (Goldberg, 2000:65). These boycotts were largely the result of Cold War rivalry,

as sports became a new policy tool in the struggle between communism and capitalism. However, another type of sporting boycott was imposed on the apartheid regime in South Africa. In the 1970s and 1980s, South Africa was an international pariah, and international action included a range of trade embargos and other negative sanctions (Booth, 2003:477). One of these was an international sports boycott starting in the early 1960s, aimed at isolating the South African regime. In 1970, the IOC formally expelled the country from the international sporting community. Following IOC's lead, the international sporting federations began suspending or expelling South Africa from their ranks (Ibid. 480). The sporting boycott by the international federations did not end until the early 1990, after apartheid ended. They claimed that 'the boycott had worked – sport had triumphed over racism' (Ibid. 491). Accordingly, this was a form of sport diplomacy administered at the international, third party level, over a wide range of sports, which was aimed at punishing and isolating the South African regime for its apartheid politics. In 1988, the Olympic Games were held in Seoul, South Korea. It has been claimed that if their neighbors, North Korea, participate in sporting events at all it is on their own terms, and they often act as 'spoilsports' (DeLay, 1999). Consequently, when South Korea received the bid for the 1988 Olympics, North Korea in due course demanded a venue change, called for a boycott, and then attempted to convince other nations that Seoul would not be safe. In short, the awarding of the Games to South Korea – still technically at war with North Korea thirty years after the end of the Korean War – at the height of the Cold War created a major challenge to the international sporting community and the IOC. Pound (1994) provides a thorough account of the International Olympic Committee's (IOC) role as mediator in the conflict as the organization entered into negotiations between the Koreas in 1984. In the end, no agreement was reached between North and South (Pound, 1994:258). The decision was taken by the North Koreans not to participate in the Seoul Olympics, but only a few other nations followed their lead. However, the sport diplomacy in the guise of IOC mediation clearly has had an impact for later events, recently witnessed by the North and South Korean teams marching together in the opening

ceremony of the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens (Davis, 2004). This will most likely be repeated in the Beijing Olympics in 2008. The International Olympic Committee and its attempts at mediating between North and South Korea in the years preceding the Seoul Olympics in 1988 thus clearly represents a case of third-party intervention (Pound, 1994).

In the late 1990s – perhaps inspired by how the ping-pong diplomacy in the 1970s provided an opening for a new American-Chinese relationship – an attempt at sport diplomacy between the US and Iran was set in motion (Marks, 1999:547). In 1998, the newly elected Iranian president Mohammad Khatami proposed people-to-people contact between Iranians and Americans, hoping that these contacts would gain a momentum that would conduce to the establishment of normal relations (Chenabi, 2004:238). This positive development led to an agreement between the American and Iranian wrestling federations – wrestling is very popular in both countries – for American wrestlers to participate in the *Takhti Cup* in Iran in 1998. This was the first time since the hostage crisis in 1979-1981 that Americans would openly, if unofficially, represented their country in Iran (Marks, 1999:547). This made for a special atmosphere for the football match between Iran and the US in the 1998 World Cup (Selliaas, 2006b). The Iranians won that match, and was invited to play a revenge fixture in California the following year. The wrestling diplomacy was a success, as the Americans were welcomed as friends and the old footage of the American flag being burned was replaced with ‘new pictures of the flag being carried by strong athletes and cheered by Iranian spectators’ (Marks, 1999:547). Football diplomacy was also a success, and the two teams jointly received the FIFA Fair Play award in 1999 (Chenabi, 2004:246). Sport diplomacy between the United States and Iran centered on wrestling and football, two sports seen as ideal for the purpose (Ibid. 244). In wrestling, both nations are among the world’s best, and it is alongside football, the national sport of Iran. In the US, both wrestling and football attract millions of practitioners, but are not particularly big spectator sports. In football both nations are minor players to be reckoned with. This precludes humiliating defeats ‘that by hurting national pride might do more harm than good.’

Finally, a less successful instance of sport diplomacy was the baseball diplomacy between the United States and Cuba. The United States has longstanding embargos in place against the Castro regime, and no formal diplomatic relations with Havana (DeLay, 1999). In May 1999, however, the Cuban national baseball team visited Baltimore to play a second exhibition game against the Major League Baseball (MLB) team the Baltimore Orioles, the first match being held in Havana earlier in the year (Carter, 1999:579). The games were also about the nationalist claims of the two countries to one sport, as baseball is considered 'America's pastime and Cuba's passion.' It has even been said that had Fidel Castro chosen a different path in his youth, he could have secured a lucrative contract as a professional baseball player in the MLB (DeLay, 1999). The baseball diplomacy resulted from talks between the MLB and the Castro regime. Carter (1999:579) has pointed out, though, that 'no new political discourse emerged between the US and Cuba as a result of this international exchange.' The exhibition games were an example of a diplomatic gesture, but did not lead to any qualitative changes in the US-Cuban relationship (DeLay, 1999). In other words, the games had no real political purpose in the US, but they did nevertheless account for a great deal of political significance in Cuba (Carter, 1999:584). Cricket is a sport that invokes fervor and excitement on both sides of the Indo-Pakistani border. Being described as a common language and a secular religion in South Asia, there is no doubt a shared passion for the sport between the states. No other sport can compete with the popularity of cricket, and it is therefore the most obvious choice for sport diplomacy in the region. When arranging cricket matches and tours, the national cricket boards have the formal responsibility for making arrangements. However, in the case of bilateral cricket between India and Pakistan, the government has the final word. Khan (in Crick, 2006:79) states that the cricket boards of India and Pakistan have had a good relationship whatever the political climate has been, but they still had to seek their respective government's approval for touring each other. He claims that only in the India and Pakistan context do they have to seek the governments' approval as such tours have political ramifications and the tours are seen as

political events. The state-to-state aspect of cricket diplomacy becomes even clearer when taking into account that the decisions not to play bilateral matches reside with the respective governments. In 1999, when Pakistan toured India for a limited number of matches, it was the Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif who made the decision to proceed with the tour (Khan, 2005:5). Moreover, it was Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee who himself took the initiative in 2004 to lift the embargo on bilateral cricket and re-start cricketing relations between India and Pakistan (Interview with Shetty in Crick (2006:84); Bhattacharya, 2005:11). In short, although the national cricket boards have the formal responsibility for arranging cricket tours, cricket diplomacy as track-two and track-three diplomacy between India and Pakistan is still administered at a state-to-state level because it is their respective governments that have the decision power concerning whether to engage in bilateral cricket contests or not.

Table 1. Summarizes the above discussion, and displays the classification of the different types of sport diplomacy mentioned. The cases have been sorted according to the aforesaid categories of how it has been conducted at one hand, and at what level the sport diplomacy has been administered at the other.

Table 1. Different Types of Sport Diplomacy

Shared passion of sport	Two sports chosen for their diplomatic value	Competitions in several disciplines
Third-party intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IOC and the Koreas 1981-2008</li> <li>- The South African sporting boycott 1963-1990</li> </ul>	
State-to-state initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- India-Pakistan: cricket diplomacy 1977-2013</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- United States-China: ping-pong and basketball diplomacy 1971-1972</li> </ul>
NGO/National Federations initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- US-Cuba: baseball diplomacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Iran-United States: wrestling and football diplomacy 1998-</li> <li>- United States-</li> </ul>

	1999	2007	USSR: track and field diplomacy 1958-1985
--	------	------	---

### **5.5.2 Cricket Diplomacy**

Having placed cricket diplomacy in relation to other cases of sport diplomacy, I will now move on to discussing the particularities of the India-Pakistan case. The first part will cover the history of the conflict which dates back to the countries' independence from Great Britain in 1947, as well as outline the history and importance of cricket in India and Pakistan. With this context in hand, I will then turn the discussion towards cricket and politics, and the main question of this thesis: whether cricket diplomacy has been successful or not.

### **5.5.3 Background**

In 1987, Pakistani president Zia-ul Haq astonished the world by travelling to India in the face of impending crisis to watch a cricket match between the two countries. The visit caught the Indian government unawares, but it helped defuse a potentially explosive situation, and the term 'cricket diplomacy' was born. The president's choice of a cricket match as a venue for diplomacy was hardly accidental, as the history of the game in South Asia makes clear. The issue of India-Pakistan relations and the history and importance of cricket in South Asia will be the theme of the following sections.

### **5.5.4 The Most Complex Divorce in History**

India and Pakistan gained independence from Great Britain in 1947, as British India was partitioned into two separate states for the subcontinents Hindus and Muslims respectively. Both countries are part of the same geographical region of South Asia, and they share a social, cultural, and civilization past, but their postcolonial history, mired in interstate conflicts, has deeply divided the region (Behera, 2002:211). The rivalry between the two

remains to this day one of the most enduring and unresolved conflicts in the world (Paul, 2005:3). History of relations between the neighbors is in many ways a history of failure; compounded by the bloodbath accompanying Partition, four wars in sixty years, and the intractable question of Kashmir (Racine, 2004:112). In short, there has been a climate of suspicion and continual accusation throughout the history of Indo-Pakistani relations. The relationship between Pakistan and India can best be described as 'the story of a divorce that went wrong,' which has given rise to the bitterness, resentment and suspicion that has characterized dealings between the states (Ibid. 113). The most contentious point at the time of Partition in 1947, described by Lapierre and Collins (2006:212) as the 'most complex divorce in history,' was the question of Kashmir. Kashmir, in many ways 'the proverbial powder keg' (Schofield, 2003:18), has continued to be the focal point of conflict for the good part of the two countries' histories. The Kashmir conflict is linked to conceptions of identity as the region can be characterized as a symbol of the 'idea of nationhood on which each of the two states has been founded' (Racine, 2002:212). Pakistan is the revisionist state in the region, as it considers Kashmir as the unfinished business of Partition. To India, on the other hand, Partition was completed in 1947, they are therefore happy maintaining the status quo (Ganguly & Hagerty, 2005:35; Paul, 2005:8-9; Schofield, 2003:225). The magnitude of the conflict is highlighted by Cohen (2001:221) who argues that 'the Kashmir problem is so complicated that one is hard pressed to say how the parties involved might ever begin to resolve it.' Of the four wars India and Pakistan have fought, only the 1971 war was not linked to the Kashmir issue. Furthermore, the stakes in this conflict are now perhaps higher than any other political dispute in the world, as both nations have become nuclear powers (Ganguly & Hagerty, 2005:10).

