CROWDSOURCING LONG-RUN MEMORIES OF INVOLUNTARY MIGRATORY DISPLACEMENT:

A MIXED METHODS ANALYSIS OF THE 1947 PARTITION OF BRITISH INDIA

Tarun Khanna (a,b,c), Karim Lakhani (a,b,c), Shubhangi Bhadada (b), Ruihan Wang (c), Michael Menietti (c), Tiara Bhatacharya (b)¹

This version: January 29, 2020

ABSTRACT

We investigate, using mixed methods, the long-run memories of the aftermath of forced displacement resulting from the 1947 Partition of British India, the largest involuntary migration in recorded human history. The data, in the form of oral narratives of survivors, were collected via a modified form of respondent-driven sampling more than seventy years after the "shock" to the preceding structures of British India. The data are also unique in their focus on disadvantaged populations, featuring voices that are usually left out of 'history,' and because they are collected across all three contemporary nations (Bangladesh, India, Pakistan). The latter feature has eluded prior work, given South Asia's political tensions, itself the result of Partition. In contrast to prior analyses of Partition, mostly qualitative by historians, we attempt diverse forms of quantification to reconfirm some conventional wisdom, and to uncover other correlations that might shed light on the institutional underpinnings of the affected societies. For example, our finding that migrants into Pakistan generally view Partition less negatively than migrants into India, despite the former's greater subsequent economic losses, suggests the privileging of narrative and the politics of identity over material well-being. Lower socio-economic status groups suffer more than those that were relatively well-off. Since our data uniquely include women's voices, traditionally ignored in South Asian societies, we also show that women felt more threatened and were more negative about Partition than were men. An analysis of marginalized minority religious groups in both India and Pakistan confirms prior intuition that minorities fared worse in both countries across various indicators. These results are relevant to our understanding of the long-run effects of several contemporary involuntary displacements and should inform both scholars and practitioners concerned with forced migrations.

^{*} For their generous comments and suggestions, we thank Caroline Elkins, Asim Khwaja, Prashant Bharadwaj, Jennifer Leaning, Ashutosh Varshney, Rafael Di Tella, Sudev Sheth, Geoffrey Jones and seminar/workshop participants at the World Economic Forum, Dalian, China (June 2017); King's College, London (September 2017); Harvard Kennedy School's Science, Technology, and Society Series, Cambridge (September 2017); Harvard World Wide Week, Cambridge (October 2017); Watson Institute, Brown University, Providence (October 2017); Asia Society, New York (November 2017); Asia Beyond the Borders Series, Cambridge (April 2018); Laboratory for Innovation Science at Harvard, Allston (December 2018); and Columbia University (April 2019).

¹ (a) Harvard Business School; (b) Lakshmi Mittal and Family South Asia Institute, Harvard University; (c) Laboratory for Innovation Science at Harvard, Harvard University.

Definition of "History"

"[T]he word the English used for the record of every time a white man encountered something he had never seen and promptly claimed it as his own, often renaming it for good measure."²

INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study various long-run memories of the aftermath of acute involuntary displacement of a population affected by the 1947 Partition of British India (Partition), which resulted in the formation of the current nation-states of India, Pakistan, and (later) Bangladesh. Applying mixed methods to the data, we start to understand why several categories of institutions pertaining to the management of human capital, particularly in northern India and Pakistan, emerged as they did, in response to this massive "shock" to the preceding structures of British India.

The Partition resulted in the largest forced mass migration in recorded human history,³ resulting in the displacement of more than 15 million refugees, and just under 3 million people missing and presumed dead (Bharadwaj et al 2008; Hill et al 2008).⁴ Although precipitated in 1947, Partition was not a singular event but was an ongoing process (Zamindar 2007). It has had cascading repercussions over several decades, resulting in four wars and numerous skirmishes, and still continues to shape the geopolitical landscape inhabited by over 1.7 billion people.

² Namwali S., *The Old Drift: A Novel*. Hogarth (2019), is set in Zambia and chronicles the multigenerational sagas of three families (black, white, brown).

³ Syria, which is often considered "the biggest humanitarian and refugee crisis of our time" (Filippo Grandi, UNHCR High Commissioner) has 6.6 million internally displaced and 5.7 registered refugees, according to UNHCR. (UNHCR, "Syria emergency" (last updated April 18, 2018) sourced from https://www.unhcr.org/syria-emergency.html).

⁴ The estimated numbers stated here, focusing mainly on the Punjab border, are much higher than previously estimated on the Partition migration; the two cited research papers have better analyses in our judgement and came to their similar conclusions independently. The demographics of Partition along the Bengal border remains less clear, since the migration patterns extended for decades.

Seventy-two years after the event, there is a rapidly shrinking pool of survivors with memories of the displacement. We analyze 2,396 oral narratives of survivors,⁵ collected via a modified form of respondentdriven sampling of these displaced populations from the three countries that Partition impacted, Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan.

The project and results recognize that there is no "objective data" or "true history;" history is always contingent, and the present is always implicated in any claims about the past. Historian E.H. Carr observed, "The facts speak only when the historian calls on them: it is he who decides which facts to give the floor, and in what order or context." (Carr 1986:5) Present day politics affects how one collects data about the past (Carr 1986). Also, memory is fickle, and it is often impossible to distinguish between real and false memories (Sacks 2017). The boundary between "factual" and "imaginary," and "true" or "false" is often blurred when it comes to remembering (Butalia 2003; Ricoeur 2010), especially the remembering of emotionally charged events (Schacter 2008). So, too, are these memories, and the ways in which they are narrated, embedded in contemporary power structures, both at the macro- and micro-levels of society (Trouillot 1995). Thus, our analysis focuses on the memories and experiences of the event, as narrated *today*, to understand the impact of an event such as Partition on survivors.

Over the last seven decades, a rich literature has emerged on Partition, virtually entirely qualitative. Scholars have studied the role of the high-level politics of the British Empire, the pre- and postindependence elites (Bhaskar Rao 1967, Jalal 1994), and the grassroots politics of organizing and communal conflict (Ahmed 2012, Lambert 2013). Historians and journalists have sought to gather documentation of the negotiations and planning that yielded the two daughter states from British India (Chester 2009, Khan 2007) as well as to document the practices, responses, and statements of members of the public and those whose voices have not been captured in the historical record (Bourke-White 1949,

⁵ 516 of the narratives in the whole dataset of 2396 were narrated by second-generation narrators, who had the information from their parents or relatives that had been survivors of Partition. The results in the sections below hold even if we exclude these 516 second-hand narratives.

Pandey 2001). The latter strain of work has brought forth the exploration of the experiences of minorities and marginalized populations (Talbot et al. 2013), including women (Butalia 1998, Menon & Bhasin 1998), non-Punjabis (Bhavnani 2014, Chatterjee 2007) and Dalits⁶ (Kaur 2007). Refugees - their narratives, sociologies and politics - have been a focus of many more recent works (Chattha 2011, Ghosh 2013, Iob 2018, Kaur 2007, Roy 2012, Malhotra 2017, Sherman et al 2014), as has been the connection between Partition and nationalism in the region (Menon 2013). Our research aims to build on the work of these scholars.

In the late 1990s, political scientist and social theorist Ashis Nandy, along with the Center for Study of Developing Societies, conducted more 1,300 interviews, including 150 in-depth interviews from mostly Indian survivors of Partition. We presume that political constraints precluded accessing survivors of Partition living in Pakistan and Bangladesh. Their qualitative analyses of 150 of these interviews yielded psychological portraits of survivors (Ghose 1997; Ashraf 2017). Our work has a larger dataset, includes survivors who are not restricted to those currently living in India, and, at least in this paper, is based on quantitative (correlational) analyses of data derived from the interviews.

The results are based on the experiences of the interviewed survivors, and it is important to keep in mind that they may have had an entirely different experience in comparison to people who tragically did not survive. While the majority of respondents had negative memories of the horrific event, specific heterogenous results stand out:

First, migrants into Pakistan are less negative about the partitioning of the sub-continent than are migrants into India, despite the less salubrious development trajectory of Pakistan in the decades since.⁷ These contrasting perspectives are perhaps consistent with the narrative of the new-born

⁶ Dalits are the lowest social group in Hindu caste system.

⁷ A basic indicator of the growth of the two countries can be seen in their per capita GDP growth – in 1960, India's per capita GDP was USD 81.3 as compared to Pakistan's per capita GDP of USD 82.5. In 1991, India's per capita GDP was USD 300.1 while Pakistan's per capita GDP was USD 410.5. However, after India opened its economy in

nation being a haven for Muslims fleeing perceived persecution in British India. We conjecture that the reasons people believed they had to undergo this trauma for (i.e., the purpose of Partition) has an impact even several decades after the fact.

Second, despite the negative memories of the actual act of fleeing, long-term memories of the aftermath of displacement appear to revert to what might be construed as a pre-displacement (perhaps individual-specific) baseline level of life-satisfaction. We discuss later on whether this is better thought of as a validation of the much discussed "set-point" theory or as a manifestation of nostalgia.

Third, we provide statistical support for some hitherto anecdotal wisdom of parts of the "process" of Partition in 1947, viz. there is a correlation between migrants forced into refugee camps, their loss of socio-economic status, their exposure to violence, and their subsequent receipt of government assistance.

