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Introduction

In February 1990 South African President FW de Klerk unbanned the African National Congress (ANC), the South African Communist Party (SACP) and the Pan African Congress (PAC), allowing these organisations to return to ‘normal’ and active politics within the country after an absence of almost three decades. Nelson Mandela and FW de Klerk were the leading figures in the protracted and complicated negotiations of the early 1990s. South Africa’s first non-racial government was elected when the ANC won a landslide victory in April 1994. Perhaps not unexpectedly, given the balance of power between the apartheid state and the liberation movement, much was conceded during negotiations. Those who had pinned their hopes on a state-led, and interventionist economic recovery programme to address the inequities in power and wealth were to be disappointed. For by the end of the Cold War, a neo-liberal approach to economic management (also referred to as the Washington Consensus), with an emphasis on labour, trade and financial market liberalisation and the privatisation of state assets, was dominant. Programmes of re-distribution and redress in many sectors of South African society were placed on the back burner, as the new government attempted to demonstrate its commitment to this new global agenda.

Despite the formation of non-racial sporting bodies in many codes at both national and provincial levels, sport (including cricket) in early post-apartheid South Africa appears to have displayed continuity rather than disjuncture with its racist past and this segment of society remained firmly in the grip of the old-white elite, for whom it was ‘business as usual’, but with the crucial added bonus of international respectability.
The ANC appreciated that symbols, songs and icons distinguish nations from each other, that sporting victories create positive images of national strength, and provide ‘shared memories’ and ideas of ‘common destiny’, and appropriated sport as part of its nationalising programme (Booth 1998: 210). This paper explores a variety of issues arising out of these changes in the province of KwaZulu-Natal. Who are the beneficiaries of change? Is transformation in cricket just racial tokenism? Are there new tensions among blacks – Africans, Indians and coloureds – over the transformation agenda? Are issues of corporate governance, in what is clearly a major industry, creating new difficulties? Among other issues it looks at the historic construction of boundaries between Indians, whites and Africans in the struggle for control of cricket in this province in the first decade of freedom. The paper is less a narrative about cricket than it is about the making and persistence of race and ethnic classifications, the struggles over resources, and the attempts to mould disparate racial, economic, political, and ideological interests into a common nationhood.

While Africans make up the majority population in KwaZulu-Natal, Indians and whites together constitute over ninety-five per cent of cricket players and administrators in the province, both historically and in the contemporary period. Cricket has always been popular among coloureds, but their numbers in the province are negligible (Desai et al 2002: chapter 4). Unlike the Cape and the Transvaal, historical circumstances resulted in cricket failing to take root among Africans in Natal. Cricket was first introduced to Africans in Durban when the local state appointed JT Rawlins as its ‘Native Welfare Officer’ in April 1930. His mandate was to gainfully occupy the leisure time of the burgeoning African urban population so as to take their minds away from political ‘agitation’. Cricket was part of a larger project by the local state to change African leisure-time activities, with the collaboration of capital, white liberals and African middle classes. The local state sponsored African participation in national tournaments for almost three decades. However, cricket was confined to African elites in Christian missions and schools, where it was part of a wider transmission of European norms and values, as well as among clerical workers in Durban and Pietermaritzburg. Soccer and leisure activities like dance halls and music, which required less investment of finance and time, were more practical for a migrant population employed primarily in low-paying jobs as dockworkers and domestics. Population growth and changes at national level, with the coming to power of the National Party in 1948, changed the
relationship between the state and Africans. The state relied increasingly on coercion to control Africans. From the 1950s Africans were relocated to townships devoid of facilities, especially for cricket which required proper playing conditions. The popularity of soccer increased while cricket ceased to be played from around 1960 (Desai et al 2002: chapter 3). Cricket was re-introduced to Africans in the 1990s and a growing number of players, coaches and administrators are coming to the fore. Their role in the struggle for control of cricket will be taken up in the latter part of this paper.

Constructing racial boundaries
The roots of racial boundaries between Indians and whites can be traced to the colonial experience when white settlers imported Indian indentured workers. They were followed by traders from the west coast of India. The emergent colonial settler government, feeling economically, socially and politically threatened by Indians, treated them legislatively as a homogenous and discrete racial category and subdued them on the basis of that race. In indentured workers, they found a convenient other (Vahed 1995:53). While Indian migrants were divided by language, religion, culture, caste and class, use of the appellation ‘Indians’ inferred that the attribute ‘Indianness’, united them as a collectivity in opposition to whites and Africans. According to Bhana, ‘Indianness’, a complex construction constituted historically through struggles among disparate Indians, and between them and whites and Africans, became racialised in the creation of white supremacist rule (Bhana 1997:100).

It was during the colonial period that the hub of what Said (1978) calls ‘Orientalism’ was instituted in the core organising principles of Natal’s polity and economy. The racially typified indentured labourers were considered different to Africans, steadier (‘the faithful servant’), but more sinister and avaricious (‘the wily Oriental’); close supervision and systematic discipline were consequently embedded in the indentured system (Vahed 1995:17). Racial separateness became more rigorous after Union in 1910 and apartheid in 1948. Racial segregation by residence, racially-segmented labour markets and wages, and a close relationship between race and concrete institutions – governmental, civil, educational and so on – ensured that race mattered for people’s life chances. Race carried ascriptive meanings and was the fundamental social categorisation for most South Africans, in a hierarchy of multiple identities. Race identity and race boundaries are sustained by new dynamics in post-apartheid South Africa. As Maré
reminds us, South Africans still ‘operate with race as a collective identity and as the articulating or organising principle for other identities … race thinking is embedded in our everyday thinking’ (Maré 2000:2).

**Cricket in South Africa: the changing global and national context**

In Victorian England cricket was seen as a particularly useful way of morally ‘disciplining colonials’ and inculcating ideals of stamina, manliness, and vigour into ‘lazy and effete’ colonials. Its spread to the Caribbean, Australia, the Indian sub-continent and South Africa had an underlying ‘quasi-official charter that was moral and political’ (Appadurai 1995:27). In South Africa, cricket came to represent British class ideology in relation to Afrikaners, and racist exclusion in relation to blacks. While all South Africans played cricket, whites represented South Africa (Nauright 1997:26-27). Cricket was also popular among Indians, Coloureds and Africans in the Eastern Cape, who developed separate cricket structures and cultures (Odendaal 1977; Desai et al. 2002; Reddy 1999). A South African Cricket Board of Control (SACBOC) was formed in 1947 to organise inter-race tournaments between Africans, Indians and Coloureds. Non-racial provincial units replaced racially-based bodies in 1961. Membership in racially-segregated cricket communities reinforced the notion of being white, African, Indian or Coloured.

