

Anthropology, Politics and the State

Democracy and Violence in South Asia

Jonathan Spencer



CAMBRIDGE

This page intentionally left blank

ANTHROPOLOGY, POLITICS, AND THE STATE

In recent years anthropology has rediscovered its interest in politics. Building on the findings of this research, this book offers a new way of analysing the relationship between culture and politics, with special attention to democracy, nationalism, the state, and political violence. Beginning with scenes from an unruly early 1980s election campaign in Sri Lanka, it covers issues from rural policing in North India to slum housing in Delhi, presenting arguments about secularism and pluralism, and the ambiguous energies released by electoral democracy across the subcontinent. It ends by discussing feminist peace activists in Sri Lanka, struggling to sustain a window of shared humanity after two decades of war. Bringing together and linking the themes of democracy, identity and conflict, this important new study shows how anthropology can take a central role in understanding other people's politics, especially the issues that seem to have divided the world since 9/11.

JONATHAN SPENCER is Professor of the Anthropology of South Asia at the University of Edinburgh. His previous books include *A Sinhala Village in a Time of Trouble: Politics and Change in Rural Sri Lanka* (1990); *Sri Lanka: History and the Roots of Conflict* (1990), *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology* (co-edited with Alan Barnard, 1996), and *The Conditions of Listening: Essays on Religion, History and Politics in South Asia* (co-edited with C. J. Fuller, 1996),

NEW DEPARTURES IN ANTHROPOLOGY

New Departures in Anthropology is a book series that focuses on emerging themes in social and cultural anthropology. With original perspectives and syntheses, authors introduce new areas of inquiry in anthropology, explore developments that cross disciplinary boundaries, and weigh in on current debates. Every book illustrates theoretical issues with ethnographic material drawn from current research or classic studies, as well as from literature, memoirs, and other genres of reportage. The aim of the series is to produce books that are accessible enough to be used by college students and instructors, but will also stimulate, provoke, and inform anthropologists at all stages of their careers. Written clearly and concisely, books in the series are designed equally for advanced students and a broader range of readers, inside and outside academic anthropology, who want to be brought up to date on the most exciting developments in the discipline.

Editorial board

JONATHAN SPENCER, University of Edinburgh

MICHAEL LAMBEK, University of Toronto

SABA MAHMOOD, University of California, Berkeley

OLIVIA HARRIS, London School of Economics

Anthropology, Politics, and the State

Democracy and Violence in South Asia



JONATHAN SPENCER

University of Edinburgh



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521771771

© Jonathan Spencer 2007

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2007

ISBN-13 978-0-511-42135-8 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-77177-1 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-77746-9 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For Janet and Jessica for everything

Contents

| | |
|---|---------------|
| <i>List of illustrations</i> | <i>page</i> x |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | xi |
| 1 The Strange Death of Political Anthropology | 1 |
| 2 Locating the Political | 19 |
| 3 Culture, Nation, and Misery | 48 |
| 4 Performing Democracy | 72 |
| 5 States and Persons | 96 |
| 6 The State and Violence | 118 |
| 7 Pluralism in Theory, Pluralism in Practice | 143 |
| 8 Politics and Counter-politics | 168 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | 186 |
| <i>Index</i> | 200 |

List of illustrations

| | | |
|---|--|----------------|
| 1 | 'We are a caste of politicians' (All India Yadav Mahasabha Convention, 1999). Photo: Lucia Michelutti. | <i>page 21</i> |
| 2 | The 'dirty work' of politics (village meeting, West Bengal). Photo: Arild Ruud. | 23 |
| 3 | 'Vote for this' (Communist slogan, West Bengal). Photo: Mukulika Bannerjee. | 73 |
| 4 | 'I can do anything' (J. R. Jayawardene at Presidential election rally, Sri Lanka 1982). Photo: Jonathan Spencer. | 75 |
| 5 | The work of counter-politics (Batticaloa, 2006). Photo: Jonathan Spencer. | 169 |

