REFERENCES

Augé, Marc, *Non-Lieux, Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité*, Paris: Le Seuil, 1992.

Baby-Collin, Virginie, 'Marginaux et citadins. Construire une urbanité métisse en Amérique latine. Etude comparée des barrios de Caracas (Venezuela) et des villas d'El Alto de La Paz (Bolivie)', Ph.D. thesis, University Toulouse II-Le Mirail, 2000.

Berque, Agustin, *Le geste et la cité*, Paris: Gallimard, 1993.

Berque, Augustin and Nys Philippe (eds.), *Logique du lieu et œuvre humaine*, Bruxelles: Ousia, 1997.

Détienne, Marcel, *Comparer l'incomparable*, Paris: Le Seuil, 2000.

Donzelot, Jacques, 'La nouvelle question urbaine', *Esprit*, 258, 1999, pp. 87-114.

Dufaux, Frédéric and Philippe Gervais-Lambony (eds), *Afrique noire/Europe de l'Est, regards croisés*, Paris: Karthala-Géotropiques, 1993.

Gervais-Lambony, Philippe, *De Lomé à Harare: le Fait citadin*, Paris: Karthala, 1994.

Gourou, Pierre, *Pour une géographie humaine*, Paris: Flammarion, 1973.

Lévy, Jacques, *L'espace légitime. Sur la dimension géographique de la fonction politique*, Paris, Presses de la FNSP, 1994.

———, *Le tournant géographique. Penser l'espace pour lire le monde*, Paris: Belin, 1999.

Louiset, Odette, 'L'urbanité ailleurs', in *Logiques de l'espace, esprit des lieux*, ed. Jacques Lévy and Michel Lusault, Paris: Belin, 2000, pp. 157-64.

Posel, Deborah, *The Making of Apartheid*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Robic, Marie-Claire, 'Epistémologie de la géographie', in *Encyclopédie de Géographie*, ed. A. Bailly, R. Ferras and D. Pumain, Paris: Economica, 1992, pp. 55-73.

CHAPTER 2

Segregation and Territory: What do We Mean? A Discussion in the Indian and South African Contexts

VÉRONIQUE DUPONT AND FRÉDÉRIC LANDY

Segregation intrinsically is linked to the relation between territory and identity and the connections between territoriality (the relationships with the territory) and identity markers. An analysis of these issues formed the core of the research programme discussed in this volume. Specifically, the project aimed to 'better understand how identities project onto space to create territories'. Debate on key concepts such as segregation, territory and identity is, however, a prerequisite for a productive, cross-disciplinary and international discussion of this topic. While there are numerous understandings of the terms 'territory' and 'segregation', we have chosen to draw from those that best express the relationship between identity and territory, and allow for a more productive comparison between the Indian and South African contexts.

TERRITORY–SPACE DELINEATED BY IDENTITY

The term 'territory' is ambiguous. First, the definition based on identity, that we have adopted, is one out of many. Second, the concept can easily become overly rigid and used for purposes that are far from scientific.

Defining Territory

The term 'territory' is polysemous (Di Méo, 1998). Seen from a purely ethological perspective, territory may refer to the space demarcated by animal urine. But the concept may be used in multiple ways. For instance, it could be transposed to describe what occurs in Amazonia

and Indonesia, where peripheral territories are demarcated by the presence of immigrants whose emigration from central areas is encouraged by government policies. Their presence is a way of expressing geopolitical appropriation of a zone, which requires a process of homogenization generated by the creation of networks (communications, transport, etc.) that enable persons and goods or information to circulate, the implementation of political decisions as well as the recognition of political power. In this frame of analysis, territory is understood as an 'integrated' space, closely tied to a geopolitical core and without excluded areas.

Territory can also be synonymous with 'mental/perceived space' (*espace perçu*) or 'lived-in space' (*espace vécu*). It is the space a person moves in during the course of a day or a year. Values and symbols have not necessarily been attributed to this space, however, which makes this type of definition too broad. 'Territory is more than "experienced"; it is learned and built by individuals through customs and beliefs that are social in nature. In the case of territory, psychological processes are subordinate to cultural models, which are either handed-down or constructed—appropriation, power, and representations come together' (Roncayolo, 1990, p. 189). Through this usage, the concept of 'territory' is, for the most part, based on feelings. Territory entails 'feelings of belongingness', 'this is where I'm from', and of appropriation, 'I am part of this place' (Brunet et al., 1992, p. 436).

Territory is therefore much more than just the space that is experienced or lived in. The definition adopted in this paper is one where territory is expressed as identity, which is then projected on to space. True, this is not a one-way relationship: conversely, identity can be partly produced by space (sometimes simply by proximity). In any case territory is the object of symbolic appropriation: the concept of 'territory' cannot exist without one of 'identity'. A clear example of this latter case could be Native American reservations in the United States where the term 'nation', which is laden with identity, has a spatial meaning that is almost synonymous with 'territory'. One can, for instance, even purchase maps of the 'Navajo nation'.

Reciprocally, is it possible to argue that there is no 'identity' without 'territory'? 'It is as if group thinking needed some visible form of space in order to exist, survive and become conscious' (Halbwachs, 1939, cited by Roncayolo, 1990, p. 183). It could be argued, however, that the new ties to space that have emerged because of globalization have now made it possible to have an identity without territory. A top executive working for a multinational corporation who stays two years in one country, three in another, and spends most of his time travelling on business could not be 'territorialized'. In France, for example, career military officers are forced to be mobile. Integration for these individuals and their families is limited. We believe, however, that even in such cases territories exist, although they are perhaps not deeply rooted and quickly forgotten. This is what Tarrius (1966, p. 191) described when referring to the 'international professional elite' who posses a 'circular territory that is extremely "technified" [*technicisé* in French, implying linkages generated through new technologies that reduce distance] and "exotified" [*exotisé* in French, arguing that previously unknown places are integrated into territories and identities].'

If space is understood as a medium for identity, in order for it to function as a territory, there has to be some mechanism by which it is appropriated. Appropriation may take place at the national level, i.e. the state: this allows for mutual recognition among inhabitants. Appropriation can take place at the local level through many types of mechanisms. The Roman law concept of ownership of property is only one of them. The French concept of *terroir* (village area) in Western Africa, 'a portion of appropriated territory that is prepared and used by the group residing there' (Sautter and Pélissier, 1964) is an example of space where *usus* (the right to use), *fructus* (the right to benefit from the fruits of the property) and *abusus* (the right to dispose of or alienate property) are separate. The 'holder' of the land (*maître de la terre*), the descendant of the first individuals who cleared the land, entrusts the land to the person who wishes to use it. In this case, the land is not legally owned. The person using the land is required to return the land to the 'holder' when he has ceased to use it. Except for a nominal gift, the land 'holder' does not receive any remuneration for lending the land.

It takes time to constitute a territory; people have to experience and use space. During the apartheid era, when Indians were expelled from inner Durban to the new neighbouring lands (townships) they had been allocated, these territories did not become 'theirs' immediately. They did not feel urban citizens in these new lands any more than they felt they were citizens of South Africa.[1] Initially, these zones were perceived as zones of forced concentration, hated rather than appropriated. In contrast, the government decided to leave Indian places of worship untouched, even though Hindu temples—such as the one in Cato Manor—were located in zones from where Indians had been

expelled. The temples were still being used as places of worship; consequently, they remained part of Indian territory. The temples were like enclaves located in the space that the racist government had expropriated from the Indians and converted into a new *no-man's land*.[2]

RIGID TERRITORIES

'Lived-in space' and 'territory' should be seen as distinct concepts. Lived-in spaces used by groups or individuals frequently overlap, without creating conflict. The overlapping of territories, however, usually leads to various types of tension. An example of conflict at a local level can be observed in India when members of a mosque or a temple have to cross a neighbourhood inhabited by the other religious community to reach their place of worship. At another scale, an unfortunate example of regional geopolitical conflict due to territory is north-east India,[3] where mountain tribes and tribes from the plains, Hindus, animists and Bangladeshi Muslim immigrants are, along with others, in competition for farming land, tea, or oil. There are as many ties to intertwined territories, as there are communities.