South Africa was isolated from world cricket from 1970 when the British government bowed to public pressure and asked the English Cricket Board to call off South Africa’s tour to England because of its apartheid policies. During twenty-two years of isolation, international teams were paid huge sums of money to break the boycott. Most blacks developed a deep hatred of South African teams and openly supported the opposition during ‘rebel’ tours. ‘No normal sport in an abnormal society’ became the slogan of the non-racial South African Council of Sports (SACOS), which was formed in 1973 to facilitate an international sports boycott (Nauright 1997:140).

There was rapid change from the late-1980s and particularly after the release of Nelson Mandela. The cancellation of a tour by English rebels led by Mike Gatting at the beginning of 1990 was followed by the first unity meeting between non-racial and white cricket bodies in September 1990, the inauguration of the United Cricket Board of South Africa (UCB) in June 1991, ‘readmittance’ to the International Cricket Council (ICC) in July 1991, a tour of India in November 1991, participation in the World Cup in Australia in February 1992, and a tour to the West Indies in April 1992.
ANC officials agreed to South Africa’s return to international cricket before a political settlement was reached to assuage white fears of cultural swamping by a majority African population (Nauright 1997:154). Grant Farred makes the pertinent observation that:

… in and of itself the use of such terms as readmission and return are tantamount to legitimising the apartheid past; it implicitly authorises white post-apartheid hegemony. It invalidates the SACOS struggle, obliterates the history of nonracial cricket, and anoints the achievements of white players. (Farred 2000:146)

South Africa’s speedy re-entry to international cricket upset many SACOS stalwarts. During negotiations the two sides had agreed on a ‘Statement of Intent’ which called for, among other things, ‘respect for the sports moratorium against cricket tours to and from South Africa’. SACB members recognised they were behind in terms of skills because of historical disparities and felt the moratorium would force whites to take seriously their pledge to redress imbalances. International cricket meant that black administrators lost an important leverage during negotiations. There was bitterness that the beneficiaries of apartheid continued to profit. Veteran anti-apartheid campaigner Hassan Howa felt that the tour to India was ‘dishonest. It represented only those who enjoyed the great benefits of racial discrimination. It was not a South African team but a white South African team’ (Saturday News 15.11.91). Howa was hurt that through the 1960s and 1970s he had vetoed international tours by non-racial teams, telling great black players to make sacrifices until political change had been achieved (Saturday News 15.11.91). Former president of the non-racial Natal Cricket Board Ahmed Kharwa was equally critical during a public meeting in Ladysmith in November 1991:

As sportsmen and administrators we accept and recognise the importance of unity as South Africa moves towards democracy. However, we feel betrayed by the breach of faith by the ANC in lifting the sports moratorium prematurely. It is disturbing that while the objective of the sports moratorium to normalise South African society was far from achieved, there has been indecent haste to participate internationally. Unity for the sake of unity is unacceptable. (Ladysmith Gazette 6.12.91)

Kharwa felt that white players and administrators, ‘desperate for international cricket’, had got their ‘first prize too easily’ (interview 16.07.2002). Black administrators were in a quandary: no international cricket meant there would be no money for development. Cricket tours were as seen as the way
to bankroll the spread of the game into townships. White cricket administrators like Ali Bacher and Raymond White retained effective power to ensure that local and international business sponsorship would not be frightened off.

**Contesting Unity: the Natal Cricket Union, 1991**

Unity in Natal must be viewed in the context of developments at national level. Negotiations between the non-racial Natal Cricket Board (NCB) and Natal Cricket Association (NCA) gave birth to the Cricket Union (NCU) on 23 May 1991. The affairs of the NCU were to be managed by an Interim Executive of 14 members, seven from each side. According to Farred:

>SACU hegemony within the UCBSA was achieved via a dual strategy. The evacuation of SACB history and, more strategically, the absorption of nonracial players and administrators, *sans* traditions. Nonracial players and clubs have had to accommodate themselves to new cricket infrastructures that bear no evidence of their struggles, their customs, of their past. Administrators have been assimilated, for the most part nominally, into the official structures of the SACU, in the guise of the UCBSA. (Farred 2000:142)

This dual strategy played itself out at provincial level. NCA vice-president Don Macleod became the first president. The NCB was absorbed into the infrastructure of the NCA, with its headquarters at Kingsmead. The lease of the ground remained in the name of the NCA ‘to ensure continuity and legality’. One of the first acts of the NCU was to appoint Brian Short as Chief Executive. Short, as public affairs manager of the Natal Building Society during the 1980s had shown a great appetite for supporting the NCA financially, but was reticent about supporting non-racial cricket (Desai et al 2002: 378). White dominance was reflected in other key positions such as the Director of Playing Affairs, Mike Procter, and the Director of Administration, Vic Hohls. The commitment to real change and transformation at grass-roots level took a back seat, as we shall now see.

**The [Under]-Development of Cricket**

**Struggles of [former] NCB clubs**

Given the atrophy of non-racial cricket by the 1980s, it was unreasonable to throw black and white cricketers together and apply merit without interventionist policies. Four teams from the NCB, Clares, New Era, Aurora and Kismet who had merged with Pirates, were included in the new Premier League of 16 teams. Many NCB clubs merged in order to become more competitive. Unification, according to Booth:
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... forced Black clubs to amalgamate, ostensibly to strengthen their competitiveness. Amalgamating tradition is not easy. It takes time to build allegiances to symbols and to develop working relationships. Nor could the new leagues absorb all the players. The three clubs with five teams suddenly became one club with three teams. This left thousands of black enthusiasts without cricket homes. (Post 29.03.95)

NCB teams found it difficult to be competitive. One of the first crises was implementation of a decision during unity talks that the Premier League would be reduced from 16 to 12 at the end of 1992/93. The decision to reduce the league would have excised all teams from the old NCB. Former NCB officials Logan Naidoo and GV Naidoo argued for a moratorium on relegation ‘as the reduction of the league ‘would not be in the best interests of cricket in Natal.’ It was agreed to retain the 16 team league for three seasons. This reprieve was temporary. The odds were stacked against teams from the NCB. They lacked proper facilities and sponsorship, while the new NCU continued to pander to white interests, without taking cognizance of history. Clubs with long histories started to fold as they failed to generate resources to keep playing the game.

