

**A Report**

# **Interrogating Forced Migration: A Research Workshop**

**Public Events, Lectures, Panel and  
Round Table Discussions, and Film Screening**



**First Research Workshop on  
Forced Migration Studies**

**16- 21 March 2015**

Organised by

**Calcutta Research Group**

in collaboration with

**Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies,  
Indian Council of Social Science Research  
and Taft Foundation**

# 1. Background

The Calcutta Research Group (CRG) was born as a facilitating group in support of the Third Joint Conference of the Pakistan-India People's Forum for Peace and Democracy in 1996. The founders were a group of researchers, trade unionists, feminist thinkers and women's rights campaigners, academicians, journalists, and lawyers. It has been primarily a forum for policy discussion and analysis on issues of democracy, human rights, peace building, and justice. Developing as a forum of mostly young public activists and socially committed researchers, CRG is now well known for its research, dialogues, and advocacy work. It has carved out a niche for itself in the scholar-activist space for its policy studies on autonomy, human rights, women's dignity, issues of forced displacement and migration, peace and conflict resolution, citizenship, borders and border-conflicts, and other themes relevant to democracy. After years of experience of research in Forced Migration studies along with its various dynamics and having successfully organized the Annual Orientation Course on Forced Migration (popularly known as the Winter Course) for eleven years, CRG this year decided to replace the old structure of the course and instead introduce a Research Workshop on Forced Migration, the first of its kind, organized by CRG with support from the Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies, Kolkata (MAKAIAS), Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSSR) and Taft Foundation, to make the best use of the accumulated knowledge of past years. The Annual Orientation Programme was more in the nature of classical instruction. Class lectures, seminars, assignments, field visits, evaluation, grading and allotment of credit were features of the programme. This year, with different collaborators with varying priorities, the first research workshop was framed in the nature of an inquiry into research and study methods on the theme of forced migration with integrated exercises, such as lectures, research paper presentations by participants, cultural sessions, round table discussions and question-answer sessions.

After eleven years of experience in the field, CRG has been able to form a rich database on forced migration studies and hence this year it intended to make the course a rich experience towards innovation and switching over to an intensive research enquiry accommodating research scholars, university teachers, eminent activists working on the field of forced migration and research organizations as participants of the workshop. In this way, through the research workshop, CRG intended to utilize its accumulated knowledge of past years to build up a research collective in the form of a collaborative study and workshop programme. The objective of the six-day workshop was to interrogate the given concepts in forced migration studies and its dynamics since forced migration has always remained as a critical global issue. From the end of the Cold War, forced migration (involving refugee flows, internal displacement, forced migration of women and children, migration in the wake of human rights violations, natural calamities, and humanitarian disasters, statelessness, illegal immigration of vulnerable people, victims of border violence and militarisation of borders, and trafficking in sex and labour) has emerged as a major phenomenon in the world. Besides, with the change in the origin and hence racial composition of migrants and refugees, attitude towards forced migration has changed the world over. Against this background, the workshop examined a reflection of some of the key concepts relating to forced migration, such as, race and racism, humanitarianism, voluntary and forced migration, mixed and massive forms of forced migration, protection, return, camp as an extraordinary site, border as method of study and analysis, problems of statelessness, issues of gender,

exclusion and inclusion as methods of a political society to deal with outsiders, the idea of autonomy of migration, and finally the absolute polarity between citizens and forced migrants (including its various incarnations) as representations of rights-bearing subjectivity and a fundamental situation of rightlessness. Such reflections may take place through a number of methods, such as historical, genealogical, logical, case study based, critical-legal, feminist, ethnographic, philosophical and ethical ones. Along with South Asia, realities of Central and West Asia were also studied as part of the programme.

Several features made the first research workshop a unique programme. Readers of the report will find the details in the subsequent pages; however it is important to summarise them and place them at the beginning:

- (a) High standard, rigorous nature of the workshop along with customizing methodologies for forced migration research and generating original research inputs and reports;
- (b) Emphasis on experiences of the victims of forced displacement in the conflict zones in South Asia;
- (c) Special focus on creative sessions like film sessions highlighting the human aspects of displacement and forced eviction;
- (d) Emphasis on gender justice;
- (e) Special emphasis on statelessness in South Asia especially taking into account the situation of protracted refugeehood of the Rohingya community worldwide;
- (f) Special attention to policy implications;
- (g) Finally, building up the programme as a facilitator of a network of several universities, independent scholars and activists, organisations working in the field, research foundations, UN institutions, etc.



*Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury, Sreeradha Dutta and Paula Banerjee (from left to right)*



*Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury and Ranabir Samaddar (from left to right)*



## 2. Structure of the Workshop

The Workshop on Forced Migration is the first of its kind organised by CRG in lieu of the erstwhile Winter Course. The Workshop was organised with a view of bringing young researchers in the field together with experts, policy makers and grassroots practitioners to hone their skills and focus on bettering and improving their research.

The Course Outline had five Modules. Each of the themes conceptualized in the form of a module was organized around a keynote lecture, research papers by participants and special lectures/sessions relevant to the module. The participants had submitted their full papers earlier which were put up online. The participants were also sent reading materials. In each module, the participants made twenty-minute long presentations based on their papers which were then discussed by the appointed discussant and opened for questioning by rest of the participants. The five modules were:

- A. Concepts and Methods in Forced Migration Studies I
- B. Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration I: Central and West Asia
- C. Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration II: West Bengal-Bangladesh Border
- D. Birth of a Stateless Community: Rohingya Refugee in India
- E. Concepts and Methods in Forced Migration Studies II

Apart from the modules, there was an Inaugural Keynote Lecture delivered by Professor S. Parasuraman, Director of the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai (TISS). The Workshop ended with a Valedictory Panel discussion on Resource Crisis and Migration by eminent scholars Subhas Ranjan Chakraborty, Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhary and Paula Banerjee. There was also a special lecture on 'Demography of Refugees and Forced Migration with focus on Asia' by eminent Iranian demographer Mohammad Jalal Abbasi Shavazi. A session on films on displacement and forced migration in context of Central Asia was led by Professor Rashmi Doraiswamy. The participants also had the opportunity to listen to and interact with the Pakistani High Commissioner to India. The module D had a roundtable discussion by eminent practitioners and policy makers on the field.

### Participants

Twenty-eight selected participants attended the workshop. The participants came from various walks of life including academics, human rights activism, law, humanitarian work, public policy etc. (For a detailed list of participants see pages: 5-6)

### Faculty

The faculty included eminent names in the field of academics, human rights law and public policy, and UNHCR functionaries from around Asia. Attention was paid to diversity of background and region. Importance was attached to the requirements of the modules; the core faculty members were also involved in developing a set of reading material. (For a detailed list of faculty members see pages: 7-8)



## Evaluation

CRG appointed a two-member external evaluators' team consisting of Dr. Ritajyoti Bandopadhyay, Assistant Professor, Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta (CSSSC) and Dr. Dipankar Sinha, Professor, University of Calcutta. Apart from this, both the faculty and participants were given evaluation forms. There was also an evaluative session on the sixth day where the course and its merits and shortcomings were discussed with the participants. (For a detailed report see pages: 60-61)



*S. Parasuraman, Ranabir Samaddar and Atig Ghosh (from left to right)*



*Ranabir Samaddar, Paula Banerjee and Atig Ghosh (from left to right)*



*Sibaji Pratim Basu and Pradip Kumar Bose (from left to right)*



*Participants in Inaugural Session*



*Participants in Introductory Remarks*



*Participants in Introductory Remarks*



### 3. List of Participants

Name	Gender	Country	Institution	Designation
Ajmal Khan	Male	India	TISS, Mumbai	Research Scholar
Anita Sengupta	Female	India	MAKAIAS, Kolkata	Research Fellow
Arpita Basu Roy	Female	India	MAKAIAS, Kolkata	Research Fellow
Asma Al Amin	Female	Bangladesh	BGC Trust University, Chittagong	Lecturer, Department of Law
Atig Ghosh	Male	India	Visva Bharati University, Shantiniketan	Assistant Professor, Department of History
Diloram Karamat	Female	Uzbekistan	Tashkent and MAKAIAS, Kolkata	Research Fellow
Madhura Chakraborty	Female	India	MCRG, Kolkata	Research Assistant
Madhurilata Basu	Female	India	Presidency University, Kolkata	Research Scholar
Neamatullah Neamat	Male	Afghanistan	Independent Researcher Kandahar, Afghanistan	Human Rights Activist
Ozlem Pehlivan	Female	Turkey	Hacettepe University, Ankara	Research Assistant
Priya Singh	Female	India	MAKAIAS and Calcutta University	Research Scholar
Priyanca M. Velath/Kriti Chopra	Female	India	St. Joseph's College, Bangalore	Assistant Professor/Post Graduate Student
Rimple Mehta	Female	India	Jadavpur University, Kolkata	Research Scholar
Sahana Basavapatna	Female	India	Supreme Court of India, New Delhi /MCRG	Human Rights Activist and Advocate
Samata Biswas	Female	India	EFLU, Hyderabad	Research Scholar

Name	Gender	Country	Institution	Designation
Simon Behrman	Male	United Kingdom	University of East Anglia, East Anglia	Lecturer, Law School
Srimanti Sarkar	Female	India	Calcutta University, Kolkata	Research Scholar
Subir Rana	Male	India	Institute of Chinese Studies, New Delhi	Research Fellow
Sucharita Sengupta	Female	India	MCRG, Kolkata	Research Assistant
Suchismita Majumder	Female	India	MCRG, Kolkata	Research Associate
Suhita Saha	Female	India	Jadavpur University, Kolkata	Research Scholar
Sutapa Bhattacharyya	Female	India	University of Calcutta, Department of South and South East Asian Studies, Kolkata	Research Scholar
Swagato Sarkar	Male	India	Jindal School of Government and Public Policy, Noida	Associate Professor
Ushashi Basu Roy Chowdhury	Female	India	Calcutta University, Kolkata	Research Scholar



*Participants in Panel Discussion*



*Madhura Chakraborty, Ajmal Khan, Ozlem Pehlivan, Neamatullah Neamat, Subir Rana and Ozlen Celebi (from left to right)*



## 4. List of Resource Persons

Name	Institution	City, Country
Anasua Basu Ray Chaudhury	Researcher, Observer Research Foundation	Kolkata, India
Anita Sengupta	Fellow, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies	Kolkata, India
Atig Ghosh	Assistant Professor, Visva Bharati University	Bolpur, India
Byasdeb Dasgupta	Professor, Kalyani University	Kalyani, India
Debarati Bagchi	Post Doctoral Fellow, Jawaharlal Nehru University	Delhi, India
Iman Mitra	Research and Programme Associate, MCRG	Kolkata, India
Mandira Sen	Director, Stree-Samya Books	Kolkata, India
Md. Jalal Abbasi Shavazi	Professor and Chair, Department of Sociology and Demography, Tehran University	Tehran, Iran
Meghna Guha Thakurata	Executive Director, Research Initiatives, Bangladesh	Dhaka, Bangladesh
Nasreen Chowdhory	Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Delhi University	New Delhi, India
Om Prakash Mishra	Professor, Department of International Relations, Jadavpur University	Kolkata, India
Ozlen Celebi	Assistant Professor, Hacettepe University	Ankara, Turkey
Paula Banerjee	Associate Professor, Calcutta University and President, MCRG	Kolkata, India
Pradip Kumar Bose	Founding Member, MCRG and Emeritus Professor, CSSS	Kolkata, India
Prasanta Ray	Secretary, MCRG and Emeritus Professor, Presidency University	Kolkata, India



Name	Institution	City, Country
Purabi Roy	Former Professor, Jadavpur University	Kolkata, India
Ragini Trakroo Zutshi	Associate Protection Officer, UNHCR New Delhi	Delhi, India
Ranabir Samaddar	Director, Calcutta Research Group	Kolkata, India
Rashmi Doraiswamy	Professor, Jamia Milia Islamia	New Delhi, India
Ravi Hemadri	Secretary, Development and Justice Initiative New Delhi	New Delhi, India
Ritajyoti Bandopadhyay	Assistant Professor, Centre for Studies in Social Sciences	Kolkata, India
Ruchira Goswami	Assistant Professor, National University of Juridical Sciences	Kolkata, India
S. Parasuraman	Director, Tata Institute of Social Sciences	Mumbai, India
Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury	Vice-Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University	Kolkata, India
Sibaji Pratim Basu	Professor, Sree Chaitanya College	Habra, India
Sreeradha Dutta	Director, MAKAIS	India
Subhas Ranjan Chakraborty	Member, MCRG and Retired Professor, Presidency University	Kolkata, India
Suchandana Chatterjee	Fellow, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies	Kolkata, India



*Resources persons of Research Workshop on  
Interrogation Forced Migration*



*Sucharita Sengupta, Rashmi Doraiswamy,  
Samata Biswas, Byasdeb Dasgupta and  
Iman Mitra*



## 5. Partnerships, Supporting and Collaborating Institutions

The First Forced Migration Workshop was supported by the MAKAIAS, Kolkata, ICSSR, and the Taft Foundation. CRG acknowledges its debt to its collaborators, without whose support it would have not been possible to organise this course.