Because workplaces vary, the lived-in spaces of individuals belonging to the same group also vary enormously. Territoriality—the relationships with the territory—however, is similar for each individual within a group and usually corresponds to a clearly demarcated space. This can easily be observed in cities, where territories usually comprise a set of neighbourhoods that are contiguous in varying degrees with borders that become important in times of crisis. During the 1992-3 riots in Bombay, neighbourhood borders, which under normal conditions were fuzzy, were clearly delineated by the location of street barricades and police cars.[4] Political communal crises contribute to making the demarcation of territories more rigid. Spaces without identity or with multiple identities disappear under the pressure brought to bear by militants from all sides who want to mark their group of houses and do away with anything that is emblematic of any other identity but their own. Examples of this behaviour are people locked in their homes and burnt alive by the extremists of an opposing faction, and the 'purification' of the territory through the profanation or destruction of *dargahs*—graves of Sufi saints—symbols of identity.[5]

Movements such as the xenophobic Marathi Shiv Sena use their 210 local branches (*shakhas*), located in municipal constituencies, to demarcate Mumbai or at the least the centrally located Marathi-speaking

neighbourhoods of Parel, Dadar, Lalbag, and Worli. The crenulated architecture of the *shakhas* is reminiscent of the forts built by Shivaji, a seventeenth-century Hindu hero. The banners, signs, and aggressive loudspeakers are usually located near mosques and mark the presence of the Shiv Sena (Heuzé, 1993). At the all-India scale, large processions (*yatras*) organized by the nationalist Hindu organizations like the RSS, the VHP and the BJP[6] have succeeded in delineating Hindu territory as the land from the southern end of the peninsula to the Himalayas, 'from Kanya Kumari to Mount Kailash'. The centre of this territory is both the geographical centre of India and the headquarters of the RSS: Nagpur (Assayag, 2001).

We will refrain, however, from believing that the territory of each Hindu is defined as clearly, aggressively and intransigently as the aforementioned examples, which, although striking, are exceptional. There are two reasons why less research has been done on moderate Hindu territories than on nationalist Hindu territories. In the former, the political stakes are less fearsome. Second, territories are more difficult to identify. They overlap and are so widespread that researchers have paid less attention to the ways in which territory reinforces identities, and vice versa, in these instances.

Until now we have only referred to religious territories. Ethnic or racial territories of the type found in South Africa may have other characteristics. To build a classification system for territories, we need to ask if the identity marker (ethnic group, religion, region, etc.) is an adequate classification criterion, or whether it is possible to include in the same class territories based on differing identity markers. For example, can we find some ethnic territories with the same characteristics as religious territories? The fact that certain identity markers are ambiguous makes the task of building such a typology more difficult. In India, for example, nationalist Hindu movements claim to speak on behalf of the nation rather than on behalf of their religious affiliation. The RSS uses the term 'Hindu' almost less often than it uses the terms *rashtriya* (national) or *bharatiya* (the adjective derived from the Sanskrit word *Bharat* meaning India) (Jaffrelot, 1993). The word 'Hindu' was originally used to designate anyone living on the land through which the Indus river flows: a religion therefore was named after a region and a river. Moreover, Hinduism is mostly practised in India, a fact that contributes to the ambiguity that Hindu nationalists skilfully use to transform the concept of Hinduism into a secular one. Nationalists claim that 'Hinduness' (*hindutva*) is only a 'way of life' and that it

should be followed by all the nation's inhabitants, including those belonging to religious minorities.

Flexible Territories

Identities are for the most part context-dependent. For instance, a South African of Indian ancestry, according to the context he finds himself in, may react on the basis of the place where he lives (a resident of Durban); his citizenship (a South African); his religion (a Hindu, Muslim, or Christian); his region of origin (descendant of Tamil or Hindi-speaking ancestors), among others.[7] If one person can have several identities, in various states of awareness, and each identity has a territory, does that person have at his disposal several territories, all of which are highly context-dependent? In Canada, outside Quebec, the French-speaking people have various territories: at the individual level, their territories are mixed seen from a linguistic perspective, since these people are living in an English-speaking milieu. At the collective level, however, one can find a purely French-speaking territory with specific associations, networks and places (Gilbert, 1999).

Territorial boundaries are often, therefore, flexible. In rural areas, territories are not as clearly defined as in cities because there are often fewer landmarks, and fewer streets and buildings that can be used to clearly delineate the boundaries. *Saltus* areas are poorly cleared, not cleared at all, or located at the periphery thus acting as a buffer zone between neighbouring territories.[8] The West African concept of village—*terroir*—is defined in terms of the centre and not the periphery. This meaning stands in contrast to modern European municipalities where territories (French *finages*) have 'outer', municipal 'limits' that are clearly demarcated. Indian villages, depending on the context, use concepts that lie somewhere between these African and European examples. When the village is located on land that has been completely cleared there are 'limits' like in a *finage*. When the village is located on partially wooded land where there is little farming activity, the boundaries are blurred as in the West African concept of *terroir*.

At one point India had this type of flexible system of territory at the national scale. The country was divided into political entities whose borders where defined by their centre rather than the peripheries, the opposite of the concept of *limes*, limits between states. That system continued till the reign of the Mughals (sixteenth to the eighteenth century), whose authority over certain local rulers was purely symbolic. A similar situation existed in France until the sixteenth century, when

French kings had to secure their authority by travelling throughout their kingdom, especially the fringes where the king had no local representatives to strengthen royal power.

Territory as defined by nomadic peoples is further proof of just how diverse the term is. The way nomads inscribe themselves into space may appear even more nebulous than that of farming communities, although the phenomenon is very real. This apparent lack of clear borders is one of the reasons why the Tuaregs inhabiting the Sahel, the cattle rearers of Thar in Rajasthan, or certain tribes living in central India encounter difficulties. National boundaries cut across the land used by nomadic people; forests are protected by the state or farmed by private firms without taking into account the practices of hunter-gatherers or shifting cultivation farmers. Hence, territoriality and permanent settlement should be considered as two separate phenomena. In defining 'circulatory territory', Tarrius (1996) clarified the complex relationships that developed between immigrants, their place of origin and their adopted homeland. There are thus many territories of mobility.

Generally speaking, rural areas in India have been inhabited for centuries; their inhabitants are thus deeply rooted in the land. Even the more recently settled frontiers (such as Punjab) are peopled by country-dwellers with a cultural heritage of intensive farming: every year land is improved and rarely do they leave their land fallow (Racine, 1997). The relatively low rate of Indian urbanization (28 per cent in 2001) reflects the importance of the relationship between rural people and rural areas. In the South African case the rural population is divided racially, supported historically by appropriation of land for 'white' farmers through forced eviction of black families and communities. 'White' farms tend to be located on productive farming land that was subsidized heavily by the apartheid state. In 1995, for instance, before land reforms, out of 55,000 commercial farmers only 1,500 were black (Gervais-Lambony, 1997). Rural population have connections to the land, but these connections have been shaped in the South African context by colonial and apartheid processes of displacement and the establishment of 'homelands'. In the apartheid and contemporary periods, homeland areas tend to be populated by the elderly and children, while working age people circulate between cities and the countryside to sustain their families' livelihoods. South Africa's long and turbulent history of massive displacement from the land produced complicated patterns of segregation that greatly contributed to the definition of complex territories.

SEGREGATION AS A SPATIAL FORM OF DISCRIMINATION

Finding a Definition

Etymologically, the word 'segregation' is derived from the Latin *segregatio*, from the verb *segregare*, i.e. 'to separate the herd'. The first meaning of 'segregation' is to separate, to set apart from the rest, to intentionally isolate. As J. Brun aptly put it: 'rather than denoting the end results, the word denotes the act' (1994, p. 23).

In the social sciences, however, the word 'segregation' denotes either a state—a descriptive form of the distribution of social groups in space, or a process—an act. The gamut of notions covered by the term segregation is very broad and encompasses a vast array of social-spatial configurations, with reference to a wide variety of processes. The question here is which definition facilitates a comparative approach?

