

Spent 3  
Bank

## A BLOT ON AFRICA

10-10  
24/2

YOUNG CRICKET ENTHUSIASTS, already puzzled by the controversy over the British team's refusal to participate in a World Cup match in the capital of the southern African nation of Zimbabwe, former Rhodesia, may find their confusion worse confounded by the action of two players of the Zimbabwe team in wearing black armbands during a competition match a few days ago. If the primary problem was one manifestation of a colonial legacy — Britain opted to forfeit the match, not minding the heavy price it had to pay in cricketing terms — the Zimbabwe cricketers' extraordinarily brave protest action was a commentary on the self-serving, authoritarian ways of the country's discredited ruler, Robert Mugabe. President since the country's independence in 1980, Mr. Mugabe secured a new term a year ago in elections widely regarded as rigged and held in an atmosphere of violence and terror unleashed by his supporters against political opponents who had regrouped under one umbrella. The Commonwealth suspended the country's membership following the repressive measures he used to muzzle opposition, including the press. Mr. Mugabe has remained unruffled, thanks in the main to the powerful support he has been receiving for his programmes from the continent's two front ranking leaders, Thabo Mbeki of neighbouring South Africa and Olusegun Obasanjo of distant Nigeria. The support seems undiminished despite the international, mostly Western, outcry over the ways of the Zimbabwe President.

Violence and intimidation of political opponents are said to remain unabated in the country, posing a threat to security as cited by Britain for not playing in Harare, the capital. But the two friends of Mr. Mugabe have launched a campaign to restore full Commonwealth membership to Zimbabwe, claiming that the Government has made meaningful progress towards resolving the political crisis that resulted in the suspension 11 months ago. If the Commonwealth is to strictly enforce its democracy norms, there may be

also other candidates for suspension from the organisation. As for Mr. Mugabe, he began his tenure amid much hope as the country emerged from the trauma of the white minority's unilateral declaration of independence. But, like many of the leaders of newly independent Africa, he was loath to allowing democracy to put down roots in his country. During his long, unremarkable tenure he has violated all democratic norms, permitting no freedoms and brooking no political opposition or an independent press. It was comparatively smooth sailing till two years ago when the powerful white minority, which controlled nearly all the land, began to despise his autocratic ways and to switch support to the political opponents of the regime. Mr. Mugabe, sensing danger to his hold on power, hit the whites where it hurt them most. He launched a violent land grab programme during which his supporters forcibly occupied land belonging to the white minority, which received no compensation. The widespread violence resulted in hundreds of casualties — and provoked an international furore.

Mr. Mugabe, who appealed without success to the colonial master Britain to assist him with compensation money for the dispossessed whites, found instant support for his action from most leaders of the continent, including Mr. Mbeki, who had by then taken over the South African presidency from Nelson Mandela. Despite protests from many capitals, they found no illegality or immorality in the violent methods Mr. Mugabe and his men adopted to regain land. Armed with their support, he launched a campaign to blunt white support to his political opponents, some of whom have fled the land fearing for their lives. If Mr. Mbeki and Mr. Obasanjo see any meaningful progress towards political reform, the rest of the world will wait to see proof. One man hiding away in London is testimony to the contrary. He is the Zimbabwe opposition leader, Morgan Tsvangirai, who faces the death sentence for treason at a trial back home in Harare.

24 FEB 2003

KD-1  
167

# England skipper may quit over Zimbabwe fiasco

Sports & Politics

**EAST LONDON (SOUTH AFRICA), FEB. 15.** The captain of the England cricket team, Nasser Hussain, said on Saturday that he might step down after the World Cup because of bitterness over the Zimbabwe fiasco, and accused the International Cricket Council of letting down the English players for "money and politics."

"I am quite annoyed. It leaves me as captain in isolation again. My trust in authorities in general today and last week has left me completely... I can't think of a better word, just kept me very low to be honest," Hussain told reporters.

