Introduction

In the climax of the 1973 Hindi movie *Garam Hava*, set in Uttar Pradesh in the aftermath of the Partition of India where people were still migrating to either India or Pakistan, Salim Mirza, an elderly Muslim shoemaker in Agra has to deal with the dilemma of whether to move to Pakistan or stay back in India. Initially he chooses to stay back with his wife and two grown children even when members of his own extended family leave their ancestral home one by one to live in Pakistan, a land of abundance (by the reports of the women who come back to visit with exaggerated accounts). Despite his firm belief in the secular ideals of the freedom struggle, the travails of his everyday existence make him realise the change in the power equations in the new republic where his community is reduced to a minority. The family is hard pressed on all sides because of the vitiated atmosphere that makes it difficult for him to even earn a living. The last straw is when his daughter commits suicide after a second relationship is unfruitful because the man does not return from Pakistan to marry her. On what is to be his journey to finally migrate to Pakistan, having packed all his belongings and closed his ancestral home, along the way he sees his son who has decided to join his friends of other communities, agitating for their right to employment as citizens. Something turns in Salim’s mind seeing this and he turns back, perhaps an indication of a decision to live life and struggle as a citizen of India rather than seek citizenship with co-religionists in another country. The film has been hailed for its poignant picturisation of the questions that partition raised for millions of ordinary citizens, among those being that of displacement, concomitant to those of identity and belonging and citizenship.

Cut to the present reality and most observers would find democratic and constitutional structures and peaceful co-existence among communities in most parts of India. However, every once in a while, violence among religious communities called communal violence does occur in some parts and that has led some scholars to describe communal violence as endemic to India.\(^1\) At times when this communal violence plays out on the streets, depending on the time taken for authorities to restore law and order, the rampaging of mobs that can cause damage to life and property can cause people to flee their homes either temporarily, permanently or to even relocate.

eventually to a place where there is safety in the numbers of one’s own community while groups have come together in the name of ‘citizens’ initiatives to highlight the plight of victims and to organize relief.2

And yet while most of the scholarship and ongoing debate on communal violence so far has attempted to understand the causal aspects of such violence, there have been fewer attempts to understand the effects of violence and fewer still on those who flee their homes when state institutions are rendered ineffectual to guarantee their safety.3 An important question that this study focuses on is that of forced migration or displacement due to communal violence and the relationship between displacement and citizenship rights. Although in our globalized times unprecedented opportunity is now afforded for mobility, for most of the world, citizenship involves as much choice as choosing the colour of one’s skin. The choice of citizenship that was available for Salim Mirza in the film is not one that would be easily available to him today however, an important poser that still remains, is the experience of citizenship rights in India for people such as those his character personified. The question that this study seeks to understand is whether displacement due to communal violence produces far-reaching changes so as to affect the experience of citizenship rights or is the displacement event just an aberration in the life of a citizen.

Paul Brass points out that an obvious or elementary character of collective violence such as riots is that it almost never engulfs an entire city or town nor does it ever include all elements in the city’s social organization whether defined by class, caste, religion, or other cultural community.4 However, as one journalist pointed out, the 2002 violence in Gujarat was different. “Earlier we would hear that a riot has taken place in one place but we were still eating and doing our thing at our own houses. Even if there was a riot in one place you could run out of one galli (street) and escape to another but 2002 was different.”5