Fourth, women and minorities had more negative experiences with the displacement. Women were more likely to feel threatened or experience violence than men, and also displayed more negative sentiments towards Partition. Further, in both India and Pakistan, minorities had a markedly more negative experience of Partition than those of the majority religion, including experiencing or feeling threatened by violence, fall in socio-economic status post Partition, and less government assistance. They also express less support for Partition.

The analyses of other behaviors, displacement experiences, mapping of migration routes, and of refugee camp locations, are ongoing. These results – even if generally not causal – help us understand the

^{1991,} the growth rates have diverged significantly. In 2017, India had a per capita GDP of USD 1942.1 while Pakistan's per capita GDP was USD 1547.85 (*Sourced from the World Bank* <u>https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?locations=PK&name_desc=true</u>).

experiences of Partition survivors through more than anecdotes. Rather, these experiences are understood through the common experiences of a large dataset of varied voices. They help us understand why the various types of institutions, particularly in northern India and Pakistan, emerged post-independence in these nation states such as the economic and financial structures of the two countries or the current urban structure of cities such as Delhi and Lahore that were massively inundated with refugees post Partition. In addition, the results are relevant to our understanding of the long-run effects of several contemporary involuntary displacements triggered by conflict and persecution and climate change, among others. Given the internecine wars in the last 20 years and accelerating climate change, which have both spurred massive population displacements, the methodology and analyses here can help provide a research design for quantifying and explaining the impact of such movements on the population over generations.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND SAMPLE CONSTRUCTION

Oral narratives of survivors of the Partition⁸ were collected in the form of interviews through a modified form of respondent-driven sampling (Heckathron 1997; Gile et.al 2010).⁹ These interviews were often conducted at the home of the interviewee and lasted, on an average, between 20-40 minutes, and were conducted in the language of the interviewee (see Figure 1). Often the interviews were in a mix of two or more languages, such as Hindi and English, or Bengali and English). Some interviews were conducted in public spaces such as old age homes, temples, or *gurudwaras* (Sikh temples). Most interviews were conducted one-on-one (with a few where couples or family members gave their interviews together based on their comfort and preference).

⁸ Efforts to document and archive the testimonies of survivors of important historical events is an established practice now. The Memory Project about the Holocaust, narrative memorials of the Armenian genocide, and the Palestinian Oral History Archive are just a few examples of such efforts. Even with respect to the Partition, there have been a number of existing efforts, including the Berkeley 1947 Partition Archive, Citizens Archive of Pakistan's archives, and the recent Partition Museum in Amritsar, India.

⁹ Respondent-driven sampling is a variant of chain-referral sampling. It is targeted at a population that is hidden, i.e. no sampling frame exists and public acknowledgement of membership in population is difficult. By tracing the links in the underlying social network, the process exploits the social structure to expand the sample and reduce its dependence on the initial (convenience) sample.

The data were collected using a semi-structured interview questionnaire, divided broadly into three categories – before Partition, experiences during Partition, and life after Partition (see Annex 1).

"We were in the very last coach of the train. I remember that whenever the train stopped, some people would get down to drink water or urinate, only to be frozen with sheer terror at the sight of Muslims seizing the train." (*Rajiv (name changed), migrated from Multan, Pakistan to Delhi, India*)

"All of a sudden some people hedged all around the hotel and they were killing all the Muslims. The owner of that hotel pulled me out from there. Though that was a Hindu hotel and he was also a Hindu he saved my life that day" (*Ali (name changed), migrated from Kolkata, India to Parbatipur, East Pakistan (now Bangladesh).*

Determining an appropriate sample size for the story collection depends on the details of the statistical question to be addressed and the use of a non-random, sample procedure for data collection. As the collection is a resource for scholarship and not a sample collected for a particular question, we can use a difference-in-proportions (DIP) test as a "standard candle." The DIP test determines if the proportion of a trait is different across two populations. For example, is the proportion of migrants exposed to violence different in the population that migrated to Pakistan versus the population that migrated to India? Based on (Cohen 1992), in order to have 80% confidence in detecting a small effect we require at least 584 samples per group, or 1,168 respondents in total.¹⁰ However, the need to use respondent driven sampling means we

¹⁰ For example, consider the hypothesis that women were more likely to be exposed to violence than men. A DIP test is run, with an $\alpha = 0.99$, on the hypothetical dataset with a random sample of 584 men and 584 women to test the hypothesis that the share of women reporting exposure to violence is different from the share of men exposed to violence. If the test is significant, there is less than a 1% chance the difference is due to random sampling noise. If the test is negative, there is less than a 20% that a small difference (much less than the variation in the data) does exist, but we failed to detect it due to sampling noise.

need to account for the non-random nature of the data per the discussion in Salganik (2006). Our sample size of 2396 coded narratives are within the range that permits exploratory statistical analyses.¹¹

The majority of the data were collected using two methods: an online survey model, and an ambassador model. In the online survey model, which is the more common form of crowdsourcing data, anyone could upload their own or their families' stories in a survey format, into an online, custom-designed system for the collection of narratives. We initially started with only the online model, but soon realized that the narratives we were seeking to include were not easily reached, especially through an online platform and instead, required human intervention and direct contact. The online model yielded very few narratives¹² as compared to the ambassador model and was mostly successful in collecting narratives from the South Asian diaspora that reside in the West today.

The ambassador model relied on trained volunteers ("ambassadors") across the region to personally interview Partition survivors. The ambassadors were trained in accordance with Harvard's Institutional Review Board and were given extensive sensitivity training to ensure that they were equipped to conduct interviews on a topic as sensitive as the Partition and so that they were made aware of their biases to the extent possible. The ambassadors interviewed the survivors, often in the native language of the interviewee, and then transcribed and, if necessary, translated these transcripts into English, with a quality check being done by the in-country point-of-contact, who was responsible for the ambassadors in a particular country. Given that the interviews were conducted utilizing a modified form of respondent driven sampling, we could not ensure that certain positionalities, such as male ambassadors interviewing female interviewees or the real or perceived religious affiliation of the ambassadors (particularly while interviewing survivors of religious minorities), was completely eliminated. However, the training that the ambassadors had to

¹¹ Salganik posits the existence of a 'design effect' a parameter determined by the network like properties of the data; the design effect is usually between 2 and 3, based on past empirics, a multiple that is applied to the 1168 narratives sample size to yield an acceptable range of 2,336-3,504 narratives.

¹² We have 47 interviews from the online method.

undergo as well as the presence of a point-of-contact who was directly accessible to the ambassadors to clarify issues, helped reduce the impact of such unavoidable situations.¹³ By the end of the project, around 300 ambassadors had conducted at least one in-person interview and a majority of them conducted more than two interviews (see Figure 2). The majority of data was collected using the ambassador model.

The model has been successful in collecting a large number of narratives from across the region, including minority voices that are often overlooked. However, the main drawback is the varied quality of the transcriptions, thereby resulting in differing levels of information that can be extracted.

The project, under the aegis of the Lakshmi Mittal and Family South Asia Institute,¹⁴ Harvard University (Mittal Institute) had various levels of organization that spanned four countries, including: the lead researchers as overseers of the project working with a group of researchers in Cambridge; in-region project coordinators; more than 300 ambassadors; and an advisory board of eminent and experienced scholars¹⁵ of

¹³ An example of this can be seen in the manner ambassadors were trained to interview women interviewees. Early on in the process of collection, it was brought to the notice of the point-of-contacts, and in turn, the research team in Cambridge that in interviews with women survivors, their husbands or some other male member of the household would often talk over them. Immediately, it was realized that we had not accounted for the often-existing patriarchal structure in South Asian society, where the males tend to interrupt women or speak for them, and women in the household frequently defer to the men. After identifying this issue of gender and kinship dynamics present in much of South Asian culture, the ambassadors were trained to be conscious of this issue going forward and either repeat the question to the women specifically or, if possible, interview the women separately.

¹⁴ The current research is part of a larger inter-disciplinary project being undertaken by the Mittal Institute on the 1947 Partition of British India. The project involves research teams in Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan as well as professors from across disciplines, including Jennifer Leaning, Harvard School of Public Health; Rahul Mehrotra, Graduate School of Design; Asim Khwaja, Harvard Kennedy School; Prashant Bharadwaj, University of California, San Diego; Tarun Khanna, Harvard Business School; Karim Lakhani, Harvard Business School; and Zehra Jumabhoy, Courtauld Institute of Art, London. The project is exploring Partition through varied lenses: the demographic and humanitarian consequences of the Partition; a textual analysis of speeches made by leaders of South Asia to understand the impact of conflict related speech on economic development, crowdsourcing oral narratives and analysing them for sentiment and trends; and the examination of the physical forms, layout, and temporality of refugee camps and settlements established for Partition migrants.

One of the main outputs of the project is a book of collected essays that is currently in drafting stage, *Looking Back, Informing the Future: 1947 Partition of British India* (working title). In addition, a number of seminars were organized in Spring 2017 related to the Partition at Harvard University as well as a number of events discussing the varied aspects of the project.

¹⁵ The Advisory Board comprises of: Ian Talbot, Professor of Modern British History, University of Southampton; Yasmin Khan, Official Fellow, University Lecturer (Associate Professor) in British History, Department for Continuing Education, Faculty of History, University of Oxford; Vazira Fazila-Yacoobali Zamindar, Associate Professor of History, Brown University; Sunil Amrith, Mehra Family Professor of South Asian Studies, Professor of History, Harvard University; and Urvashi Butalia, Writer and Publisher.

