Crossroads Guantánamo

Barbara Harlow

Victoria Brittain and Gillian Slovo, *Guantánamo: 'Honor Bound to Defend Freedom*, London, Oberon Books, 2004; £7.99 paperback.

Paul Farmer, *Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 2005; £10.50 paperback.

Philippe Sands, *Lawless World: America and the Making and Breaking of Global Rules from FDR's Atlantic Charter to George W. Bush's Illegal War*, New York, Viking, 2005; £12.99 paperback.

Strategic dates, from November 2001 to October 2005, provide the chronological frame for a timeline to 'The Ongoing Legal Battle', included in the playbill received by audiences of *Guantánamo: Honor Bound to Defend Freedom* in its production at Washington D.C.'s Studio Theatre in November 2005. This timeline begins with George W. Bush's November 2001 issuance of a military order - shortly following the attacks of September 11 and the subsequent US invasion of Afghanistan - that authorised the detention of non-US citizens as 'unlawful enemy combatants' and concludes with October 2005 when 90 percent of US Senators voted in favour of an amendment that would define and limit interrogation techniques used by US personnel in questioning prisoners held around the world. The chronology also details a summary narrative of the contestation that ensued from the initial military order: the Supreme Court's ruling in June 2004 that Guantánamo detainees had the right to protest their detention in US courts; the November 2004 ruling by a district court suspending the closed Guantánamo military tribunals (which was then overruled a year later by a federal court in November 2005). On 28 March 2006, the US Supreme Court, despite persistent manoeuvres both legal and extra-judicial on the part of the Bush administration, heard arguments in the case *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, in which Salim Hamdan, a Guantánamo detainee from Yemen, challenged the authority of the military commissions authorised by Bush and his appointees in the half-decade since 9/11.[1]

By contrast, the chronological frame provided in the playbill for *Guantánamo*'s summer 2004 production at London's West End theatre, The Ambassadors, where it had moved from its opening run in May at the Tricycle Theatre, was rather longer, beginning with the December 1903 lease agreed between the United States and Cuba, allowing the US 45 square miles of land and water to be used as a coaling station on the island. That lease is maintained still (and can only be terminated by mutual consent of both

1. In June 2006 the Supreme Court ruled in favour of Hamdan.

parties), despite the fact that Fidel Castro cut off water and supplies in 1964, obliging the area - Guantánamo Bay - to become 'self-sufficient', so much so, so sufficient that is, that the US Naval Base was used to accommodate many of the 34,000 Haitian refugees fleeing the Caribbean island following the coup that overthrew popularly elected President Jean-Bertrand Aristide in 1991. The base remained no less ready a decade later to receive the first of the 'unlawful enemy combatants' seized in the Bush administration's launch of its 'war on terror' in 2001-02. The temporary facilities at Guantánamo Bay have in the intervening years become a permanent installation and a controversial crossroads in the evolving political debates over national sovereignty, international humanitarian law, human rights, globalisation, and the very concept of the 'rule of law'.

Guantánamo: Honor Bound to Defend Freedom (its subtitle is taken from the sign announcing entry into the prison camp, a formula coined by US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and used as a motto by the Guantánamo Joint Task Force) was written by British journalist Victoria Brittain and South African-born novelist Gillian Slovo in the months immediately following the release in early 2004 of five British citizens held in Guantánamo. The play, a formally creative documentary, 'taken from spoken evidence', is based strictly on interviews with the former detainees and members of their families, together with verbatim interventions cited from the public pronouncements of other participants in the Guantánamo controversy, including US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, British Lord Steyn, UK Foreign Secretary Jack Straw, and attorneys from both countries, Gareth Peirce, Clive Stafford Smith, Major Dan Mori, Greg Powell and Mark Jennings. In its peregrinating productions, from the Tricycle Theatre to the West End, to New York City, Stockholm, San Francisco, Washington DC, with versions performed in a school setting in Pakistan, and new productions in Chicago and Florence, *Guantánamo* and the 'honor' that is said to be 'bound to defend freedom', have encountered sundry obstacles. In an account, for example, of the play's New York production (staged just as the Republican National Convention was mustering to nominate George W. Bush for a second presidential term and in which South African Archbishop Desmond Tutu made his off-Broadway debut in the role of Lord Steyn) in late August 2004, one of its authors, Gillian Slovo, recalled for *The Guardian* her own trepidations concerning the play's possibly problematic trans-Atlantic move, notwithstanding the alliance and allegiances sworn between the Blair and Bush governments. The anticipated dissonance turned out to be not only generic and geographic, however, but historic as well:

> For a novelist who has not previously written for the theatre, New York did seem rather unbelievable, and, it has to be confessed, not a little frightening. This is a play, after all, that centres on British Asians or British Islamic converts, people who had all got caught up in the events that followed the obliteration of the Twin Towers. How would Americans deal with it?