The violence of 2002 was triggered by what has now come to be known as the ‘Godhra incident’. On February 27th, 2002, 58 passengers, a large number of whom
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5 Interview with Ayesha Khan, journalist for Indian Express, Ahmedabad, 13/12/2008.
were kar sevaks returning by train from Ayodhya were burned alive when a coach in Sabarmati Express caught fire shortly after an altercation at a train station in Godhra, an area where there is a Muslim majority. The understanding initially held even by the police, reported in the media and widely disseminated was that the fire was initiated by the mob that had been pelting stones at the coach due to the earlier altercation at the train station. Subsequently, a panel set up the Indian Railways led by Justice U.C. Banerjee held that the fire could not have been started by the throwing of flammable liquid from outside.\(^6\) However, the belief that a coach full of Hindu kar sevaks including women and children was burned by a Muslim mob produced violent communal clashes from 27\(^{th}\) February and mid June 2002 that affected fifteen to sixteen districts\(^7\) and was most intense in the districts of Ahmedabad, Anand, Mehsana, Sabarkantha, Panchmahal, Vadodara, Bharuch and Dahod. The violence continued till March 3 and after some abatement a new round of violence began from March 15.\(^8\) Mobs roamed the streets of Gujarat with impunity for at least 15 days since when the violence broke out.\(^9\) According to independent reports mobs of not less that 2-3000 armed with swords, *trishuls* (a spear forked at the blade into three) and other agricultural instruments such as *dharia* (machetes), sickles etc.\(^10\) According to official figures by the government the deaths caused by the communal violence that year were 975 out of which 713 were Muslims and 262 Hindus. These figures are estimated to be much lower than actual figures, with reliable estimates ranging as high as 1,500 to 2,000 at the end of the first month of the violence itself with a ratio of 15 Muslims killed for 1 Hindu in the rioting that followed.\(^11\) Families were burned alive in their homes, a large number of women raped, people were stabbed and stoned, their houses damaged, and shops and businesses owned by Muslims were looted and set on fire. Mosques and Islamic monuments were destroyed. Nine incidents that witnessed a high death toll have come to be referred to as carnage incidents among which the highest death toll was recorded in the Naroda Patiya carnage where an estimated 95 people died on a single day on the 28\(^{th}\) of February.


\(^7\) *Frontline* Vol. 19, no.12 8-21 June 2002.


\(^10\) *Ibid* p 19.

The state government appointed a judicial commission headed by retired High Court Justice K.G. Shah and following protests regarding his political affiliation, appointed retired Supreme Court Justice G.T. Nanavati to inquire into the burning of the coach of Sabarmati Express and the violence that followed the incident. The Commission that submitted its report in 2009 exonerated the state government however a large number of reports by independent fact finding teams of journalists, academicians, politicians and national and international NGOs, investigative undercover journalistic reports as well as the National Human Rights Commission have not just condemned the failure of the state machinery but have also pointed to the state government’s complicity in the violence. The violence also attracted international attention and condemnation. The European Union condemned the violence in the Brussels Parliament which the Indian government reacted sharply against. The United States’s International Religious Freedom Report of 2004 while expressing deep concern about the violence traced the violence to BJP’s Hindutva ideology and the Commission on International Religious Freedom citing remarks of the Supreme Court and of the NHRC pointed to Chief Minister Narendra Modi’s complicity in the Gujarat violence. The United States’ State Department also went on to deny a diplomatic visa to Narendra Modi and revoked his tourist visa.

The violence rocked both houses of Parliament and even the allies of the then ruling Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) led National Democratic Alliance (NDA) like the Telugu Desam Party, joined the opposition in pressing for a discussion for the
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12 Justice G. T. Nanavati and Justice Akshay H. Mehta, *Report by the Commission of Inquiry Into the facts, circumstances and all the course of events of the incidents that led to setting on fire some coaches of the Sabarmati Express Train on 27.2.2002 near Godhra Railway Station and the subsequent incidents of violence in the State in the aftermath of the Godhra incident*, Government of Gujarat, Ahmedabad, 2008.


resignation of Chief Minister Narendra Modi after the violence had not abated for 40 days. The issue was taken up for discussion in the Rajya Sabha under Rule 170 which entails a vote after discussions and the house passed a resolution calling for central intervention in Gujarat under Article 355 of the Constitution which enables the central government to intervene to protect the citizens of a state where there is an external emergency or serious internal disturbance. The government accepted the motion presumably to avoid possibility of losing the vote which the motion entailed in the Rajya Sabha where it was then in a minority. In the next month after an opposition sponsored censure motion was defeated in Parliament after a 16 hour long debate, the then Prime Minister A.B. Vajpayee, put aside this demand stating his view that the Government of Gujarat was doing reasonably well. Subsequently, even the then President K. R. Narayanan revealed that during his term as President, his repeated advice to the Prime Minister to send in the army to suppress the violence in Gujarat was ignored. To the international attention the then Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee replied sharply that it was India’s internal matter and to the attention at the national level in the Parliament, that it was a state matter, that central interference would disturb the federal balance. In a speech in Goa on 3rd March 2002 Prime Minster Vajpayee said,