CRG is especially grateful to the Director, Dr. Sreeradha Dutta, and researchers of MAKAIAS for their cooperation in organising the workshop and especially for providing us with the venue for the programme. Thanks is especially due to all the participants from near and far for making the workshop such a vibrant and stimulating space and to the faculty members who came from far away destinations and enriched us with their expertise.



*Sreeradha Dutta*



*Om Prakash Mishra*



*Sibaji Pratim Basu, Prasanta Ray and Samir Kr. Das (from left to right)*



*Atig Ghosh, Nasreen Chowdhory, Sahana Basavapatna and Tinku Roy (from left to right)*



*Ozlen Celebi, Anita Sengupa and Priya Singh (from left to right)*



*Ravi Hemadri, Suhita Saha and Ragini Trakroo Zutshi (from left to right)*



## 6. Schedule of the Workshop

### Interrogating Forced Migration: A Research Workshop

#### Day 1: 16.03.2015

**Venue:** Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies

09.30-10.00 am: **Registration**

10:00-11:00 am: **Introductory Remarks**

**Speakers:** Sreeradha Dutta *Director, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies*

Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury *Vice-Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University*

Paula Banerjee *President, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group, and Associate Professor, Calcutta University*

11:00-11:30 am: **Tea**

#### **Module A:** *Concepts and Methods in Forced Migration Studies I*

11:30- 01.00 pm: **Keynote Lecture**

**Speaker:** Ranabir Samaddar *Director, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*

**Chair:** Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury *Vice-Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University*

01.00- 02.00 pm: **Lunch**

02.00- 03:30 pm: **Participants' Research Papers**

**Speakers:** Byasdeb Dasgupta *Professor, Kalyani University*; Samata Biswas *Assistant Professor, Haldia Government College*

**Chair:** Ritajyoti Bandyopadhyay *Assistant Professor, Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta*

**Discussant:** Iman Mitra *Research Associate, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*

03.30-04.00 pm: **Tea**

04.00-05.00 pm: **Special Lecture: Reviewing Forced Migration Studies in the Last Twenty Years**

**Speaker:** Pradip Kumar Bose *Founding Member, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group, and Former Professor, Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta*

**Chair:** Sibaji Pratim Basu *Professor, Sree Chaitanya College, Habra, and Treasurer, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*

05.00-06.30 pm: **Break**

### **Special Inaugural Lecture**

**Venue:** Hotel the Sojourn

06.30-06.40 pm: **Short Presentation on the Workshop**

**Speaker:** Atig Ghosh *Assistant Professor, Visva Bharati University*

06.40-07.50 pm: **Special Lecture**

**Speaker:** S. Parasuraman *Director, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai*

**Chair:** Ranabir Samaddar *Director, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*

07.50-08.00 pm: **Vote of Thanks**

08.00 pm onward: **Reception and Dinner**

### **Day 2: 17.03.2015**

**Venue:** Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies

**Module B:** *Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration II: Central and West Asia*

09.30-11.00 am: **Keynote Lecture**

**Speaker:** Özlen Çelebi *Assistant Professor, Hacettepe University*

**Chair:** Rashmi Doraiswamy *Professor, Jamia Milia Islamia*

11.00-11.30 am: **Tea**

11.30-01.00 pm: **Participants' Research Papers**

**Speakers:** Anita Sengupta *Fellow, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies*; Diloram Karamat *Fellow, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies*; Priya Singh *Fellow, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies*

**Chair:** Özlen Çelebi *Assistant Professor, Hacettepe University*

**Discussant:** Suchandana Chatterjee *Fellow, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies*

01.00- 02.00 pm: **Lunch**

02.00- 03.30 pm: **Participants' Research Papers**

**Speakers:** Özlem Pehlivan *Research Assistant, Hacettepe University*; Neamat Neamatullah *Independent Researcher, Afghanistan*; Arpita Basu Roy *Fellow, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies*

**Chair:** Purabi Roy, *Former Professor, Jadavpur University*

**Discussant:** Mohammad Jalal Abbasi Shavazi *Professor of Demography, University of Tehran, and Director, National Institute of Population Research, Ministry of Science, Research and Technology, Iran*

03.30- 04.00 pm: **Tea**

- 04.00-05.00 pm: **Special Lecture Followed by Questions and Answers Session**  
**Speaker:** Mohammad Jalal Abbasi Shavazi *Professor of Demography, University of Tebran, and Director, National Institute of Population Research, Ministry of Science, Research and Technology, Iran*  
**Title: Demography of Refugees and Forced Migration with Focus on Asia**  
**Chair:** Debarati Bagchi, *Post Doctoral Fellow, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India*
- 05.00- 07.00 pm: **Film on Forced Migration and Discussion**  
**Resource Person:** Rashmi Doraiswamy *Professor, Jamia Milia Islamia*  
**Chair:** Atig Ghosh *Assistant Professor, Visva Bharati University*

**Day 3: 18.03.2014**

**Venue:**

**Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies**

**Module C:**

***Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration I: West Bengal-Bangladesh Border***

- 09.30-11.00 am: **Keynote Lecture**  
**Speaker:** Sreeradha Dutta *Director, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies*  
**Chair:** Prasanta Ray *Secretary, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group and Emeritus Professor, Presidency University, Kolkata*
- 11.00-11.30 am: **Tea**
- 11.30-01.00 pm: **Participants' Research Papers**  
**Speakers:** Sucharita Sengupta *Research Assistant, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*; Atig Ghosh *Assistant Professor, Visva Bharati University*;  
Paula Banerjee *President, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group, and Associate Professor, Calcutta University*  
**Chair:** Om Prakash Mishra *Professor, Jadavpur University*  
**Discussant:** Meghna Guhathakurta *Executive Director, Research Initiatives, Bangladesh*
- 01.00-02.00 pm: **Lunch**
- 02.00-03.30 pm: **Participants' Research Papers**  
**Speakers:** Subir Rana *Associate Fellow, Institute of Chinese Studies*; Swagato Sarkar *Associate Professor, Jindal School of Government and Public Policy*; Rimple Mehta *Research Fellow, Jadavpur University*  
**Chair:** Mandira Sen *Director, Stree-Samya Books*  
**Discussant:** Anasua Basu Ray Chaudhury *Fellow, Observer Research Foundation*
- 03.30-04.00 pm: **Tea**



04.00-05.30 pm: **Talk on Immigrant Turkish Music in Germany**  
**Resource Person:** Imran Ayata *Author, Musical Archivist and Translator*  
**Chair:** Atig Ghosh *Assistant Professor, Visva Bharati University*

**Day 4: 19.03.2014**

**Venue:** Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies

**Module D:** *Birth of a Stateless Community: Rohingya Refugees in India*

09.30-11.00 am: **Keynote Lecture**  
**Speaker:** Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury *Vice-Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University*  
**Chair:** Ranabir Samaddar *Director, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*

11.00-11.30 am: **Tea**

11.30-01.00 pm:

**Participants' Research Papers**

**Speakers:** Madhura Chakraborty *Research Assistant, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*; Suchismita Majumder *Research Assistant, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*; Srimanti Sarkar *Researcher, University of Calcutta and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies*

**Chair:** Paula Banerjee *President, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*

**Discussant:** Ragini Trakroo Zutshi, *Associate Protection Officer, UNHCR New Delhi*

01.00-02.00 pm: **Lunch**

02.00-03.30 pm:

**Participants' Research Papers**

**Speakers:** Sahana Basavapatna *Lawyer, Supreme Court of India*; Priyanca Mathur Velath *Assistant Professor, St. Joseph's College, Bangalore* and Kriti Chopra *Researcher, St. Joseph's College, Bangalore*; Suhita Saha *Researcher, Jadavpur University*

**Chair:** Ragini Trakroo Zutshi, *Associate Protection Officer, UNHCR New Delhi*

**Discussant:** Ravi Hemadri *Secretary, Development and Justice Initiative, New Delhi*

03.30-04.00 pm: **Tea**

04.00-05.30 pm:

**Roundtable Discussion on Rohingya Refugees**

**Speakers:** Ravi Hemadri *Secretary Development and Justice Initiative, New Delhi*; Ragini Trakroo Zutshi *Associate Protection Officer, UNHCR New Delhi*; Meghna Guhathakurta *Executive Director, Research Initiatives, Bangladesh*

**Chair:** Subhas Ranjan Chakraborty *Member, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group and Former Professor, Presidency College, Kolkata*

**Day 5: 20.03.2015**

**Venue:**

**Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies**

**Module E:**

***Concepts and Methods in Forced Migration Studies II***

09.30-11.00 am:

**Special Lecture**

**Speaker:** Prasanta Ray *Secretary, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group and Emeritus Professor, Presidency University, Kolkata*

**Title:** **From the Margins into the Centre: Towards new perspectives in Migration Studies**

**Chair:** Ranabir Samaddar *Director, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*

11.00-11.30 am:

**Tea**

11.30 -01.00 pm:

**Participants' Research Papers**

**Speakers:** Simon Behrman *Lecturer, University of East Anglia*; Asma Al Amin *Lecturer, BGC Trust University*; Azmal Khan *Researcher, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai*

**Chair:** Iman Mitra *Research Associate, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group*

**Discussant:** Nasreen Chowdhury *Assistant Professor, Delhi University*

01.00-02.00 pm:

**Lunch**

02.00-03.30 pm:

**Keynote Lecture**

**Speaker:** Atig Ghosh *Assistant Professor, Visva Bharati University*

**Chair:** Nasreen Chowdhury *Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Delhi University*

03.30-04.00 pm:

**Tea**

04.00-05.30 pm:

**Participants' Research Papers**

**Speakers:** Madhurilata Basu *Researcher, Presidency University*; Ushasi Basu Roy Chowdhury *Researcher, University of Calcutta*

**Chair:** Anita Sengupta *Fellow, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies*

**Discussant:** Ruchira Goswami *Assistant Professor, West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences*

**Day 6: 21.03.2015**

**Venue:**

**Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies**

10.00-10.30 pm:

**Rapporteurs' Presentations**

10.30-11 am:

**Tea**

11.30 -01.00 pm:

**Evaluation Session**

**Chair:** Paula Banerjee *President, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group, and Associate Professor, Calcutta University* and Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury *Vice-Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University*

01.00-02.00 pm: **Lunch**

**Venue:** **Swabhumi**

05.00-06.00 pm: *Guns and Roses*, a Play by Chaepani (Script and Direction: Debashis Sen Sharma)

06.00-06.40 pm: **Certification Ceremony**  
To Be Presided over by Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury *Vice-Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University*

06.40-07.30 pm: **Valedictory Panel on “Resource Crisis and Migration”**  
**Speakers:** Subhas Ranjan Chakraborty *Member, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group and Former Professor, Presidency College, Kolkata*; Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury *Vice-Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University*; Paula Banerjee *President, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group, and Associate Professor, Calcutta University*  
**Chair:** Prasanta Ray *Secretary, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group and Emeritus Professor, Presidency University, Kolkata*

07.30 pm: **Vote of Thanks**



*Tinku Roy, Ajmal Khan, Iman Mitra, Samata Biswas and Ravi Hemadri (from left to right)*



*Atig Ghosh, Ananya Chatterjee, Simon Behrman and Samir Kr. Das (from left to right)*



*Rimple Mehta, Asma Al Amin, Ushashi Basu Roy Chowdhury and Meghna Guha Thakurata*



*Madhura Chakraborty, Suchismita Mazumder, Simon Behrman and Ananya Chatterjee*



## 7. Module Notes and Reading Material

The Course was structured around five modules. Below we present the module notes and the respective lists of reading material sent out to the participants. The reading material is preserved in CRG library in digitized form.