A strict definition of segregation would denote the following: 'a form of institutionalised social distance which results in spatial separation' (*Dictionnaire de la sociologie*, 1989); 'policies of wilful separation of two different ethnic communities' (George, 1970, p. 421); 'forced, institutionalised, and regulated separation of population groups based on racial criteria' (Lapeyronnie and Rouleau, 1988, p. 611); or '. . . only cases where physical separation ensues from a principal of institutionalised social organization, [. . .] segregation [appears] as a spatial order for which the dominant group gives itself the means to impose on those it seeks to segregate' (Grafmeyer, 1994a, p. 87).

The two most frequently given examples of segregation are the segregation suffered by blacks in the southern United States, which was institutionalized by Jim Crow legislation in 1870 and continued till the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and apartheid in South Africa, literally 'separate development'. Apartheid segregation reflects a principle of separation of the 'white city' from the 'black city' (native city), which was the basis of British colonial urbanization in India as well.[9] Urban planning, as developed by the colonial authorities in cities under their control, was clearly wilful and organized separation. Spatial order was imposed on native populations, although it was not always backed by the type of radical and restrictive laws used for residential segregation in South Africa under apartheid.

The building of New Delhi in the 1910s and 1920s offers a good example of urban planning based on segregation (Dupont, 2001). The new imperial capital was deliberately built at a distance from the existing 'native' town, Old Delhi. A wide stretch of land was cleared and left undeveloped and used to mark the boundary between the two urban

areas, not unlike the undeveloped buffer zones that separated 'black' and 'coloured' townships in South Africa from the 'white' city.[10] In New Delhi, the spatial organization of housing for civil servants directly reflected their position within the hierarchy. Moreover, housing for British employees was separate from that of Indian employees, with the latter housed as far away from the vice-regal palace as possible (Evenson, 1989).

If, however, we want to extend our analysis and go beyond the historical context (India ceased to be a colony in 1947 and the phasing out of apartheid in South Africa began in 1990), a definition of segregation limited to the concept of institutionalized separation would limit the analysis of current situations in post-apartheid South Africa and independent India.

On the other extreme, purely empirical and descriptive accounts would consider segregation as: 'spatial distinction among the residential zones of population groups living in the same agglomeration' (Brun, 1994, p. 22); 'lack of homogeneity of space in terms of population characteristics' (Castells, 1981, 219, a commentary on the work carried out by the Chicago School on American residential space); and 'differences in [residential] location of groups defined using criteria such as social position, ethnic origin, religion, etc., [that risk] having segregation likened to, ultimately, any type of social different-iation of space' (Grafmeyer, 1994a, p. 88; 1994b, p. 36).

These approaches may explain processes of aggregation or of 'spontaneous segregation' resulting from preferential residential clustering by individuals sharing similar characteristics and aspiring to live among one another. It is then possible, for example, to speak about 'rich ghettos'. In such cases, it needs to be proved that aggregation of the rich (active agents who chose to segregate themeslevs) is the same process as segregation of the poor (passive agents who are subjected to segregation). This conception would imply that in South Africa, whites are segregated to a greater extent than blacks, given the fact that they live, almost exclusively, in white zones, whereas some blacks lived in interstitial squatter settlements, or in servant quarters; moreover certain Blacks—members of the new bourgeoisie—live in predominantly white neighbourhoods. Also, if we adopt a very broad definition, the heuristic benefits of a comparative approach between India and South Africa would lose significance. In addition, we risk comparing and drawing irrelevant conclusions from phenomena and processes that are based on different rationales.[11]

We need to adopt a definition that is more rigorous and precise, which allows us 'to go beyond the ambiguities that are inherent in the indiscriminate use of the concept' (Brun, 1994, p. 48), but is not limited to the legal forms of separation imposed by governments. We believe that there are several principals that are essential to the concept of segregation: the original notion of separation and setting aside; discrimination (identified as essential by authors such as Brun, 1994; Grafmeyer, 1994a; 1994b; and Gervais-Lambony, 2001); the concept of 'hierarchical sorting' (Navez-Bouchainine, 2001); and inequality in relations among social groups (Brun, 1994).

According to Grafmeyer, 'segregation is always the creation of social distance coupled with physical separation' (Grafmeyer, 1994b, p. 39); consequently, we have adopted a definition of segregation as a process whereby social discrimination results in spatial separation.[12] We show how this definition of segregation permits study of the interrelations between segregation, territory and identity.

Determining Relevant Scales and Spaces of Reference

Any discussion of the concept of segregation has to include reflection on the scale at which we are going to observe the phenomenon. If we are interested in studying the residential dimension of segregation, we must take note of Lévy's and Brun's (2000, p. 239) concern that: '. . . one is hesitant when it comes to using terms such as homogeneity or heterogeneity, since both concepts can change completely with a change in the scale at which one is observing the structure of the population'. On a city-wide scale, in a metropolis such as Delhi, a marked diversity in the socio-economic structure of the population and in housing at the level of large zones is coupled with highly salient segregation phenomena that can be observed at the scale of smaller spatial units. This is especially true in the case of the former untouchable castes—the scheduled castes.[13] On a neighbourhood scale, there is high residential concentration, but from a city-wide scale scheduled castes (as identified by the Census of India) reside in areas that are distributed throughout the capital (Dupont, 2004; Dupont and Mitra, 1995).[14] We must ask, therefore, a more general question: where do we draw the line between segregation and residential mixing?

Traditional quantitative analyses of residential segregation depend on how spatial units are demarcated within the entire space under study and on the size of the single units that have been selected for

study.[15] The most frequently used segregation index[16] depends on the size and number of spatial units: the bigger the spatial unit, the lower the index and the larger the number of units, the higher the index. Researchers working on a comparative analysis of segregation in various regions or cities are faced with this type of problem. All the more reason why researchers conducting a comparative study, quantitative or otherwise, involving different countries must clearly define the spaces being studied and the scale of observation. In Europe and North America most of the research on segregation focuses on cities. In order to grasp the segregation phenomenon specific to South Africa and India we require a broader perspective, one that goes beyond the urban framework. At first glance, however, traditional segregation processes do not call into play the same spatial categories or the same scales.

In India, the Hindu[17] socio-religious hierarchy underpinning the traditional caste system implies a segmentation and hierarchy of space that can be observed (or were once observed) in the internal structure of every town or village. A village is generally characterized by heterogeneity of castes and it is at the microlocal scale—a hamlet, a neighbourhood, a street, or even a block of houses—that segmentation by caste becomes evident. The fact that members of each caste live in their own neighbourhood does not exclude certain observable types of caste mixing. Yet, the most flagrant and enduring example of residential segregation is the case of the former untouchable castes which are systematically relegated to hamlets outside the village (Deliège, 1999).

Sanskrit treatises on architecture recommended spatial separation (Begde, 1978). In cities, segregation was not always rigorously observed; this is especially true of cities in the south. Notwithstanding, the lines separating the castes at either end of the hierarchy have always been extremely clear: the Brahmins have invariably received special treatment (their neighbourhoods were usually located next to the temple) while at the other end of the social ladder, the Untouchables were segregated, relegated to the neighbourhoods located on the periphery. In pre-industrial cities in northern India, neighbourhoods located in the centre were segmented into blocks that housed the members of a specific community or sub-caste (for instance, *mohallas* in Delhi, *pols* in Ahmedabad).

Clearly, contemporary social dynamics are profoundly changing the segmentation in Indian society. The spatial growth of cities and villages tends to encapsulate and engulf segregated areas. As built-up areas become wider, groups that were initially relegated to the fringes find

themselves inside the agglomeration. Notwithstanding these processes, many studies have shown that caste continues to be a key factor in socio-spatial organization in contemporary Indian cities (Gandhi, 1983; Noble and Dutt, 1977; Racine, 1990; Schenk, 1986; Trivedi, 1996; Vaguet, 1997). The Harijan[18] *bastis*, the neighbourhoods where the former untouchable castes live, are still an urban reality, although other residential neighbourhoods are the outcome of other complex economic and social dynamics. Therefore, the persistence of residential segregation according to caste should be studied at the intra-urban as well as the intra-village level.