Partition who consulted on the project and research design (see Figure 3). A discussion of the role that the lead researchers' personal connection played in the research methodology and data collection, and how they straddled the dichotomies of *insider/outsider* and *qualitative/quantitative* in the research and analysis can be found in Khanna, et. al (in publication, 2021).

Though the data collection efforts were comparatively more successful in India, we used innovative methods in Pakistan and Bangladesh to ensure the dataset was somewhat balanced and reflected views from all sides.¹⁶ The Mittal Institute entered into partnerships with different organizations such as Citizens Archive of Pakistan (CAP) and Independent University of Bangladesh and tried various strategies in different parts of the sub-continent such as newspaper ads, radio talks, and small group discussions to promote the recruitment of volunteers and finding survivors who were willing to talk to the team. CAP provided 245 oral narratives (included in the total dataset of 2,396 narratives).¹⁷

Researchers manually coded qualitative interview data for a series of variables, based on a codebook that the team developed. These coded results have subsequently been used to run a series of regressions, using a linear model. In addition, the text of the interviews has been analyzed for sentiment using a dictionary of positive and negative words specifically created for the dataset.

The data collection process focused on collecting narratives of survivors, particularly those who were displaced during Partition, and included minority and marginalized voices. Seventy eight percent of the narratives are from people who stated that they migrated across the newly created borders around Partition (Table 1).¹⁸ Our sample thus clearly skews in the direction of those who migrated during Partition. This is

¹⁶ It was relatively difficult to collect interviews in Bangladesh as for most of the population there, the memories of 1947 have been superseded by the 1971 civil war that led to the creation of Bangladesh.

¹⁷ These 245 narratives were part of larger interviews conducted by CAP during their own collection process. CAP sifted through the larger interviews and shared the information related to the questionnaire from these 245 narratives in the form of written answers to our questionnaire and subsequent coding of these answers to add to our data set.

¹⁸ India had a marginally higher inflow of migrants during Partition. According to Bharadwaj et. al (2008), the absolute number of migrants into India was 7.3 million, into Pakistan 6.5 million, and into Bangladesh around 0.7 million. The

likely a consequence of the process by which we identified interviewees, wherein survivors volunteered to be interviewed or were referred to us by others and the ones who experienced migration were more willing or interested in sharing their experience with us than those who did not migrate. Below, we are cautious about the interpretation of our correlations as a result of this.

Forty nine percent of the survivors stated that they either experienced violence or experienced a threat of violence (Table 2). A comparison between the regression analysis of the full data set and one that includes only non-migrants does not show any substantial differences in the results except that women are more likely to experience violence in the full sample, but not within non-migrants (See Annex 2 for the analysis).

Of the 2,396 individuals interviewed, women comprise 32.4 percent of the sample (Table 3) and 22 percent are religious minorities (including Hindus in Pakistan, Muslims in India, Sikhs, Parsis, and Christians) (Tables 4a and 4b).

The socio-economic status (SES) of most displaced changed for the worse, with the proportion of poor and lower middle class increasing from 19.3 percent of the total dataset before Partition to 35.6 percent after Partition. 29.8 percent of the total dataset fell by one or more classes. 63.2 percent of the dataset received some form of government assistance after Partition (see Tables 5, 6, and 7). SES was manually coded based on varied factors such as occupation, land ownership, family wealth, class, belongings travelled with, mode of transportation etc. that were mined from the responses of the interviewees. For example, interviewers who reported that their families were one of the wealthiest in their hometown/city were categorized as wealthy. They often travelled by plane. "Upper Middle Class" were those who often came from families that had doctors, lawyers, and other privileged professions. These families were not extremely wealthy but were affluent. They often travelled by ship, or special vehicles provided by the government. "Middle Class"

outflow numbers for the three countries are 8.5 million out of India, about 5.4 million out of Pakistan, and 2.9 million out of Bangladesh.

is the default category, these families held middle-income posts. Most government employees, police, army, or schoolteachers will be coded as "Middle Class." "Lower Middle Class" and "Poor" are differentiated based on occupation and landholding. "Lower Middle Class" and "Poor" respondents were clerks, farmers, blue collar workers, small shop owners, rural residents etc. They often bore the brunt of violence and travelled on foot or with public trains.

RESULTS¹⁹

I. Descriptors of the Partition Process

The pattern of associations in migration experiences are largely intuitive (see Table 8). The probability of negative experiences increases with migration and staying in a refugee camp - a pattern that is consistent with greater risks for those displaced during the Partition. Government assistance is more likely for those facing negative outcomes during the Partition, consistent with assistance being distributed as compensation. Notably, women are about 8% more likely to be exposed to violence during the Partition, more than half the effect of staying in a refugee camp.

In the following section, we break down the analysis of government assistance into sub-sets of India and Pakistan. When we did the same for "exposed to violence" and "SES falling," there were no discernable differences and hence those analyses are not reported.

II. Government Assistance

Table 9 reports regressions of the probability of receiving government assistance on the respondents who migrated during the Partition. The first column reports results on all migrants. The next two columns report results separately for each country, i.e. India and Pakistan. The pattern is largely consistent across samples with assistance mainly being distributed to compensate migrants. The Pakistan sub-sample does show assistance as more likely to go to those with higher social and economic status before Partition.

¹⁹ Additional analysis of each of these results with varying sets of covariates to ensure these results discussed here hold can be seen in Annex 3.

III. Views on Partition

Column (1) in Table 10 includes measures of contemporaneous experiences during Partition. Column (2) reports regression coefficients for the probability of holding nonnegative views on Partition as a function of preexisting (exogenous) characteristics: social and economic status before Partition, religion, gender, and an interaction effect for gender and religion. Those who are currently in India (whether as a result of migration or because they stayed on in India) have a less positive view of Partition. Only the loss of social and economic status is additionally significantly correlated with long term views on Partition. ²⁰

IV. Sentiment of Oral Narratives

Sentiment was measured (Pang et. al 2008) using a dictionary specifically created for the dataset²¹ and measured in three buckets, based on answers to questions related to experiences before Partition, during Partition, and after Partition. The word-clouds below reflect the most common words that appeared in the answers for each of these periods and reflect the dominant experience of contentment both before and after Partition (Figures 4 and 6), with clear distress and negative emotions during Partition (Figure 5).

The measured sentiment reflects the same results as the word-clouds in Figures 4-6. Measured sentiment in Table 11 regarding conditions before and after Partition are largely not significantly associated with the measured covariates. Sentiment for the experience of Partition itself is responsive in an intuitive manner;

²⁰ Here are some cautionary comments about this result. For robustness, we subsequently ran regressions on a matched sample of migrants and non-migrants (given our likely oversampling of migrants). A matched sub-sample was created on the basis of four observable exogenous variables – gender, religion, socio-economic status before Partition, and being a religious minority. The relatively negative view of those in India towards Partition does not survive this matched sample analysis. We also dropped subsets of observations from the full sample in an attempt to understand the drivers of our main correlation. The differential negativity towards Partition appears to be driven by a subsample of middle class Muslim men who stayed behind in India. The removal of these data points shakes the result of migrants to Pakistan being less negative about Partition. So, it is possible that the full-sample result is driven by this subset being especially negative about Partition (which is why they did not migrate).

²¹ Examples of words in the dictionary include: (i) Positive words: peace, homeland, harmony, humanity, comfortable, settled; (ii) Negative words: killing, loot, seize, riot, disturbance, dead, hunger.

exposure to violence and other negative experiences is associated with negative sentiment. Interestingly, women report significantly more negative sentiment regarding the Partition experience.

Our definition of the different categories of SES is a combination of both income (land ownership, family wealth) and status (occupation, class). The table above reflects that a loss in SES reflects more negative sentiment, which intuitively makes sense. Further research is needed to unpack these results more and understand the impact of change in income and/or status to the negative sentiment (Tella et. al 2010).

Sentiment Distribution. Sentiment values for the experience during Partition are significantly more negative than those for experiences before or after Partition (Figures 7 and 8).²² The sign test results reported in Table 12 confirm the distribution differences seen in the plots.

The graphs in Figures 7 and 8 show how, despite the negative memories of the actual displacement and related trauma, the long-term memories of life after Partition appear to revert to the baseline level of satisfaction, established by life before Partition. This line of interpretation is consistent with what has come to be known as the "set-point" theory of subjective well-being (itself somewhat contested)²³ i.e. the idea that individuals have a largely predetermined level of subjective happiness to which they tend to revert regardless of stochastic variation in life's circumstances (Brickman and Campbell, 1971; Lykken and Tellegen, 1996).

It might also relate to what the literary scholar Světlana Boym has defined as nostalgia, "a longing for a home that no longer exists or has never existed. Nostalgia is a sentiment of loss and displacement, but it is also romance with one's own fantasy." (Boym 2001:xiii). Similar observations were made by Ghose (1997), who described it as a "utopia of nostalgia", referring to the 150 interviews of Partition survivors carried out

²² Score: The score equals to the number of positive words in the dictionary subtracts the number of negative words, i.e. Sentiment Score = # Positive - # Negative

²³ See for example, Heady B., "The Set-point Theory of Well-being Needs Replacing – On the Brink of a Scientific Revolution?" *German Institute for Economic Research Discussion Paper*. DIW Berlin (2007).

by the Indian social theorist Ashis Nandy in the 1990s where he found repeated references to "life in undivided India as flawless, rosy in every respect". He observed that a number of respondents did not see anything wrong with their life before Partition and attributed any troubles to the Partition (Ghose 1997).