### Course Modules

- A. *Concepts and Methods in Forced Migration Studies I*
- B. *Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration I: Central and West Asia*
- C. *Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration II: West Bengal-Bangladesh Border*
- D. *Birth of a Stateless Community: Rohingya Refugees in India*
- E. *Concepts and Methods in Forced Migration Studies II*

### MODULE A AND E: Concepts and Methods in Forced Migration Studies I and II

**Core Faculty Member:** Ranabir Samaddar and Atig Ghosh

### Concept Note

*Concept as an epistemological category and the function of problematising:* This module will aim to discuss the process in which concepts have emerged in forced migration studies and have given birth to certain definite methods in pursuing studies in this field. In this note concepts and methods are treated as interlinked. Concepts are not de-linked from method/s because they (the former) emerge as this note wishes to demonstrate through a process of critique (the latter). Critique will be defined here as criticism of existing practices, policies, and discourses (which can be collectively called episteme) in a mode that relies on working on the margins or the threshold of existing ideas. Critique is thus problematising (turning the given into a problem as distinct from problem setting, a favourite past time in policy exercises) a given knowledge, and a step towards thematising (turning a practice into a theme). In this way critique gives rise to concepts. Concepts become ruling formulations in the particular field. But this does not mean there will be no clash of concepts. Indeed they can work against each other. However a concept is known by its family identity. Hence we speak of family of concepts. Studying concepts is thus inherently genealogical. Yet to discuss the historical evolution of a concept in a “presentist” framework is not enough. The purpose is to lay bare the “hidden” structure of the concept, its anatomy, the laws of its formation and function. The mode is always problematising the received theme through a critical procedure.

1. *Family of concepts:* Refugees, asylum, non-*refoulement*, protracted displacement, environmental refugees, statelessness, situations in limbo, regime of protection, protection agencies, refugee laws and conventions, borders, illegal immigration, irregular migration, voluntary and forced migration - and we can go on - belong to a family of concepts. They are like signs of a phenomenon moving together and making sense only in association with each other. Indeed after a point, they are empty signs almost exhausted of any further reference; but they are

not empty because they point collectively to a particular power structure. Problematising these concepts and categories is a political task aimed at critiquing existing knowledge and power structure. In some cases problematising means showing the impossibility of certain claims, in this case of the ethical claims of protection. *Interrogating the abnormal*: Problematising may also mean discussing how the immigrant becomes the abnormal figure of our time, also how this figure represents insecurity in various forms. To get a sense of the relation between migration and security a genealogical method of enquiry will aim to understand (a) the post-colonial nature of the phenomena of population flows today, (b) the protracted nature of displacement; (c) the mixed and massive nature of forced population movements; (d) borders, security, and borderland existence, and (e) migrant as the subject of the modern empire. Contemporary law, administrative practices, and mainstream economy consider the borderland existence of population groups, their flux as threat to security, which is built around the idea of stable population groups. A genealogical investigation of these issues will take us forward towards the post-colonial task of settling the still un-resolvable problematic in the science of ruling – settled governments and the unsettled populations of our time.

2. *The historical intelligibility of some contemporary studies*: Studies on aspects of welfare state and schemes suggest a different way of understanding modern governance in which the study of the nation is not at the centre of political understanding. Instead, of significance in such studies is the inadequately explored history of governing a mobile, unruly world of population flows. These works have given us a sense of the hidden histories of conflicts, of desperate survivals, and of networks new and old. Studies of hunger in the nineteenth century, of itinerant movements and preaching, transportations of coolies, spread of famines, shipping of children and adult girls, trafficking in sex and labour, and pieces of welfare legislation to cope with this great infamy tell us how actually we have arrived at our own time of subject formation. This is certainly different from conventional nation-centred histories. Working within this new strand of history-writing, labour historians have tried to recognise the political significance of labour migration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Their works suggest a different way of writing the history of the nation-form in the last two centuries, where the extra-nationalist narrative of mobile labour constitutes a different universe. After all, the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was the period of several changing modes of labour process – the slave, the indentured, the contract, and finally the free. These modes historically never appeared as pure types, because much of the availability of labour depended on labour's mobility. In fact, it was largely on the condition of making labour mobile that globalisation would proceed at that time. Transit labour then too, as it does now, occupied a crucial place in capitalist production. The late nineteenth and early twentieth century was a period of globalisation when migration controls were put in place. It was in that age that control of mobile bodies began constituting one of the most critical aspects of governance. Likewise studies of gendered nature of migration tell us the emergence of some of the different forms of labour subjectivities marking our world today can be traced back to that time. A genealogical understanding will be thus helpful to problematise the present history of care. Care will appear as a function of power (and vice versa) in this demystified picture of refugee protection, indeed of the social factory as a whole.

3. *Strategic mapping of critical work in this field (research, knowledge exchange, and dissemination)*: For a long time the research agenda of forced migration studies was dominated by the scholars and thinkers from the global North. Researchers of the global South were expected to work on



case studies that would support the meta-narratives produced in the north. However, with the influx of a new group of scholars from the global South in the last two decades that picture changed substantially. This was possible because they brought in issues that completely changed the agenda of research in forced migration. They pointed out that categorization of forced migrants into rigid groups of refugees, IDPs, forced migrants, environmental migrants, and economic migrants is unhelpful to say the least. They also pointed out that forced migrants were always vulnerable people irrespective of whether the particular vulnerability came from poverty or political situation within a society, but that it always resulted in severe persecution. Death caused by genocide or hunger was equally reprehensible and most conflicts at the end were conflicts over resources. As a result of research done by these new age scholars avant-garde centres grew up in hitherto unknown quarters in the post-colonial world. New issues such as mixed and massive flows, labour migration, statelessness, and several other issues began to be debated. The post-1989 political situation also contributed to these developments. Focus on terror brought to the forefront the critique of the role of global North in producing forced migrants in the South in the name of anti-terror operations. Pakistan and Iraq are burning instances of this. More and more research began to focus on vulnerable groups and their own narratives of living as forced migrants. Subjectivity of the victims thus became an important theme of research. There is also an accompanying shift from a focus purely on refugee laws. Critical juridical discourse is one of the outcomes of this shift. It was increasingly pointed out that in the end it should be remembered that research on forced migration is research on human beings who are severely discriminated and disempowered. Demands have also emerged that knowledge networks in this field should play the role of a bridge between research institutions of global North and global South to take up joint research, that there should be more emphasis on qualitative research and joint leadership of research projects. The challenge is how to escape policy driven research, because good research always produces policy critiques and policy implications.

4. *Strategic displacement in this field:* When around the mid-nineties forced migration studies began in Kolkata, researchers were of course aware of bonded labour, indentured labour, village to city migration of labour in forms of servitude, in short different forms in which the “forced” comes into play, but refugee studies had not till then been taken up as a separate field of research. Forced migration was, it appeared from the beginning, a much more holistic concept. Innocence at times helps. Several critical investigations have now enabled us to see the inter connections between various forms of “force”. If we think of this little more deeply, you will see the reason for this change is our realisation that only with a *post-colonial sense* of history we can move on from the old, restricted, “northern” way of looking at things to the broader, more historical, political way of looking at the phenomenon of forced migration. A critical post-colonial approach is important. It enables critical post-colonial way of chronicling and analyzing various forms of forced migration, which now marks the writings of a number of scholars. These writings are informed by a strong sense of history, awareness of the distinct nature of post-colonial politics and society, and an appreciation of the migrant and the refugee appearing as the subject of history of our time that is marked by the return of the empire. These writings and reports are marked by collaborative research, critical post-coloniality, and a strong sense of the significance of the local in this globalizing time. In the course of all these we have been enabled to take a long view of citizenship and alien-hood, histories of hatred, reconciliation, friendships and enmities, the significance of camp as a liminal space of subjectivity and submission, of control and escape, despair and inefficacy of international norms, laws, and arrangements, and victims’ own voices about

how and what could be done. All in all, one can say that forced migration studies has come out of the restrictive framework of refugee studies, and has evolved to embrace many other aspects of migration, and has now entered a critical post-colonial phase. This is a case of strategic displacement. Even though there is every chance of a new dogma being produced, the method has to be vigilant against such possibility. Its role is to impart criticality of approach, and it should be able to place migration in the grey zone of force/volition, subjectivity/conditions, human rights/humanitarianism, and all other binaries that at times lead us to a blind alley. We need a dialectical approach.

5. *Partition as a critical marker in forced migration studies*: It has been rightly said that the twentieth century will be remembered as a century of partitions. Partition leads to forced migration – refugee flows and flows of other types. Partition also makes the question of return crucial. Do partition refugees have right to return? If they have the right to return, then what is the period they will enjoy the right? Also, will there be certain conditions, in as much as we know that there may be forced return. Partition is the prism in which the stakes in the study of forced migration become sharper. But there is a danger also. Partition scholars and there are hundreds of scholars of partition today, take post-partition migration to be a unique process, and ignore the possibility that post-partition migration can be built on lines of historical continuity, and it is important to find out the continuities and discontinuities in the process. Do we study for instance the nature of forced migration in Europe in their century of religious wars, and compare that with what happened in India when the great religious war broke out in the second half of the forties of the last century? Can we compare the subjectivity evoked in Brecht's *Mother Courage* and Manto's *Toba Tek Singh*? I believe we are still to appreciate the stakes in studying partition as a major marker in forced migration studies. Partition of the Ottoman Empire, of Germany, Palestine, and Korea in the last century, or the Indian partition or the partitions by default that happened in the last decade of the last century – these are only some of the major events to shape the story of forced migration. May be we have to master the art of writing event-centric history to bring out the depths of the phenomenon of forced migration. There are so many unnoticed events, which are neither as major nor as infamous as the Partition of 1947, but which create their histories of migration. These small histories will enrich our forced migration studies. There is of course the question, namely, whether the researcher's location of belonging to a partitioned country makes it possible for him/her to have a distinct view of forced migration. This is a significant question. Of course there is the fact that at least in India migration studies picked up after the mid-nineties of the last century when more and more scholars started studying forced migration when the historical fact of partition repeatedly came up along with the fact of fifty years of Indian independence. We can thus say: the citizen is the defence of the visibility of Constitution; the alien is the shadow, its prey. The citizen exists in the alien as the savage form. Citizen is articulate; the alien is inaudible, silent. Yet the more interesting question will be: What are the ways in which the alien overcomes the two obstacles of inaudibility and invisibility? To understand this life world of visibility and shadow forced migration studies will have to adopt the strategy of interrogating alterity. The same principle of interrogation will be valuable in studying actual conditions of statelessness in the post-colonial world.