The conflict born out of Partition has been extremely persistent, and fits the description of what Paul (2005:3) has termed an 'enduring conflict,' defined as conflicts between states that 'last more than two decades with several militarized inter-state disputes punctuating the relationship in between.' Like other such conflicts, it seems to draw its energy from 'an inexhaustible supply of

distrust' (Cohen, 2001:199). This makes it hard for any side to offer concessions or compromise on even minor issues because such an act might give the other side an impression of one's own weakness and risk inviting further demands. Furthermore, easing of tensions can be a tricky challenge when any triumph over the other 'in any sphere of life is taken as a cause of celebration; any setback is seen as a national humiliation' (Chatterjee, 2004:625). Thus, mutual distrust and suspicion fosters only renewed animosity. Breaking this pattern of mutual distrust and enmity must therefore be a key component of any attempt at easing tensions in the Indo-Pakistani relationship. The question is whether cricket can help to solve this conflict.

### **5.5.5 Origins of Cricket in India and Pakistan**

The first to play cricket on the subcontinent were British sailors and soldiers as early as 1721, according to Mukharji (2004:351). They played the game among themselves, and against other British teams, in their bungalows, colonial towns and cantonments (Guha, 1998:158). Cricket started in England, and that was to determine its outreach, as the popularity of cricket is 'limited almost exclusively to the countries that at one time formed the British Empire' (Varney, 1999:558). Today, this includes Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka in South Asia, all highly ranked and highly passionate cricketing nations. Cricket watching, as well as playing, soon proved to be an appealing collective and participatory exercise, 'indulging the Indian taste for chatter and disputation, gossip and debate,' according to Guha (2002:339). Cricket may just be among the most complex and at the same time subtle of all sports, leaving a lot for discussion (Varney, 1999:558). The leisurely pace of cricket, which originally had no time constraints, has also added to the appeal of cricket to Indians and Pakistanis alike. It has been argued that it is exactly these 'underlying rhythms and mythic structures of the game that makes it profoundly Indian and that it is therefore appropriate that the game should be most enthusiastically appropriated by those from South Asian cultures' (Mills, 2005:4). The first Indians to adopt the game were the Parsis of Bombay (present-day Mumbai), an educated, prosperous, Westernized, and

relatively small community, who lived in India after exile from Persia (Guha, 1998:158). The first Indian cricket club – the Oriental Cricket Club, which successor is still going strong today – was founded by Parsi men in 1848 (Guha, 2002:14). The other communities of Bombay soon followed the Parsis in their taste for cricket. The Hindus started playing cricket in ‘a spirit of competitive communalism’ because of their long-standing social and business rivalry with the Parsis in the city (Guha, 1998: 159). The Muslims followed not long after, and even Catholic and Jewish groups formed teams along the same communal lines. This pattern was followed all across the subcontinent when teams were formed. Guha (1998), a prominent historian of cricket in South Asia, provides an account of how these rivalries were played out. At first, the British thought little of their subjects’ attempts to take to their national game. After a while, however, the Indians slowly began acquiring aptitude, and in 1877 the Parsis were invited to play a match against the Bombay Gymkhana, the association that represented the Europeans of Bombay. The Hindus started playing the Europeans from 1886, and in 1907 the so-called Triangular Tournament brought the three together in an annual competition. The Muslims, too, joined in to make it a four-way competition. Finally, the competition became the Pentangular in 1937 by adding the other communities under a catch-all category simply called ‘The Rest.’ The tournament was held in its various forms every year until 1946, and was to ‘play a formative role in the development of cricket’ in South Asia, argues Guha (1998:160). The Bombay tournament spawned similar tournaments all over British India, thus competitive cricket was organized along communal lines. Sown into this segmented system, no doubt, were the seeds of social conflict (Ibid.165). What had during British rule been a city-specific rivalry turned into a countrywide rivalry between Hindus and Muslims, would after Partition be replaced by a cross-border rivalry of dimensions. The entire history of cricket in India and Pakistan has as a result been fraught by communal rivalries. From its earliest introduction by British sailors and soldiers to the subcontinent, cricket teams were formed along communal lines with Hindus and Muslims having their own teams. Guha (2002:428) argues that the history of cricket relations between

India and Pakistan thus almost exactly mirrors the history of cricket relations between Hindus and Muslims in British India. The post-independence years have been marred by a search for identity and conflict off the field, and this has of course had repercussions for the cricket rivalry with the attachment of symbolic significance to the winning or losing of cricket matches against the archenemy, either it being India or Pakistan.

### **5.5.6 Cricket, Identity and Unity**

As much as relations on the cricket field has been considered almost a proxy for the conflict between India and Pakistan, mimicking the tensions off it, the game is also the common love for the south Asian countries specially the nations of these two countries. Peoples of both countries love very much to play cricket. Cricket is not a game of just these two countries but it is also a game of all over the South Asian countries. Cricket permeates practically every layer of South Asian society, and has occupied 'a central place in a range of emerging positions and identities in the years after Independence in 1947' (Sengupta, 2004:600). All over South Asia – not the least in India and Pakistan – cricket has to some 'assumed an all-consuming hold on people from every walk of life' (Khan, 2005:Vii). In order to appreciate the standing and meaning of cricket for Indians and Pakistanis, one has to imagine it being something like 'football and pop music rolled together,' where the top player – especially in India – are megastars (Windor, 2004). According to observers of sports in South Asia, cricket seems to have assumed this role because it is 'the game in which sportspersons from this part of the world have given innumerable impressive performances at the international level with some degree of consistency' (Chatterjee, 2004:613). Cricket has been characterized as the subcontinent's secular religion, uniting Indians and Pakistanis in the intensity of their passion for it (Pennington, 2004; Thakur, 2004). After the partition in 1947, when british left this area the South Asian passion for cricket consequently lived on, maybe to even a greater extent than during the Raj (Stoddart, 2005). In the years following Partition, cricket would be

seen to contribute to shape post-colonial identities and provide a sense of national unity in newly independent India and Pakistan (Sengupta, 2004:601). Cricketing prowess soon came to be identified with patriotic virtues in the newborn countries. Thus, cricket has, in terms of Kaufmann's (2001:16) conception of a symbol as an 'emotionally charged reference to a myth' held in common by a large group<sup>5</sup> There is one more realm of international significance in which India, as well as Pakistan, has entered as an actor to be reckoned with, though: the realm of nuclear weapons. of people, come to mean something more than just an athletic activity for Indians and Pakistanis. In other words, it has been firmly established in the collective psyche of Pakistanis and Indians alike as a symbol of unity, identity and national pride. Identity did not play such an important part in India's attitude towards Pakistan in the post-independence period, as did identity in Pakistan (Nasr, 2005:192). This is not to say, however, that Indian identity is uniform. India, a nation as multi-faceted as perhaps no other faces its problems and internal divisions. However, cricket is for many like a religion uniting a nation of so many religions. Cricket has additional importance for Indians since it is often considered 'the only realm where Indians can flex their muscles on the world stage; it is the nation's only instrument with which to have a crack at world domination.<sup>5</sup> It is, to put it simply, much more than a 'game' for Indians' (Majumdar, 2004:128). Pakistan, like other postcolonial societies, has struggled to define its national identity. The successful struggle for a homeland for the subcontinent's Muslims meant that people from 'disparate ethnic backgrounds, following different cultures, and conversant in different languages, were thrown together' (Nasr, 2005:182). Thus, Pakistan after Partition was by no means a united entity, composed as it was of different ethnic groups that displayed various degrees of support for the new country (Sathasivam & Shafqat, 2003:119-121). Cricket serves as an important symbolic determinant of national identity in South Asia. Thus, especially in a country as ethnically divided as Pakistan, cricket serves as one of the major components that bind society together (Shahzad, 2002). Khan (2005:Viii) claims that cricket is the 'strongest unifying force amongst its people, young and old, rich and poor, man or woman,

Shia or Sunni, Pathan or Sindhi' as it brings 'a unity in peacetime only achieved in times of war.' Bhattacharya (2005:51) argues in the same vein, quoting a former high-ranking PCB official as saying that 'cricket is *the* great leveler in Pakistani society,' and that there are only two things that 'run right through this country, through all regions, through all sections, through everything – one is Urdu, which is the national language of the Pakistan and the other is cricket.' Thus, the fate of the national cricket team can be considered the main factor that unites Pakistan (Khan, 2005:179).

Sport always provides a sense of identity, belonging and unity for many, and this is of particular importance to governments with diverse populations (Coakley, 2004:449-450). Cricket is the only sport in South Asia that has this capacity to bring peoples for unity and developed their social and economic situations and makes them distinguish with each other including make them as Separate entities. Eriksen (1991:191) remarks that virtually every modern nation-state is ethnically divided to some extent, and both India and Pakistan are countries divided along lines of ethnicity, language and religion. The choice of a particular sport, as with the institutionalization of football as a Fascist game in Italy, has been instrumental for building a sense of national unity and identity. In India and Pakistan, cricket has by presenting something of a common symbol for the nation, arguably been 'one of the few things that can unite at all' (Crick, 2006: 27). Sport can occupy an important role in relations between people and nations. Close ties between sport and conceptions of national identity have been identified, as something that is complex and multifaceted. Furthermore, sport possesses the ability to provide people with notions about who they are, and can promote a sense of national identity and unity (Smith & Porter, 2004:1). Houlihan (2000:87) has argued that the national team carries enormous symbolic value as a metaphor for the nation. Therefore, the fate of the national team becomes linked to the fate of the nation. Nowhere is this more evident than in cricket-mad South Asia, as the national teams in cricket in both India and Pakistan are seen as carrying a vital symbolic role, as well as playing the role of national unifier to perfection, according to Dasgupta (2004:576).

### **5.5.7 Is Cricket an Appropriate Diplomatic Tool?**

The traumas of Partition, the outbreak of war over Kashmir under a year after independence, as well as the very foundation for the state of Pakistan as a Muslim homeland in South Asia, meant that the relations between the two neighbors were strained from the outset, a relationship characterized by layered complexity. Cricket, as a unifying force in two countries beset by diversity, has taken on such importance for Indians and Pakistanis, and in a way so that the underlying rivalry off the field has virtually been projected onto the field. Thus, cricket matches has to some extent come to mimic the conflict that is taking place in the sphere of politics and diplomacy. The cricketing rivalry, which was once played out between Hindu and Muslim teams within British India, has simply been transferred to an inter-state competition between secular – albeit overwhelmingly in the Hindu mould – India and Muslim Pakistan. Thus, the antagonism has in a certain way been centralized and strengthened, adding to and feeding off the complexities of the strained relationship between India and Pakistan, the ‘terrible twins of world politics’ (Khawaja, 2004).

