

Macmillan Social Science Library

INTERNATIONAL ENCYCLOPEDIA of the SOCIAL SCIENCES

Volume 2 : a-z



WILLIAM DARTY *Editor in Chief*

A certain type of musician—the disc jockey (DJ)—also values vinyl, not simply as a means for reproducing existing sounds, but for creating new music. DJs are often thought to do little more than play records, but the ways in which many hip-hop and electronic dance music (EDM) DJs in particular manipulate records elevate them to the status of musicians. DJs may combine the sounds of multiple records, alternate between discs in complex counterpoint, or “scratch” them (move them back and forth underneath the stylus), all of which can create new sounds not contained on any single one of the manipulated discs. EDM DJs often combine dozens of individual songs into a seamless musical flow that may last several hours, while hip-hop DJs (also known as turntablists), may take a single passage from a record and manipulate it into an extended composition.

The standard equipment for most DJs has been two turntables and a mixer (a machine that regulates the signal being sent from the two machines to the speakers). In the 1990s, however, various companies began developing and refining CD turntables. The advantages of these players are clear. It is a much simpler matter to find, repeat, and shape particular recorded passages than with traditional turntables, and one need not worry about replacing cartridges or wearing out records. (With digital turntables, the DJ manipulates a simulated record platter, whose movements—even scratching—are converted into signals that transform the sound of the CD.) Moreover, with inexpensive CD burners, DJs can easily compile their own individualized records from other CDs or from digital files, such as MP3s.

Despite these advantages many DJs have resisted the incursion of CD turntables. This resistance is strongest among hip-hop DJs, and can be explained with a single word: vinyl. Because vinyl was present at, and largely responsible for, the birth of hip-hop (which developed around the art of the DJ), it is considered a precious substance, one that carries with it the whole history, the DNA, of hip-hop. Moreover, with traditional turntables, the DJ handles the sound directly, essentially touching the music; CD players remove the immediacy and tactility of vinyl. Nevertheless, as CD turntables continued to improve in the early 2000s, DJs increasingly began turning to digital machines. Some have argued that DJing transcends vinyl and must evolve with changing technologies.

In the early years of the new millennium, vinyl finds itself both cherished and embattled. It continues to be collected and manipulated, and coexists, sometimes uneasily, with digital technologies. Although it plays an important role in the lives of many listeners and performers, its place in the musical life of the future is uncertain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Eisenberg, Evan. 2005. *The Recording Angel: Music, Records and Culture from Aristotle to Zappa*. 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fikentscher, Kai. 2000. The Cult and Culture of the DJ. In *You Better Work!: Underground Dance Music in New York City*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Katz, Mark. 2004. The Turntable as Weapon: Understanding the DJ Battle. In *Capturing Sound: How Technology Has Changed Music*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Milano, Brent. 2003. *Vinyl Junkies: Adventures in Record Collecting*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Schloss, Joseph G. 2004. Materials and Inspiration: Digging in the Crates. In *Making Beats: The Art of Sample-Based Hip-Hop*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Straw, Will. 1997. Sizing Up Record Collections: Gender and Connoisseurship in Rock Music Culture. In *Sexing the Groove*, ed. Sheila Whiteley, 3–16. London: Routledge.

Mark Katz

VIOLENCE

Though violence has been characterized as the use of force by and against one or more social subjects with the intention to inflict bodily harm, the study of violent processes over the past three decades has broadened the concept by underscoring its varying forms, which emerge from the struggle for power between modern states, elites and subalterns, and recently formed communities. Interstate war, discourse and the coercive apparatuses of the state, epistemic violence, ethnic conflict, collective recovery, and terrorism represent intellectual signposts in the scholarship on violence, although they emerge from different trajectories of inquiry that do not belong to a single genealogical tradition or discipline.