V. Analysis of Muslims and Minority Groups in India and Pakistan

Tables 13, 14, and 15 reflect the results of the descriptors of Partition, views on Partition, and measured sentiment respectively for only the Muslim interviewees. The subset included Muslim interviewees from both India and Pakistan.

Table 13 shows that Muslims who decided not to leave India and migrate to Pakistan received less assistance, which is consistent with the results of Table 8 – that most of the government assistance was concentrated in favor of migrants. Further, experience of violence impacted the socio-economic status of Muslims negatively and correspondingly, resulted in greater government assistance.

Table 14 shows that Muslims who are currently in India have a less positive view of Partition than those who migrated to Pakistan. This is despite the fact that Muslims in India received less assistance from the government, as reflected in Table 13.

Finally, Table 16 reflects a minority group analysis wherein the minority groups are defined as Muslims who stayed back in India and Hindus who stayed back in Pakistan. The table shows that minorities have done worse in a variety of ways in both countries, including fall in SES, more experience or threat of violence, and less assistance from the government. This also reflects in their views of Partition and sentiment of the events during Partition, which are negative.

VI. Mapping of Routes and Refugee Camps

Figure 9 reflects a heat map of the departure locations from the 1,873 oral narratives that state that they migrated during Partition. The frequency of the location mentioned is reflected by the colors – green being the least and red being the most mentioned. As Figures 9 and 10 reflect, Lahore was the most popular spot of departure. Migration across the Bangladesh (erstwhile East Pakistan) occurred gradually and over a longer period of time post Partition.

Correspondingly, Figure 11 reflects a heat map of the arrival locations from the 1,873 oral narratives that state that they migrated during Partition. As Figures 11 and 12 reflect, Delhi was the most popular spot of arrival.

Figure 13 is a heatmap of the refugee camp locations mentioned in the dataset. Corresponding to the most popular route of migration being between Lahore and Delhi, most refugee camps mentioned fall within this route. Delhi and Amritsar can be seen as two major camps areas on the Indian side, while camps in and around Lahore are most prominent on the Pakistan side of the border.

These are some of the initial results from geocoding²⁴ and analyses are continuing to map and trace the specific routes taken by the displaced, including the multiple stops during the journey, and the locations of refugee camps mentioned in the oral narratives (in comparison to ones that are mentioned in archival documents). Figure 14 shows an example of fifteen distinct routes taken by refugees during Partition, including the various intermediary stops and distance traveled. It is possible that the oral narratives may yield routes and refugee camp locations that have not been mentioned or analyzed in qualitative literature and books so far, particularly on the Pakistan side. A more detailed analysis of these results will be covered in a future essay.²⁵

²⁴ An example of a multi-stop journey can be seen in the story of Sunil and his family (name changed) – they lived in the village of Hakimwala, Pakistan and moved to Chiniot, Lahore (in Pakistan) and then Amritsar, Kurukshetra, Rohtak, and finally settled in Gohana (in India). Each of these points in Sunil's story have been geocoded as well as the refugee camps they stopped in Chiniot Amritsar, Kurukshetra, and Rohtak.

²⁵ Khanna et. al, 1947 Partition of British India: Migration Routes and Refugee Camps (working title).

CONCLUSION

This paper is a first step in quantitatively analyzing and understanding (some) long-run memories of Partition and the resulting forced migration, using mixed methods. These results provide preliminary quantification of correlations between violence, migration, and government assistance, among other issues that have been hitherto studied extensively, but only qualitatively.

Perhaps most striking is our conjecture about the important role that identity and narrative play, even more than seventy years after the event, with migrants to India having a less positive view of Partition while Muslims to Pakistan within the sub-set of Muslims having a more positive view, despite the attendant violence and loss of socio-economic status by virtue of migrating, and the relatively slower progress of Pakistan over recent decades compared to India.

Our crowdsourced data are unique not only in being from all three countries that resulted from the Partition, but also in emphasizing data collection from under-represented voices, particularly women and religious minorities. The estimated correlations seem to suggest that women internalized the trauma more dramatically. In addition, an analysis of the minority groups shows that minorities had a worse experience of Partition across various indicators, including fall in socio-economic status, less government assistance, and more threat and experience of violence. Future work has to give voice to the underrepresented.

The return to baseline level of satisfaction by most interviewers in their description of life after Partition, similar to their memories of life before Partition, possibly reflects the resilience and strength of humans to overcome traumatic events as well as potentially rose-tinted memories of the past. Mapping of refugee camps and migration routes can provide more insight into the mechanics of movement and new leads to information that may very well be lost with the loss of this last generation that has memories of Partition.

These preliminary results are just scratching the surface in understanding the rich trove of data that exists in these 2,396 narratives, collected across the three countries, about the history and impact of Partition on the subcontinent. The analysis can help us understand the emergence of several categories of institutions in South Asia since 1947, particularly in northern India and Pakistan. The administrative bureaucracy and financial institutions of the two countries, particularly Pakistan, emerged in its current form post Partition. The continuing impact of Partition and the resultant migration can also be seen in the current urban structure of various cities in India and Pakistan, particularly Delhi and Lahore. The influx of refugees into these cities, the land reforms and policies adopted by the government and society to manage and absorb these refugees, and their impact on the urban form of these cities is clearly reflected today.²⁶ We hope that future scholars will analyze these data further to help us to not only understand forced migration and displacement during that traumatic time, but also manage contemporary crises and recognize their long-term impacts.

²⁶ For a full discussion, see Mehrotra, R. and Athaide, D "Partition: The Effects on Urbanization in India and Pakistan" (*in draft*).



Figure 1: Distribution of language of interview



Figure 2: Number of interviews per ambassador



Figure 3 – Organizational Structure



Figure 4: Word-Cloud for Experience Before Partition

Draft, please do not circulate



Figure 5: Word-Cloud for Experience During Partition



Figure 6: Word-Cloud for Experience After Partition



Figure 7: Sentiment Distribution



Figure 8: Sentiment Distribution

Draft, please do not circulate



Figure 9: Departure Locations



Figure 10: Departure Locations with Distance from Lahore

Draft, please do not circulate



Figure 11: Arrival Locations



Figure 12: Arrival Locations with Distance from Delhi

Draft, please do not circulate



Figure 13: Refugee Camp Locations



Figure 14: Routes taken by Refugees with Stops and Distance

TABLES

Table 1: Migration Frequencies

Migrated	1873
to India	1197
to Pakistan	572
Other Directions (within country etc)	104
Did Not Migrate	516
Migration Status Unknown	7
Total	2396

1268
293
2396

Table 2: Frequencies of reported exposure to violence²⁷

Threatened	690
Experienced	487
Did not Experience	1137
Missing	82
Total	2396

Table 3: Frequencies of reported gender²⁸

Male	Female	Transgender	Couples
1601	778	1	16

 ²⁷ Table 2 includes the experiences of all the narratives, not just migrants. People who experienced violence are exclusive of those having experienced threat of violence.
 ²⁸ 16 interviews here were of couples, i.e. male and female. These interviews were conducted jointly in accordance

²⁸ 16 interviews here were of couples, i.e. male and female. These interviews were conducted jointly in accordance with the preferences of the interviewees.

Table 4a: Frequencies of reported religious affiliation

Hindu	Islam	Sikh	Others	Christian	Parsi	Unknown
1070	1045	205	27	28	17	4

Table 4b: Hindus and Muslims in India and Pakistan

	Now in India	Not in India
Hindu	1039	31
Muslims	221	824
All other religions	225	52
Unknown	4	
Total	2396	

Table 5: Frequencies of socio-economic status²⁹

	Poor	Lower Middle	Middle	Upper Middle	Wealthy	Unknown
Before	78	386	1041	507	138	246
After	237	616	839	254	62	388

Table 6: Frequencies of changes in SES from before to after Partition

	<-2	-2	-1	0	1	2	Unknown
Before	48	166	502	1196	63	5	416

Table 7: Frequencies of reported government assistance post Partition³⁰

Received Non-Land Assistance	920

Received Land 596

²⁹ For parsimony in the tables, "Poor" and "Lower Middle Class" were combined into "Lower Class" and "Upper Middle Class" and "Wealthy" were combined into "Upper Class". ³⁰ The two categories in the table are mutually exclusive.