He was speaking after the ICC's technical committee rejected for the last time England's request to have its Thursday's abandoned match against Zimbabwe relocated from Harare to South Africa, and awarded four forfeit points to Zimbabwe.

England had refused to go to Harare because of security concerns, arguing that a politically-volatile Zimbabwe was not safe enough to stage the game. "The team is very disappointed. It is not the start we wanted. There are issues at stake here much more important than four points. (The players) will all be very disappointed that the

most major tournament that they had worked for a long time started off like this," Hussain said.

Asked if the controversy would force him to think about relinquishing the captain's post after the World Cup, Hussain replied: "Most definitely." He added that "it suggests" that he would step down as captain of one-day and test teams after the tournament. "Most definitely I have to think about the future (but) I haven't actually made up mind on anything."

He said the ICC should have seen the Zimbabwe problem six months or a year ago. "I saw a group of players whose whole World Cup dream had been taken away from them. It's been shattered by politics... It's come down to politics and money," he said.

"I still firmly believe that this group of cricketers, given the situation between England and Zimbabwe and the political wrangling, have been let down by the ICC." Hussain denied that he ever spoke rudely to the ICC chief executive, Malcolm Speed, or swore at him during a meeting last week after the alleged death threat was received. — AP

THE HINDU

16 FEB 2003

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 2003

27/1  
CRICKET AND COMPROMISE CD-CA 149-10

THE UNCERTAINTY IS over, but the row is far from settled. The International Cricket Council's recent decision on the World Cup is essentially in the nature of a temporary arrangement. Under the compromise, India will play the cricket World Cup and will play it on its own terms. At the same time, the ICC has made it clear that the commercial issues involved in its dispute with the Board of Control for Cricket in India — which revolve around the nature and scope of ambush marketing clauses for international tournaments — will have to be resolved through arbitration. Until then, the ICC has declared it would hold the BCCI responsible for damages that may arise from the Indian cricket team's refusal to fully endorse the Players' Contracts. The BCCI also will not receive its share of the World Cup earnings (a considerable \$9 million) until the larger dispute is settled. Given that the World Cup is scheduled to get under way in South Africa in less than a fortnight, a temporary truce such as this was possibly the best outcome one could have hoped for. It is a victory of sorts for the BCCI, whose president, Jagmohan Dalmiya, had virtually dared the ICC to throw India out of the World Cup. Mr. Dalmiya had strongly supported the Indian cricketers who were averse to endorsing those clauses in the ICC's Players Contracts that affected their lucrative personal endorsements. If the BCCI president's brinkmanship succeeded, it was not because of the force of his arguments but the commercial clout of the nation he represents. If no other cricket board could have challenged the ICC in the manner the BCCI did, it is simply because the vast chunk of the world's cricketing revenue (as much as 80 per cent according to one estimate) is generated from India.

The ICC's reluctance to act firmly against the BCCI stemmed wholly from the fear of the financial consequences. Throwing India out of the World Cup would have greatly reduced the

interest in the tournament amongst the Indian public and in turn diminished the interest of the official sponsors who pour money into the event largely to capture the attention of this vast cricket-crazy audience. In its dispute with the ICC, the BCCI of course received a boost from an unexpected quarter when the Delhi High Court directed the Union Government not to release any foreign exchange to the India-based sponsors of the World Cup in the event that the Indian squad was excluded from taking part in it. This had created a further complication for the ICC since after the court's interim order, acting firmly against India would have been tantamount to putting a direct squeeze on the Cup's official sponsors.

At a larger level, it is irrelevant who climbed down and who emerged victorious from the dispute. The real issue is about the nature of the financial management of cricket in an environment where the sport has become both commercialised and globalised. In the long run, there has to be some mechanism to protect the commercial interests of sponsors who fork out enormous sums of money in support of the events. Those who protest against any restriction in the form of ambush marketing clauses fail to appreciate that they are both accepted and enforced in many other international sporting events and that, in the longer term, they actually help increase the volumes of money that are pumped into the game. The larger cause of sport is well served by such event sponsorship arrangements even if there is some diminution in the earnings of a few top stars from personal endorsements. The sponsorship dispute has already threatened two international tournaments — the ICC Champions Trophy a few months ago and now the World Cup. For the sake of cricket, it would be a good thing if it is referred to arbitration and settled once and for all.