In South Africa, the institutionalized system of separation for the population was applied to the entire country and not confined to urban areas. Even before the introduction of apartheid, which strictly speaking can be traced to the victory of the National Party in the 1948 elections, segregation laws were aimed at stemming the urbanization of blacks and controlling their stay in cities. The Land Act of 1913 established areas reserved for blacks—homelands or bantustans. Blacks could only acquire property on these reservations. The Native (Urban Areas) Act of 1923 instituted a system of passes, sojourner permits, for urban zones. The Group Areas Act of 1950, deemed to be the most powerful urban planning tool used for apartheid, established residential sections for each racial group: whites, black Africans, coloured and Indians. Racist legislation divided and created hierarchical divisions of space according to the four 'races'. Although in certain contexts these boundaries are blurring, they continue to broadly demarcate space. Race is thus closely linked to space, and belonging to a specific race strongly attaches one to a specific place (Christopher, 2001).

South African townships are frequently bigger than the caste-based neighbourhoods of India. They are also more diversified in socio-economic terms (a logical consequence of the effect of scale). For example, a Harijan *basti* in an Indian city is usually more homogeneous in socio-economic terms (there is an over-representation of the poor engaged in manual labour or demeaning services), whereas today in the formerly black townships, there are well-off black families who either do not have access, or do not wish to live in white neighbourhoods. Because of their high level of social and professional diversity, black townships in South Africa might rather resemble former Jewish ghettos in Europe.

Does Racial and Caste Discrimination Constitute a Relevant Starting Point for a Comparative Approach to Segregation in South Africa and India?

What is the relationship between caste and race? Are they comparable? Studies comparing the caste system in India and social-racial stratification in the United States are fairly dated[19] and have been the subject of much criticism. Louis Dumont dedicated an entire chapter to this in his book *Homo Hierarchicus*, 'Caste, racism and "stratification"' (Dumont, 1966 and 1998). Dumont, unlike certain authors who are critical of this type of study (Deliège, 1999), does not, *a priori*, regard a comparative analysis of these two distant cultures as irrelevant. He does, however, state that certain conditions must be established:

> . . . comparative sociology requires concepts which take into account the values that different societies have chosen for themselves. [. . .] In so doing one will of course in no way impose upon a society the values of another, but only endeavour to set mutually 'in perspective' the various types of societies. (1998, p. 266)

While these debates go beyond the framework of this paper, we thought it important to point out their recent re-emergence[20] at the UN World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance held in Durban in September 2001—although the issues were clearly more political in nature. Indian NGOs speaking for the Dalits[21] requested that discrimination based on caste be put on the conference agenda against the official stance taken by the Indian government which argued that the issue was an internal affair. The action taken by the Dalit organizations was supported by the definition of racial discrimination proposed by the United Nations International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 1965 (Article 1(i)):

> Any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.

The debate focused on the definition of caste and race. A.S. Narang (2001, p. 2499) drew attention to the paradox in relation to this issue: 'Interestingly, the term "descent", which is not found in any other international document, was suggested by India during the elaboration

of the Convention.' The term 'descent' can be used to refer to castes in India (or in Sub-Saharan Africa) as well as the Burakumins in Japan and the Roms in Europe. The term *jati* or caste has the same root as the Sanskrit word for 'birth'. Moreover, the literal meaning of the term for the four major caste groups, *varna*, is 'colour'. The *varnas* are described in the Vedas as different species: the highest *varna* (the Brahmins) is associated with white, while the lowest *varna* (the Shudras) is associated with black. The concept of race has pervaded, to some degree, caste ideology. At one point, a team of geneticists believed they had proven that the higher castes were genetically different from the lower castes, the former being closer to Europeans than to Asians.[22]

The controversy surrounding the nature of both social constructs—caste and race—and the stratification system they are part of are not as interesting, for our purposes, as the comparative analysis of racial discrimination and caste-based discrimination. Gail Omvedt's (2001) arguments about possible race and caste comparisons help us establish a basis for comparative Indian-South African research:

> Both [caste as a social system and 'racism'] (. . .) are systems of discrimination that attribute 'natural' or inherent qualities to people born in specific social groups. In other words, while caste has nothing to do with 'race', the justifications of caste discrimination have a lot to do with the social phenomenon of 'racism'.

To enhance our understanding of current segregation systems it is pertinent to draw parallels between the discrimination of blacks in South Africa and the practice of untouchability in India, and to examine how these systems are manifested in space and how that space is used. There are several underlying principles and mechanisms that merit our attention.[23]

In both countries discrimination systems are highly institutionalized although they rely on two different mechanisms: in South Africa, the political regime and the coercive legislation it created; and in India, social-religious ideology. In both cases, the justification of systems that deprived large parts of the population, blacks in South Africa and untouchables in India,[24] of their humanity, used sacred scriptures, even if it meant developing tendentious interpretations: the Bible, by the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa, and the Vedas, by the Brahmins in India.

The period during which segregatory systems were established differ, of course. The science of architecture that advocated residential

segmentation according to the four *varnas*, the *Vastu Vidya*, a legacy of the Vedic period (tenth to fifth century BC) is much older than the initial forms of South African segregation in the Cape Colony, which date back to the nineteetnth century (Houssay-Holzshuch, 1999). Articles 15 and 17, respectively, of the 1950 Indian Constitution prohibited caste-based discrimination and abolished untouchability. In South Africa apartheid was not completely eliminated until the new constitution was ratified in 1996 and came into effect in March 1997. Both systems of segregation, however, also present significant similarities: the determination to separate and create distance through certain principles and measures.

Both the caste system and apartheid, until its repeal in the early 1990s, disallow mixed marriages—marriage between members of different castes (or sub-castes), or different 'races'. According to the logic of both systems, endogamy is deemed necessary as it maintains the social hierarchy and prevents pollution from external groups.

In order to segregate populations, one needs to be able to discriminate. Discrimination criteria, which in both systems are determined by lineage, must remain clearly and easily identifiable; marriages and births must be regulated. The Prohibition of Mixed Marriage Act of 1949 in South Africa outlawed marriage between members of different races. The *Immorality Act*, strengthened in 1959, severely punished sexual relations outside of wedlock and between members of different races. In India, caste endogamy is still the dominant model; this is clearly illustrated in community and caste-wise classified marriage advertisements (where the mention of a preference for 'fair skin', a practice that would be considered illegal in South Africa, is nothing exceptional). Above all, for the higher castes, marriage with formerly untouchables is still unthinkable. As reported by Deliège (1999), death is often stated as the punishment required if a young woman runs away with a Harijan. Events corroborate these words.

In addition to the residential segregation, there is another equally restrictive dimension involved in the process of segregation: the banning of access to specific public spaces, or separating the use thereof. Under apartheid, there were a set of laws that severely regulated segregation in public places and within various institutions. The Reservation of Separate Amenities Act (1953) reinforced segregation in, among others, buses, toilets, post offices, beaches and benches. The State-Aided Institutions Act (1957) invested the power in authorities to institute segregation in libraries, stadiums, and theatres. The Extension of

University Education Act (1957) led to the setting up of separate universities for blacks, coloureds and Indians who only in exceptional circumstances had the right to register in white universities.

In India there were many restrictions on untouchables. These restrictions varied from one region to the next, according to local customs. Among the more widely observed restrictions were no admittance to temples, main wells, bathing *ghats*, certain roads, and restaurants. A survey carried out in 1982-3 by the Harijan Sevak Sangh[25] in a sample of villages located in twelve states showed that although the 1950 Constitution made all these restrictions illegal, thirty years later they were still common place.

While certain communities of untouchables in south India have converted to Christianity (a practice that dates back to the sixteenth century), even within churches, religious conversion has failed to put an end to segregation. Some eloquent examples can be quoted from Deliège (1999). In Tamil Nadu, there were churches with two naves to separate the untouchables, while in Vadakkankulam a 6-ft high brick wall had been built in the middle of the church to separate the Nadars (a lower caste) from the Vellalas (the higher caste). Until recently, in Trichy people fought to prevent converted untouchables from being buried in the same cemetery.