Table 8: Descriptors of the Partition Project

	Violence	SES Falling	Gov. Assist.
Migrated	0.187***	0.226***	0.227***
	(0.051)	(0.045)	(0.041)
Migrated to Pakistan	0.016	-0.118**	0.139***
8	(0.058)	(0.051)	(0.046)
Staved in Refugee Camp	0.136***	0 144***	0 409***
Suryeu in Refugee Sump	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.022)
Poor	0.034	_0.305***	0.001
1 001	(0.072)	(0.064)	(0.061)
Lower Middle Class	0.042	0.120***	0.019
Lower Mildule Class	0.042	$-0.180^{-0.180}$	(0.018)
Harris Millie Chan	(0.032)	0.107***	(0.027)
Upper Mildule Class	-0.049	(0.026)	(0.003)
***	(0.029)	(0.020)	(0.023)
Wealthy	-0.034	0.321***	-0.025
	(0.053)	(0.046)	(0.043)
SES Fell 1 Class	0.098***		0.039
	(0.028)		(0.024)
SES Fell 1+ Class	0.186***		0.040
	(0.042)		(0.036)
Violence Threatened		0.067***	0.035
		(0.025)	(0.023)
Violence Experienced		0.125***	0.046*
	0.040	(0.027)	(0.026)
Received Non-Land Assistance	0.049	0.042	
	(0.033)	(0.030)	
Received Land from Gov.	0.056*	-0.004	
Machine	0.050	0.028)	0 160***
WIUSHIN	(0.050)	-0.040	$-0.109^{-0.1}$
611	(0.033)	0.020	0.016
SIKI	-0.010	-0.030	-0.010
	(0.050)	(0.043)	(0.042)
Christian	-0.012	-0.059	-0.147
	(0.142)	(0.128)	(0.112)
Parsi	0.028	0.070	-0.311**
	(0.189)	(0.172)	(0.157)
Other Religion	0.058	-0.070	-0.050
	(0.109)	(0.098)	(0.094)
Female	0.078**	0.040	-0.039
	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.027)
Gender Other	-0.161	-0.116	-0.088
	(0.167)	(0.149)	(0.136)
Muslim x Female	0.003	-0.070	-0.001
Sileh - Francis	(0.053)	(0.048)	(0.044)
Sikn x remale	(0.031)	(0.003)	0.043
Constant	(0.079)	(0.0/1)	0.160***
Constant	(0.054)	0.084*	(0.100^{-44})
Madhad	<u>(0.054)</u>	(0.040) DE	(0.04 <i>3)</i>
Niethod	KE 1720	<u>KE</u>	1000
II A directed D2	1/38	0.21	0.21
Aajusted R2	0.08	0.21	0.31

*10%, **5%, ***1% Significance

Exposure to violence

	p-value	Test Statistic
Migrated + Migrated to Pakistan	0.000	17.116
SES Falling		
	p-value	Test Statistic
Migrated + Migrated to Pakistan	0.014	6.071
Government Assistance		
		T

	p-value	Test Statistic
Migrated + Migrated to Pakistan	0.000	91.432

Table 9: Government Assistance

	Both	India	Pakistan
Migrated	0.227***	0.237***	0.327***
	(0.041)	(0.046)	(0.046)
Migrated to Pakistan	0.139***		
	(0.046)		
Stayed in Refugee Camp	0.409***	0.423***	0.338***
	(0.022)	(0.026)	(0.045)
Poor	0.001	0.006	0.069
	(0.061)	(0.072)	(0.111)
Lower Middle Class	0.018	0.032	0.001
	(0.027)	(0.033)	(0.048)
Upper Middle Class	0.005	-0.030	0.071*
	(0.025)	(0.030)	(0.043)
Wealthy	-0.025	-0.088	0.070
	(0.043)	(0.056)	(0.071)
SES Fell 1 Class	0.039	0.043	0.012
	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.052)
SES Fell 1+ Class	0.040	0.065*	-0.096
	(0.036)	(0.040)	(0.088)
Violence Threatened	0.035	0.004	0.133***
	(0.023)	(0.027)	(0.043)
Violence Experienced	0.046*	0.026	0.134***
	(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.049)
Muslim	-0.169***	-0.166***	-0.002
-	(0.043)	(0.055)	(0.148)
Sikh	-0.016	-0.022	0.068
	(0.042)	(0.042)	(0.338)
Other Religion	-0.050	-0.020	0.123
	(0.094)	(0.101)	(0.337)
Christian	-0.147	-0.225	0.045
	(0.112)	(0.239)	(0.202)
Parsi	-0.311**	-0.046	-0.242
	(0.157)	(0.232)	(0.248)
Female	-0.039	-0.032	-0.058
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.188)
Gender Other	-0.088	-0.2/1	-0.060
Muslim x Female	_0.001	_0 130	0.037
mushin a remate	(0.044)	(0.096)	(0.192)
Sikh x Female	0.043	0.047	0.310
	(0.068)	(0.067)	(0.560)
Constant	0.160***	0.161***	0.013
	(0.043)	(0.049)	(0.148)
Method	RE	RE	RE
n	1880	1288	617
Adjusted R2	0.31	0.32	0.27

Linear Hypothesis Test

	p-value	Test Statistic
Migrated + Migrated to Pakistan	0.000	91.432

Table 10: Views on Partition

	1	2
Migrated	-0.097**	-0.025
	(0.048)	(0.027)
Migrated to Pakistan	0.155***	
	(0.054)	
Stayed in Refugee Camp	-0.007	
	(0.027)	
Poor	-0.099	-0.066
	(0.067)	(0.054)
Lower Middle Class	-0.053*	-0.045*
	(0.030)	(0.027)
Upper Middle Class	0.010	-0.029
- II - A	(0.028)	(0.025)
Wealthy	0.010	-0.016
······································	(0.050)	(0.042)
SES Fell 1 Class	-0.057**	(0.012)
	(0.027)	
SES Fell 1+ Class	-0.158***	
	(0.040)	
Received Non-Land Assistance	0.065**	
Received 1 (on Land Assistance	(0.032)	
Received Land from Gov.	0.038	
	(0.030)	
Violence Threatened	0.007	
	(0.026)	
Violence Experienced	-0.039	
r	(0.029)	
Muslim	0.135***	0.201***
	(0.051)	(0.033)
Sikh	-0.000	-0.026
	(0.047)	(0.045)
Other Religion	0.051	0.057
5	(0.103)	(0.101)
Christian	-0.277**	-0.149
	(0.134)	(0.091)
Parsi	-0.017	0.001
	(0.180)	(0.111)
Female	0.007	-0.011
	(0, 030)	(0.029)
Gender Other	-0.031	0.011
	(0.157)	(0.135)
Muslim x Female	0.043	0.071
	(0.050)	(0.044)
Sikh x Female	-0.100	-0.046
	(0.074)	(0.072)
Constant	0.360***	0.289***
	(0.050)	(0.035)
Method	RE	RE
n	1726	2147
Adjusted R2	0.11	0.08

Linear Hypothesis Test

	p-value	Test Statistic	
Migrated + Migrated to Pakistan	0.205	1.607	

Table 11: Measured Sentiment for Experiences Before, During, and After, Partition

	Before	During	After	Difference
Migrated	-0.023	0.294	0.142	0.234
	(0.189)	(0.308)	(0.246)	(0.297)
Migrated to Pakistan	-0.184	-0.592*	-0.202	0.305
	(0.208)	(0.348)	(0.279)	(0.323)
Staved in Refugee Camp	0.070	-0.007	0.096	0.059
v o i	(0.108)	(0.171)	(0.135)	(0.169)
Poor	0.037	0.166	-0.260	-0.245
	(0.280)	(0.423)	(0.346)	(0.449)
Lower Middle	-0.018	-0.062	-0.069	0.042
Class				
	(0.122)	(0.191)	(0.150)	(0.191)
Upper Middle Class	0.167	0.252	0.025	-0.100
opper mane entry	(0.113)	(0.178)	(0.140)	(0.176)
Wealthy	0.273	0.600*	0.315	0.066
vi curriy	(0.207)	(0.328)	(0.257)	(0.323)
SES Fell 1 Class	0.034	0.038	0.076	0.039
SEST CHT Class	(0.108)	(0.172)	(0.134)	(0.167)
SFS Fell 1+ Class	0 144	-0.401	-0 573***	-0.812***
SES Pen 1+ Class	(0.159)	(0.254)	(0.108)	(0.245)
Paggived Non Land	-0.055	_0.092	0.057	0.053
Assistance	-0.055	-0.092	0.037	0.055
Assistance	(0.128)	(0.202)	(0.158)	(0.199)
Received Land from	-0.029	-0.383**	0.044	0.001
Gov.				
	(0.118)	(0.189)	(0.149)	(0.183)
Violence Threatened	0.005	-0.869***	0.029	0.078
	(0.104)	(0.165)	(0.130)	(0.162)
Violence Experienced	0.169	-1.484***	-0.027	-0.237
-	(0.117)	(0.185)	(0.145)	(0.181)
Muslim	0.110	0.566*	0.218	-0.079
	(0.197)	(0.325)	(0.261)	(0.308)
Sikh	-0.080	-0.238	0.109	0.244
	(0.183)	(0.295)	(0.234)	(0.285)
Other Religion	-0.908**	0.051	0.324	1.010
8	(0.422)	(0.673)	(0.548)	(0.681)
Christian	-1.085*	0.624	0.067	1.352
	(0.586)	(0.984)	(0.765)	(0.953)
Parsi	0.228	1.161	-0.964	-1.208
	(0.690)	(1.090)	(0.846)	(1.063)
Female	-0.172	-0.447**	-0.190	-0.037
	(0.122)	(0.192)	(0.150)	(0.189)
Gender Other	0.114	-0.556	-1 151	-1 708*
Genuer Other	(0.582)	(0.948)	(0.766)	(0.935)
Muslim x Female	0.222	0.286	0.431*	0.311
	(0.205)	(0.321)	(0.252)	(0.320)
Sikh x Female	0.210	0.587	0.018	-0.263
	(0.299)	(0.473)	(0.370)	(0.463)
Constant	0.404**	-1.329***	0.222	-0.239
	(0.194)	(0.323)	(0.258)	(0.304)