Cricket, to use Allison’s (2004:348) words, is considered to ‘exemplify the spirit’ of the nation. It follows that a defeat for the national team can be considered to reflect the state of the nation. Defeat for India or Pakistan at the hands of their rivals has been felt as a collective sense of national humiliation, followed by public outrage. In the case of Indo-Pakistani cricket, the nationalist sentiments attached to the game have mostly made it resemble a battlefield since as early as the 1960s (Lal, 2003:207). Using a sport that both nations are passionate about can therefore be risky business for the involved parties as too much prestige can be put into winning (Selliaas, 2006b). Nevertheless, the case has been made for cricket to contribute to an improved relationship between the two countries on account of it being their common love, thereby providing a possible ‘bridge of peace.’ Coakley (2004:454) points out that a longstanding

ideal underlying international sport has been achieving peace and friendship among nations. Sport has therefore been added as a tool for diplomacy, for possessing the capacity to help ease tensions and contribute to rapprochement between enemies. However, events such as the Football War in 1969 (Kapuscinski, 1992), and the fervor and nationalist passion often considered part and parcel of competitive sports, somewhat negates this positive outlook. In some cases, sport functions as a vehicle for rivalry. This may not lead to war, but it stirs up a lot of emotion and enmity towards the 'enemy.' Chenabi (2004:239) similarly argues that 'the idea of improving people-to-people relations through athletic competition seems somewhat counter-intuitive, as international sports events more than not crystallize nationalistic passions.' On the other hand, Chenabi notes, when sporting contests take place 'that are accompanied by mutual signalling of goodwill and friendly cheering spectators, a shift in attitudes can be inferred from that.' Considering the history of cricket in South Asia, one would hardly consider it the most appropriate of means with which to promote peace and rapprochement. Varney (1999:560) has observed that 'the clashes between India and Pakistan, whose politics pitches them close to war across their shared border, often take on an extra and quite heated dimension in the spectator stands if not on the cricket ground itself.' Thus, in the past cricket has sometimes come close to igniting a state of hostility between the parties. On the other hand, cricket is close to being the only real unifying force, both within and between India and Pakistan. As mentioned earlier, cricket is the common love of the subcontinent, and hence a powerful diplomatic tool. In addition, making peace is a process by multiple means, according to Lederach (2001:841). This implies that conflict resolution and diplomatic efforts should not be confined to the official level, known as track-one. Peace building must be undertaken at different levels of society, Lederach argues. In other words, the activity of peace building 'has multiple activities, at multiple levels, carried on by different sets of people at the same time' (Ibid. 841). In the case of India and Pakistan, cricket has constituted such an avenue for conflict resolution. The cricket tours of recent years have provided venues for 'conversational space,' and have helped the

easing of tensions and reduction of mutual mistrust between Pakistanis and Indians. As such, cricket diplomacy has followed the second and third tracks in the multi-track diplomacy paradigm, complementing and backing up the developments at the official, track-one level. The efforts at the second and third tracks of diplomacy are 'supposed to feed into official diplomacy by serving as a "testing ground" for new policy initiatives and in creating a public peace constituency,' and the varied range of such initiatives over the years trying to build bridges between India and Pakistan is extensive (Behera, 2003). Thus, there is no doubt that cricket has been an appropriate diplomatic tool for easing tensions between India and Pakistan.

#### ***5.5.8 Cricketing Ties between India and Pakistan***

Relations between India and Pakistan have been troubled from the start as their history demonstrates. Their cricketing relationship has throughout this period reflected their political relationship, and bilateral cricket has as previously mentioned been treated as a political matter. Cricket has contributed to communal and regional divisions in South Asia, and high levels of passion are often incited when matches are played. At the same time, it is the common love of the entire region, and has contributed to a feeling of unity for diversified populations. Therefore, the idea that cricket can function as a 'bridge of peace' (Khan, 2005:180) between Indians and Pakistanis will be the starting point of this discussion, which will deal with the Indo-Pakistani cricketing and political relationship from the advent of cricket diplomacy in 1987.

#### **5.5.9 Politics and Cricket from 1977 to 2013**

Since President Zia's cricket diplomacy raised the hope of a more forthcoming Pakistani policy in 1987 (Cohen, 2001:208), India and Pakistan have engaged in bilateral cricket contests on six more occasions (Cricinfo, 2007). India toured Pakistan in November-December 1989 for a full Test series, but after the Kashmiri uprising in 1989 and ensuing crisis in 1990 led to soured relations between the two countries (Ganguly & Hagerty, 2005:78), bilateral cricket relations suffered. Relations between India and Pakistan then deteriorated further

after the demolition of the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya, India, by Hindu extremists in 1992 (Guha, 2002:400). The destruction sparked communal violence in large parts of India, and put Hindu-Muslim relations to the test. Thus, the political climate that prevailed between India and Pakistan after 1989 put an effective stop to bilateral cricket.

This is the short-version of the game, lasting only one day. A Test match can last for as much as five days. Racine (2004:131) argues that president Zia's 1987 version of cricket diplomacy was purely cosmetic, and that nothing had changed ten years later. India had not toured Pakistan due to wretched political conditions since 1989, but in September-October 1997, they played a limited number of One Day International matches in Pakistan. This was the first bilateral cricket contest on Indian or Pakistani soil in eight years, but the following year both states exploded nuclear devices, contributing to heightened tensions and a growing fear of what escalation of the conflict could lead to. In other words, Indo-Pakistani tensions were put to the test once more, and bilateral cricket suffered as a consequence. After the nuclear tests in 1998, there was a realisation at the government level that tensions needed to be eased (Schofield, 2003:207). When the prime ministers of India and Pakistan met at the SAARC meeting in Sri Lanka in July, they both agreed to resume formal talks. The culmination of these talks was Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee's historic and symbolically significant visit on the inaugural run of the Delhi-Lahore bus service on 20 February 1999 (Ganguly & Hagerty, 2005:151; Talbott, 2006:153). The Lahore Summit in 1999 between Prime Minister Vajpayee and his Pakistani counterpart, Nawaz Sharif, represented a considerable thaw in Indo-Pakistani relations (Nasr, 2005:195). This thaw in the relations was rooted in mutual interests of the governments and was directed at measured steps towards de-escalation of tensions. In the region, Vajpayee's trip resulting in the Lahore Declaration was even hailed as comparable to Richard Nixon's trip to China in 1971, which followed the successful ping-pong diplomacy.

With relations warming once more, the two countries' Prime Ministers played an important part in the decision to resume cricketing ties in 1999. This

was the first Pakistani tour of India since 1987, and it came only the year after both countries conducted tit-for-tat nuclear tests that had created yet another crisis in Indo-Pakistani relations (Ganguly & Hagerty, 2005:116). There was some controversy in both countries over whether the tour should be undertaken or not. In India, the tour faced strong opposition from the Hindu extremists of the right wing party Shiv Sena, who threatened the Pakistani team if they travelled to India. They even went to the step of digging up the cricket pitch in Delhi (Bhattacharya, 2005:11; Khan, 2005:3). In Pakistan, on the other hand, the debate saw opinion divided between the pro-tour lobby who felt that a successful tour could help reduce cross-border tensions, and those who feared that a tour of India would 'unnecessarily risk a deterioration of relations' (Khan, 2005:4). The cricket players as symbolic representatives in other words carried the worries and expectations of their home countries on their shoulders. The tour went ahead in January-February 1999, and Shaharyar M. Khan (2005:vii-viii), manager of the Pakistan cricket team during the tour and later chairman of the Pakistan Cricket Board, describes how cricket diplomacy provided communicational opportunities and conversational space wherever they travelled. In every Indian city the team visited, they were greeted with genuine goodwill, and everywhere the message was the same: to let bygones be bygones, that there was so much to gain, so much in common. After the first test match of the tour in Chennai, the victorious Pakistanis even received a standing ovation from the 40,000 Indian spectators in the stands. Such 'positive waves of goodwill' that the crowd emitted surpassed in Khan's view anything that had happened at the popular level in the history of India-Pakistan relations. The sum of these unexpectedly warm welcomes by the people of India to the 'enemy' team was the sentiments that, Khan contends, encouraged Prime Minister Vajpayee's famous bus-journey to Pakistan and the Lahore Summit. Khan (2005:72) claims that the public relations success and good spirit surrounding the cricket tour helped pave the way for this 'diplomatic milestone.' Cricket players as symbolic representatives therefore had an important part to play when it came to bolstering the fresh peace process by

providing a channel of communication between the populations of the nuclear neighbors.

All good things can't last, however, and despite the apparent success of cricket diplomacy in 1999, the Lahore Summit did not live up to its goals and failed to contribute to a significant amelioration of Indo-Pakistani tensions (Ganguly & Hagerty, 2005:151). Much of the goodwill created by the 1999 tour was washed away by the Kargil war and the Indian Airlines hijacking by Pakistan-based 'Islamic radicals' in 1999 (Cohen, 2001:207; Talbott, 2006:185). After these incidents, the Indian government decided a renewed ban on bilateral cricket until Pakistan changed its stance and stopped supporting the insurgency in Kashmir (Bhattacharya, 2005: 10; Chatterjee, 2004:613; Sengupta, 2004:605). It has even been argued that 'Kargil destroyed any sub continental solidarity that had existed previously' (Sengupta, 2004:606). General Musharraf's assumption of power in Pakistan in 1999, as well as the attack on the Indian parliament, the Lok Sabha, in December 2001 contributed to renewed tensions that damaged relations even further (Ganguly & Hagerty, 2005:167). In consequence, cricket diplomacy succumbed once more due to deteriorating political conditions.