> The first surprise came in the auditions. There a succession of male actors (*Guantánamo* being an essentially masculine event) wowed us with their English accents. Only after a half-dozen of these 10 minute comings and goings did it dawn on me why it was so odd - although the accents they produced for our delectation, were indeed English, they were culled from an England circa 1950.[2]

2. Gillian Slovo, 'Lost for Words', *The Guardian*, 11/09/04.

Other Anglo-American translations too were required, such as, 'In the play, an Englishman who lost his sister in the Twin Towers talks about the fact that he doesn't call it "9/11" - he didn't refer to the month and the day in that order before, so why should he now?'[3]

3. Ibid.

Whether 9/11 (or 11/9 as the case the may be) 2001 should be accredited, however controversially, as an epoch-making, or even deciding, datum of history's periodisation, those disputed 45 square miles of Guantánamo Bay, the now 'legal black hole' or 'law-free zone' leased by Cuba to the United States in 1903, have come to function as a crossroads of a sort - or crossed roads? - of historic movements, political debates, and international critical currents. Indeed, Guantánamo provides a central setting for two recent accounts of new directions for old imperatives: *Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor* (2005) by anthropologist-physician Paul Farmer who has worked between Haiti and Harvard since the early 1980s; and *Lawless World: America and the Making and Breaking of Global Rules from FDR's Atlantic Charter to George W. Bush's Illegal War* (2005) by British international lawyer and university professor Philippe Sands. If *habeas corpus* (literally, 'you should have the body', the legal term for the demand that a prisoner be brought before a court or a judge) is critical to the appeals of the current detainees held in Guantánamo's prison facilities, the insistence that their cases be heard before appropriate courts with proper representation, *habeas corpus* also, more interdisciplinarily perhaps, subpoenas the untold stories, the suppressed narratives, that those bodies, their voices, can yet tell, for themselves, by others, and, no less but surely more incriminatingly, on and about still other parties to the cases. *Pathologies of Power* maintains that, in order to understand 'what it means to be sick and poor in the era of globalization and scientific advancement' (p6), it is crucial to 'link case histories of individuals to broader analyses of health and human rights' (p19). Philippe Sands in turn, in his portrayal of a 'lawless world', describes by way of a series of institutional case studies just how, since World War Two and the Atlantic Charter, 'human rights took on a life of their own' (pxi).

'Lives of their own' are very much the focus of Paul Farmer's work in Haiti, Guatemala, Chiapas, Russian prisons, Peru, and Guantánamo; they are the topic too of the chapters that comprise *Pathologies of Power*, drawing as the essays do on the individual stories of the physician-anthropologist's patients across that geo-cultural spectrum of glaringly discrepant inequities in their shared struggle against the 'war on the poor' (rather than on behalf

of the 'war on terror'). In the final essay of the book, Farmer cites 'just a few examples' - statistics rather than stories - to emphasise the significance of the tales he tells: 'By 1995', he reminds his readers, 'the total wealth of the top 358 "global billionaires" equalled the combined income of the world's 2.3 billion poorest people. In 1998, Michael Jordan', Farmer goes on, 'earned from Nike the equivalent of 60,000 years' salary for an Indonesian footwear assembly worker. Haitian factory workers, most of them women, make 28 cents per hour sewing Pocahontas pajamas, while Disney's US-based chief executive makes $97,000 each hour he toils' (p222). Compelling as these figures might be, however, such data are not the crux of Farmer's presentation. As economist and Nobel laureate, Amartya Sen, describes it in his introduction to *Pathologies of Power*, 'A phenomenon can be either characterized by a terse definition or described with examples'.[4] In Farmer's words, that is, the '"texture" of dire affliction is better felt in the gritty details of biography' (p31).