What happened in Gujarat? If a conspiracy had not been hatched to burn alive innocent passengers of the Sabarmati Express then the subsequent tragedy in Gujarat could have been averted. But this did not happen. People were torched alive. Who were those culprits? The government is investigating into this... But we should not forget how the tragedy of Gujarat started. The subsequent developments were no doubt condemnable, but who lit the fire? How did the fire spread?...Wherever Muslims live they don’t like to live in co-existence with others, they don’t like to mingle with others; and instead of propagating their ideas in a peaceful manner, they want to spread their faith by resorting to terror and threats. The world has become alert to this danger."

In official communications, media reportage and academic works as well the violence has come to be named as the ‘post Godhra’ violence that constantly associates the violence with the incident near the train station in the town of Godhra
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despite the fact that violence occurred in as many as 16 districts in Gujarat in 2002 and went on for as long as 5 months in some places whereas in the town of Godhra itself after the incident of the burning of the train coach there was little violence and no displacement. As the term riot, which has an element of spontaneity certainly does not fit the violence in the state of Gujarat during the period, in this thesis what is commonly known as the post Godhra violence is therefore referred to as the violence of 2002.

Meanwhile, within a month of the violence, nearly 1,00,000 persons were compelled to seek refuge in 101 relief camps and just two weeks later the number went up to 1,50,000 in 104 relief camps\textsuperscript{18} set up entirely by the members of their own community. Six years after the violence over 25,000 Gujarati Muslims had still not returned to their original homes\textsuperscript{19} and till today continue to live instead in 86 relief colonies scattered across 10 districts in Gujarat.\textsuperscript{20} In 2007 an NGO called Antarik Visthapit Hak Rakshak Samiti (AVHRS) loosely translated as the Committee for the Protection of the Rights of Internally Displaced Persons was formed that uses the recently formulated category of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) to describe these Muslims who fled their homes during the violence and have made their homes in Muslim dominated areas or relief colonies in the periphery of cities, towns and villages. The selection of the context in which to place the discourse on violence for scholars as well as journalists and politicians is a serious political act.\textsuperscript{21} Indeed the relevance of an international category created by the UN to a situation of displacement due to communal violence in India requires explanation.

The category of Internally Displaced Persons is the most recent innovation at the international level regarding displacement. Displaced populations first became a focus in human rights discourses that emerged in the post war era that underlined the need to protect subjects from their own states. Subsequent developments leading to the development of the refugee regime created provisions for those who are forced to flee their homes and cross an international border. The category of Internally Displaced Persons was coined by the UN in 1998 to describe those displaced who live in refugee like conditions within the borders of their own country. The UN Guiding

\textsuperscript{18} Times of India, 27/3/2002 and Frontline 19, no.8, 13-26 April 2002.

\textsuperscript{19} Times of India, 26/10/2006.


Principles on Internally Displaced Persons describe internally displaced persons as "persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border." This description emphasizes the involuntary and coerced nature of movement and the fact that it takes place within national boundaries. The Guiding Principles on Internally Displaced Persons approach displacement from the perspective of the needs of internally displaced persons and identify their rights and guarantees. They articulate the needs of the IDPs in terms of protection, assistance and solutions. The principles lay down guidelines for protection against displacement; protection during displacement; protection during return, resettlement and reintegration and a framework for humanitarian assistance. The principles are not a draft declaration on the rights of internally displaced persons, nor are they binding in law but reflect and are consistent with international human rights law, humanitarian law and refugee law. They are the result of the gleaning of international law, humanitarian law and refugee law to compile those provisions most relevant to IDPs, where the gaps and lacuna in these were filled by principles that are analogous to refugee law. Although the Guiding Principles are not legally binding, the formulation of the category of IDPs has had the effect of making the normative advances at the level of international law available at the national level.

