



Partition as a Tool of Conflict Resolution: A Global Perspective

Firdosi Akhtara Basid

PhD Student

Department of History,

Assam University Silchar, Assam

Abstract: *This paper intends to see how, historically, partition has become a political tool first to divide the spoil of colonial gains and secondly as a spoil of national gains in different countries. Partition has been an instrument for the colonial powers to divide and destroy people's unity, commonality, solidarity, and strength in different countries of the world. Locating India in the history of partition, this paper also discusses the partition of India into two countries – India and Pakistan- which were subsequently bifurcated into different nations along with different identities. While forming the global context of the paper, the second part discusses the formation of the global collective identities in a world context with similarities witnessed in different layers of a partition across the world.*

(Keywords: Conflict, Partition, Collective Identity)

The Concept of Partition

Partition is derived from the Latin Word '*Partitio*', which means division. The Oxford English Dictionary defines the word as n. division, separation, splitting up, chunking up, vb. divide, separate off, share out or subdivide. In historical context, it can be defined as chunking or cutting up of lands among contesting people instead of keeping in common land. It began to be used in a political sense in the 18th century, notably in 1751 when Voltaire referred to the 1700 accord of London as '*ce-trait de partage*' and then in connection with the partition of Poland in 1772, 1793, and 1795. By the 19th century, it was understood in an apolitical sense, as in the partition of Africa. In the political literature, it provoked the apologist of partition that has claimed and allowed the fulfilment of legitimate national aspirations of people, while critics of partition politics have condemned it for mutilating national entities. Historically partition has become a political tool first to divide the spoil of colonial gains and secondly as a spoil of national gains. However, the partition can also be seen as a negotiation between contested powers toward an ending solution. It is not necessarily augmented as a story of victimisation in many cases. The state mechanism, diplomatic relationship with other nations, and world politics also worked as a background stone towards the articulation of dividing soil in the name of the partition. The partition of India was not the only partition that history has ever witnessed. Much before and after the partition of India, nations continued to be partitioned, and new nations continued to be made by chunking older nations. Indian partition is important in this sense that it had become an example of crafting new nations out of nations through the easiest tool of 'partition'. Partition did not

happen only in South Asia. Partition evolved as a tool of conflict resolution by the European powers in different parts of the world. First, it was used to divide the spoils of loot and plunder by imperialist powers as was in colonial Africa. It was then experimented by the United Kingdom to destroy the nationalist movement by appropriating the communal division as was in Ireland. After the First World War, the Ottoman Empire (1918) was partitioned to satisfy the nationalist aspirations of rising nationalities in Europe as was in Ottoman Empire. (Ottoman Empire 1918; Austria-Hungary 1918), The end of the second world war and the decline of colonialism saw the partition of countries to either resolve conflicting nationalist aspirations or polarised ethnicities or weaken a superpower like Germany, which had threatened the balance of power in Europe or to create a space by partitioning another country for a persecuted nationality like the Jews as was the case in Israel. Thus, the post second world war period saw the partitioning of several countries like Korea (1943), Germany (1945), India (1947), Palestine (1947), Vietnam (1954), Pakistan (1971), Soviet Union (1991), Yugoslavia (1991), Czechoslovakia (1993), Ireland (1920), Pakistan (1971) Sudan (North and South Sudan) Eritrea broke away from Ethiopia 1993 and the latest being East Timor after partitioning Indonesia. Although most of this partitioning was either to resolve conflicts or create national spaces, it is interesting that most of these partitions failed to realise their objectives and created either more conflicts or nationalist aspirations.

Partition of Africa

The European Colonizers used the concept of partition for the first time in the context of the Partition of Africa, which is also called as 'scramble of Africa' by seven Western European powers, namely Belgium, British, France, Germany, Italy, Portuguese, and Spain during a short period known as New Imperialism between 1881-1914.ⁱ The decade of 1880 was a significant turning point in the history of Africa. Until then, the European impact on the greater part of the continental had crossed through gradual encroachments, religious missions, and economic penetration.ⁱⁱ During 1870 the very small portion of Africa, which was under the control of the Europeans, increased up to 90 per cent by 1914, except for Ethiopia and Liberia. However, Ethiopia was later invaded and captured by Italy in 1936. However, the Berlin Conference of 1884 was usually accepted as the first step toward European colonisation and trade in Africa.ⁱⁱⁱ There were huge political rivalries among the European empires during the last quarter of the 19th century, which led to the partition of Africa, even though without any war between the European powers. The later years of the 19th century witnessed a transition from "informal imperialism" — military influence and economic dominance — to direct rule.^{iv}

By 1840, businessmen from Europe had established small trading posts along the coast, but they seldom moved inland, preferring to stay near the sea. In the middle decades of the 19th century, European explorers mapped much of East Africa and Central Africa.^v Even as late as the 1870s, Europeans controlled only ten per cent of the African continent, with all their territories located near the coast. The most important holdings were Angola and Mozambique, held by Portugal; the Cape Colony, held by Great Britain; and Algeria, held by France. By 1914, only Ethiopia and Liberia remained independent of European control, and Liberia had strong connections to the United States.^{vi} Technological advances facilitated European expansion overseas. Industrialisation brought about rapid advancements in transportation and communication, especially in the forms of steamships, railways, and telegraphs. During a time when Britain's balance of trade showed a growing deficit, with shrinking and

increasingly protectionist continental markets due to the Long Depression (1873–96), Africa offered Britain, Germany, France, and other countries an open market that would garner them a trade surplus: a market that bought more from the colonial power than it sold overall.^{vii}