**Provincial team: ‘baaskap’ management**

During the early 1990s there were many outstanding young black cricketers like Yunus Bobat, Imraan Paruk and Jesse Chellan. Jesse Chellan was the best batsman in the NCB at the time of unity. He had a poor first season but was excellent in his second season, scoring over 700 runs in Inter-City league and a century for Natal B. But that was the limit of his progress. He was not selected for the A team. In the absence of proper facilities and training, an unfamiliar environment, feelings of alienation and low expectations on the part of white officials, most of these players became disillusioned and some gave up the game altogether. Ashok Odhav, a former NCB executive member, complained that ‘a white player is given countless chances because of his “tremendous potential”; if a black player fails once he is dumped’ (Post 6-9.01.98).

During the mid-1990s Natal had a powerful team and ‘development’ took a distant back seat. Winning was prioritised; there was little will to redress historical imbalances. In 1997/98, the UCB introduced quotas which made it mandatory for provincial B teams to include at least three black players. Graham Ford was concerned about the ‘feelings’ of whites players, who might have to be excluded to meet quota requirements. He asked black selector Krish Reddy how he was expected to explain this to whites
The indifferent response of whites was reflected on the playing fields. On 16 January 1998 young fast bowler Desigan Reddy represented a Natal Academy XI against Gauteng, but was not asked to bowl a single ball while part-time white bowlers were given preference (Daily News 22.01.98). Disdainful treatment became a regular experience for black players.

The anger of blacks was fuelled by a number of other ‘race’ incidents. Pat Symcox was accused of being abusive towards South African Indian spectators during a match against Pakistan in Durban in February 1998. A disciplinary committee found that he used abusive, but not racist, language. During the same match, trainer Paddy Upton was fined £250 and fast bowler Fanie de Villiers warned for getting into a confrontation with South African Indian spectators (Electronic Telegraph 14.03.98). Many South African Indians particularly despised Allan Donald because he swore at Rahul Dravid of India during a match at Kingsmead in January 1997 (Daily News 28.01.97). Abbey Naidoo felt that white cricketers were deliberately aggressive ‘to teach dark-skinned cricketers who is boss’ (Sunday Tribune 14.02.99). According to a UCB report, the anti-South African sentiment among South African Indians in Durban was ‘even worse’ than that experienced in Australia, South Africa’s traditional rivals. White players were made to run ‘the gauntlet of hostile and often acrimonious racial abuse and the worst kind of foul language imaginable’ (Cricinfo 13.03.98).

Another row broke out in February 1999 when Brian McMillan asked a teammate to bowl a ‘coolie creeper’ to an Indian player Ashraff Mall during a domestic match between Western Province and KZN. McMillan’s reaction to protest against his comments was that he had used a ‘cricketing term’ and the fuss was a ‘load of crap’ (Natal Witness 06.03.99). The white editor of a local newspaper felt that ‘we must be careful not to fall into the trap of conducting a purge of terminology that is termed politically incorrect’ (Sunday Tribune 07.03.99). For Indians, ‘coolie creeper’ was not a cricketing term. It was freely used by white schoolboys who understood its derogatory connotations. According to Valentine Daniel, while ‘coolie’ referred to a servant in India, in the imperial context the word acquired a different connotation. ‘Coolie’ is a mixture of Gujarati and Tamil terms and has to do with a denial of personhood and suggestions of someone devoid of morals (Daniel 1992). Whites and Indians in colonial Natal understood this very well. For example, ‘White Man’ wrote to the Natal Mercury (26.08.99) that while ‘coolie’ literally meant a servant, in Natal the ‘word “coolie” can only
be used in speaking of Indians. Neither work nor anything else under the sun can make a white man a “coolie”’. ‘Cricket Lover’ added that ‘creeper’ signified using a sneaky way to get a stubborn batsman out: ‘sneaky like conniving, manipulating, shrewd and cunning Indians. These are the very images that whites created of Indians in Natal’. (*Daily News* 10.03.99).

**The ‘development’ programme**

The UCB’s ‘development programme’ aimed at ‘broadening the culture of the game, democratising opportunities for all our communities, [and] ultimately assisting in establishing cricket as the “peoples” game’ (UCB 1997). Since 1986 coaches had been going around South African townships to spread the game. The operating budget in 2001 was R35 million (*Cricinfo* 30.08.2000). Development was inherently problematic. It was launched in African townships that lacked a culture of cricket, like Soweto and Alexandra, because cricket was a key component of the apartheid regime’s programme of upgrading African townships. The game failed to take root. ‘Development’ could not be launched in Indian, coloured or African townships with a cricket tradition, because anti-apartheid organisations made it impossible for white cricket to make inroads (*Post* 29.03.95). After unity, critics felt that development was not taken seriously. An anonymous letter writer ‘Let Justice Prevail’ complained in 1992 that past officials of the NCB had conveniently forgotten past struggles ‘among people of colour’:

> All that matters to these people who have moved from ‘shorts and sandals to three piece suits’ appears to be personal gain, popularity, status, being seen with prominent white figures and cheap publicity ... It is only on ‘special days’ that the UCB organises busloads of aspiring black mini-cricket players in free T-shirts and displays them in front of TV cameras. (*Daily News* 3.10.92)

A related problem was the thrust of programmes. Mohammed Timol, who attended an NCU meeting chaired by Don McLeod in 1992, complained that ‘the belief that underpinned this strategy was that blacks had to be introduced to the game. There was disregard for the fact that they had a long cricket history and needed facilities and opportunities’ (Interview 01.08.2002). The failure of ‘development’ was a national malady. A UCB investigation in September 1997 concluded that black administrators felt they were accommodated in positions where they could not influence policy or attain ‘ownership’ of programmes, and concluded that a ‘paternalistic approach was very much in evidence’ (UCB 1997). It was clear by the late 1990s that the development programme had failed.
Neglect of schools cricket
For several years after unity, African, Indian, coloured and white schools played cricket separately. Black youngsters handicapped by inadequate facilities and poverty could not compete against whites from affluent backgrounds, with access to the finest education and coaching. There was no conduit for talented black players to progress. The Director of Playing Affairs only attended white schools cricket weeks, while the identification of black players was on an ad-hoc basis (Naidoo 1993:224). The progress of black schoolboys was left to interested parents. One such initiative was led by Mohamed Timol. In 1990, Timol approached Andrew Layman, then chair of Natal Schools Cricket, to field an under-16 team in the Offord Week in 1993, a tournament that brought together top cricketing schools in the province. Timol’s composite side, known as Clubs X1, had a traumatic time. Timol complained to Layman on 10 December 1993 that players of Kearsney College directed racist comments against his players. For example, when Clubs players cheered a team member, a Kearsney fielder shouted: ‘Shut up you coolies’. Against Ixopo a spectator shouted ‘Bowl daardie Coolie a creeper’. Against unbeaten Maritzburg College, when last man Pranesh Naidoo was bowled for 13, he was told by Cowley ‘get off you fucking Coolie’.