However, despite its seemingly neutral emphasis on humanitarian assistance this category is located in a particular context. The category of IDPs has evolved in the backdrop of the end of the cold war. Some scholars also see the creation of the category of IDPs as part of the politics for containment of refugees promoted as the 'right to remain' in their own country, since from the time of the end of the cold war refugees no longer count for political one-upmanship.
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It is also important to note that the category of IDPs does not take into consideration structural violence by economic as well as ethnic factors as one of the "push factors" of displacement. Although violence and coercion are considered as benchmarks in determination of IDPs, the notion of forced is so defined that the structural violence permeating societies escapes our attention.\textsuperscript{25} A farmer’s decision to move to an urban area, for instance, looking for alternate sources of income when faced with drought and increasing debt can hardly be described as choice. Importantly, in India caste and religion are a part of social structures that are the faultiness along which violence occurs that is regarded as endemic to India. In the case of violence against Dalits as in the past and most recently in Mirchpur, Haryana in 2010 when 18 Dalit homes were gutted, violence causes Dalits to flee their homes. Even in the case of displacement due to mass violence fomented by communalism, which is the focus of this study, displacement can be gradual and spread out over a period of time as manifested in ghettoisation or not as visible due to the dispersion of populations to other localities or the return of displaced populations to their original homes after the violence.

Despite legitimate criticisms regarding this category of Internally Displaced Persons, one must concede that a category has been created, and institutions need categories to respond to situations. Categories don’t evolve in vacuum but arise in response to certain catalysts and in particular contexts as has this category of internally displaced persons. Categories are also important because they shed light on particular realities. As is the expectation of human rights instruments, this category does "give voice to human suffering, to make it visible, to ameliorate it".\textsuperscript{26} Displacement is now widely acknowledged through studies on displacement due to development, to produce a multiple deprivation of rights.\textsuperscript{27}


\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Ibid}, p 4.

These developments in recent years have given rise to new theoretical shifts and conjectures and lent greater analytical visibility to the phenomena of displacement. However, Liisa Malkki draws attention to entrenched ways of thinking about displacement that continue to persist such as the ‘sedentarist’ bias of social sciences that privileges the study of settlement as normal and pathologises movement and displacement. She also points to the overly humanitarian emphasis that has come to characterize studies on displacement that tends to depoliticize it. Hannah Arendt however, saw displacement as symptomatic of a danger inherent in the very structure of the nation state where despite the existence of constitutional structures and rule of the law in the Europe of her times the state had been transformed from an instrument of the law into an instrument of the nation leading to genocide. More importantly, she also asserted that this danger of genocide occurring despite the existence of constitutional structures “quite democratically-namely by majority decision” continued to persist. However due to historical reasons and the involvement of the UN, the discourse on displacement has come to be characterized by an international and humanitarian emphasis that is reflected in much of the scholarship on displacement so far. In addition to measures to deal with the humanitarian crisis in a situation of displacement therefore, there is a need to probe deeper into the larger questions that displacement raises.

The emerging domain of forced migration studies offers opportunities to break new ground. Critiquing the inside/outside dichotomy that has characterized refugee studies Ranabir Samaddar for instance, has pointed to the need to make refugee studies holistic by analyzing the perspective of refugees on various fronts through ethnographic work; understanding and encapsulating the perspective of society and

28 Malkki carries forward Deleuze and Guattari’s theorization of history as “always written from a sedentary point of view and in the name of a unitary state apparatus” to the analysis of notions of attachment and rootedness to land so that displacement is usually defined by “those who study refugees as a subversion of national categories, as an international problem”. Liisa Malkki, ‘National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialisation of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees’, Cultural Anthropology, Vol.7, No. 1, Space, Identity and the Politics of Difference, February 1992. pp 24-44.