WAR, THE STATE, AND COERCION

Violence is identified as an effect of competitive war-making in early modern Europe, which produced a bureaucratic apparatus that could secure the material and human resources required for managing warfare. Such bureaucratic apparatuses would form the institutional skeleton of modern national states from the seventeenth century onward (Tilly 1990). The link between war, the state, and violence is reflected in Max Weber's remark that a striking feature of the modern state is, ideally, its “monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force” and, therefore, its ability to sanction the use of force (Gerth and Mills 1946, p. 78). However, this is not to say that modern states only seek to stem forms of unsanctioned violence, especially those that appear to threaten its authority. Michel Foucault's

inquiries (1963, 1966, 1975) reveal that modern welfare states also strive to redefine, regulate, and channel the use of force in order to achieve social order. This insight marked a watershed in the study of violence and shifted the focus of research on the phenomenon from interstate war to the subtle manners in which coercion and the “measured” use of force are deployed by state agencies in order to shape the social identities of individuals.

Foucault’s studies of institutions of criminal punishment and rehabilitation, schools and hospitals, and the spaces of economic production underscore the discourses that organize these institutions, in order to socially produce docile subjects whose utility would, ostensibly, advance societal welfare and maintain order. Competing legal, penal, medical, and academic disciplines converge to define, discursively, what forms of violence are criminal, why they are socially immoral or harmful, and how their perpetrators should be punished or rehabilitated. Far from remaining ideological platitudes that are applicable only to those labeled as “criminals” or “insane,” these social meanings of deviance are authoritative because they are articulated as categories of objective knowledge, and they become a metric by which to measure—and curb—our own deviant and violent tendencies. Foucault not only demonstrates how social control is achieved from above, he also reveals the political utility of microdimensions of violence, which enable the reproduction of a predictable social order by conditioning individuals to coerce themselves through conformity to institutionally sanctioned categories of “normal behavior.”

Ironically, the very institutional apparatuses and discourses that seek to discipline subjects can also be the source from which to innovate new strategies for resisting violent and coercive regimes. Studies of collective violence associated with popular revolution in western Europe, for example, reveal that tactics employed by protesters borrowed heavily from the police forces’ own methods of employing violence to suppress collective protest. Similarly, these investigations also point to the manner in which episodes of collective violence directed against monarchical power were morally legitimated by perpetrators through the appropriation and redeployment of political concepts like *popular sovereignty*. Anthropologists, historians, and sociologists attentive to the discursive dimensions of collective movements enrich the meaning of the concept of violence by tracing the manner in which knowledge, as a means of exercising social power, can animate and constrain collective forms of resistance that employ the use of force.

EPISTEMIC VIOLENCE

Inquiries into the creation of social order under European colonization identify epistemic forms of violence that rad-

ically essentialized social identities and dismantled previously existing social solidarities. This body of literature marks a departure from a previous form of anthropological study that accepted the “traditional culture” of non-Western societies as an essentially differentiating feature and one that necessitated methods of exhaustive description as a form of analysis. Anthropologists and historians interrogating the cultural objects of “tradition” demonstrate that in the name of crafting effective procedures of political rule, colonial administrators set about to objectify “native traditions.” Such a project involved the production of systematized bodies of objectified knowledge that documented the “cultures and traditions” of colonial subjects; rather than learning about their dynamism, the European project reduced their complexity and then enabled their ossification (Cohn, 1987, 1996; Dirks, 1987, 2001; Chatterjee, 1986, 1993). Working with Orientalist assumptions about “the traditional East,” these bodies of knowledge taxonomically classified categories and practices of social identity in new and singular relationships with Western notions of religion, ethnicity, or clan. Importantly, the concept of violence in this domain of research is considered a historical process that involved supplanting the previously existing “fuzzy” character of social identity, which was shaped by numerous sources of competitive influence, with rigid conceptions of identity (Kaviraj 1992, p. 20).

Having epistemologically fixed such “traditions” as the primary source of native identity, colonial rulers applied these taxonomies to form key state undertakings spanning law and policing, education, urban planning, the fine arts, and census-taking operations. State projects aimed to stabilize the colonial state’s task of maintaining social order, creating the conditions for profitable and taxable economic production, while representing—ostensibly—only a latent imposition on the social and cultural practices of colonial subjects. In fact, these brutal processes of colonial rule would engender more violent social transformations and political conflicts.

