

# Dbq: cricket and politics rough draft

[Sport & Tourism](#)



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

When examining the relationship between cricket and politics in South Asia from 1880 to 2005, there was much continuity and change. A significant continuity was that as in document 3, "first it was the hunter, the missionary, the merchant, next the soldier and the politician, and then the merchant." It was said by Cecil Headlam that this was the history of British colonization. As this continued cricket brought together the rulers and the ruled, which continued to make things more moral.

A significant change is that politically India and Europe didn't really get along so in Document 6 and the Natore XI defeated European teams that had such pride. Also in document 2, Prince Ranjitsinhji would return to England to join the Sussex team, but will return to India as head of an English team and then return as a head of an Indian team. It shows how politics changed things in India as well in England where cricket brought people of different religions and politics together over time.

Most of the documents I could find many great continuities between politics and cricket, cricket seemed to bring more people together of different backgrounds from competitively to just the game itself. Since the early 1900's cricket united the people of a supreme power to its followers. The game since then to 2005 put the politics to the side and taught people morals, self-restraint, and even education in pluck. Cricket was far more valuable, this helped to continue the history of the British colonization (Doc. ). Also cricket has many lessons in others walks of life not just in India or even Britain, but there continues to be a lesson. In the game there was always a connection to the other players because they all came to play the same game (Doc. 6). In the 1940's the Hindu cricket club requested

Mohandas Gandhi for his support in continuing religiously based cricket competitions, to Gandhi the continuation of religious based teams were un-sportsman like.

The influence of government changed who played the game of cricket and now challenged each other's religion instead of the game. (Doc. 8). The game of cricket has been looked upon as not of an elite sport. Also problems were seen mostly in class systems in Docs. 2, 3, and 4. In Doc. 2 Prince Ranjiitsinhji was able to join a team in Britain, were Britain's looked down to Indians. In Doc. 3, In England a English writer saw the game of cricket as a uniting tool, but if this came from an Indian historian things could be seen differently.

It seems that the English always tried to make the game of cricket full of unity, but I feel as if the Indians would disagree with many things the English had put out over the years, in which India later on became independent. In Doc. 4 there was more of a sense of equality between the castes in India, they seemed to be able to ignore the caste and focus on the true game of cricket. If it wasn't for cricket the people of the different classes would look down on the lower classes or even the lower classes would not like the others.