

Chapter One

Introduction

Situating Everyday Peace

As we sat on the padded cotton-lined floor of Jamaal's sari showroom, drinking Sprite out of thick green glass bottles, he proceeded to tell me with great enthusiasm just how intertwined relations were between Muslims and Hindus in the silk sari industry of his north Indian city. "Hindus and Muslims all work in this industry," he said "it's like a cycle, the silk is sold by a Hindu and prepared by a Muslim, then the weaver is Muslim and the embroidery is later done by a Hindu and finally the sari is sold to a Hindu woman who wears it." Jamaal was a member of a prosperous Muslim family, but as many Muslim and Hindu informants had told me before our meeting, and as I would continue to hear many times after this encounter: "in the silk sari culture *itna pakka rishtedar hai*" (relations are really good), they are like "*tānā bānā*" (warp and weft). The reiteration of this narrative, often framed in terms of "brotherhood" and consciously describing everyday harmonious relations between Hindus and Muslims, is striking in the context of north India.

A glance at the Indian and western print-media over the past few decades portrays a different story; of the incommensurable differences between

Hindus and Muslims, and the persistently violent nature of their interactions, often made manifest in “riots” (see Tambiah 1996). But Jamaal was not an idealist. He acknowledged that there were sometimes tensions between these two communities, and in recent years riots had created challenges for their working relationships, which had subsequently prompted different parties to actively ensure that the “*shanti*” (peace) was not disturbed. Such “peace talk” was not only articulated by Muslim weavers and businessmen eager to make a living in a challenging market, but it also animated conversations amongst other residents about the character of their city, and it underpinned the political and media discourses that were deployed about urban life, especially where everyday peace appeared to be under threat.

Sensitive to the rhetorical and lived potency of “peace talk” and practice in this north Indian city, this book develops a critical and grounded approach to understanding everyday peace. The account presented here is concerned with questions about what peace looks like, how peace is spatially and socially produced and reproduced, in whose image is peace constructed and how different people experience peace differently. Importantly, it seeks to interpret experiences of peace from the margins, and accordingly develops an understanding of everyday peace through the lives of those living in a Muslim neighborhood, in the majority-Hindu city of Varanasi.

India’s Muslims, as in other parts of the world, are regularly marked either as “dangerous terrorists” or as “passive victims” and in both instances subjected to patterns of discrimination and stigma. A key argument of this book is that these pervasive narratives differentially conceal the notion of the Indian Muslim as citizen. They obscure the ongoing struggles by Muslims to improve or maintain their material wellbeing as well as the myriad ways in which Muslims are orientated towards securing and maintaining peace within the Indian secular state and social milieu. By grounding peace in this specific spatial and social context, this book illustrates how peace interacts with agency and legitimacy, citizenship and justice, and how these are constitutive of the production of place. As such, this is a book about the geography of peace: how peace makes place, and how a place makes peace. It demonstrates how as an inherently relational construction, peace is both the product of and the context through which differences and connections are assembled and negotiated across scale, articulated through different forms of “peace talk” and informed by uneven geographies of power. Rooted in the local, this particular geography of peace is thus concerned with how peace is socially and spatially (re)produced in and through interconnected sites and scales, including the body, the neighborhood, the city, region and nation.

India represents a fascinating place within which to problematize the notion and practice of peace because of the region’s postcolonial experience of religious

politics, violence and nonviolence. Incidents of Hindu–Muslim violence, notably referred to as “riots,” have taken place in India, during and since the subcontinent’s partition, and increased in their frequency and intensity between the late 1980s and 2000s (e.g. Pandey 1990; Roy 1994; Nandy 1995; Kakar 1996; Tambiah 1996; Oza 2006). More recently, Islamist terrorist attacks in India’s metropolitan and regional cities have caused death and injury (Ahmad 2009; Bishop and Kay 2009). The notion of immanent tension and violence between Hindus and Muslims is also reflected at the geopolitical scale with respect to the hostile nature of India–Pakistan relations, for instance, political posturing around nuclear capabilities, the ongoing dispute over Kashmir and following the 2008 Mumbai terrorist attacks (see Wirsing 1998; Ganguly and Hagerty 2005; Ramesh et al. 2008). Meanwhile, the 2000-km fencing project along India’s national border with Bangladesh represents a particularly tangible geopolitical articulation of the divisive nature of Hindu–Muslim politics that informed the making of India and continues to shape politics in the region (see Jones 2009; Hussain 2013). These tensions have become intertwined in the making and remaking of India’s geopolitical borders and politics and ultimately, underpin its citizenship project.

It is not just within India’s cities and along its borders that the nation’s religious differences and inherited inequalities find expression, but also in state policy spaces, through the drafting and interpretation of the Indian Constitution. The Constitution was underpinned by the need to imagine how the idea of India’s democracy would be institutionalized and practiced in order for India to realize a peaceful postcolonial future. Key challenges facing the architects of the Constitution were: how to manage and minimize imagined and material differences between India’s majority Hindu population and its largest religious minority, Muslims; and how to create mechanisms for the inclusion of marginalized groups in order to avert the possibility of separatism or dissent and further inevitable violence. Given this, I argue that the Indian state policy of secularism can be interpreted as a living document for national peace, one that is informed by the understanding that to reproduce peace, spaces of tolerance, freedom, respect and equality need to exist between different communities. And, the state has to remain equidistant from all religions in its style of politics, although not entirely absent as is the case in most European applications of secularism. Despite the fact that secular practices of respect and equality between all religions have been compromised, with sometimes violent outcomes between religious groups, the idea of secularism nonetheless persists as a powerful rhetorical imaginary mobilized across different scales. Today, secularism constitutes a dominant political narrative and practice at different scales within Indian society. Exploring how it constitutes a vehicle for hope and opportunity for marginalized

religious groups to make their claims to the nation and their rights to equality and justice importantly contributes to understandings of “lived secularism” as citizenship from below, and lived practices of peace.

When it comes to exploring Indian Muslim experience in India today, especially in the context of relational life, it is difficult not to become immersed in dominant literatures that emphasize the role of religious division and violence in shaping India’s national and geopolitical relations. Without denying the import of critiques concerning moments of intercommunity and international strife, the prevalence of such views has unwittingly functioned to construct and to fix Hindu–Muslim interactions as intractably antagonistic and habitually violent. More importantly, the focus on violent events means that actual lived realities in much of India, characterized by inter-community coexistence and everyday peace, risk being occluded.

Interestingly, this principal focus on violence and divisive politics is not unique to India. More generally, matters of war and violence have proven to be far more seductive foci for academic analysis whilst issues of peace have been typically relegated to a position of referential obscurity, in which “peace” is constructed simply as a negative, empty state, as the absence of violence. On the idea of nonviolence Kurlansky (2006) suggests that the problem is that despite the concept being the subject of praise by every major religion, and practitioners of nonviolence recognized throughout history, *violence* is taken for granted as the fundamental human condition (Arendt 1969). The implicit yet seldom expressed viewpoint amongst most cultures is that violence is real and nonviolence is unreal (Kurlansky 2006, p. 6).

This book argues the case for peace and nonviolence as something “real” and worth understanding, in its own right. Whilst we revere war we have not been taught how to think about peace (Forcey 1989). This may partly explain why previous engagements with peace in geography (e.g. Stolberg 1965; Pepper and Jenkins 1983; Kliot and Waterman 1991; Flint 2005b) and anthropology (e.g. Howell and Willis 1989; Sponsel and Gregor 1994) have not produced a coherent and sustained body of scholarship, let alone a critical perspective on peace. By contrast, the social sciences have contributed to deconstructing and uncovering the nature of power relations inherent in the course of “war,” particularly the War on Terror (Gregory 2006; Pain and Smith 2008; Dodds and Ingram 2009), conflicts in the Middle East (Yiftachel 2006) and the Balkans (Dahlman 2004). Even where “peace” is the focus of study in geography (Kobayashi 2009; Gregory 2010) and in peace studies (Barash 2000; Cortright 2008), the concept and actual experience of peace itself has been given remarkably little attention. However, the arguments for a more critical examination of peace have been building within different disciplines over recent years (Richmond 2005, 2008; Jutila et al. 2008; Williams and McConnell 2010; Megoran 2010, 2011 and McConnell et al. 2014).

Responding to these arguments this book evokes the pragmatism demonstrated by Jamaal as he seeks to negotiate peaceful relations in Varanasi's silk market. Peace is not regarded as a trouble free product, but instead an ongoing process that is at once political and infused with power across different sites and scales. Adopting a geographical approach to notions of space, place and politics this book makes four key theoretical interventions. First, by grounding peace in place, this account illuminates the role of human agency in the (re)production of everyday peace. My account shows how local actors actively negotiate and (re)produce peace as policy, narrative, practice and strategy within different urban spaces and across different scales. Paying attention to local agency echoes recent moves by Oliver Richmond to foreground the role that international *and* local actors can play in peace keeping, through a hybrid local-liberal peace (Richmond 2010). In thinking about everyday peace I expand the focus beyond postconflict spaces, and into more prosaic contexts to show the contingent ways in which individuals and groups are situated within wider arenas that inform the everyday possibility and practice of living together.