COMMUNAL AND ETHNIC CONFLICT

Institutionalizing such rigid conceptions of identity in the state’s operations created the conditions for political forms of violence by sharpening—and rendering incommensurable—the perceived cultural differences between novel “traditional” communities that consequently began to form. This was especially palpable in the context of emerging native leaders who were able to cultivate new supportive constituencies, in terms of their imagined traditional commonalities, and call for the state to arbitrate when conflicts with rival communities arose. As historians of colonial Asia and Africa demonstrate, despite the state’s

quest to maintain social order, communal and “tribal” conflict became a bloody and conspicuously recurring phenomena in this era.

The emergence of competing traditional communities became a mobilizational resource—and source of tension—when native elites began to organize collective resistance to colonialism. Such communities were rallied behind the call for national sovereignty through movements of cultural nationalism. For native elites, political independence was a corresponding entitlement of these traditional communities who now aspired to the status of nationhood. Of course, such cultural forms of nationalism were riddled with tensions, often manifesting in violent internal conflict. Though statehood was eventually achieved for most colonies, the process was often characterized by territorial partition, bitter campaigns of violence, and the unprecedented displacement of people (as in the case of India and Pakistan). In other instances, the hollowness of constitutional arrangements based on “multiculturalism” was exposed when domestic politics spiraled into intense ethnic violence or agonistic competition over political and economic resources. Such violence emerges historically out of—and through—the commission of epistemic forms of violence.

COLLECTIVE INJURY AND TERRORISM

The study of violence associated with contemporary episodes of ethnic cleansing and genocide has revealed much about the dynamics of collective recovery. Scholars in this subfield have shown how testimonies relating to experiences with violence are often shaped by an implicit requirement that frayed ethnic or national solidarities be restored. Testimonials are burdened with the tasks of reestablishing familial-communal honor, identifying perpetrators, and securing state resources for communal rehabilitation. Strikingly, the analysis of collective memory and recovery points to the difficulty of articulating pain as an experience and how the depth of it is necessarily reduced when it is articulated as a collective and social form of suffering (Das 1997).

The theme of collective injury is also salient to discussions of more recent forms of violence associated with terrorist groups, particularly those movements that seem to be morally organized by a religious ethos. Scholars have shown that the moral justifications employed by such movements draw upon earlier forms of cultural nationalism that challenged foreign occupation and imperialism, as well as “heretical” regimes and moral “waywardness.” Many current-day militant movements draw their moral authority from religious reform movements from the colonial era that placed an emphasis on the correct observance of religious rituals. The Taliban, for example, trace

their genealogy to the Deoband movement in late-colonial-era India, which initiated and institutionalized the *madrassa*-based study of Islamic law and the upholding of Muslim ritual practices (dress, morality, and regular prayer) as a means to achieve a virtuous way of life.

Tellingly, the focus of such religious reform movements was transformed during the Cold War period when “insurgents” were recruited, trained, and armed by alliances of Western states and their clients to fight “communism.” Militant and globally dispersed movements that turn noncombatants into targets of political violence are the products of proxy wars that were waged between the superpowers in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

In summary, the study of culture and ideology has transformed the meanings of *violence* by shifting away from an emphasis on interstate war and physical harm to an exploration of the more insidious ways in which highly regulated forms of violence and coercion—presented as socially productive methods of reform and development—are sanctioned by the state in order to govern the actions of individuals. Examinations of the formation of discourses, as loci in which social power is exercised through claims to disciplinary knowledge and truth, reveal how epistemic forms of violence reduce the complexity of social identity and, in the colonial sphere, artificially classify non-Western societies as premodern. Ironically, the history of nationalist and political movements from the end of European colonial rule through the Cold War and afterward is marked by forms of communal and ethnic conflict that reinforce the social and political salience of tradition. Terrorism—and the predominantly Orientalist public debate surrounding it—is a contemporary example of the ways in which religion and politics can come to be mutually dependent and, moreover, of how many of the most dynamic cultural and logistical strategies that organize violence rest outside the domain of the state.