Method	RE	RE	RE	RE
n	1492	1555	1531	1454
Adjusted R2	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.01

Linear Hypothesis Test

Before		
	p-value	Test Statistic
Migrated+Migrated to Pakistan	0.255	1.295
During		
	p-value	Test Statistic
Migrated+Migrated to Pakistan	0.323	0.978
After		
	p-value	Test Statistic
Migrated+Migrated to Pakistan	0.802	0.063

Table 12: Sign test results for a 2-sided test of median differences.

	p-value	Test Statistic
Before v. During	0.000	1381.000
Before v. After	0.077	724.000
After v. During	0.000	1375.000

Table 13: Descriptors of the Partition Process for the Muslim Sub-Set

	Dependent variable:			
-	Violence	SES Falling	Gov. Assis.	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	
Currently in India	0.010	0.010	-0.327***	
	(0.045)	(0.035)	(0.041)	
Violence Threatened		0.123***	0.261***	
		(0.032)	(0.039)	
Violence Experienced		0.245***	0.270^{***}	
		(0.038)	(0.047)	
Lower Middle Class	0.086^{*}	-0.068^{*}	0.013	
	(0.046)	(0.035)	(0.044)	
Poor	0.036	-0.153***	0.023	
	(0.072)	(0.056)	(0.070)	
Wealthy	-0.028	0.221***	-0.019	
·	(0.075)	(0.055)	(0.073)	
Upper Middle Class	0.019	0.115***	0.035	
	(0.046)	(0.035)	(0.044)	
SES Fell 1 Class	0.273***		0.056	
	(0.052)		(0.051)	
SES Fell 1+ Class	0.289***		-0.007	
	(0.091)		(0.089)	
Received Non-land Assistance	0.221***	0.044		
	(0.048)	(0.037)		
Received Land from Gov.	0.343***	0.013		
	(0.045)	(0.036)		
Gender Others	-0.464*	-0.040	0.326	
	(0.270)	(0.209)	(0.260)	
Gender Female	0.070^*	-0.013	0.029	
	(0.039)	(0.031)	(0.038)	
Constant	0.264***	0.072**	0.333***	
	(0.036)	(0.028)	(0.033)	
Observations	733	733	733	
\mathbb{R}^2	0.154	0.129	0.188	
Adjusted R ²	0.141	0.116	0.176	
Residual Std. Error (df = 721)	0.463	0.358	0.445	
F Statistic (df = 11; 721)	11.937***	9.715***	15.217***	
Note:		*p<0.1; **	p<0.05; ***p<0.01	

Table 14: Views on Partition for the Muslim Sub-Set

	Dependent variable:			
	1	Non-negative views o	n partition	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	
Currently in India	-0.162***	-0.202***	-0.273***	
	(0.048)	(0.045)	(0.039)	
Lower Middle Class	-0.014	-0.034		
	(0.051)	(0.049)		
Poor	-0.114	-0.115		
	(0.078)	(0.077)		
Wealthy	-0.051	-0.009		
	(0.086)	(0.073)		
Upper Middle Class	0.017	0.027		
	(0.049)	(0.045)		
SES Fell 1 Class	0.027			
	(0.060)			
SES Fell 1+ Class	0.247**			
	(0.102)			
Received Non-land Assistance	0.062			
	(0.053)			
Received Land from Gov.	0.068			
	(0.054)			
Violence Threatened	-0.010			
	(0.045)			
Violence Experienced	0.039			
	(0.057)			
Gender Other	0.151	0.152	-0.186	
	(0.328)	(0.333)	(0.235)	
Gender Female	-0.00005	0.007	0.002	
	(0.043)	(0.040)	(0.037)	
Constant	0.342***	0.406***	0.436***	
	(0.040)	(0.032)	(0.023)	
Observations	596	698	793	
R2	0.066	0.051	0.061	
Adjusted R2	0.045	0.042	0.057	
Residual Std. Error	0.458 (df = 582)	0.467 (df = 690)	0.468 (df = 789)	
F Statistic	3.179*** (df = 13; 582)	5.330*** (df = 7; 690)	17.044*** (df = 3; 789)	
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01			

Table 15: Measured Sentiment for Experiences Before, During, and After, Partition for Muslim Sub-Set

		1		
	Before	During	After	Diff
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Currently in India	0.350*	-0.147	-0.066	-0.441*
	(0.187)	(0.282)	(0.228)	(0.266)
Lower Middle Class	-0.175	-0.188	-0.323	-0.099
	(0.194)	(0.292)	(0.235)	(0.275)
Poor	-0.201	0.696	-0.231	-0.024
	(0.294)	(0.445)	(0.370)	(0.424)
Wealthy	0.296	0.353	0.488	0.161
	(0.337)	(0.517)	(0.419)	(0.485)
Upper Middle Class	0.074	-0.114	-0.062	-0.158
	(0.198)	(0.297)	(0.242)	(0.284)
SES Fell 1 Class	0.083	0.353	0.256	0.159
	(0.227)	(0.343)	(0.276)	(0.319)
SES Fell 1+ Class	-0.580	-1.256**	-0.494	-0.005
	(0.448)	(0.634)	(0.508)	(0.629)
Received Non-land Assistance	-0.349*	-0.214	-0.064	0.457
	(0.211)	(0.313)	(0.257)	(0.304)
Received Land from Gov.	0.008	-0.862***	0.151	-0.045
	(0.203)	(0.300)	(0.244)	(0.290)
Violence Threatened	0.046	-0.697***	-0.240	-0.103
	(0.177)	(0.264)	(0.215)	(0.253)
Violence Experienced	0.373*	-1.577***	-0.154	-0.488
	(0.222)	(0.332)	(0.269)	(0.318)
Gender Other	-0.893	-0.439	-0.627	0.360
	(1.058)	(1.634)	(1.307)	(1.479)
Gender Female	0.201	-0.122	0.226	0.120
	(0.168)	(0.253)	(0.206)	(0.241)

Dependent variable:

Constant	0.407**	-0.767***	0.675***	0.177
	(0.164)	(0.241)	(0.194)	(0.235)
Observations	611	649	630	586
R2	0.024	0.081	0.016	0.017
Adjusted R2	0.003	0.062	-0.005	-0.005
Residual Std. Error	1.810 (df = 597)	2.797 (df = 635)	2.235 (df = 616)	2.528 (df = 572)
F Statistic	1.126 (df = 13; 597)	4.279*** (df = 13; 635)	0.782 (df = 13; 616)	0.775 (df = 13; 572)

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 16: Minority Group Analysis

	Dependent variable:							
	Violence	Assistance	SES Falling	Non-negative Views	Sentiment Before	Sentiment During	Sentiment After	Sentiment Diff
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Religion Minority	-0.112***	-0.429***	-0.228***	-0.504***	0.214*	0.515***	-0.081	-0.280
	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.120)	(0.191)	(0.142)	(0.182)
Constant	0.521***	0.586***	0.323***	0.717^{***}	0.427***	-1.791***	0.407***	-0.035
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.040)	(0.063)	(0.047)	(0.061)
Observations	2,314	2,049	2,396	1,819	2,017	2,138	2,045	1,922
R ²	0.005	0.075	0.023	0.120	0.002	0.003	0.0002	0.001
Adjusted R ²	0.004	0.075	0.023	0.119	0.001	0.003	-0.0003	0.001
Residual Std. Error	0.499 (df = 2312)	0.480 (df = 2047)	0.453 (df = 2394)	0.446 (df = 1817)	1.685 (df = 2015)	2.751 (df = 2136)	2.002 (df = 2043)	2.519 (df = 1920)
F Statistic	11.049*** (df = 1; 2312)	165.969*** (df = 1; 2047)	556.990^{***} (df = 1; 2394)	247.674 ^{***} (df = 1; 1817)	. 3.207* (df = 1; 2015)	7.256 ^{***} (df = 1; 2136)	0.327 (df = 1; 2043)	2.362 (df = 1; 1920)

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

REFERENCES

Ahmed I., *The Punjab Bloodied, Partitioned and Cleansed: Unravelling the 1947 Tragedy through Secret British Reports and First-Person Accounts*. Oxford University Press (2012).

Bhavnani N., The Making of Exile: Sindhi Hindus and the Partition of India. Tranquebar Press (2014).

Bhaskar Rao U., The Story of Rehabilitation. Delhi: Delhi Department of Rehabilitation, Ministry of

Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation, Govt. of India (1967).

Bhadada S., Bhatacharya T., Khan N., Khanna T., Lakhani K.," Refugee Camps during the 1947 Partition of British India" (working draft)

Bharadwaj P., Khwaja A. I., & Mian A. R. "The Big March: Migratory Flows after the Partition of India" *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2008).

Bourke-White M., *Halfway to freedom; a report on the new India in the words and photographs of Margaret Bourke-White*. Simon and Schuster (1949).

