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Abstract
For cricket purists, Test cricket is the only game to watch. An international contest between two teams lasts up to five days and requires skill, perseverance and grace in batting, while demanding endurance, tactics, skill and guile when bowling and fielding. For cricket aficionados, Test contests are rewarding and challenging as the balance of the game fluctuates over two innings a side, and the pressure of the event can expose as many frailties in individuals as it can reveal aspects of strong character.
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INTRODUCTION
For cricket purists, Test cricket is the only game to watch. An international contest between two teams lasts up to five days and requires skill, perseverance and grace in batting, while demanding endurance, tactics, skill and guile when bowling and fielding. For cricket aficionados, Test contests are rewarding and challenging as the balance of the game fluctuates over two innings a side, and the pressure of the event can expose as many frailties in individuals as it can reveal aspects of strong character. Watching a batsman play himself in and then build a big score can take all day, but it can be a very enjoyable one as a spectator, often seated in the outer ground or in the grandstand, preferably partaking of some liquid refreshment. There is the thrill of seeing a master batsman take a bowling attack to pieces or watching a fast bowler devastate opposing batsmen in short bursts. Equally enthralling can be a spinner weaving his magic on a final day turning pitch when the fielding side just needs those last two wickets to win the game, while spectators hope vainly that the no. 10 and no. 11 batsmen can hang on for an honourable draw in the final overs. But such cricketing delicacies take time, so it was perhaps inevitable that in the revolution of media and communications developed in the 1960s and 1970s, ‘extravagances’ such as a five-day game would be revised to fit with the demands of immediacy.

In 1963 the game of ‘limited overs’ cricket, known now as ‘one-day’ cricket, was introduced into the English county competition (Pollard 662). In this style of cricket two teams bat for one innings each on the same day for a limited number of overs. The game still takes about eight hours, but there are fewer long breaks and there are restrictions on field positions within the first 15 overs. Initially limited overs cricket was for 60 overs a side but the standard format has become 50 overs per side.1 At first such a break with tradition attracted enormous hostility. The new game was described by traditionalists as a ‘circus’ or ‘pyjama cricket’ owing to the colourful clothing adopted by national teams. Ironically, the very commercialisation of the game provided a lifeline to Test cricket, which was suffering from dwindling crowds and stale television coverage. The revenue gained from the more frequent one-day international competitions (or ‘ODI’ as they are now known), played usually before or after the Test series, assists national...
The 2007 Cricket World Cup

The West Indies has a proud cricket history and is unique in that it is a ‘national’ team with players from more than one nation-state. The West Indies cricket teams to finance their tours, to develop new cricketing talent, and to pay elite players in an era of professionalism. For purists, the short version of the game has moved from an anathema to a necessary evil.

The biggest prize in one-day cricket is the quadrennial World Cup. This event was first held in 1975 and has been staged in England (1979, 1983, 1999), the subcontinent (1987 and 1996), Australia and New Zealand (1992), and South Africa (2003). It has grown in importance and has become financially lucrative for both winners and hosts. For the 2003 World Cup held in South Africa, with games also in Zimbabwe and Kenya, a total of US$5 million in prize-money was offered with a $2 million cheque to the winner and $800,000 for the runner up (CricketInfo, 2003a). Over 40,000 international tourists were expected to attend the 54 matches at 15 venues in the three countries (South Africa Info). In the end over 626,000 people watched the 52 matches’ and the opening ceremony (WCCOC), and the games had a television audience of an estimated 1.2 billion people (Illawarra Mercury).

The 2007 Cricket World Cup will be held in the West Indies, and estimates are that around 100,000 tourists will descend on the region (Best 3). International visitors require a variety of accommodation types, meals, tickets to the games, and nightclubs and bars in which to celebrate. Caribbean states are already well placed to handle such demand but could do more to streamline the movement of tourists between different islands. Integration of schedules and migration controls in airports may facilitate tourist travel, banking and other services, and may produce an unforgettable Caribbean experience for the many thousands of international cricket supporters who may desire to return later. The Caribbean Community (CARICOM) has the opportunity to use the event to work toward the full implementation of its planned Caribbean Single Market Economy (CSME). A World Cup in the Caribbean would also provide a significant cash injection to West Indian Cricket in the form of revenue from broadcasting rights, and the West Indies Cricket Board (WICB) has reportedly already concluded broadcast rights with BSkyB for an undisclosed amount (BBC Sport, 2002a 2). This article focuses on the preparations for the 2007 World Cup to explore some of the issues associated with increased regional integration in the Caribbean. The island and mainland states of the Caribbean world, as well as the West Indies cricket team, will need to focus on making the event both a sporting and economic success. To maximise this opportunity Caribbean states need to push the CSME concept right to the boundary. Long after 2007, when the World Cup competition has receded into memory, the significant effects of increased integration on the economies of Caribbean states through the creation of a common market will remain.