27 JAN 2003

## ICC-BCCI TRUCE ON CONTRACTS

# Game on for India

State News Service

NEW DELHI, Jan. 24. — The uncertainty dogging India's participation in the World Cup has finally been laid to rest. The ICC today confirmed in a press release that the Indian cricketers' conditional signing of the Players' Contracts has been accepted by the world body, allowing India to take part in cricket's showpiece event.

The release said the decision by ICC's Board — reached by telephone hook-up between London and New Delhi — “effectively calls a truce between ICC and the BCCI to allow the players to play by putting in place a series of steps scheduled for after the tournament to resolve the commercial issues” in question. The matter has thus been resolved amicably, in the interests of millions of cricket followers worldwide, albeit only for the moment. For the “truce” is only temporary and hostilities may resume after the Cup.

The release further goes on to say that if ICC's sponsors incur any losses or damage “as a result of the Indian team playing under altered contracts”, the onus will be on BCCI to compensate the parent body with the amount arrived at through arbitration. Pending the outcome of the arbitration ICC will not release India's share of revenue from the Cup, which amounts to \$9 million.

The BCCI faces serious consequences if it is held responsible for damage and any loss, and if it refuses to pay the compensation. In such a scenario, the ICC Executive

Board will have little option but to suspend India from the council. ICC President Mr Malcolm Gray said: “This agreement will see the ICC and the BCCI put the current commercial dispute aside at least for the period of the World Cup.”

“It clears the way for the best team to represent India and ensure that the ICC is able to protect the commercial interests of the game around the world.”

The decision means the ambush marketing clause barring players from endorsing non-official sponsors would apply to Indian players only during the duration of the Cup. The imaging clause, which allows official sponsors to use images of all Cup players, would be restricted to three months.

BCCI chief Mr Jagmohan Dalmiya was at first rather tightlipped in his response, but later in Kolkata told The Statesman that “it was the right move in the right direction at the right time”. The alterations in the Contract were not “something that

the ICC had proposed ... they were given by us and I am happy that ultimately it is the cricketing aspect of the matter which has triumphed over the commercial.”

Sponsors happy: LG Electronics India, a major Cup sponsor, expressed satisfaction over a compromise to settle the Players' Contracts row, adds PTI. LG has a five-year \$25 million sponsorship deal with ICC.

Pepsi indicated it had worked “behind-the-scenes” to resolve the row. “For the sake of Indian cricket and the cricket-loving public, we are willing to go to any length to resolve the issue,” said a Pepsi official.

### Zimbabwe stays Cup host

LONDON, Jan. 24. — Zimbabwe held on to its six Cup games today after the ICC defied political pressure from the British and Australian governments to shift them to South Africa. Unless security deteriorates “drastically,” the games in Harare and Bulawayo will go ahead as scheduled, ICC said.

Mr Malcolm Speed, giving the go-ahead at a press meet here, said ICC was not in a position to take a political stance. — PTI

# Court blow sets pitch for cricket clash

LOKENDRAPRATAPSAHI

Calcutta, Jan. 22: The World Cup-related Player Terms/contracts war is far from over.

While today's interim order by a division bench of Delhi High Court has pushed the International Cricket Council (ICC) on the back foot, the body will take its own decision — via a teleconference of the executive board — on Friday.

Technically, that will come

from the ICC's business arm — IDI Ltd. There, too, all 10 Test-playing nations have representation. Besides, there are seats for these Associate members.

The court's order, on a PIL filed by 1983 World Cup-winning captain Kapil Dev, teammate Madanlal and others, stops revenue flow from India to the ICC and the official World Cup sponsors if Indian players are punished.