4. Amartya Sen, 'Foreword' to Farmer, *Pathologies of Power*, op. cit., pxiii.

The 'lives of their own' are here - and there - the stories of impoverished peasants in the clinic in rural Haiti, of tuberculosis-ridden, multi-drug-resistant prisoners in Russia, and similarly stricken poor residents of the shantytowns of Lima, Peru - all of them among Farmer's 'partners in health'. Partners in Health (PIH) is the name of the organisation that Farmer founded to support his work in the small community in Cange, Haiti, an organisation that now provides medical care to peasants and prisoners as well as advice - and admonitions - to World Health Organisation (WHO) and World Bank policy-makers. As his biographer, Pulitzer Prize-winning Tracy Kidder, describes Farmer and his colleagues at PIH in *Mountains Beyond Mountains*, the care-giver's own life is that of a 'player in international health'.[5] According to Kidder, 'To classmates, later to his students, Farmer's medical memory seemed encyclopaedic and daunting, but it was not inexplicable. "I date everything to patients", he told me once. Patients, it seemed, formed not just a calendar of past events but a large mnemonic structure, in which individual faces and small quirks - he'd remember, for instance, that a certain patient had a particular kind of stuffed animal in his hospital room - were like an index to the symptoms, the patho-physiology, the remedies for thousands of ailments'.[6] That mnemonic structure traces as well a 'simple epidemiological map', a map, described by Kidder, that is devastatingly divided by 'what Farmer called "the great epi divide" (*epi* being short for *epidemiological*) - [that] would partition many countries, many cities'.[7] The same divide, however, serves to connect Haiti and Guantánamo Bay in Farmer's legendary history, each of the places a parcel of two divided Caribbean islands, one part - Haiti - a disputed nation, the other part - Guantánamo Bay - contested international terrain.

5. Tracy Kidder, *Mountains Beyond Mountains: The Quest of Dr. Paul Farmer, A Man Who Would Cure the World*, New York, Random House 2004 (first published 2003), p121.

6. Ibid., p113.

7. Ibid., p125.

Yolande Jean, a Haitian woman detained in Guantánamo in the early 1990s, is the story teller featured in Chapter 2 of *Pathologies of Power*, 'Pestilence and Restraint: Guantánamo, AIDS, and the Logic of Quarantine'. Yolande's story is special but not at all singular and represents the conflicted geography of health, diseases, and their various treatments, of human bodies and body politics. Following the 1991 coup that brutally ousted popularly-elected

Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide, thousands of Haitians fled their violence-torn country, seeking refuge and asylum on the shores of the United States. Haitians, ever since their revolution in the late eighteenth century, however, had not been made welcome in that territory whose own revolution had announced itself fewer than two decades earlier - and they had indeed failed in their appeal (so poignantly and epochally described by C.L.R. James in *The Black Jacobins*) to the ideals of 'liberty, equality, fraternity' no less nobly declared in France on the occasion of its own 1789 revolution.[8] Even as the French revolutionaries rejected the demands of the Haitian slaves asserting their rights at the turn of that earlier century, so too did the United States at the end of another century deny the appeals of refugees from Haiti's upheaval. Yolande Jean, who lost her family to Haiti's troubled politics, found herself quarantined - detained - at Guantánamo, one of so many of her compatriots, many infected with the AIDS virus, who had fallen prey to the predatory politics of hemispheric domination and despoliation. Yolande Jean participated in the initiation of a collective hunger strike on the part of the Haitian detainees. She was placed in solitary confinement.

8. C.L.R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution* [1938], London, Allison & Busby, 1980.

Already in 1991, Farmer notes, Guantánamo had become 'a place where non-US nationals would be stowed away in a sort of lawless limbo, out of reach of US or international law' (p57). Or, as Yale law professor Harold Hongju Koh describes it in his review of Brandt Goldstein's *Storming the Court: How a Band of Yale Law Students Sued the President - and Won* (2005), 'Guantánamo became a centre of international controversy and a stain on America's human rights reputation'.[9] *Storming the Court*, according to Koh who had been part of the 'band', describes the tortuous sequence of hearings in the early 1990s that followed from the suit filed in a Brooklyn federal court 'against the US government on behalf of screened-in Haitian refugees and several Haitian service organisations. Our initial claim', writes Koh, 'was that lawyers and clients had constitutional rights to speak to one another before the clients were returned to possible death or persecution in Haiti'.[10] In his postscript to the Guantánamo chapter in the story of 'pathologies of power', meanwhile, Farmer describes that same period of 'pestilence and restraint' as the 'most painful to update': although Yolande Jean is now faring well and reunited with her sons in New York, 'Guantánamo itself […] is once again teeming with prisoners: this time, with men captured in Afghanistan and alleged to be al-Qaeda terrorists. Journalists' access to the US base is again sharply restricted' (p80).

9. Koh, Harold Hongju. 'Captured by Guantánamo'. Open Democracy website. <http://www.opendemocracy.net/globalization-institutions_government/guantanamo_haiti_2867.jsp#>; Brandt Goldstein, *Storming the Court: How a Band of Yale Law Students Sued the President – and Won*, New York, Scribner, 2005.