This focus also develops scholarship on India from political science perspectives that have examined the role of agency in escalating intercommunity violence (Brass 2003) and wider societal mechanisms underpinning peace (Varshney 2002), but which have not directly addressed questions of peace and agency and the micropolitics of everyday life. Understanding the micromechanisms that constitute peace helps to explain how and why actors differentially orientate themselves towards people of difference through contrasting experiences of tolerance, solidarity, hospitality, indifference, tension and brotherhood, and how these everyday realities impact the shifting potential to (re)produce peace "on the ground." With agency also comes questions of responsibility and legitimacy, so not only why and how certain people chose to act towards peace but also whether their actions are positively recognized, or not, and by whom.

Secondly, I contend that peace is political. Whilst peace is more often portrayed as a condition that is without or after politics and violence, the empirical narrative that emerges here is that peace is, in and of itself, political. A critical approach to peace is paramount for unpacking in whose image peace is made and remade, who bears the responsibility for maintaining peace and what the implications of this are for future peace. Examining the interacting role of narrative and practice in the (re)production of peace reveals the political work of peaceful narratives, for, whilst they may appear universally "good" they may also conceal and perpetuate uneven relations of power and marginality. Critical scholars of international relations and geographers, too, have exposed the structures of power that underpin the discourse of "liberal peace," with its particular "Western" vision for what peace should look like and how it should be done (Duffield 2002; Jeffrey 2007; Richmond

2008; Springer 2011; Daley 2014). The book shows how other expressions of “peace talk” such as “brotherhood,” intercommunity harmony and interdependence, along with its vernacular equivalents, act as powerful narratives in both describing and constructing peaceful realities across different scales. But also, that these narratives have particular histories and are constitutive of a particular politics. Placing peace, therefore, foregrounds how power is integral to the making, shaping, undoing and remaking of peace. Where power is recognized as the immanent normalizing force that operates through the detailed fabrics of people’s lives, it is important to consider the different techniques of peace and how these may include domination, coercion, seduction, authority, compliance and complicity and not just, or not always, involve the reconciliation of tensions and realization of equality and justice that is often imagined as integral to “peace.” Whilst inspired by Johan Galtung’s rich conceptualization of peace, the book therefore challenges the binary between “negative peace” as the absence of violence and “positive peace” as the presence of social justice (Galtung 1969).

Third, the book develops an understanding of peace as process, as always becoming. From this perspective, peace demands ongoing labor and work rather than standing as an endpoint or as something which can be concluded (see Cortright 2008). As such, peace is precarious, it is contingent and its contours are continuously being reworked by actors and events along a continuum from the local to the global. Bearing in mind the political work involved in peace as process, the book questions assumptions that peace is a generative and positively transformative process (see Galtung 1969) and argues that practices of peace can also re-inscribe patterns of marginality. This approach builds on Laura Ring’s (2006) problematization of peace in a Karachi apartment building, and intersects with an understanding of human agency which goes beyond resistance, to consider the ways in which pragmatism, acceptance, resilience and patience find expression in efforts to make and re-make everyday peace. As such, peaceful realities need to be interpreted within a framework that encompasses broader practices of coexistence, as well as practices of citizenship, where subaltern actors struggle for inclusion in the city and wider polity. Finally, this account departs from “top down” conceptualizations of peace to represent a situated geography of peace. This in part responds to recent calls within peace studies to interpret the meaning of “peace” through fieldwork (Jutila et al. 2008) and extends anthropology scholarship on “peaceful sociality” (Howell and Wills 1989; Sponsel and Gregor 1994) by thinking more explicitly about the spatial and scalar processes that constitute peace. The book therefore attends to everyday peace “on the ground” to show how practices and narratives of peace are spatially situated and socially (re)produced within a particular north Indian city. It shows how

peace as “talk” and as practice informs the making of place, and that, in turn place makes for particular forms of peace. It demonstrates the multi-scalar practices of different actors and demonstrates the interconnections between everyday peace and related practices of citizenship and experiences of justice from a subaltern perspective.

In order to develop this grounded approach to “everyday peace” the book centrally draws on different scalar narratives and practices of peace in and around a Muslim neighborhood in Varanasi, a regional city in north India and home to one million people. On the one hand Varanasi represents an “ordinary city” which contrasts with the metropolitan centers of New Delhi and Mumbai that are more often in the academic limelight, owing to their discernible global reputations and interconnections (see Robinson 2002). But, on the other hand Varanasi is also an “extraordinary” city; as an important center for silk manufacture involving Hindus and Muslims, who comprise almost one-third of the population, as a sacred Hindu pilgrimage site, and also as a city locally renown to be a “microcosm of India” given its diverse representation of other people from all over India. In many ways because of its “extraordinary” character, Varanasi is popularly constructed in regional and national imaginations as a “peaceful” city. Understanding how “peace talk” is expressive of various scalar articulations of Hindu-Muslim interactions and also contributes to a (re)making of place as peaceful is a central objective of the following chapters.

In order to conceptualize and empirically illuminate an understanding of everyday peace in north India the remainder of this chapter brings into dialogue diverse but related collections of literature over six core sections. First, I briefly introduce the politics of Hindu-Muslim violence and nonviolence in India to contextualize the theoretical and empirical impetus for research on everyday peace. Secondly, I outline the contours of studies on peace and peaceful sociality from different disciplinary spheres before turning more explicitly to look at geographies of peace in the third section. Fourth, I show how feminist geopolitics provides a useful framework through which to interpret everyday peace in a way that foregrounds the role of subaltern agency, space and the political. In addition, I explore how scholars have approached questions of violence and the everyday. In the fifth section I extend the scalar politics of feminist geopolitics to illustrate how citizenship affords a complementary way to theorize agency and practice from within the margins in the context of state and society relations. The sixth section turns to work on Muslim geographies and introduces the situation of India’s Muslims more specifically, by drawing on literature in South Asian Studies. The chapter concludes with an overview of the book’s structure and its key arguments.

The Politics of Hindu–Muslim Violence and Nonviolence

The partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947 led to the creation of the secular, multicultural nation of India, with a sizeable majority Hindu population, and the “Muslim state” of Pakistan. The act of partition was realized through months of intense material and rhetorical violence that took place across the Indian subcontinent, as India’s Muslims and Pakistan’s Hindus moved to be on the “right” side of the border, and through this process the perception of religious difference became reified (see Pandey 2001; Khan 2007). Ironically, more Muslims remained in India than settled in Pakistan, but as the largest religious minority they have experienced practices of discrimination in economic, educational and political life as well as physical violence since Indian independence (Hasan 2001). Such realities have undermined their potential to fully realize their formal citizenship rights, as I discuss later. The position of India’s Muslims has been heavily influenced by the transformation of Hindu nationalism in contemporary India (Jaya 2011). The central objective of Hindu nationalism is to create political unity amongst the Hindus, which requires the imaginary of an ethnically homogeneous community with a singular Indian citizenship (Jaffrelot 1996). Thomas Blom Hansen has documented the contours of this cultural–political movement to show how “the identification of the Other as Muslims is instituted and repeated endlessly by Hindu nationalism” (1996, p. 152). Similarly, Arjun Appadurai (2006) argues that the exorcizing of the Muslim Other is symptomatic of the majority’s “anxiety of incompleteness” – that is, the feeling that the minority, however small, is hindering the realization of a pure and untainted national ethos.

With the rise of popular Hindu nationalism during the mid-1980s to early 2000s, Hindu–Muslim “riots” have taken place with increased intensity and frequency, more often in parts of urban north India. Rupa Oza (2009) has documented the geographies of Hindu–Muslim violence, which were most visible and intense in 1991–2 in Ayodhya following the destruction of the Babri mosque by Hindu right activists (see van de Veer 1994) and in the Mumbai riots that followed in 1993 (Hansen 1999, 2001). Further wide scale violence in Gujarat in 2002 resulted in 100,000 displaced, 1000 Muslims injured and claims by human rights groups concerning the complicity of the state government in anti-Muslim violence (Varadarajan 2002; Engineer 2003; Lobo and Das 2006).

Following these events, considerable academic labor has been devoted to the task of deconstructing this apparent propensity towards violence in India, and the conditions and causalities underpinning such events. The debate has been typically characterized by positions that conceptualize “ethnic” violence as the normative narrative of inter-community relations, as an inevitable

product of capitalist modernity and as the failed rationale of Indian secularism (Nandy 1995; Engineer 1995; Tambiah 1995; Kakar 1996).

In spite of major high profile incidents of violence and political tension between Hindus and Muslims, and the dominance of academic inquiry into what explains violence over recent decades, everyday life in much of urban and rural north India is *not* characterized by perpetual inter-community violence (Varshney 2001, 2002; Varma 2005; Tully 2007). Recognizing this, some political scientists have shifted their gaze away from such large-scale ideologies towards accounts that seek to uncover relational dynamics within civil society and political arenas and to open up space for thinking about why violence does not happen, as well as why it does (Varshney 2002; Brass 2003; Wilkinson 2004). This book develops that work by viewing peace as a process that is constituted within and reproduced through civil society and the everyday, and as shaped by individual agencies and local contexts. But, it also turns attention to the ways in which peace as a process is political and constituted through uneven geographies of power. It thereby seeks to encompass a view of the ways in which violence and disorder become attached and absorbed into the ordinary (Das 2007), and underpin the reproduction of everyday peace.