Timol complained of the treatment of black players in a confidential report to the NCU dated 23 January 1995. When selected for representative teams, black players were not given an opportunity to bat or bowl. Black and white officials interpreted affirmative action differently. Timol referred to clause 5 of the Affirmative Action Charter which stated that ‘the process of affirming the disadvantaged player must occur by ensuring that his role is no less significant than any others in the team’ (Timol to NCU 01.04.95). Timol met with Mike Bechet, the manager of the schools team, on 14 February 1995 to resolve this issue. A disappointed Timol reported to the NCU on 20 February 1995 that the meeting had been futile because Bechet was adamant that ‘the success of the team is the most important factor’. He did not understand ‘affirmative action to mean the boys of colour had to be preferred over white boys’. White players and administrators refused to acknowledge historical discrepancies and provide opportunities to black players.

‘Unity’ and its discontents: COGOC and NAMIC
In the mid-1990s many blacks began to express their disquiet about the absence of black players in the Natal team. Some exchanges were
acrimonious. Black administrators were branded ‘sell-outs’ by critics. SK Reddy remembers being constantly badgered: ‘It didn’t matter where you were. Somebody would come up to you and ask how come there were no Indians in the team.’ (Interview 12.10.2001). Criticisms from old stalwarts of the NCB began to gain momentum. Ronnie Govender, former non-racial sports official, condemned black officials as ‘former fighters against racialism who … now that they are ensconced in cushy careers, have abandoned the struggle. It is time they realized their public responsibility and woke up.’ (Daily News 13.05.98).

Black supporters became convinced that white cricket structures would not provide opportunities for black players. Black anger at marginalisation lacked an organisational imperative. The first signs of organised opposition came from a group of ex-NCB players and administrators who organised a pressure group in December 1996 called ‘Concerned Group of Cricketers’ (COGOC). Leading members were Karam Hiraman (president), Ash Bissessar (vice-president) and Nelson Raju (secretary). According to Raju, by 1996 former NCB officials and players had become

… thoroughly disgusted at the slow pace of transformation. We had the distinct impression that they had been co-opted. They were projecting the façade of transformation taking place…. We were not only interested in the few administrative positions and players. We were frustrated with the whole thing, who was selling the peanuts, ice-cream, cricket caps. Whites were running the show with a few cosmetic changes. (Interview 26.07.2002)

COGOC, Hiraman explained, wanted to protest against the lack of transformation, transparency and stakeholder involvement in cricket. They were concerned that the NCB had been incorporated into the dominant white organisation. The ‘NCB system’ had ceased to exist while the white system was there with a few ‘comfortably ensconced’ Indians at the top, who were incapacitated by the fact that they had lost contact with former colleagues and clubs, and were helpless to bargain within the white-dominated organ (Interview 26.07.2002). COGOC’s strategy included criticising former NCB officials through articles to the press, holding meetings, canvassing among clubs and writing to government (Interview Bisesswar 25.07.2002).

By April 1997 COGOC had branches in Ladysmith, Pietermaritzburg, Stanger, Tongaat, Verulam, Phoenix, Sydenham, Chatsworth and Isipingo. At a meeting at Springfield Training College on 23 March 1997 ‘to
formalize the concerns and grouses of a growing constituency’, COGOC members rejected ‘meritocracy’ in a context of ‘massive inequalities in resources, opportunity, education and leisure time’ and called for ‘a mass infusion of new blood into cricket’s top structures instead of the gradual entryism of the type propagated by the leadership of the UCB’, and a Truth and Reconciliation Commission make those who ‘propped up racist cricket … account for their actions’ (Hiraman Collection).

While COGOC’s letters to the UCB and Minister of Sport Steve Tshwete on 25 May 1997 were ignored, the KZNCU was forced to the negotiating table. At a meeting on 13 May 1997, COGOC argued that cricket had failed to assist in the creation of democracy and was in fact detrimental to nation building. KZNCU president SK Reddy, however, said that black officials did not need the mandate of the ‘community’. He argued that since the NCA and NCB had merged into the KZNCU, leaders could not be accountable to a body (NCB) that did not exist (Minutes Hiraman Collection). The KZNCU did not fulfill its promise of a follow-up meeting.

By December 1997 the numbers of the disillusioned had grown. A group of younger cricketers, organised by Sadha Govender and Sathie Govender, met with COGOC in Chatsworth on 15 January 1998. These ‘Young Turks’ felt that COGOC was ‘too academic’ and that its strategy of letter writing and petitions would not produce meaningful changes. Together with COGOC, they formed the Non-Aligned Movement in Cricket (NAMIC), which called for active protest such as holding placard demonstrations at matches and organising boycotts. The aim was to galvanise the support of black clubs to unseat the white power structure. A carefully planned public protest during a one-day international between Pakistan and South Africa at Kingsmead on 3 April 1998 gave publicity to the cause. About 100 members entered the ground and, as pre-arranged, met below the new multi-million rand electronic scoreboard, the most conspicuous point in the ground. They held placards denouncing the national team as unrepresentative. It was a brave act in a hugely hostile environment, and added pressure on the UCB (Interview Vishnu Tewari 31.07.2002).