6. *Critique of received binaries*: It has been observed that the proportion of refugees has gone down significantly in the last twenty years and that of different categories of the internally displaced people/population groups/persons (IDPs) gone up. Now the question for instance will be, is this not an oversimplified statement that somehow hides the mixed and

massive flows of population worldwide? To begin of course we have to acknowledge the IDP issue has done enormous service to forced migration studies. By including the IDPs forced migration studies has widened in scope and has become more truthful to the world. We are now able to link issues of nation, sovereignty, economy, globalisation, social violence, environment, and developmental issues in a more meaningful way. We have become aware of displacement as the most critical issue of our time – and all these after we could connect and integrate the IDP issue and the phenomenon of forced migration. Recognition of the rights of the IDPs is the collective product of decades of struggles of population groups trying to survive. It is strange that very few big names in refugee studies care to see displacement in a broad light or do any worthwhile research on IDP issues. Yet the point raised here is significant, because we witness today massive and mixed flows of people across and within countries, and these flows in the wake of globalisation should make us sit up and wonder how worth are the various categories of displaced population groups that we use in terms of analysis and policy response? The UNHCR in one of its recent notes has taken cognizance of this. Old protection strategies are failing. New strategies are needed to ensure the rights of victims of protracted state of displacement. Old forms of refugee status determination do not make much sense in this new situation. Old guarantees of asylum likewise do not make sense in the light of preventing strategies of States and Unions such as *fortress Europe*. Also, how does one distinguish between a classic refugee, a person escaping hunger and in search of work by any means and anyhow, and say, trafficked labour in servitude? Rights are indivisible. Yet the way forward may not be to do away with all the institutions and set up new ones, which will inevitably result in more centralization for controlling population movements. Probably a more dialogic relationship is necessary, also we have to struggle for minimizing - if we cannot do away altogether - the hold of security related thinking, provisions, and practices in matters of recognizing and protecting the rights of the victims of forced migration. Institutions have their vested interests, their domains. To try to reduce them is the need of the hour. To do so we have to begin with working out and formulating the consequences of the theoretical recognition that population flows are massive and mixed. The reality of these mixed and massive flows questions old polarities. They need to be recognized in their variety, plurality, and amorphous nature – and this is possible only when we have a more federal way of looking at things, not from an institutional-pyramid point of view from the top, but from the point of understanding how it works on the ground. We shall then be able to challenge the customary distinction between refugee studies and forced migration studies, and episodic violence and structural violence in terms of protection policies and institutions. We shall be able to ask, if constructing hierarchy of the victim is the appropriate way to frame protection policy. This way of analyzing through interrogation of received binaries is already evident in the ongoing studies on statelessness. These binaries such as refugee/IDP, episodic violence/structural violence, citizen/stateless, movement due to fear/movement due to economic imperative, international norms/national responsibility, human rights/humanitarianism – have been subjected to critical inquiry today. Such critical inquiry has to feature forced migration studies. This is possible only when we consider forced migration studies not as an isolated discipline or a subject, defined by some strange esoteric rules, but as a field marked by lines of power and flight paths of various subjectivities. To work with that awareness we require not only a sense of rights and responsibilities, but some sort of political awareness of the way in which the migrant appears in our civilized societies as *abnormal*. To back to a point made earlier, interrogating the production of abnormality in the figure of the migrant has to be a research concern. All these are additionally relevant when we recognize the current time

as one of the return of primitive accumulation when footloose labour becomes the ubiquitous figure of abnormality in the society of the settled and the propertied.

7. *Relevance of legal pluralism.* The UN Convention of Refugees has completed 60 years and UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement have also been in existence for more than 15 years. Yet the question is if they are adequate in the contemporary context of displacement of population, and if we must argue in favour of regional conventions and/or protocols to deal with the situation? We all know that the 1951 Convention is dated for all kinds of reasons. The cold war perspective is long over. The nature of forced migration has changed. New forms of servitude have appeared along with new vulnerabilities. The 1951 Convention also does not address the issue of burden sharing. But no one wants to open the can lest the worms should come out. Likewise the Guiding Principles emphasise only a particular context. It is too much rooted in a particular reading of the contexts of Africa, some parts of Latin America, and the Caucasus. It ignores developmental displacement, and places the issue in the framework of what is known as sovereignty as responsibility. While the Guiding Principles have done service to the cause of the displaced population groups, yet it has left open many occasions for abuse. Great Powers can intervene on the pretext of saving endangered population groups (recall Syria) while they may be the responsible one to a large extent for the unsettling scenario. Again while they may be responsible for economic catastrophes in many countries and regions, they can appear as saviours. On the top of that, while the origin of the Guiding Principles in the human rights principles is clear, its structure carries an old state of international law. In a sense the Guiding Principles has removed the focus from the issue of developmental displacement in today's world. However the modality of *guiding principles* is significant and has dialogic potentiality. It offers new insights into the process of law making. If we take 1951 Convention we can see the reason for its wide acceptance. It creates a legal person (of the refugee), a whole penumbra of institutions, an office, etc. without making any one – nation, government, big powers, individual – responsible for creating refugee-hood. It has been able to merge in a milieu of a fantasy the ethics of humanitarian protection and guarantee of rights of a right-less person, who the refugee is. Likewise, the Guiding Principles are not law, yet they have the appearance of some kind of moral injunction with at least the partial effectiveness of law. So countries may not have signed the Principles, they are only a resolution. Yet they appear as giving birth to some kind of law. How do we retain this fantasy and proceed? Possibly, not only that we need to move on to the regional level as the most crucial level in framing the international, but that there too there will be the need to innovate the art of successful law making by combining the fantasy with injunction. The art of governmentality will never cease to be relevant. The important point here is how to produce the consent that is necessary for enacting what is termed as soft law. On one hand we have sovereignty as a still important factor in treaty making process, which is a crucial part of international law making, also we have great power concord and combined pressure to produce the law, on the other hand there is the effort to produce consent of the probable treaty parties. This is a process, which is getting more and more intriguing. How to produce consent for a treaty is a serious problem for the international that we speak of today. It may be that the more we decentralise the process the more we shall produce the consent necessary for law. After all we may not need grand and universal laws any more, or at least not to the extent to which we are led to believe. As if the world will break down if we do not have a single treaty, a single convention, a single office... And therefore what we need is possibly not books and books on soft law (because the soft may be more insidious, as we have seen this in the iniquitous application of the principle of intervention on humanitarian grounds), but more work on the

process of producing the consensus at different levels and making that work. In that sense legal pluralism may be a significant area of work in this field.

8. *The concept of ethics of care and protection.* The ethical practices of care and protection to the extent they are there in the legal mechanisms for protection of the displaced persons are like a double edged sword. They strengthen the principles of humanitarianism, which we need in our individual and collective lives. Yet when applied they tend to reduce the persons they seek to protect and care for to being objects of care and charity. Therefore in the refugee protection literature there is this debate on charity or rights. Also some people say that whatever protection people have got are not due to the principles of care and hospitality, but through struggle for rights. How is basic rightlessness removed? A philosopher may say, that while the principle of care and hospitality is unavoidable, yet we care only to the extent self-care allows. Thus there is always a limit to the care that these international legal mechanisms offer. At times a great power will bomb a country, create refugees, displace millions, and then the so-called international community will invoke the principles of care to rush in those bombed out countries, and within the limits set by the big power help the displaced. That is why people in war ravaged countries sometimes despise the humanitarian workers, many of whom are inspired with the noblest values, yet get represented as the ones who have come to supply artificial legs in the evening after their legs have been cut off in the morning on the order of a tyrant. Therefore it may be the case that the process of infusing the legal and administrative mechanisms of protection of the displaced with the principles of care and protection is a contradictory one. And one has to therefore examine this process through an examination of the self-care involved in the big humanitarian enterprises we witness today. In this respect, we need to interrogate a concept such as humanitarianism. It may be an ideology that works like a machine. It may be based on sentiments, but we create institutions to give effect to those sentiments, and then we legitimise those institutions with an overarching ideology of care, which may gloss over the injustices of the entire process through which persons have been reduced to being objects of care and protection. And what sense shall we make of the fact, that in any case a large number of the displaced millions on earth, possibly the majority of the displaced persons, do not depend on these legal arrangements? Care operates in the lives of the millions in a different way. We can see this paradox then even in the legal and administrative mechanisms for the protection of the displaced. There is no one single arrangement of care, for instance in India. Care of the displaced due to violence is organised along one line, or set of lines, while care of the displaced due to developmental activities runs along another set, while again the care of the displaced due to natural disasters is organised in a different set of ways. There are similarities in these three cases, yet the principle of care operates in a differential way. Humanitarianism in the nineteenth century was for the destitute, the abnormal, and the poor in the colonies. Yet we cannot do away with the principle of care. The task possibly will be to organise the principle in a different way, to see how this operates in popular life, to entrust the people with the task of protector than making the mighty the protector of imperilled lives. Federalisation of care is important. Likewise important is the task of making dialogic the principles of care and protection. This requires the insertion of the principle of justice, which will bring back the issues of claims and rights. We thus cannot avoid the contradiction between care and rights; therefore a dialectical view is necessary. Can justice be compatible with the principle of care? Probably that is the main task in public morality today. Only a sense of justice can make us more caring. The evolution of the jurisprudence on disability rights as an instance shows how a sense of justice can lead to a more caring deliberation and approach.



*Conclusion:* (a) Through these points there is a running thread. It is the idea that there is no pure field of concepts. Concepts in forced migration studies are linked to several modes such as problematising, thematising, conceptualising, critique, genealogy, dialectical handling, quantifying, observing, narrating, analysing, and several others including ones that are deployed to de-construct a concept. In fact methods turn in time into concepts. Forced migration studies is a particular field with specific concepts and its own history. As a field of scientific research It has policy implications. It deals with human beings in vulnerable situations. It is a study in power. It has quantitative dimensions. Also its concepts are embodiments of social relations. For all these reason, we always begin with concepts, never with pure descriptions. Even the purest of the descriptions has an underlying concept. Therefore concepts are like signs. They are also at times metaphors. Thus for instance, one of the questions presently marking forced migration studies is around the institution of border. *Is border a concept, a sign, or a concept-metaphor, or all these and therefore an analytical method?* (b) At a second level of analysis we may say that forced migration studies aims to understand forced migration, however incompletely, and uncover the contents within the forms of forced migration. But it has to still ask, why the contents have assumed their particular forms, that is to say, why the migrant is the abnormal subject, why border appears as ubiquitous, why forced migration has a pronounced gendered nature, why the power of the government requires the element of care, why the concept of human rights needs as its complement the ideology of humanitarianism, why camps exist as abnormal site, yet whose abnormality is only discrete, in other words, camps functioning only as one end of a series of forms of confinement and protection, and why the measurement of vulnerability as expressed in the phrase *forced migration* is expressed by duration and by the magnitude of the protection involved. These questions, or research queries, bear the unmistakable imprint of belonging to an age in which the process of displacement appears to have overwhelmed societies, and therefore the concepts and policies seem to appear as nature imposed necessity instead of societies and social systems producing migration being considered as *natural*. Hence the given knowledge of forced migration studies appears to treat all non-official, non-legal knowledge, particularly pre-existing non-official and non-legal knowledge, as belonging to nature, which is pre-scientific and pre-practical in this age. To understand displacement in the realm of understanding we need to introduce the issue of security, which functions as the silent other of the contradictory process of eviction, migration, and care. With the volume of forced migration increasing worldwide and with situations in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, sub-Saharan Africa, and other countries and regions, one can already notice the irrelevance of the international protection system in this field. There is a distinct possibility that with this massive increase the entire complex of the concepts in this field may break down. The irrelevance of the institutions, laws, and norms will reflect in the irrelevance and obsolescence of the categories.