The 2007 Cricket World Cup

The West Indies has a proud cricket history and is unique in that it is a ‘national’ team with players from more than one nation-state. The West Indies
was one of the first Test playing nations (1926), and from the mid 1970s to the early 1990s they were the undisputed Test cricket champions. Their rise to world dominance in the 1970s and 1980s was based on raw talent. Teams were built on a fearsome all-pace attack and were characterised by graceful, yet destructive, batting. Despite the Caribbean’s economic woes, the West Indies cricket team — often known as the ‘calypso kings’ or ‘The Windies’ — provided a focal point for Caribbean people and gave them enormous pride. The West Indies won the first two World Cup finals in 1975 and 1979, were runners-up in 1983, and set the standard in fielding that other teams sought to emulate. As in politics, however, staying at the top is difficult and any long-term period of domination becomes increasingly difficult to sustain, as rivals strive harder to take the top position. With player retirements in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the once mighty calypso kings became relative easy-beats and they went through a humiliating slump. Fortunately there are signs of a resurgence with some strong performances throughout 2003 and 2004.

The career of current Test Captain Brian Lara in some ways mirrors the fortunes of the West Indies cricket team during this recent period. The mercurial left-hander from Trinidad was first capped in the Third Test against Pakistan at Lahore in 1990, but he really set the international cricket public talking as the sun began to set on West Indies cricketing domination. With his 277 against Australia at the Sydney Cricket Ground in January 1993 Lara came of age (Baggy Green). The next year he set record Test and first class cricket scores — 375 for West Indies against England at St John’s, Antigua in April 1994 (Cricket Org 2003a), and 501 not out for Warwickshire against Durham in June of the same year (ECB). As a batsman he is much respected, but he alone can only do so much. After some indifferent form in the late 1990s, Lara led the way in the West Indies’ first World Cup game in 2003 against host country South Africa where he hit a stylish 116 from 134 balls as the West Indies scored 278 and bowled the hosts out to win by 3 runs (Sydney Morning Herald). Almost a decade after his Sydney double century he captained the young West Indies team against current Test and World Cup champions Australia in a spirited but ultimately lop-sided four test series in the Caribbean in April and May 2003. The Sir Frank Worrell Trophy was retained by Australia on the back of the 3-1 result, but the West Indies’ Fourth Test victory at St John’s, Antigua (admittedly a dead rubber) produced the highest successful fourth innings run chase in Test history when the West Indies scored 418 to win by 3 wickets (Miller, 2003a). Their good form was partly carried into the one day series where the West Indies came back from 4-0 down to end Australia’s unbeaten 21 game winning one-day streak, ultimately losing 4-3 (Miller, 2003b). At the ‘national’ level, the backbone of a strong Test and one day teams is emerging, and if the current players stay it will be a team that reflects the cultural diversity of the Caribbean. The 2003 West Indies Test squad against Australia involved the Guyanese Shivnarine Chanderpaul and...
Ranmnaresh Sarwan, the Jamaicans Marlon Samuels and Jermaine Lawson, Devon Smith from the Windward Islands, Ridley Jacobs from the Leeward Islands, Brian Lara, Mervyn Dillon and Darren Ganga from Trinidad and Tobago, and Vasbert Drakes, Pedro Collins and Tino Best from Barbados.