Boym S., The Future of Nostalgia. Basic Books (2001).

Brickman P.D. and Campbell D.T., "Hedonic relativism and planning the good society" in M.H. Appley ed. *Adaptation Level Theory*. Academic Press, pp. 287-302 (1971).

Butalia U., The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India. Penguin Books India (1998).

Carr E.H., What Is History?: The George Macaulay Trevelyan Lectures Delivered in the University of Cambridge, January-March 1961, by Edward Hallett Carr. Macmillan (1962)

Chatterjee J., *The Spoils of Partition: Bengal and India, 1947 - 1967*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2007).

Chattha I., Partition and Locality: Violence, Migration, and Development in Gujranwala and Sialkot 1947-1961. Karachi: Oxford University Press (2011).

Chester L., Borders and Conflict in South Asia: The Radcliffe Boundary Commission and the Partition of Punjab. Manchester: Manchester University Press (2009).

Cohen J., "A Power Primer " Psychological Bulletin Vol 1 (1992).

Ghosh V., This Side, That Side: Restorying Partition (an Anthology of Graphic Narratives). New Delhi:

Yoda Press (2013).

Gile K.J., and Handcock M.S., "Respondent-Driven Sampling: An Assessment of Current Methodology" *Sociological Methodology* Vol 40 (August 2010).

Heady B., "The Set-point Theory of Well-being Needs Replacing – On the Brink of a Scientific Revolution?" *German Institute for Economic Research Discussion Paper*. DIW Berlin (2007).

Heckathorn D.D., "Respondent-Driven Sampling: A New Approach to the Study of Hidden Populations" *Social Problems*. Vol 44 (1997).

Hill K., Seltzer W., Leaning J., Malik S. J., & Russell S. S., "The demographic impact of Partition in the Punjab in 1947" *Population Studies* Vol 62 (2008).

Iob E., Refugees and the Politics of the Everyday State in Pakistan: Resettlement in Punjab, 1947-1962.Routledge (2018).

Jalal A., *The sole spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League, and the demand for Pakistan*. Cambridge University Press (1994).

Kaur R., *Since 1947: Partition Narratives among Punjabi Migrants of Delhi*. Oxford University Press (2007).

Khan Y., The Great Partition: The Making of India and Pakistan. Yale University Press (2007).

Khanna T., Lakhani K., Dave S., Bhadada S., Khan N., Alam R., Hewett M.S., "Crowdsourcing Memories: Mixed Methods Research by Cultural Insider-Epistemological Outsiders" *Academy of Management Perspectives Symposium Issue* (in publication, May 2021).

Lakhani K.R., *Managing Communities and Contests to Inn ovate with Crowds* (D. Harhoff & K. R. Lakhani, Eds.) In *Revolutionizing Innovation: Users, Communities, and Open Innovation*. MIT Press, 2016.

Lakhani K.R., & Boudreau K.J.,"Using the Crowd as an Innovation Partner" *Harvard Business Review*,91(4) (2013).

Lambert R.D., Hindu-Muslim Riots. Oxford University Press (2013).

Leaning J (ed.), Looking Back, Informing the Future: 1947 Partition of British India (draft).

Lykken D., and Tellegen A., (1996) Happiness is a stochastic phenomenon. *Psychological Science*, 7 (1996).

Malhotra A., *Remnants of a Separation: A History of the Partition through Material Memory*. Harper Collins (2017).

Mehrotra, R. and Athaide, D "Partition: The Effects on Urbanization in India and Pakistan" (in draft).

Menon J., *The Performance of Nationalism: India, Pakistan, and the Memory of Partition*. Cambridge University Press (2013).

Pandey G., *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India*. Cambridge University Press (2001).

Pang B., and Lillian L., "Opinion mining and sentiment analysis" *Foundations and Trends*® *in Information Retrieval* 2.1–2 (2008).

Ricoeur P., "The Historian's Representation", *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer. U of Chicago (2010)

Roy H., Migrants, Refugees, Citizens in India and Pakistan, 1947-65. Oxford University Press (2012).

Sacks O., The River of Consciousness. Knopf (2017).

Salganik M.J., and Heckathorn D.D., "Sampling and Estimation in Hidden Populations Using Respondent-Driven Sampling" *Sociological Methodology* (2004).

Salganik M.J., "Variance Estimation, Design Effects, and Sample Size Calculations for Respondent-Driven Sampling " *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* Vol. 83 (2006).

Schacter D.L., Searching for Memory: The Brain, the Mind, and the Past. Basic Books (1996).

Serpell N., The Old Drift: A Novel. Hogarth (2019).

Sherman T. C., Gould W. & Ansari S. (eds), From Subjects to Citizens: Society and the Everyday State in India and Pakistan, 1947–1970. Cambridge University Press (2014).

Talbot, I (Ed.), The Independence of India and Pakistan: New Approaches and Reflections. Oxford

University Press (2013).

Tella R.D., New, J.H., MacCulloch, R., "Happiness adaption to income and to status in an individual panel" *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Organization*, 76 (2010).

Trouillot M-R., Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History. Beacon Press (1995).

UNHCR, "Syria emergency" (last updated April 18, 2018) *sourced from <u>https://www.unhcr.org/syria-</u>emergency.html.*

Zamindar V. F-Y, *The Long Partition and the Making of Modern South Asia: Refugees, Boundaries, Histories*. Columbia University Press (2007).

ANNEX 1

1947 PARTITION OF BRITISH INDIA: PARTITION STORIES --- INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

BASIC INFORMATION (<i>To be filled out by interviewer</i> Name of Interviewee) Date of Interview
Interview Location	Language of Interview
Interviewee experiences or recounting for someone else?	Interviewee (self) Someone Else: (Name/Relationship)
Migrated From/To/	p)
Hometown/Current residence/	
Religion of Interviewee Education	Age during Partition
CONSENT Before you begin to answer the questions, please acknow o You give permission to be interviewed. Me	rledge: thod of consent: • Audio • Signature On Paper

QUESTIONS: 1947 PARTITION OF BRITISH INDIA: PARTITION STORIES

Before Partition

1. Describe life before Partition. Where were you before Partition happened? What were you doing? What were things like? What was the feeling then? (Your feelings, general atmosphere.)

During Partition

2. When and how did you learn about Partition? Please tell us about your experience: What happened during Partition? Where were you when Partition happened? Did you stay where you were or did you have to leave?

Migration

If you *migrated*:

3a. Where did you leave from/to? Which towns did you cross or stay in? How was the decision to leave reached?

3b. Who did you travel with? What method(s) of transportation did you take? Did people in your area leave? Who left, who stayed back?

3c. What did you take with you and why? What did you end up with? What happened on the journey? If you *did not migrate*:

3a. Please describe how it was decided to stay. Where did you stay? Who did you stay with?

3b. Did you interact with migrants? How?

Refugee Camps

4. Were you at a refugee camp (at any point on the journey)? If yes, then: 4a. Where was the camp? (Location)

4b. When were you there? (If you don't remember exact dates, try to remember season, recent events, or year.)

4c. How long were you there? How did you decide to leave the camp?

4d. How many people were there?

4e. Describe life at the camp. (Food, water, medicine/medical care, sanitation, activities at the camp, work/money, registration, deaths.)

4f. Was there any temporary education center? Did you study there? Do you have any certificate?

Health

5. Could you tell us what kind of diseases or illnesses were common at the time of Partition?6. Did you, or anyone you know of, experience any health-related issues during Partition (for e.g. diseases, injuries, or mental illnesses)? If yes, did you get any help to deal with those issues during that time? Who provided help?

Education

7. What was the impact of Partition on your education? Did you change your stream? Could you tell us if you missed school/ college, and if yes, for how long?

Livelihood/ Profession

8. How did the Partition impact your livelihood/ professional life?

Response of the Government and Civil Society

9. How did the government and/or civil society in the new countries respond to the Partition? What do you think they did well and where did they falter? Do you remember any other individuals that were active during that time?

10. What do you remember about the role of the police and military during the Partition?

After Partition

11 What was it like after Partition? Was life any different than it was before Partition happened? (Did you undergo any lifestyle changes as a result of Partition? For example: change schools, eat different foods, aspects of daily life and care, etc.)

12. How do you feel about the decision of Partition? Is that any different than how you felt in 1947-8?13. Have you been, or are you, in touch (present or in past) with anyone from your birth place/ location before Partition? Would you like to share anything about that communication?

14. Can you share any photographs or memorabilia with us from the time of Partition?

15. Have you been interviewed before? If yes, by whom?

AFTER COMPLETING THE INTERVIEW, PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

O Permission to use your name, first name (or initials) in our study. Name First name Initials

O Permission to use quotes/excerpts from this interview. Name Short name Anonymous

O Permission to use age, location during Partition, audio (name as above). Age Location Audio

O Permission for the information above to be included on the Harvard South Asia Institute website devoted to the research Yes (grant permission) No (research only)

ANNEX 2: Results of the full dataset vs non-migrants set

These tables compare regression estimates using both the full sample and the sample of non-migrants. The coefficients shown are those that are significant in either regression. Overall, the regression analysis of the non-migrant sub-sample seems to agree with the full sample. The most substantive difference is that women are more likely to experience violence in the full sample, but not within non-migrants.