‘Quo Vadis?’ Vision Seminars and the Transformation Charter

Protest over transformation and representivity dominated the national cricket scene from around 1997/98. Black protest eventually forced white elements to concede that urgent change was needed to embrace blacks. In response to the growing crisis the UCB convened a ‘Vision Seminar’ in
mid-1997 (Daily News 15.05.97). Hiraman, chairman of COGOC, considered it ‘preposterous’ that the UCB, which had failed to deliver benefit to the majority population, should audit its own performance while COGOC, as a watchdog organisation, was not invited (Daily News 27.05.97). Hiraman’s call was ignored. Delegates failed to reach consensus on whether ‘Africanisation’ included Indians and coloureds (Minutes of Vision Seminar July 1997). Another meeting on 12 August 1997 focused specifically on ‘Africanisation’. The category ‘black’ was defined as referring to Africans, Indians and coloureds. The absence of Africans was singled out as a problem that needed to be addressed urgently, and separate racial targets were set for Africans (UCB 1997). ‘Transformation Visions Seminars’ were held throughout the country during 1998 to analyse the shortcomings of unity, and commit provinces to addressing imbalances. KZN’s Stakeholder Conference on 10-11 May 1998, attended by COGOC/NAMIC members, turned out to be an important process of ‘bloodletting’. Ahmed Kharwa, patron of the NCU, gave a powerful critique of transformation which summed up the perspectives of the COGOC/NAMIC grouping:

I cannot, try as I may, find it in me to support the present South African team. Many of those associated with the present team, players, coaches, and administrators alike, supported apartheid. It is unprincipled for South Africa to field a ‘National’ team which is really the fruits of an evil ideology. Winning is not all. International glory can wait for a while longer, until the evil of the past has been wiped off the slate …. What is development? It is no more than a new catchphrase. It is represented by several million rands, press releases, corporate blazers, taking care to use key phrases like ‘grass roots’ which caress the black conscience. Millions of rands are handed over as ‘silence money’ to placate once non-establishment officials. Former SACB officials need to be reminded that their posture thus far: ‘I am all right, bugger you, Jack’ is abhorrent … (Kharwa Collection: speech May 1998)

As part of the ‘healing process’ delegates wrote down things they were ‘sorry’ about. Their narratives sum up the major issues facing cricket - the disillusionment among blacks that cricket remained under white control; racism; lack of Africanisation; the psychological difficulty experienced by blacks in identifying with such bastions of apartheid as the old cricket stadiums, inadequate development facilities; resistance to affirmative action; and issues around the selection of teams (KZNCU 1998). A Steering Committee of 16 was formed ‘to bring about change in cricket, create a cricket environment for the entire cricket community, promote all aspects
of the game and to make it accessible and identifiable to all peoples in KZN’
(Steering Committee Minutes 19.05.98).

Even while provincial seminars were being held, cricket lurched from
crisis to crisis nationally. There was a public outcry in November 1998 with
the announcement of an all-white team for the historic first test against the
West Indies. Even though South Africa beat the West Indies Herschelle
Gibbs, a coloured player, was drafted into the team, and the UCB established
a Monitoring Committee to ensure at least one black selection. Further,
‘criteria other than merit’ would be used to include black players once the
outcome of a series had been decided (Cricinfo 8.12.98). Despite a historic
5-0 series win over the West Indies, there was more concern with the
‘demographic representativeness’ of the team than its performance.

Provincial seminars led to a national charter. In a major publicity
exercise to win black support, the UCB unveiled its Transformation
Charter on 3 January 1999 ‘to ensure that cricket flourishes among the truly
disadvantaged of our society, who come mainly from black African
communities’ (Cricinfo 04.01.99). A Transformation Monitoring Committee
(TMC) was formed to ensure that the objectives of the Charter were fully
embraced. Professor Andre Odendaal, curator of the Robben Island Museum,
chaired the TMC, which began its work on 16 January 1999. Provincial
Monitoring Committees (PMCs) were formed to monitor transformation at
provincial level. The onus was on provincial CEOs to ‘embrace and self-
consciously drive the process from the top’ (TMC 1999). Sports Minister
Tshwete continued to pressure the UCB. He felt that provinces were
‘frustrating and suppressing black talent. We see players coming through at
the youth levels but they do not go into provincial teams’ (Agence France
Presse 02.01.99). At a UCB Development Conference in May 1999, quotas
were set from school to provincial levels for players, administrators,
journalists, scorers, groundsmen, umpires and coaches with the objective of
achieving equal representivity by 2003. There were specific targets for
black Africans within the category black (UCB 1999).

‘Power shifts’ in KZN cricket
Protesting groups in KZN were determined to seize power. In 1999 Durban
president Robbie Kurz agreed to make the constitution more democratic.
Premier League clubs, who were all white, had the most votes and could
determine the president. This was changed to give an equal vote to every
team affiliated to the Durban and District Cricket Union, the major affiliate
of the KZNCU. The effect of this was that black teams had 76 votes and white teams 60. NAMIC organised effectively. Meetings were held with black (mainly Indian) teams imploring them to attend the DDCU AGM. On election night 26 May 1998 seven executive positions were contested. Representatives of black clubs turned up en masse and seven black candidates were elected to the DDCU executive. With voting strictly along racial lines, the incumbent white office-bearers were unseated. KZN cricket was revolutionised. First Logan Naidoo and subsequently Sathie Govender were elected successively as presidents of DDCU. Black representation increased at all levels. The 36 Councillors of DDCU in 2001/02, for example, comprised 21 Indians, 3 Africans and 12 whites. Logan Naidoo explained the difficulties faced by black administrators:

Some [white] administrators were wary of how new administrators would cope and, instead of supporting them, appeared to be waiting for them to make mistakes. There was a misconception that blacks only knew about politics and whites all about administration. Much to the dismay of many, we exploded that myth… The media hounds progressive black administrators while supporting white administrators whose commitment to transformation was questionable. (Sunday Tribune Herald 04.06.2000)

Changes in KZN mirrored those at national level where ‘white’ rule ended. A row over the selection in November 1999 of an all-white Gauteng team to play England led to intervention by new Sports Minister Ngconde Balfour, and the inclusion of a black player. For Balfour, ‘two things are non-negotiable. One is transformation and the second is representivity, and if federations cannot do it themselves, we have to step in and assist them’ (Cricinfo 01.2.99). White resigned in protest. He felt the UCB was ‘little more than the cricket organ of the ANC’ and that he had been ‘swept away’ for resisting political interference. He was replaced by a coloured, Percy Sonn (Electronic Telegraph 24.01.2000). In another important change Rushdie Magiet became the first black convenor of selectors in October 1999, while the new panel of six selectors was made up of three whites and three blacks. The TMC recognised that change had brought to the surface ‘anxieties in conservative (white) cricket circles’, and met the national team in Johannesburg on 20-21 September 1999. Players expressed concern about ‘excellence’ versus transformation. They felt ‘insecure’ because they lost their match fees when they omitted to accommodate black players (Odendaal 2001:62).
Bacher understood the groundswell of African demands for empowerment. In January 2000 he announced that a black MD would be appointed from 1 July 2000 to replace him. The move to appoint an African MD was testimony that African leadership was non-negotiable in South Africa in 2000. Appointing an African eased political pressure on Bacher’s position as director of the 2003 cricket World Cup. In October 2000 the UCB announced that 41-year-old Gerald Majola, a national selector and member of the UCB General Council, had been appointed to succeed Bacher, with others appointed at provincial level. This seemed to mark the coming to the fore of African administrators in meaningful positions.