The Second Italo-Abyssinian War (1935–36), ordered by the Fascist dictator Benito Mussolini, was the last colonial war occupying Ethiopia – which had remained the last independent African territory apart from Liberia. Italian Ethiopia was occupied by Fascist Italian forces in World War II as part of Italian East Africa.^{viii} The occupation is an example of the expansionist policy that characterised the Axis powers as opposed to the Scramble for Africa.^{ix} By the end of the First World War, there were about fifty states in Africa except for Liberia and Ethiopia; the rest of Africa was under the rule of European countries. During the inter-war years, the resistance and revolt of various kings that had occurred during the early colonial rule, there was no longer the form of the struggle waged by the African people. On the surface, colonialism seemed to have established itself, and the stability of colonial rule led some people to refer to this period as the 'golden age of colonialism in Africa.'^x

Partition of Ireland

Ireland was one of the first colonies of England. The Partition of Ireland^{xi} was the process which had been enacted on 3rd May 1921 under the Government of Ireland Act of 1920, through which the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland divided Ireland into two self-governing parties, Northern Ireland and Southern Ireland.^{xii} However, the act intended for both the territories to remain under the United Kingdom, but the smaller northern -Ireland was duly created with a Home Rule Government and remained under the UK. At the same time, the larger Southern Ireland was not recognised by most of its citizens instead, they recognised self-declared 32 countries as the Irish Republic.^{xiii}

The Ulster province, the territory that became Northern Ireland within the Irish province, was the plantation region of the English along with the Scottish, who worked on the land of the six counties of Ulster. Ulster, because of their association with the Scottish, was largely Protestants and Presbyterians against their Irish brethren, who were largely catholic. In Northern Ireland, the Catholics were in a minority, while in Southern Ireland, it was the Protestants.^{xiv} Both communities were suspicious of each other and did not want to be under the rule of the other. This rift weakened the rise of Irish nationalism. The colonial British power took advantage of this polarisation^{xv} Which further led to the Irish War of Independence in 1919-20 and a guerrilla conflict between the Irish Republican Army (IRA) and British forces. In 1920 the British Government introduced another bill to create two different governments, one for the six northern countries known as Northern Ireland and one for the rest of the island called Southern Ireland. It was passed as the Government of Ireland Act 1920 (by the British Government, obviously), and the country got partitioned.^{xvi} The Anglo-Irish Treaty concluding the Anglo-Irish war was a preliminary negotiation between De Valera and Prime Minister Devid Lloyd George with a concluding agreement on a conference in London 'to ascertain how the association of Ireland with the community of nations known as the British empire might best be reconciled with Irish national aspirations and the ultimate breakdown came with the question of partition.'^{xvii} The Irish delegates headed by De-Valera sought to find an alternative solution of partition or the formation of a boundary commission instead. The negotiation reached a dramatic climax on 5th

December when Lloyd George offered the threat of a resumption of war balanced by the last-minute occasion of fiscal autonomy for the new Irish state and demanded immediate settlement within the empire. On 6th December the delegates signed a treaty establishing the Irish Free State as a self-governing dominion within the British Commonwealth.^{xviii} The capital Belfast witnessed unprecedented communal violence, mainly between Protestant and Catholic civilians. More than 500 were killed, and over 10,000 became refugees; most civilians were from the Catholic minority.^{xix} The state of Northern Ireland came into being because of this Act. This Act did not come into force in 'southern' Ireland, and instead, the Anglo-Irish Act of 1921 created the 'Free State, which became the 'Republic of Ireland' in 1949. The Anglo-Irish Treaty contained a provision that led to the composition of a Boundary Commission through which the northern and southern areas were demarcated, although several protestant areas remain in Ireland and similarly, many catholic majority areas remained within Northern Ireland, which remained a part of the United Kingdom. Most of the leaders of both pro and anti to treaty were expected the commission could award largely such areas, which were called nationalist areas like County Fermanagh, County Tyrone, south Londonderry, South Armagh, and South Down and the city of Derry, to the Free State while the remnant of Northern Ireland would not be economically viable. Since partition, the Irish republicans and nationalists have opted for the end of partition, while the Ulster Loyalists and the Unionists have sought to maintain it. The pro-treaty Cumann- na-nGaedheal^{xx} Government of the free state hoped the boundary commission would make Northern Ireland too small to be viable.