SEE ALSO *Anticolonial Movements; Colonialism; Decolonization; Foucault, Michel; Genocide; Orientalism; Terrorism*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brass, Paul R. 2003. *The Production of Hindu-Muslim Violence in Contemporary India*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Chatterjee, Partha. 1993. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chatterjee, Partha. 2004. *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cohn, Bernard S. 1987. *An Anthropologist among the Historians and Other Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Cohn, Bernard S. 1996. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Das, Veena. 1995. *Critical Events: An Anthropological Perspective on Contemporary India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Das, Veena. 1997. Language and Body: Transactions in the Construction of Pain. In *Social Suffering*, eds. A. Kleinman, Veena Das, and M. M. Lock. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Das, Veena. 1998. Official Narratives, Rumour, and the Social Production of Hate. *Social Identities* 4: 109–130.
- Das, Veena, et al., eds. 2001. *Remaking a World: Violence, Social Suffering, and Recovery*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dirks, Nicholas B. 2001. *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Feldman, Allen. 1991. *Formations of Violence: The Narrative of the Body and Political Terror in Northern Ireland*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1971. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books. (Originally published as *Les mots et les choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines*. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.)
- Foucault, Michel. 1973. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archeology of Medical Perception*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books. (Originally published as *Naissance de la clinique: Une archéologie du regard médical*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963.)
- Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books. (Originally published as *Surveiller et punir*. Paris: Gallimard, 1975.)
- Gerth, H. H., and Mills, C. Wright, eds. 1946. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kaviraj, Sudipto. 1992. The Imaginary Institution of India. In *Subaltern Studies*, vol. VII. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 2001. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 2004. *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror*. New York: Pantheon.
- Metcalf, Barbara. 2004. Piety, Persuasion, and Politics: Deoband's Model of Social Activism. In *The Empire and the Crescent: Global Implications for a New American Century*, ed. Aftab Ahmad Malik, 156–147. Bristol, U.K.: Amal Press.
- Pandey, Gyanendra. 1990. *The Construction of Communalism in Colonial North India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Pandey, Gyanendra. 2001. *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism, and History in India*. Cambridge, U.K. and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, David. 1999. *Refashioning Futures: Criticism after Postcoloniality*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Sewell, William H., Jr. 1996. Historical Events as Transformations of Structures: Inventing Revolution at the Bastille. *Theory and Society* 25 (6): 841–881.
- Tambiah, Stanley. 1996. *Leveling Crowds: Ethnonationalist Conflicts and Collective Violence in South Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 1990. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990–1990*. Cambridge, U.K.: Blackwell.
- Tilly, Charles, Louise Tilly, and Richard Tilly. 1975. *The Rebellious Century, 1830–1930*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Verdery, Katherine. 1999. *The Political Lives of Dead Bodies: Reburial and Postsocialist Change*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Warren, Kay B. 1993. *The Violence Within: Cultural and Political Opposition in Divided Nations*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Arafaat A. Valiani

VIOLENCE, FRANTZ FANON ON

According to the Martinican author and political theorist Frantz Fanon (1925–1961), violence fundamentally defined the meaning and practice of colonialism, and as such violence was central to the effort to resist and overthrow colonial rule. For Fanon, violence was both the poison of colonialism and its antidote.

Fanon arrived at this view on violence largely through his work as a psychiatrist. He was born in Martinique and trained in France, later working in a hospital in Algiers, the capital of Algeria, under the auspices of the French colonial administration. Most of his psychiatric patients were native Algerians, many suffering from the mental and physical turmoil of colonial degradation, including the experience of torture at the hands of French interrogators. Some of these French torturers were also his patients, and by working with them Fanon learned how the “disease” of colonialism also infected the mind of the colonizer. Beyond the hospital walls, Fanon saw how the constant presence of French police stations and military barracks conveyed to the Algerians the clear message that they were little more than animals, to be beaten, dehumanized, and contained for the sake of colonial interests. He thus gained first-hand knowledge of the damage that colonialism inflicted on the minds and bodies of African people.

On November 1, 1954, leaders of the embryonic Algerian national movement, known as the Front de Libération Nationale (FLN), began the armed struggle for independence with violent attacks against French military