Making gains – but for whom?
The ascension to power by what journalist Patrick Compton called ‘Indian radicals’ (*Daily News* 31.05.2000) ushered changes at all levels. While some problems were redressed, change also brought to the fore fissures along new fault lines.

**Schools and elitism**
The emergence of black administrators created opportunities for black players. The realization by 1997 that the various development programmes had failed to produce quality black players resulted in a change of strategy. Funded by large corporations like Anglo_American and De Beers, a new programme was inaugurated to place black players in traditional white schools ‘with a culture of cricket and a track record of developing high-quality cricketers’. One of the first so placed was Hassim Amla who moved from Tongaat to Durban High School, a school which has produced more international cricketers than any other in South Africa. One such was the legendary Barry Richards. Hassim Amla was himself selected for South Africa in 2005. Less successful was another ‘transfer’, Lucky Dladla, who was placed at Maritzburg College. Five years later, Dladla formed part of the KwaZulu-Natal senior squad but after modest success, was released from his contract after three seasons.

While this policy has created opportunities for talented youngsters to hone their cricket skills, it has also removed the imperative to reinforce a culture of cricket in townships, while it could also be said that it transmits the values of white institutions to the selected few black cricketers. This is a case of a ‘development’ strategy reproducing class privileges, with minimal material impact on the majority population. It reflects a continuity between the new and the old. Instead of race, class is privileged.
The policy still remains in place in 2006 and the dominance of former white schools of provincial schools’ cricket continues. Seven of the twelve members of the 2005/6 KZN Schools Under 19 team were Black. All attended former white schools. C. Mabuyo, M. Mbatha, C. Nhlapo, J. Vandiar, and M. Shezi attended Durban High School; K. Maharaj was from Northwood and K. Chetty from Westville. This elitism will continue for the foreseeable future. Enver Mall, CEO of KZN Cricket, defends the policy: throughout the world your best cricketers come from private cricketing schools, whether it is in England, West Indies, India, or even Pakistan. Existing cricketing schools in South Africa have the infrastructure (coaches, grounds, equipment, tradition), and for the moment, given our various other needs, we are exploiting this situation for our advantage. We hope that in time we can establish similar schools in townships but that is sometime off…. The use of elite cricketing schools is the only practical option for the moment. (Interview 20.03.06)

As long as the status quo remains, transformation will mainly be viewed as a race issue. Until these facilities are extended int townships and the base of cricket expanded, the gap between haves and have-nots will remain.

Promoting black clubs
A more encouraging move by the newly-elected officials was to provide opportunities to black teams to participate in higher domestic leagues. This met a deep need in black communities. Sundra Reddy of Chatsworth United, imploring the NCU to include his team in the Premier League, explained:

We will not be absorbed into historically-white clubs and neither will we tolerate the cradle-snatching of our talented players. We believe in transformation. The heritage and principled struggle of all those people of Chatsworth must be revered by way of respect for the efforts put in by people to develop a club such as Chatsworth…. We have walked a long road - we have developed our people, our players, our sponsors and are of the belief that our players can represent this country without having to play second fiddle. (Daily News 31.03.99)

Shortly after the ‘Black Cabinet’ assumed power in 1999, township clubs like African Warriors, Chatsworth United, Phoenix, and Delta were promoted to the Premier League. While Wanderers and Phoenix struggled, Chatsworth United and Sparksport Delta made steady progress. In an attempt to break down race barriers, Logan Naidoo mooted in 2000 a policy requiring white league clubs to field at least two black players, with financial incentives provided from 2002/3. While well-meaning, this policy was a double-edged
sword in that, if implemented, some black clubs would have faced the prospect of losing some of their best players as the white clubs looked to the townships to fill their quotas. However, the policy was never implemented because, on review, and put on hold for two reasons; first, there was a concern that the exodus of the best Black players to White teams would be counter-productive and, second, that club cricket was seen as a social activity by the UCBSA and it was deemed unfair to force integration at this level (interview: Logan Naidoo 21.06.05).

The difficulty of achieving a greater degree of racial integration at club level was underscored by an incident in late 2005 when the all-Indian Crimsons of Reservoir Hills and the all-white Crusaders Pam Golding were involved in an altercation where abusive language was used, knives were used and one player hospitalised. All players from both sides were banned from all cricket for two years.

Quotas vs merit
Debate over ‘affirmative action’ has been a source of great tension. Crises over national selection, often involving government intervention, resulted in the UCB a few years back introducing quotas at provincial level. Many blacks feel that white insistence on ‘merit’ is ahistorical because meritocracy overlooks the legacy of inequality fashioned by apartheid. The white-dominated media, however, often portray attempts to redress imbalances as ‘racist’. Lynette Steenveld from the Department of Media Studies at Rhodes University found that cricket stories were ‘ideologically loaded’. There was a general failure to recognise race as a phenomenon playing a role in cricket, an assumption that sports and politics were separate spheres, that issues in cricket did not have a political dimension and that language was ‘loaded’ to denigrate transformation (TMC 1999). Patrick Compton, weekly contributor to the Daily News, wrote with regard to quotas that ‘It’s tough being an Umlungu’ (white):

No cricketer likes to think he is in the team because of the colour of his skin. Transformation should be about processes and structures being just. The big T should not simply be about numbers. You don’t need to be over-endowed in the brains department to realize that it is becoming increasingly tough to be a white cricketer in South Africa today…. It is why an increasing number of local schoolboys have been lost to this province in recent years. (Daily News 01.02.2001)

Transformation has created some apprehension among whites. Since 1999, a number of white players with British or European passports have emigrated
to England. Natal lost Maritzburg College product Kevin Pietersen, a young off-spinner and hard-hitting batsman, who left in October 2000 to join Nottinghamshire, coached by former national player and selector Clive Rice. According to Rice, Pietersen moved to enable him to escape the quota system and non-merit selections ... I first saw Kevin in the 1997 schools’ week in Grahamstown and he missed out on South African Schools selection then due to the quota system. And that is something that will continue to push him sideways in South Africa, whereas in England merit selection is entrenched in the game. It’s his best chance of playing Test cricket. (Cricinfo 03.10.2000)

Pietersen went on to represent England and starred in the final test match against the Australians in September 2005, by scoring 158 to help England regain the Ashes after 18 years. Earlier he had scored three brilliant one-day centuries against South Africa in January 2005.