31 Ibid. p 299.
not just a section; and undertaking rigorous archival work to bring out the evolution of institutional practices of governing population flows.\textsuperscript{32}

India, the world's largest democracy with its rich diversity of people groups and communities has witnessed a number of instances of displacement of people due to conflict. One form of conflict that has received much attention is that between religious communities commonly referred to as communalism which when it turns violent is referred to as communal violence. Colonial administrators had used the term 'communal' to refer to sectarian conflicts that was subsequently used by them as well as scholars, policy makers and in common parlance to refer to conflict between religious communities especially between the majority Hindus and Muslims that constitute the largest minority\textsuperscript{33} of nearly 150 million citizens. Depending on the time taken to restore law and order by the government in power at the state, incidents of communal violence which are not infrequent can cause destruction of life and property and displacement of people. Depending on the scale of displacement, relief and rehabilitation pose a major challenge to the government long after violence has abated.\textsuperscript{34}

This issue of communal violence however has been seen primarily as a law and order problem in state practices. The significant scholarship on communal violence as well is primarily concerned with determining the causation and processes of communal violence. Rich empirical and theoretical accounts have sought to explain communal violence through economic,\textsuperscript{35} social science,\textsuperscript{36} anthropological\textsuperscript{37} and psychological\textsuperscript{38} lens employing essential, instrumental and constructivist arguments\textsuperscript{39} that seeks to elucidate causality to actors such as the communities involved, the state or society or a combination of these\textsuperscript{40}. In this significant literature

\textsuperscript{34} Satish Tripathi, \textit{Op.cit.}
\textsuperscript{36} Paul Brass, \textit{Op.cit.}
however, displacement has been seen primarily as a peripheral consequence. It is noteworthy however, that in polarized situations such as those of major communal violence in 1969 and 1985 riots in Ahmedabad, the 1984 anti Sikh riots, the 1992 riots in Mumbai as well as in 2002 that civil society groups have mobilized efforts for relief and rehabilitation of displaced people as ‘citizens groups’.41

What is it about citizenship that it is invoked for rights claims in polarized situations as well as other situations demanding basic needs? The concept of citizenship conventionally denotes the principle of membership in a polity usually understood through the cerebral, jural and procedural lens of what the criteria of political membership are and its claims and entitlements.42 Since the advent of what is called modernity universality has become an essential aspect of citizenship. This principle of membership that has received unprecedented attention in recent times has come to be a much loaded concept also implying universality, status, the possession of rights and identity. Recent debates and theoretical shifts have sought to give more depth and reach to this principle of membership. Various strands in these debates include those that are concerned with the entitlements of individuals such as in passive liberal traditions in contrast to the more robust republican traditions of a political community with citizen engagement and civic participation. In recent times the question of the construction of universality and the place of cultural particularity have animated debates in the contest between civic universalism and cultural particularism similar to debates on multiculturalism for cultural equality. However, while the dominant debates on citizenship rights quite centrally engage with the question of discrimination due to membership to different social groups, they seem to occlude the question of the displaced that had been defined, before the innovation of the category of IDPs, under the refugee regime as those who flee their home country, “owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion”. While the backdrop of the World Wars and the development of the refugee regime led to the

question of displaced persons being viewed primarily from an international lens as those outside the boundaries of the nation state, the debates on citizenship rights quite centrally engaged with question of discrimination due to membership to different social groups and majority and minority cultures within the state and within the polity. This study seeks to understand citizenship in the light of the question of displacement due to the post Godhra violence in Gujarat in 2002.

Initial field visits threw up a lot of questions as there was a disconnect between the larger political universe in the state of Gujarat where displacement is denied and the public domain at the national and international level where there is much condemnation of the violence and atrocities against Muslims invoking the ideal of citizenship and employing the language of human rights. While the violence in 2002, widely considered to be unprecedented among the many riots since independence, has been described as a pogrom and genocide, the party that was in power at the time of the violence i.e. BJP led by Chief Minister Narendra Modi has won two emphatic victories in elections to the legislative assembly in the state. While Narendra Modi’s has continued as a popular leader in Gujarat there have been voices even from within the Muslim community calling for Muslims to move on from recalling the violence and participate in the economic progress initiated by the administration of Narendra Modi.