On Peace and Peaceful Sociality

So how might we start to understand complex, everyday experiences of peace? To examine this question I evoke a range of studies on peace and peaceful encounters and draw on work from peace studies and international relations, anthropology and sociology, before turning to consider more recent attention on peace in geography. The study of peace and war has been a central component in the discipline of international relations (Kant 1795/1991; Knutsen 1997), but it was not until the 1950s that “peace” became a discipline in its own right. At this time the USA and UK were grappling with questions about the causes and consequences of war, and peace research developed at the intersection of peace activism and modern social science (Gleditsch et al. 2013). Johan Galtung (1969, 1996) was one of the original founders of “peace research” and continues to be a preeminent theorist on peace. His work has been instrumental in making the case for peace as more than just an absence of violence. To counter this negative construction of peace, Galtung introduces the idea of “positive peace” through which he depicts a more full-bodied account of peace. This concerns not just the absence of violence, but also “the integration of human society,” as constitutive of collaborative and supportive relationships and the presence of justice (1996).

An important aspect of Galtung's work on peace is the attention he dedicates to conceptualizing violence. He developed the idea of "structural violence" to describe situations of "negative peace" that have violent or unjust consequences and "originating violence" as an oppressive social condition that preserves the interests of the elites over the needs of disposed and marginalized populations (Galtung 1969). Galtung's work has been critiqued for, amongst other things, its black and white distinction between "negative peace" and "positive peace" (Boulding 1977). Boulding (1970) attempts to blur these boundaries in his discussions on "unstable" and "stable peace" and the recognition that peace has many different phases within it, which "may encompass greater or lesser justice, oppression, competence, enrichment, impoverishment, and so on" (Boulding 1988, p. 2). Yet, whilst the work of both Galtung and Boulding are useful prompts for highlighting the different forms and types of violence *and* concurrently peace, they are primarily concerned with the relationships between nation states and Western ideologies and represent normative constructions of peace.

The tone and focus of peace studies and its relationship to violence has shifted in line with the transformations from interstate to intrastate violence and the rise of "new war" cultures (Kaldor 1999). Responding to the rise of intrastate violence peace scholars have increasingly recognized the need to act in the midst of violent conflict "to ameliorate its consequences and prevent its recurrence" (Cortright 2008, p. 5). This has been witnessed in the rise of UN peacekeeping operations and peace-building missions in recent decades in the Congo, Sudan, Northern Ireland, the former Yugoslavia and Iraq amongst other places. As work on post-conflict peace-building has demonstrated, peace is a process. It is not a stage in time or an absolute endpoint but "a dynamic social construct" that demands input from peacekeepers, civil society and state actors (Lederach 1997, p. 20; Cortright 2008). Yet, it is interesting to observe the ongoing tension and debates within peace studies concerning the discipline's preponderance to focus on wars, with less attention directed towards understanding broader practices of violence, injustice, oppression and exploitation in society (Carroll 1972; Johansen 2006). And in recent years the studies that address peace more explicitly, do so almost exclusively through the lens of "liberal peace" (Gleditsch 2014).

Meanwhile the activist realms of peace studies have been connected with non-violent movements for social change: from the acts of civil disobedience by American Quakers during the American war of Independence to Gandhi's stance of non-cooperation under colonial India and the use of nonviolence as a political tool or technique by Gene Sharp (Holmes and Gan 2005; Thompson 2006). Put simply, nonviolence means abstaining from the use of physical force to achieve an aim; as an ethical philosophy it contends that

moral behavior excludes the use of violence and as a practice it can be a strategy for social change, an act of resistance and the working towards peace. In contrast to “nonviolence,” the notion of peace and associated ideas of pacifism, are sometimes regarded as apolitical and ineffective.

Despite importantly highlighting the nature of peace as an ongoing process that is constituted by different forms of violence rather than their absence, peace studies scholarship remains far better at proposing ideas about what peace *should* look like and who *should* do it, rather than examining what peace *does* look like. As an idealistic construct, Galtung’s thesis for example, is less conceptually open to contrasting cultural productions of peace, the intimate and messy relationship between violence and peace and the ways in which hostile and antagonistic relationships are often also a part of peace. Peace studies fully recognizes that peace is a contested term which constitutes contested realities (Cortright 2008), yet there are calls within the discipline to focus more directly on peace, and to understand the contested and complex realities of peace from the “bottom up” (Jutila et al. 2008; Richmond 2008; Gleditsch 2014).

This book therefore takes up that invitation to explore the grounded realities of peace and empirically engage with peace as a process which is always complexly and intricately intertwined with forms of violence. The challenge therefore, in attempting to understand peace is to also expose the conflicts and injustices that pass as “putative peace” (Roy 2004, p.15), to expose the violence of peace.

The task of understanding and exposing the uneven politics of power that shape post-conflict settings and their representations has been taken up by International Relations scholars. In particular, they have highlighted the role of the discipline itself in perpetuating global governance norms through the uncritical language of “liberal peace” which, some argue, serves to conceal the underlying inequities and inequalities that perpetuate conflict (Duffield 2002; Pugh 2004; Pugh 2011 et al.). The term “liberal peace” is designed to capture the belief that liberal democratic states are inherently peaceful and serve as the ultimate model for so-called “failed states.” Rather than transform systematic inadequacies of the neoliberal order, peacekeeping missions reproduce geopolitical structures and power relations which maintain patterns of marginalization (Higate and Henry 2009, p. 13, see also Richmond 2008). Oliver Richmond argues that “liberal peace” represents a form of “orientalism.” He contends that liberal peace is dependent on elite actors “that know peace to create peace for those that do not”; peace is therefore a state which enlightened and rational actors impose on others. The notion that peace is created in a particular image, which both includes and excludes specific groups, should be taken seriously. Richmond reflects on the intimacy

of peace and war, both of which are states of being and methods of political change (2008, p. 14). The especial potency of peace however, is that it represents an apparently universal view of an ideal worth striving for and is discussed, interpreted, and referred to in a way that nearly always disguises the fact that it is essentially always contested (Richmond 2008, p. 5). In problematizing the idea that “liberal peace” is inherently “good,” Richmond contends that attention should be directed towards the everyday in order to fully comprehend and incorporate the role of situated agencies and local conceptions of peace within peace-building programs. Richmond proposes the notion of “hybrid peace agendas,” which both integrate the “bottom up” and “top down” approaches (Richmond 2009, pp. 324–34), however, little work has advanced empirical understandings of local practices and experiences of everyday peace.

An interesting approach to understanding the scalar complexity of peace, and how local and national narratives of peace interact, is reflected in the research of John Heathershaw (2008) on peace building in Tajikistan. He highlights how the circulation of multiple narratives in the (re)production of peace find expression across different scales. He distinguishes between the international rhetoric of “peace building,” the elite notion of “*mirostroytelstvo*” (Russian: peace building) and the popular “*tinji*” (Tajik: wellness/peacefulness) and suggests that different actors differentially draw upon these narratives in their everyday and institutional work towards maintaining peace (Heathershaw 2008, pp. 219–23). But, the focus on the narratives rather than the actors involved within these different spheres reveals little about what local agencies actually look like. My account is enriched by this recent intellectual shift in international relations towards a more critical perspective of the normative power of peace discourses and a greater appreciation of how peace policies are experienced and interpreted on the ground. However, international relations has so far been less effective at empirically illustrating the interconnections between the geopolitical and the everyday, and the situated interplay between narrative and agency in reproducing peace. By advancing an empirical approach to everyday peace, this book develops a crucial perspective on the role of legitimacy (and contingency) in shaping the contours of everyday peace. And, it contributes to a neglected area of investigation on the practice and experience of peace in “undramatic” contexts, away from postwar zones and away from international blueprints for peace (see also McConnell et al. 2014).

Examining the nature of peaceful sociality in “undramatic” contexts, has been the preserve of a few anthropologists concerned with “peaceful peoples” and “peaceful societies” (Howell and Willis 1989; Sponsel and Gregor 1994), and others concerned with the intimate relationship between violence and

nonviolence in everyday contexts (Scheper-Hughes 1993; Ring 2006; Das 2007). These insights prove hugely instructive in three ways for thinking critically about peace. First, they draw attention to the importance of rich empirical understandings in illuminating forms of “microlabor” and ongoing effort articulated by different agencies in maintaining everyday peaceful life, and elucidate the uneven (re)production of power in particular places. Second they show how peace and violence are entangled in complex ways. The work of Veena Das (2007) is particularly instructive for illustrating how histories of emotional and physical violence insidiously inform seemingly ordinary life worlds long after the tangible realities of violence. Third, peace is not contingent on purely peaceful interactions and the successful resolution of tensions, but may also be constituted through the suspension of tensions and/or the articulation of relations that are less than peaceful. Laura Ring (2006) interprets everyday peace within the social spaces of an ethnically diverse Karachi apartment building. Her work importantly illustrates that peace is not an end-product, but rather is always in a state of becoming. Moreover, peace as a process does not necessarily involve or nurture the potential for transformation. To the contrary, the reproduction of peace may depend on maintaining uneven balances of power characteristic of the status quo. This account of peace builds on these studies which have been typically less successful at drawing linkages across scale and attending to the uneven realities of power.

At the heart of these studies on peace is the matter of how difference between people and ideas are negotiated and potentially transformed. The nature of encounter and interaction across difference has been the concern of sociologists, as well as anthropologists and geographers, interested in the social dynamics of multicultural cities. City life has long been recognized as “a being together of strangers” (Young, 1990, p. 240), whilst recent debate has focused on how the ways in which people live together across difference can inform and transform our relations with the “other” (Sennett 2011; Amin 2012).