### Reading Materials- Module A & E

- i. Humanitarian Innovation and Refugee Protection
- ii. The Birth of a 'Discipline': From Refugee to Forced Migration Studies by *B.S.Chimni*
- iii. Undocumented Migrants in Resistance against Detention: Comparative Observation on Germany and France by *Christoph Tometten*
- iv. Refugees, Forced Resettles and 'Other Forced Migrants' : Towards a Unitary Study of Forced Migration by *David Turton*
- v. On Research and The Politics of Migrations: Views Out of Place by *Giorgio Grappi*

- vi. Orchestrating Collective Action: Social Media and Human Rights by Ishita Dey
- vii. Refugees and Humanitarianism by *Itty Abraham*
- viii. Refugee Status Determination Conducted by UNHCR
- ix. A Note on Concept and Methods in Forced Migration Studies by Ranabir Samaddar
- x. Environmental Change and Chronic Famine in Manbhum, Bengal District, 1860-1910 by Nirmal Kumar Mahato
- xi. Environment and Migration, Purulia, West Bengal by Nirmal Kumar Mahato
- xii. Protocols for Fieldwork
- xiii. In Search of a Methodology of Forced Migration Studies by Samir Kumar Das
- xiv. Colonialism, Resource Crisis and Forced Migration by Subhas Ranjan Chakraborty
- xv. Lower Strata, Older Races, and Aboriginal Peoples: Racial Anthropology and Mythical History Past and Present by Sumit Guha

## **MODULE B: Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration I: Central and West Asia**

**Core Faculty Member:** Anita Sengupta

### **Concept Note**

Population mobility had always been associated with the region that is now identified as stretching from Afghanistan, across Central and West Asia. Movements of nomadic pastoralist societies but also movements resulting from trade, pilgrimage and conquest marked the landscape of the region since times immemorial. With colonial redrawing of the political map, these everyday movements were sought to be restricted in a variety of ways. Subsequently, sedentarization, the Soviet collectivization campaign, forced deportation of minorities during and after the world wars and the buffer status that Afghanistan had in the ‘great game’ has traditionally been identified as the cause of forced migration and displacement in the region. With the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the emergence of new states a number of other issues have assumed importance in the interpretation of forced migration and refugees. State building processes across the region have left people stateless as they fall outside the definition of citizens (Uzbek brides in Kyrgyzstan), ethnic conflicts have encouraged movements across borders that have subsequently been met by resistance from the host state as upsetting demographic balance (Uzbeks who crossed the border into Kyrgyzstan after 2005) economic imperatives have led to labour migration, in certain cases resentment among displaced peoples have encouraged them to join resistance movements in other parts of the globe (IMU joining ISIS) and environmental degradation has led to displacement (Aral Sea). Most of these movements cannot be comprehended through a statistical approach since the flows escape official census. There is also the trend of the return of the refugee with all the associated institutional issues (the return of Afghan refugees). In certain cases states have actively encouraged return for a variety of political reasons (the Uzbek government have asked for the return of migrants from Russia) and the reluctance towards return has come from the migrants. In other situations refugees have become politically significant for states who wish to replace regimes in neighbouring states or even transform border demarcations (Turkish government is asking for a buffer zone between Turkey and Syria to restrict the movement of Syrian refugees into Turkey). All of these invite new interpretations in the study of forced migration and refugees. This module identifies four facets that involve recent events requiring detailed study.

## Reading Materials- Module B

- i. Afghan Trans National Networks: Looking Beyond Repatriation by Alessandro Monsutti
- ii. Why do children undertake the unaccompanied journey by Chona R. Echavez; Jennefer Lyn L. Bagaporo; Leah Wilfreda RE Pilongo; Shukria Azadmanesh
- iii. Searching For My Homeland: Dilemmas Between Borders EXPERIENCES OF YOUNG AFGHANS RETURNING “HOME” FROM PAKISTAN AND IRAN by Mamiko Saito
- iv. 2015 UNHCR sub regional operations profile - Central Asia
- v. Diary of an Uzbek Gastarbeiter by Mumin Shakirov
- vi. Forced Migration of Syrians to Jordan: An Exploratory Study
- vii. By Mohamed Olwan; Ahmad Shiyab
- viii. Crisis in Lebanon: camps for Syrian refugees? by Jeremy Loveless
- ix. ‘Migration and Security’ by William Walters
- x. POPULATION MIGRATION IN UZBEKISTAN (1989-1998) by Alikhan Aman
- xi. Repatriation to Afghanistan: durable solution or responsibility shifting? by Susanne Schmeidl
- xii. Return Migration and Development Nexus: Casual Labourers of Kabul by Afghanistan Public Policy Research Organization
- xiii. Security, Stability, and International Migration by Myron Weiner
- xiv. The Emerging Migration State' by James F. Hollifield

## MODULE C: Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration II: West Bengal-Bangladesh Border

Core Faculty Member: Paula Banerjee

### Concept Note

The present state system in South Asia, in particular the state system of the sub-continent, is a result largely of the partitions in the eastern and western parts of the erstwhile united India, giving birth to three states – India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. The borders dividing these countries are markers of past bitter history, current separate, distinct, and independent existence, and the sign of the territorial integrity of these states. The bitterness of the past has been exacerbated by the lack of mutual confidence at present. This makes migration across these borders extremely contentious. There is another added dimension to the borders and that is the existence of thousand and one linkages across these borders that make the South Asian borders and migration across it as a unique phenomenon. South Asian borders then are lines of hatred, disunity, informal connections and voluminous informal trade, securitised and militarized lines, heavy para-military presence, communal discord, humanitarian crisis, human rights abuses, and enormous suspicion resulting in making migration a violent affair. Yet migration across these borders never stops.

While the Indo-Pakistan border (including the Line of Control) is in the eye of world attention, therefore closely monitored, the border in the East – Indo-Bangladesh border – remains neglected in terms of attention. Security concerns overwhelm all other equally legitimate concerns and values. Military security dominates over human security in the border region. As a result of this, States often forget that borders are not only lines to be guarded, they are also lines of humanitarian management, because borders are not lines but

borderlands – that is to say these are areas where people live, pursue economic activities, and lead civilian lives attuned to the realities of the borders. Human security in the borderlands would mean first security of the civilian population along the borderlines.

This workshop is meant to analyze the human rights and the humanitarian situation on the Indo-Bangladesh border. It will discuss some of the aspects given below:

- (a) Analyze how immigrants are prima facie accused of illegal entry and do not get due recourse to law;
- (b) The border security forces on both sides engage in forcible push-backs – harsh methods of deportation resulting in loss of limbs, lives, money, and dignity.
- (c) Long and undue detention at jails and sub-jails;
- (d) Rampant sexual abuses, and killings in no man's land;
- (e) Distress of inhabitants of border enclaves;
- (f) Boundaries running through villages and consequent harassment of villagers;
- (g) Fencing and electrifying the fence with high voltage;
- (h) Forcibly stranded people on the no-man's land as security forces on both sides refuse to accept them;
- (i) Communalisation of border villages and subsequent killings of apprehended immigrants;
- (j) Shifting of river-bodies, problem of people living around them.
- (k) Chitmahals and violence faced by people living therein.
- (l) Different types of boundaries in different sectors (river, village, train line, no natural demarcation, hills, etc.
- (m) Existence of stateless population
- (n) Widespread trafficking in labour, sex, animals, and goods
- (o) Insecurity of security guards

### Reading Materials- Module C

The Insecure World of the Nation by *Ranabir Samaddar*

- i. Circles of Insecurity by *Paula Banerjee*
- ii. Narrated Time and Constructed Space: Remembering the Communal Violence of 1950 in Hooghly by *Anasua Basu Ray Chaudhury*
- iii. The Bengal-Bangladesh Borderland: Chronicles from Nadia, Murshidabad and Malda by *Paula Banerjee*
- iv. Voices of Women in the Borderlands by *Aditi Bhaduri*

### MODULE D: Birth of a Stateless Community: Rohingya Refugees in India

Core Faculty Member: *Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury*

### Concept Note

*Context:*

1. Forced Migration is a critical global issue today. Not merely in academic discourse but in understanding global inter-connectedness and the current profile of insecurity and vulnerability, forced migration plays an extremely important role. From the end of the Cold

War, forced migration (involving refugee flows, internal displacement, forced migration of women and children, migration in the wake of human rights violations, natural calamities, and humanitarian disasters, statelessness, illegal immigration of vulnerable people, victims of border violence and militarisation of borders, and trafficking in sex and labour) has emerged as a major phenomenon in the world.

2. Against this backdrop, understanding South Asian or South East Asian forced migration becomes even more crucial. South Asia and South East Asia is a greater migration-producing region. There are many reasons for this, including partition, religion, ethnicity, decreasing status of women, economic and resource crunch, new legal regimes that create marginalization of the vulnerable leading to their migration, new developmental paradigms that leave large groups distressed and destitute; etc. At present, there is no single, coherent theory of South Asian or Southern global migration, but only a fragmented set of theories that have developed largely in isolation from one another, sometimes but not always fractured along disciplinary boundaries.

*Origin of the Rohingya Problem:*

3. King Dragon Operation of the Myanmar Army in 1977 was aimed at scrutinizing each individual living in the state, designating citizens and foreigners in accordance with the law and taking actions against foreigners who have filtered into the country illegally. This military campaign directly targeted civilians, and resulted in widespread killings, rape and destruction of mosques and further religious persecution.

4. Due to this operation, the Rohingya population amounting to 200,000 living in the State of Arakan fled to Bangladesh in 1987. The Rohingya is a predominantly Muslim ethnic group living in the Arakan State of western Myanmar.

5. Section 3 of the Burma Citizenship Law, 1982 provided: "Nationals such as the Kachin, Kayah, Karen, Chin, Myanmar, Mon, Rakhine or Shan and ethnic groups as have settled in any of the territories included within the State as their permanent home from a period anterior to 1185 B.E., 1823 A.D. are Myanmar citizens." So the Rohingyas were excluded by this Act as a citizen of Myanmar. This actually made them Stateless as per the 1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons. At present Myanmar has about 800,000 stateless Rohingyas, without access to basic healthcare or education.

Issues of Protection in South Asian Countries:

6. Violent Burmese military campaigns have been waged against the Rohingyas leading to mass influxes into eastern Bangladesh in 1978 and 1991-1992. Faced with its own social and economic development challenges, the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) favored swift repatriation of the refugees and with the agreement of the Government of Myanmar a massive repatriation exercise was undertaken. Between 1993 and 1997 some 236,000 refugees were repatriated amidst accusations of coercion. Since 1992, the GoB has refused to recognize subsequent Rohingya arrivals and has prohibited their access to the two remaining refugee camps. Up to 2009, 29,127 are recognized as refugees with the UNHCR and live in Kutupalong and Nayapara camps. Registered refugees receive basic health services, primary education and food rations but about 4,271 of the camp residents were not properly

registered and thus are not considered as refugees by the GoB and consequently are barred from receiving food rations.

7. Rohingyas also faced problems while they were repatriated in Myanmar from Bangladesh. The Burmese authority sanctioned them as they were travelling without any travel documents. Many of the repatriated refugees returned back to Bangladesh and living in unauthorized camps in the Cox's Bazar District. They were not registered with the GoB or with the UNHCR.

8. According to the UNHCR, New Delhi there are about 5,500 Rohingya refugees and asylum-seekers from Myanmar registered in India spread across the states of Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Jammu, Haryana, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. Most of these people are living in makeshift camps in India. Government of India's decision to provide the registered refugees with long term visa and work permit are still not in place.

9. In the State of West Bengal more than thousand Rohingya people were prosecuted under the Foreigners Act, 1946 and sent to correctional homes. These people will be shifted to refugee camps only when these people get refugee status by the UNHCR.

10. Though India and Bangladesh are not parties to the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and 1961 Convention Relating to Reduction of Statelessness, but they are party to several other important human rights instruments like ICCPR, ICESCR, CEDAW and CRC. These human rights instruments create obligation on both the States to provide with basic humanitarian treatment to these people.