War seemed imminent throughout 2002, and as a result India refused to play Pakistan at cricket or any other sport (Khan, 2005:103). The diplomatic process between the two countries was re-established once again in 2003 with the resumption of the bus service between Delhi and Lahore in May, and the agreement of a ceasefire in Kashmir in November (BBC News, 2005b). The peace process had in this way received a new lease on life, and cricket was considered by the two governments as a vehicle for developing mutual trust between their populations. In the first week of January 2004, Vajpayee and president Musharraf met in Islamabad on the margins of a SAARC summit. Vajpayee agreed to talks on all issues, including Kashmir, and a roadmap to peace was agreed upon in principle (Talbott, 2006:219). In addition, it was agreed to re-establish bilateral cricketing ties. This meant that India would undertake the first full cricket tour of Pakistan since 1989, despite some of the same debate as in 1999 regarding whether the tour should be undertaken or not

(Bhattacharya, 2005:193). In the end, Prime Minister Vajpayee himself took the decision that India should tour (Ibid. 9). The Indian tour of Pakistan in any case represented the thawing of a 14-year freeze in bilateral full test series (Windor, 2004). Ramiz Raja, chief executive officer of the Pakistan Cricket Board commented on the breakthrough, saying that 'until people from both sides meet and develop trust, these things cannot be resolved and cricket can be a major vehicle for this' (CNN, 2003). The thawing of relations between India and Pakistan therefore provided the perfect timing for cricket diplomacy. The Indian cricket team's tour of Pakistan in March-April was labeled 'the Friendship Series,' and the tour lived up to its name. While previous series had been marred by occasional riots, mob violence and murders, this time around things were different. There was something new happening, one reporter observed: 'Pakistani fans draped in the Indian flag, Indian fans celebrating among them, in the heartland of Pakistani extremism' (Astill, 2004). Even Imran Khan, one of Pakistan's greatest cricketers of all time and a member of parliament, observing this feeling of friendship, said that 'I've never seen an Indian-Pakistan game with an atmosphere like this ... it is if we're saying, "War is no longer an option – we need something new"' (Ibid.). Others joined in, saying that sporting exchanges such as this were 'good therapy' for the relations between India and Pakistan. But, at the same time, such exchanges can also inflame passions and carry the risk of cutting both ways (Pennington, 2004). This did not happen, though, as the friendly atmosphere prevailed.

The Friendship Series worked wonders for building confidence between Indians and Pakistan. Even though it was the first time India had won at cricket in Pakistan, there was no violence or trouble. On the contrary, the Indian team got standing ovations at more than one occasion during the tour (Bhattacharya, 2005). Vajpayee's farewell message to the Indian cricket players had been: 'Win not only matches, but hearts too' (Ibid. 30). Not only did the Indian cricketers get a good reception in Pakistan, but those tens of thousands of Indian fans and journalists who also crossed the border, went back to India remembering a hospitality and welcome they had not imagined possible from their 'enemies.'

Thus, they had gone back to India 'acting as Pakistan's ambassadors' (Khan, 2005:187).

The Indian cricket team's 2004 tour of Pakistan can be considered both a track-two and track-three initiative. It provided the athletes with an opportunity to play each other in an atmosphere of friendship and unity. These symbolic representatives of their states engaged in friendly competition on the field, which mirrored the developments in the political arena. This meant that the cricket tour had positive effects for the peace process in the sense that it provided unprecedented visibility and publicity. Additionally, thousands of Indian supporters visited Pakistan during the series, and encountered for the most part the same atmosphere and friendship, as they rediscovered that Indians and Pakistanis share the same culture and history. The series provided the single biggest window there had been in almost fifty years for a people to talk to another, and it took place in the name of a cricket contest (Bhattacharya, 2005:309). This is one of the benefits of sport exchanges highlighted by the UN report *Sport for Development and Peace*, and an important aspect of the term conversational space. The channels of communication provided by cricket diplomacy therefore played an important part in the further strengthening of the peace process and its popularity in the minds of ordinary Indians and Pakistanis. Sporting contest therefore also constitute a sort of barometer of the public or collective psyche of a population, and provides crucial input for state leaders on how to proceed with the process. Finally, cricket matches also present state leaders with an opportunity to meet under the auspices watching the game, in order to have talks over the opening of negotiations or to continue with other measures of rapprochement. With the success of the 2004 Friendship Series fresh in mind, it was decided to carry on the momentum with another cricket series. Pakistan subsequently undertook a full tour of India in February-April 2005. This time around, the series played an even more significant diplomatic role as it gave the leaders of both countries a 'new momentum' for the opportunity to meet (Cherian, 2005). Pakistani president Pervez Musharraf expressed his wish to travel to India, much like president Zia-ul Haq had done in

1987, virtually inviting himself ostensibly to watch cricket but mainly to discuss political issues. By making his arrival known through a media interview, the Indian government was left with little choice but to extend a formal invitation to the Pakistani president. Musharraf's attempt at cricket diplomacy came at a time of an ongoing peace process, but it still caught New Delhi with nearly as much surprise as Zia had in 1987. As the talks were to begin, Musharraf let it be known that 'the core issue' of Kashmir was more important than cricket, and that it would be the most important topic for the talks with the Indian leadership (Reddy, 2005). The Pakistani Information Minister remarked on this saying that: 'The president will watch cricket for some time but he will play more on the political pitch' (Daily Times, 2005). The Delhi match provided Musharraf with an opportunity to speed up the official dialogue process, which the Pakistanis felt India was stalling (Croft, 2005:1055-1056). Musharraf and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh watched the match in Delhi side by side, and pictures of the two leaders were broadcast throughout the world (Crick, 2006:46). Furthermore, in a joint press conference after their talks, they announced that now 'the peace process was irreversible' (Croft, 2005:1041). Cricket thus provided the conversational space for Indian and Pakistani leaders to meet and discuss on political conflict areas. This added to the success of unofficial cricket diplomacy and people-to-people contact that had been the hallmark of the two foregoing series, showing how these earlier efforts contributed to backing up talks at the official level. Unofficial in nature as cricket diplomacy is, it has an added official level as well. Moreover, cricket diplomacy had now really found its pace, and in April the same year the first passengers from either side of the border crossed divided Kashmir as the landmark bus service across the ceasefire line dividing Indian- and Pakistani-controlled Kashmir got underway (BBC News, 2005b). The normalisation of political and cricketing links between India and Pakistan led to the third successive instalment of bilateral cricket in January-February 2006 (Marqusee, 2006), with India this time touring Pakistan. This can be seen as good news for anyone concerned about the future of peace in South Asia. In short, the recent cricket tours exemplify the claim that 'sports bring people and

nations together' as they create a shared language, shared passions and highlight our ways of interacting with one another (Sengupta, 2004:587). 2007 marks the twentieth anniversary of the birth of the term cricket diplomacy. The peace process re-ignited in 2003 has survived so far, and leaders in both countries have showed their commitment to the process. India and Pakistan both participated in the World Cup of cricket in February-April 2007, which meant that the annual fixture was not held, but cricket has nonetheless been an important part of the current Indo-Pakistani peace process. On the one hand, cricketers as symbolic representatives of their respective states provide the peace efforts with high visibility by engaging in friendly competition on the field. Bilateral cricket matches would not have come about without official sanction, however, but once employed it plays a significant part in strengthening the process. Cricket diplomacy has also provided channels of communication, which provided at the right time, can help shape a better understanding between Indians and Pakistanis.

#### **5.9.9.1. *Batting for Peace***

Khan contends that cricket has acted as a 'bridge of peace,' and the nature of the current Indo-Pakistani relationship lends him support of his claim. In order to assess the success or failure of cricket diplomacy as a specific case of sport diplomacy, it is necessary to return to the two research questions posed in the introduction. The first question relates to whether it is the timing of cricket diplomacy that is the crucial factor behind its success, or lack thereof. It is necessary, in other words, to consider the prevailing political climate when cricket diplomacy is initiated. Second, the durability of cricket diplomacy also needs to be taken into account. This means more precisely if it once underway can survive periods of deteriorating relations, and if so, maintain a vital line of communication between India and Pakistan. These questions will be the focus of the following chapters.

#### **5.9.9.2 Timing of Cricket Diplomacy**

Cricket has functioned as a confidence-building measure between India and Pakistan, and its success in recent years is evident. However, a factor relating to its success concerns the timing of cricket diplomacy. In what sort of climate does it actually occur? Successful conflict management in enduring rivalries has proved to be a rare occurrence (Geller, 2005:81). One thing is for certain, Paul (2005:20) contends, and that is for an enduring rivalry such as the Indo-Pakistani variant to end, then 'both favorable.

### 5.9.9.3 Cricket Diplomacy between India and Pakistan.

Adolf Ogi, Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on Sport for Development and Peace, has said he believes that 'both national cricket teams are pioneers in the quest for peace and stability in South Asia and can serve as role models for other countries and regions around the world' (United Nations, 2005). Ogi thus acknowledges that cricket diplomacy has been successful, as have several others. Timing and durability has been important factors in this equation, as has been discussed. It is therefore important to consider whether cricket has been the driving force behind reconciliation initiatives, or a confidence-building measure used in a climate of thawing relations, and what this has meant for the survival of cricket diplomacy and the peace process. Table presents an overview of the previous discussion, in which different events are sorted according to conditions at the time of the start of cricket diplomacy, and if it survived deteriorating relations.

Table 2. Success of Cricket Diplomacy by Year of Initiation

Cricket diplomacy continued after relations worsened	Cricket diplomacy stopped after relations worsened	
General thawing of tensions when cricket diplomacy started	2004, 2005, 2006	1989, 1999
Strained relations when cricket	1987	1997

diplomacy started		
-------------------	--	--

#### **5.9.9.4 The Partition History**

The idea of a separate Muslim state emerged in the 1930s. On March 23, 1940, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, leader of the Muslim League, formally endorsed the "Lahore Resolution," calling for the creation of an independent state in regions where Muslims constituted a majority. At the end of World War II, the United Kingdom moved with increasing urgency to grant India independence. The Congress Party and the Muslim League, however, could not agree on the terms for a Constitution or establishing an interim government. In June 1947, the British Government declared that it would bestow full dominion status upon two successor states--India and Pakistan, formed from areas in the subcontinent in which Muslims were the majority population. Under this arrangement, the various princely states could freely join either India or Pakistan. Accordingly, on August 14, 1947 Pakistan, comprising West Pakistan with the provinces of Punjab, Sindh, Balochistan, and the Northwest Frontier Province (NWFP), and East Pakistan with the province of Bengal, became independent. East Pakistan later became the independent nation of Bangladesh. The Maharaja of Kashmir was reluctant to make a decision on accession to either Pakistan or India. However, armed incursions into the state by tribesman from the NWFP led him to seek military assistance from India. The Maharaja signed accession papers in October 1947 and allowed Indian troops into much of the state. The Government of Pakistan, however, refused to recognize the accession and campaigned to reverse the decision. The status of Kashmir has remained in dispute.

