Punjab historians have traced these migrations from Punjab back to the middle of the nineteenth century beginning with the recruitment of Sikh soldiers in the British army followed by that of artisans and cultivators (Tatla 1995; Metcalf 2007; Gilmartin 2004; Talbot and Thandi 2004; Talbot 2007; Yong 2005). They have discerned an unmistakable link between imperial policies in Punjab such as the construction of Sikhs as ‘a martial race’ after the 1857 Revolt, the introduction of Land Reforms Acts, the establishment of canal colonies and voluntary and forced migrations from Punjab (Tatla 1995; Metcalf 2007; Gilmartin 2004; Talbot and Thandi 2004; Talbot 2007; Yong 2005). On the other side this region became the flashpoint ground of British army recruitment and it added the more importance to Punjab. The limits of Indian nationalism, it is argued, are very much ‘ethnic’ and apparent in the failure of nation-building in the peripheral regions of the union. Second, with reference specifically to Punjab, but also Jammu and Kashmir and the north-eastern states, the rise and fall of ethnonationalist movements is examined within the frameworks of hegemonic and violent control — the outer limits of India’s ethnic democracy within which these movements are politically accommodated or physically suppressed. Hegemonic and violent control, it is asserted, are the operational mechanisms for managing peripheral ethno-nationalist movements. And although these mechanisms have . . .