Ash Amin argues that for encounters to be transformative the bringing together of people in particular places matters. He contends that “micropublics” such as the workplace, schools, colleges, youth centers, sports clubs and other spaces of association engender degrees of interdependence which demand dialogue and “prosaic negotiations” (Amin 2002, p. 14). Through these practices contextual identities and experiences may transcend notions of ethnic difference. Amin is optimistic that such sustained social contact within shared environments will offer the potential to destabilize dominant notions of difference with longer-term, progressive implications. This perspective resonates with literature in South Asian studies which has emphasized the role of particular settings in underpinning inter-community and intercaste relations, including civic publics (Varshney 2002), the workplace (Chandhoke 2009), tea stalls (Jeffrey 2010) and

leisure pursuits (Kumar 1988). This account engages with these studies and extends Amin's concern with "micropublics" through an examination of economic, civic and political spheres in an Indian city. But, it also goes further to illuminate the ways in which matters of ethnic difference are entrenched and more often aligned with patterns of social and material inequality, and how "micropublics" may be reconfigured at different times, themselves located within shifting cultural political economies.

Yet, the nature of the encounter itself is also significant for inspiring acts of tolerance and respect, as well as shifts in previously held prejudices. In reality, it seems that coexistence proves contradictory and may involve both solidarities and disconnections between groups and individuals. For example, Humphries et al. (2008) have shown how the city of Bukhara was projected as a site of harmonious coexistence situated within global networks of connection whilst its residents simultaneously emphasized the nature of their boundaries and reserved intimate spaces. And, in Egypt, Bayat (2008) has documented how Coptic Christians and Muslims differentially imagine and articulate inclusive inter-communal connectedness and exclusive communal identity through the course of time and space.

Others are less optimistic about the potential for encounters within public spaces to challenge or destabilize the kind of inequalities and prejudices that underpin notions of majority-minority difference. Acts of tolerance that appear to structure exchanges may in fact obscure and thereby facilitate implicit power relations, where to tolerate someone else is an act of power; to be tolerated is an acceptance of weakness (Walzer 1997, p. 52). As Valentine (2008) has argued, positive encounters with individuals from minority groups do not necessarily alter people's attitudes towards groups as a whole and for the better, at least not with the same speed and permanence as negative encounters do. Others suggest that spatial proximity may actually inspire defensiveness and the bounding of identities and communities (Young 1990) rather than generate connections.

Yet, in order for people of apparent difference to live together, it is not always possible or necessary that friendships inevitably develop for peaceful sociality to be sustained. Frederick Bailey's return to his ethnography conducted in the 1950s in the east Indian state of Orissa is especially illuminating. Bailey (1996) argues that the village of Bisipara was cut through with difference; villagers saw each other quite literally as different breeds and arranged these breeds in hierarchy of worthiness. However, inhabitants adopted a "commonsensical pragmatism" about the extent to which such prejudices dominated their everyday lives. Accordingly, they articulated strategies to negotiate possible tensions, including practices of ritualized politeness, and attention to the etiquette of status. Whilst notions of difference were firmly moralistic,

they were simultaneously domesticated and kept under control. In this setting Bailey argues that the “civility of indifference” prevented the potential for tensions and conflict to escalate into violence. The notion of “indifference” as a productive way of being with others resonates with the theories of situated cosmopolitanism (Sennett 1994; Sandercock 1998; Donald 1999; Amin 2002; Tonkiss 2003), and challenges the argument that intercommunity relations need to be transformative in order for peaceful coexistence to prevail. Bringing scholarship on geographies of encounter into dialogue with conceptualizations of peace as an ongoing and precarious process helps to illuminate the ways that practices and experiences of encounter inform peaceful realities. Encounters generate very different kinds of outcomes between individuals and groups, and across sites and scales. This book attempts to understand, in part, how the uncertain outcome of encounters contributes to the contingent reality of everyday peace.

In view of these wide-ranging disciplinary studies, the framework of everyday peace offers important analytical purchase. It foregrounds particular modes of prosaic and “less than violent” (Darling 2014) interaction concerning, coexistence, friendship, tolerance and indifference, and enables a wider perspective of how these practices are differentially constitutive of peace. Thinking about everyday peace opens up the possibility for interpreting how contrasting experiences of coexistence, tolerance and indifference, for example, may conjoin and constitute the reproduction of peace for different people, realized in and through different spatial practice and narrative.

Geographies of Peace

This account of everyday peace contributes to and contrasts with emergent work in geography that is explicitly orientated towards understanding and problematizing “geographies of peace” (see McConnell et al. 2014), antiviolence, (see Loyd 2012) nonviolence (Woon 2014) and “non-killing” (see Inwood and Tyner 2011a, 2011b). The history of geography’s engagement with the concept of peace has been well documented and shows a discernible shift in the discipline from actively making war to averting war (see Mamadouh 2005; McConnell et al. 2014). This book responds to calls by Gerry Kearns for a “progressive geopolitics” (2009) which privileges the view that humanity is not predisposed towards enmity and calls for better understanding of the constructive nature of geopolitical relations outside of the nation state. Developing this geopolitics of peace Nick Megoran’s “pacific geopolitics” is orientated towards understanding “how ways of thinking geographically about world politics can promote peaceful and mutually enriching coexistence”

(2010, 2011: 185). Nick Megoran's (2010, 2011) research is illustrated by the strikingly transformative effect of Crusade apologies of Christian missionaries and is productive for considering the different ways in which people actively orientate themselves towards one another in the (re)production of peace. However, this account diverges from Megoran's approach in two ways. First, it is not motivated and framed by a Christian morality towards peace, and, secondly, the account portrayed is notably less optimistic about the inherent potential for transformation in the lives of those who practice peace. The arguments set out in this book adopt a more cautious approach that grounds peace in a specific context and, informed by a subaltern view of peace, reveals the uneven geographies of power through which peace comes to be practiced and experienced.

The production and reproduction of peace is inherently spatial, where space is both the context for and the product of peace, whilst peace is also shaped by the spaces in which it is made (Koopman 2011b). Here, it is useful to evoke the work of Massey (2005), who conceptualizes space as the unfolding of social interaction. She argues that to think about space is to think about the social dimension, the contemporaneous coexistence of others. As the sphere of the continuous production and reconfiguration of heterogeneity in all of its forms – diversity, subordination, conflicting interests and connection – space is therefore relational. It is the dimension which poses the question of the social and therefore of the political. More specifically, Massey is concerned with “the *character* of relations and their social and political implications” (emphasis mine 2005, p. 100). This sensitivity to the spatial and social implications of peace reflects concern with orientations towards tolerance, trust and hospitality, but it also underpins geographical approaches which show how space is instrumentalized to control bodies within conflict and post-conflict zones, as well as within “peaceful” societies. The deployment of state and/or unilateral force may actively if not also aggressively secure spaces of peace through practices of “peace-keeping” (Grundy-Warr 1994; Higate and Henry 2009), coercive technologies of government (Lyon 2004; Moran 2008; Coaffee and Murakami Wood 2008), methods of containment (Alatout 2009) and the enforced exclusion of apparently violent bodies (Beckett and Herbert 2010). Actions towards keeping the peace concern material practices in space, made manifest in the form of the wall in the West Bank (Cohen 2006; Pallister-Wilkins 2011), the Belfast “peace lines” or “peace walls” (Nagle and Clancy 2010, pp. 79–80) or the conceptual demarcation of “no go” areas (Peake and Kobayashi 2002). Through the securitizing and narrating of space, places are relationally constituted as “safe cities” (Hyndman 2003) and “zones of peace” (McConnell 2014).

The spatially contingent and strategic nature of peace is exemplified by the fascinating work of Sara Koopman on protective accompaniment and

transnational solidarity. She shows how the positioning of particular bodies within space and alongside particular others creates useful local sites of security (2011a, 2011b, 2014). In Columbia, protective accompaniment “makes space for peace” by putting bodies that are less at risk next to bodies that are under threat in order to enhance mobility and enable their struggles to build peace and justice in the midst of conflict. This is revealing of the way that peace can be embodied, and space manipulated by different actors as a form of strategy.

How peace interacts with different people and places is intimately related to peace discourses; the ways in which peace is imagined by diverse actors and circulated through networks of knowledge and experience. Like their contemporaries in international relations, geographers have been critical of the ways in which the liberal peace has been conceived of, implemented and justified in different contexts (Jeffrey 2007; Springer 2011). They have also documented the situated contradictions and contestations of the liberal peace agenda, as Patricia Daley (2008, 2014) illustrates in her work on postconflict Central Africa, where the dissonance between liberal peace programs and local cultural contexts has inadvertently reinforced gender inequalities and local insecurities. Others have examined how public policy processes seek to transform identities and relations in postconflict polities (Graham and Nash 2006) and how cultural policymaking does constructively inform more everyday peaceful realities (Mitchell 2011). But discourses of peace do not only originate with the state and international actors. Geography scholarship has shown how an international language of human rights is appropriated and reworked by NGOs to build local, domestic practices of peace, for example in Uganda (Laliberte 2014), and how discourses of nonviolence are reworked by different actors for political strategy (McConnell 2014). This book promotes a more grounded interpretation of peace to develop an understanding of the ways that local, embedded and vernacular expressions of peace emanate within particular places and resonate differently for people.