Creation of Israel and Partition of Palestine

Things began to change in Israel when the British replaced the Ottoman rulers after the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. The League of Nations formalised the British administration under the 'Palestine Mandate'^{xxi} in 1923 as part of the partitioning of the Ottoman Empire following World War I.^{xxii} The Mandate reaffirmed the 1917 British commitment to the Balfour Declaration, for establishing a "National Home" in Palestine for the Jewish people, with the prerogative to carry it out.^{xxiii} However, it did not work for a long time as Jewish migration continued to occur widely. To secure the country from foreign control and to pursue national independence, strikes and armed insurrection took place by the Arabs in 1937, which continued for about six months. The prolonged strike compelled the British to establish the Peel Commission. After prolonged discussion, the Commission concluded that the Mandate had become unworkable and recommended Partition into an Arab state linked to a small Jewish state and a mandatory zone known as Transjordan.^{xxiv} With the outbreak of World War II, British policies were influenced by a desire to win Arab world support and could ill afford to engage with another Arab uprising. The McDonald White Paper of May 1939 declared that it was "not part of the British government's policy that Palestine should become a Jewish State".^{xxv} After World War II, in August 1945, President Truman asked for the admission of 100,000 Holocaust survivors into Palestine. but the British maintained limits on Jewish immigration in line with the 1939 White Paper.^{xxvi} The Jewish community rejected the restriction on immigration and organised armed resistance. These actions and the United States' pressure to end the anti-immigration policy led to the establishment of the Anglo- American Committee of Inquiry. In April 1946, the Committee reached a unanimous decision to admit 100,000 Jewish refugees from Europe into Palestine immediately.^{xxvii} The recommendations triggered violent demonstrations in the Arab states and called for Jihad

and the annihilation of all European Jews in Palestine. In February 1947, Britain announced its intent to terminate the Mandate for Palestine, referring the matter of the future of Palestine to the United Nations.^{xxviii} In May, the UN formed a Special Committee (UNSCOP)^{xxix} to prepare a report on recommendations for Palestine. In August, after three months of conducting hearings and a general survey of the situation in Palestine, a majority committee report recommended that the region be partitioned into an Arab and a Jewish state. On 3 September 1947, the Committee reported to the General Assembly.^{xxx} On 23 September 1947, the General Assembly established an *ad-hoc* Committee on the Palestinian Question to consider the UNSCOP report. On 29 November 1947, the United Nations General Assembly voted 33 to 13, with ten abstentions and one absent, in favour of the modified Partition Plan.^{xxxi}

The United Nations Partition Plan for Palestine was a proposal by the United Nations which recommended a partition of Mandatory Palestine at the end of the British Mandate. On 3rd September 1947, the Committee reported to the General Assembly Chapter V: PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS (I), Section A of the Report contained eleven proposed recommendations (I-IX).^{xxxii} Chapter VI: PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS (ii) contained a plan of partition with the economic union to which seven members of the Committee, namely Canada, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, the Netherlands, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay expressed themselves in favour.^{xxxiii} The report of the majority of the committee of CHAPTER VI envisaged the division of Palestine into three parts: an Arab State, A Jewish state, and the City of Jerusalem. On September 23rd, 1947, the General Assembly established the Ad-Hoc committee on the Palestine question to consider the UNSCOP report representative of the Arab Higher Committee and Jewish Agency were invited and attended. Further, another sub-committee was set up on October 23rd to draw up a detailed plan regarding the partition plan. Gradually 29 November 1947, the UN General Assembly adopted the Partition Plan as Resolution 181(II).^{xxxiv}

The resolution recommended the creation of independent Arab and Jewish States and a Special International Regime for the city of Jerusalem. The Partition Plan, a four-part document attached to the resolution, provided for the termination of the Mandate, the progressive withdrawal of British armed forces, and the delineation of boundaries between the two States and Jerusalem.^{xxxv} Part I of the Plan stipulated that the Mandate would be terminated as soon as possible, and the United Kingdom would withdraw no later than 1 August 1948. The new states would come into existence two months after the withdrawal but no later than 1 October 1948.^{xxxvi}

The German Partition

The partition of Germany within the span period from 1945-1990, following the Second World War, was the consequence of the attempts by the four major wartime allies to feed a structure to replace the Third Reich and secure European peace. Ratified at Yalta in February 1945 along with the agreement of Potsdam on August 1st, 1945, after nearly a year and a half of negotiations, under the pressure of the Cold War, the four-zone of occupation became a de-facto partition between Eastern and Western block led by the United States and the Soviet Union.^{xxxvii} Following Germany's defeat in World War II, more than a quarter of its territory was annexed to Poland and the Soviet Union, leading to huge population displacement in Germany. Nearly 12-14 million

German-speaking refugees and expellees arrived in Western and central Germany from the Eastern provinces and other countries of Eastern and Western Europe between 1944-50. An estimated two million died on the way there.^{xxxviii} According to the Soviet estimate, the total number of Soviet people perished in the war was 20 million, about 10 per cent of the total population. Some Westerners believe there was widespread resentment against Stalin's regime in the Soviet Union. However, unparalleled German brutality against the Soviet people in the initial stages of the war itself showed what Hitler had in store for them. Thus, German brutalities unified them, and they built up the most powerful resistance against the German invaders. Large-scale guerrilla warfare developed in every part of the Soviet Union; more than a million partisans were taking part against the German army, leading to Germany's defeat and ultimate divisions.^{xxxix}