Acknowledgements

This book is the product of many conversations over the years. Parts of it have been presented in seminars and workshops in Cambridge, Colombo, Edinburgh, Gothenberg, Harvard, Heidelberg, London, New Orleans, Oxford, Paris, and Peradeniya. I am grateful to the late Raj Chandavarkar, the late Neelan Tiruchelvam, Radhika Coomaraswamy, Goran Aijmer, Arthur Kleinman, the late Richard Burghart, Robert Gibb, Mattison and Gill Mines and Mayfair Yang, Tudor Silva, Sudipta Kaviraj, and David Washbrook for their hospitality on these occasions. The annual meetings of the South Asian Anthropologists' Group have not only provided an audience for parts of this work in progress on more occasions than I care to remember; they have also kept me in touch with some of the most exciting and fresh research from emerging scholars, research which has in some cases found its way into the chapters that follow. I am especially grateful to three of its most active members, Mukulika Banerjee, Lucia Michelutti, and Arild Ruud for kindly allowing me to use photographs from their own path-breaking research on South Asian politics. The arguments in this book grew (in rather unpredictable and unruly ways) out of the Malinowski Memorial Lecture which I gave at the London School of Economics in 1995: my thanks to the Department of Anthropology, and especially Chris Fuller and Jonathan Parry, for the invitation to deliver that lecture, and much else besides over the years. My friends in the Centre for South Asian Studies at Edinburgh, especially

Acknowledgements

Paul Dundas, Tony Good, Hugo Gorringe, Roger and Patricia Jeffery, and Crispin Bates, have provided a constant source of interdisciplinary stimulation, while my colleagues in Social Anthropology have been supportive and stimulating in appropriate proportion. I have been especially lucky to have worked alongside a small group of people in Edinburgh who have been doing genuinely path-breaking anthropological work on broadly political topics, notably Thomas Hansen, Iris Jean-Klein, Heonik Kwon and Yael Navaro-Yashin, Tony Good, and recently Kimberley Coles and Toby Kelly. I must also thank all the wonderful graduate students I have worked with in Edinburgh, especially in recent years Premakumara de Silva, Sharika Thiranagama, and Becky Walker.

In conversations over the years, a number of academic friends have – sometimes, I suspect, unwittingly – convinced me that the idea of a book on this theme was not entirely barmy: notably, at different times, Mukulika Banerjee, Richard Burghart, Veena Das, Thomas Hansen, Sudipta Kaviraj, Sunil Khilnani, and David Washbrook. Thomas found time in his breath-takingly full life to read a complete draft and provide helpful suggestions at an especially psychologically vulnerable moment.

The immediate stimulus for this work was the award of a Research Fellowship from the Nuffield Foundation. I am grateful to them for their wonderfully un-bureaucratic and patient support. My original fieldwork in Sri Lanka was carried out with the support of the then Social Science Research Council (now the ESRC), and return visits since 1991 have been supported by University of Edinburgh research and travel funds, and the British Council.

Parts of chapter [two](#) first appeared in *Journal des Anthropologues* 92–3: 31–49 (2003), and parts of chapter [four](#) were published in *Political Ritual*, edited by A. Boholm (Göteborg, IASA, 1996), and a longer version was translated into Spanish as ‘La democracia como sistema cultural’ (Democracy as a Cultural System) and published in *Antropologica* 7: 5–28. An early version of chapter [seven](#) was presented to an international meeting in Colombo to celebrate the life of the Tamil politician and

human rights activist Neelan Tiruchelvam who was assassinated by a suicide bomber in 1999. A copy of that presentation was subsequently published without permission in a daily newspaper in Sri Lanka, provoking a lengthy rebuttal from a leading nationalist ideologue, published under the heart-warming headline: Spencer Sponsors Tamil Racism. ‘Cheerful laughter is our response’, as Brecht’s Galileo put it on another, not entirely dissimilar, occasion.

Charles Hallisey and Jayadeva Uyangoda have been with me through thick and thin, and it is fair to say that both this book, and its author, would not be in the shape they are in today without their remarkable capacity for friendship. Janet Carsten and Jessica Spencer have been there throughout the writing, and have endured the consequent moments of abstraction as best they could. When I realized parts of the argument were as old as Jessica herself I was reminded of a story about my old teacher Barney Cohn. When a veteran Chicago graduate student bumped into Barney one day and excitedly told him that he thought he was almost ‘finished’ on his dissertation, Barney replied ‘Sometimes you shouldn’t try to “finish”. Sometimes you just have to stop.’



The Strange Death of Political Anthropology

What happened to the anthropology of politics? A subdiscipline which had seemed moribund in the 1980s has moved back to the centre of anthropological argument. Political themes – nationalism, conflict, citizenship – inflect exciting new work across (and beyond) the disciplinary spectrum. Where have these themes come from and what issues do they raise for anthropology in general? This book seeks to take stock of the recent political turn in anthropology, identifying key themes and common problems, while setting an agenda for work to come. In the pages that follow, I do not argue for any particular theoretical orthodoxy, but instead try to stage a dialogue between critical social and political theory and – anthropology's great strength – equally critical empirical research. The empirical research I concentrate on comes predominantly from one part of the world, South Asia, especially India and Sri Lanka, where particularly fruitful conversations have taken place between activists and intellectuals, and amongst representatives of different academic disciplines – especially history, political theory, and anthropology.