10. Koh, op. cit.

For historian Charles Tilly, however, in his discussion of 'terror as strategy and relational process', stories, generically speaking at any rate, only aid and abet a perpetuated perpetration of dastardly deeds. According to Tilly, '[s]tories place limited numbers of actors within well-bounded times and spaces, accounting for everything that happens as consequences of those actors' behaviors'.[11] In curtailing the plot, restricting it to characters, it seems, stories for Tilly serve at best to circumvent a more fully dress-rehearsed analysis - of the setting or its context, the set-up so to speak. In other words, Tilly's words,

11. Charles Tilly, 'Terror as Strategy and Relational Process', *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 46, 1-2 (2005): 19.

> [s]tories simplify causation drastically by eliminating simultaneous and reciprocal causation, feedback, incremental effects, indirect effects, environmental influences, mistakes, and most unanticipated consequences. They do a wonderful job of making events and social processes memorable and comprehensible, but at the cost of ignoring the sorts of complex causation that appear regularly in biological, physical, economic, or sociological explanations of the same events and social processes. Everyday discussions of terror tell stories: terrorists - certain kinds of persons - felt desires to inflict harm on certain sorts of victims, and did so.[12]

12. Ibid., p20.

It is a story, however - or stories, rather - that makes for a historical narrative, of how 'human rights took on a life of their own', that structures Philippe Sands's *Lawless World*,[13] and its account of 'America and the making and breaking of global rules from FDR's Atlantic Charter to George W. Bush's illegal war'. For Sands, a QC and law professor who participated in the efforts in 1998 to extradite former Chilean president Augusto Pinochet from England to Spain to face charges of gross human rights violations during his infamous regime, it happened that, in the course of the post-World War 2 era, 'international law had wrought a revolution' (pxi). That revolution would, however, summon the legacies of previous canonical - and national - revolutionary agendas: the American, the French, the Haitian, the Russian, to name perhaps the better-known textbook cases. In the second chapter of *Lawless World* then, Sands asks his readers in the opening gambit to try to recall their own erstwhile disposition: 'Where were you when Pinochet was arrested?' (p23). For Sands, speaking again to his readers, 'In the select world of international law, October 16, 1998, is the closest you will get to a JFK or a John Lennon moment' (p23).

13. A new and updated edition of *Lawless Worlds*, released in early February 2006, includes an account of a memo detailing the meeting between Tony Blair and George W. Bush in January 2003 in which the two leaders agreed to military intervention in Iraq.

Those moments, the location of characters - and readers - in settings, constitute the plot of *Lawless World*, with its chapters accounting and recounting the tales of an International Criminal Court, the World Trade Organization, foreign investment protection, the US war on Iraq ('kicking ass in Iraq'), terrorists and torturers, along with tough guys and lawyers, 'seemingly disparate and apparently self-contained stories' (pxx). But Chapter 7 of *Lawless World* is entitled 'Guantánamo: The Legal Black Hole', and the very title suggests just how desperately the example - and the history - of those 45 square miles at the tip of an island off the coast of the United States prepositionally redisposed the concept itself of the 'rule of law'. Even Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia had to opine, in his dissenting opinion regarding the June 2004 ruling in the case of *Rasul et al v. Bush* to the effect that US federal courts did indeed have jurisdiction over the fate of Guantánamo's detainees, that, when all was said and done, Guantánamo was surely 'a foolish place to have housed alien wartime detainees' (cited in Sands, p172). Indeed.

While Guantánamo might well have been - and might even continue to be - a most 'foolish place', it nonetheless stands too as a crossroads, the setting,

the crossed roads of colliding and colluding historical narratives, the stories of individual detainees, the characters, making up the plottings of political projects. Four of those characters, Jamal al-Harith, Ruhel Ahmed, Moazzam Begg, and Bisher al-Rawi feature in the dramatis personae of *Guantánamo: Honor Bound to Defend Freedom*. Three of them - Jamal, Ruhel, and Moazzam, all British citizens - have been released. Bisher, a long-time British resident but an Iraqi citizen, remains in Guantánamo detention. They each tell their stories in the course of the play: Bisher, for example, was arrested in Gambia, together with his brother Wahab, where they were launching a business venture; Jamal had travelled to Pakistan to study religion; Ruhel writes to his family, asking them to send contact lenses and the solution for their cleaning from Boots; and Moazzam, who had travelled with his family to Afghanistan to implement water projects and stayed to teach school, is concerned that his wife and child will be looked after while he remains in detention. As his father says, in the opening scene of the play,

> Moazzam did his initial schooling there (in a Jewish junior school in England) and one day he said: 'Dad I want to make a society' and I smiled [because he was too young to talk about society] and said; 'what kind of society are you going to make son?' He said: 'A society to help older people, feeble people, and people with disabilities and all that.' So, I said: 'This is a very good thing, it's a noble thing. I'll not stop you doing that.' I don't know how far he went … (p7).