Division of Korea

Korea's division also grew out of immediate post-world war circumstances, as American troops in the south and Russian in the north replaced the Japanese in 1945. It was the first war in which the US got directly involved, and after the defeat of the Japanese, it had been divided into two occupation zones viz., the northern zone under the Soviet Union and the Southern zone under the United States. Only after a full-scale war between 1949 and 1953 did an armistice confirm the existence of two Korean republics, north and south.^{xl}

Partition of Vietnam

The Partition of Vietnam was resolved in one of the most controversial wars of recent times. Divided into north and south by the Geneva Conference, which ended the war against the French, Vietnam was never to enjoy peace until reunification came with the victory of North Vietnam and its southern communist allies in 1975. The policy of contentment led to the US involvement in the war of Vietnam. The proclamation of independence of Vietnam by Ho Chi Min in 1945 led to the establishment of a democratic republic in Vietnam. With the help of Britain and the US, the French tried to restore their rule in Vietnam, ultimately leading the French into a war in 1946. However, the Soviet Union and China deliberately helped Vietnam in its war against the French. In 1954 the French forces suffered a debacle, and around 12,000 French troops were besieged by the Vietnamese at a place called Dien Bien Phu. In July 1954, an agreement was signed at Geneva, and accordingly, French rule in Vietnam came to an end. Vietnam was temporarily divided into North Vietnam and South Vietnam.^{xli}

Partition of Eastern Europe (Yugoslavia. Czechoslovakia)

Serbia and Montenegro separated from each other after the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Similarly, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czech and Slovakia, Croatia and Macedonia, Serbia, and Kosovo, all of whom former parts of Yugoslavia have found partition as the only way to part ways. The Soviet Union broke up into 15 republics between 1990 and 1991. The prelude to all such partitions was the separation of Hungarian Magyars and from the Hapsburg Dynasty in Austria-Hungary through an *Ausgleich* (compromise) in 1867.^{xlii} Despite their distinctive language and ethnic origin, Magyars have been unable to maintain their independent position in Central Europe. They were under competing pressure from two sides, the Hapsburgs of Austria and the Ottoman Turks, eventually coming under the Hapsburgs in 1699. Since then, the Hungarians have been resisting the Austrian connection over them. After the defeat of Austria by Prussia in 1866, the Magyars pressed for an equal partnership in the empire.^{xliii} The result was Act XII of 1867 whereby it was agreed between the states of Hungary and Austria,

which virtually partitioned the Hapsburg domain into two states in which one was destined to be ruled by the Magyars and the other by German Austrians. There were provisions for separate assemblies but a common defence, foreign affairs, and financial arrangement for the two. The eventual division of the two after the First World War confirmed the partition.^{xliv} But all these partition cases were inherently different from Ireland, Palestine, and India, where a partition had decidedly different origins.

Locating India in the History of Partitions:

The First World War led many Indians to question British moral superiority. Here was the nation they had long been taught to reverse as the ultimate goal in the articulation of “The White Men’s Burden’ theory, locked in a bitter struggle with other European powers, accusing each other of atrocities and coming near to defeat. The Russian Revolution showed the British colonies, as well as the Indians, that it was possible to challenge the existing order, while the entry to the war by the United States promised international emphasis on Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points and their call for national self-determination.^{xlv} On the other hand, Muslim nationals of India were also disturbed as their troops were fighting the Turks, whose sovereign, the Ottoman Sultan, was regarded as the Caliph. Under this chaos, Britain’s answer to deal with all the aspirations of the Indians ‘after the war’ was not adequate. Much of the British Government’s colonial policy after the end of the First World War was found to be illogical and self-defeating. The Partition of Ireland left a deep impact on the minds of the Indians as they observed many similarities to their own situation in India. The unnecessary violent overreaction of the British to the Irish Nationalist Uprising in 1916 made them realise that any hope for a peaceful move towards home rule was almost impossible and led instead to a violent war of independence.^{xlvi} In India, the Montagu-Chelmsford package was also proved to be less expected. The creation of the system of shared power in the name of ‘dyarchy’ eventually offered much power to the British Viceroy as well as, in the absence of any single delegates from the country itself, created major discontentment among the Indians. Further, the Rowlat Act added fuel to the fire.

After World War I, India has also become less important to the British in commercial prospects. Before the war, the country imported about 185 million woven cloths from British mills, which was reduced to only 29 per cent of total cloth imports, the rest mostly from other Asian countries. In 1929 India imported 3,645 British cars but 7,943 from the United States. The British stranglehold on India’s balance of payment was gradually reducing. A Terrif board was created in 1923, and in 1925. Accordingly, the cotton excise was abolished, and measures were introduced to protect Indian manufacturers from Japanese imports.^{xlvii} Reducing commercial pressure, Indian nationalist agitation and changing British attitudes combined to influence the British government’s move towards home rule. The constant demand for Swaraj by the Congress party further resulted in the introduction of the Government of India Act of 1935, which successfully implemented the local Self-Government with its failure of a clear commitment to actual freedom.^{xlviii} However, the Act introduced a federal system, but this was soon to be proved catastrophic in Bengal, creating confusion regarding the allocation of seats to the Muslims. The Muslim League viewed the Act in a different way. The League expected that they might obtain power in Sindh, in Northwest Frontier Province, Punjab and Bengal as all the province were predominantly Muslim majority, but in the resulting elections, it turned out to be different as in the 1937 election, Congress swept the board as in five

out of the eleven provinces, they won a clear majority. Despite of Congress's misgivings about working with the British, they set about forming ministries and started the work of provincial government. The period of 1937 to late 1939 was one of the peaceful periods until world events took a different course for the Indians.^{xlix}

