

# INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR ADVANCED STUDIES

FONDATION MAISON DES SCIENCES DE L'HOMME, PARIS  
THE COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR SCHOLARS AT REID HALL, PARIS

## THE PARTITION PROJECT : A REPORT

### PARTITIONS COMPARED AND LESSONS LEARNT : ISSUES IN THE POLITICS OF DIALOGUE AND PEACE

October 2001-January 2002

#### Core Group Members

**Rada Ivekovic**, Department of Philosophy, Paris VIII University

**Stephano Bianchini**, Director, Centre for Studies on East, Central and Balkan Europe,  
Bologna

**Ranabir Samaddar**, Director, Peace Studies Programme, South Asia Forum for Human  
Rights, Kathmandu, Nepal

**Sanjay Chaturvedi**, Department of Political Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh,  
India

#### I. REPORT ON THE WORK CONDUCTED DURING THE STAY IN PARIS

##### 1. A Joint Research Work

The joint research project *Partitions Compared and Lessons Learnt: Issues in the Politics of Dialogue and Peace* was carried out in Paris, within the framework of the International Programme for Advanced Studies at the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme and the Columbia University Institute for Scholars at Reid Hall in Paris. The project was conceived in a planning meeting in Paris in October 2002 through deliberations among the noted historian Eric Hobsbawm, Maurice Aymard, Jean Luc Racine (both from Maison des Sciences de l'Homme), Rada Ivekovic (University of Paris 8), and Ranabir

Samaddar (Peace Studies Programme, South. Asia Forum for Human Rights). Rada Ivekovic was the coordinator of the core team which consisted of following researchers:

- Stephano Bianchini, professor of East European History and Institutions at the University of Bologna, Italy, and the Director of the Centre for Studies on East Central and Balkan Europe there; central coordinator of the Europe and the Balkans International network, and author among others of La Question Yougoslave (Paris: Castermann, 1996), and Sarajevo, Le Radici dell'odio. Identità e Destino dei Popoli Balcanici (Rome: Edizioni Associate, 1996); he is also the co-editor of three well known volumes in English, From the Adriatic to the Caucasus - The Dynamics of (De)stabilization (Ravenna: Longo, 2001), State Building in the Balkans (Ravenna: Longo, 1998), and The Yugoslav War, Europe and the Balkans - How to Achieve Security (Ravenna: Longo, 1995).
- Sanjay Chaturvedi, Reader in the Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh and the Co-ordinator of the Centre for the Study of Geopolitics there, a specialist in political geography, and author of The Polar Regions: A Political Geography (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1996), and the co-editor of the volume, Rethinking Boundaries: Geopolitics, Identities and Sustainability (Delhi: Manohar, forthcoming); he is also on the editorial board of the journal Geopolitics published by Frank Cass, London, and has contributed to various reputed journals including Third World Quarterly, Ocean Yearbook and the Journal of Economic and Social Geography.
- Rada Ivekovic, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, University of Paris-8, Paris, and author of Orients: Critique de la Raison Postmoderne (Paris: Eds. Noël Blandin, 1992), and Autopsia dei Balcani. Saggio di psico-politica (Milano: Raffaello Cortina 1999) also published in German as Autopsie des Balkans. Ein psycho-politischer Essay (Graz: Droschl 2001).
- Ranabir Samaddar, Director of the Peace Studies Programme at the South Asia Forum for Human Rights, Kathmandu, and earlier a professor of South Asian Studies at the Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies, Calcutta; he has recently completed a three-volume study of post-colonial nationalism in South Asia, Whose Asia is it Anyway: Nation and the Region in South Asia (Calcutta: Pearl Publishers, 1996), The Marginal Nation: Transborder Migration from Bangladesh to West Bengal (Delhi: Sage Publications, 1999), and A Biography of the Indian Nation, 1947-97 (Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001). He is the editor of the well-known volume Reflections on Partition in the East (Delhi: Vikas, 1997).

The core team worked for over 3 months from October 2001 to January 2002, when the members met in Paris and worked together on the themes and sub-themes of the study, drew up principles of comparing cases and experiences of partitions and dialogues, organized meetings and seminars, prepared draft essays, and finally a plan for a publication. The outcome of this team work has been in form of four Working Papers for publication in their collective book, and the project of a proposed volume, tentatively titled, *Partitions – Reshaping States and Minds*.

The core team had regular meetings also with other scholars located there who were interested in the project. The aim was to involve a larger group than the core team itself into producing a collective and common research programme on partitions. The connection and collaboration with the larger circle of partners not available in Paris was maintained over e-mail.

