VU Research Portal

[Review of: R. Ganguly, I. Macduff (2003) Ethnic conflict and secessionism in South and Southeast Asia: causes, dynamics, solutions]

Salemink, O.H.J.M.

published in

Journal of Asian Studies
2004

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.1017/s0021911804000129](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0021911804000129)

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Salemink, O. H. J. M. (2004). [Review of: R. Ganguly, I. Macduff (2003) Ethnic conflict and secessionism in South and Southeast Asia: causes, dynamics, solutions]. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 63(1), 133-135.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0021911804000129>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

The Journal of Asian Studies

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JAS>

Additional services for *The Journal of Asian Studies*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

***Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism in South and Southeast Asia: Causes, Dynamics, Solutions.* By Rajat Gsnguly and Ian Macduff. New Delhi and Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications, 2003. 292 pp. \$49.95 (cloth).**

Oscar Salemink

The Journal of Asian Studies / Volume 63 / Issue 01 / February 2004, pp 133 - 135

DOI: 10.1017/S0021911804000129, Published online: 26 February 2007

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0021911804000129

How to cite this article:

Oscar Salemink (2004). Review of Rajat Gsnguly, and Ian Macduff 'Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism in South and Southeast Asia: Causes, Dynamics, Solutions' The Journal of Asian Studies, 63, pp 133-135 doi:10.1017/S0021911804000129

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

terrorists.” The other part of the problem is that Simons considers many but not all of the key variables that have contributed to turbulence and strife in the Muslim world (the discussion of which is generally confined to North Africa, the Middle East, and Pakistan, with scant mention of Afghanistan, and no consideration of Malaysia, which has sustained a pace of rapid development that is probably second to none in the Muslim world, or of Indonesia, which is both the world’s largest Muslim country and heir to long traditions of democratic pluralism—or of Muslims in Western Europe, America, or the former nations of Yugoslavia or the Soviet Union). Such variables certainly include those cited by Simons: rapid urbanization, high birth rates, staggering unemployment and underemployment, and economies heavily dependent on oil and gas (as opposed to coal, iron, or steel, which are arguably more conducive to the creation of middle classes and the eventual emergence of democratic arrangements and sensibilities), as well as despotic monarchies and unholy alliances of Western-educated elites and their military supporters. But, nowhere does Simons adequately factor U.S. and other Western foreign policies of the twentieth century into the mix, although there are passing references to the relationship between Israel and Palestine and comparable remarks of a sporadic and indirect sort. This seems extremely problematic for at least three reasons: state boundaries imposed from on high during the colonial era are heavily implicated in many contemporary conflicts involving Muslims; U.S. foreign policies during the latter part of the cold war contributed immeasurably to the emergence of the Taliban and al Qaeda alike; and U.S. support of unpopular and antidemocratic regimes in many parts of the Muslim world has impeded progressive change and the dissolution of anti-Western sentiment, and has otherwise contributed to a worsening of social, economic, political, and human rights conditions in a multitude of contexts. Simons does at least end on a less deterministic and more hopeful note than those who predict or see in the present “a clash of civilizations,” arguing alongside a growing number of seasoned observers that the recent acts of destruction perpetrated in the name of Islam by small numbers of violent extremists is in all likelihood less a harbinger of future trends than a swansong attesting to the marginalization of such individuals from the mainstreams of contemporary Muslim civilization.

MICHAEL G. PELETZ
Colgate University

Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism in South and Southeast Asia: Causes, Dynamics, Solutions. Edited by RAJAT GANGULY and IAN MACDUFF. New Delhi and Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2003. 292 pp. \$49.95 (cloth).

Few people would dispute that ethnic conflict is a serious issue in the post-cold war era, warranting and receiving considerable scholarly attention. Much of the theoretical literature is global, regional, or local in scope, with few titles deliberately comparing two regions. Covering both the South Asian and Southeast Asian regions, this volume fills a gap. In his introduction, Rajat Ganguly explains that the volume adopts an explicitly “comparative cross-regional perspective” in “a theoretically informed way” toward the three ambitious goals of the book: identifying “the main causal factors behind the growth of ethno-nationalist and secessionist sentiments,” examining “ethnic conflict dynamics in South and Southeast Asia,” and examining “different options available for managing and ultimately resolving violent ethnic conflicts” (p. 20).

The book is divided into nine chapters, including six case studies and three comparative, theoretical parts. Three of the case studies deal with South Asia. Vernon Hewitt provides an adequate historical overview in "The Political Evolution of Ethnic Identities in Jammu and Kashmir, 1947–2001," in which he devotes a good deal of attention to the dynamics of ethnic mobilization. Teesta Ghosh offers a rather confused and poorly edited chronicle of the "Ethnic Conflict in Sindh and Its Impact on Pakistan" between Sindhis and Mohajirs in Pakistan. She invites the suspicion of partiality by openly backing Mohajir demands for "self-government" (p. 118) in an ethnically diverse environment. In the third case from South Asia, Peter Chalk gives a good overview of the Tamil Tiger insurgency in Sri Lanka. Chalk focuses on the Liberation Tigers' organizational capacity and on the role of diaporas and governments, with a recently increased tendency to treat the Tigers as a terrorist group.