The board will either accept the contracts' conditional sign-

ing by the Indians and refer possible claims of compensation for arbitration, or ask the Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI) to send a fresh set of contracts signed without preconditions," said a source.

Speaking to **The Telegraph** from London, he added: "If the second option is exercised, the BCCI will have 72 hours to comply. Failure will invite legal provisions listed in the Participating Nation Agreement..."

Moreover, should the Jagmo-

han Dalmiya-headed BCCI not agree to abide by the arbiters' verdict, if the dispute does reach Lausanne, the board will "consider" calling for India's suspension at the ICC's annual general meeting in June. One understands this has been formally conveyed to the BCCI.

For now, though, the ICC can't be enthused by acting Chief Justice Devinder Gupta and Justice Bader Durrez Ahmed's order. The three Cup sponsors from India — Pepsi, LG and Hero

Honda — also stand affected.

As another source put it: "Attitudes within the ICC could harden."

It's to be seen whether the move (initiated a few days ago) to "provisionally" accept the Indians' conditional signing gains momentum in the next 48 hours.

After all, many in the ICC are now convinced the PIL has been wholly encouraged by the BCCI. To talk of sponsors, LG has gone ballistic, threatening to move the Supreme Court.

The high court order included (a) No foreign exchange to the ICC, either through sponsorship or damages, if the Indian players are debarred from the Cup; (b) No telecast of advertisements featuring official Cup sponsors, from India, if the national team isn't allowed to participate; (c) No foreign exchange remittance for the official Cup sponsors if either the BCCI or the Indian players are penalised by the ICC.

The respondents (including the ICC and the Union govern-

ment) have a week to file replies and the next hearing is listed for February 18, by which date India would have played two Cup matches.

Incidentally, unless resolved, the Sri Lankan Imbroglia will also figure in the teleconference. Apparently, the Lankans will be given 72 hours to forward the contracts/terms.

Otherwise, the ICC (the IDI Ltd, technically) will initiate legal proceedings. ■ See Page 6





## England will play in Zimbabwe

London: Rejecting premier Tony Blair's call for a boycott of Zimbabwe, the England and Wales Cricket Board decided on Tuesday to go ahead with a World Cup cricket match in Harare. The decision to play the match in Harare on February 13 was taken unanimously by the ECB, despite intense pressure on them to approve a boycott.

"The cancellation of one cricket match will not make the slightest difference to the Mugabe regime," ECB chief executive Tim Lamb told newsmen after a board meeting. A news conference to announce the decision was delayed for almost two hours because of demonstrations by placard-carrying protesters led by Peter Tatchell, a well-known campaigner for various causes and a critic of Zimbabwe President Robert Mugabe. PTI



# Indian cricketers sign ICC contract with reservations

By S. Dinakar

*SPM 9 PM* *HD-1* *10/11*  
**AUCKLAND, JAN. 10.** The storm could blow over after all, with the 15 members of the Indian team signing the controversial 'players terms' contract of the International Cricket Council (ICC), that could clear the way for their participation in the World Cup.

Though they signed the contract here on Friday, the cricketers have objected to certain clauses that may still prove a stumbling block. The fact that the players have set the ball rolling is a positive sign though. The signed forms have been sent to the Board of Control for Cricket in India (BCCI) and they will be forwarded to the ICC, well ahead of the last date of January 14.

On their part, it is understood that the cricketers will urge their sponsors to keep away from ambush campaigns during the World Cup. However, the clause dealing with the 'image rights', which prevents any rival from advertising for one month before and after the tournament, is understood to be the bone of contention.

The captain, Sourav Ganguly, said the players

and the ICC would have to make some adjustments. "It can never be one-sided." He indicated that the cricketers, who were in constant touch with the BCCI, had informed the Board, what their problems were. The BCCI will take up the key issues with the ICC. Ganguly said the players had done what they could from their side, and it was now the ICC's turn to respond. "We already have existing contracts and they have to be honoured." The controversy over the 'player contracts' for the ICC tournaments had erupted in a big manner before the Champions Trophy tournament in Sri Lanka in September last, and it was only a last minute settlement that ensured the participation of India's best side.