To understand how discourses are circulated and deployed towards the generation of peaceful realities, it is necessary to understand the role of agency, how actors are located in particular contexts, how their actions acquire legitimacy, and why it is that constructive agency may be articulated in some times and spaces and destructive agency in others. For example Chih Yuan Woon’s (2015) move to “people” peaceful geographies serves to destabilize perceptions of the military in the Philippines as warmongers and to illuminate the place of military personalities and their relations with civil society organizations that work to maintain peace. Other geographers have highlighted the complex and contingent role of religious brokers in facilitating peace (Johnson 2012), the ways in which charismatic

celebrities come to embody peaceful international relations (Megoran 2014), and how political leaders may become synonymous with peaceful imaginaries and agendas (McConnell 2014).

The focus on agency has been hugely productive for understanding the everyday and embodied dimensions of peace; nonetheless it tends to privilege the role of elite actors rather than ordinary citizens interpreting and orchestrating peace on the ground in both mundane and extraordinary circumstances.

My account is empathetic to the principle held by “non killing” geographies: that as geographers we have a responsibility for destabilizing rather than reproducing the boundary between war and peace and challenging taken-for-granted norms concerning cultures of war and practices of killing. The underlying rationale is that pursuing these goals will enable geographers to address social and economic inequality through the use of nonviolent practices, work toward the promotion of a lasting peace, and incorporate those practices in the classroom through a pro-peace pedagogy. However, my interpretation of “non killing” scholarship is that it largely aims to destabilize the war–peace binary by problematizing *war*, rather than problematizing *peace* as the emerging scholarship on “geographies of peace” (McConnell et al. 2014) strives to do. Despite the significant and exciting rise in attention towards peace by geographers there remains a conspicuous lack of commitment to actually understanding what peace looks like from a subaltern perspective (for exceptions see Koopman 2011); how it is constituted as a process within the spaces of the micropolitical; and how everyday peace activities are indicative of and entangled with patterns of power and “the political” across different scales. In order to address these concerns and show how peace, space, discourse and agency are connected, I turn to feminist geopolitics.

Feminist Geopolitics, Violence and “Everyday Peace?”

Critical geopolitics, and especially feminist geopolitics affords a useful framework through which to foster a grounded perspective on peace that is especially attentive to agency, power and the political in and through different sites and scales. Here, I identify four important approaches for conceptualizing everyday peace. To begin with, feminist geopolitics destabilizes the primacy afforded to geopolitical action and discourse, and shifts attention to the everyday and routine spaces of life. Feminist geopolitics has been expressly engaged with revealing the local, everyday and embodied manifestations of war across different sites (Dowler and Sharp 2001; Cowen 2008; Enloe 2010). Others have shown how citizenship and identity becomes reconfigured (Cowen and Gilbert 2008) and how war narratives take on gendered dimensions

(Dowler 2002). De-centering the role of geopolitical actors and the state in matters of violence and security opens up space for considering the “other kinds of securities” that are possible, that operate outside of the government and are otherwise “off the page” (Koopman 2011a). This is important for thinking about lived realities of peace, where Koopman challenges the geopolitical focus on peace practices (the peace treaties, peace accords, peace-building programs) by thinking about and working with “peace communities” and “protective companions” in situ. Foregrounding embodied experiences privileges an understanding of the emotive infrastructures (Woon 2011, 2014) of war and peace, and how emotions such as fear (Pain 2009), danger (Megoran 2005) and feelings of security or insecurity (Dodds and Ingram 2009) differentially structure everyday war *and* peace settings where memories of violence linger and conflicts remain suspended. Second, as well as uncovering the violent politics of difference and how these are embodied and experienced, feminist geopolitics has examined the connections and the conditions under which alliances are formed across scales (Katz 2004; Koopman 2008). Underlying these approaches is a concern that “the political is not just about differences – either between people or between perspectives; it is also about the webs of power and social relationships that are the basis of connections” (Staeheli and Kofman 2004, p. 6). I would also suggest that sometimes the presence of differences may underscore the imperative to build and sustain solidarities and connections.

In these respects, a feminist geopolitical approach to peace inspires a grounded understanding of how the geopolitical practices of peace are produced through the everyday, and are made manifest at the level of the body, household and community, city, region and nation. It therefore enables a critical perspective of the ways in which peace is constituted both through narrative and practice, and intertwined with processes across scale. For instance, in the Indian context this prompts an examination of the ways in which Indian state policies of secularism inform practice of tolerance and coexistence “on the ground” as well as the ways in which geopolitical action and discourse interacts with everyday life. And, it helps to show how practices of connection and disconnection are differentially engendered, made visible through sartorial choices, deportment, local social and economic alliances, institutional discourses, urban life and media rhetoric.

Third, of particular importance to this account is how India’s Muslims experience everyday peace in the margins of society. Feminist geopolitics grounds politics in practice and in place in a way that makes the experiences of the disenfranchised more visible (Koopman 2011a). Such exposure necessarily attends to matters of subaltern agency (Sharp 2011), which may be situated within particular histories of violence and nonviolence (Dowler and

Sharp 2001; Abu-Lughod 2008[1990]). By examining individual and group practice, this book contributes to critical scholarship that recognizes that agency is often more than simply resistance. Katz's reworking of resistance through her research on youth in Howa, Sudan and New York, USA provides us with some useful tools for thinking about resistance. She differentiates between "resistance" that involves oppositional consciousness and achieves emancipatory changes, acts of "reworking" that modify the structure but not the distribution of power relations and "resilience" as the capacities that enable people to survive but do little in the way of transforming the conditions that make their survival so difficult. Contextualized accounts of agency in different sites are important because "they can attend to its variations, including its limits, its structuring context and its uneven impact, rather than simply its autonomous existence" (Sparke 2008, p. 424; see also see McNay 2000, 2004).

Expressions of resilience (Katz 2004), the "politics of patience" (Appadurai 2002), practices of waiting (Jeffrey 2010) and strategies for "dealing with and getting by" (Sharp 2011), therefore all represent significant modes of everyday agency shaped and enabled through networks of power and which may inspire more subtle forms of transformation (Katz 2004). Adopting this approach "encourages conceptualizations of agency not simply as a synonym for resistance to relations of domination, but as a capacity for action that specific relations of *subordination* create and enable" (Mahmood 2005, p. 17). This approach is important for understanding the ways in which practices of peace interact with the *status quo*, and may or may not be transformative.

Fourth, feminist geopolitics has recognized and problematized the ways in which violence and nonviolence, war and peace, are intertwined, and addresses the unequal relations between people on the basis of their real or perceived difference. Sara Koopman makes the case that whilst feminist geopolitics explicitly "eschews violence as a legitimate means to political ends" (Koopman 2011a, p. 277) it has done little to offer up alternative solutions. In response, Koopman (2008) proposes "alter geopolitics" to reflect the ways in which grassroots movements are not only pushing back against the global hegemonic powers and spaces of (in)security, but are also cultivating new forms of nonviolent practices and securities in autonomous, non-state spaces. Jenna Loyd deploys the concept of "antiviolence" to counter the dominant liberal state narratives of domestic peace that juxtapose war abroad. She contends that feminist approaches are vital for "understanding interlocking relations and spaces of violence, who is most vulnerable to harm, and how people work for justice and peace that can transform the conditions in which they live" (Loyd 2012, p. 486).

To understand how spaces of violence and peace are intertwined it is important to recognize how different forms of violence (see Brubaker and

Laitin 1998) intersect and reconfigure local intercommunity experiences and subjectivities across different scales. Violence between Hindus and Muslims in India has been typically characterized as “collective violence” which takes the form of “riots.” This conveys a sense of “spontaneous” or “instinctive” eruptions of violence which may or may not be attached to certain primordial identities or communities and which take place in the public arena, enacted by citizens rather than agents of the state. In reality, collective violence is rarely “impulsive” and does not represent an aberration of normal life, but construing it as such serves to depoliticize and dehumanize violence by detaching it from its socioeconomic and political contexts as well as its longer-lasting legacies (Hansen 2008, and for historical perspective see Bayly 1983; Pandey 1990).

Tyner and Inwood (2014) have cautioned against a tendency within social sciences to treat violence as fetish such that violence becomes abstracted from its concrete forms and affects. They go beyond Galtung’s distinction between “structural violence” and “direct violence,” to propose a dialectical approach that is simultaneously concerned with ‘real’ concrete forms of violence and their abstracted affects. Allen Feldman’s (1991) excavation of political violence in Northern Ireland usefully shows how violence sits in sites, bodies and spaces; the state, the city, the neighborhood, the jail, the jail cell, the gunmen, the body of the hunger striker. In particular, he emphasizes how political violence achieves and works through the “instrumental staging and commodification of the body” (1991, loc.135 of 4562). This view of violence echoes Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois’s (2004) conceptualization of violence as a social process that has a “very human face” which gives violence its meaning and force. Indeed, understanding why people kill and do violence involves seeing social worlds as political and historical products. But there are deep ambiguities in recognizing violence, and what counts as violence is a matter of perspective that is often best understood through an empirically grounded approach.

