

Politics by other means

Hansen, Thomas Blom

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Hansen, T. B. (2006). Politics by other means. *Ethnicities*, 6(1), 102-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796806062238>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften


Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



Copyright © 2006 SAGE Publications (London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi) 1468-7968
Vol 6(1): 102-117; 062238
DOI: 10.1177/1468796806062238
<http://etn.sagepub.com>

Review Symposium: The Production of Hindu–Muslim Violence in Contemporary India by Paul R. Brass (published May 2005, pbk)

Politics by other means

THOMAS BLOM HANSEN

Yale University

Paul Brass' latest book *The Production of Hindu–Muslim Violence in Contemporary India* (2003) is an extraordinary work that sums up almost 40 years of research on politics, religious identities and violence in northern India. Focusing on the politics of Hindu–Muslim relations in one city in Uttar Pradesh – Aligarh – over the entire post-Independence era, Brass argues that riots are permanent features of Indian politics, produced and staged by 'institutionalized riot systems'. Condemning and bemoaning riots and casualties have become part of India's modern political culture – as much as the riots themselves.

Brass's introductory chapter takes aim at what he sees as the unsatisfactory and, ultimately, mystifying explanations that have been advanced in explaining riots. 'Naturalizing' accounts portray riots as inevitable eruptions of anger between communities divided by deep and incommensurable differences. Others view riots as pathologies of Indian political life, resulting from the cynical manipulation of religious passions by criminal business people and ill-intentioned politicians focused on short-term electoral gains. These explanations, Brass argues, not only obscure the processes at work; they are complicit in the very regime of interpretation that perpetuates riots. Portraying them as either 'justified' or as short lived 'aberrations', these explanations fail to recognize the integral, normalized roles riots play in political competition and communal organization in large parts of India.

With its prosperous Hindu *bania* (trader) communities and substantial Muslim artisan population, Aligarh is a typical north Indian city. At the same time, the presence of India's premier Muslim institution, Aligarh Muslim University, the deep and enduring communal polarization in the city, and the early alliances between Muslims and ex-untouchables make the city special. Unlike Ashutosh Varshney in his recent work (Varshney, 2002), Brass rejects the official classification of certain cities as 'riot-prone'. *The Production of Hindu–Muslim Violence in Contemporary India* emerges as a welcome rejoinder to Varshney's influential and overly schematic analysis, where communal riots result from the absence of civic ties across communities. In explaining specific riots, Brass obviously finds analytical distinctions between 'politics', 'civil society', and 'the state' less plausible than the detailed stories of individual careers and sociopolitical networks in the city's neighbourhoods.

Riots are best understood as the results of actions by identifiable specialists and networks of specialists in 'riot-production': the systematic rehearsal, staging and interpretation of collective violence as spontaneous acts of self-defence or retaliation against what is perceived as unjust and murderous threats from the other community. Understood in this way, Brass sensibly concludes, riots can be policed and prevented more effectively. How does Brass reach his conclusion? How does his conception of riots as complex localized productions compare to other explanations of riots in South Asia?

The evidence presented in the book is comprehensive and represents, thus far, the most systematic exploration of 'riot production' in India (and possibly anywhere).

Brass presents the context and development of a sequence of riots in Aligarh since 1925 and explores the changing roles of Aligarh Muslim University, national political campaigns, local rivalries over space and livelihoods, and policing strategies. He presents data on the changing spatial and demographic features of Aligarh, testing the popular thesis of Hindu–Muslim economic competition as the source of rioting. In subsequent sections Brass analyzes the nature of political competition and local electoral arithmetic with cogency and precision, while the role of the police and the media are treated in separate chapters.

The sheer volume and complexity of this unique longitudinal study comprising interviews, official reports, statistical evidence, and biographies of key figures prevents strong conclusions. Brass reminds us that riots do not happen in most places most of the time, not even in times of generalized *tanav* (tension) between communities. His material convincingly demonstrates that over the decades, riots have repeatedly occurred in only four or five specific localities in Aligarh. These localities are all characterized by the presence of seasoned riot specialists, men whose activities span business, politics, and cultural-religious organizations; men who are

willing and able to translate rumours and general discourses into local mobilization.

RIOTS AS ROUTINE POLITICS

This book is the work of a mature mind and does not discount the broader cultural and psychological explanations of how the history of Hindu–Muslim enmity has, over time, produced a rich archive of mythical knowledge of ‘the other’, an archive which defies logic and reasoned argument. Brass is, however, more interested in when, where and how this archive is activated and transformed into arguments for action and violence. His insistence on ‘demystification’ is refreshing and this book once again shows the immense value of sustained and localized field research.

The most suggestive conclusion to emerge from Brass’s book is that riots are integral and routinized aspects of India’s modern political culture, and that condemning and bemoaning riots and their casualties have become as much a part of this political culture as the riots themselves. Recent studies of lower caste movements and other forms of political mobilization in India suggest that activists are groomed to regard politics as a permanent state of warfare. Violence no longer represents the breakdown of political communication, but lies, rather, at the heart of contemporary Indian political practice.