These conversations have taken place in years of upheaval. The critical events in India include the rise of Sikh separatism in the Punjab in the early 1980s, culminating in the assault on the Golden Temple in Amritsar in 1984, followed soon after by the assassination of Indira Gandhi and the wave of anti-Sikh violence which followed it; the destruction of the Babri

Masjid mosque in Ayodhya in 1992, and the Hindu–Muslim clashes which followed that; and the rise to national power of the right-wing Hindu Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). In Sri Lanka, violence against the minority Tamil population in 1984 precipitated a decline into civil war between the government and the separatist Liberation Tigers of Tamil Ealam (LTTE). Indian intervention in 1987 sparked further schisms, this time between the government and a radical Sinhala youth party, the Janata Vimukti Peramuna (JVP): in the late 1980s thousands were killed or disappeared in this dispute. The war with the LTTE rumbled through the 1990s until both sides agreed a ceasefire in 2002, since when low-level violence has continued in parts of the country. Nepal, which supplies a third strand of material for my argument, has in the same period seen a self-consciously democratic revolution, and the rise of violent Maoist insurgency, as well as the bizarre slaughter of the king and other members of royal family in 2002. Unruly times, indeed.

We live in a world in which it has become brutally apparent that our collective survival depends on the ability to understand, and sometimes to anticipate, the strange world of other people's politics. (And, yes, the first problem is pinning down who 'we' might be, and asking just who 'other people' are, in formulations like this.) To achieve this, we need to pay sympathetic attention to the workings of apparently different versions of the political in places with different histories, and apparently different visions of justice and order. Anthropology is an academic discipline apparently well suited to this task, and in recent years it has made notable contributions to the interpretation of, among many other topics, religious violence in India, civil war in Sierra Leone, post-Apartheid processes of reconciliation in South Africa, the 'magical' aura of the secularist state in Turkey, and Islamic visions of democracy in Indonesia.¹

¹ For example Richards on war in Sierra Leone, Wilson on truth and reconciliation in South Africa, Das and Hansen on religious violence in India, Navaro-Yashin on Turkey, Hefner on Islamism in Indonesia (Das 1990a; Das 1995b; Richards 1996; Hansen 1999; Hefner 2000; Hansen 2001b; Wilson 2001; Navaro-Yashin 2002).

The themes of this work – democracy, secularism, citizenship, nationalism and the nation-state, war and peace – are the big themes of political modernity. They are, though, somewhat different from the central themes of the subdiscipline known as political anthropology in the 1950s and 1960s, as a glance through the index of Joan Vincent’s authoritative *Anthropology and Politics* (Vincent 1990) will confirm. Something has changed. In 1996 Vincent herself introduced a short overview of the field with the valedictory observation that political anthropology had been a ‘late and comparatively short-lived subfield specialization within social and cultural anthropology’ (Vincent 1996b: 428). The political turn in anthropology since the 1980s, which is the subject of this book, has been fuelled by external intellectual influences, from poststructural theorists of power, most obviously Michel Foucault, to postcolonial critics of the politics of representation, most notably Edward Said. It has, though, equally been shaped by global political developments, like the resurgence of religious and ethnic conflict in different parts of the world in the post-Cold War era. A casual reader of Vincent’s later anthology on *The Anthropology of Politics* (Vincent 2002) would be hard pressed to identify what intellectual unity bound the short extract from Edmund Leach’s micro-analysis of land conflict in 1950s Sri Lanka, with Gayatri Spivak’s closing piece, which offers a poststructural commentary on Marx, the Enlightenment, and the politics of girls’ schooling in rural Bangladesh (Leach 2002 [1961]; Spivak 2002 [1992]). Each of these perfectly sums up the intellectual-political sensibility of its time: the first is scrupulously empirical and morally detached from the people whose machinations it analyses, the other is equally scrupulously theoretical and overtly morally engaged with its subjects. Something indeed has changed.

Let me, though, start my story where it started for me: in Sri Lanka in 1982.