#### **5.9.9.5 Reasons for partition**

India and Pakistan won independence in August 1947, following a nationalist struggle lasting nearly three decades. It set a vital precedent for the negotiated winding up of European empires elsewhere. Unfortunately, it was accompanied by the largest mass migration in human history of some 10 million. As many as one million civilians died in the accompanying riots and local-level fighting, particularly in the western region of Punjab which was cut in two by the border. The agreement to divide colonial India into two separate states - one with a Muslim majority (Pakistan) and the other with a Hindu majority (India) is commonly seen as the outcome of conflict between the nations' elites. This explanation, however, renders the mass violence that accompanied partition difficult to explain. One explanation for the chaos in which the two nations came into being, is Britain's hurried withdrawal with the realization it could ill afford its over-extended empire. If Pakistan were indeed created as a homeland for Muslims, it is hard to understand why far more were left behind in India than were incorporated into the new state of Pakistan - a state created in two halves, one in the east (formerly East Bengal, now Bangladesh) and the other 1,700 kilometres away on the western side of the subcontinent. It is possible that Mohammed Ali Jinnah, leader of the Muslim League, simply wished to use the demand for a separate state as a bargaining chip to win greater power for Muslims within a loosely federated India. Certainly, the idea of 'Pakistan' was not thought of until the late 1930s. One explanation for the chaotic manner in which the two independent nations came into being is the hurried nature of the British withdrawal. This was announced soon after the victory of the Labor Party in the British general election of July 1945, amid the realization that the British state, devastated by war, could not afford to hold on to its over-extended empire.

#### **5.9.9.6 Transfer of power**

A group migrates to its new homeland after the partition of India in 1947 © An act of parliament proposed a date for the transfer of power into Indian hands in June 1948, summarily advanced to August 1947 at the whim of the last viceroy,

Lord Louis Mountbatten. This left a great many issues and interests unresolved at the end of colonial rule. In charge of negotiations, the viceroy exacerbated difficulties by focusing largely on Jinnah's Muslim League and the Indian National Congress (led by Jawaharlal Nehru). The two parties' representative status was established by Constituent Assembly elections in July 1946, but fell well short of a universal franchise. Tellingly, although Pakistan celebrated its independence on 14 August and India on 15 August 1947, the border between the two new states was not announced until 17 August. It was hurriedly drawn up by a British lawyer, Cyril Radcliffe, who had little knowledge of Indian conditions and with the use of out-of-date maps and census materials. Communities, families and farms were cut in two, but by delaying the announcement the British managed to avoid responsibility for the worst fighting and the mass migration that had followed.

#### **5.9.9.7 Tensions in India**

Many have wondered why the British and Indian leaders did not delay until a better deal over borders could have been agreed. One explanation is that in the months and years immediately following World War Two, leaders on all sides were losing control and were keen to strike a deal before the country descended into chaos. Immediately before World War Two, India was ravaged by the impact of the Great Depression, bringing mass unemployment. This created tremendous tensions exacerbated during the war by inflation and food grain shortages. Rationing was introduced in Indian cities and in Bengal a major famine developed in 1942. The resulting discontent was expressed in widespread violence accompanying the Congress party's 'Quit India' campaign of 1942 - a violence only contained by the deployment of 55 army battalions. The last months of British rule were marked by a naval mutiny, wage strikes and successful demonstrations in every major city. With the cessation of hostilities, the battalions at the disposal of the government in India were rapidly diminished. At the same time, the infrastructure of the Congress Party, whose entire leadership was imprisoned due to their opposition to the war, had been

dismantled. The Muslim League, which co-operated with the British, had rapidly increased its membership, yet still had very limited grassroots level organization. This was dramatically revealed on the 16 August 1946, when Jinnah called for a 'Direct Action Day' by followers of the League in support of the demand for Pakistan. The day had dissolved into random violence and civil disruption across north India, with thousands of lives lost. This was interpreted by the British as evidence of the irreconcilable differences between Hindus and Muslims. In reality, the riots were evidence as much of a simple lack of military and political control as they were of social discord. Further evidence of the collapse of government authority was to be seen in the Princely State of Hyderabad, where a major uprising occurred in the Telengana region, and with the Tebhaga ('two-thirds') agitation among share-cropping cultivators in north Bengal. A leading role was played in both by the Communist Party of India. Elsewhere, the last months of British rule were marked by a naval mutiny, wage strikes and successful demonstrations in every major city. In all of these conflicts the British colonial government remained aloof, as it concentrated on the business of negotiating a speedy transfer of power.

#### **5.9.9.8 Hopes for Pakistan**

Strong support for the idea of an independent Pakistan came from large Muslim landowning families in the Punjab and Sindh, who saw it as an opportunity to prosper within a captive market free from competition. Support also came from the poor peasantry of East Bengal, who saw it as an opportunity to escape from the clutches of moneylenders - often Hindu. Both were to be disappointed. Independent Pakistan inherited India's longest and strategically most problematic borders. The heartland of support for the Muslim League lay in Uttar Pradesh, which was not included within Pakistan.

At the same time, 90% of the subcontinent's industry, and taxable income base remained in India, including the largest cities of Delhi, Bombay and

Calcutta. The economy of Pakistan was chiefly agricultural, and controlled by feudal elites.

Furthermore, at the division of India, Pakistan won a poor share of the colonial government's financial reserves - with 23% of the undivided land mass, it inherited only 17.5% of the former government's financial assets. Once the army had been paid, nothing was left over for the purposes of economic development. The great advantage enjoyed by the Indian National Congress was that it had worked hard for 40 years to reconcile differences and achieve some cohesion among its leaders. The heartland of support for the Muslim League, however, lay in central north India (Uttar Pradesh) which was not included within Pakistan.

Muslims from this region had to flee westwards and compete with resident populations for access to land and employment, leading to ethnic conflict, especially in Sindh. Top Post-partition and conflict over Kashmir The death of Muhammed Ali Jinnah in 1948, the conflict with India over the Princely State of Kashmir (which both countries claimed at independence), as well as ethnic and religious differences within Pakistan itself, all combined to stymie early attempts to agree on a constitution and an effectively functioning civil administration. This failure paved the way for a military takeover of the government in 1958 and later on, a civil war in 1971. This saw the division of the country and the creation of the separate state of Bangladesh. Ever since then, military rule has been more often than not the order of the day in both countries. India has maintained remarkable cohesion since independence, especially considering it is nearly the size of Europe.

At independence, in India and in Pakistan, civil unrest as well as ethnic and religious discord threatened the stability of the new country. However, the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi on 30 January 1948 by a Hindu fanatic strengthened the hand of secularists within the government. Indian politicians ratified a constitution, which led to the first democratic elections in 1951. This made India the world's largest democracy and consolidated governmental authority over the entire subcontinent. However, major tensions have persisted among both Muslim and Sikh communities, which suffered most from the

violence and land loss resulting from partition. These tensions erupted most seriously in the 1980s in a violent campaign for the creation of a separate Sikh state which led ultimately to the assassination of Indira Gandhi. Renewed victimisation of Muslims has also occurred, notably with the destruction of the Muslim shrine at Ayodhya in 1992 and anti-Muslim riots in Gujarat in 2004. With such notable exceptions, however, India has maintained a remarkable level of cohesion since independence, especially if one considers that it is a country nearly the size of Europe. For both India and Pakistan, the most singular conflict unresolved since partition has concerned the former Princely State of Kashmir, whose fate was left undetermined at the time the British left. Lying as it did on the border, Kashmir was claimed by both countries, which have been to war over this region on numerous occasions. The conflict has wasted thousands of lives and millions of dollars, but is closer to a solution now than at any time since independence. If achieved, it might finally bring to fruition the dreams of Mohammed Ali Jinnah and Mahatma Gandhi and once more set an example for post-colonial societies elsewhere in Africa, Asia and the Middle East to imitate and follow.

#### **5.9.9.9 Cricket at the Peace**

Cricket was the subject of two nominations at the 2011 Peace and Sport Awards, announced in Monaco on October 27. In all categories the quality of candidates was very high. For the "Peace and Sport Image of the Year" Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Pakistan PM Yousaf Raza Gilani together waving to the crowd at Mohali Stadium before the ICC (International Cricket Council) Cricket World Cup semi-final between their two nations in March. Before an enthusiastic, cheering crowd, it was an act of what some termed 'cricket diplomacy'. The fragile cricketing ties between India and Pakistan had been severed following the terrorist attack in Mumbai on November 26, 2008 and the attack on players and officials prior to the Pakistan-Sri Lanka Test in Lahore in the following March. The Pakistan Cricket Board is currently seeking to host a fresh visit by the Indian team in 2012.

*Statement of Pakistani Prime Minister and President Mr. Asif Ali Zardari to use sport diplomacy for peace*

*Pak India Cricket: Sports Will Bring Peace.President Zardari*

*Islamabad: Chairman Pakistan Cricket Board Zaka Ashraf meet President Asif Ali Zardari, today.*

*He briefs the President about Pak-India cricket diplomacy.*

*President appreciated him and said that sports will bring peace and friendship among both the countries. (Three One-Day Internationals and two Twenty20 Internationals will played in December 2012 among both countries for Peace.)*

*Pak India Cricket: Sports Will Bring Peace.President Zardari*

*Islamabad: Pakistan | Jul 17, 2012 at 6:46 AM PDT ( <http://www.allvoices.com/contributed-news/12610560-pak-india-cricket-sports-will-bring-peacepresident-zardari>)*

*Three One-Day Internationals and two Twenty20 Internationals will played in December 2012 among both countries.*

Pakistan's Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani said on Monday his visit to India to watch the World Cup cricket semifinal in Mohali between the two arch-rivals was in the "national interest". Gilani accepted an invitation from his Indian counterpart Manmohan Singh to attend the match after a meeting with President Asif Ali Zardari. *"I have decided to avail of this opportunity in national interest," an official statement quoted Gilani as telling a meeting of the federal cabinet in Islamabad. It is also a timely opportunity for the two governments to show to the world that the two nations can play together as well as sit and deliberate together on issues of national importance,"* he said. He also said that this is the time to promote peace through sport and use sport diplomacy to promote peace between the two countries India and Pakistan.

## **Tennis ties**

Indian tennis ace Rohan Bopanna used a visit to Pakistan on Thursday to call for cross-border tennis in a bid to raise the profile of a sport overshadowed by cricket in south Asia. The 31-year-old from Bangalore travelled to Pakistan to attend the wedding of his former Pakistani doubles partner Aisam-ul Haq Qureshi this week.