Lara has been in the team for the high points — including the last time Australia was beaten in a Test series at home (1994) — and for the low points, especially the one-day defeat by then cricketing minnows Kenya in a 1996 World Cup game in Sri Lanka, a loss that sent shock waves around the cricketing world. In the international market of competitive sport, a batsman as talented as Lara is much in demand, and for those fortunate enough to be blessed with cricketing talent, the ability to play at international level may lead to a secure financial future. The high remuneration offered by the English county cricket competition draws many of the best players from Test cricketing countries. West Indian cricketers of the calibre of Vivian Richards and Clive Lloyd made a decent income playing for English county teams, then for World Series Cricket, as well as stints in Australia’s state-based competition when it needed an injection of talent in the 1970s and 1980s.4

There were, however, places where some West Indians would not go. In the days of white minority rule in South Africa, the cricket chairman (and 2003 World Cup organiser) Dr. Ali Bacher offered Vivian Richards a blank cheque to play in South Africa. Returning the cheque, the ‘Master Blaster’ (as Richards was called in the sports media) allegedly said, ‘Till the day comes when you people will recognize a man irrespective of the colour of his skin, I’ll not go to your country’ (Woolridge). These days however a rehabilitated South Africa is an acceptable place for West Indians to earn a living from cricket. Lara has played for Northern Transvaal, and in 2003 Jamaican Jimmy Adams, then recently retired from Test Cricket, was skipping the South African Free State side in the South African Provincial championship (Alfred). At an individual level cricket can provide select West Indians with opportunities to earn a relatively high income, if good enough, and with national selection comes opportunities for self-enrichment.

**CRICKET, POLITICS AND THE 2003 WORLD CUP**

Alone among Test cricket playing nations, the West Indies team does not represent a single nation-state. Test playing nations have national cricket boards that are independent of their governments, although they are often pressured to adopt the stance of the government on specific issues. In the Caribbean the game is administered by the West Indies Cricket Board (WICB), which functions as a board of control, and it is in the unusual position of having to balance the views of many independent governments, as well as the interests of the players. It therefore has difficulty in taking a political position on any matter, except perhaps player safety. As it has to be physically located somewhere, its offices are in St John’s Antigua (WICB 2004a). The WICB regulates the international fixtures,
selects the ‘national’ coach, appoints the selectors, and issues press releases. The WICB website further provides up to date statistics and other information on Caribbean cricket competitions, cricketers, records and news.

An example of the difficulties facing the WICB in balancing player payments, player safety and security, as well as politics, came in the 2003 World Cup in South Africa. With each game a matter of potential earnings, maximising the opportunity to play generally makes political principle a thing for wealthy nations. South Africa as the host of the 2003 World Cup, and in its bid to ‘share the spirit’, scheduled some pool matches outside of its own territory. Six games were scheduled for Zimbabwe, three each in Harare and Bulawayo, and two for Kenya, both in Nairobi. In the lead-up to the start of the World Cup competition the political situation in Zimbabwe and the security situation in Kenya became central issues and the international cricket community found itself divided.

The move to boycott the Zimbabwe games was led by the governments of England and Australia. In doing so they found themselves at odds with other participating World Cup countries, their own cricket boards and the International Cricket Council (the ICC).

The security situation in the other East African host nation, Kenya, was also in the news. On 31 January 2003 New Zealand Cricket announced it did ‘not believe the International Cricket Council’s (ICC) decision to play in Nairobi was reasonable’ (ABC News Online), citing the ICC Security Delegation report which made it clear there was a ‘tangible terrorist threat in Nairobi’. The other team set to play in Kenya was the West Indies and during these dramas the West Indies Cricket Board (WICB) consistently refused to make any comment on safety in East Africa, on the ‘right’ or ‘wrongness’ of travelling to Zimbabwe, or on the positions adopted by other teams with respect to Zimbabwe or Kenya.

In mid January both the acting chief executive of the W1 cricket board, Roger Braithwaite and opening batsman Wavell Hinds issued press releases to say that BBC quotes attributed to them about Zimbabwe which claimed they supported touring, were fabricated (BBC Sport). An example of the difficulties facing the WICB in balancing player payments, player safety and security, as well as politics, came in the 2003 World Cup in South Africa. With each game a matter of potential earnings, maximising the opportunity to play generally makes political principle a thing for wealthy nations. South Africa as the host of the 2003 World Cup, and in its bid to ‘share the spirit’, scheduled some pool matches outside of its own territory. Six games were scheduled for Zimbabwe, three each in Harare and Bulawayo, and two for Kenya, both in Nairobi. In the lead-up to the start of the World Cup competition the political situation in Zimbabwe and the security situation in Kenya became central issues and the international cricket community found itself divided.