The outbreak of World War II in 1939 and Linlithgow, then the Viceroy's declaration without consulting either with the Congress or with the League, of India's participation in the War had taken a major turn on the ongoing political atmosphere of India. The promise of giving independence after the war was also proved to be in vogue. From August 1942, two major movements, the Civil Disobedience and the Quit India Movement, though launched by Gandhi, proved to be fairly ineffective in practical terms. However, it was a major distraction to the British war effort. The British mobilisation to the war increased the Indian army from 175,000 to over 2 million, which was far more than just a recruiting exercise creating hurdles to maintain with rapid mechanisation.¹ The Indians started working alongside a new class of British soldier which also exposed them from all areas and backgrounds to trades and mass modernisation. Simultaneously, the Indian industry received a massive boost from the war economy resulting in higher employment and wages, which led them to stand for themselves against colonial rule.^{li}

The war years in India were overshadowed by the Bengal famine of 1942-44, which killed six times as many human beings as all the other British Empire lost in the second world war. The 1943 famine enquiry initially estimated 1.5 million subsequent deaths from disease resulting from malnutrition and starvation.^{lii} Throughout 1942 the price of rice doubled from about 6 rupees per mound to 14 rupees, and by 1943 it had risen to 37 rupees. Food stocks in 1943 were, in fact, 11 per cent higher than they had been in 1941.^{liii} The poor rural population could not afford to buy rice, and the Governments in Delhi and Bengal appeared incapable of introducing a price control or rationing system that would have allowed them to do so or given them the minimum to survive. By June 1943 the situation became more desperate as people were dying on the streets of Calcutta out of starvation.^{liv} The government's grip both in Delhi and Calcutta was equally strange and hopeless. Khwaza Nizamuddin, the Premier of the Bengal government and Huseyn Suhrawardi, the Minister for Supply, were very critical towards the British Government's failure to handle the situation. In order to reserve some grains in India, Viceroy Wavell was pressing Churchill in London to give attention to India's crisis and to divert shipping, which, however, did not receive any attention from him. Churchill's refusal to release shipping has been blamed for causing more deaths in Bengal.^{lv}

Through 1944 and 1945, General Bill Slim 14th Army swept the Japanese out of Burma and retook Rangoon. Allied forces under Mountbatten, working in conjunction with American forces in the Pacific, led to Japan's surrender on 15th August 1945. In the meantime, in July 1945, the Labour Party scored a convincing and expected win in the British general election. In the king's speech on 15th August, the new prime minister Clement Attlee published that the government do its utmost to promote, in conjunction with the leaders of Indian opinion, the early realisation of self-government in India.^{lvi}

Part of the cabinet mission plan also recommended establishing a constituent assembly elected by the provincial legislatures. Jinnah accepted it, encouraged by Gandhi Congress prevaricated. However, elections for the constituent assembly took place in July Congress won 205 seats and the League 73. At the end of July, the League

met in Bombay and withdrew their previous support for the plan units and priority; He called the 'Direct Action Day' in Calcutta, and by the autumn of 1946, both sides were as far apart as about despite the interim government actually forming without any League participation on 2nd September followed by an appalling outbreak of rioting in Calcutta lasting several days.

The British were also dealing with an Indian army who's what time experience had changed from the time recruitment on class-based, where soldiers were elected according to religion, caste and often the district they lived. By the end of the war, there were very few of the old Indian army officers left serving with their regiments, and during 1946, occasional education had developed among Indian soldiers. Muslim soldiers were affected by British policy in Palestine, which they thought was unfair, and regiments returning from Indonesia had seen the independence struggle there against the Dutch. Issue of free cigarettes to British troops but not to Indians we can major issue has blown up in the press. The Indian National Army, which was organised and founded by Subhash Chandra Bose, recruited Indian soldiers during the Japanese in 1942 and from the large Indian population in Burma to fight against the British. Though Bose himself was killed in August 1945, the Indian National Army had made significant political statements and supported Congress.

The interactive political situation of increasing violence and cramming the country in January 1947 was not a happy month for Wavell. On 17 January, he wrote to Attlee saying that he was very sorry that the cabinet had not been able to give him a more definite policy and that all he could do at present was to draw up plans for an emergency withdrawal. On 21 January established, an Emergency Planning Committee repairing plans to evacuate the one lakh British and European civilians and 63 000 British military and British serving with the Indian armed forces.