Views on Partition

_

The results for non-migrants are in-line with the full sample. The coefficient on Received Non-Land Assistance differs in sign. However, it has large standard errors in each regression, so changes are not unexpected.

_	Non-Migrants	Full	
		-0.277**	Christian
		(0.134)	
	0.347***	0.360***	Constant
	(0.084)	(0.050)	
	-0.084	-0.053*	Lower Middle Class
	(0.080)	(0.030)	
		-0.097**	Migrated
		(0.048)	
		0.155***	Migrated to Pakistan
		(0.054)	
	0.244***	0.135***	Muslim
	(0.088)	(0.051)	
	-0.057	0.065**	Non-Land Assistance
	(0.141)	(0.032)	
	-0.139	-0.057**	SES Fell 1 Class
	(0.147)	(0.027)	
	-0.354	-0.158***	SES Fell 1+ Class
	(0.498)	(0.040)	
	-0.172*	0.007	Violence Threatened
	(0.094)	(0.026)	
	RE	RE	Method
	236	1726	n
	0.03	0.11	Adjusted R2

Violence

	Full	Non-Migrants
Constant	0.180***	0.199***
	(0.054)	(0.076)
Female	0.078**	0.009
	(0.032)	(0.065)
Land Assistance	0.056*	0.303
	(0.032)	(0.241)
Migrated	0.187***	
	(0.051)	
SES Fell 1 Class	0.098***	0.171
	(0.028)	(0.125)
SES Fell 1+ Class	0.186***	0.887**
	(0.042)	(0.429)
Stayed in Refugee Camp	0.136***	-0.029
	(0.028)	(0.183)
Upper Middle Class	-0.049*	0.188**
	(0.029)	(0.084)
Method	RE	RE
n	1738	240
Adjusted R2	0.08	0.03

SES Falling

	Full	Non-Migrants
Constant	0.084*	0.085**
	(0.048)	(0.037)
Lower Middle Class	-0.180***	-0.062
	(0.028)	(0.038)
Migrated	0.226***	
	(0.045)	
Migrated to Pakistan	-0.118**	
	(0.051)	
Poor	-0.305***	-0.081
	(0.064)	(0.065)
Stayed in Refugee Camp	0.144***	-0.033
	(0.025)	(0.100)
Upper Middle Class	0.197***	0.012
	(0.026)	(0.046)
Violence Experienced	0.125***	0.018
	(0.027)	(0.051)
Violence Threatened	0.067***	0.103**
	(0.025)	(0.043)
Wealthy	0.321***	0.039
	(0.046)	(0.073)
Method	RE	RE
n	1726	236
Adjusted R2	0.21	0.00

Government Assistance

	Full	Non-Migrants
Constant	0.160***	0.039
	(0.043)	(0.034)
Migrated	0.227***	
	(0.041)	
Migrated to Pakistan	0.139***	
	(0.046)	
Muslim	-0.169***	0.033
	(0.043)	(0.035)
Parsi	-0.311**	
	(0.157)	
SES Fell 1+ Class	0.040	-0.316*
	(0.036)	(0.181)
Stayed in Refugee Camp	0.409***	0.422***
	(0.022)	(0.095)
Violence Experienced	0.046*	0.049
	(0.026)	(0.051)
Violence Threatened	0.035	0.125***
	(0.023)	(0.042)
Method	RE	RE
n	1880	266

Sentiment

Before Partition

	Full	Non-Migrants
Christian	-1.085*	
	(0.586)	
Constant	0.404**	0.680**
	(0.194)	(0.307)
Other Religion	-0.908**	
	(0.422)	
Method	RE	RE
n	1492	204
Adjusted R2	0.00	-0.03

During Partition

	Full	Non-Migrants
Constant	-1.329***	-1.257***
	(0.323)	(0.431)
Female	-0.447**	-0.095
	(0.192)	(0.367)
Land Assistance	-0.383**	-3.528**
	(0.189)	(1.475)
Migrated to Pakistan	-0.592*	
	(0.348)	
Muslim	0.566*	0.379
	(0.325)	(0.451)
SES Fell 1+ Class	-0.401	-8.185***
	(0.254)	(2.224)
Violence Experienced	-1.484***	-1.348***
	(0.185)	(0.504)
Violence Threatened	-0.869***	0.003
	(0.165)	(0.442)
Wealthy	0.600*	1.423*

	(0.328)	(0.822)
Method	RE	RE
n	1555	207
Adjusted R2	0.06	0.07

After Partition

	Full	Non-Migrants
Female x Muslim	0.431*	
	(0.252)	
Muslim	0.218	0.913**
	(0.261)	(0.450)
SES Fell 1+ Class	-0.573***	-3.098
	(0.198)	(2.511)
Violence Threatened	0.029	-0.951*
	(0.130)	(0.504)
Method	RE	RE
n	1531	203
Adjusted R2	0.01	0.03

ANNEX 3

This annexure provides additional context to the main findings of the paper.

Women's Sentiment

Women hold significantly more negative views of their experience during the Partition. The direct effect seen in column (1) of Table 17 indicates that women are more than 30% less likely to hold positive views than men. The effect is partially related to the different conditions experienced by men and women. As seen in column (3), controlling for conditions of the partition experience increases the effect of being female.

	1	2	3
Female	-0.311**	-0.333**	-0.355**
	(0.133)	(0.167)	(0.176)
Other	-1.024	-1.028	-0.453
	(0.851)	(0.852)	(0.927)
Female x Muslim		0.059	0.194
		(0.273)	(0.311)
Poor	-0.092	-0.091	-0.015
	(0.164)	(0.164)	(0.184)
Wealthy	0.274*	0.273*	0.306*
	(0.148)	(0.149)	(0.171)
Migrated			0.246
			(0.302)
Migrated to Pakistan			-0.521
			(0.333)
Stayed in Refugee Camp			-0.027
			(0.170)
SES Fell 1 Class			0.041
			(0.172)

Table 17: Women's sentiment regarding their experiences during Partition.

SES Fell 1+ Class			-0.353
			(0.248)
Non-Land Assistance			-0.114
			(0.201)
Land Assistance			-0.397**
			(0.188)
Violence Threatened			-0.860***
			(0.165)
Violence Experienced			-1.489***
			(0.185)
Muslim	0.342**	0.324*	0.521*
	(0.169)	(0.189)	(0.305)
Constant	-1.832***	-1.824***	-1.294***
	(0.133)	(0.139)	(0.309)
Method	RE	RE	RE
n	1933	1933	1555
Adjusted R2	0.01	0.01	0.06

Women's Exposure to Violence

Women are about 8% more likely to report being exposed to violence (threatened with or experiencing violence) during the Partition than men. The effect is stable whether examining only the direct effect, column (1) of Table 18, or conditioning on experiences during the partition, as in column (3) of Table 18. The effect appears to be largely driven by an increased likelihood of reporting receiving threats of violence as shown in Table 19.

Table 18: Women's reported exposure to violence.

	1	2	3
Female	0.075***	0.057**	0.083***
	(0.023)	(0.029)	(0.029)
Other	-0.153	-0.157	-0.150
	(0.146)	(0.146)	(0.164)
Female x Muslim		0.047	-0.001
		(0.046)	(0.051)
Poor	0.026	0.026	0.042
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.030)
Wealthy	-0.003	-0.003	-0.046*
	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.028)
Migrated			0.186***
			(0.050)
Migrated to Pakistan			0.018
			(0.055)
Stayed in Refugee Camp			0.136***
			(0.028)
SES Fell 1 Class			0.098***
			(0.028)
SES Fell 1+ Class			0.188***
			(0.041)
Non-Land Assistance			0.049
			(0.033)
Land Assistance			0.056*
			(0.032)
Muslim	-0.049*	-0.063*	0.050
	(0.029)	(0.033)	(0.051)
Constant	0.493***	0.500***	0.180***
	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.051)

Method	RE	RE	RE
n	2147	2147	1738
Adjusted R2	0.01	0.01	0.09

T 11 10	***					
Table IU	$\cdot M/ome$	n'e evnoeur	e to violenc	no and ite	component	norta
I ADIC 1 7		ii s cadosui		<i>c</i> and no	COMBONCH	Darts.

	Exposure	Threat	Experience
Female	0.083***	0.071**	0.015
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.026)
Other	-0.150	-0.163	-0.009
	(0.164)	(0.164)	(0.141)
Female x Muslim	-0.001	0.008	0.024
	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.045)
Poor	0.042	0.040	0.061**
	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.026)
Wealthy	-0.046*	-0.043	-0.013
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.024)
Migrated	0.186***	0.188***	0.023
	(0.050)	(0.050)	(0.043)
Migrated to Pakistan	0.018	0.015	0.048
	(0.055)	(0.056)	(0.047)
Stayed in Refugee Camp	0.136***	0.133***	0.120***
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.024)
SES Fell 1 Class	0.098***	0.098***	0.072***
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.025)
SES Fell 1+ Class	0.188***	0.185***	0.130***
	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.036)
Non-Land Assistance	0.049	0.054	0.040
	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.029)
Land Assistance	0.056*	0.058*	0.019
	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.027)

Muslim	0.050	0.063	-0.008
	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.044)
Constant	0.180***	0.166***	0.081*
	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.044)
Method	RE	RE	RE
n	1738	1726	1725
Adjusted R2	0.09	0.08	0.05