In her ethnographic study of survivors of riots in India, Veena Das (2007) shows how violent events become absorbed into everyday life, and are always attached to the ordinary, not just as memory and experience, but also as fear of the potential. Similarly, Gyanendra Pandey (2005) proposes the concept of “routine violence” to access the way in which violence is routinely folded into the everyday and ordinary. He argues that violence against India’s minorities is palpable, not just as violent events but also in the exclusionary nationalist discourses which underpin constructions of community and belonging, and concurrently the production of the nation’s “marked” and “unmarked” citizens. Recognizing how situated experiences of material and rhetorical violence shape everyday peaceful realities is therefore an important dimension of this book.

Unlike the studies by Das (2007) and Feldman (1991) this book does not take the immediate presence or “aftermath” of violence as the subject for study. Rather it focuses on a city which is locally and nationally represented as a site of “peace” between Hindus and Muslims yet situated within wider spatial and temporal experiences of violence. By examining the presence of peace, the book does not eschew forms of violence but instead seeks to interpret how peace is negotiated and framed in dialogue with routine, physical and potential violence. Approaching this problem from the perspective of the *everyday* focuses attention on human agency and the micro-politics of interactions to counter conceptions of peace that are disembodied and romanticized. It offers an insight into how ordinary people negotiate spaces, sites and bodies of violence and peace, justice and injustice and it reveals how practices of peace are contested and negotiated in the everyday. It highlights the scalar nature of narrative and practice, and how these intersect and inform events and experiences that cohere in particular places and have particular implications for the construction of everyday peace (on the everyday see Rigg 2007).

Geographers have typically engaged with the everyday as a means to contrast other categories deemed extraordinary or spectacular such as the carnival (Lewis and Pile 1996) and parades (Brickell 2000). In its role here as a residual category the meaning or existence of “the everyday” is rendered uncertain. Froystad (2005) argues that the apparent ambiguity around the concept of the everyday constitutes its most valuable function, in its capacity to provide the milieu for the main subject of research. More importantly, it also acts as a repository for phenomena, particularly those not naturally under the spotlight of research categories (2005: 18). Everyday life can also refer to lived practice, both bodily experiences and practical knowledges that constitute social experience and intersubjectivity (de Certeau 1984; Lefebvre 1991; Gardiner 2000).

Focusing on everyday life and the everyday is therefore a tactical maneuver to question the peaceful practices and narratives that take on the appearance of being taken-for-granted and routine (Felski 2000; Dowler 2002). It is a way of uncovering what lies beneath peace, examining how peace is held together, and asking by whom, with what intentions, and for what purposes, is peace remade. The trouble with interpreting everyday experiences through everyday narratives is recognizing when these serve as a “thin simplification” of reality (Scott 1990, p. 319). Yet, sometimes the discourses used to construct everyday life are simultaneously working to naturalize and normalize a context that is in reality far more precarious and fragile.

Sensitive to this, the book follows the concern of Navaro-Yashin (2003) in asking not merely what everyday life is about, but also attempting to draw out the disaster and disorder that underlies the seeming pretense to normality, by

working against rather than simply depicting the normalizing discourses of informants. The uncertain juxtaposition of “everyday” and “peace” in the book’s title is therefore intended to convey something of the precarious and incomplete reality of peace in north India. It gestures to the intimate relationship between peace, violence and the everyday. Further, its purpose is to agitate on the matter that narratives of peace need to be questioned, for they are often political, and their reproduction is contingent on concealing or coopting uneven geographies of power.

Citizenship as Inclusion and the Scalar Politics of Peace

I propose that the practice and articulation of citizenship is an important concept for interpreting the scalar politics of everyday peace and the role of agency and practice from within the margins. Citizenship facilitates thinking about vertical relations with state and geopolitical practices and imaginations as well as horizontal relations – the connections *and* disconnections – that exist within society. This book contributes to understandings of citizenship by showing how citizenship is concerned with structures of inclusion and exclusion, and strategically negotiated by people within different urban settings in ways which draw on and are orientated towards reproducing “everyday peace.” My contention is that from the margins, these strategies and struggles for everyday peace respond to and are orientated towards realizing practices of tolerance, trust, civility, hospitality and justice.

Increasingly, scholarship conceives of citizenship as more than a legal or place-bound identity, arguing instead that it might be more appropriately understood as a set of discourses and practices that are rendered unevenly across asymmetrical social groups and contexts (Benhabib et al. 2007; Stacheli 2008 and Secor 2004; McConnell 2013). Through routinized habits, practices, customs and norms, a sense of meaning, belonging and identity may come to inform lived experiences of justice and rights (Lister 1997; Werbner and Yuval-Davis 1999), which may be interpreted in a comparative sense rather than against a fixed ideal (see Sen 2009). As such, this book responds to calls from citizenship studies (Nyers 2007) and geography (Desforges et al. 2005; Barnett and Low 2004) to examine actually existing citizenship. That is, how citizenship operates as “lived experience” (Nyers 2007, p. 3).

The fundamental issues of our time may concern struggles over citizenship (Isin et al. 2008), so what does citizenship mean in India, how is it actually realized and currently theorized? For marginalized communities, there is more often a disconnect between citizenship as *status* bestowed through membership of a nation (for example Marshall 1950) and citizenship as it is

actually practiced (see Holston 2008), articulated in and through the social (Isin 2008). In some postcolonial nations the extent to which members are citizens or subjects is a significant question, where the transition to democracy has been partial and the notion of citizenship differentially enacted (Mamdani 1996; Chatterjee 2004; Stepputat 2004; Holston 2008).

In their project to decenter the state and recast the social in citizenship, Isin et al. (2008) invert the teleological account of citizenship proposed by Marshall (1950). Where Marshall theorized that citizenship primarily concerned the granting of civil rights, then political and, finally, social, Isin et al. (2008) suggest that we should recognize citizenship as firstly social before it can be civil and political. This resonates with Naila Kabeer's (2007) contention that the potential to actually realize the rights endowed through political citizenship in postcolonial space is more often contingent on the constructive nature of horizontal relations within society. When considering the relationship between the social and citizenship it is worth reflecting upon the ways in which "the social" has come to bear upon the theoretical and actual realities of citizenship in the Indian context. From the outset, the Indian Constitution, unlike the American, *was* heavily invested in the social and especially in questions concerning social uplift, equality and social identity (Mehta 2010). The government of India's deep concern with, and ultimate involvement in, the social is a product of the context in which Constituent Assembly debates took place between 1947 and 1950 (Tejani 2008, see also Bajpai 2002). More specifically, it relates to the inherent and inherited diversity of India's society and the ways that this would inexorably inform the simultaneous project of nation building and unity. Given the fissiparous tendency of India's social domain, it was thus decided that state power and the political afforded the capacity to unify the nation, through a form of liberal citizenship underpinned by the ethics of secularism.

In Constitutional terms, Muslims are formally and fully citizens of India (see Roy 2011; Jayal 2013). However, political transformations in recent decades, most notably the rise of Hindu nationalist forces, have contributed to the creation of a social and political consensus that citizens enter the public sphere preconstituted by their identities, and that mediation by ascriptively defined communities constitutes the legitimate form of interaction between the citizen and the state (Jayal 2011, p. 145; see also Roy 2010). It is clear that the state alone could not guarantee citizenship where social and political forces also play an influential role in shaping the normative meaning of who is "included" and who is "excluded" from the national political community. Indeed, "political rationalities rarely find their exact mirror image in citizenship practices or politics. Their imprint on both the subject and the collective is always mediated by institutional constraints, different forms of resistance and, indeed the accidents of history" (Brodie 2008, p. 23).

Even whilst Indian citizenship privileged the importance of the social in structuring encounters between society and the state, the possibility of individuals fully enacting their citizenship has proven to be fundamentally contingent on experiences of, and positions within, the social (Isin 2008). In reality, groups are socially constructed, spaces of exclusion and inclusion are determined through social processes, and unequal relations are centrally located (Isin et al. 2008, p. 11). Invariably, the dominant population produces and reproduces normative citizenship narratives, which inevitably rest on the exclusion of others (Isin 2002; Chandhoke 2005), may shift for political gains, and often transcend the nation or state. In India today, public life is arguably dominated by “banal, everyday forms of Hindu nationalism” (Nanda 2009, p. 140; and Mathur 2010), which insipidly exclude India’s Muslim as well as other religious minorities from fully participating in social and political life.

Isin (2002) asserts that exclusion is integral to struggles for inclusion and that the logics of alterity are inherent to constructions of citizenship, which are fundamentally about our relations with immediate others (2002, pp. 22, 25, 29). Ó Tuathail (2005) furthers this line of argument to emphasize the significance of the geopolitical in constructing notions of the Other and reconfiguring local practices of citizenship. But, reflecting on her own research as well as that of others, Staeheli argues that citizenship would be more aptly presented as “a quest for inclusion” (2005, p. 350). Where “inclusion” represents a distant, if not unobtainable reality, the focus of study turns to process, struggle and contestation as a means to recognize and question the inequality and exclusion that inhibits the full democratic potential. I find this argument particularly compelling, especially in a global context when the vast majority of the world’s inhabitants are struggling to be included in society. I propose that the struggle for inclusion is in itself a practice of citizenship that engages with situated questions of justice and injustice and eschews universal constructions of citizenship to instead articulate forms of mundane practice that communicate solidarity and trust.