While white commentators believe that this trickle will evolve into a flood, Odendaal believes the move is due more to the strength of the British pound and regards the concerns of white journalists as irrational: ‘It’s always seen as whites being threatened, and the effect of that is to make the victims of yesterday the problems of tomorrow.’ (2001:61) Quotas, on the other hand, have facilitated the emergence of in Natal cricket of players like Goolam Bodi, Rivash Gobind, Imraan Khan, Lucky Dladla, Hassim and Ahmed Amla, Ugasen Govender and Saidi Mhlongo who, history suggests, would have been discarded prematurely if the selectors had not been forced to provide opportunities to black players.

**A turn to the right?**

The policy on quotas changed when South Africa was humiliated by Australia in tests played in the 2001/02 season. In July 2002, the UCB announced that henceforth national and senior provincial teams ‘were to be chosen entirely on merit’ and that quotas were to be replaced by targets. One senior cricket official explained that there was ‘a subtle difference’ between quotas and targets. ‘In exceptional circumstances, you don’t have to enforce a target. Quotas on the other hand are permanent and fixed’ (Interview Enver Mall: 20.03.06). Then KZNCU president, Dr Logan Naidoo, explained that his province was one of the front runners in scrapping quotas. Black and white players felt that quotas resulted, in his view, in a ‘negative vibe … We have reached a stage where enough players can walk into sides on merit. We need to stop calling them development

This announcement did not impress Sports Minister Ngconde Balfour who felt that the few black players who had got to the top were feeling the ‘heat’ of negative comments by the media, and wanted to kick away the ladder that allowed them to climb to the top (SAFM Radio 16.07.2002). Balfour felt ‘insulted’ that the new guidelines did not make it mandatory for an ‘African’ to be included in the national or provincial A teams. What message was cricket sending out to Africans who made up 80 per cent of the population, he asked rhetorically? Balfour summoned the UCB hierarchy to a meeting on 10 July 2002. While the UCB reaffirmed its view that quotas were not necessary, it committed itself to a minimum of five black players in the national squad for the 2003 World Cup (*Daily News* 11.07.2002). It kept to that pledge and it is clear that an informal quota system continues in effect at all senior levels of the game.

‘Too many Indians are chiefs’

Racial tension in post-apartheid sport is no longer only an issue of black and white. New and more complex ‘patterns of prejudice’ have surfaced. The meaning of ‘black’ is now contested, and struggles have emerged between Africans, Indians and Coloureds over power and opportunity. The nomenclature ‘black African’ in the Transformation Charter is a source of concern to many Indians and Coloureds, as it excludes them. The UCB, for example, promised extra funding to province’s contracting ‘black Africans’, notwithstanding the fact that the South African constitution regards Indians and Coloureds as black (TMC 2000).

The demographics of the KZNCU executive and council, however, of why the definition of ‘black African’ has become important. In KwaZulu Natal cricket, black has become largely synonymous with Indian. In the 2000/2001 season, for example, the Union’s Honorary Life Vice-President, its seven patrons, the CEO, the president, the treasurer, seven of 15 members of the Executive Committee (the other eight were white), the manager of Amateur Cricket, president of the largest sub-union and five of the seven black-contracted players, were all Indian. In the 2004/2005 season, two African teachers, Themba Memela and Slovo Mabaso, with little or no cricket background were co-opted on to the Executive. According to Cassim Docrat, these members had little impact on the Executive when they raised problems that faced African cricket development (Interview 22.06.2005). A third African was added in 2005/06. One interviewee who
wished to remain anonymous told us that the reluctance of Indian officials to stand down and let Africans be elected was a major problem.

The identity and pride that Steve Biko and the Black Consciousness Movement attempted to forge among all black and oppressed people from the 1970s appears to be unravelling at least in cricketing circles in the context of new historical conditions. In August 2001, Dr Mtutuzeli Nyoka of Gauteng, a surgeon by profession and head of the UCB’s Medical Committee, challenged Percy Sonn, a three-decade veteran of non-racial cricket, for the presidency of the UCB on the basis that an African should lead the organisation. When defeated, Nyoka told reporters, ‘I hope one day this organisation will be led by a black African. It is what millions of marginalised people are calling for and I hope that time will come sooner rather than later’ (Sunday Tribune 05.08.2001). Nyoka has been insistent that the broad notion of black be jettisoned and quotas refer specifically to Africans. After his defeat, Nyoka resigned asking:

How do we tell this country’s 35 million black Africans that transformation is working when only one player [Makhaya Ntini] represents them? While the numbers of the other racial groups are on the increase the African continues to be underrepresented ... The UCB’s transformation record is a betrayal of African aspirations. No man can belong to an organisation in which his people’s inferiority is assumed without building up powerful resentments. (Johannesburg Star 10.04.2002)

The non-involvement of Africans in KZN cricket became more of an issue following the stirrings of anti-Indianism in the province, highlighted by a CD released in May 2002 by Mbongeni Ngema. The track AmaNdiya touches on the sensitive relationship between Africans and Indians, and contains such lyrics as ‘We need strong and brave men to confront Indians’; ‘Indians do not want to change’; ‘Even Mandela has failed to make them change’; ‘Whites were better than Indians’; ‘Indians have conquered Durban’; ‘We are poor because all things have been taken by Indians’.

How did such sentiments play out in the local cricket arena? Fast bowler Mfuneko Ngam, who joined the KZN Dolphins during the season 2004/2005, returned to the Eastern Cape after just one year. He told Drum magazine (April 2005) that the future of African players in KZN was ‘bleak. I’ve played there and what I’ve witnessed was depressing. African players are third-class citizens in the province.’ He felt that the UCB should intervene because little was done to develop African players who did not
have ‘mentors and proper guidance’. CEO Docrat had a different perspective on the Ngam issue, arguing that the Union took a player ‘practically going nowhere’ and offered him a chance to turn his career around. He did concede, however, that the failure to increase African involvement in the game was due to a combination of factors, including the fact that many Indians were superficial about the issue of transformation, (interview 22.06.05).