11. At this present juncture, detailed research to focus on the origin of the issue, current status of the Rohingyas in Myanmar and in other South Asian countries, issue of human rights and humanitarian dimensions and policy needs for South Asia should be taken into consideration.

12. The workshop will look at the following four themes broadly:

- i. History and Present Situation of Rohingyas in Myanmar, Bangladesh and India-Issue of Camps, Statelessness, Protracted Displacement, etc.
- ii. Human Rights, Humanitarian Necessity and Legal Protection to the Rohingyas under International Law and Domestic Legal Framework
- iii. Gender Perspective of the Rohingya Refugee Crisis
- iv. The Need for a Regional Policy for Protection

The draft studies on these issues will be discussed in the workshop keeping the importance of research, legal analysis and advice, advocacy, capacity building, media awareness and network building.

### **Reading Materials- Module D**

- i. Briefing the Burmese Rohingya Crisis on World Refugee Day Edited by M.S.K Jilani (USA) & Sadek (Malaysia)
- ii. Bangladesh Country of Origin Information (COI) Report by COI Service

- iii. Arakan Rohingya Union (ARU) Formed- Report in Brunei Times
- iv. A Critical Analysis of Refugee Protection in South Asia by Veerbhadran Vijayakumar
- v. Comparing the Impacts of Local People and Rohingya Refugees on Teknaf Game Reserve by Salim Uddin and Arfin Khan
- vi. Hear our Screams-Making a case for the Rohingya Genocide by Schabas
- vii. Is Citizenship the Answer-Constructions of belonging by Pugh
- viii. Myanmar-The Roots of Ethnic Conflict and Civil Unrest in Rakhine State
- ix. Preying on the Rohingya-Reuters Report
- x. Refugee Situation in South Asia-Need of A Regional Mechanism by Narayan Sharma
- xi. Refugee Protection and Regional Cooperation in Southeast Asia by Mathew and Harley
- xii. Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh and Thailand-Danish Immigration Service
- xiii. Sanctuary Under a Plastic Sheet-Grundy-Warr and Wong
- xiv. Statelessness-Forced Migration Review Issue No. 32
- xv. The Rohingya Crisis- ECHO fact sheet
- xvi. The Rohingya Issue-A Thorny Obstacle between Myanmar and Bangladesh by Nemoto
- xvii. The Rohingya-From Stateless to Refugee by Imtiaz Ahmad
- xviii. Tradition and Modernity in Myanmar-Gartner and Lorenz
- xix. Defining Myanmar's "Rohingya Problem" by Benjamin Zawacki



*Ozlen Celebi*



*Rashmi Doraiswamy*



*Md. Jalal Abbasi Shavazi*



*Subhas Ranjan Chakraborty*





## 8. Participants' Research Papers and Respective Abstracts

### Module A

Date of Presentation: 16 March (Monday)

Presenters	Themes of Presented Papers
Byasdeb Dasgupta	A Short Note on Class-Focused View of Forced Migration from the Lens of an Economist
Samata Biswas	Forced Migration and Fiction: A case Study of Sea of Poppies

### ***A Short Note on Class-Focused View of Forced Migration from the Lens of an Economist*** **by Byasdeb Dasgupta**

This paper is an attempt by the author to re-examine certain dominant perceptions regarding what is dubbed today as *forced migration*. The very idea of forced migration from the lens of an economist is tantamount to what Keynes in his *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* in 1936 termed as *involuntary unemployment*. The Keynesian concept of involuntary unemployment, which Keynes in the context of the Great Depression of 1930s described as that unemployment which is *generally* found in any money-using modern competitive market economy when an individual in the workforce of the country cannot find any employment at any money wage in the labour market irrespective of whether the particular individual searching for a job is skilled or not, educated or illiterate, or living in a rural or in an urban space of the economy. This in other words means that a person who is involuntarily unemployed is not unemployed out of his/her own choice. In fact, he/she has hardly any choice to make in the labour market with few exceptions in the present context of the global economy. Rather, he/she is not voluntarily unemployed. And in this regard the particular person, however rational he/she is as per mainstream neoclassical rationality postulate, does not have any choice to make between how much labour hours he/she will provide to the concerned employer and how much leisure hours he/she will have as per his/her own choice. So, this does not go hand in hand with the typical neoclassical tenet of an individual person's (who is in the labourforce of the country) freedom to make a choice of trade-off between labour hours to provide at the prevailing nominal wage rate and the leisure hours to enjoy at his/her own disposal.

Similarly, forced migration is quite akin to Keynesian notion of involuntary unemployment. As in Keynesian notion of involuntary unemployment, forced migration by the very qualifying adjective "forced" means it is involuntary. The migrant population who are compelled to do so are not at all doing this migration out of their voluntary choice. Secondly, as some of the post-Keynesian economists of our time has argued in favour of the Keynesian concept of uncertainty which to a great extent as per them may be held

responsible for the whims and fancies of capitalist money-using free market economy in terms of unpredictable nature of ups and downs in effective demand in the market and hence, an uncertainty in the generalized purchasing power of the commonplace in terms of holding money. Hence, this paper will make an attempt to indicate the following as far as the very nature of forced migration is concerned in this globalized socio-economic system of the day:

- (a) First of all, the paper will make an attempt to show that the border economy of West Bengal is not an abnormal space and neither a space outside capital or the space of world of the third; rather, it is a typical space of money-using market economy where money is non-neutral *a la* Keynes. However, the capitalism (global capitalism *per se*) has taken a form different from the one which we observe in a city space like Kolkata.
- (b) People living here do suffer from *money illusion* which goes a long way to decipher the typical political economy of the geographical space where physical geography and related natural environment do play a great role in determining/influencing this political economy.
- (c) The border economy witnesses two different kinds of forced migration – one from Bangladesh to this place and one from this space to other places of India and/or abroad. In these two kinds of migration the people who have migrated did do so involuntarily as they were subject to abject poverty, political violence and displacement or dislocation from their occupations in the region either due to modern economic development and/or natural factors like erosion in the Padma river banks.
- (d) A sense of uncertainty does prevail in the life forms of the people in the border economy including those who have migrated and who have not migrated which propels/impels people living in the area to migrate and even not migrate then to continue with their economic activities which remain mostly hidden as the law of the land does not want them to be foregrounded. What is therefore foreclosed either in terms of forced (out) migration or forced (in) migration with reference to the border economy of West Bengal is the reality which forces people to take to these (illegal) occupations out of no choice for themselves and/or out of sheer money-illusion.
- (e) Finally, what is unique about the border economy space of West Bengal is the fact even those who are stressed to migrate out in seeking alternative earning opportunities elsewhere (either within the state or within India or in abroad) never cut their socio-economic link with the space. This fact will facilitate to another dimension of political economy of the space and the forced migration that is happening persistently since last two decades at least.

Given these viewpoints, the paper will make an attempt to understand the nature and causes of forced migration vis-a-vis the political economy of border economy of West Bengal – an understanding which will try to refute the existing public opinion regarding the both (border economy as well as the forced migration to and from there) as something abnormal and hence, needs some public policy measures to normalise it (meaning to take to the path of mainstreaming which is the *mantra* of the present day public policy in India principally based or focused on the avowed neo-liberal agenda of *inclusive growth and sustainable development*).

## ***Forced Migration and Fiction: A Case Study of Sea of Poppies by Samata Biswas***

In *Sea of Poppies*, the ship, *Ibis*, serves as a powerful metaphor for the passage, the experience of both the experience of forced migration, within the novel- and the craft of fiction itself, both, in several broad sweeps, obliterating difference and engendering new, multiple identities. This paper is an attempt to read these sweeps; to analyse their contours and to investigate the assumptions behind them. The hope, of course is that the study of fiction would emerge as a powerful method in the field of forced migration studies, not merely as a repository of information, or description of experiences and suffering, but also as pointers towards elisions in metanarratives of inclusion. Instead of trying to say what a study of literature might bring to the field of forced migration studies, in this paper I look into texts dealing with borders and resource crisis to analyse how they treat the fictional works that they invoke. Interestingly, although not incidentally, these works deal with novels by Amitav Ghosh- not incidental since questions of movement, migration, loss and belonging have been central to Ghosh's work for several decades. Ghosh's book expectedly have received immense critical attention, and are obvious choices when enquiring into questions of migration, maps and territories. What interests me however, is how this critical attention towards Ghosh's work in the field of forced migration studies work.

The study of literature--fictional literature dealing seriously with forced migration, or in which forced migration (keeping in mind the complexities inherent in both "forced" and "migration") features as a significant thematic and structural component- as a conceptual and methodological tool in the field of forced migration. If critique, as Samaddar defines it, consists of working on the margin or threshold of existing ideas, then, literature surely is at the margins of the field of forced migration studies, dominated as it is, by various methods and methodologies of social science disciplines that look upon literature and the humanities as offering little more than information and entertainment and might have the potential to undertake a "critique". This paper, then, is an attempt to see how literature can become a powerful methodological tool in the field of forced migration studies.

### **Module B**

**Date of Presentation: 17 March (Tuesday)**

<b>Presenters</b>	<b>Themes of Presented Papers</b>
Anita Sengupta	The 'Migration State' and Labour Migrants in Central Asia
Diloram Karamat	State Building, Displacement and Statelessness
Priya Singh	Displacement in the West Asian Space: The Syrian Migration to Lebanon and Jordan
Neamatullah Neamat	Forced deportation of Afghan Nationals from Iran
Arpita Basu Roy	Returnees in Afghanistan: Impediments to Reintegration
Özlem Pehlivan	Impact of Syrian Refugee Crisis on Turkish International Migration Policy

### ***Labour Migration and the Gasterbaitery by Anita Sengupta***

In the post-Soviet situation it is common to think of migration as a “westward” process where the movement is from Russia to southern and western Europe, the United States or even Israel. There is however another kind of migration out of the former Soviet space into the Russian Federation and Kazakhstan inspiring the use of the term *gasterbaitery* (the Russianized plural form of the German word *Gasterbaiter* meaning unskilled or semi-skilled migrant labours). Russia and Kazakhstan’s resource fuelled building boom has transformed them into one of the world’s largest net recipients of migrant labour after the United States and post-Soviet states like Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan rank among the most remittance dependent states in the world. This has made migration an issue of considerable political commentary in both the states and in June 2012 President Putin signed into force a concept paper on Russia’s migration policy till 2025 which recommended changes to legislation that would require the testing of certain categories of migrant workers for their knowledge of Russian language, history and legislation. Similar changes to Kazakh legislation called for distinguishing between the ethno national vision of encouraging the *oralman* (ethnic Kazakhs who had migrated to other states, particularly Mongolia) and the securitization perspective of discouraging illegal migration. Despite the scale of the movement there are few detailed studies of the meaning of this migration for the migrants themselves, its resonance for domestic politics in receiving states and its implications for those on the move and their families left behind. In the states from where this migration originates policy makers have been preoccupied with the macro dimensions of the numbers who move, the amount of remittance and whether this movement should be restricted by actively encouraging locals to record the migration and ask for their return. While seasonal migration had always been a way for funding life cycle ceremonies, the present migration needs to be understood in terms of not just the lack of economic opportunities but also difficulties associated with remaining legal in circumstances where political capital is made out of their illegality but they are “tolerated” for economic reasons. The ways in which migration feeds into the nationalist discourses of both the sending as well as the recipient states also remains largely unexplored.