Of interest here is how this more inclusive and hopeful account of citizenship informs everyday actions and struggles to reproduce everyday peace. The book shows how everyday peace and citizenship interact in this particular geographical place where actors variously engage with peaceful concepts as expressed through policy, narrative and practice in order to articulate their citizenship from the margins, contest exclusionary and sometimes violent imaginaries and thereby struggle for inclusion. The manner and extent to which citizenship is actually realized by Muslims in the context of everyday peace also informs an understanding about the transformative potential of everyday peace for a particular subaltern group.

Political geographers have shown how citizenship and space are closely entangled (Smith 1989; Dowler and Sharp 2001; Mirafteb and Wills 2005; Pain and Smith 20008; Dikeç 2009). In her study of Kurdish women in Istanbul Anna Secor (2004) views citizenship as a spatial “strategy” that is negotiated through the hiding and unhiding of different identities in everyday life. And, both Secor (2004) and Staeheli (2008) have shown with respect to communities how visibility may be an important strategy for empowering communities and facilitating citizenship, but at other times may undermine partial practices of citizenship that are realized.

As the work of both Kabeer (2002) and Isin (2002 and with Nielsen 2008) illuminates, underpinning claims to citizenship is often the question of justice or injustice as it is actually experienced and interpreted “on the ground.” In line with shifts in geographical thinking towards a socialized, situated understanding of justice (see Barnett 2011; Fincher and Iveson 2011), the book finds great value in the arguments presented by Amartya Sen (2009). He proposes that we need to understand justice not in terms of the normative frameworks with fixed notions of maximum justice, but to engage empirically and relationally with justice as it is actually realized along a continuum. Linking conceptualizations of justice and everyday peace elucidates agency and the uneven geographies of power that constitute and are constitutive of peace. As such, the book problematizes the idea that peace entails perfect justice, and theorizes the differential ways in which justice is conceded, suspended and struggled for in contrasting relational and scalar contexts. A theme running through the book, therefore, concerns the contingent relationship between visibility, justice, community and citizenship and the ways that this is differentially negotiated by Muslims in the context of realizing everyday peace.

As practices of citizenship and efforts to maintain peace have been located within the domain of civil society by some (Janoski 1998; Varshney 2002), this provokes questions about the nature of civil society in the Indian context, and its relation to the state and citizens. The traditional, “Western” notion of civil society constitutes the area of public space between the state and the individual citizen (or family), which makes connections between individuals, families or groups possible. Associations that emerge in this space take an organized and collective form which exist outside the direct control of the state (Held 1989, p. 6). Through these formal institutions disinterested individuals come together and engage in a dialogue about “the public good.” A further assumption is that civil society consists of more or less voluntary associations outside the state. At this point however, the idea of civil society in Indian society departs from the Western-derived concept. As Elliott (2003, p. v) asks, does it include “only western style voluntary associations or the

larger array of groups in the Indian social environment?" The allure of civil society in India, as indeed elsewhere, is rooted in a general disenchantment with the state (see Chandhoke 1995; Seligman 1992). In India, social movements, cultural assertions and affirmative action have all been linked with civil society, so that it has become identified with tradition and ascriptive bonds and not exclusively with voluntary associations (Gupta 1997). Furthermore, ethnic and religious associations can combine ascription and choice; for example, not all Hindus have to be members of a temple in a given town (see Varshney 2002).

While I employ the state and civil society as investigative tools within the book, it is important to problematize this distinction. Developed along the tradition of European anti-absolutist thinking, this delineation has the analytical disadvantage today of either regarding the domain of the civil as a depoliticized domain in contrast with the political domain of the state, or of blurring the distinction altogether by claiming that all civil institutions are political (Chatterjee 2001, pp. 171–2). Chatterjee finds it useful to keep the Hegelian notion of a distinct state and civil society. In light of the formation of mass political formations he finds it productive to think in terms of a field of practices mediating not between state and citizens in civil society, but between governmental agencies and population groups. Between those that govern and those who are governed. Unlike in "the West," Chatterjee argues that "[m]ost of the inhabitants of India are only tenuously, and even then ambiguously and contextually rights-bearing citizens in the sense imagined by the constitution" (2005, p. 83). Although people in this group are not regarded as members of civil society by the state, they are not positioned outside the reach of the state and the domain of politics. Instead, Chatterjee argues, they occupy the realm of "political society" which encompasses the relations between the governmental agencies and population groups that are targets of government policy.

In this reading of society-state relations, Chatterjee is pointing to alternative spaces in which citizenship comes to be realized for India's marginalized groups, spaces not in line with the formal constitutional contract. These are zones of "paralegal practices, opposed to the civic norms of proper citizenship" (2004, p. 128). Within these spaces also, Chatterjee senses the possibility for new, and often contextual and transitory, norms of fairness and justice in providing the welfare and developmental functions of government to large sections of the poor and underprivileged people (2004, p. 128). This book contributes to knowledge that at once challenges conventional readings of "civil society" and further nuances our understanding about the everyday manifestations of "political society," and how individual and group agencies are both informed by and shape this arena in often civil and peaceful ways (e.g. Jeffrey 2010; Mannathukkaren 2010; Gudavarthy 2012).

Muslim Geographies: Experience, Identity and Agency

In part, this book contributes to perspectives within geography and social sciences on Muslim experience, identity and agency in multicultural spaces. Such work came to prominence in the late 1980s and 1990s following the publication of Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*, which raised questions for the UK and Europe about multiculturalism, liberalism and religious equality (Asad 1990, Modood 1994). In the aftermath of 11 September 2001 and the ensuing geopolitics associated with the "War on Terror" these questions gained renewed traction and importance, but this time with greater attention turned towards actually lived Muslim lives. A dominant objective has been to expose pervasive and often pernicious misconceptions about Muslim identity and agency as variously inward looking, conservative, aggressive and incompatible within Western multicultural societies (Dwyer 1999a, 1999b; Modood et al. 2006). Others have shown how Muslim experience is shaped in and through different scales, from the local to the geopolitical (Hopkins 2004, 2007), and examined how Islamic religious structures become symbolic and contested sites of identity articulation in multicultural cities (Naylor and Ryan 2002; Dunn 2005). Meanwhile, Tone Bringa's (1995) work in Bosnia is instructive for highlighting the types of corporeal and discursive strategies that Muslims employ in their everyday lives, in order to negotiate geographies of connection and disconnection.

My attention to Muslim lives builds on this commitment to challenge dominant understandings about Muslims as the "uncivil terrorist" or "helpless victim," and to develop more fine-grained understandings of Muslim lives and agencies as they are negotiated through different sites and scales of everyday life in multicultural India. At once subordinate and rendered invisible within the majority Hindu construction of India, India's Muslims have been paradoxically central subjects in the project of nation building and (re)defining India's imagined and physical borders. The provocative "Muslim question" – "can a Muslim be an Indian?" (Pandey 1999) – continues to resonate in some sections of Indian society and media. In many ways, the simultaneously ambiguous and contested status of India's Muslims undergirds the polarization of narratives around their membership in the contemporary Indian nation.

It should be kept in mind that far from being a unified, internally coherent group, India's Muslims represent a diversity of educational and employment backgrounds, regional and linguistic identities and cultural aspirations. Nonetheless, political and academic enterprises have contributed to a reification of India's Muslim "community." This has implications for imagining Muslims as citizens, and interpreting their engagement with citizenship as a

process of both self and subject-making and how this is wrapped up with experiencing and realizing everyday peace.

Counterpoised to imaginations around the Muslim aggressor, dominant popular and academic discourses also construct Muslims as “helpless victims.” Scholarship documenting the condition of India’s Muslims since independence has importantly highlighted their economic marginalization (Hasan 1996), lack of political representation (Ansari 2006), struggles to see Urdu recognized as a national language (Abdullah 2002) and low levels of education and literacy (Alam and Raju 2007). Muslim women are regarded as doubly marginalized; as women and as Muslims they have unequal access to citizenship (Hasan and Menon 2004). A report by a high-level parliamentary committee chaired by Chief Justice Rajinder Sachar and presented to the government of India in 2006 determined that India’s Muslims experience widespread discrimination and marginalization in all walks of life; in education, employment, in access to credit and political representation. And, Muslims are routinely victimized at the hands of the Indian police (Khan and Mittal 1984; Varadarajan 2002; Brass 2003; Engineer 2003).

Stories abound in the national and regional media about innocent Muslim males arrested on charges of terrorism, held indefinitely without official criminal cases filed against them, or worse, shot in the course of police encounters. The “Batla House encounter” involving the fatal shooting of two Muslim students by New Delhi police in 2008 provides one such high-profile incident. Discriminated against by the state and society, Muslims are portrayed as having little recourse to agency or opportunities for self-representation, whilst the poorest amongst them are portrayed as “people without history” (Seabrook and Siddiqui 2011). The conclusions often drawn are that Muslims chose to segregate themselves and look inwards to the Muslim community rather than participate within Indian society. In many ways they have become socially and imaginarily ghettoized.

These polarized and contradictory normative constructions of India’s Muslims as “terrorist” or “helpless victim” function to depoliticize the dominant structures of power that mediate the ways in which Muslim experiences of state–society encounters are produced in and through the social. And, they conceal the possibility of another kind of Muslim citizen as actively committed to the secular good, pragmatic and resilient about the possibilities of asking questions about justice. Turning attention to Muslim identity, agency and experience in the context of questions about citizenship “from below” opens up the possibility for examining alternative perspectives about Muslim agency and intercommunity realities. This is where citizenship may be conceptualized as “the art of being with others, negotiating different situations and identities, and articulating ourselves as distinct yet similar to others in our everyday lives, and asking questions of justice” (Isin 2008, p. 7).