In India, as in South Africa, policies were designed to remedy the problems brought about by discriminatory practices aimed at former untouchables and blacks. Through affirmative action—a term that is rarely used in India—or 'black empowerment', South Africa provides blacks key posts in the public sector and black firms are given priority in calls for tender, for instance. In India, the policy of reservations keeps a certain quota of jobs for members of the scheduled castes or lower castes in the public sector (in the administration as well as in big firms); special education grants, loans, among others, are also available. Clearly, we could also compare the different types of civil society activism (by NGOs, and citizens groups, for instance) found in both countries.

Processes of Segregation Today

Allowing for a broader concept than our own, Schelling (1978) described three processes of segregation. The first is a top-down process that is the result of collective determination or organized action, and can either be legal—such as apartheid, or illegal—unconstitutional restrictions imposed on untouchables in certain parts of India. A second

process results from inequalities in resources, and is unintentional. The third process is due to the combining of individual discriminatory practices.[26] In real life these three processes intertwine. Untangling the mechanisms that serve to separate and exclude from aggregation phenomena based on affinity is not necessarily an easy task. Just as it is equally difficult to ascertain in certain preferential residential clusters which factors are due to spontaneous dynamics and which are due to imposed restrictions.

In the cases of India and South Africa the following questions must be addressed if we are to weed through current segregation processes:

Following the banning of untouchability and caste-based discrimination on the one hand and the abolition of apartheid on the other, what evidence remains of both of these institutionalized systems of segregation?

To what extent have these systems been taken over by individual discriminatory practices, reinforced by market forces, as well as social and economic inequality? And, to what extent do actions taken by institutional agents thwart or promote individual dynamics?

In India, there are strategies that combine exclusion (to the detriment of the lower castes) and clustering (practised by people of similar socio-economic strata, or belonging to castes of similar status). Among the various types of modern collective housing that have been developed in Indian cities, the co-operative housing societies provide a good illustration of combined practices leading to segregation. Such groups practise co-optation within the same communities, social group or professional circle to filter out potential buyers and tenants. This is in addition to the filtering mechanism based on the income required to access the various segments of the housing market (Dupont, 2004).

Although in South Africa the processes have shifted from being institutional to being spontaneous, they have remained very powerful. The 'nimby' (not in my backyard) attitudes taken by middle-class whites were clearly expressed in Johannesburg by '. . . a massive uprising of white residents against the building of housing for poorer families in the areas surrounding Bloubosrand [a middle-class neighbourhood]. The fear of being 'invaded' by corrugated metal shanties and thieves and 'murderers' made any discussion between the parties impossible' (Bénit, 2000, p. 275).[27]

In this context, social distance continues to be manifested by the desire for spatial distance: members of the upper social strata—whites—seeking distance from the lower-class, 'less white' who are still considered a threatening strata.

Lemon (1996, p. 64) eloquently described the inertia in the residential segregation model leftover from apartheid in South Africa and the current political obstacles to desegregation:

> Most urban Blacks who live in informal settlements, now the majority in most cities, cannot afford access to any formal housing, let alone former white areas. Even among township Blacks, only a relatively small minority can seriously contemplate such a move. Moves to some former Coloured and Indian areas may be more practicable economically, but the advantages may be small in relation to perceived social and cultural objections (which may deter many who could afford to move to former white areas).

Admittedly, there are some neighbourhoods inhabited by lower-class whites that are undergoing a process of rapid 'Africanization'. Yet, as pointed out by M. Houssay-Holzshuch (1999) when describing Cape Town, certain post-apartheid municipal public housing programmes '(. . .) reinforce the urban morphology created by segregation: the poorest segments of the population, which are also the less white, are housed in peripheral zones, far from employment centres', in these areas that were once buffer zones surrounding black and coloured townships. The private sector, which assumes an important role in housing production, has in any case limited interest in investing in the rental housing sector (Watson, 1999).

SEGREGATION AND TERRITORY

Is there Segregation without Territory?

'Segregation is inherently spatial as it involves creating distance between the segregating party and those who are set apart' (Gervais-Lambony, 2001, p. 33). Brun (1994, p. 37) also argued that the existence of 'spatial boundaries separating clearly defined groups' is essential to the concept of segregation. However, does the intrinsic link that exists between segregation and space imply that there is also an intrinsic link between segregation and territory? In other words, is there segregation without reference to a territory? Joye and Schuler (2001, p. 168), *a*

priori, believed that this is not possible, 'Social segregation (. . .) by definition involves territory'. If by territory we mean the result of the projection of identity on to space, and if we also maintain that segregation is linked to discrimination—then the relation between segregation and territory is mediated through identity.

Without differentiation among social groups, based on race ethnicity, caste, religion, social standing, profession or geographical origin, in short without identity, it becomes impossible to discriminate and therefore to segregate. According to Gervais-Lambony (2001, p. 35):

> Segregation is linked to territory for two reasons. Firstly segregation is a territory-building process. Secondly, segregation leads populations into the process of building territorial community identity. (. . .) [These] identity building processes are what create similarities between segregation and territorialization. In both cases we are dealing with social constructs.

Before any of this can happen, populations first have to appropriate spaces. In the process of appropriation, such spaces become part of identities. This process takes time.

When blacks were displaced, because of apartheid, the new residential spaces they moved into were for the most part devoid of identity. Segregation was clearly in place, but at first there was no territory. We can assume that, if individuals and groups lay claim to spaces other than those they occupy, this is because they do not feel that the space they occupy is wholly their territory. Either the space is too small; or they have no ties to this space: they may have no cultural ties because they have been displaced to a space that is foreign to them, or they have no economic ties like in certain Indian resettlement colonies for evicted squatter settlement dwellers and, previously in South African townships, where inhabitants were not allowed to do business. Segregation creates territories just as territory can create segregation by fostering two opposite and complementary processes: clustering (voluntary) and exclusion (forced). 'A certain degree of territoriality can create social ties and solidarity while a high degree of territoriality annihilates them' (Brunet, 1992). Territory 'reduces distances within and creates infinite distance without' (Retaillé, cited by Di Méo, 1998, p. 39). The study of these dynamics is very complex because in addition to taking into account the dialectic between economic and political rationales (Castells, 1981), we also have to consider the strategies of individuals and households (Lévy and Brun, 2000).

Social Distance and Spatial Distance: An Equivocal Relation

The fact that the relation between segregation and territory is highly significant does not mean that we should not consider other, non-spatial, facets of segregation. Social and cultural distance cannot always be correlated with spatial distance.

We have to keep in mind that segregation and isolation are two distinct things. Ethnic reservations are exceptional (to our knowledge, there are none in India; even in cases where tribal land can only be sold to tribe members and the tribe has a monopoly on all non-timber forest products). Segregated populations and spaces are, therefore, integral parts of society and of national space.

Untouchables in India and many blacks in South Africa are segments of the labour force that are indispensable to the economies of both countries. These segments usually perform tasks that other social groups refuse to perform. Untouchables and many blacks are discriminated against and oppressed, but they are not truly excluded. This is where the difference between 'segregation' and social 'fragmentation' comes into play. In extreme cases, the latter can be used to describe the type of isolation chosen by certain hermetic and almost autonomous groups (Navez-Bouchanine, 2001). As Gervais-Lambony (2001, p. 34), aptly put it, 'Segregation is separation without significant spatial distance. That is why the phenomenon is such a great paradox and why it is so effective: segregation creates social distance without creating too much spatial distance—the labour force has been distanced socially but must be economically exploitable.'[28]

In certain cases, Brun noted: '. . . cohabitation in a situation where distances are short and proximity is functional may go hand-in-hand with the existence of very rigid social barriers. The caste system and slavery are examples [of this type of cohabitation]. . .' (Brun, 1994, p. 26).

Spatial proximity does not determine modes of cohabitation nor does it preclude social distance.[29] In a Marxist analytical framework, according to Castells (1981, p. 233):

> . . . the degree of class struggle influences the forms and cadence of segregation: . . . an open struggle reinforces spatial fragmentation and may even lead to the creation of 'forbidden ghettos'. . . . However, in places where one class is completely subordinate and where domination by the other class is accepted at all levels, residential mixing is possible. This may happen in an atmosphere of 'ecological paternalism' where dominating and dominated classes live in the same neighbourhood albeit in very different conditions.