Moazzam Begg went to Afghanistan, to Guantánamo, and (was) returned to Britain, having been released without charge, in early 2005; at home in the UK both he and his father have continued to speak out against the US-led war in Iraq.[14]

As Frederick Cooper has noted in calling 'colonialism in question',

> To write as if 'post-Enlightenment rationality' or 'the cunning of reason' or the 'insertion of modernity' were what shaped the political possibilities of colonial situations is to give excessive weight to the determining power of agentless abstractions and offer little insight into how people acted when facing the possibilities and constraints of particular colonial situations. We lose the power of example to remind us that our own moral and political choices, made in the face of the ambivalences and complications of our present situation, will have consequences in the future.[15]

Guantánamo, then, and now. A 'foolish place', a 'legal black hole', a 'law-free zone', 45 square miles leased by Cuba to the United States in 1903. Quarantine centre for Haitian refugees fleeing a coup d'état and detention camp for enemy combatants from the US war on terror. The tales are all too telling. One such story was been told on March 28, in the summary hour and a half allotted to arguments by the Supreme Court in its hearing

14. Moazzem Begg, with Victoria Brittain, *Enemy Combatant:A British Muslim's Journey to Guantánamo and Back*, London, Free Press, 2006.

15. Frederick Cooper, 'Introduction', *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 2005, http://www.ucpress.edu/books/pages/10212/10212.intro.html

of the case of *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, with its conclusion to be delivered in the Court's subsequent decision: *habeas corpus* - where is the body? Where now, that is, are the bodies, the stories, the lives of their own, buried in and by the detritus of historical narratives - national, regional, hemispheric, global - that have intersected at 'crossroads Guantánamo' at the turn of a twentieth into a twenty-first century?

Englishness and its (Cricketing) Ashes

Claire Westall

Anyone But England: An Outsider Looks at English Cricket, Mike Marqusee, London, Aurum Press, 2005, 346 pages, bibliography; £8.99 paperback.

On Thursday 7 July 2005 four explosive devices were detonated on London's public transport network killing fifty-six people, including the four suspected suicide bombers. Exactly two weeks later, on Thursday 21 July, the capital was hit by a second series of four explosions. That same day the England cricket team was also in London, at Lord's - 'the home of cricket' - beginning their quest to regain The Ashes for the first time in sixteen years from Australia, their oldest imperial ally and cricketing foe. The public was calling for cricket to 'come home' even though England has not held an exclusive claim over the sport since at least 1882 when Australia first won 'the ashes of English cricket'.[1] On the afternoon of 21 July, recently re-elected leaders Tony Blair and John Howard (the Australian Prime Minister) held a joint press conference condemning the attacks on London, asserting their unity in the 'War on Terror' and reiterating that 'common values' bind England and Australia together except, as both men implied, on the cricket pitch. Whilst watching this live press conference and listening to the first Test Match between the two countries, I was holding a copy of *Anyone But England*, Mike Marqusee's study of English cricket.

Taking its title from Dennis Skinner's 1993 claim to support 'Anyone But England' in matters of international cricket, Marqusee's work was originally published in 1994 after England had been humiliatingly beaten 4-1 by Australia in the previous summer's Ashes series in England. Written under the shadow of these heavy defeats, the book carried the timely subtitle 'Cricket and the National Malaise' to reflect its concern with the dire situation of English cricket, and English society, during the early, Major-ridden, 1990s. It was revised in 1998 with a substantial new chapter exploring the four years since its release. Then, in the summer of 2005, on the eve of what would be a historic Ashes contest, Aurum Press reissued Marqusee's text as *Anyone But England: An Outsider Looks at English Cricket*, with a fresh final chapter that presents the author's thoughts a decade after his book's first publication - a decade that culminated in another conflict in Iraq, England's re-emergence as a powerful cricket team and the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB)'s decision to sell the vestiges of domestic cricket to Rupert Murdoch's Sky Sports.

In the context of a run of England victories and the consequent optimism surrounding the 2005 Ashes tour, Aurum moved away from Marqusee's

1. The Ashes is the biennial fixture between England and Australia whose name derives from a satirical obituary published in *The Sporting Times* in 1882 after Australia beat England in England for the first time. The obituary stated that English cricket had died and that 'the body [would] be cremated and the ashes taken to Australia'. An urn supposedly containing a set of burnt bails symbolising 'the ashes of English cricket' resides in the MCC Museum at Lord's regardless of who wins the series. Until 2005, England had not been able to defeat Australia and win an Ashes series since Australia won in 1989.