While there were relief colonies that housed thousands of displaced in the periphery of cities of districts such as Ahmedabad, Anand, Baroda and Sabarkantha there seemed to be no displacement in the place that started it all, Godhra. The site with highest death toll, Naroda Patiya also seemed to have more Muslims than even before the violence. In the tribal dominated district of Panchmahal where at least 3 incidents of mass murders took place in Pandharwada, Kidiad and Dailol in addition to arson, looting and stabbings an ageing Muslim farmer now goes to his field everyday like he always has in his village that was also affected during the violence in 2002. He however balks at the suggestion of staying the night in his now destroyed

and burned house in the village and would rather commute daily to his field from the relief colony built near a Muslim seminary in the nearby town of Lunawada. More than seven years after the violence, he cannot think of staying the night in his village because, as he simply says with much fear in his eyes, “*dar lagta hai na ben*”.46

A Collector in the Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation very matter of factly pointed out, “You can’t prove anything by showing so many people moved from here to there”.47 Beside the fact that any study on population movements would pose significant methodological challenges especially in our globalized times where with increasing mobility, people’s movements within and beyond borders seem to constitute huge masses of unaccounted population entering the world of obscurity, the collector’s assertion made much methodological sense in that people move for a host of reasons and to establish causality would require evidence that is not discernable in existing forms of aggregate data in the public domain whether in census or land and property market data which do not publish social aspects such as caste and religion. Although there are relief colonies that house some of those displaced due to the violence in 2002 in Gujarat even today, tracking the extent of displacement of Muslims due to the violence posed significant methodological challenges as did depicting their voice and story more than seven years after the violence and finding their presence and representation in the larger political universe where there largely seems to be much denial of their existence. These factors were further compounded in the analysis of previous instances of displacement due to communal violence.

Although the violence in Gujarat in 2002 has been the subject of much commentary, there has not been a systematic documentation and critical analysis of the displacement that occurred. This study documents, examines and provides an account of the displacement of Muslims in Gujarat through an analysis of events that occurred at the local, state and national level in 2002 and the subsequent years using newspaper reports, ethnographic accounts of the displaced, independent, media and investigative reportage and interviews with community workers, NGO practitioners, academics and media persons in Gujarat. The study also analyses the state’s handling of population movements due to communal violence through a complex of government resolutions, policies, correspondence of the Government of Gujarat with

46 Interview with Mohammad (from Anjanwa village), Relief Colony in Lunawada, Panchmahal district, 18/9/2008.
constitutional bodies such as the NHRC and NCM, court judgments, court cases, reports of state appointed commissions of inquiry, legislative assembly debates and newspaper reports in 2002 as well as in previous instances of communal violence in the state of Gujarat since the time of independence.

This study employs the analytical visibility afforded by the category of Internally Displaced Persons to examine what happened, namely the displacement of Muslims; how it happened, i.e. the processes of displacement and; the main actors that emerged in dealing with the situation from Muslim organizations, civil society organizations, the state to the displaced themselves, to explore the relationship between displacement and citizenship rights. This thesis argues that displacement due to communal violence is a due case of displacement (as mentioned in the U.N. Guiding Principles on Internally Displaced Persons and scholarship on displacement due to development) that has a bearing on citizenship. The analysis of the state’s handling of population movements in several instances of communal violence in the state of Gujarat since independence reveals a serious lacuna in law with respect to addressing relief, rehabilitation and justice for the victims and punishing perpetrators. This study also argues that communal violence is part of structural violence that has frequently occurred in India and can continue to occur causing violation of citizenship rights of the victims.

The analysis of state responses reveals that the Government of Gujarat has implemented the relief package instituted by the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) led government at the centre but also returned 19.1 crore as unutilized amount. The BJP spokesperson for Gujarat Yamal Vyas insists that things have returned to normal in Gujarat and that activists and academicians pick up issues only because they make good copy. What happened after the violence in Gujarat he argues, is no different from migration that has always happened within cities. He cited the example of Jains who had to move out of Jamalpur area in Ahmedabad because of the influx of Muslims. Since the fact of being forced to flee is a defining aspect of displacement, this is not the first time that the subjective aspect of coercion has been played upon to
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48 The Indian Express 15/5/2009.
49 Interview with Yamal Vyas, Spokesperson for BJP in Gujarat, Ahmedabad, 10/2/2009.
question displacement of population. The Gujarat government even announced a study on migration ostensibly to counter allegations of displacement.