The move to boycott the Zimbabwe games was led by the governments of England and Australia. In doing so they found themselves at odds with other participating World Cup countries, their own cricket boards and the International Cricket Council (the ICC).

The security situation in the other East African host nation, Kenya, was also in the news. On 31 January 2003 New Zealand Cricket announced it did ‘not believe the International Cricket Council’s (ICC) decision to play in Nairobi was reasonable’ (ABC News Online), citing the ICC Security Delegation report which made it clear there was a ‘tangible terrorist threat in Nairobi’. The other team set to play in Kenya was the West Indies and during these dramas the West Indies Cricket Board (WICB) consistently refused to make any comment on safety in East Africa, on the ‘right’ or ‘wrongness’ of travelling to Zimbabwe, or on the positions adopted by other teams with respect to Zimbabwe or Kenya.

In mid January both the acting chief executive of the W1 cricket board, Roger Braithwaite and opening batsman Wavell Hinds issued press releases to say that BBC quotes attributed to them about Zimbabwe which claimed they supported touring, were fabricated (BBC Sport). In international relations, doing nothing can sometimes be a very important strategic move. WICB officials did not take a position on these issues, but given the difficulties of balancing the views of several national governments as well as player concerns about the possibility of lost payments and lost world cup points, this was not surprising. However there are other explanations for the apparent non-position. While playing in Kenya was perceived as a security risk by New Zealand, it is unlikely that the same risk was attached to a West Indies game. New Zealand is identified with Western interests and the cricketing ‘establishment’ of England and Australia, despite its refusal to support the ‘coalition of the willing’. On the other hand West Indies cricketers are seen as being supportive of Kenya and sharing a past of colonial domination with the other non-white Test nations.

In international relations, doing nothing can sometimes be a very important strategic move. WICB officials did not take a position on these issues, but given the difficulties of balancing the views of several national governments as well as player concerns about the possibility of lost payments and lost world cup points, this was not surprising. However there are other explanations for the apparent non-position. While playing in Kenya was perceived as a security risk by New Zealand, it is unlikely that the same risk was attached to a West Indies game. New Zealand is identified with Western interests and the cricketing ‘establishment’ of England and Australia, despite its refusal to support the ‘coalition of the willing’. On the other hand West Indies cricketers are seen as being supportive of Kenya and sharing a past of colonial domination with the other non-white Test nations.
Tourism would be the obvious winner. It would help Kenya for both the interests of its own players and for itself. The WICB's policy of no tacit support for the hosts. The ICC had already given its approval to the WICB's bid to host the 2007 World Cup in the Caribbean. The WICB's policy of no comment also served to maximise potential future votes on the ICC membership board, comprised of the ten Test playing nations and three associate members, one of whom was Kenya ICC Executive Board. Playing the match in Kenya would help Kenyan cricket authorities, themselves pressing for full ICC membership and thus Test Match status. In this instance the WICB was able to help Kenya for both the interests of its own players and for itself.

The 2003 World Cup had a television audience of approximately 1.2 billion people. A world cup in the Caribbean will no doubt similarly provide a significant cash injection in the form of broadcasting rights, and generate significant multiplier effects for several cricketing and non-cricketing Caribbean states alike.

CARIBBEAN CRICKET

For the majority of Caribbean cricketers being selected for the national team will remain a goal, and the domestic competition is probably the farthest they will climb in world cricket. At the 'domestic' level, cricket is organised into first class and one day competitions. In the Caribbean the championship for the longer version of the game is named after the major sponsor, Carib Beer, and is comprised of six teams: Barbados, Guyana, Leeward Islands (the islands between Anguilla and Dominica), Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and the Windward Islands (the islands between Martinique and Grenada). In 2003 both a touring India A side and a West Indies B side participated in an effort to raise the skill level of the championship (Cricket Info 2003c). For the 2004 competition Kenya replaced India A as the international invitee, but with the winning cash prize of just US$10,000, and $150 for each man of the match award (WIBC 2004b), the incentive to play in the England county championship is still strong where contracts for established Test players are often in the region of £40,000-50,000 a season.9

For decades Caribbean cricketers were without structured support and hence entirely reliant on their individual talent and business acumen. Recently moves have been made to develop the best young local players. In 2001 the Shell Antilles and Guianas Ltd., a major petroleum supplier and shipping company, in a joint venture with the WICB, commenced its sponsorship of the Shell Cricket Academy, located at St George’s University, Grenada. The institution aims to train young cricketers not only in cricketing skills — such as shot selection, slips fielding techniques, running between wickets, and improving bowling action — but also computer and other literacy skills, and financial management (Nicholas 2002).