2. 1976 was the summer when, according to Marqusee, 'Clive Lloyd's masterful

specification of an English 'malaise'. Instead, they take their title's tag-line from Marqusee's position as an 'outsider' - an American who fell in love with cricket in the summer of 1976 without the personal baggage of a cricket-filled youth or the cultural millstone of cricket's nostalgic tie to Englishness.[2] Yet, this American-born baseball fan writes entirely from within cricket. His only loyalty is 'to the game itself', its 'visual beauty', its 'magical universalism', its ability to 'sell itself'. Throughout, Marqusee's belief in cricket's communal value, unfaltering sense of justice and intense socialist commitment set his work apart from orthodox histories of the game but firmly align it with C.L.R James' canonical *Beyond A Boundary* (1963) and those - like Chris Searle, author of the engaging collection *Pitch of Life* (2001) and Marqusee's friend and comrade - who have followed James' lead.[3] Moreover, *Anyone But England* is a broad, fast- moving but well-researched study that reads nation and empire, race and class, money and prejudice through the polysemous game of cricket and, in doing so, identifies the post imperial 'malaise' (or 'melancholy' for Ian Baucom and 'melancholia' for Paul Gilroy) that continues to haunt England and English cricket, even in victory.[4] Although Aurum's 2005 edition sadly lacks an index (so usefully provided in the first edition) and the concluding chapter is all too brief for its own political ramifications, it constitutes the most comprehensive and up-to-date version of what is an influential, insightful and highly readable examination of cricket and Englishness on and off the field of 'play'.

Before concentrating on cricket's 'clash with modernity' post 1960, Marqusee offers a brief but pertinent synopsis of the game's history, its obsession with its own historical narrative and its relationship to the construction of specific notions of English identity or Englishness. For he understands that 'the past shades and highlights, nuances and enriches cricket … [but] also sits like a dead weight on the game cutting it off from sources of renewal' (p71). He draws particular attention to the manner in which cricket was transformed from a rural game into a modern sport at the end of the eighteenth century but was simultaneously inscribed with the image of an always-already lost pastoral England. As Anthony Bateman has explained, cricket was 'identified with its past [real and imagined] at the very time that it was inaugurated as a product of modernity'.[5] Like numerous other critics, Marqusee also highlights the way in which cricket became 'a distillation of Englishness' (p74) in the nineteenth century when, as C.L.R James has described, the figures of Thomas Arnold, Thomas Hughes and W.G. Grace came to dominate the ideology of Englishness as encapsulated by Muscular Christianity, the amateur gentleman, 'fair play' and 'it's not cricket', all so famously portrayed in *Tom Brown's School Days* (1857) and spread throughout the Empire.[6] Marqusee adds that the nineteenth century 'integration of world cricket under the English landed elite coincided with the beginnings of that elite's decline in domestic and international politics' (p112). For him, a straight line can be drawn from the 1784 Star and Garter Committee of 'Noblemen and Gentlemen' who established a complete version of 'the laws

West Indian side blew away Tony Greig's puny Englishmen' and the superiority of the black players from the Caribbean caused much anxiety among English commentators (p20).

3. C.L.R. James, *Beyond a Boundary*, London, Hutchinson, 1963; Chris Searle, *Pitch of Life: Writings on Cricket*, Manchester, The Parrs Wood Press, 2001.

4. See Ian Baucom, 'Mournful Histories: Narratives of Postimperial Melancholy', *Modern Fiction Studies*, 42,2 (1996): 259-88; Paul Gilroy, *End of Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture*, London and New York, Routledge, 2004.

5. Bateman, Anthony '"More Mighty than the Bat, the Pen … ': Culture, Hegemony and the Literaturisation of Cricket', *Sport in History*, 23,1 (2003): 27-44.

6. My own Ph.D. thesis, entitled 'What *Should* We Know of Cricket Who Only England Know?' explores these issues further by considering cricket's place and purpose in English and Caribbean Literatures and examining the occupiable spaces in the discourse of Englishness offered by the 'literaturisation' of cricket.

of cricket' and were 'men who took for granted their right to rule at home and abroad' (53), and the modern membership of the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC), including the late John Paul Getty who stands as an 'impressive testimony to the endurance of landed wealth as a touchstone of elite status in English cricket', even if he was only 'an expensive copy' (p95).[7] In charting and demystifying cricket's past, Marqusee seeks and repeatedly manages to expose the historically derived instabilities, double-standards and hypocrisies at the heart of English cricket, and thereby of the ideology of Englishness itself. He even suggests that 'hypocrisy … is indeed one of the things that makes English cricket *English - the way it lies to itself about itself. The Englishness is in the lie*, in the culture of the honest yeoman and the village green, in the denial of cricket's origins in commerce, politics, patronage and an urban society' (p71).