For all its merits, the book leaves a range of questions unanswered. We hear a great deal about the ‘riot systems’ constructed over decades by various Hindu nationalist figures in Aligarh. The riot systems on the other side, among Muslims, appear less documented – almost non-existent – despite stories of links between Muslim criminals and academics at Aligarh Muslim University. Is this due to the difficulties involved in gathering information from marginalized communities? Or is it because their networks are differently organized? Or absent? Or is the whole idea of symmetry, of equally apportioning blame and culpability to Hindus and Muslims – really a myth in itself and a part of an official interpretative regime that absolves Hindu nationalists of their prime responsibility for what are, increasingly, anti-Muslim pogroms?

Another question left open is why riots occur in localities without established ‘riot systems’. Brass’s answer would undoubtedly be that ‘new’ riots signify initial and necessary steps by local operators in organizing more permanent ‘systems’ that will ensure both their influence over a constituency and the political effectiveness of future riots. Yet, the question is whether this comes close to a tautology. Can one, for instance, assume that a riot always represents more of the same logic? The evidence on the effects of the Babri Masjid controversy in Aligarh

indicates that the national scale and systematicity of Hindu nationalist campaigns in recent years constantly transform new areas into loci of communal conflict and violence and thus seem to reduce the significance of local factors.

THE ARITHMETIC OF HATRED

Although Brass has qualified his earlier, more hard-headed 'instrumentalist' position on how and why ethnic-communal identities are created and maintained, assumptions of underlying political rationalities reverberate through the book. Riots are ultimately rational mechanisms organized and orchestrated in order to consolidate political constituencies and to reproduce paranoia and mistrust. The problem with this 'switch on/off' theory of riot production is that it assumes that political operators working behind the scenes always have their eyes on the larger, supra-local picture. Brass's own evidence, however, provides several examples of how this was not always the case. His interviews with key figures also make it plain that they are deeply immersed in what he brands irrational and 'fantastical' ideas about the threat posed to the Hindu majority in India. Maybe we should see riots as truly political actions, i.e. tentative, chaotic, and complex occurrences, immersed in dominant social and political ideological formations and always unpredictable in their effects. We cannot extrapolate causes from effects. We can, Brass reminds us, always be sure that riots are intentional and organized with certain objectives in mind. Yet, the 'riot systems' do not always manage to produce the desired effects.

The postscript on the pogroms in Gujarat in 2002 provides additional support for Brass's thesis of riot systems being systemic features of India's political culture. Aligarh has experienced almost a decade without violence: during this time political alignments have shifted and the Muslim population has grown in strength, while the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) in Uttar Pradesh remains paralysed. As a consequence, a non-communal candidate was elected by both Muslim and Hindu voters in 2002. Simultaneously, in the neighbouring state of Gujarat, the 'riots systems' painstakingly constructed by the Hindu nationalist movement organized a gruesome pogrom against Muslims, in complicity with the police and parts of the government. While the riot systems were dormant in Aligarh, they flourished in Gujarat because the BJP and aligned forces seized the opportunity to use public violence to consolidate 'Hindu sentiments' and their political constituency.

If Brass is right, the same can happen again in Aligarh when the combination of national political discourse, electoral arithmetic and local grievances make it possible and expedient for the seasoned riot specialists of that city to resume their deadly game.

References

- Brass, Paul R. (2003) *The Production of Hindu–Muslim Violence in Contemporary India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Varshney, Ashutosh (2002) *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

THOMAS BLOM HANSEN is Professor of Anthropology in the Department of Anthropology, Yale University. Address: Department of Anthropology, Yale University, PO Box 208277, New Haven, CT 06520–8277. [email: Blomhansent@hotmail.com; thomasblom.hansen@yale.edu]

Review of Paul Brass

A.R. MOMIN

University of Mumbai

It can hardly be disputed that communalism, particularly in its most horrifying manifestation in Hindu–Muslim riots, poses the gravest threat to the cohesiveness and stability of society and state in India. The social, economic and human costs of communal violence are enormous and in fact incalculable. There is an unfortunate dearth of systematic, intensive and empirically based studies on communal violence; most of the studies on the subject tend to be rather descriptive and lack analytical rigour and theoretical refinement. This book (Brass, 2003), based on an intensive case study of communal violence in the riot-prone town of Aligarh in northern India carried over a period of nearly 38 years, makes a valuable contribution to the systematic study of communal violence in contemporary India.

Brass argues that persistent communal violence in Aligarh, as elsewhere in the country, is embedded in a discourse of communalism which is premised on a deliberate and calculated accentuation of religious and cultural differences between Hindus and Muslims, hostility towards Muslims, and militant Hindu nationalism. Riots, according to him, are not spontaneous occurrences which can be facily explained in terms of mob fury. They are essentially a planned, orchestrated and institutionalized phenomenon. Brass argues that there exists at sites of endemic communal violence an ‘institutionalized riot system’ which works as a central factor in the genesis and persistence of communal riots. This system, which is