The last remark is descriptive of situations in Indian cities, where the caste hierarchy and the socio-economic hierarchy are clearly reflected in housing conditions. In the same neighbourhood there may be a row of shabby huts next to affluent, luxury apartment buildings. It is also descriptive of a widespread phenomenon, servant quarters that are located in the apartments or houses of affluent families.

Does the Existence of Spatial Mobility Call into Question the Relation between Segregation and Territory?

By highlighting the need to go beyond the purely residential aspects of segregation, spatial mobility and accessibility in general modify the relation between segregation and territory. According to Joye and Schuler (2001, p. 173), '. . . mobility has become crucial to the definition of segregation'.

In their words, the issue is

> . . . if everyone is equally mobile and functions in different spheres for work, recreation and residence, then how relevant is [a concept of] segregation based only on a residential dimension? On closer analysis we find that not everyone has access to the same degree of mobility. Mobility is determined by social standing and is an integral part of a system of inequalities.

In fact, 'unequal access to tangible and symbolic goods' (Grafmeyer, 1994a, p. 89) is another essential dimension of segregation. The most underprivileged segments of the population are affected by an accumulation of various forms of segregation,[30] whereas voluntary 'ghettoization', as practised by the rich living in gated communities, corresponds to a form of segregation made all the more relative by the fact that generally residents have the best access to urban facilities and services and are thus most mobile.

Circular mobility of individuals moving between different places of residence calls into question any concept of residential segregation based on an individual attached to a sole place (Brun, 1994, p. 47). In European countries weekend homes or secondary residences have become very significant; and in developing countries, such as India where the majority of the population is from a rural setting, people who have migrated to cities are still strongly attached to their native village.

Consequently, if we take spatial mobility into account, '. . . segregation, rather than being based exclusively on static place concepts, is based on the dynamic concepts of spatial and temporal accessibility. In other words, if we introduce the issue of accessibility, instead of dealing with space we are dealing with a network' (Kaufmann, Bassand and Joye, 2001, p. XV).

Social networks can easily extend beyond, overlap, and even disregard spatial limits, or in certain situations strengthen them (Offner and Pumain, 1996). According to Louiset (2000, p. 163), this is the case in India, where:

> . . . the boundary that counts is the one that serves to identify the group and not to demarcate space; the latter does not manifest itself in a continuous manner. A definition of urban identity based on territory is as problematic at a neighbourhood scale as it is at city scale.

To better understand the new forms of social and urban segregation Kaufmann (2001) proposed the introduction of the notions of 'motility' (defined here as 'an individual's or group's capacity to be mobile, spatially or virtually'[31]) and 'connectedness' (*connexité*, physical or virtual proximity via technology, namely the telephone, fax, e-mail, and the web). Kaufmann argued that with the emergence of virtual connection services, to the detriment of (physical) proximity services, '. . . the phenomenon [of connectedness] is creating a new form of social segregation and even exclusion; social integration has [the] tendency to become a function of an agent's potential for connected mobility' (2001, p. 101).

Motility, when taken into account, frees us from the constraints of geographical distance and underscores the inequalities in access to new technologies. But does it weaken the link between segregation and space? Probably not: the density of terminals with access to the Internet is far from being the same in all spaces. The 'digital fracture' is to a certain extent comparable to the types of fractures that appear in more common understandings of segregation.

CONCLUSION

In addition to 'conventional' socio-economic inequalities, India and South Africa are both characterized by legacies of hierarchical systems based on alleged religious purity and racial superiority. The resulting 'segregation', comprising of a process of social discrimination and the projection on to space of the ensuing social distance, largely persists despite efforts to diminish it. Furthermore, cultural diversity in both countries has generated or maintained a multiplicity of identities all with their own 'territory' (defined here as the result of the projection of identity on to space).

The combination of both territory and segregation leads to complex situations: segregation can create territories, just as territories can reinforce segregation. Yet, we have argued here that we should try to avoid using an approach that exclusively addresses fractures and antagonisms. Many territories have fuzzy boundaries or overlap without leading to conflict. Many different identities co-exist within the same space or the same individual, creating particularly complex versions of territoriality. Moreover, if we factor in different forms of spatial mobility we construst a very different picture. We would be giving extremist factions of all sorts a free hand if we were to only reason in terms of opposites and exclusion. Even in highly segregated societies, there is no such thing as absolute territory or absolute segregation.

NOTES

1. French and English use different concepts to express the relationships between individuals and a city and those between individuals and the nation. In French, the cognates *citadin* (city-dweller) and *citoyen* (citizen) express a feeling of belonging to a city and a feeling of belonging to a nation, respectively. If we use those terms, we can say that during apartheid South African townships were sometimes peopled with veritable *citadins*, who were not necessarily *citoyens*. In contrast, in India, as elsewhere, many rural immigrants living in cities are not integrated into the latter and are not veritable *citadins*, although they are fully-fledged *citoyens*. In English, a single term, 'citizen', is used for both concepts—*citadin* and *citoyen*—thus creating ambiguity.

   In English, however, 'city dweller' is a neutral term that can be applied to country folk living in, but not integrated into, cities, in other words, citizens who are not *citadins*. In French, the term *urbain* means 'urban'. But it generally denotes a very strong concept, *urbanité*, which describes a sense of 'used to the city', a concept which insinuates that an individual has appropriated the city in some way. Finally, the term *urbain* is not as neutral as 'urban-dweller'.
2. Cf. H. Mainet-Valleix's contribution in this volume.
3. Cf. S. Das' contribution in this volume.
4. The many ins and outs of community territories in Mumbai are described in G. Heuzé's (2000) autobiographical novel.

5. About the Gujarat riots, read for example *Frontline*, 7 June 2002.
6. Respectively, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh, the Vishva Hindu Parishad, and the Bharatiya Janata Party.
7. Cf. the contributions by R. Ebr.-Vally, F. Landy and H. Mainet-Valleix in this volume.
8. 'Saltus' refers in Latin to the space between fields around the central village ('ager') and the uncleared area ('silva' meaning forest) at the periphery of the territory. In India, this area is often called 'wasteland' by the government although it is commonly used as grazing land and as a source for firewood.
9. See A.J. Christopher's contribution in this volume.
10. One of the significant challenges of post-apartheid desegregation policies is the urbanization of these zones.
11. 'When the word "segregation" is used to describe complex or ambiguous situations, what is unfortunately implied, before it is proven, is that the situations are the result of the same rationale' (Brun, 1994, p. 32).
12. By discrimination we mean separating a social group from other social groups through unfair treatment. Thus, in South Africa blacks were barred from skilled jobs. In India, the hereditary transmission of professional specialization and crafts is an essential component of the caste system, and many castes carry the names of crafts and professions. The occupations deemed to be especially 'polluting' (because they involve waste disposal, i.e. scavengers, waste collectors, sweepers, the quartering of animal carcasses) explain specifically the origin of untouchability of communities which traditionally practised these occupations. Even today, many economic sectors remain segmented along caste or religious lines (Deliège, 1999; Gandhi, 1983).
13. Since this contribution focuses on issues related to segregation, we use preferentially the socio-anthropological term 'untouchables' (for references to the past, until Independence) or 'former untouchable castes' (for references to the period after the Indian Constitution abolished 'untouchability') that refers to discrimination by the higher castes, rather than the administrative term 'scheduled castes' that refers to the list of former untouchable castes that have been indexed by the government in order so that they benefit from a series of positive discriminatory measures, in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Constitution.
14. See also the contribution by V. Dupont and M. Houssay-Holzschuch in this volume.
15. For issues related to measuring segregation issues see C. Rhein (1994) and H. Le Bras (1994).
16. The segregation index is the sum, for the various areas within a spatial unit, of the differences in absolute terms of, on the one hand, the distribution of a given group in area 'i' relative to its overall numbers, and on the other hand, that of other groups in area 'i' to their overall numbers. For South Africa, see A.J. Christopher (2001).
17. The Hindus accounted for 81 per cent of the population of India in 2001.
18. The term 'Harijan' (literally the people or children of Vishnu) was coined by Gandhi to refer to untouchables.
19. Namely the work of American sociologists carried out in the 1930s and 1940s, which refers to the *caste school of racial relations*. Among those reviewed by L. Dumont, were: L. Warner (1936), G. Myrdal (1944), J. Dollard (1937), and K. David (1941). More recently, another American sociologist, G. Berreman (1972, 1979, cited by Deliège, 1999), compared former Untouchables in India to Black Americans. He points out the similarity in the type of discrimination suffered by both groups and postulates that discrimination criteria—caste and race—are both tied to lineage and are the basis of social status.
20. The Indian newspaper *The Hindu* has been the sounding board for the controversy. See articles by Béteille (2001) and Omvedt (2001).
21. The use of the term 'Dalits' (the oppressed) was initially linked to a political movement, the Dalit Panthers, that was founded in Bombay in 1972. The movement used as a model the Black Panthers in America (Deliège, 1999). The various terms used to designate the same set of castes reflect the different facets of discrimination: 'untouchable' is descriptive of discrimination by the higher castes, 'scheduled castes' refers to affirmative action on the part of the state; Harijan is a term filled with compassion; and Dalit evokes revolt.
22. R. Ramachandran, 'The Genetics of Caste', *Frontline*, 22 June 2001, pp. 84-5, referring to the conclusions made by an international team co-ordinated by M.J. Bamshad of the University of Utah. The conclusions are highly questionable mainly because they are based on a sample of 265 subjects, all from the same district in Andhra Pradesh.
23. The Indian press published viewpoints during the international Conference Against Racism that were far from euphemistic, i.e. in his article entitled 'India's Apartheid', Rajeev Dhavan concluded, 'Casteism is not a social preference, but India's apartheid' (*The Hindu*, 24 August 2001). Dalits' campaign slogans during the conference in Durban did not hesitate to draw such analogies as, 'Annihilate the Apartheid of Caste in India'.
24. Black Africans in South Africa form the vast majority of the population (79 per cent in 2001), while the scheduled castes account for 16 per cent of the population in India; in absolute terms, however, the latter group is impressive in size: 167 million people in 2001.
25. According to this survey, reported by Herrenschmidt (1996, p. 412), in the villages that were visited, at that time, 'restaurants, temples, and wells [designated for other castes] were still barred to untouchables in Karnataka, Kerala, Orissa, and in the Madurai district of Tamil Nadu'.