Three case studies are devoted to Southeast Asia. Mark Rolls puts his essay, "Indonesia's East Timor Experience," in the context of the cold war. The conflict turned around with the 1991 Dili massacre and the end of Suharto's regime. Regarding President Habibie's sudden decision to hold a referendum, the (Australian) author attributes particular significance to a shift in Australian policy regarding East Timor. Syed Serajul Islam describes the conflict in the Mindanao-Sulu region of the Philippines as an "ethno-communal conflict" rather than as a religious conflict. In a badly sourced, one-sided analysis, the author squarely backs claims for Moro autonomy according to the 1976 Tripoli Agreement, even though Moros are now a majority in only four of the thirteen provinces covered by that agreement. In the last case study, Roderic Alley attempts to unpack the complexities of the ethno-secession in Bougainville, Papua New Guinea. In terms of ethnic makeup, this place is so complicated that it is difficult to understand why ethno-nationalism came up in Bougainville and how it was intersected by other (economic, generational) dimensions. The (New Zealander) author describes in detail the role of the New Zealand government in brokering a settlement between the various parties.

Although the six case studies have a common structure, they are highly descriptive and idiosyncratic. In spite of the claims of the book, the case studies are not at all comparative and are hardly informed by explicit theory, even lacking reference to the theoretical chapter by David Carment. Although they focus on the dynamics of the various ethnic conflicts in terms of political events, they do poorly in identifying causes; for instance, in at least four chapters, ethnic categories are simply taken for granted. The chapters also pay attention to possible solutions to the conflicts, which in four cases reflect recognizable particular interests on the part of the author. Given the sometimes partisan analysis (Gosh, Islam) or the particular country perspective (Rolls, Alley), it is regrettable that information and justification about the selection of the cases and the authors are simply lacking.

In the absence of explicit theory and comparison in the case studies, the explicitly theoretical and comparative essays by Carment and Ian Macduff are supposed to make up for this. The main theoretical thrust comes from Carment's essay, "Secessionist Ethnic Conflict in South and Southeast Asia: A Comparative Perspective," which provides a state-of-the-art literature review of political theories on ethnic conflict and secessionism. "Theoretically informed" refers to comparative political science theory, mostly ignoring what has been written on ethnic conflict in other disciplines. Hence, the rejection of a primordialist approach in this essay (but not in the case studies which take ethnic categories for granted) is heralded on the cover as a step forward. Carment's essay draws on global theories of ethnic conflict but hardly refers to the six case studies. If there is reference to Asia, it is almost exclusively to South Asia (which

goes for the chapters by Ganguly and Macduff as well); important work on Southeast Asia by David Brown is not even mentioned. In his conclusion, Macduff only gives two or three references to the chapters in the book, limiting himself mostly to building theory on conflict management and integration of stakeholders in the solution of ethnic conflict.

Although this book is a timely contribution to an important topic, it does not live up to expectations. Theory and analysis are drawn apart in different chapters, resulting in very descriptive case studies of varying quality. Theory is narrowly defined in terms of political science, resulting in a focus on dynamics but a rather poor analysis of causes and a sometimes pedantic suggestion of solutions. There is hardly an attempt to compare between the South Asian and Southeast Asian regions, partly because the literature on Southeast Asia is mostly ignored. If the scholarly gap between the two regions needs to be bridged, this book will not do that.

OSCAR SALEMINK
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Trans-Pacific Relations: America, Europe, and Asia in the Twentieth Century.
Edited by RICHARD JENSEN, JON DAVIDANN, and YONEYUKI SUGITA.
Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2003. xvi, 304 pp. \$69.95 (cloth).

As editor Jon Davidann writes, “[t]his collection of essays seeks to sort out the complicated historical reality of Western and American influence in Asia in the twentieth century and to help put it into clearer historical perspective” (p. x). With a few exceptions, such as Jennifer Hubert’s chapter on intellectuals and modernity in contemporary China, most of the essays focus on America’s troubled relationship with East Asian nations. “Western” really means the United States, and mention of Europe in the title is odd, given that discussion of European powers figure prominently in only a few of the twelve essays in this volume. The unifying theme of the majority of the offerings in *Trans-Pacific Relations: America, Europe, and Asia in the Twentieth Century* is the Americans’ discovery of limits to their power and influence in the region. Although Davidann contextualizes the postwar United States as a neocolonial power in his introduction, such judgments do not become an ideological straitjacket. The majority of the contributors are historians, and the essays display a range of methodical approaches, ranging from traditional diplomatic history based on primary documents to cultural history based on published works by Asian authors to broad overviews utilizing secondary sources.

Four interpretative essays on cold war topics are fine introductions to their topics and would be useful for sparking discussion among students. Stanley Sandler’s examination of the Korean War is particularly helpful, as the author directly addresses debates in the field, recent archival discoveries, and some of the mythology of the war. For example, he posits that, in light of the United Nations forces’ vast superiority in air and naval power, the Inchon landing was not the miracle that some would like to believe. His suggested-readings section would be beneficial to anyone beginning research in the field. However, one of his assertions, that “Korea was only the second Asian nation to sign a treaty with the United States, in 1882” (p. 149) is incorrect. At the very least, by this date the United States had signed agreements with the Kingdom of Siam, Qing-dynasty China, and Tokugawa Japan. Richard Jensen discusses America’s shifting definitions of victory in Vietnam. Reminiscent of the