Administrative and financial support is also firming at the international level. For the 2003 World Cup, the West Indies Player Association (WIPA) reached an agreement with the WICB to maintain the equal split of sponsorship moneys. In September 2003 the WICB announced the formation of a bid to host the 2007 World Cup in the Caribbean. The WICB's policy of no comment also served to maximise potential future votes on the ICC membership board, comprised of the ten Test playing nations and three associate members, one of whom was Kenya ICC Executive Board. Playing the match in Kenya would help Kenyan cricket authorities, themselves pressing for full ICC membership and thus Test Match status. In this instance the WICB was able to help Kenya for both the interests of its own players and for itself.

The 2003 World Cup had a television audience of approximately 1.2 billion people. A world cup in the Caribbean will no doubt similarly provide a significant cash injection in the form of broadcasting rights, and generate significant multiplier effects for several cricketing and non-cricketing Caribbean states alike. Tourism would be the obvious winner.
addition, the West Indies’ major sponsor, the LNM Group, the Trinidad-based second largest steel producer in the world (Nicholas 2003), was to award the team incentives for reaching each stage of the World Cup (Reuters 2003a). The financial benefits for teams that win such prestigious championships are considerable. The Australian players who won the 2003 World Cup took home AUD $3.6 million (Reuters 2003b), or around AUS$224,000 each for the seventeen players who formed the squad, each. Such prize money in the Caribbean would go some way toward setting a player up for his retirement. The world’s best Test cricketers such as Sachin Tendulkar (India), Brian Lara (West Indies), Ricky Ponting or Shane Warne (Australia), have increased earning power through playing contracts and advertising endorsements. West Indians playing full-time in the Caribbean are not as fortunate as the contracts and match payments are much less. On the whole individual and even team success in cricket can do little to ameliorate the larger problems of standards of living in the Caribbean, however, the 2007 World Cup has the potential to bring significant foreign exchange, infrastructure, construction and expansion in the service sector, particularly in tourist facilities. Hosting this major sporting event will be a challenge and Caribbean states will need to deepen their efforts at regional integration to make sure they receive the full economic benefit.

**THE 2007 WORLD CUP IN THE WEST INDIES**

The governing body of the game of cricket is the International Cricket Council (ICC), composed of cricket playing nations and geographic areas from around the world. The World Cup tournament is allocated on a continental basis and all cricketing countries registered with the ICC are eligible to submit bids to host matches. The 2007 World Cup is actually allocated to the North American continent but the status of the West Indies as a Test nation — as well as the fact that West Indians understand, appreciate and support the game — dictates that the Caribbean host the event. However, the ICC is keen to expand the game globally and therefore invites bids from all cricketing nations, basing its decision to allocate games on the best possible financial returns and the interest of promoting cricket. In the North American continent Canada has competed in several World Cups, most recently in South Africa, while the United States of America and Mexico are ICC Associate Members. All three countries have apparently expressed an interest in hosting World Cup games. The big threat to Caribbean cricket is the USA, which boasts over 10,000 domestic players but plans to increase this to 40,000 by 2006, and hopes to attain ODI status in the same year, guaranteeing it an automatic place in the 2007 World Cup. The USA has 37 separate cricket leagues and a stated objective of hosting one-day games between full members at various locations (USACA). Managing director and CEO of ‘Windies World Cup 2007’, Chris Dehring, claimed it was a ‘distinct possibility’ that some part of the tournament would be played in the USA. Disney World, in Orlando Florida, could perhaps be a venue (BBC Sport 2003b).
While the event appears to have been secured, the WICB has not rested on its laurels and has announced the creation of a Cricket World Cup 2007 Board with 15 members. The new organisation includes Chris Dehring, several WICB nominees, as well as a representative from CARICOM, one from the Caribbean Tourism Organisation, business leaders, aviation and communications specialists, the St Lucian Minister of Foreign Affairs and a finance attorney (WICB 2003). The success of the World Cup depends to a large extent on streamlining travel between the various Caribbean islands and to Guyana. Pat Rousseau clearly understood this in 2002 when he stated ‘We cannot have 10 or 11 customs and immigrations to clear. It is nonsense’ (BBC Sport 2002b). To this extent the Cricket World Cup 2007 Board’s primary purpose dovetails well with the larger project of regional integration that is the basis of the CARICOM organisation. If the World Cup is a success, the region may be poised to enjoy the benefits of further regional cooperation.