26. For a critique see cf. Y. Grafmeyer (1994a).
27. Similar if not identical avoidance strategies aimed at the lowest classes can be observed in many other countries, including France.
28. See also M. Houssay-Holzchusch (2000) for the case of South Africa, and R. Deliège (1999) for the case of untouchables in India.
29. For further information on cohabitation in France see the now famous article by Jean-Claude Chamborédon and Madeleine Lemaire (1970) 'Proximité spatiale et distance sociale. Les grands ensembles et leur peuplement' (Spatial Proximity and Social Distance: Large Housing Complexes and Their Residents).
30. Y. Grafmeyer (1994a, p. 89) talked about 'triple segregation faced by blue collar workers' in big cities in France during the 1970s which was manifest in 'the location and quality of housing, utilities and public services, and the distances between the home and the workplace'.
31. According to V. Kaufmann (2001, pp. 94-6), 'motility' gives us 'an integrating concept that allows us to acknowledge the agent'. 'Motility' is different from the concept of mobility. What is important with the concept of 'motility' is the mobility potential of each agent, 'each agent has his or her own mobility potential, prior to movement, that may or may not be transformed into movement depending on the desire to do so and circumstances'. There are three components of 'motility': '. . . *context* [which] refers to the range of what is possible in a given place (...); *access* [which] refers to all of the conditions under which what is available becomes accessible (. . .); and *appropriation* [which] refers to an agent's abilities and internalization by that agent of his potential (opportunities) to move (. . .). [These] three dimensions (. . .) reflect the allocation of resources and skills and consequently social structure and its distribution in space, and as such they are necessarily associated to the issue of power'.

REFERENCES

Assayag, J., *L'Inde, désir de nation*, Paris: Editions Odile Jacob, p. 348.

Begde, P.V., *Ancient and Medieval Town-Planning in India*, New Delhi: Sagar Publication, 1978.

Bénit, C., 'Johannesburg: déségrégation raciale, ségrégation sociale ? La banalisation des mobilités résidentielles dans la ville d'apartheid", in *Métropoles en mouvement. Une comparaison internationale*, ed. F. Dureau, V. Dupont, É. Lelièvre, J-P. Levy and Th. Lulle, Paris, IRD-Anthropos (Coll. Villes), 2000, pp. 69-80.

Bernard, C., 'Ségrégation et anthropologie, anthropologie de la ségrégation. Quelques éléments de réflexion', in *La ségrégation dans la ville*, ed. J. Brun and C. Rhein, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994, pp. 73-84.

Berreman, G., 'Race, Caste and other Invidious Distinctions in Social Stratification', *Race*, 13, 1972, pp. 378-414.

———, *Caste and other Inequities: Essays on Inequality*, Meerut: Folklore Institute, 1979.

Béteille, A., 'Race and Caste', *The Hindu*, 10 March 2001.

Brun, J. 'Essai critique sur la notion de ségrégation et sur son usage en géographie urbaine', in *La ségregation dans la ville*, ed. J. Brun and C. Rhein, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994, pp. 21-58.

Brun, J. and C. Rhein (eds.), *La ségrégation dans la ville*, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994.

Brunet, R., et al., *Les mots de la géographie*, Reclus-La Documentation Française, 1992.

Bonnemaison, J., L. Cambrezy et al. (eds.), *Les territoires de l'identité*, t.1, *Le territoire, lien ou frontière ?*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1999.

Castells, M., *La question urbaine*, Paris: Maspero, 1986 (1st edn. 1970).

Chamboredon J.C., M. Lemaire, 'Proximité spatiale et distance sociale. Les grands ensembles et leur peuplement', *Revue Française de Sociologie*, XI, 1, 1970, pp. 3-33.

Christopher A.J. (ed.), *The Atlas of Changing South Africa*, London: Routledge, 2001.

Deliege R., *The Untouchables of India*, tr. N. Scott, Oxford: Berg Publishers, 1999.

Dhavan, R., 'India's Apartheid', *The Hindu*, 24 August 2001.

Dictionnaire de la Sociologie, Paris: Larousse, 1989.

Di Méo, G., *Géographie sociale et territoire*, Paris: Nathan, 1998, p. 317.

Dumont, L. *Homo Hierarchicus, Le Système des castes et ses implications*, Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

———, *Homo Hierarchicus, The Caste System and Its Implications* (revd.), New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Dupont, V., 'Delhi aujourd'hui: la ville des planificateurs et celle des habitants', in *Perception et organization de l'espace urbain: Une confrontation Orient-Occident*, ed. R. Hagelstein and P. Servais, Louvain-la-Neuve: Academia-Bruylant (série Rencontre Orient-Occident, no. 3), pp. 239-66.

———, 'Socio-spatial Differentiation and Residential Segregation in Delhi: A Question of Scale?', *Geoforum*, vol. 35, no. 2, March 2004, pp. 157-75.

Dupont, V. and A. Mitra, 'Population Distribution, Growth and Socio-Economic Spatial Patterns in Delhi: Findings from the 1991 Census Data', *Demography India*, 1995, vol. 24, nos. 1 & 2, 1995, pp. 101-32.

Evenson, N., *The Indian Metropolis, A View toward the West*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.

Gandhi, R., 'Social Structure of Urban India: Continuities and Change', in

Main Currents in Indian Sociology, vol. VI: *Urban India*, ed. Giri Raj Gupta, New Delhi: Vikas, 1983.

George, P., 'Ségrégation', in *Dictionnaire de la Géographie*, Paris: PUF, 1970, p. 499.

Gervais-Lambony, Ph., *L'Afrique du Sud et les Etats voisins*, Paris: Armand Colin, 1997.

———, 'La ségrégation dans la grande ville, un essai de définition', in *Les très grandes villes dans le monde*, ed. M.-A. Gervais Lambony, Paris: Atlande, 2001, pp. 33-8.

Gilbert, A., 'Les territoires de la francophonie canadienne hors du Québec', in ed. J. Bonnemaison et al., 1999, pp. 173-81.