In this joint work, besides the Maison des Sciences de L'homme whose advanced studies programme hosted the project and the Columbia University for Scholars where the research work was sited, collaboration came from (a) some individual scholars, (b) the University of Paris-8, where a 3-years research-and-teaching project “Les partitions comparées - Une approche d'anthropologie de la communication” initiated from the Department of philosophy was taking shape, (c) the journal “Transeuropéennes” which published a special issue on the topic (19/20, 2001) and triggered discussion on the theme; and (d) the Department of Political Science, University of Bologna (Forli) and their Institute for Central Europe and the Balkans. Below is given the list of collaborators and participants (other than the four core members) in the six month long discussion and three month long work in Paris. The institutional affiliations are also mentioned and they are not repeated in the following reports of discussions:

Sia Anagnostoupoulou, University of Cyprus, [athanas@ucy.ac.cy](mailto:athanas@ucy.ac.cy)  
Natasha Avtonomova, Academy of Sciences, Moscow, [natavtonomova@yahoo.com](mailto:natavtonomova@yahoo.com)  
Maurice Aymard, Maison des Sciences de L'homme, [aymard@msh-paris.fr](mailto:aymard@msh-paris.fr)  
Etienne Balibar, University of Nanterre, [etienne.balibar@wanadoo.fr](mailto:etienne.balibar@wanadoo.fr)  
Paula Banerjee, University of Calcutta, [paulaban@cal.vsnl.net.in](mailto:paulaban@cal.vsnl.net.in)  
Gian Luca Bonduri, University of Bologna, [bonduri@spbo.unibo.it](mailto:bonduri@spbo.unibo.it)  
Alain Brossat, Paris, [abrossat@club-internet.fr](mailto:abrossat@club-internet.fr)  
Urvashi Butalia, feminist historian and publisher, Kali for Women, [urvashi.butalia@vsnl.com](mailto:urvashi.butalia@vsnl.com)  
Marie-Claire Caloz-Tschoppe, University of Geneva, [marie-claire.caloz-tschopp@pse.unige.ch](mailto:marie-claire.caloz-tschopp@pse.unige.ch)  
Fabio Ciaramelli, University of Naples, [ciaramel@unina.it](mailto:ciaramel@unina.it)  
Ghislaine Glasson Deschaumes, Editor, *Transeuropéennes*, [transeuropeennes@wanadoo.fr](mailto:transeuropeennes@wanadoo.fr)  
Daho Djerbal, Algiers University, & Naqd, [ddjerbal@wissal.dz](mailto:ddjerbal@wissal.dz)  
Danielle Haase Dubosc, Columbia University Institute for Scholars, [dhd.columbia@reidhall.com](mailto:dhd.columbia@reidhall.com)  
Goran Fejic, diplomat, former UN official, and economist, [goran@wanadoo.fr](mailto:goran@wanadoo.fr)  
Maurice Goldring, University of Paris 8, [goldring@ext.jussieu.fr](mailto:goldring@ext.jussieu.fr)

David Goodman, University of Sydney, [david.goodman@uts.edu.au](mailto:david.goodman@uts.edu.au)  
Ali Guenoun, University of Paris 1, [aliquenoun@hotmail.com](mailto:aliquenoun@hotmail.com)  
Dick Howard, State University of New York, [RHoward@ms.cc.sunysb.edu](mailto:RHoward@ms.cc.sunysb.edu)  
Ivan Ivekovic, American University in Cairo, [iwek@aucegypt.edu](mailto:iwek@aucegypt.edu)  
Christophe Jaffrelot, CERI, [jaffrelot@ceri-sciences-po.org](mailto:jaffrelot@ceri-sciences-po.org)  
Radha Kumar, Council of Foreign Relations, [Rdhkumar@aol.com](mailto:Rdhkumar@aol.com)  
Giacomo Marramao, University of Rome 3, [marramao@phil.uniroma3.it](mailto:marramao@phil.uniroma3.it)  
Roma Melkote, Osmania University, [melkote@hd2.dot.net.in](mailto:melkote@hd2.dot.net.in)  
Ritu Menon, feminist historian and publisher, Kali for Women, [ritumen@nda.vsnl.net.in](mailto:ritumen@nda.vsnl.net.in)  
P. Marrati, Transeuropéennes,  
Julie Mostov, Drexel University, Philadelphia, [mostovj@drexel.edu](mailto:mostovj@drexel.edu)  
Chantal Mouffe, University of [ChantalMouffe@compuserve.com](mailto:ChantalMouffe@compuserve.com)  
Jacques Poulain, University of Paris 8, [poulain@univ-paris8.fr](mailto:poulain@univ-paris8.fr)  
Francesco Privitera, University of Bologna, [priviter@spbo.unibo.it](mailto:priviter@spbo.unibo.it)  
Jean Luc Racine, Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, [racine@msh-paris.fr](mailto:racine@msh-paris.fr)  
Paolo Rumiz, University of Trieste, [p.rumiz@repubblica.it](mailto:p.rumiz@repubblica.it)  
Jacques Rupnik, CERI, [rupnik@ceri-sciences-po.org](mailto:rupnik@ceri-sciences-po.org)  
Elias Sanbar, Chief Editor, *Revue d'Etudes Palestiniennes*, [esanbar@fr.inter.net](mailto:esanbar@fr.inter.net)  
Martine Spensky, University Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, [martine@easynet.fr](mailto:martine@easynet.fr)  
Eleni Varikas, University of Paris 8, [varikas@noos.fr](mailto:varikas@noos.fr)  
Susana Villavicencio, University of Buenos Aires, [svilla@radar.com.ar](mailto:svilla@radar.com.ar)  
Oren Yiftachel, Ben-Gurion University, [yiftach@bgumail.bgu.ac.il](mailto:yiftach@bgumail.bgu.ac.il)