On 20 February, prime minister Atlee announced in the House of Commons that it was 'His Majesty's Government's definite intention to take necessary steps perfect that transfer of power to responsible Indian hands by a date not matter than June 1948.^{lvii} All the parties were asked to see their differences to consider the powers of the central government in British India should be handed over on the due date, whether as a whole to some form of Central Government for British India or in some areas to the existing provincial government or in such other way Asin more responsible and in the best interest of the Indian people.^{lviii}

However, the deep difference of AIML could not be bridged by a film-see-paper scheme such as the Cabinet Mission had devised. Both the parties, in so far as they accepted it at all, avowedly did so in order to achieve their own objectives, which were extremely contradictory. Jinnah, at the early stage, became convinced that the Congress would never tolerate the weak, easily divisible union of India desired, and it did on the Congress leaders, especially after their experience of the attitude of the League representatives in the interim government that the price which the leak wood exact for preserving unity would be too high they would insist on strong States or groups of states with divergent interest and Outlook and a weak federal centre which its own internal communal divisions would paralyse and quite incapable of normal problems of poverty in literacy and out moderate social customs. the areas which they could in this suitable to which most of the Congress leaders at come to buy the beginning of 1947, the labour of 9 months was not there for only in the rain they have at any rate brought home to everyone except for Gandhi the necessity of partition. But partition was a major operation which, even in agreeing to buy the party leaders, was bound to entail much blood shading. In August 1947, the tectonic plates of

Indian politics shifted abruptly. The British colonial rule in India came to an end with the split of the nation into new nations with such sadness. The emergence of new borderlands was strange for the people; many of them were unknown of their exact location for several days. Nothing had foreshadowed its geographical positions, and the creation of new nations took them to find themselves to be in an alien nation.^{lix}

Towards the Construction of ‘Global Collective Identity’:

The construction of the boundaries of social systems and organisations entails delineating the relations of the people of respected regions with their perspective environment or environments. Each ecological setting provides a range of possibilities with respect to its resources and social structures. Choices have been made or set the limits or the boundaries of the system and generate its particular sensitivity to environmental changes. The construction of a great variety of environments in different ecological settings has been a listed feature of world history. Moreover, changes in various components of international systems in mapping different socio-political activities and groups within societies, and such interaction activates various potentialities of protest and conflict.^{lx} On the one hand, it is the recognition of the ubiquity of such border frameworks and, on the other, their volatility and changeability that lies behind the analysis presented as world history. The process of the constitution for the construction of collective identity has been taking place in different groups in societies under the impact of such interrelations for the forming of new trends in sociological analysis and contemporary analysis of ethnicity or nationalism. Collective identities are socially constructed. Hence, their construction has always been a basic dimension of the constitution of societies or social order.^{lxi} A central aspect of such construction is an accepted definition of ‘similarity’ among its members as against the ‘strangeness’, the differences that distinguish the other or others. Certain areas of political relations, economic connections and social activities influence the construction of collective identities. The primordial code of collective identity focuses on such components as gender and generation, kingship, territory, language, and race as a factor for constructing and reinforcing the boundary between inside and outside.^{lxii} The boundaries that are constructed are perceived as naturally given. The second code is constructed based on familiarity with implicit and explicit rules of contact traditions and social routines that define and demarcate the boundary of collectivity.^{lxiii} These rules are regarded as the core of the community's collective identity. These codes are considered as the ‘sacral’ or ‘transcendent’ that links the constituted boundary between ‘us and ‘them’ or ‘one’ to ‘another’, not to natural conditions but to a particular relation of the collective subject. The construction and reproduction of collective identity or consciousness are attended through a combination of the promulgation and institutionalisation of models of social and cultural order with various attends to control the production and flow of resources.^{lxiv} Thus, the construction of collective identities has been going on throughout human history in all human societies in different economic and political-ecological settings, from small city States to great kingdoms. In all cases, the process of disintegration and structure relates to advances with growing motion implemented in heterogeneous economic and ethnic populations with some degree of international political and ecological context.

The process of Colonization and Decolonisation of Africa, Ireland, Israel and India shared a commonality of British thrust for economic and political gains. The basic code of ‘collective identity’ as formed by basic ‘familiarity’ between ‘one to another’ worked as a background force for the Indians to rise against Colonialism.

Worldwide wars like 1st and 2nd World Wars led them to experience the Gobel political connectivity. Not only this, the history of the Partition of Ireland shared quite a similarity with the Partition of India. As a bridge of collective identity, the religious factors that were gathering the cause for the partition of Palestine shared commonality with the political atmosphere of India. The rise and growth of Capitalism in the European countries were shared responsible for the establishment of British colonies to serve them as a global market. The ‘Scramble Africa’, subsequently the partition of Vietnam, Korea, Ireland, Palestine, and India, also served the code of collective identity in the perspective of common genealogy, language, sufferings, trauma, human displacement, economic catastrophes etc. However, these countries had different geographical locations, yet they related to each other through a shared experience called ‘Partition’ and which led them to form the basic code of ‘collective identity’ and which is ‘similarity’. In her study of ‘totalitarianism’ in Europe, Hannah Arendt established the link between state formation and the flow of refugees.^{lxv} The subsequent partitions of the countries also faced massive refugee influx marking a high point of fragmentation not only of any country’s landscapes but also of the identities of its people. The people on either side of the border of a divided nation suddenly became homeless and were also many times given the status of the minority on the strength of their population. This status incurred enormous fear and severe atrocities and compelled them to move across the border. The wave of the refugee influx, their mighty struggle, conversion into the new political phenomenon, towards the integration process of re-conversion into citizens led them to form one ‘collective identity’ belonging to the globe.