In all its communication to questions raised by constitutional bodies such as the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) and the National Commission for Minorities (NCM), the Government of Gujarat has carefully avoided all mention of displacement. Even though it has identified 86 “resettlement colonies” spread across 10 districts in Gujarat in its reply to the National Minorities Commission, the state government insists that these colonies consist of Muslims who live there of their own volition. The rights claims of the displaced are addressed to the state but against the state as well. Displacement for the state however is a contentious issue that must not be called by name. To acknowledge displacement would be tantamount to acknowledging the state’s role in the violence that several independent and media reportage already point to.

Methodology

Given the history of communal violence and displacement in the subcontinent, in order to better understand the phenomena of displacement in this emerging area of forced migration studies, the grounded theory approach seemed to be best suited to inductively arrive at conclusions. In this study therefore the analysis is mainly informed by the testimonials of displaced persons. Interviews with the displaced have been the main source of the themes taken up for analysis and the conclusions derived from them. These narratives have been collected through semi structured interviews with open ended questions. Although the questions were open ended, the questions were framed to primarily obtain information on the respondents profile, their living conditions before the displacement, their experience of the violence and their condition after the displacement. While advances in the various studies on displacement due to development such as the patterns identified and typologies developed, as well as the UN Guiding Principles on Internally Displaced Persons have informed the choice of questions posed to the displaced persons and the analysis of their responses, an attempt has been made to take into account all responses of the

---

displaced for the analysis, even those outside the questionnaire, in an attempt to record their voice.

The sites of inquiry were the 2 cities of Ahmedabad and Baroda and 2 smaller cities of Anand and Himmatnagar. As Sabarkantha has the largest number of displaced persons, two additional semi-urban areas, Modassa and Idar which have a large Muslim populations and which became shelters for the displaced from rural areas of Sabarkantha and the surrounding districts were also taken up. Besides the respondents from rural areas who had shifted to relief colonies in urban areas, field visits were also conducted in villages whose residents were victims of ‘carnages’ such as Ode, and Kidia; Mogri a village in Anand district where Muslims have not returned; and Deshotar, a village where a majority of Muslims have returned. Gujarat has had a number of incidents of communal violence and therefore, a number of Muslims have been displaced multiple times. Additional detailed interviews were taken up with such respondents who had been displaced twice or even more times before due to other incidents of violence. Their accounts provided a comparative insight of displacement due to communal violence across time.

This study also examines how displacement has been viewed and dealt with by the state as well as the experience of the displaced with the state. Gujarat Legislative Assembly debates since the formation of the modern state of Gujarat in 1960 to the year 2003 have been analysed to see where the displaced figure in legislative parlance as well as to find clues to state practices towards the displaced. The reports of Commissions of Inquiry instituted after major riots in 1969, 1985 and in 2002 have also served as important sources to cull official responses to displaced populations. Policies of housing and urban planning, government resolutions (GRs) related to relief, judgments and court cases of the displaced and analysis of newspaper reports as well as Gujarat state Legislative Assembly debates and newspaper reports of the years of communal violence in the state of Gujarat have been analysed to understand various institutional and discursive practices towards displaced populations. Interviews with senior government officials and BJP functionaries have also been undertaken. Also, as seen in policy studies, policies on paper are often not reflected on the ground because of the implementation process. This is why interviews with affected people, NGO practitioners and secondary sources have also been used to understand the effect of policies on the people they were purportedly made for.
While extensive interviews among displaced persons in the sites chosen have been the source of understanding the perspective of the displaced, the perspective of mainstream society has sought to be culled through newspaper reports, interviews with several community workers, activists, NGO workers, journalists as well as academicians. There has been a significant body of reportage on the violence by the English press, activists, academics and civil society organizations both nationally and internationally, in addition to documentaries and 2 feature films. The National Human Rights Commission in its correspondence and reports on the Gujarat violence during the time of the violence on 2 occasions pointed out that given the fact that FIRs, particularly those involving crimes against women and children were not being fully and accurately registered and therefore material provided by “other credible sources, eg. NGOs should be fully taken into account.” These have served as important sources for this study.