## 2. The Theme

The turning point of 1989 has not only shaken many parts of the globe, and affecting its construction, it has rendered overtly visible and further undeniable the process of globalisation. It is also part and parcel of the general reconfiguration of power, economy and communication on the whole planet. It is furthermore the point in time from which more than one analogy can be drawn between various types of state restructuring, decolonization processes, post-socialist transition and post-colonial transition; it is also an analogy that throws light on these several concurrent processes, more fundamentally the process of deepening the crisis of the western welfare state. In all these cases, the “transition” (much more blurred in the case of the “West”), though undefined, is after all that towards an unquestioned Western capitalist model, rather (neo-)liberal model. And while the colonial and the socialist/communist modernity, possibly a side-product of western modernity, is considered to have been failures, the latter is still proposed as the best and indeed the only pattern to follow, this time by erasing decades of local history and by starting anew from zero in the newly independent states. The violence in store through this levelling of time and history is rarely foreseen.

The nation produces its minorities, as the state produces its regionalisms and sometimes its secessions. The comparative analysis of the cases of violent partitions, such as that of India in the forties or of the former Yugoslavia in the nineties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, shows however that the patterns of ethnicization of politics that resulted from

both conflicts cross the lines of a supposed “pre-modernity” to become features of completely “modern” and “post-modern” conditions, such as the fact of inscribing the re-constitution of Europe itself with deep dividing lines. The similarities of these various transitions do not lie in a supposed liberation from conditions of servitude and of domination by one nation over another, rather in the inherent difficulties and the obstacles in the way of the constitution of autonomous political subjects (agents), and thus of independent and responsible citizenship in the new, post-transition, or post-cold-war, conditions.

The way these obstacles present themselves may not be the same. Yet, there is a general feature in all these obstacles. They represent a tendency re-emphasized today and corroborated by an age-old leaning – the tendency to resist autonomous subject-constitution and open citizenship (not conditioned by class, ethnicity, age, gender or other determinations). The nation resists fiercely its own evolution towards a society, acting in this respect as an ally of the state. The state resists as much as possible, and through ever new devices, that for which it is at the same time still the only possible framework - a society of trans-communal citizens acting in common and in solidarity through individual and shared responsibility. Partitions more often than not represent these obstacles. These obstacles condition the reconfiguration of patriarchy, through the creation of new “traditions” and a fresh distribution of gender roles. They present relations that are to be first renegotiated so as to represent a preliminary “contract” for any emerging political society. Naturally, this happens through a narrative, a dominant political discourse and ideology, and, where deemed necessary, also through laws all effecting partition and the reconstitution of the State. A comparative study of partitions in recent history is therefore needed, and such a study must necessarily have a historical perspective to see how the form of partition has evolved and has been used over time. Such a historical perspective will enable us to find out the commonalities and particularities in the variety of experiences. It will also show how and when the ideas of "homeland", "mass expulsion", "nationalism" and "blood and belonging" became the natural attributes of the form.

The historical perspective will also enable us to choose the cases to do justice to a comparative format. The experiences of the Irish, Balkan, Czech-Slovak, Palestinian, South Asian, African, Trans-Caucasian partitions are relevant in such a perspective. Such a collaborative study while dealing with particularities will address the issues of borders, boundaries, arrival of ethnicity, de-colonization, international factors, role of the pre-partition states now to be partitioned, choices (and their limits) of the population affected, and the particular techniques used such as referendum, plebiscite, boundary commission, award, genocides, international agreements on division, and the ideologies and arguments of nationalism.