Conclusion:

Decolonisation in South Asia is best understood as the intricate process by which these relationships are unrevealed at different levels of imperial engagement across an array of locations. It was not and could never have been a smooth unilinear movement along the high road of return; along the way, there are starts and stops, spurts and lulls, with more crises and corners to be negotiated than open roads and clear destinations.^{lxvi} Only by recognising the integers and complex interlace, both temporal and spatial, can one begin to grasp what the colonisation was and still is today. After the end of the first world war, from the Indian perspective, the first major occasion when the corners Indians were faced with an unprecedented confrontation with the worldwide crisis was for Britain with its head-on collision with the Ottoman Sultan and Khalif of Islam. On this occasion, the British deeply tested the loyalty to the British of India's Muslims. The Gadar revolt and the Khilafat movement were loosely connected and simultaneously began to take place from local to National and then global. The global wartime further engages the Indians with European society on the ground of military recruitment. There were many well-known combatants, but most were soldiers, and half were from Punjab. In peacetime, the recruitment into the Indian army was about 15000 men; during the word war, it rocked upwards to almost 1.3 million men over four years. No previous movement in history had South Asians enter Europe in comparable numbers, which father helped them to gain knowledge from Europe to the villages and towns of upper India as well as other seditious ideas.

In the series of partitions that took place in the history of the world, India occupied a very prominent place mainly because it not only divided a united country but created two separate nations. The partition of India was on the

premise of religion. Still, the premise was proved false when Bangladesh was born out of Pakistan, creating a new basis of nation formation – language. Partition of India was to resolve the communal conflict between Indian Hindus and Muslims, but it not only failed to resolve the objective, it created two permanent enemies in the form of India and Pakistan. But when borders between the two nations were drawn, it was found that the two-nation theory was false because the Hindus and Muslims did not represent two separate geographical entities. They cohabited, had a syncretic culture, and were enmeshed with each other in such a way that it was not only difficult to create two separate geographical nations but also separated the two enjoined twins. Although the communal polarisation was between the Hindus and Muslims when there was the actual creation of nations, it was between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs as was in Punjab, Muslims and Muslims as was in Kashmir and Hindus, Muslims, and Christians as was in North East India. The partition of India rewrote history and redefined the politics of the subcontinent. In this context, the partition of India was unique and most important in the history of partition. The states of South Asia bear the imprints of their colonial past. The Partition of India resulted from the two hundred years of divide and rule policy of the colonial state profoundly reshaped the land ownership, agricultural setup, market, trade, political identity, social integrity, and citizenship in India and Pakistan and later in Bangladesh.

ⁱPhilip Curtin, Steven F, Leonard Thompson & J. Vansina: 1978: "African History from Earliest Times to Independence", published in the USA by Longman publishing New York, p. 397; Can see, Shillington, Kevin (2005). Encyclopedia of African history. New York: CRC Press, p. 878

ⁱⁱ Ibid. p. 398

ⁱⁱⁱDarwin John: 1997: "Imperialism and the Victorians: The Dynamics of Territorial Expansion", English Historical Review, pp. 614-40

^{iv}Shillington, Kevin (2005). Encyclopedia of African history. New York: CRC Press, p. 878

^vIbid. p. 879

^{vi}Strachan Hew (ed) 2014: "The Oxford Illustrative History of the First World War", 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, ISBN 978-0-19-164040-7, p.101

^{vii}Shillington: 2005: 301

^{viii} Ullendorff Edward :1995: "The Ethiopians: An Introduction to Country and People", second edition, London Oxford University Press, ISBN- 0-19-285061-X, p.90

^{ix}Arjun Dev & Indira A. dev:2009: "History of the World", Orient Black Swan Private Limited, p. 97 ; Can see, H. R. Cowie :1982: "Imperialism and Race Relations Vol-5", revised edition, Nelson Publishing house, pp. 60-130

^xIbid. p.98

^{xi}Note: 'The partition of Ireland' is called in Irish 'criochdheighilt-na-hEireann'

^{xii}Lynch Robert: 2019: "The Partition of Ireland: 1918-1925", Cambridge University Press, pp.11-15

^{xiii}Ibid. pp.30-40

^{xiv}Ibid. pp.100-101

^{xv}Coleman Marie:2013; "The Irish Revolution 1916-1923" Routledge publication, p. 67

^{xvi}Ibid p. 68

^{xvii}S. J Connolly (Ed) :1998: "The Oxford Companion to Irish History", oxford university Press, p. 16

^{xviii}Ibid. p.16

^{xix} Op. Cit. Lynch Robert :2019: 131

^{xx}Note: "Cumann nanGaedheal" was a political party in the Irish Free State, which formed the government from 1923 to 1932.

