

***New Capital, Emerging Conflicts and Social Governance in Northeast India: Nagaland and Manipur***

Paula Banerjee and Sucharita Sengupta

**Discussant: Sibaji Pratim Basu (Professor, Vidyasagar University)**

In the context of North east India, organisations are very important and have played pivotal role in shaping opinions. They have also been instrumental in spearheading the entire debate surrounding governmentality in the Northeast. Following Ranabir Samaddar's comments on the same theme in one of his articles, I would also like to pose the same question, that what does it mean to govern the society. Interlinked to this would be, who are the stakeholders involved, what are the considerations that the government should take into account, and the question of accountability too becomes important in the context. Governing society also means governing democracy, so the important question that also needs to be addressed by the researchers will be how democracy can be managed. Again, in this entire paradigm, both the formal and informal sectors and enterprises play pivotal roles. The researchers have to study their role too in order to attempt a comprehensive study on the theme. I have seen Paula's earlier work too on Naga women, their negotiations in resolving conflict in the Naga society and their role in the social governance of the region. It is commendable how this time around the authors are also probing into the role of women as agentive forces, instrumental in bringing a change to the age old social infrastructures. For instance, we have seen the example of Irom Sharmila, who was rejected for expressing her desire to take part in the electoral process, despite being a face of the women movement in Manipur in the last one decade. So, it will be interesting to investigate into the elements that shape public opinion, evoking policy responses. Among new groups the authors have mentioned how "women from all ethnic groups have taken part in the resistance movements". I agree that women, especially in the Naga society, have taken a constructive role in spearheading the new social movements in northeast that has evoked newer responses of the government in terms of its policy. However, I will urge the authors to look into the role of Naga men too in their study to unravel the nuances of the politics of Naga society.

In one of his recent articles, Pradip Phanjoubam has mentioned that the social friction in the North east, especially in Nagaland and Manipur is because of the tradition v/s modernity structural

adjustments. The recent clashes in Manipur over creation of new districts also indicate this tension. The authors too have mentioned Pradip's work in their abstract. My suggestion will be to address this question that is what are the tradition and modern structural apparatuses exist in the present day northeast. For this point to be addressed, as Subir Bhaumick has also pointed out, the authors need to elaborate on what they at the outset mean by 'new' social disruptions. They will also do well by justifying the specificity of the Northeast India in this context. Why is the tradition-modernity conflict only Northeast specific? This is true for other regions as well, so why is Northeast an abbreviation? This needs to be addressed too. So, the authors should look into the series of points raised, and their interconnectedness as well for conducting this study.