An investigation into the form of partition and practices is above all a study of the self that emerges from within the smoke and the smouldering fire that partition creates in its wake. In other words, the issue of self-determination is reflected in the mirror of partition and offers us a glimpse into the way in which the political self emerges in conditions of modernity, ethnicity, neo-patriarchy, and the politics of nationalism, identity and

recognition. Such a study shows how long after the act of partition has been over, partition lives on in form of production of refugees, non-state personhood, alien-hood, incessant boundary disputes, and the ethnicization of citizenship. Such a study throws light on how partition has always been a disciplining event that shuts out other possibilities of resolving the conundrum whose one form is partitioning the country.

Finally, a comparative study of partitions will also throw light on the process of dialogue that runs parallel to the process of partition. Contrary to the common idea that inadequate dialogues make partition inevitable, such a study can show how dialogues can accelerate the process of partition, or how the same power configuration that marks the politics of partition can characterise the

3. Do we study the issue of translatability of concepts, ideas, and writings across boundaries in border and boundary studies? How do we relate the issue of boundaries of manifold character that is implicit in partition studies? For example, what language on which occasion evokes pertinent memories? Or, how do we reconnect memory, experience, and the continuing political reality of divisions and borders and boundaries? In short, is dialogue after partition the dynamics of connecting with the other?
4. Are intellectual studies on partitions in any way relevant to the politics of partitions that goes around?
5. How do we study forms of partition?
6. In what way can we make the study feminist, and not gender-blind?
7. Can we make partition study comparative, and if so, what are the structures to be compared, and what are the rules of comparison?
8. Can we fruitfully engage in comparison of forms of partitions without making deeper investigations in experiences of partitions – specific histories, area studies?
9. How can we combine specific study with comparison of forms?
10. In what way can partition studies become a part of critical peace studies in a political sense?
11. Can we speak of an exceptionality of a situation of partition, *not* in a comparative mode, but in a non-referential mode, in terms of its most critical elements?
12. Can we link this study with current developments?

**Note:** Present in the discussion had been Maurice Goldring, Ghislaine Glasson Deschaumes, Natasha Avtonomova, Urvashi Butalia, Claudio Nappo, Rada Ivekovic, Goran Fejic, and Ranabir Samaddar.

## **21 October 2001**

*The following questions were raised, or rearticulated:*

1. Are partitions an attempt towards the come-back of geopolitics?
2. What makes partitions inevitable?
3. Are partitions inevitable?
4. Otherwise, are partitions inevitable in some regions of the world only?
5. Is it modernity that brings partitions, or is it the fear of modernity that does it?
6. Partition is a concept which requires chronological restrictions.
7. “Small” politics (the people) escapes “Grand” politics (the state)
8. Sovereignty is shattered; it is governed by the system of nation states; to be investigated further
9. Symbolic power as much as resources etc may be at the bottom of partitions
10. The point of non return, the void, the point zero of partitions should be investigated.

**Note:** Present at the meeting had been Stefano Bianchini, Goran Fejic, Rada Ivekovic, Maud Lasseur, Ranabir Samaddar, and Martine Spensky.

## 2 November 2001

*Certain theoretical questions and problems raised and discussed, such as:*

1. A study of dialogue is the second part of our project - peace studies and dialogue. Such a study has to be integrated in a study of partitions.
2. But why is it that we find it difficult to think (of) the dialogue? Because the structure of dialogue and war are the same – binary. This is why we should be interested in the point of no return, point zero, from where anything is possible. We should link this to the question raised at the first meeting - one participant had asked, “Why are we interested in partitions only when they are violent?” We should also inquire into the structure of dialogue.
3. We should discuss the making of Europe, which would introduce dialogue and peace studies.
4. Dialogue also takes place during and after partition, not only in order to prevent it, sometimes to anticipate following partitions.
5. Partitioned Balkans within de-partitioned Europe, particularly in the backdrop of a reconstructed Europe.

**Note:** Present had been Stefano Bianchini, Rada Ivekovic, and Ranabir Samaddar.

## November 8, 2001

*Several substantial questions relevant to the debate on partition were raised.*

1. Julie Mostov and Radha Kumar shared their experiences on the politics of partition. The gender perspective in ethnocracies was presented, and the history of the Moldova-Gagauzia non-partition case was recounted. Gagauzia is inhabited by Turkish speaking Orthodox Christians who first wanted to secede after the dismantlement of the former Soviet Union, but were then convinced to remain together. The apple of discord was the language, and also privatisation. The Gagauzians wanted to write the “state language” (Romanian) in the Roman script, while the ethnic Rumanians (Moldovans) were using the Cyrillic. They finally achieved a relative autonomy in both area and renounced partition. It is a “success story” of dialogue.
2. There was discussion on a project on ethnic conflicts and peace processes around five case studies of partitions (Ireland, India, Israel/Palestine, Cyprus, Bosnia and Kosovo).
3. Some differences in concepts and methods of study were noted. In one case partition was broadly defined, in another one a stricter and more legalistic approach towards defining partition was taken. According to one scholar, there had been partitions from times immemorial, since states had been always born of a partition of a sort; while another tended to restrict this broad definition. Still another scholar argued for a rigorous definition, the example given being that some federations were not partitioned, since their constitution permitted



separation. So, Yugoslavia (or the USSR, or Czechoslovakia) was not partitioned, but Bosnia was, by the Washington and Dayton agreements. From another point of view, what happened to Yugoslavia and to Bosnia-Herzegovina were exactly the same thing, and it was strange to place them in different categories.