*“It’s nice to be in Pakistan and I hope we resume tennis between the two countries which in turn would increase interest in the sport in both the countries,”* Bopanna told reporters after playing a practice game in Lahore. He also said that they are good friend at international tennis and they will try to play series between India and Pakistan in both playing grounds so that they could promote peace between India and Pakistan. Indian-Pakistan sporting ties ended with the 2008 terror attacks on Mumbai, where Islamist gunmen killed 166 in a 60-hour killing spree that Pakistan later admitted was plotted at least partly on its soil.

# CHAPTER 6

## 6.1 Recommendations for Governments.

Include sport as a tool in government strategies, to address the challenges confronting excluded populations and to prevent conflicts arising from these challenges.

Review the use of sport for nation-building purposes to ensure that the messages conveyed are peaceful and conducive to preventing conflict both within and outside the country.

Observe the Olympic Truce.

Address conflict and peace-building at the socio-political level and the individual level.

Adapt and apply the principle of “do no harm” in all sport for peace initiatives during the hole years. Ensure that sport for peace initiatives are not only evaluated at the program level, also for their impact on the peace environment at large.

- More cricket and other types of sporting events should be introduced and developed them through the national Olympic Associations.
- All the national federations should made their programme and exchange them with each other for the sporting events development so that peace could be more established between two countries.
- Annual meetings should be arranged by the both national cricket boards because cricket is very famous in both countries and all the population of both countries like it very much, this is the best way to use sport for peace development.

- Organize annual world peace and sports conference in SAARC countries and also at international level especially in India and Pakistan.
- Organize an international peace forum with the cooperation of united nation, UNESCO and IOC international Olympic committee annually in both countries.
- At least 1 meeting between India and Pakistan prime ministers should be arranged annually through foreign office policy to organized Cricket Series for Peace.
- A forum of sports and peace should be held every year between the two countries with the cooperation and participation of IOC and united nation.
- Both the countries must organized a cricket series every year or may be after two years in both lands because cricket is very famous in both countries and this sporting event can play crucial role for the development of sustainable peace in both countries and can resolve the conflict.
- Both countries should start a movement between the peoples through peace educational progarmmes so that peoples could be aware.
- The nature of both countries needs to be changed through positive campaign.
- The international truce progarammes should be introduced every year.
- Pakistani government should declare to India as most favorite country so that the conflict could be resolved between both countries.
- Both countries should declare some of the Cricket, Kabaddi, Wrestling and Hockey, players as peace ambassadors every year for the development of peace through sports.
- Media of both countries including international media and international and national NGO's should encourage to the peoples of both countries for the spreading of peace through sport.
- The participation of kashmiry people's should also be encouraged at national and international level.

- Peoples of Kashmir should have a right to their participation in international sporting events with their country of choice either; they want to play from India or Pakistan.
- Political parties of both the countries should avoid creating any conflict through media and they must have role to delivered good message for the peoples of both countries.
- Cricket series 2012/2013 should be organized with the name of (peace cricket trophy).
- Rohann Boppana and Aisam-UI- Haq both tennis series should be organized every year.

## **6.2 Conclusion**

Although the conflict between both countries is present yet because of Kashmir issue which is the major obstacles between peace development for both countries since their partition but still sport can resolve all problems and can develop peace between two countries may be forever. Cricket is very famous sporting event in both countries and the peoples of both countries love this game. Pakistan and Indian cricket board should organize a series of one day international including test series every year on both lands. The captains of both cricket teams should be the ambassador of peace from both countries and they should deliver the message to the peoples through international media for peace through sports. Pakistan have declared India a favorite nation and both the prime ministers have met during the SAARC (South Asian Association for regional cooperation) conference so cricket can add to that improvement in relations, ICC international cricket council should also encouraged to organized the cricket series with the name of (cricket series for peace trophy) every year for both countries and also international one day tournament with the name of (one day international cricket peace trophy), organizing peace trophy through ICC will be good message for international countries for peace development through sports. President of both cricket boards should try for the revival of cricket series on both lands with the cooperation of ICC.

### **6.3 Has Cricket Diplomacy been Successful?**

Cricket has been an important part of the current peace process dating back to 2003, and in that sense it clearly has been successful. To discuss the case of cricket diplomacy between India and Pakistan means assessing whether and how cricket matters, rather than how much it matters since cricket clearly is not the only intervening variable in the relationship. That involves taking into account the questions of timing and durability as success criteria in the discussion. On the account of timing – whether cricket diplomacy has been used to initiate rapprochement, or if it used in a climate of thawing relations – cricket diplomacy as track-two and track-three diplomacy has been most successful when used as a confidence-building measure as part of a peace process, as illustrated by table 4.1. One of the most significant uses of sport diplomacy has been as a means of improving relations between enemies, and this normally comes about in periods where the political climate is conducive to rapprochement. Chari (2002:242) argues that confidence-building measures such as cricket indeed have a better chance of succeeding in times of relative peaceful relations rather than during periods of heightened tensions. Furthermore, cricket with all its potential for inciting rival passion and nationalistic fervour, is at the right time a uniting force in South Asia. Cricket provides the state leaders with a powerful tool for making the peace process visible, and for gauging the public's attitude towards their efforts. In other words, there is a great potential for peace in cricket as it is perhaps the only real unifying force on the subcontinent. What matters is the timing of bilateral cricket contests, and cricket diplomacy as confidence-building has been instrumental for strengthening the current peace process. The second success criterion concerns the durability of cricket diplomacy. It is clear from table 4.1 that fortunes have been mixed when it comes to cricket's ability to survive periods of deteriorating Indo-Pakistani relations, making it difficult to come to any final conclusions on this question. Nevertheless, it seems that cricket diplomacy has not been able to survive when state-to-state relations have worsened significantly. President Zia's visit to India in 1987 averted an impending crisis, but the Pakistani-supported Kashmiri uprising in late 1989 put a lid on bilateral

cricket between the two neighbors for several years. It was in this period the Indian government that sanctioned the freeze of bilateral cricketing ties, not the national cricket boards. The renewed efforts due to easing of tensions in 1997 and 1999 were also short-lived. Cricket diplomacy was not an issue in those periods. In other words, from 1989 until 1999 cricket not only succumbed to deteriorating relations between India and Pakistan, but was deliberately excluded from their bilateral relationship. Bilateral relations experienced a shift in 2003, and cricket diplomacy was resumed with the Indian cricket team's Friendship Tour of Pakistan in 2004. This time around, cricket diplomacy has survived despite some setbacks in the Indo-Pakistani relationship. Cricket diplomacy has become an annual fixture, and has contributed in large parts to strengthening and preserving the peace process.

#### **6.4 Can Sport Create Peace?**

Examples of sport diplomacy are far between, but they show a great deal of variety as table 3.2 illustrates. Cricket diplomacy, involving a sport both countries are passionate about and administered at a state-to-state level, is but one of seven cases mentioned in this thesis. Add to that the particularities of the India-Pakistan relationship, and the question whether the findings here are applicable to other cases materializes. Case findings must in any case always be considered to be of a provisional character (George & Bennett, 2004:90), and Punch (2005:146) therefore suggests two main ways in which a case study such as this can produce results that 'at least suggest generalizability:' by conceptualizing, and by developing propositions. Based on the case studied, is possible to put forward propositions that can be asserted for their applicability and transferability to other situations. Two general propositions emerge from the discussion about cricket diplomacy from 1987 to 2007. First, a thaw in relations between adversarial states seems to be a prerequisite for successful sport diplomacy. In other words, sport diplomacy when applied under circumstances conducive to rapprochement will have the greatest chance of succeeding. Second, sport diplomacy's ability to survive deteriorating state-to-state relations can be vital for maintaining channels of communication even in periods of dire

political climates. The question is however how severe a deterioration sport diplomacy is able to withstand, something that probably will vary from case to case. This could and should be a question for future research.

### ***6.5 Future Prospects***

In the past, the role of cricket could have possibly been best described as a mock battleground for India and Pakistan to play out their grievances, even adding to these in some cases thereby fulfilling Orwell's gloomy view on sport as 'war minus the shooting.' With all the emotion and notions of national pride and prestige attached to winning against the old enemy, what chance has cricket of continuing to help the cause of peace? The above discussion might seem to suggest that cricket merely plays an ameliorative role in the Indo-Pakistani relationship – that cricket is not what really matters when it comes to war and peace. Dasgupta (2004:577) argues that cricket matches have provided 'a quick, albeit temporary, resolution to this face-off where there are no victors in real life.' What's more, it is not the Indian and Pakistani cricket players as symbolic representatives by themselves who can bring about détente between their nations, but the two countries' leaders decision to improve relations (Chenabi, 2004:239). In other words, the governments of India and Pakistan carry the ultimate responsibility for making the peace process work. But if the playing field 'can provide a stage for political grievance and conflict, certainly it can also facilitate cooperation and understanding' (Goldberg, 2000:65). Across South Asia today, there is 'a fanatical following for cricket which no other sport has known' within its shores (Khan, 2005:179). All this combined makes for a potent role for cricket to play as perhaps the only real unifying force and national identity marker for Pakistanis and Indians alike. As sport can divide, it also has the potential as the world's common language to unite people both within and across borders. Imran Khan, a former Pakistani cricketer, spoke of his hopes for the Friendship Series in 2004, saying that: 'When the two countries are trying to become friendly, trying to ease tensions, then cricket plays a healing role, cricket becomes a cement in bonding the countries together' (Jawad, 2004). Shaharyar

Khan, chairman of the Pakistan Cricket Board, added his voice to this positive outlook when asked if cricket diplomacy has succeeded in advance of the Pakistani team's return tour of India in 2005: 'Of course it has. Look at the amount of goodwill the two teams generated during the series played in Pakistan. If the Indians won the hearts of the Pakistanis in Pakistan, we are here to achieve the same goal in India. Cricket diplomacy has worked. I have no doubts on that score' (Rediff, 2005). It seems therefore that cricket diplomacy has the potential to stick around for a while. Nothing is certain when India and Pakistan are involved, though, and it is still too early to tell if cricket will contribute to lasting peace between India and Pakistan.

# Bibliography – References

Academy of Management Review , 14(4), pp.532-550.

Ahmar, Moonis, 2003. 'Why Rethink the Paradigms of Conflict Resolution?', in Moonis Ahmar (15-30).

Ahmar, Moonis, ed., 2003. *Paradigms of Conflict Resolution in South Asia*. Dhaka: The University Press Limited.