### ***State Building, Displacement and Statelessness by Diloram Karamat***

After the collapse of the Soviet Union the majoritarian nationalism that gained ground in the Central Asian states jeopardised the ethnic balance. This resulted in the movement of Russian minorities as a response to the anticipated loss of status and politicization of political life. In a number of cases it also led to statelessness. Large numbers of people with different ethnic backgrounds and holding Soviet documents discovered that new nationality laws of emerging sovereign states left them out of the definition of a citizen though in most cases constitutions recognized all people living within its territorial boundaries as citizens. However, not all of them acceded to UN conventions on refugees and statelessness. This was complicated by the fact that the history of borders in the region is problematic and the territories of the five states are closely interwoven with the existence of a number of enclaves. Post delimitation the borders were left flexible within a broader system where people shared a common Soviet passport and movement and employment was unrestricted. This, of course, changed in the post 1991 period. In most cases, as in the Ferghana Valley where populations were mixed movements, trade, marriages continued unhindered. Since movement across the borders in the valley did not require documentation old Soviet passports were often not changed to new national ones. From 1999 and particularly since

2005 when borders (like the Uzbek-Kyrgyz or Uzbek-Tajik) were fenced and visa regimes were introduced large numbers of people found themselves stateless. Statelessness is not just the result of circumstances (like the border brides of Central Asia) but also the result of events like riots that leave people without documentation (the Uzbek Kyrgyz riots in Osh). In recent times citizenship rules have been used in Uzbekistan as a political instrument to punish non-compliance with the ruling establishment and passports have been cancelled leaving nationals stranded in third countries.

### ***The Syrian Displacement by Priya Singh***

There is a lingering history of forced migration to, from, and within West Asia. The roots of forced displacement in the twentieth century can be traced to colonial experiences (Palestinians ousted from the territory which subsequently became Israel), post-colonial circumstances (as in the case of Kurdish refugees), civil war (Syrian and Lebanese refugees) and conflict and post conflict situations (Iraqi and Libyan refugees). Along with the instances and experiences of internal displacement, the region has also witnessed intersecting processes of forced displacement and enforced sedentarization of mobile and nomadic populations for whom movement and mobility are essential parts of their lives and livelihoods. Since the formation of the nation-states in the region, the borders between countries of West Asia have remained porous, enabling refugees to move reasonably effortlessly throughout the sub-region over the past century.

In the aftermath of the Arab Uprisings of 2011, the Syrian refugee crisis has assumed critical proportions as the nation is trapped in the midst of a civil war singularly characterised by the absence of proportionality, which has displaced vast numbers of Syrians from their homes and communities. Over 6.45 million (August 2014) were estimated to be displaced within Syria and more than 2.9 million (August 2014) exiled as refugees beyond Syria's borders, the great majority of them hosted by neighbouring countries who struggle to respond to the needs of the countless refugees that they host. The increasing sectarian nature of the conflict has raised fears as ethnic and sectarian conflicts tend to lead not only to large scale but also protracted displacement. Since March 2011, internal displacement has been widespread. Given both the direct and indirect effects of the conflict, millions of Syrians have left their communities in search of safety and survival and continue to move in search of security. Displacement in Syria as elsewhere is a dynamic process. People return to their homes to check on property and relatives, they go to stay with relatives in areas perceived as safer and then move on even if either conditions deteriorate or when they perceive it is no longer safe. Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey primarily but also Egypt and even Iraq have accommodated the Syrian refugees rather openhandedly. However, after almost three and a half years, they are feeling the strains in the form of growing social tensions in host communities, the competition between citizens and Syrian refugees for health care, shelter, water, employment and education. In Lebanon, it is the fear of spill over of violence which is the major concern. For Turkey, the large influx of Syrians raises serious questions about its relations with Syria and the broader region as well as about domestic ethnic sectarian relations within the country in addition to the crisis influencing Turkey's long standing Kurdish problem. The main political impact of the arrival of Syrian refugees has been felt in Kurdistan as it has given an impetus to the pro-Kurdish agenda in the region. In terms of the repercussions of the influx of the Syrian refugees on domestic political life in Jordan, it could threaten the tribal Bedouin base of the Hashemite kingdom, which has already been endangered by the Palestinian refugee presence. Egypt in the present state of affairs is principally concerned

about the security implications of continuing to allow large number of Syrians to enter their territory. These challenges call for an exhaustive yet inclusive approach to an analysis of what is a dynamic albeit enforced displacement both within and beyond the borders of Syria with its implications both for the nation itself and for the region at large.

### ***Forced Deportation of Afghan Nationals from Iran by Neamatullah Neamat***

The deportation takes place at two points in Afghanistan, one at Pool Abrisham (Abrisham Bridge) in Zaranj city Nimroz province at the south west of Afghanistan and the second point is in Islam Qala the border point between Iran and Herat province at the west of the country. Here we cover only that deportation that takes place through Pool Abrisham only.

It has been noticed that most of those Afghans trying to escape to Iran through various illegal channels have been forced to do so due to the ongoing poverty and unemployment in the country, although there are some other reasons as well, most of those individuals who try to go to Iran come from areas which is geographically surrounded with mountains and no hope for good employment has been noticed.

Starting 21 March -22 November 2014, 2031 families (1346 lead by male family member and the rest lead by female family member ) consisting 8465 Afghans including 1118 children were forced to cross the border from Iran to Afghanistan through Pool Abrisham. Almost all those deported had no legal documents to show that they could stay further in Iran, although there were hundreds of individuals who left behind their extended families since he or she was arrested by the Iranian authorities at some point and was no more allowed to join the family that was still in Iran and were illegally living there in order to get job and feed their families. At the same period 39581 individuals all single male Afghans including 2793 children were deported to Afghanistan through the same route. Also 643 vulnerable individuals(almost all male) including 205 children were forced to deport, although they were the victims who were either beaten, tortured in the Iranian custody, or injured by the Iranian police when trying to escape on the way to Iran, or even suffered injuries during various traffic incidents when trying to escape from the arrest of the Iranian police. Also some of those individuals were either sick and had no relative family or friends to take care of their health and alternatively preferred to surrender them self to the police in order to be arrested and deported back to Afghanistan through the nearest border where they were not supposed to pay for transportation charges . Most of those 643 individuals were given temporary shelter and food by IOM at a Camp inside the Afghan border and many of them were financially supported with transportation charges to their place of origin. At the same period it has been recorded that at least 42780 Afghans including 4014 children were illegally trafficked to Iran through various deserted border points between Iran and Afghans.( some others says that around 500-1000 individuals are flying to Iran on daily bases, something that has not been confirmed officially) Some of them were trafficked through the borders points between Iran and Kang district in Nimroz province and some others through KhubGah area that has been situated between Zaranjcity and ChaharBorjak district in Nimroz province. But a majority of them were trafficked first to ChaharBorjak district In Nimroz followed by going to Dak area that is around 60 Kilometers away from the district center of Chahar Borjak and is right on the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, later they have been delivered to the travel agents ( human traffickers) who then take the refugees to Mashkel and Marjawa area in Pakistan territory that is around 100 Kilometers way from Dak, and those two areas has been situated very close to the Pakistan Iran border. After having a rest



of two –three days the refugees have been taken than to the following areas one after another. First to the Iranian town near the border named Iran Shar followed by Khush then to Zahedan and at last to Kerman where they have been normally spread to other parts of the country.

### ***Returnees in Afghanistan: Impediments to Reintegration by Arpita Basu Roy***

Migration is often explained in terms of violent conflict or the attraction of labour markets in rich countries or urban centres. Although many other factors may be at play such as natural disasters, developmental projects, it is usually the political or economic causes which are used to distinguish between involuntary and voluntary migration respectively. It is becoming increasingly clear that this primarily causal framework may not do justice to the complexity of today's global migration flows, including those involving Afghans. Afghans are found in a range of places which includes countries in the neighbourhood (primarily Pakistan and Iran) and further abroad, forming networks, which are connected through the continuous circulation of people, money, goods and information. Neither the definition of "refugee" in international texts nor the various typologies of migration offer a satisfactory analytical framework to explain and understand the migratory strategies developed by the Afghans.

Recognizing regional realities are necessary and the legal categories that define refugees and returnees do not necessarily describe Afghans and their neighbours as they live, move, work, and intermix along Afghanistan's borders. Refugee and returnee movements are and have been part of larger social and economic processes that Afghans have engaged in and developed for generations if not centuries. This has been both a source of strength and a weakness for Afghans. On the one hand, this mobility has given them an important tool for coping with adversity. On the other, however, it has clouded their legal status, making it difficult to provide for their protection and search for durable solutions. Many of these people are neither refugees nor returnees, strictly speaking, and neither permanent local resettlement nor permanent refugees' returns are entirely appropriate outcomes.

In the case of Afghan refugees, repatriation has not been the panacea some had initially hoped. The fact that an interim government was established in Afghanistan in 2002 after the removal of the Taliban regime had in fact led to a peculiar phenomenon where both Iran and Pakistan started officially talking about full repatriation of the Afghans and threatened closure of refugee camps. Thus the real issues in sustainable reintegration and the importance and role of such migratory networks between these countries came to the fore. Afghanistan's immense poverty, poor socio-economic indicators, its ongoing security difficulties, decision of the international troops to pull out and the massive continuing migration across its borders all suggested that an exclusive emphasis on repatriation was neither "feasible nor desirable. The capacity of Afghanistan to absorb more returnees is stretched. On the other hand, research suggests that returns program since 2002 may not have been as ruinous as some feared. Afghans do not appear to feel they were forced to repatriate, and they have moved back to an Afghanistan that closely matches their own economic circumstances. Indeed, given the lack of regulation at the border with Pakistan and the continued ability of Afghans to work in Pakistan and especially Iran, the status quo may not have been all that different had assisted returns been much fewer — that is, many Afghans would have continued to live and work on both sides of the border, crossing frequently for social and economic reasons.

The complex myriad of Afghanistan's institutional weakness, conflicting land laws and regulations, the multiple layers of disputes, the weak judicial system, the powerful elites that act with impunity, and the predominantly landless nature of returning refugees, are some of the most serious obstacles to successful reintegration of Afghan returnees. Without access to land, it is extremely difficult to provide other basic services to returnees. As a result, they will likely continue to migrate to the urban informal settlements *en masse*. More flexible definitions for the moving Afghans and intermediate solutions for Afghans in the border regions include solutions that should involve exploring ways to guarantee refugee and returnee rights within a broader human rights framework, focusing and coordinating development strategies simultaneously on both sides of the border to provide a better foundation for monitoring and normalizing the extensive cross-border traffic.

### ***Impacts of Syrian Refugee Crises on Turkish International Migration Policy*** **by Özlem Pehlivan**

Four years ago, when the so-called Arab Spring began, it was discussed whether Turkey would be a part of these events. Today, we see that Turkey is a part of this with more than one million refugees from its neighbor, Syria.

The aim of this presentation is to define the current situation in Turkey in relation with refugees, specifically the Syrians. It is claimed that Turkey is establishing a new refugee regime at domestic level. Latest Syrian refugee crisis, just like 1991 Iraqi refugee crisis, has led major structural, legal and institutional changes in Turkey in relation with the refugee policy.

Actually, this is not the first massive refugee flow from a neighboring country to Turkey. One of the major crisis of forced migration in post-Cold War period did occur in 1991, consisting of Kurdish people who fled from Iraq. The second and the biggest crises is the result of a civil war in Syria. Turkey received those people with open arms, officially speaking Turkey did follow an "open door" policy.

It is possible to define push and pull factors in case of Syrian refugees in Turkey. There's no doubt that they were forced to flee from Syria because of civil war. Despite the fact that war is the main push factor for many Syrian refugees there are millions of internally displaced people in Syria who could not leave their countries due to several reasons. Furthermore, it is obvious that economic environment in Syria as well as Iraq is very much deteriorated and may also be considered as a push factor.