4. There was discussion on the difference between partition and secession that brought into picture the topic of state sovereignty and of priorities. It was also suggested that the dislocation of empires should not be lost sight of – Austro-Hungarian, Russian; presumably the Ottoman too.
5. Attention was drawn to the presence of a third party in the process of partition. A third party had been always there, not as a unique agency, but as one by which things were given a push. If left to themselves, the different populations would not come perhaps to a partition, but might well slaughter themselves. Presence of a "third party" implies notion of responsibility or its absence in the carnage and massacre.
6. A clear and useful difference was introduced between post-colonial and post-socialist partitions. Are there "ethnic" partitions? Several discussants suggested that the term "ethnic" should not be used, since ethnic differences were in themselves the result of the conflict and therefore could not explain the event. Ethnicities were not fixed, they were distinctive of partitions and made through them. One discussant said, that the aspect of religion should be studied, although religion in itself was the form the conflict took, and again was not its cause.
7. All partitions started with a transfer of power. What was hence significant to note was that how systemic changes related to power could create tensions in communities and then lead to partitions which then required a third party to intervene. In the case of the Balkans, the international community (that is, the third party) acted a lot according to their preconceived ideas about local ethnicity, and did not change at all their approach over the years. The case of an impossible partition was raised, that of the Basque Country. Also that of Switzerland. The question was also asked about probable or oncoming partitions (Syria? Nigeria? Indonesia?). But the view was expressed that partition is not a fatality, but a possibility.

**Note:** Present in this discussion were Hafid Hamdi-Cherif, Goran Fejic, Ellie Schaffer, Julie Mostov, Nenad Miscevic, Rada Ivekovic, Radha Kumar, Mohammed Hachemaoui, Daho Djerbal, Igor Stiks, Teodora Tabacki, Sébastien Babaud, Ghislaine Glasson Deschaumes, Ali Guenoun, Samia Soualili, Eleni Varikas, and Michael Löwy.

## **November 16, 2001**

*The points taken note of in the discussion were:*

1. The Indian partition was of British India, a diverse land under imperial control, and not of a monolithic undifferentiated sub-continent.

2. Thus when we speak of partition, it is not one partition, the partition, not even two partitions, but several partitions.
3. Partition reflects the supremacy of geopolitical reasoning, to be correct, the clash of several reasons.
4. Partition was the product of excessive geopolitics.
5. This excess was caused by reasoning along geopolitical line itself that triumphed over other lines and arguments, which were subsumed temporarily under excessive geopolitics but reared their heads afterwards to reassert their presence and functions.
6. In this context, it is important to take note of the partitions before the Partition, and the partitions that continued after the Partition – the ignored partitions.
7. One will have to study the moments of the return of geopolitics – then and now.
8. A study of partitions needs to be a map of mapping – imperial cartography and mapping, nationalist mapping, ethnic mapping of the nation, and the military-security mapping of the terrain, how they overlap, and how they contradict.
9. The moment of partition and the process of partition both are revealing in bringing the geopolitical reasoning to its extreme, to its state of excess.
10. Finally, partition is resisted also - before the act, during the act, and after – in form of dialogues. Representation and resistance – both mark the hour.

**Note:** Present in the meeting were – Karel Bourgois, Dick Howard, Ranabir Samaddar, Chantal Mouffe, Yacine Saadi, Goran Fejic, Rada Ivekovic, Ernesto Laclau, Helene Bourgois, Sanjay Chaturvedi, and Ghislaine Glasson Deschaumes.