## Dalmiya reserves comment

PTI reports from Kolkata:

The BCCI president, Jagmohan Dalmiya, reserved comment saying: "I will not say anything today. Let me ascertain all the facts first." Asked whether the players signed the forms on instruction from the BCCI, he said "I will answer all your queries tomorrow".

THE HINDU

10/11/11

SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 2003

## WORLD CUP WOES

Sports  
Editor

A DISTRESSING CLOUD of uncertainty surrounds the Cricket World Cup, which is now threatened by two totally disparate issues. On the one hand, the game's most important tournament faces a sudden and unexpected challenge with the Governments of Britain and Australia declaring their opposition to matches being held in Zimbabwe because of the human rights abuses perpetrated by the Robert Mugabe regime. On the other hand, the tournament is in danger because of the continuing deadlock between the ICC and the BCCI over the sponsorship dispute, one that could keep the Indian side from competing in the Cup. Neither problem is intractable but with the World Cup scheduled to kick off next month, they need to be resolved quickly. As far as the Zimbabwe issue goes, Australia and Britain have launched a joint campaign to pressure the ICC into moving the six matches scheduled in Harare and Bulawayo to venues in South Africa. Although New Zealand has expressed support for this proposal, the ICC seems determined to go ahead with the matches as scheduled. This is hardly surprising. Cricket boards of six countries due to play in co-host Zimbabwe have declared their commitment to fulfil their fixtures. Moreover, shifting the matches is simply not possible. This would require the consent of South Africa and officials in that country have made it clear that they would refuse to stage any match that is reallocated.

Until now, Australia and Britain have formally not gone beyond expressing their unhappiness over their respective cricket teams playing in Zimbabwe. However, if the Governments headed by the Prime Ministers John Howard and Tony Blair (both of who have personally expressed their opposition to the matches being played in Zimbabwe) decide to directly advise their respective cricket boards not to play, then they probably would have no option but to obey such counsel. Popular support in both countries against playing in Zimbabwe seems to be growing and the question at this moment is how far the two Governments will go once it becomes

apparent that there will be no rescheduling of matches. Failure to play in Zimbabwe will mean the cancellation of two matches, fines slapped on Australia and Britain and the possibility of a reciprocal boycott by Zimbabwe in the future. In contrast, the costs of not resolving the ICC-BCCI deadlock are arguably greater. A failure to break this stalemate could result in India not taking part in the World Cup at all. One immediate result of this is the likely pullout of many of the tournament sponsors (who are India-based), a possibility with enormous financial implications for the ICC, the various cricket boards and the World Cup tournament itself.

19.10.11

The dispute between the ICC and the BCCI is over the terms of the World Cup players' contract, which are opposed by Indian cricketers because it affects their own contracts with personal sponsors. It was the very same issue — ambush marketing and imaging clauses — that had threatened the Champions Trophy in Sri Lanka earlier this year. The BCCI president, Jagmohan Dalmiya, had succeeded in getting the ICC to back down then and — having resigned from the ICC Contracts Committee and having declared his support for the Indian cricket players — he is clearly banking on this happening once again. The majority of the world's cricketing revenue (as much as 80 per cent by one estimate) is generated from India and Mr. Dalmiya knows that the World Cup's sponsors will be reluctant to cough up the \$ 550 million they have promised if the top Indian cricketers were to absent themselves. Meanwhile, the ICC has declared that it has already made what it has described as its "final offer", which the BCCI can either take or leave. Where this war of brinkmanship will end is anybody's guess, but any process of mediation will have to settle the issue before January 14, the deadline for signing the players' contracts. Cricket lovers, particularly in India but elsewhere in the world too, will hope that this controversy over contracts will be sorted out and will not be allowed to spoil cricket's best-loved tournament.

THE HINDU

4 JAN 2003