Akhtar, Shaheen, 2003. 'Linkage Between Confidence-Building Measures and Peace Process in South Asia', in Moonis Ahmar (47-70).

Ali, A. (2009). Sport for peace report: Executive summary. *ICSSPE Bulletin*, 56, 11.

Allison, Lincoln & Terry Monnington, 2002. 'Sport, Prestige and International Relations', *Government and Opposition* Vol. 37, no. 1: 106-134.

Allison, Lincoln, 2000. 'Introduction', in Lincoln Allison, ed., *Taking Sport Seriously*. Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Sport (1-5).

Allison, Lincoln, 2004. 'Sport and Nationalism', in Jay Coakley & Eric Dunning, eds., *Handbook of Sport Studies*. London: Sage (344-355).

Allport, G.W. (1954) *The nature of prejudice*, Reading, MA: Addison - Wesley

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

and civilization, London: Sage Publications.

*and Peace*, Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group

Armand Colin.

Armstrong, G. (2004). Life, death, and the biscuit: Football and the embodiment of society in Liberia, West Africa. In G. Armstrong & R. Giuliannotti (Eds.), *Football in Africa: Conflict, conciliation and community* (pp. 183-209). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

2nd edition, Hemel Hemp

. New York: Prentice Hall. Gomm, R., Hammersley, M., Foster, P. (Eds.) (2000)

- 2nd edition. Harlow: Pearson Education. Yin, R.K. (1994) Case study research:
- Baker, R. & Esherick, C. (2009). Sport-based peace initiatives: Playing for peace. In E. Ndura-Ouédraogo & R. Amster (Eds.), *Building cultures of peace: Transdisciplinary voices of hope and action* (pp. 102-124). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Baker, William J. (1988) *Sports in the Western World*, Illinois: University of
- Barston, R. P., 1997. *Modern Diplomacy*. London & New York: Longman.
- Beacom, Aaron, 2000. 'Sport in International Relations: A Case for Cross-Disciplinary Investigation', *The Sports Historian* 20,2 (Nov,2000): 1-23.
- Beck, Peter J., 2004. "The Most Effective Means of Communication in the Modern World"? British Sport and National Prestige', in Roger Levermore & Adrian Budd (77-92).
- Behera, Navnita Chadha, 2002. 'Forging New Solidarities: Nonofficial Dialogues', in Monique Mekenkamp, Paul van Tongeren & Hands van de Veen, eds., *Searching for Peace in Central and South Asia*. Boulder: Lynne Reiner Publishers (210-236).
- Berridge, G. R., 2002. *Diplomacy. Theory and Practice*. New York: Palgrave.
- Bhattacharya, Rahul, 2005. *Pundits from Pakistan: on tour with India, 2003-2004*. London: Picador.
- Biermann, M. (2011). Claims and effects of sport-in-development projects: A state-of-the-art analysis. Unpublished thesis, submitted January 21, 2011. Universität Paderborn.
- Booth, Douglas, 2003. 'Hitting Apartheid for Six? The Politics of the South African Sports Boycott', *Journal of Contemporary History* Vol. 38(3): 477-493.
- Borders & boundaries: women in India's partition by Menon, Ritu & Bhasin, Kamla (New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1998)
- Boulding, Elise. (1990) *Cultures of Peace*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Bouzou, Joel. (2010) *Peace Through Sport: When the Myth Becomes Reality*, Paris:
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*. Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

- Bull, Hedley, 2004. 'Diplomacy and International Order', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 5).
- Bull, Hedley, 2004. 'Diplomacy and International Order', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 5).
- Bush, Robert. A Baruch. Folger, Joseph. P. (2005) *The promise of Mediation: The*
- Byrne, Sean & Loreleigh Keashley, 2000. 'Working with Ethno-Political Conflict: A Multi-Modal Approach', in Tom Woodhouse & Oliver Ramsbotham, eds., *Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution*. London: Frank Cass (97-120).
- Byrne, Sean & Loreleigh Keashley, 2000. 'Working with Ethno-Political Conflict: A Multi-Modal Approach', in Tom Woodhouse & Oliver Ramsbotham, eds., *Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution*. London: Frank Cass (97-120).
- Cahn, S. (1998). *Coming on strong: Gender and sexuality in twentieth-century women's sports*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carter, Thomas, 1999. 'The Fallacy of Baseball Diplomacy', *Peace Review* 11:4 (1999): 579-584.
- Carter, Thomas, 1999. 'The Fallacy of Baseball Diplomacy', *Peace Review* 11:4 (1999): 579-584.
- Case study method: key issues, key texts . London: Sage Publications.
- Case study methods . California: Sage.
- Chari, P. R., 2002. 'The Need for Confidence-Building Measures', in Monique Mekenkamp, Paul van Tongeren & Hands van de Veen, eds., *Searching for Peace in Central and South Asia*. Boulder: Lynne Reiner Publishers (237-248).
- Chari, P. R., 2002. 'The Need for Confidence-Building Measures', in Monique Mekenkamp, Paul van Tongeren & Hands van de Veen, eds., *Searching for Peace in Central and South Asia*. Boulder: Lynne Reiner Publishers (237-248).
- Chatterjee, Kingshuk, 2004. 'To Play Or Not To Play: Fabricating Consent over the Indo-Pak Cricket Series', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* vol. 21, Nos. 3/4, June-September 2004:613-628.

- Chatterjee, Kingshuk, 2004. 'To Play Or Not To Play: Fabricating Consent over the Indo-Pak Cricket Series', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* vol. 21, Nos. 3/4, June-September 2004:613-628.
- Chenabi, H. E., 2004. 'Sport Diplomacy between the United States and Iran' in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 53).
- Chenabi, H. E., 2004. 'Sport Diplomacy between the United States and Iran' in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 53).
- Cherian, John, 2005. 'A New Momentum', *Frontline* Vol. 22, issue 08, Mar. 12-25, 2005 (Available online at <http://www.flonnet.com>).
- Chigas, Diana, 2003. 'Track II (Citizen) Diplomacy', in Guy Burgess & Heidi Burgess, eds., *Beyond Intractability*. University of Colorado, Boulder: Conflict Research Consortium (Available online at <http://www.beyondintractability.org>).
- Coakley, Jay, 2004. *Sports in Society: Issues & Controversies*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Coalter, F & Taylor, J. (2010). *Sport-for-development impact study. A research initiative funded by Comic Relief and UK Sport and managed by International Development through Sport*. Retrieved from <http://www.uksport.gov.uk/docLib/MISC/FullReport.pdf>.
- Coalter, F. (2006). *Sport-in-development: A monitoring and evaluation manual*. London: UK Sport.
- Coalter, F. (2008). Sport-in-development: Development for and through sport? In M. Nicholson & R. Hoye (Eds.). *Sport and social capital* (pp. 39-68). London: Elsevier.
- Coalter, F. (2009). Sport-in-development: Accountability or development? In R. Levermore & A. Beacom (Eds.). *Sport and international development* (pp. 55-75). Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coalter, F. (2010). The politics of sport-for-development: Limited focus programmes and broad gauge problems? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45, 295-314.

- Cohen, Stephen Philip, 2001. *India: Emerging Power*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press.
- Conflict: Psychological Dimensions to War and Peace*, Westport: Praeger.
- Crick, Emily, 2006. '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'. Master Thesis in Development and Security at Bristol University, 2005-2006.
- Croft, Stuart, 2005. 'South Asia's arms control process: cricket diplomacy and the composite dialogue', *International Affairs* 81, 5 (2005): 1039-1060.
- Cronin, Orla. (2011) *Comic Relief Review: Mapping the research on the impact of*
- Darnell, S. (2012). *Sport and international development: A critical sociology*. New York: Bloomsbury
- Dasgupta, Jishnu, 2004. 'Manufacturing Unison: Muslims, Hindus and Indians during the India-Pakistan Match', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* vol. 21, Nos. 3/4, June-September 2004: 575-584.
- DeLay, Jeanine, 1999. 'The Curveball and the Pitch: Sport Diplomacy in the Age of Global Media', *The Journal of the International Institute* Vol. 7, no.1, Fall 1999 (Available online at <http://www.umich.edu/>).
- Development (SAD), Bienne: Switzerland
- Dimeo, Paul, 2003. "With political Pakistan in the offing...": Football and Communal Politics in South Asia, 1887-1947', *Journal of Contemporary History* Vol. 38(3): 377-394.
- Dittmer, Lowell, 2001. 'South Asia's Security Dilemma', *Asian Survey* Vol. 41, No. 6 (Nov. – Dec., 2001): 897-906.
- Donnelly, Peter. Kidd, Bruce. (2007) *Literature Reviews on Sport for Development*
- Easton, G. (1992) Learning from case studies
- Eban, Abba, 1983. *The New Diplomacy*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Eban, Abba, 1998. *Diplomacy for the Next Century*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989) "Building theories from case study research."

- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland, 1991. 'Ethnicity versus Nationalism', *Journal of Peace Research* 28 (3) 1991: 263-278.
- Foer, Franklin, 2004. *How Football Explains the World. An Unlikely Theory of Globalization*. London: Arrow Books.
- Football for Hope 20 Centres for 2010: Baseline Study*, Swiss Academy for
- Forbes, H.D. Ethnic Conflict and the Contact hypothesis, IN: Lee, Y.T. McCauley, C.
- Frey, James H. & D. Stanley Eitzen, 1991. 'Sport and Society', *Annual Review of Sociology* Vol. 17 (1991): 503-522.
- Galtung, Johan. (1996) Peace by peaceful means: peace and conflict, development
- Ganguly, Sumit & Devin T. Hagerty, 2005. *Fearful Symmetry: India-Pakistan Crises in the Shadow of Nuclear Weapons*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Geller, Daniel S., 2005. 'The India-Pakistan rivalry: prospects for war, prospects for peace', in T. V. Paul (80-102).
- George, Alexander L. & Andrew Bennett, 2004. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- George, Alexander L., 1979. 'Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison', in Paul Gordon Lauren, ed., *Diplomacy. New Approaches in History, Theory, and Policy*. New York: Free Press (43-68).
- Ghuri, P., Gronhaug, K. and Kristianslund, I. (1995)
- Gillham, Bill. (2008) Observation Techniques: Structured to Unstructured, RealGoldberg, Jeremy, 2000. 'Sporting Diplomacy: Boosting the Size of the Diplomatic Corpse', *The Washington Quarterly* Autumn 2000:63-70.
- Guha, Ramachandra, 1998. 'Cricket and Politics in Colonial India', *Past and Present* No. 161 (Nov., 1998): 155-190.
- Guha, Ramachandra, 2002. *A Corner of a Foreign Field: The Indian History of a British Sport*. London: Picador.