Hyderabad” into the Indian Union (1948), its subsequent merger with the Andhra region and the establishment of the State of Andhra Pradesh (1956). She explained how specific historical circumstances since the times of British colonial rule, contributed to the shaping of political forces that, after independence, assumed different attitudes with regard to the modalities of the region’s integration into the Indian Union. In Hyderabad, the regime of the *Nizam*, autocratic and feudal, though relatively respectful of the region’s multi-cultural reality, prevented the emergence of distinct political subjects and the political articulation of cultural and other differences. In the meantime, in the Andhra region, the British rule allowed the development of national political parties based on criteria of social, linguistic or religious representation. In other respects too, the Andhra region became socially and politically more advanced (for example, there existed a movement against *sati* and child marriage and in favour of social reforms). These and other circumstances contributed to the complexity of the debate that ultimately led to the merger between the two entities. Though, in 1948, the integration of the “princely State” into the Indian Union enjoyed considerable popular support, the central government chose to prompt its implementation by resorting to force, a questionable decision from today’s perspective. The issue, however, remained open since a strong peasants’ movement, supported by the Communists, decided to continue the struggle against what it perceived as the remains of the Nizam’s feudal system (they viewed Hyderabad as India’s Hunan). It is only in 1951 that the armed struggle was called off. It is interesting to note, according to R.Melkote, that official history tends to simplify the process by reducing this complex interplay of political, social, cultural and linguistic factors to a single narrative which emphasizes “the treachery of the Nizam who refused to join the Indian Union”. In 1956, Hyderabad and the Andhra region were merged into Andhra Pradesh which became the first state of the Union established on the basis of linguistic criteria, in spite of Nehru’s opposition to that idea. Nowadays, the issue of the region’s territorial organization is once again being raised by various political forces. The common state, formerly perceived as responding to reformist aspirations, is now being defied on other grounds. The merger of the two Telugu speaking regions is now raising new questions. The domination of the coastal Andhra Kamma –the dominant caste—and the exploitation of the Telangana region by the successive governments, is giving rise to the demand for a separate Telangana state. Assertions of cultural superiority of the Andhra over Telangana takes various forms, such as the purity of Telugu language spoken in Andhra, which is also the language of literature, the media, the film industry, which is second largest film industry in the country. The Telugu films portray the Telugu people of Telangana, mostly ridiculing them. The rise of a movement for separate Telangana is taking shape on grounds of the region being reduced to an internal colony. As for the women’s movement, several questions which the participation of women in the Telangana peasant struggle raised continue to be valid. Here again, as in other cases, the women’s movement is looked at with suspicion and dismissiveness, and their loyalty is seen as divided. In any case, new political forces are intervening in the process and if the Telangana

movement acquires strength and a new State is established, it will most likely be along different lines and not those imagined by traditional political parties.

3. In concluding remarks, it was pointed out that the case of Hyderabad showed how partition and merger processes were interrelated, one often leading to the other. Therefore, they both need to be addressed by the research-group in their mutual interplay. They both reflect the tendency to “territorialize” complex issues and they show how easily different political struggles keep falling into the “territorial trap” again and again.

**Note:** Present in the discussion had been: Rama Melkote, Danielle Haase-Dubosc, Manisha Das, Rada Ivekovic, Ellie Shaffer, and Goran Fejic.

## **December 9, 2001**

*The discussions culminated in a significant one day conference at Reid Hall, Paris, on **Nation, Partitions, and Dialogues – Issues in the Politics of Peace Today**. Below is presented the agenda of the conference, which by itself is indicative of the breadth of the coverage of relevant themes and sub-themes.*

### (a) Partition, borders, boundaries, and geopolitical imagination

Sanjay Chaturvedi, "Performing Partitions after the Partition: Geopolitics, Territoriality and Identities in South Asia"

(Discussant: Paula Banerjee)

### (b) Partitions - structures, forms, histories, destinies

Stefano Bianchini, "Nationalism, Subversive Institutions and Matrioshka Partitions"

(Discussants: Jacques Rupnik and Francesco Privitera)

### (c) Reproductive capacity of the nation and challenges of state-reconfiguration

Etienne Balibar, "At the Borders of Europe"

(Discussants: Michael Löwy, M-C. Caloz-Tschopp)

### (d) Partition and forms of dialogue / Dialogues in a partitioned world

Ranabir Samaddar, "In the Time of the Partitioned Nations"

(Discussants: E. Balibar & Ghislaine Glasson Deschaumes)

### (e) Partitions as histories of nations failing and succeeding

Maurice Goldring, "Partition in Northern Ireland and in the Basque Country"

(Discussants: Martine Spensky)

### (f) Comparing processes : de-colonization, self-determination, and partition

Rada Ivekovic, "On Transitions Compared"  
(Discussant: Eleni Varikas)

## General Discussion

**Note: Present:** Sandhya Patel, Martine Spensky, Rada Ivekovic, Goran Fejic, Rama S. Melkote, Hélène Bourgois, Jean-Manuel Bourgois, Yann Braem, Ranabir Samaddar, Jacques Rupnik, Ellie Schaffer, Maurice Goldring, Marie-Claire Caloz-Tschopp, Susana Villavicencio, Etienne Balibar, Ghislaine Glasson Deschaumes, Paula Banerjee, Sanjay Chaturvedi, Maria Eleonora Sanna, Igor Stiks, Mihaly Fülöp, Michael Löwy, Teodora Tabacki, Sébastien Babaud, Francesco Privitera, Giacomo Marramao, Aleksandar Krstevski, Danièle Haase-Dubosc, and Eleni Varikas.