**REGIONAL COOPERATION IN THE CARIBBEAN**

Historically regional cooperation between Caribbean states has been difficult to achieve. The attempt to bring the Caribbean together into a political or economic union between 1958 and 1961 to create the Caribbean Federation was not successful. This pre-independence system was intended to unite the thirteen English speaking colonies into a political federation that would then grant individual independence within a large federated Caribbean state after five years. When Jamaica withdrew, largely because of economic concerns about subsidising smaller Caribbean nations, the scheme was effectively finished (Manley 22-23). Independence did however come to the British Caribbean territories that desired it.13 From these new states came also a desire to have closer association, especially economic integration, and the signing of the Treaty of Chaguaramas in 1973 marked the formation of the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM). The slow progress of CARICOM toward realising its goals was further regional cooperation.

The ICC Executive has the power to allocate matches, and former WICB President Pat Rousseau claimed the ICC could take the event away from the West Indies if facilities were not adequate by 2005, although the ICC denied there was a deadline. It is likely that most, but perhaps not all, World Cup games will be played in the Caribbean in 2007. To secure the fixtures the WICB has made progress on venues and infrastructure, as well as undertaking a study tour of the 2003 World Cup in South Africa (AFP 2003a). Rousseau claimed that in 2002 only Grenada’s facilities were up to standard (BBC Sport 2002b), a fact confirmed by Dehring when he admitted at a July 2003 ICC meeting in London that ‘… the West Indies understood that the world expected international standard stadium facilities, quality support services, enhanced security, efficient event management and commercial responsibility. … A team of dedicated professionals will be hired to help us deliver a truly world class event with Caribbean flavour’ (AFP 2003a).

To this extent the Cricket World Cup 2007 Board’s primary purpose dovetails well with the larger project of regional integration that is the basis of the CARICOM organisation. If the World Cup is a success, the region may be poised to enjoy the benefits of further regional cooperation.

**REGIONAL COOPERATION IN THE CARIBBEAN**

Historically regional cooperation between Caribbean states has been difficult to achieve. The attempt to bring the Caribbean together into a political or economic union between 1958 and 1961 to create the Caribbean Federation was not successful. This pre-independence system was intended to unite the thirteen English speaking colonies into a political federation that would then grant individual independence within a large federated Caribbean state after five years. When Jamaica withdrew, largely because of economic concerns about subsidising smaller Caribbean nations, the scheme was effectively finished (Manley 22-23). Independence did however come to the British Caribbean territories that desired it.13 From these new states came also a desire to have closer association, especially economic integration, and the signing of the Treaty of Chaguaramas in 1973 marked the formation of the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM). The slow progress of CARICOM toward realising its goals was...
recognised at the 1989 Heads of Government meeting in Grenada and identification of the areas that required increased cooperation began in earnest (Department for International Development (DFID) 1). That meeting identified nine areas where improvements in regional cooperation was desired: (i) institutional arrangements and procedures for critical decision making in CARICOM; (ii) the rights of establishment, provision of services and movement of capital in the community; (iii) industrial policy; (iv) trade policy; (v) agricultural policy; (vi) transport policy; (vii) disadvantaged countries, regions and sectors; (viii) competition policy; subsidies and dumping; (ix) disputes settlement (Ibid 2). On 5 July 2001 an amended treaty that sought to redefine the ‘objectives, organs and powers’ of CARICOM and to create the ‘Caribbean Community including the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME)’ was opened for signature. The revised Treaty of Chaguaramas (the CSME Treaty) requires states to sign up to Protocols I to IX, which form the basis of a plan of action for increased regional integration (CARICOM 2002a).

CARICOM aims to integrate Caribbean states into a single economic entity with uniform laws in key areas, a free flow of goods and services and the ability to bargain collectively with the outside world. One benefit of regional cooperation is that Caribbean states would no longer compete against each other for markets in which to sell similar products. When this point is reached CARICOM will cease to exist and will become CSME. CARICOM’s Terms of Reference: Caribbean Single Market and Economy (CSME) Assessment of Region’s Support Needs argued that a consultant was required to study and identify apparent problems preventing the implementation of the nine protocols. While monetary union and fiscal harmonisation were not originally on the agenda, the document noted that it was time to embrace such ideas and push toward a true common market (DFID 1).