7. As Marqusee notes, Getty, having bought 'a stately home at Wormsley in Buckinghamshire from the Fanes, an aristocratic family of a former England Test captain … attempted to recreate country house cricket' (p113).

As Marqusee surveys English cricket's more recent domestic and international affairs he tracks the continuity of the hypocrisy of Englishness as it is performed in cricketing actions and relations at home and abroad. He demonstrates that the myth of the 'level playing field' is still promoted despite the large scale exclusion of black and Asian players and the English cricketing establishment's persistence with its 'see no evil, hear no evil' approach to racism in the face of racist chanting at Test matches broadcast live on television and/or radio.[8] The same racially charged hypocrisy bemoaned the 'danger' presented by West Indian fast bowlers - stereotyped by David Firth as 'seven foot monsters' - but failed to object to the absolute ferocity of the Australian duo of Thomson and Lillee against the West Indies in 1975-76 and perpetually sees little wrong with English 'bouncers'.[9] It also tolerates, if not promotes, the double standard that allowed England's cricketers on the one hand to argue for the separation of sport and politics, flout International Cricket Council (ICC) regulations, and play cricket for hefty remuneration in white South Africa during the Apartheid era, and, on the other hand, to argue for the inextricability of sport and politics, again flout ICC regulations, and *refuse* to play cricket in Zimbabwe during the 2003 World Cup. It sanctions the contradiction that enables cricket's traditionalists to call for money and politics to be kept out of the game even as they actively court financial investors and seek political support. It also allows Christopher Martin-Jenkins (a voice of cricketing conservatism in *The Times* and on *Test Match Special*) to claim, without a hint of irony, that 'whatever else may have been true about world cricket, when it was in the hands of England and Australia, greed and political point-scoring never entered anyone's head' (qtd. in Marqusee, p260). Marqusee pointedly cites this response to the news that the Asian subcontinent would jointly host the 1996 World Cup instead of England (who had given up the 'right' to serve as automatic hosts of the competition in 1983) as typically English in its tone of unhistorical and hypocritical superiority. It was certainly difficult to see England or Australia, as represented by their premieres, refraining from political point scoring on 21 July 2005.

8. Some may claim that the recent arrival of Monty Panesar in the England team marks the beginning of change for the cricket establishment but this remains to be seen.

9. Making this point in his first autobiography, *Hitting Across the Line*, London, Headline Books, 1991, Viv Richards, now Sir Vivian Richards, wrote that the West Indies started to field four quick bowlers precisely because Australia 'had done this to [them]' in 1975-76. Richards suggests it is racist hypocrisy for the West Indies to be criticised or penalised for adopting this line of attack (pp73-74).

The success of the collective Indian, Pakistani and Sri Lankan bid and

the resultant 1996 World Cup is more fully explored in *War Minus the Shooting*, Marqusee's superb study of cricket, the nation and the market on the Asian subcontinent.[10] In *Anyone But England* he gives more attention to the controversial Pakistan tour of England in 1992 when the ability of Waqar Younis and Wasim Akram to reverse swing the ball (something Simon Jones does to great approval today) solicited cries of 'cheats'. Not only does Marqusee highlight the fact that the 'cheating' was not officially an issue during the series but also that the type of seam lifting or ball tampering described was so common in English cricket that the same season Surrey County Cricket Club was fined for ball tampering and Alec Stewart, England's vice-captain, told he would be dismissed as Surrey's captain if it happened again, as it had done twice since 1990 (187). Marqusee also quite rightly suggests that '[t]he clash between "England" and "Pakistan" became not only a battle between nations, but part of a larger war between "the West" (embodied in fair play, honest umpires, and decorum on the field) and Islam (embodied in extravagant appealing, disrespect for umpires, and cheating)' (pp190-91). It was a battle that continued when Ian Botham and Alan Lamb sued Imran Khan for libel in 1996 (their suit failed) and that was of course strengthened in its ideological resources by the 'War on Terror' in the wake of 9/11 and last year's bomb attacks in London. It is likely to be further fuelled by future confrontations between England and Pakistan, particularly those on English soil where the questions of belonging, nationhood and identity are most acute. Indeed, the summer 2006 tour by Pakistan may provide new and old ammunition for the tabloids in the form of the bowling action of Shoaib Malik, who has recently been cleared by the ICC of the charge that his bowling action is illegal, and the ferocious pace and temperament of fast bowler Shoaib Ahktar.