## 20 December 2001

*Two lectures were held, after which an excellent discussion took place engaged between the two lecturers and between the lecturers and the public.*

1. Professor Oren Yiftachel (Ben Gurion University, Israel): "The Consequences of Failed Partitions: the Emergence of the Israeli 'Ethnocracy' and the Palestinian Intifadas"
2. Elias Sanbar, Chief Editor of *Revue d'Etudes Palestiniennes*, Paris: "La notion de frontières dans le conflit israélo-palestinien".

The lectures and the debate were followed by a documentary film by film director Dominique Dubosc, ***Palestine Palestine***.

**Note:** Present in the discussion had been Ghislaine Glasson Deschaumes, Yacine Saadi, Nadia Tazi, Oren Yiftachel, Elias Sanbar, Dominique Dubosc, Françoise Gaillard, Danièle Haase Dubosc, Igor Stiks, Marijana Aleksandar Krstevski, Patrick Jacquet, Gildas Billet, Emmanuel Nekic, Zorka Domic, Rada Ivekovic, Goran Fejic, Sanjay Chaturvedi, Ranabir Samaddar, Rama Melkote, Elie Kheir, and about 25 participants from the journal "Transeuropéenne", Group "Confluences des revues", and from Reid Hall).

## 4. The book plan

As a result from the October 2001-January 2002 meetings in Paris, Stefano Bianchini, Sanjay Chaturvedi, Rada Ivekovic, and Ranabir Samaddar have come out with a concrete publication plan for a book, the provisional title of the book being ***Partitions – Reshaping States and Minds***. The four main chapters provisionally are: *Partitions – Categories and Destinies* (by Stefano Bianchini), *Partition as the Excess of Geopolitics* (by Sanjay Chaturvedi), *Un-definable Acts of Partition and Dialogue* (by Ranabir Samaddar), and *Partition as a Form of Transition* (by Rada Ivekovic). There will be besides an introductory chapter and a concluding chapter.

The introductory chapter by way of introducing the theme will take note of several experiences of partition, the insights of a comparative work, the literature on partition, the gendered nature of the partitioning acts, the flux inherent in boundary-making exercise in recent political history of the modern state, the transformation of the power-structures in local and global milieus, and will present the four core chapters in their inter-related markings. The concluding chapter will present the key conclusions framing them in a discussion on the closed nature of the world of partitions and the various exit routes, and the policy implications of the study in terms of democracy, dialogue, conflict resolution, and peace.

There have been some books and essays on partitions in the world. The partition of the Indian sub-continent, the recent collapse of the Soviet Union and erstwhile Yugoslavia, the reunification of Germany, the continuing feud between two Koreas, the Irish peace process, the failure of the Oslo peace process and the Madrid peace process in case of Israel-Palestine, and the lingering partition of Cyprus – all these have occasioned many writings and have fuelled new thinking on the strategy and acts of partitioning countries, states, nations, and continuities. The violence, often assuming proportions of genocide and the form of ethnic cleansing, has created a sense of urgency in this re-kindled interest in the theme of partitions. However, most of these studies have focused on singular experiences and are not in comparative framework, they are (with one or two exceptions) not concerned at least explicitly with policy implications for state building, regional politics, reconciliation and peace policies, transitional strategies, and the entire historical experiences of de-colonization and other forms of transition. Forms of violence and violence-induced or associated transition are now worthy of analysis in their own right. The impact of a variety of forms of violence on current politics, such as ethnological conflicts, territorial wars, or religious pogroms, is not confined to a locality only that witnesses the partition of polity, its impact is also global. Indeed one can say that, that there is a strong relation between partition, local violence, and globalisation. Therefore, there is need for new studies in a comparative framework that goes beyond area-centric readings, and tries to sum up the experiences and implications in form of readings into cross-cutting themes such as violence, state-formation, transition, union, geopolitical reasoning, reality, and its excess, and the co-existence of dialogue in the time of partition. There is further need to look at partition in the light of the themes of the emergence of gendered power-structure following partition, deficit of democracy, impoverished sovereignty, the juxtaposition of the interior and the exterior in the politics of borders and boundaries, and finally the theme of regional union, such as the European Union, as the exit route from a partitioned world. The proposed volume aims to fill in this gap in the studies of partition to some extent. It will be of interest to historians, political theorists and philosophers, policy makers, international relations experts, peace building institutions and practitioners, and political scientists.