The CSME goal will involve the abolition of protective tariffs under which such industries as exist in the Caribbean were created, so across the region progress toward integration has been uneven and has foundered on the rock of state self-interest. In international relations, states frequently join organisations on the chance that the association will be beneficial, even if they are unsure about their real level of commitment. The hesitancy is often due to concerns by nations over their sovereignty, a concept that can be loosely understood as a state’s control over what goes on within its borders (Krasner 142). Involvement in regional organisations necessarily involves tradeoffs between the domestic and international spheres. The nine key areas of proposed action for CARICOM involve significant changes to the functioning of Caribbean states, and to some extent the creation of supra-state institutions such as a Caribbean Court of Justice. To an extent the CSME concept abrogates national sovereignty but, like the European Union, the idea is to create something closer to ‘pooled sovereignty’ where nations agree to create a body that can assist in regional governance, while states retain paramount importance in decision-making and within the
institutional structures they have created (Kegley and Wittkopf 190-191). The positive effects need to outweigh the negative consequences before states enter into such agreements. As Paul Sutton (1993 9-10) notes, the reason that Caribbean states are involved in regional cooperation at all is so that they may increase their individual development.

Specific CARICOM policy goals have been the creation of a common market for goods and services, the furthering of social welfare in health and education infrastructure, articulated transport systems and a forum in which to attempt to develop coordinated foreign policy. Such moves are of benefit to all Caribbean states, so it is no surprise that the number of treaty signatories has expanded since 1973 when only four states — Barbados, Guyana, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago — signed the original instrument (CARICOM 2004a). By September 2003 thirteen of the fifteen CARICOM states had signed the revised 2001 treaty that created the CSME— Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago — leaving only Montserrat to sign, yet only seven had ratified the instrument, and of these only Barbados and Suriname had enacted the treaty into their domestic law (CARICOM 2003a 1).

By late 2003 all member states had identified Ministries with responsibility for CARICOM Affairs (Ibid). Twelve member states have signed an agreement to create a Caribbean Court of Justice that may hear disputes arising from conflict between states, and ten have ratified the instrument (Ibid), which is sure progress from April 2003 when only Barbados, Guyana and Saint Lucia had ratified (CARICOM 2003b 2). Some progress has also been made on the important provision of the Free Movement of Goods, although most states retain discriminatory internal taxes or other fiscal charges on goods of community origin (CARICOM 2003a 2). CARICOM passports have not yet come into operation, nor have states taken action on the removal of barriers to the free movement of capital (Ibid 3-4).

In 2003 CARICOM celebrated its 30th birthday, however, the process of regional integration in the Caribbean is not yet complete. Despite significant achievements in identifying areas where efficiencies could be created and cooperation increased, further commitment to progress on economic integration and the creation of a single market is required. One of the main reasons that regional cooperation is desirable is because it is perhaps the best defence against the policies of neo-liberal economic globalisation that promote competition amongst nations and specialisation in production. Small states that first create a common market among their own members may be partially shielded from the economies of scale of larger developed states and form the fluctuation of global commodities markets. Regional cooperation thus provides one defence against the vulnerabilities felt by small nations. Colonial rule was largely responsible for the plantation economies in Caribbean states and the sectoral imbalances of production. The irony may be that the most enduring cultural trait of colonial
rule — cricket — provides the driving influence to overcome these economic problems through the unexpected benefit of forcing regional integration.

CONCLUSIONS

Thankfully for cricket purists the prospect of a World Cup final played at Disney World in Orlando Florida appears to be receding. This nightmare scenario will at least make it to the second round of the tournament. As 2003 World Cup hosts South Africa found to their detriment, it is important to do the sums right in cricket games,15 and Kenya showed that a non-Test playing team can reach the semi-finals if it can cause a few upsets and other results go their way. But the West Indies will need more than just correct mathematics and luck to reap the maximum benefit from this coming event. The 2007 World Cup will not solve the economic problems of Caribbean states, but CSME may well assist the lives of Caribbean people by creating a more stable economic structure, and closer interaction between states and peoples.