Before the underpants, obviously enough, came the sarong. In the early 1980s Cyril de Silva was a minor government official in an out of

the way village in Sri Lanka. He owed his position to his links to the ruling political party, the United National Party (UNP), which had come to power in 1977. As a man of local substance, his normal style of dress was the postcolonial bureaucratic trouser. But when his party's candidate won the 1982 Presidential election, Cyril celebrated flamboyantly in his off-duty clothes, which meant his sarong. At his house, which served as the informal party offices for the village, he and his friends spent the day of the election results engaged in serious drinking. In mid-afternoon, they spilled out into the road: they sang, they danced, Cyril climbed on a signboard at a road junction and harangued the crowd with a ribald speech. Finally, with his friends cheering, he tucked his sarong into his underpants and danced down the street in an impersonation of the failed opposition candidate in the role of a demon.

A couple of months later, when his party won an extension to their parliamentary majority in a contentious referendum, Cyril shed what few inhibitions he still had. This time he dropped his sarong altogether and danced down the street in his underpants.

As they say in Sri Lanka: what to do? As a witness to the first of these scandals, and an audience as friends excitedly whispered to me about the second, I was a fledgling ethnographer with a problem. Empirically, the political was an inescapable feature of the social landscape in which I was carrying out research. Put simply, it dominated everyday life in this corner of Sri Lanka in the early 1980s. Theoretically, I had no obviously adequate language with which to capture the exuberance and unboundedness of a moment like this. I address the inadequacies of the available theoretical languages – the by-then almost moribund tradition of classic political anthropology and the emerging wave of resistance studies – in the [next chapter](#). Here I want merely to register my problem twenty years ago, because this book is the late product of a long coming to terms with the questions raised by Cyril's exhibition: questions about the political and questions about the potential role of anthropology in understanding the political.

Intellectually, it all started for me in Sri Lanka, and some of the examples that follow come from there, but in order to make sense of these examples I have had to look further afield. My period of looking has, of course, coincided with a wave of growing interest in other people's politics. This interest has shown itself in fruitful interdisciplinary conversation between anthropologists, sociologists, historians, political theorists, and those political scientists not trapped in the parochialism and formalism that have so disfigured the academic understanding of the political. Rather too much of this conversation has probably been provoked by the spectacle of political violence – the other unresolved problem I brought back from my first Sri Lankan fieldwork – and not quite enough by issues of poverty, of representation, and of the close relationship between the political structures of a postcolonial modernity and the attendant contours of social hope. Many of my examples are taken from India, and derive in part from the conversations I have had, not as an anthropologist, but as a regional specialist talking to friends from Delhi, Kolkata, Dhaka, and Kathmandu. In the years I have worked on these themes I have, though, also engaged with colleagues working in Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and various outposts of the post-socialist world. Some of their concerns run throughout the book, but I engage them most directly in the concluding chapter, where I try to sketch out the themes I see as central to the newly emerging anthropology of the political.

Politics and Culture

This is also a book about politics and culture. At the very first – still in Sri Lanka ruminating on my puzzle – I thought my problems required nothing more than a case for including a cultural dimension in our understanding of politics. But as I worked on the themes I have explored in this book, I realized it was more complex and more important than that. In the past twenty years, the abstractions labelled 'politics' and 'culture' have had a curiously close relationship in anthropology. The so-called 'politics

of culture' – the self-consciousness about needing, having, and protecting one's culture, found in arguments on nationalism and multiculturalism – has undermined innocent anthropological references to culture and cultures. But, equally, the recognition that politics always happens in a culturally inflected way also undermines the naïve formalism found in a great deal of political science, not to mention much of the earlier work done in political anthropology.

This book, then, concerns the way in which the politicization of culture has destabilized anthropologists' assumptions about cultural difference, and the language we use to talk about it. But it also concerns the way politics operates in different cultural and historical contexts, and the need for anthropologists to distance themselves from the reductionist models of the political which dominate much academic writing. Of course these issues have taken on new significance since the collapse of the twin towers in September 2001. Suddenly the politics of cultural difference is high on everyone's intellectual agenda. In this context we might expect anthropological accounts of other people's politics to command a special authority in public discussion. On the whole, though, they do not, and popular understandings of the politics of cultural difference have been dominated by models of quite remarkable crudity.

Given the sheer unexpectedness of the events of September 11, it was extraordinary how many commentators, both academic and journalistic, claimed to have seen it coming all along. The version of 'we-told-you-so', most often heard in the mainstream media referred back to an article by a Harvard political scientist, Samuel Huntington, published in *Foreign Affairs* in 1993. Taking for his title a phrase from the historian of Islam, Bernard Lewis, Huntington spoke of a new world where conflict would not be primarily ideological or political-economic, but cultural: a world where we could expect (it was claimed with hindsight) more events like those in Manhattan on September 11, because what motivated those events was what had motivated both sides in the war in former Yugoslavia, and