Read this way, what becomes interesting to explore is the process of negotiation and the kinds of strategies deployed by different Muslims to “get by” or “get on,” and how these are informed by particular contexts and respond to and through different scalar practices. Based on their fieldwork in rural northeastern Uttar Pradesh in India, Jeffrey et al. (2008) show how local and geopolitical events shaped the strategies of young Muslim men as they sought education and employment opportunities. When looking for work outside Muslim circles or interacting with state officialdom and the police, young men actively negotiated and moderated their educated Islamic identities to limit or avoid negative feedback. On the whole, they tended to withdraw from, rather than assert themselves in political spheres, which functioned to reinforce their exclusion. The study usefully illustrates how cultural and political influences significantly shaped the types of strategies employed by Muslim men.

Similarly, in his study of the Jamaat e-Islami Hind in contemporary India, Ahmad (2009) is sensitive to how Indian Muslim actions are situated within India’s particular cultural political economy. He looks at how this Islamist organization has encountered, engaged with and undergone transformation within India’s secular democracy. He argues that the Jamaat’s evolutionary trajectory reflects a strong engagement with Indian secularism which has informed the party’s progressive democratization. And, he contends that radical Islamist actions, notably by Students Islamic Movement of India (SIMI), are best understood within the context of Indian Muslims’ discrimination and exclusion from mainstream society. Meanwhile Rubina Jasani (2008) has documented the constructive agencies of Islamic relief organizations in providing spaces of care after the Gujarat earthquake where the state government failed to provide humanitarian relief.

These studies document contrasting situations in which Muslim individuals and groups differentially engaged with the state and society under shifting circumstances, expressing different forms of agency from withdrawal, to resistance and pragmatism. Examining everyday peace mainly through the voices and experiences of Muslim informants disrupts constructs of Muslims as the local and global subaltern of contemporary times with little recourse to agency. Rather, it offers a particular perspective on Muslim action in public urban life as situated within particular histories of violence and nonviolence as well as state practices and social realities. It shows how Muslim individuals and groups articulate citizenship in diverse and creative ways, differentially engaging with the state and society in ways that often forge spaces of hope of connection (Mills 2009; Phillips 2009, 2010; Phillips and Iqbal 2009; Jones 2010) and sometimes engender the potential for transformation.

This is not a book about religious thought and action, but it does appreciate the lived and practiced nature of Islam, and as such contributes to studies examining the ways in which religion constitutes an important social identity which is differentially constructed, experienced and intersected by other identities in everyday life. By documenting everyday experiences in India it shows how religious identity does hold important implications for practices of citizenship and realizing everyday peace. This account is sympathetic to the studies by Peter Gottschalk (2000), Jackie Assayag (2004) and Katinka Froystad (2005) that problematize the notion that India's Hindu and Muslim communities are fixed and bounded entities by documenting the highly complex and composite experiences of religious identities, and the negotiated, fluid nature of encounters with "the Other." In order to think about the implications of religious identities in public life, the book illustrates how the politics of religion are spatially produced and reproduced through key sites, buildings, bodies and practices, and how differences and tensions are actively negotiated as well as connections and collaborations forged.

Crucially underpinning this line of enquiry is a concern not only with the everyday politics of religion but also the lived realities of Indian secularism. This account seeks to understand how the policy and ethics of Indian secularism are actually interpreted and mobilized, and how these practices shape both the aspirations for and realization of citizenship and everyday peace. Privileging a situated understanding of religion and secularism chimes with recent geographical research on religion that has called for "grounded theologies" that map the actually existing and complex realities of secularism (Tse 2013). It also expands our understanding of lived secularisms beyond prevalent European constructs (Iqtidar and Lehman 2012), which denote the privatization of religion (see Levey 2009) and stand in marked contrast to the Indian secular **imagination**, where religion is a fundamental part of the public sphere.

Structure of the Book and Key Arguments

As a body of research this study does not intend to offer prescriptions or predictions for how or when peace might be maintained. Rather, it seeks to uncover the ways in which peace was talked about, imagined and experienced by a section of the city's Muslim population who lived and worked alongside Hindu communities. Peace is an important lens for analysis precisely because Varanasi was popularly portrayed as a comparatively peaceful city. Had life in Varanasi in the mid-2000s been dominated by a rhetoric and reality of Hindu-Muslim violence, the starting point for

interpreting Muslim lives and intercommunity relations would have been quite different. It is, therefore, vital that the argument of this book is located within its specific geography of peace.

The book explores everyday peace and citizenship through five empirical sites in the city. The backdrop to this research is outlined in the next chapter, which introduces the scalar politics of peace in north India by documenting experiences of violence, politics and peace within the state, city and neighborhood. The chapter includes a discussion about the methodological strategies employed and their implications for the production of the research. Chapter Three plays an important role in making peace visible in Varanasi by opening up the initial line of sight to different sites, scales and actors involved in the reproduction of peace in the city. It provokes some of the big questions of the book: how is peace situated, constructed and reproduced? And, in whose image is peace maintained? It does so by examining why everyday peace persisted in the aftermath of terrorist attacks on Varanasi in 2006, which were widely interpreted to be acts of violent provocation. The chapter documents the various actions of local, religious and political agencies which expose an important relationship between agency, “peace talk” and legitimacy when it comes to restoring everyday peace. It shows how peace is a process that is always being worked out through interactions within society and the state, and is complexly intertwined with the memory and anticipation of violence. And, it begins to illustrate how agency and narrative play out in a place which is heavily influenced by the shared intercommunity spaces of the silk industry and the uneven geographies of power that this embodies.

Chapter Four takes up this concern with the uneven geographies of power in Varanasi and turns attention to a Muslim-majority neighborhood to examine everyday encounters with the state and society, and the important role that policy and practice play in shaping everyday peace on the ground, from the margins. The chapter makes the argument that the reproduction of everyday peace is intimately related to the negotiation and articulation of citizenship for Varanasi’s Muslims, where realizing citizenship directly concerns encountering and engaging with the state and society. Citizenship, therefore, provides a framework for thinking through the scalar politics of peace. In a nation where Hindu majoritarianism comprises the normative framework for public space I examine how Muslims strategically located themselves in both visible and less visible ways within public life, as they negotiated the possibility of realizing degrees of citizenship and justice. Chapter Five focuses on the civic spaces of Madanpura to show how local, national and geopolitical events have contributed to the sharpening of boundaries along religious lines whilst not entirely undermining practices of everyday coexistence. Within this context the chapter looks at the experiences

and perceptions of inter-community interactions, and develops a perspective on how “playing with peace” can derive political and social capital for some. I document how Bengali Hindu processions annually interrupted everyday peace in Madanpura to momentarily destabilize peaceful relations and thereby heighten geographies of separation and interaction between the respective communities and police administration. By examining the formal and informal mechanisms deployed by state and society actors towards peace the chapter highlights contrasting experiences of security and insecurity and the uneven geography of peace as process.

In light of the city’s uneven geographies of citizenship and experiences of peace and security, Chapter Six examines the spaces of economic peace in greater detail. By focusing on the experiences of Muslim Ansaris the chapter develops the argument that uneven geographies of power not only inform everyday peace, but are also critical for its reproduction. The chapter uncovers the ways in which imagined and real notions of “Hindu–Muslim *bhātachārā*” (brotherhood) were experienced and perceived, especially by Muslim participants, and interprets everyday intercommunity peace as an ongoing process, which is simultaneously the by-product of economic conditions and ambitions *and* essential for the continued success of the market economy. The chapter draws central attention to the politics of peace and the role of the political within peaceful spaces, where the articulation of difference is continuously negotiated.

The book’s earlier chapters argue that realizing citizenship and everyday peace often entails a struggle for inclusion, which is contingent on reproducing the status quo and unequal conditions of citizenship. Chapter Seven offers a contrasting view on citizenship in practice, which shows the limits of everyday peace, perpetuated through inequality and injustice. It mobilizes a particular event – a public protest against the arrest of a local religious teacher and concurrent framing, of both the Islamic scholar and the neighborhood, as “dangerous terrorists” – to show what happens when local Muslim residents chose to become visible and publicly defy the unjust actions of the state. I contend that the protest constitutes a particular act of citizenship that seeks to ask questions about justice, where local Muslims visibly constituted themselves as subjects of rights and contested the quality of citizenship. The appeals to reclaim citizenship and recast dominant stereotypes were articulated in ways that sought to reproduce, rather than jeopardize, the contours of everyday peace. The events described in this final empirical chapter serve to highlight a theme that runs through the book concerning the intimate and complex relationship between violence and everyday peace. And, it further questions the extent to which Muslim politics can be transformative within this particular geography of peace.

The concluding chapter returns to question what everyday peace means in this particular place. It draws out the key contributions of the book's arguments to emphasize the connections between space, place and agency and the contingent and precarious realities of remaking peace every day. It does so by reflecting on the empirical analysis in light of the broader postcolonial and geopolitical context of Varanasi and India to understand this particular geography of peace and its potential value for exploring peace as it happens elsewhere.