NOTES

1 While the first limited overs World Cup was held in 1975, the popularity of the modern one-day game owes much to the later rupture between the cricketing ‘establishment’ and 66 of the world’s best international players who from 1977 signed up for the new ‘World Series Cricket’ (WSC) competition sponsored by the Australian media magnate Kerry Packer. In essence the dispute concerned taking cricket from an amateur sport and making it a professional sport that could be made more suitable for broadcast on television.

2 Two of the planned 54 games were cancelled. England withdrew from their contest with Zimbabwe over security concerns and New Zealand did the same for their bout against Kenya (see note 16).

3 The idea of a Caribbean community has been around for some decades and is discussed later in this article.


5 The controversy over Zimbabwe concerns land, food, race and political control. Of the minority white population of around 250,000 in 1979, some 190,000 have now left for Europe and the USA.
left. The remaining 60,000 white Zimbabweans represent under half of one percent of the population of over 12,627,000 million. Nonetheless around 4,000 white farmers own about one third of the land in Zimbabwe, and the countries most productive farms. Supporters of President Robert Mugabe seized white farms, and the issue became central to the March 2002 election won by Mugabe's Zimbabwe National African Union Patriotic Front (ZANU–PF). The Commonwealth Chairpersons' Committee on Zimbabwe — President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa, Nigerian President Chief Olusegun Obasanjo and Prime Minister John Howard of Australia — examined the election results and concluded they were deeply flawed with widespread vote rorting and intimidation. It then called for international agencies to assist Zimbabwe with food shortages, and for South Africa and Nigeria to work with Zimbabwe with an end to promote political reconciliation between the Mugabe government and its opponents, principally the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC). The Commonwealth then delivered its ultimate sanction — suspension — effective immediately for one year. ICC member nations who sought to play their fixtures in Zimbabwe would be doing so against the backdrop of Zimbabwe's suspension from the Commonwealth.

Such fears stem from the bombing of the US Embassy in Nairobi on 7 August 1998 that killed at least 213 people, and possibly as high as 254, injuring between 4,500-5,000. On 28 November 2002 the Israeli-owned Paradise Hotel in the port city of Mombasa was bombed, killing thirteen people, three of whom were Israelis on holiday.

For their part the West Indies played in Kenya at the Kimberley ground in Nairobi on 4 March, and won.

The story allegedly claimed that Jamaican opener Wavell Hinds, wicket keeper Ridley Jacobs and WICB chief executive Roger Brathwaite had argued against a boycott of Zimbabwe.

Figure is an educated guess as details of contracts are private. As an incentive to performance England in 2000 adopted an elite 'central contract' system for the main Test players, each worth around £250,000, for up to 20 players. This mirrors a system adopted by Australia — examined the election results and concluded they were deeply flawed with widespread vote rorting and intimidation. It then called for international agencies to assist Zimbabwe with food shortages, and for South Africa and Nigeria to work with Zimbabwe with an end to promote political reconciliation between the Mugabe government and its opponents, principally the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC). The Commonwealth then delivered its ultimate sanction — suspension — effective immediately for one year. ICC member nations who sought to play their fixtures in Zimbabwe would be doing so against the backdrop of Zimbabwe's suspension from the Commonwealth.

The ICC has 10 Full Members, 27 Associate Members and over 50 affiliate members. The ICC Executive Board works to fulfil the ICC objective of promoting cricket around the world and consists of the President, the Chief Executive Officer, the ten Full Members and three Associate Members — currently Kenya, Malaysia and Holland. The three non-Test playing positions are rotated among Associate members. Some of the lesser-known Affiliate member states where the game of cricket is played include Iran, Finland, Brazil, Vanuatu and, apparently, Afghanistan (ICC 2004).

The Bahamas is a member of the Caribbean Community but not the Common Market.
South Africa miscalculated under the Duckworth-Lewis system employed to decide rain affected matches and drew their final Pool match with Sri Lanka. They required one more run to win but the South African batsman Mark Boucher, acting on instructions from captain Shaun Pollock who believed the score was enough, blocked the final ball. Pollock was later relieved of the captaincy and South Africa descended into a state of mourning as they failed to qualify for the tournament they were hosting. The incident shows how the local team doing well is important for local media coverage and enthusiasm when staging a large event.
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