The approach of the volume is to draw on concrete experiences in order to find out the links between various elements of these experiences and thus build on the generalizing themes of nationalism, ethnicity, territoriality, homelands, political reasoning, and state-formation. Such an approach will hopefully encourage more comparative studies of

partitions in different countries and different epochs in terms of understanding partition as a study-field that is more valuable than one may think in the world. Partitions have invented in recent history a new way of creating nation-states in contexts of political deadlocks through killings, territorial divisions, and transfers of population. Citizens have been made out of subjects through massacre of a section of subject-citizens. It is the specificity of the mode of the emergence of new state sometimes with democratic legitimacy that is at the centre of our political study, and that would be of interest to a wide section of readers. Pursuing two goals simultaneously – theoretically explaining regime types giving rise to partitions, and empirically explaining the processes of partitions in global and local contexts, the study will also show deep fissures in the theory and practice of democracy, equal citizenship, legitimation of states and regimes, and the politics of the distribution of power and resources in formation of new states.

### **5. The next phase of the project:**

1. The core research-team thinks that it is worth continuing with research on "partitions compared" in an interdisciplinary way. The exchange has given the members unexpected new insights. Further work should combine (some) area studies with theoretical work in history, political philosophy, anthropology, feminist studies, geopolitics etc. To their knowledge this kind of exchange has not been engaged elsewhere and is new and has potential for theoretical insights and policy readings.
2. It is important because it casts new light also on contemporary events which are in need of explanation and analysis. Partitions are more widespread than one might think, and they are ongoing processes. They often drag on into protracted "transitions". Violence usually involved in these partitions makes it necessary to study the logics of geopolitics, of partitioning, of de- & re-territorialisation, of political violence, the gender-divide; the constitution of the nation, state, and identities, the homogenizing narratives about the origins, the meanings of hegemony and of democracy, and the justification of one set of inequalities and injustices by another one, more consensual. We plan to do more of this, and with the help of several other authors as well, in a second book, the work on which will develop as the work on the first book *Partitions – Reshaping States and Minds* makes progress.
3. The e-mail discussion will be re-organized and will continue.
4. More specific experiences will be brought into discussion.
5. Studies on policy implications in terms of juxtaposing partition with union, federation, regional association, peaceful separation, and other forms of non-national state forms will be planned.
6. Finally, the study will be linked to studies on borders, boundary-making, borderland studies, frontier politics, mass-violence, genocide, big power strategies of crisis-management, and the related dynamics of dialogue. It may go back to earlier centuries to develop a proper historical perspective, but it has to also link itself more than ever to the current history of globalization.
7. Several seminar series, courses, special journals, publications, a dedicated website, and a continuing e-group exchange of notes and ideas are on agenda,

and the group will approach funding agencies for that and will be happy to cooperate with any university adopting part of this agenda.

## 6. Acknowledgements

The research was a part of the International Programme for Advanced Studies Programme of the Maison des Sciences de L'homme (MSH), Paris, and the group's thanks go to the MSH first. Similarly our thanks go to the Columbia University and its Institute for Scholars at Reid Hall, Paris, where the group work was housed, and the members worked as the Reid Hall fellows making use of its excellent work-facilities. The journal *Transeuropéennes* brought out a special issue on partitions that sparked debates and discussions on the theme leading to the group research. We remain indebted to the journal for its encouragement and constant companionship for the work. The Department of Philosophy at the University of Paris 8 conducted a three month long seminar for students on diverse aspects and experiences around the theme. Our thanks go to the members of the faculty, the students, and other participants, and the lecturers who undertook the trouble for participating in the series. The University of Bologna, particularly the Centre for Studies on East Central and Balkan Europe, and the Europe and the Balkans International Network remained a constant source of support and encouragement. The journal *Confluences des revues* had been also a source of support. Our debt is to *Radio France* also, the radio organized discussion on the work at its end. Finally, and not the least, our deep obligation remains to all who joined our meetings, gave us ideas, shared their expertise, helped us with fresh insights, dropped in to provide encouragement, and to those who could not come but maintained links with the programme. We hope to continue to receive the support from all institutions and individuals involved in one form or another.

## II. PUBLICATIONS : an update

### - THE BOOK Partitions – Reshaping States and Minds

As announced in the report submitted after the group has met in Paris for three months, the manuscript of a collective volume has been prepared, under the title : ***Partitions – Reshaping States and Minds.***

The book has been accepted for publication by Routledge, London

### - OTHER PUBLICATIONS

#### **Partition. Divided Countries. Separated Cities**

When the group was working in Paris an issue of the journal *Transeuropéennes* (n° 19/20, 2001) was published (all papers appearing both in French and in English) under



the title : «Partitions. Divided Countries. Separated cities/pays partagés, villes séparées ». Rada Ivekovic was a co-editor of the volume, which included also a paper by Ranabir Samaddar.