Chapterisation

The innovation of the category of internally displaced persons by the UN in 1998 has led to the emerging domain of forced migration studies. While new conjectures and theoretical shifts have sought to give greater analytical visibility to population movements than ever before, these developments continue to carry theoretical baggage of refugee studies. There seems to be much separation and insularity between studies on different kinds of displacement. The first chapter therefore examines historical and theoretical developments related to displacement up to the recently coined category of internally displaced persons in order to analyse the relevance of this category to understand situations of internal displacement in India and specifically Gujarat. The category of internally displaced persons has served to highlight the situations of internal displacement in India and amplify the voice of the displaced.

The second chapter examines the context of this study, namely Gujarat. As displacement is a study of forced population movement this chapter examines the demographic spread of Gujarat and examines various population movements such as
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immigrations, migrations and displacement and the processes associated with them that have played a significant role in the shaping of the polity of Gujarat.

Chapter 3 seeks to address the migration-displacement debate by chronicling what happened. Newspaper reports and interviews with displaced have been used to reconstruct circumstances and processes in the journey from being vatanis which loosely translated means citizens or inhabitants to having to flee their homes through their stay in temporary dwellings such as relief camps, rented accommodations or houses of relatives and friends to relief colonies or houses in places of Muslim concentration and being identified by NGOs as visthapith or displaced people. Due to the gruesome nature of the violence and the national and international attention it drew, a significant body of information was produced that sought to document and comment on the events. These varied accounts with the exception of a few scholarly works were essentially fact finding reports, or journalistic accounts of what happened which were important snapshots that recorded varied aspects of the events of 2002. There was a need to draw from these varied accounts, corroborate events and figures to document the history of what happened and narrativise the experiences of the displaced which the third chapter seeks to do.

Various mechanisms and measures came up in response to the situation of displacement in the aftermath of the violence that the next chapter presents an ethnographic account of. This chapter focuses on the issue of what are called relief colonies most of which were constructed almost overnight in the wake of the humanitarian situation of displaced Muslims in camps primarily by Muslim organizations. The stepping in of Muslim jamaat\textsuperscript{52} organizations to deliver at the time of crisis filling the gap left by the state has had the effect of amplifying their voice and influence. However, as the chapter illustrates on many occasions displaced persons have retained their agency in various decisions including their faith and lifestyle.

\textsuperscript{52} Jamaats are composed of people who might share the same occupation, ethnicity or regional origin; or might comprise people who recognize the authority of a particular shrine, or follow a specific school of jurisprudence or doctrinal orientation. From Edward Simpson, “Hindutva as a Rural Planning Paradigm in Post-Earthquake Gujarat”, in John Vavos et al (Ed.), \textit{The Politics of Cultural Mobilization in India}, Andrew Wyatt and Vernon Hewitt, Oxford University Press, New York, 2004. p 87.
Chapter 5 documents and analyses state practice and policies towards the displaced by examining Gujarat Legislative Assembly debates for the major instances of communal violence in the state since independence. Responses of the Government of Gujarat to constitutional bodies such as the National Human Rights Commission and National Minorities Commission have also been analysed to determine the Gujarat government's stand on the situation of displacement. This chapter argues that the logic of compensation that usually applies to relief of affected persons in case of natural disasters of man made calamities escapes those affected due to communal violence who are merely doled out "assistance". Even the last package by the central government for those affected by violence in Gujarat eludes the peculiar problem of the displaced by giving "ex gratia" amounts to the dead and injured but a far reduced amount as assistance for housing. This is because the language of rights has been avoided and displacement has been referred to as migration.

The last chapter seeks to locate the rights claims of the displaced in the dominant debates on citizenship. It explores the relationship between displacement and citizenship to argue that both debates as well as recent debates on citizenship have centrally dealt with the question of minorities in the construction of modern nation state. Drawing from Hannah Arendt's argument of displacement being symptomatic of the larger problems of a polity it postulates that the phenomena of displacement that has been occluded in debates on citizenship rights is in fact critically linked to it.