10. Mike Marqusee, *War Minus the Shooting*, London, Heinemann, 1996.

Anyone But England's underlying concern is with cricket's relationship to Englishness, in all its complex contradictoriness, and the burden this has placed on the game and its participants; a burden Marqusee saw embodied by the defeated England team of 1993 who 'seemed bowed down not just by the burden of losing, but even more by the burden of representing their country' (p26). Marqusee perceives the chaos which surrounded the selection of the England team in the early 1990s, the team's poor performances and the plentiful excuses proffered in the wake of its failures as emblematic of 'English in a Shrinking World' in which 'the projection of empire', on which English national identity and superiority had formerly rested, is now 'the projection of the loss of empire' (p277). Indeed, 'English cricket is a mirror of what Englishness has become. It epitomises the shift from a nationalism based on dominance to one based on insecurity' (p279). This insecurity, a combination of traditional insularity and fear of a world no longer under control, is the basis for the racialised tropes of inclusion and exclusion that underpinned Norman Tebbit's 1990 cricket test, aptly described by Marqusee as a 'perfect example of the new racism in which the old naked assertions of white supremacy, discredited by the collapse of empire and the decline of

England as a world power, are replaced by an emphasis on mutually exclusive cultural identities' (p158). The 'Tebbit Test' gives rise to a question that runs throughout *Anyone But England*, namely; 'just who [is] an Englishman and, more importantly, who [is] not?' (p33). It was a question raised by Henderson's racist 1995 article 'Is It In The Blood?' for which Devon Malcolm successfully sued *Wisden*. It was also a question raised by the all-white Ashes-winning England team of 2005 which included Simon Jones, a Welshman, Geraint Jones, a Welsh-Australian (who had lived in Australia and learned his cricket there until the age of 22) and Andrew Strauss and Kevin Pietersen, two South African-born batsman. Pietersen, in fact, had left South Africa for England as recently as 2001, convinced that affirmative action in the post-apartheid state was preventing him from securing the place that he believed he deserved in the South African team. Eager, no doubt, to establish his credibility as an 'Englishman' - his authenticity and commitment - he had the blue England Three Lions emblem tattooed onto his left upper arm. When he scored 150 runs in the final test match to secure England's series win, however, all legitimate questions concerning his national belonging were drowned out by the noisy celebrations of victory.

Anyone But England moves from Ashes to Ashes, from 1993 to 2005, from defeat to victory. Matthew Engel (present *Wisden* editor) made a valid point in his rather cutting review of the 2005 edition when he argued that Marqusee should have made more of England's self- imposed departure from the ICC Chairmanship in 1993. However, it was unfair of him to criticise the book for being dated because of its focus on England's run of failures and to conclude that the 'game has moved; the book has not'.[11] Marqusee himself recognises the change in England's fortunes but is wisely cautious about the fetish that is today being made of 'success', that is, about the increasing demand for national teams to be *seen* (that is to say to be branded and marketed) as successful, and for success to be the sole criterion, to be obtained by any means. Consequently, he opposes Tony Blair's assertion that 'in sport, as in politics, victory is all. The well fought campaign for second place means nothing' (331). Surely, the 2005 Ashes series showed that Blair was out of touch with the cricket supporters who were enraptured by the games before any result had emerged? Marqusee remains sceptical about claims that victory in The Ashes will re-ignite popular interest in the game in England, pointing out that participation has fallen in the last few years and that the de-listing of home Tests and their sale to Sky will mean their disappearance from terrestrial television just as newcomers have started to like the look of cricket. Still, Marqusee is never pessimistic about cricket or its future and remains confident about the game's ability to thrive as a *game* - if not necessarily a national one - if people are given the chance to see it and play it. He repeatedly calls for a 'democratic redistribution of power and resources' to combat cricket's narrow social base and help establish a 'living bond between the "top" and "bottom" of the game' (p135). As 'unresolved conflicts within the nation are the nation' (p298), Marqusee argues that 'in the

11. Matthew Engels, 'A Generous Spirit and Political Spin', <www.Wisden.com>, 25 August 2005. England's recent 2006 tour of India with its very mixed performances and results highlighted the need for a continuing analysis of England's collapses and defeats, especially in the wake of the 2005 Ashes success.

modern world, the search for a homogenous national culture or unchanging national identity [is] both futile and dangerous, and an historic burden on English cricket' (p335). Hence, he believes that 'cricket is its own end' and that the 'best thing for cricket is for young people to forget the "English" part and rediscover the game' (p318), to take up cricket for cricket's sake and leave the game's Englishness to its ashes.