Grafmeyer, Y., 'Regards sociologiques sur la ségrégation', in *La ségrégation dans la ville*, ed. J. Brun and C. Rhein, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994a, pp. 85-117.

———, *Sociologie urbaine*, Paris: Nathan, 1994b.

Herrenschmidt, O., 'Les intouchables et la Républiques indienne', in *L'Inde contemporaine. De 1950 à nos jours*, ed. Ch. Jaffrelot, Paris: Fayard, 1996.

Heuzé, G., 'Bombay: la Shiv Sena et le territoire urbain', *Hérodote*, 71, 'L'Inde et la question nationale', 1993, pp. 149-68.

———, *Bombay en flammes 1993. Le cri des deux mondes*, Paris: L'Harmattan, 2000.

Houssay-Holzschuch, M., *Le Cap ville sud-africaine. Ville blanche, vies noires*, Paris: L'Harmattan, Coll. Géographie et Culture, 1999.

Jaffrelot, C., 'Nationalisme hindou, territoire et société', in *Hérodote*, 71, 'L'Inde et la question nationale', 1993, pp. 93-111.

Joye, D. and M. Schuler 'Inégalités, territoires et mobilités: Une perspective renouvelée pour la sociologie urbaine?', in *Enjeux de la sociologie urbaine*, ed. M. Bassand, V. Kaufmann, D. Joye, Lausanne: Presses polytechniques et universitaires romanes (Coll. Sciences, Technique, Société), 2000, pp. 159-80.

Kaufmann, V., 'La mobilité : une notion clef pour revisiter l'urbain', in *Enjeux de la sociologie urbaine*, ed. M. Bassand, V. Kaufmann, D. Joye, Lausanne: Presses polytechniques et universitaires romanes (Coll. Sciences, Technique, Société), 2001, pp. 87-102.

Kaufmann, V. et al., 'Introduction', in *Enjeux de la sociologie urbaine*, ed. M. Bassand, V. Kaufmann, D. Joye, Lausanne: Presses polytechniques et universitaires romanes (Coll. Sciences, Technique, Société), 2001, pp. xi-xvii.

Lapeyronnie, D., B. Rouleau, 'Ségrégation', in *Dictionnaire de l'urbanisme et de l'aménagement*, ed. P. Merlin and Fr. Choay, Paris: PUF, pp. 611-12.

Le Bras, H., 'Echelle et ségrégation', in *La ségrégation dans la ville*, ed. J. Brun and C. Rhein, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994, pp. 181-95.

Lemon, A., 'Post-Apartheid Cities: Planning for a New Society', in *Contemporary City Structuring*, ed. R.J. Davies, Cape Town: International Geographical Union: Commission on Urban Development, Society of South African Geographers, 1996, pp. 62-73.

Lévy J.-P. and J. Brun, 'De l'extension au renouvellement métropolitain: mosaïque sociale et mobilité', in *Métropoles en mouvement. Une comparaison internationale*, ed. Dureau et al., Paris: IRD-Anthropos (Coll. Villes), 2000, pp. 229-46.

Louiset, O., 'L'urbanité ailleurs', in *Logiques de l'espace, esprit des lieux. Géographie à Cerisy*, by J. Lévy et al., Paris: Belin, 2000, pp. 157-64.

Narang, A.S., 'World Conference Against Racism', *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 36, no. 27, 2001, pp. 2495-9.

Navez-Bouchanine F., 'Des villes entre fragmentation spatiale et fragmentation sociale: une approche critique de la notion de fragmentation', in *Vocabulaire de la ville*, ed. E. Dorier-Apprill, Paris: Editions du Temps, 2001, pp. 109-18.

Noble, A.G., and Dutt, A.K. (eds.), *Indian Urbanization and Planning: Vehicles of Modernization*, New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Offner, J.M. and D. Pumain (eds.), *Réseaux et territoires. Significations croisées*, La Tour d'Aigues, Editions de l'Aube, Paris: LATTS, 1996.

Omvedt, G., 'The U.N., Racism and Caste', *The Hindu*, 9 and 10 April 2001.

Racine J.L. (ed.), *Peasant Moorings. Village Ties and Mobility Rationales in South India*, New Delhi: Sage, 1997.

Racine, Jean (ed.), *Calcutta 1981: The City, Its Crisis and the Debate on Urban Planning and Development*, New Delhi: Concept, 1990.

Ramachandran, R., 'The Genetics of Caste', *Frontline*, 22 June 2001, pp. 84-5.

Retaillé, D., *Le monde du géographe*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Politiques, 1997.

Rhein, C., 'La ségrégation et ses mesures', in *La ségrégation dans la ville*, ed. J. Brun and C. Rhein, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994, pp. 121-62.

Roncayolo, M., *La ville et ses territoires*, Paris: Gallimard-Folio, 1990.

Sautter, G. and P. Pélissier, 'Pour un atlas des terroirs africains: structure-type d'une étude de terroir', *L'Homme*, vol. IV, no. 1, 1964, pp. 56-72.

Schelling, T.C., *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*, New York: Norton, 1978.

Schenk, H., *Views on Alleppey: Socio-historical and Socio-spatial Perspectives on an Industrial Port Town in Kerala, South India*, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, 1984.

Tarrius, A., 'Territoires circulatoires des migrants et espaces européens', in *La ville: agrégation et ségrégation sociales*, ed. N. Haumont, Paris: L'Harmattan, 1996, pp. 189-94.

———, *Les nouveaux cosmopolitismes. Mobilités, identités, territoires*, La Tour d'Aigues, Editions de l'Aube, Paris: LATTS, 2000.
Trivedi, H.R., 'Towards a General Theory of Urbanization and Social Change', in *Social Structure and Change*, vol 3: *Complex Organizations and Urban Communities*, ed. A.M. Shah, B.S. Baviskar and E.A. Ramaswami, New Delhi: Sage, 1996, pp. 237-8.
Vaguet, O., 'Ville indienne, ville hindoue? Facteurs et processus de ségrégation spatiale', *Espace, Populations, Sociétés*, 1997, vols. 2/3, pp. 211-24.
Watson, V., 'L'accès au logement en Afrique du Sud', in *La question urbaine en Afrique australe. Perspectives de recherche*, ed. Ph. Gervais-Lambony, S. Jaglin and A. Mabin, Paris: Karthala, 1999, pp. 227-42.

CHAPTER 3

Identity, Space and Territory in India: An Anthropological Perspective

M.A. KALAM

What shapes an individual's identity? Is it language, religion, the culture of the group to which the individual belongs, the locale in which the individual is found, or a combination of all these? Can some other factors be added to this list, such as inhabited territory or space claimed or visualized by the group for domicile? When and why do these factors come into reckoning? Is it to define one's group in absolute terms, or *vis-à-vis* another, or to set one's group apart from another? In order to set one's group apart from the others what markers are used, how, why and in what different ways? Can a group draw boundaries in real physical terms around it and define the area as its territory in topological terms, or are such boundaries marked or visualized in cognitive (or even imaginary) terms?

According to Horowitz,

> [T]he symbols employed to differentiate group from group may be of widely divergent characteristics at different levels of identity. An over-arching identity may be indicated by language, while a lesser one may be evidenced by a behavioral trait and a still lesser one by a visual one. Finally, it almost goes without saying that a symbol of identity that is of the highest imperative in one society may be ignored or interpreted quite differently in the next, depending on the shape and significance of the underlying criteria of identity. (1976, pp. 120-1)

This paper examines how identities are shaped in spatial and territorial terms, and how space and territory impinge upon identity, and can even sharpen or blur and dilute identity. In this context, it is important to relate the discussion to questions of nationality and citizenship *vis-à-vis* the state and its role in *shaping* identities of those who are part of a country or nation state.

Dupont Véronique, Landy F. (2005)

Segregation and territory : what do we mean ? : a discussion in the Indian and South African contexts

In : Gervais-Lambony P. (ed.), Landy F. (ed.), Oldfield S. (ed.) Reconfiguring identities and building territories in India and South Africa

New Delhi (IND) ; New Delhi : Manohar ; Centre de Sciences Humaines, 43-72. ISBN 81-7304666-2