^{xxi}**The Palestine mandate was responsible for putting into effect the 'Belfour declaration' originally made on November 2nd, 1917

^{xxii}Mansfield Peter: 1992: "The Arabs", p. 172

^{xxiii}Ibid. p. 174

^{xxiv}Sumanta Bose: 2009: "Contested Lands: Israel – Palestine, Kashmir, Bosnia and Sri Lanka", Harvard University Press", ISBN- 978-0-674-02856-2, p.223

^{xxv}Benny Morris :2011: "Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist- Arab Conflict 1881-1998", Doubleday Publishing Group, p. 159

xxvi Ibid. 160

xxvii Ibid. p. 162

xxviii Russel A. Stone & Walter P. Zenner (Ed): 1994: "Critical Essays on Israeli Social Issues and Scholarship, Vol-3, SUNY Press, pp.179-182

xxix Note: UNSCOP stands for "United Nations Special Committee on Palestine".

xxx Sumanta Bose: 2009: "Contested Lands: Israel – Palestine, Kashmir, Bosnia and Sri Lanka", Harvard University Press", ISBN- 978-0-674-02856-2, p.223

xxxi Op. cit. Morris: 2011, p. 164

xxxii "United Nations Special Committee on Palestine: Report to the General Assembly Volume 1, 3rd September 1947, p. 51

xxxiii Benny Morris :2011: "Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist- Arab Conflict 1881-1998", Doubleday Publishing Group, p. 159; can see, Russel A. Stone & Walter P. Zenner (Ed): 1994: "Critical Essays on Israeli Social Issues and Scholarship, Vol-3, SUNY Press, pp.179-182

xxxiv Ibid. p. 53

xxxv Note- "the primary objectives sought in the foregoing schemes were, in short, political division and economic unity; to confer upon each group, Arab and Jew, in its territory, the power to make its laws while preserving both, throughout Palestine, a single integrated economy, admittedly essential to the well-being of each and the same territorial freedom of movement to individuals as is enjoyed today" Can see, Report of the General Assembly, Vol-1.

xxxvi Report of the General Assembly, Volume -1

xxxvii A.C. Roy, "World Since 1945",

xxxviii Ibid.

xxxix Ibid. p.151

xl A. C. Roy "World Since 1945"

xli Ibid. p.130

xlii Young Marilyn :1991: "The Vietnam Wars: 1945-1990", New York Harper Perennial, p.41

xliii Logevall Frederick :2012: "Embers of War: The fall of an Empire and the Making of America's Vietnam", Random House, pp. 95-130

xliv Ibid. pp.130-139

xlv Burney W. Spinner: 2017: "Partition: The Story of Indian Independence and the creation of Pakistan in 1947", first published in Great Britain by Simon & Schuster UK Ltd. P.31

xlvi Ibid. p. 32

xlvii The Times of India Special Report, 18th February 1930.

xlviii Op. cit. pp. 34-37

xlix Ibid. p.38

¹ ICHR, 1942-43, Part-ii, section viii, p. 87

ⁱⁱ Ibid. p.89

ⁱⁱⁱ L. Khan " The Great Partition", p.82

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ Ibid. pp. 84-85

^{liv} Op. cit. Burney White: 2017: pp. 39-45

^{lv} Note: Wavell Summed it up when he complained to Amery after his first visit to Bengal that, "In the old days the senior members of the ICS were to some extent public figures.... regarded as ministerial. They held themselves morally and personally responsible for the welfare of the people in their charge. And would not have tolerated in Calcutta, then you would in London, the disgraceful episode of the beatitudes. The officials do not seem to me to be conscious of the disgrace brought upon the administration. He concluded the Bengal Famine as one of the disasters that has be fallen any people under the British rule and damage to our reputation here is incalculable" – Burney White:2017: p.45

^{lvi} Ibid. p.30-35

^{lvii} Kaushik Roy (ed) :2012: "Partition of India: Why 1947?", Oxford University Press , p.240

^{lviii} Ibid. p. 241

^{lix} As one them recalled it "*was a time for great confusion. You should realize that the separation happened all of a sudden and people were not well informed. Many people thought that it was temporary and that two countries would one day be one again. They turned our world upside down... nobody asked us, we did not know what was happening till much later... our lives were amputated.*" Can see William V. Schendel "The Bengal Borderland : Beyond State and Nation in South Asia".

^{lx} Philip Pomper, Rechar H. Elphick & Rechar T. Vann (Ed):1998: "World History: ideologies, Structures, and Identities", Blackwell Publishers, USA, pp. 101-3

^{lxi} S. N. Eisenstadt & B. Giesen :1995: "Construction of Collective Identities", European Journal of Sociology, vol-36, pp.72-79

^{lxii} Such codes are somewhat akin to what Max Weber called 'Wirtschaftsethik'. Unlike contemporary structuralists Weber did not consider such an ethos, like the economic one, to be purely a formal aspect of the human mind which generates only a set of abstract symbolic categories. He saw such an ethos as given in humans in their social existence and carrying a direct implication for the order of society. Weber conceived such codes as variant expressions of the symbolic orientation of humans, beginning towards the facts of their existence in general and towards the problem of social interaction.

lxiii Op. cit. pp-80-101

lxiv Op. Cit. Philip Pomper, R. Elphick & R. Vann:1998: pp. 104-105

lxv For the concepts of 'totalitarianism' one can see Arendt Hanah's " The Origins of Totalitarianism".

lxvi Joya Chatterji : 2019: "Partition's Legacies", Orient Blackswan Private Limited, pp. 8-12