Hamel, J. (1993)

Hocking, Brian, 1999. 'Catalytic Diplomacy: Beyond 'Newness' and 'Decline'', in Jan Melissen (Chapter 2).

Houlihan, Barrie, 2000. 'National Responses to Global Sports', in Lincoln Allison, ed., *Taking Sport Seriously*. Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Sport (77-103).

Houlihan, Barrie, 2004. 'Politics and Sport', in Jay Coakley & Eric Dunning, eds., *Handbooks of Sports Studies*. London: Sage (213-227).

History of India and Pakistan <http://www.historyofnations.net/asia/pakistan.html>

Illinois Press.

Inventing Boundaries: gender, politics and the Partition of India edited by Mushirul Hasan (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000)

James, Alan, 2004. 'Diplomacy and International Society', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 10).

Jönsson, Christer & Martin Hall, 2004. 'Communication: An Essential Aspect of Diplomacy', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 20).

Jönsson, Christer & Richard Langhorne, eds., 2004. *Diplomacy: Volume I-III*. London: Sage Publications.

Jönsson, Christer, 2002a. 'Diplomacy, Bargaining and Negotiation', in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomass Risse & Beth A. Simmons, eds., *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage Publications (212-234).

Jönsson, Christer, 2002b. 'Idrott och diplomati' [Sport and Diplomacy], *Internationalen* Nr. 2 (Summer) 2002:22-28.

Kapuscinski, Ryszard, 1992. *Fotbollkrigen* [The Soccer War]. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Kaufman, Stuart J., 2001. *Modern Hatreds. The Symbolic Politics of Ethnic War*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Keens-Soper, Maurice, 2004. 'Francois de Callières and Diplomatic Theory', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 1).

- Khan, Shaharyar M., 2005. *Cricket: A Bridge of Peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane & Sidney Verba, 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry. Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lal, Vinay, 2003. *Of Cricket, Guinness and Gandhi. Essays on Indian History and Culture*. Calcutta: Seagull Books.
- Langhorne, Richard, 2004. 'Current Developments in Diplomacy: Who are the Diplomats Now?', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 58).
- Lapierre, Dominique & Larry Collins, 2006. *Freedom at Midnight*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing.
- Lederach, John Paul, 2001. 'Civil Society and Reconciliation', in P. R. Aall, C. A. Crocker & F. O. Hampson, eds., *Turbulent Peace. The Challenges of Managing International Conflict*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace (841-854).
- Levermore, Roger & Adrian Budd, 2004. 'Introduction: Sport and international relations: Continued neglect?', in Roger Levermore & Adrian Budd (6-15).
- Levermore, Roger & Adrian Budd, eds., 2004. *Sport and International Relations. An Emerging Relationship*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Levermore, Roger, 2004. 'Sport's Role in Constructing the 'Inter-State' Worldview', in Roger Levermore & Adrian Budd (16-30).
- Maiese, Michelle, 2003. 'Confidence-Building Measures' in Guy Burgess & Heidi Burgess, eds., *Beyond Intractability*. University of Colorado, Boulder: Conflict Research Consortium (Available online at <http://www.beyondintractability.org>).
- Majumdar, Boria, 2004. *Once Upon a Furore: Lost Pages of Indian Cricket*. New Delhi: Yoda Press.
- Marks, John, 1999. 'Wrestling Diplomacy Scores in Iran', *Peace Review* 11:4 (1999): 547-549.
- Marqusee, Mike, 2004. 'War minus the shooting', the Guardian, 10 March, 2004 (Available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk>).

- Marqusee, Mike, 2005. 'A committed neutral speaks', Outlook India, 17 March, 2005 (Available online at <http://www.mikemarqusee.com>).
- Marqusee, Mike, 2006. 'Level Playing Field', The Hindu, 8 January, 2006 (Available online at <http://www.mikemarqusee.com>).
- Martin, Simon, 2004. *Football and Fascism*. Oxford & New York: Berg.
- Melissen, Jan, 1999. 'Introduction', in Jan Melissen (i-xxiii).
- Melissen, Jan, ed., 1999. *Innovation in Diplomatic Practice*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Mills, James H., 2005. 'Introduction', in James H. Mills, ed., *Subaltern Sports: Politics and Sport in South Asia*. London: Anthem Press (1-17).
- Moghaddam, F.M. Worchel, S. (eds.) (2004) *The Psychology of Ethnic and Cultural*
- Montville, Joseph V., 1991. 'The Arrow and the Olive Branch: A Case for Track Two Diplomacy', in Vamik D. Volkan, Joseph V. Montville & Demtrios A. Julius (Chapter 9).
- Morgenthau, Hans J., 2004. 'Diplomacy', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne, (Chapter 4).
- Mukharji, Projit B., 2004. 'The Early Cricketing Tours: Imperial Provenance and Radical Potential', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* vol. 21, Nos. 3/4, June-September 2004: 351-362.
- Nasr, Vali, 2005. 'National identities and the India-Pakistan conflict', in T. V. Paul (178-201).
- ness students.
- Orwell, George, 1953. *Shooting an Elephant and Other Essays*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Pakistan as a peasant utopia: the communalization of class politics in East Bengal, 1920-1947 by Taj ul-Islam Hashmi (Boulder, Colorado; Oxford: Westview, 1992)
- Paul, T. V., 2005. 'Causes of the India-Pakistan enduring rivalry', in T. V. Paul (3-24).

Paul, T. V., ed., 2005. *The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perry, C. (1998) "Processes of a case study methodology for postgraduate re

Pound, Richard W., 1994. *Five Rings Over Korea. The Secret Negotiations Behind the 1988 Olympic Games in Seoul*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Punch, Keith F., 2005. *Introduction to Social Research*. London: Sage Publications.

Pcb [www.pcboard.com.pk](http://www.pcboard.com.pk)

Peace and sports conference 2011. [www.peaceandsport.org](http://www.peaceandsport.org)

Qadeem, Mussarat, 2003. 'The Debate on Non-Nuclear CBMs in South Asia', in Moonis Ahmar (159-172).

Racine, Jean-Luc, 2002. 'Pakistan and the "India Syndrome": Between Kashmir and the Nuclear Predicament', in Christophe Jaffrelot, ed., *Pakistan: Nationalism Without a Nation?* London: Zed Books & New Delhi: Manohar (195-228).

Racine, Jean-Luc, 2004. 'Living with India: Relations between Pakistan and India', in Christophe Jaffrelot, ed., *A History of Pakistan and its Origins*. London: Anthem Press (112-133).

Rauf, Tariq, 2005. 'Confidence-building and security-building measures in the nuclear area with relevance for South Asia', *Contemporary South Asia* 14(2), (June, 2005): 175-189.

Reddy, B. Muralidhar, 2005. 'Behind the game', *Frontline* vol. 22, issue 09, Apr. 23 – May 06, 2005 (Available online at <http://www.flonnet.com>).

Remembering Partition: violence, nationalism and history in India by Gyanendra Pandey (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Research methods in business studies: a practical guide

'Reviews: The high politics of India's Partition: the revisionist perspective' by Asim Roy (*Modern Asian Studies*, 24, 2 (1990), pp. 385-415)

- Rouhana, Nadim M., 1999. 'Unofficial Intervention: Potential Contributions to Resolving Ethno-National Conflicts', in Jan Melissen (Chapter 7).
- Sathasivam, Kanishkan & Sahar Shafqat, 2003. 'In India's Shadow: The Evolution of Pakistan's Security Policy', in Uk Heo & Shale A. Horowitz, eds., *Conflict in Asia*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger (Chapter 8).
- Satow, Ernest, 2004. 'Diplomacy; and the Language and Forms of Diplomatic Intercourse', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 2).
- Saunders, Harold H., 1991. 'Official and Citizens in International Relationships', in Vamik D. Volkan, Joseph V. Montville & Demetrios A. Julius (Chapter 4).
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2000) Research methods for busi-  
Schofield, Victoria, 2003. *Kashmir in Conflict: India, Pakistan and the Unending War*. London & New York: I.B. Tauris.  
search in marketing." *European Journal of Marketing* , 32 (9/10), pp.785-  
 Secretariat: Toronto, Canada.
- Selliaas, Andreas, 2006a. 'Kan sportsdiplomati forene?' [Can sport diplomacy unite?], *Dagsavisen* 31 May, 2006 (Available online at <http://www.dagsavisen.no>).
- Selliaas, Andreas, 2006b. 'Tid for sportsdiplomati?' [Time for Sport Diplomacy?]. *Dagsavisen* 7 November, 2006 (Available online at <http://www.dagsavisen.no>).
- Sengupta, Jayanta, 2004. 'Globalizing Patriotism? Some Lessons from the Cricket World Cup of 2003', *The International Journal of the History of Sport* vol. 21, Nos. 3/4, June-September 2004: 585-612.
- Sharp, Paul, 2004a. 'For Diplomacy: Representation and the Study of International Relations', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 11).

- Sharp, Paul, 2004b. 'Who Needs Diplomats? The problem of diplomatic representation', in Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne (Chapter 44).
- Siddiqi, Farhan Hanif, 2003. 'Conflict Resolution and Peace: Conceptual and Theoretical Concerns', in Moonis Ahmar (31-46).
- Smith, Adrian & Dilwyn Porter, 2004. 'Introduction', in Adrian Smith & Dilwyn Porter, eds., *Sport and National Identity in the Post-War World*. London: Routledge (1-9).
- Sport and Development interventions, Comic Relief.*  
[sportanddev.org/data/document/document/254.pdf](http://sportanddev.org/data/document/document/254.pdf)
- stead: Prentice Hall.
- Talbott, Strobe, 2006. *Engaging India: diplomacy, democracy, and the bomb*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- The Partitions of Memory: the afterlife of the division of India edited by S. Kaul (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001)
- The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the demand for Pakistan by Ayesha Jalal (Cambridge University Press, 1985)
- Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Time Magazine, 1971a. 'The Ping Heard Round the World', *Time Magazine* April 26, 1971 (Available online at <http://www.time.com>).
- Time Magazine, 1971b. 'Nixon's Coup:
- Tennis Ties <http://www.dawn.com/2011/12/15/pakistan-and-india-should-resume-tennis-ties-bopanna.html>
- transformative approach to conflict, San Francisco: Jossey - Bass.
- World Research, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.