Whatever the case, it is an indictment of the KZNCU that of the twenty teams in the Premier leagues in 2006 only one, African Warriors, caters largely for African players while, incredibly, Saidi Mhlongo, who plays for DHS-Pirates, is the only African player among the remaining nineteen teams. Perhaps even more astonsishingly, for the 2005/06 cricket season not one African player was contracted by the KZNCU. After a series of good performances at club and KZN A team levels, Mhlongo made his provincial debut in February 2006 and has had much success. Will he fulfil his promise or fall by the wayside like the others?

In what may be a hopeful development, however, most of the once-promising African players who failed to make it into the provincial team have been employed by the KZNCU as coaches. Lucky Dladla, the first KZN-born African player to make his mark when he burst on the scene in 2002, was released from his contract at the end of the 2004/2005 season. He now coaches at a local school and has a bursary to study for a teaching degree. Linda Zondi, who represented South African U-19 in the late 1990s as wicketkeeper, is coach of Glenwood High School and a provincial selector. Zibane Bongani, Simon Sakhele, and Anderson Ndlovu, are employed by the Union. Bongani is an Assistant coach at the Union Academy and the Dolphins U-19 team; Sakhele is a coach / coordinator of the Academy; Ndlovu is the Administration Manager of the Academy. Sakhele was sent to India during 2005 to attend a coaching clinic for spinners in order to hone his coaching skills. The fact that these “failed” cricketers were put into pivotal positions is an indication of how valuable a commodity the African cricketer is. One cannot imagine non-African players being treated in like manner. From the point of the Union, utilising African coaches is very sensible. They invested large sums of money and time in these players who understand the system very well and are well placed to take the game to African youth in the townships. Time will tell whether this policy pays dividends. One positive development was that in February 2006 the Union Executive formed an African Forum with a
mandate to provide guidance on issues pertaining to the development of African cricket in the rural and township areas and work closely with the Transformation Committee to increase African representation (http://www.dolphinscricket.co.za/default.asp).

‘Corporate mis-governance?’
Issues of corporate governance and financial mismanagement have recently dominated the KZNCU. Since 2003, the Union has spent over R300 000 in three separate investigations into its management and financial affairs.

In the context of apparently strained relations between the then President, Logan Naidoo and CEO, Cassim Docrat, a Re-structuring Committee was appointed in mid-2002 to examine the state of KZN cricket. It was known in cricket circles as the ‘Govender Commission’ because it was chaired by Sada Govender, with Sathie Govender and Ravi Govender making up the three-man team. Its findings were that the CEO had a limited knowledge of financial management, ‘lacked decisiveness and conflict-resolution skills’, and avoided ‘controversial decisions’. It recommended that Docrat’s removal as CEO should be negotiated.

Soon thereafter, however, Sathie Govender did an about-turn, distanced himself from the package offered to the CEO and advised him not to accept it (Docrat Interview 22.06.2005), all this in the context of renewed tensions around the time of the elections to the KZNCU Executive. As it turned out, Logan Naidoo stood down as President to be replaced by Sathie Govender at the elections held in June 2003. Docrat remained on as CEO.

The new executive KZNCU appointed a Commission of Enquiry to, inter alia, look into allegations of financial irregularities and mismanagement in the affairs of the KZNCU. Its report has never been made public most of its findings were published but in local papers in June 2005. The major portion of the Commission’s report was devoted to alleged financial irregularities surrounding the allegedly improper purchase of a racehorse using cricket union funds and apparent irregularities in the procurement of computer equipment. We would argue, however, having seen the entire report, that it is amateurish and incoherent and unhelpful; it neither provided an analysis of the crisis in KZN cricket, nor did it make recommendations that would have gone some way to addressing the structural, management, financial and governance changes that seem to us to be necessary conditions for the improvement of the KZN cricket establishment.

In October 2004, Docrat announced that he would be ‘retiring’ at the end
of February 2005. He was succeeded by Enver Mall. In June 2005 it was announced that Dr Logan Naidoo would again try for the presidency, hoping to oust Sathie Govender. Amidst more allegations of nepotism and misgovernance, Govender announced that he would stand down for the ‘good of the game’ and that he expected Naidoo to do the same. The situation was so serious that the AGM of the KZNCU was postponed. However, eventually in July 2005 Naidoo was re-elected President.

The shenanigans surrounding KZN cricket over the past few years led journalist and long-time critic Patrick Compton to exclaim: ‘if you want a free roller-coaster ride, just become a student of the affairs of the crisis-ridden KwaZulu-Natal Cricket Union. If you don’t feel giddy after a few days, you’re either a hardened politician or mentally defective’ (Mercury 29.06.2005).

**Conclusion**

Sport is an important element of popular culture in South Africa. Many see cricket, soccer and rugby as bridges by which to cross language, race and class barriers, and draw both spectators and participants to a common nationhood. This paper has shown that while sport is obviously a source of pleasure, it is equally a site of contestation.

Tensions generated by change appear to be producing hostility along the fault lines of race and class. As Erasmus has argued, ‘race’ will be with South Africans for some time to come, even if only ‘a detour on the way to new creations. It is always there because, whether we like or not, we are still living in the shadow of the history of colonialism, segregation and apartheid, and their cultural and political aftermath’ (Erasmus 2000: 392).

It is proving difficult to reduce the ‘complex and sometimes incompatible’ experiences of South Africans to something ‘manageable within the broad framework of the definition of South Africa as a “rainbow nation”’ (Maingard 1997:17). Ashwin Desai has argued that the ‘construct “South African” has simply become too difficult to sustain under economic pressure; and people in bars and shebeens across the nation are reverting to the common sense of being innately black, white, Indian and so on’ (2000: 387).

Contestation for leadership among the formerly disadvantaged partly reflects the fact that in post-apartheid South Africa sport is an important vehicle through which to make oneself visible; and it can therefore become a terrain of struggle by those keen to promote their personal advancement and standing in an increasingly crowded market place. Conflict may also be
due to the fact that some well-meaning and committed administrators are struggling to come to terms with changes resulting from the professionalisation of cricket. Both globally and in South Africa, new pressures have arisen for proper corporate governance in the administration of business and government, and the affairs of national and provincial cricket in South Africa are not immune from this. But so far there is little evidence that cricket authorities have understood, let alone responded to, these pressures.

Note
1. This is a revised and significantly updated version of a paper first published under our joint authorship in *Patterns of Prejudice* 38(2) 2004.
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