

CRG'S RESPONSE

- How well do the original questions in the proposal hold up after our fieldwork? Should we modify them and if so: in which way?

CRG thinks that the original idea of relating issues of peace building with modes of governance is important. It moves away from the usual and by now exhausted way of studying conflicts and peace processes, and places the issues in a relational framework. What need to be added to the original framework, as CRG earlier expressed in a note, are questions of justice, the salience of a war-peace continuum in a society, and the interface of governance and dialogue. This will take us to the great question of democracy. Close studies of peace building show us the contention between a governmentalised version of democracy and the way popular politics negotiates the issue of democracy. In other words we must treat the research agenda from the angle of contentious politics.

- How relevant is Foucault's critique of governance in our empirical contexts i.e. of Eurocentric or Indian state governance? How far do issues relating to culture, or post-colonial critiques and debates about Western/ non western forms of governance, help us?

Foucault's critique of governing logic/s is of extreme importance in this study. This is for two reasons: First, studies of Indian governmental exercises in conflict situations within the country show the eternal dilemma of the rulers as to how much to govern and how much to concede to what Foucault called the subjugated histories; Second, this critique also tells us to read the science of governing in a new light – in the light of what Foucault said in *Discipline and Punish* about modern governance practising civilian ways of ruling in the mirror of war like exercises, such as specific way of planning, deployment, requisition, various aspects of logistics, etc. However, Foucault's insights have to be studied in the backdrop of post-colonial reality, which raises concerns of justice, dialogues, and popular politics. These form the other of modern governmentality. In short we have to keep in mind the post-colonial contentions and predicament, which pitch the autonomy of the subject and governmentality against each other even while they make each other. The issue of culture is perhaps not much important here unless we bring specific thing, like religion, etc. Indeed work at the ground level shows how much demands of political economy and market logic have penetrated "culture". More important is to study the genealogy of governmental logic in coping with conflicts. Field studies compel us to raise the question: What does peace mean to government? Unhindered accumulation of capital? Unhindered development of society in the way government desires? A particular version of democracy, that is as a regime, as a framework of rules? By the same token, what does peace building mean to government? Eliminating various stakeholders, parties, etc? Do rules of war apply to peace building as well, its strategies and tactics?

- How relevant are the varied contextual/ cultural critiques of governance / conflict resolution in our project?

Contextual critiques are important. Field studies bring out the contexts with clarity. Contextual critiques tell us the role of events; they tell us of tactical developments, contingent factors, and the productive capacity of sudden developments. They tell us to study facts meticulously – small facts, little facts, ignored, unstressed or under-stressed facts, etc. One thing that such close reading of facts tells us is the heterogeneity of peace process, the heterogeneous nature of the peace question, and plural nature of dialogue.

- What types of agencies can be seen in EU conflict resolution or Indian conflict resolution settings. Do they oppose or modify/ work with governance approaches? Do EU or Indian modes of institutional or state governance facilitate or hinder CR, and if so how?

CRG is not in a position to comment on EU setting. However we think the question of Indian institutional governance facilitating or hindering conflict resolution is an interesting one. This can by itself be a significant topic of research. For instance: Does deployment of army in quelling conflicts helps (think of AFSPA)? Do the National Human Rights Commission and other human rights agencies have at all any role in peace building? If not, why? Why cannot they suggest in conflict situation Geneva protocol like measures to adopt humanitarian measures, which help peace building? Do existing bureaucratic structures (think of the Union Home Ministry) with their respective entrenched positions help peace? What has been the juridical critique of the institutional mode (think of the Supreme Court verdict on Salwa Julum case) of peace building? Institutions of governance transform at the ground level peace building into pacification exercises. This must be studied carefully. Institutional practices are more significant than strategies etc.

- Do **governance** approaches to conflict resolution impact on social justice / gender relations / human security / civil and political liberties in our case studies? If so: in which way?

Yes, it does. We have indicated how the issues of gender relations and social justice on one hand and norms of governance on the other are mutually predicated. However we can devote some attention to security here. For a time it was thought that if the idea of human security is taken as the main yardstick of conflict resolution, and governance policies are shaped accordingly, peace building will be easier. Yet the world over, including Kashmir, Northeast, and Bihar, this is easier said than done. We may say that if human security is there, conflict will remain within limits of management. But once conflict breaks out, provisions of human security become scarce, they too become part of conflict, and then governmental steps towards limited amount of supply of food grains, aid, restoration of transport and communication, etc., are seen as parts of counter-insurgency strategy. Therefore such effort mostly fails. On the other hand the architecture of security which is sought to be provided as the umbrella over the peace process becomes a real issue of contention. CRG demonstrated earlier how a macro-structure of security co-exists with what we can call micro-insecurities or molecular insecurity. This is where the argument for pluralizing dialogues has to be posited. We have to ask: Who is the subject, the ethical and the political subject of security? What kind of subjectification as well as subjectivation occurs under the compelling structure of macro-security provided by governance of peace building – one that spawns only micro-insecurities? In this sense we are speaking here of physical security, security of the body – that is sought to be provided by this macro-structure yet precisely because this security is built along the fault lines of conflict (ethnic, etc.) it only increases the micro-insecurity – the insecurity of life and the body. Security is an essential part of governance of conflict and that is where we we must turn our probing eyes.

- What general and specific dynamics have become clearer relating to conflict/ and or peace-related local agency, mobilisation, and capacity after our fieldwork? It will be interesting to discuss if these mean different things within and between India and Europe.

It is difficult to conclude at this point of work. It will need some analyses and sustained reflection. However what is becoming clear is not that there are local dynamics reflected in local institutions, agency, mobilisation, capacity, etc., but the unequal relation between the

general and the local. It will not be an exaggeration to say that at times the *raison d'être* of the general is to marginalise the local. The study of the relational dynamics will be significant both in India and Europe. We can also see, how exactly does this general emerge – as a concert, as a guideline, as aid, as military force, as sanction, etc? We are speaking here of the disciplinary possibilities of the general.

- What have we learned about the permutations of statehood (and related social contracts/ compacts and citizenship) in India and the EU?

Conflict is productive in many ways. In India these conflicts have repeatedly demonstrated how the democratic or state building agenda is always unfinished. Conflicts have led to innovations in popular politics. Conflicts have made stereotypes difficult, equally difficult to accept straightjacket solutions. Conflicts make the hitherto accepted as “natural” borders and boundary making exercises problematic. Conflicts produce the occasions for renewing social contracts. And in all these ways they revise our notions of citizenship. Marshall spoke of social citizenship. This was, let us say, the first great revision of citizenship. Decolonisation led to citizenship for millions and millions in the world – the second great revision. And now with struggles for democracy and for making boundaries flexible we shall witness the third great revision in the order of citizenship.