Pull factors can be described mainly as geographic location of Turkey which has long land and sea borders both with the EU and refugee sending Middle Eastern countries; historical ties, religion and kinship. Furthermore Turkey's expanding economy is a source attraction for many transit migrants. Since the Syrian crisis began in 2011, Turkey is estimated to host almost two million Syrians. Turkey has maintained an emergency response of a consistently high standard and declared a temporary protection regime, ensuring *non-refoulement* and assistance in 22 camps. In 2014, Turkey also witnessed an unprecedented increase in asylum applications from Afghans, Iraqis and Iranians. Deteriorating security in Iraq saw a sudden increase in Iraqi refugees: an estimated 81,000 were in Turkey by September 2014, with numbers expected to grow to 100,000 by year-end. The number of refugees and asylum-seekers in Turkey in 2015 is expected to rise.

While Turkey still maintains the geographical limitation to the 1951 Convention, the Law on Foreigners and International Protection which came into force in April 2014 provides the legal basis for protection and assistance for asylum-seekers and refugees, regardless of their country of origin.

In accordance with the geographical limitation to the 1951 Convention, Turkey does not accept non-European asylum seekers as refugees. This “geographic limitation” causes conceptual confusion. Turkey defined these asylum-seekers or non-European refugees as “guests” in the early days of this influx. In order to prevent this ambiguity, Turkey amended its legislation on this issue and made a new law and issued a direction.

This refugee influx with a great number of people is leading to a turning point in Turkey’s immigration policy.

Turkey also established Directorate General for Migration Management. But, it is not enough to overcome this problem. Many institutions –Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency, Red Crescent, Ministry of Foreign Affairs- are working together.

### **Module C**

**Date of Presentation: 18 March (Wednesday)**

<b>Presenters</b>	<b>Themes of Presented Papers</b>
Atig Ghosh	Sehnsucht? Survival and Resilience in the IndoBangladesh Enclaves
Paula Banerjee	Continuum of Violence: The Case of Indo-Bangladesh Border
Sucharita Sengupta	On the edge: Women- Life and Confinement
Subir Rana	Contested Boundaries, Negotiated Lives, Shadow Economies: Case Of Indo-bangaldesh Border Regionand BCIM-EC
Rimple Mehta	Mobility across Borders and Continuums of Violence
Swagato Sarkar	Economy of Exception: A political economy of violence at the Indo-Bangladesh border areas

### ***Sehnsucht ? Survival and Resilience in the Indo-Bangladesh Enclaves by Atig Ghosh***

This paper studies the numerous Indo-Bangladeshi enclaves, which are sprinkled along the international border of Bangladesh and India, collectively known as *chhitmabal*, and how they constitute a bizarre political geography. Most of these enclaves are in the Cooch Behar and Jalpaiguri districts of West Bengal, India, and in the Kurigram, Nilphamari, Lalmonirhaat and Pachagarh districts of Bangladesh. The word *chhit* ordinarily invokes a number of senses in Bengali. It may mean a fragment, a piece or portion (as of a cloth); it may mean a drop or a blob (as of ink); alternately, when used to describe a person, it suggests eccentricity — that

the person thus described is dotty. The appositeness of the first two senses of the word in describing the enclaves is self-evident. However, the third sense is also not wide of the mark. It is rumoured that the enclaves came into being when the king of Cooch Behar and the Mughal faujdar of Rangpur used land in high stake chess games in the seventeenth century — an eccentric origination surely. Even if one considers the claim made in such a fantastic story to be misleading, it has to be admitted that the enclaves represent a markedly unusual example of political and human geography. That the chhits paid taxes to one state but were surrounded by the territory of another state, however, did not render them intractable to the revenue collectors of precolonial and colonial South Asia. The overarching anxiety, so to speak, about territorial contiguity comes with decolonization and what can be described as the birth of the modern nation-state. The ambition of the modern nation-state to produce gaunt, clear-cut borders was belied in the fastnesses of North Bengal. The Boundary Commission somewhat hurriedly ‘drew’ the border between India and East Pakistan basing itself on district maps rather than field surveys. Presence of patchwork jurisdiction further complicated, and ultimately scrambled, the border-drawing exercise in the north. The patchy and amorphous ‘border’ that emerged therefore was more in the nature of a ‘frontier’. Attempts to tame this obstreperous frontier were at the root of the production of a stateless population in North Bengal. To begin with, however, one needs to establish if, from the legal point of view, the people of the chhitmahal qualify as stateless. The International Law Commission observes that the definition of a stateless person contained in Article 1(1) of the 1954 Convention is now an integral part of customary international law. Both the 1954 Convention and the 1961 Convention exclusively deal with the issue of statelessness. Both these legal instruments explain statelessness predominantly in two ways: *de jure* and *de facto*. This paper argues that the people living on the chhits are *de facto* stateless persons who are outside the country of their nationality and hence are unable — or, for valid reasons, are unwilling — to avail of the protection of that country. Protection in this sense refers to the right of diplomatic protection, exercised by the state of nationality in order to remedy an internationally wrongful act against one of its nationals, as well as diplomatic and consular protection and assistance generally, including repatriation. This situation may be evidenced in practice by, for instance, the refusal of the country of nationality to allow him or her to return home, even though it still recognizes the individual as a national. In such a situation, the person may also fall under the definition of a ‘refugee’ depending on the circumstances and refugees are indeed the numerically most important category of *de facto* stateless persons. Viewed in the light of the above elaboration, the residents of the Indo-Bangladeshi chhits are victims of *de facto* statelessness. It is true that in terms of legal straitjackets and definitional imperatives, it may seem that the enclaves are still part of the territory of the mainland state and, as such, the prerequisite for *de facto* statelessness (being outside country of nationality) is not met. In theory and in terms of public opinion, they are citizens or nationals of either India or Bangladesh (previously East Pakistan). However, due to the gradual tightening of national territoriality in the early 1950s, they have in practice been rendered *de facto* stateless. Having said this, it must also be mentioned that the enclave dwellers belong to the somewhat rare group of *de facto* stateless people who are not, at the same time, refugees: for, they live in little ‘islets’ of land that legally belong to the mother country but are completely cut off from it and surrounded by a foreign country. No benefits of citizenship, of belonging to a state, are available to these people at all. Based on extensive interviews with local officials, political groups and inhabitants of the chhits, this paper concludes that there are borders in the mud that may prove elusive and there are borders in the mind that are terrifying. The chhit, in this latter sense too, exists. There is always the fear of imminent foreignness: the scary prospect of being prosecuted as trespassers by the

national selfish giants. Between the polarities of law and crime, we know, there is the immense range of quasi legality, compromise, necessary illegality, malfeasance, petty crimes, and so on, and obviously the people of the enclaves have liberally made use of these strategies to survive. In doing so, if these people have normalized their state of precariousness, then it amounts to a psychopathological condition that is best avoided.

### ***Continuum of Violence: The Case of Indo-Bangladesh Border by Paula Banerjee***

The present state system in South Asia, and the state system of the subcontinent in particular, is a result largely of the division of the eastern and western parts of the erstwhile united India, which gave birth to three states: India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. The borders dividing these countries are markers of bitter history, current separate, distinct, and independent existence, but also the sign of the territorial integrity of these states. The bitterness of the past has been exacerbated by the lack of mutual confidence in the present. Added to that are security concerns because two of the three states have “the bomb”. This makes the state borders in this region extremely contentious. Globalisation brought about thousand and one linkages across these borders that make these borders and migration across them a unique phenomenon. The fact that South Asian borders are lines of hatred, disunity, communal discord, humanitarian crisis, human rights abuses, informal connections and voluminous informal trade, are securitised and militarised with heavy paramilitary presence, and are viewed with enormous suspicion makes migration a violent affair. Yet migration across these borders never stops. While the Indo-Pakistan border (including the Line of Control) is in the eye of world attention, therefore closely monitored, the border in the East – Indo-Bangladesh border – remains neglected in terms of attention. Security concerns overwhelm all other equally legitimate concerns and values in this region and anybody subverting the border even by crossing it is perceived of as a threat to national security. National security is often equated and interchangeably used with military security and that is the trope of security that tends to dominate over human security in the border region. As a result of this, states often forget that borders are not only lines to be guarded, they are also lines of humanitarian management, because borders are not lines but borderlands – that is to say these are areas where people live, pursue economic activities, and lead civilian lives attuned to the realities of the borders. Human security in the borderlands would mean first security of the civilian population along the borderlines. This means the security of the people who live in this area and the ones who traverse it. Yet these are the people whose security is most notoriously undermined by those who are meant to protect the borders.

This paper written in the context of Indo-Bangladesh border discusses how this region becomes the epicentre of insecurity and how any efforts to securitise the region actually leads to growing violence and insecurity of people who find themselves there. They are there sometimes from their own compulsions and at other times historically they found themselves in that space. Their presence in the border areas is by no means to challenge the nation form. Yet border people are often seen as aberration and instruments for subversion of national sovereignty. The significant way to control state borders is still considered to be violent administrative interventions even by otherwise well intentioned people. State violence leads to other forms of violence and suspicions of violence. So much so that in border areas no one is above suspicion be they people living in the border, crossing it or guarding it.

### ***On the Edge: Women--Life and Confinement by Sucharita Sengupta***

While analyzing the cross border migration of people across the West Bengal- Bangladesh borderlands, the paper aims to unravel the vulnerability of women migrants from Bangladesh to India, who knowingly or unknowingly – illegally –have crossed the demarcation line between the two territories and have landed in many prisons in this side of the border. Prison as a space in this paper is used as a prism through which the paper tries to analyze the porous, precarious, mobile and dynamic nature of the Bengal borderland and the flows- both human and goods across it. Drawn arbitrarily on a paper, this particular borderland has never been passive since its birth; rather it has a very vibrant space along with a strong parallel economy. Although a vast array of literature exist on the Bengal Borderland, the legal dimension of crossing it, in particular the forced uniformity or adhocism of law for all illegal immigrants from Bangladesh have not been discussed at length. Thus in seeking answers to what constitutes justice and freedom for these women, this paper explores the narratives of Bangladeshi women and also Rohingyas– a stateless community from Myanmar - in four Correctional Homes of West Bengal – The Balurghat District Correctional Home (South Dinajpur District), Behrampur Central Correctional Home (Murshidabad District), Dumdum Central Correctional Home (North 24 Parganas) and Alipore Women Correctional Home (Kolkata). The purpose of choosing these correctional homes is deliberate. These homes have the maximum number of inmates who are Bangladeshi nationals- both men and women. Against this backdrop, the paper tries to address three research inquiries: The nature of population flows, the question of legality, illegality and detention of ‘illegal migrants’ in Bengal jails and the violation of dignity, rights and justice of the detainees. The first attempts to map the nature of cross border population flow through the study of the aforesaid correctional homes, the second deals with problems that the women inmates face in the prisons and the third dwells on how the eastern part of the border is important for shaping frontiers of new identities– how borderlands are markers of multiple/merged identities, religion and nationality and how borders constantly negotiate between communities and new identities are evolved through this.

### ***Peripheral Spaces, Contested Boundaries: Case of Indo-Bangladesh Border Region by Subir Rana***

Borders and borderlands have always been highly contestable regions especially for modern nation states and an interesting scholarly exercise for academics and researchers. It is a paradox that though the promise of globalization assures porous and diffused borders with a constant flow of material, non-material and human traffic (both legitimate and illegitimate) crisscrossing national boundaries and become part of what can broadly be called ‘regimes of circulation’ with hybrid cultures, creole religion and kitsch languages. Borders are radical zones and support a large population by providing sustenance and major source of livelihood for people on both sides. Moreover, with the onset of globalization, this traffic of material and non-material artifacts has increased in intensity and has resulted in a rich interaction of the local with the global. These are reciprocal relationship and exchange influences the political systems and legal apparatus along with influencing notions like citizenship, sovereignty, marginality, regionalism and issues of migration policy, insurgency, ethnic mobilization and conflict etc. Such concerns have also resulted in a ‘scopic’ regime and governmentality of fringe population on the borders which may a time leads to violence and bloodshed affecting bilateral ties between nations. Even though national boundaries in



popular discourse are perceived to be cartographic markers, yet, history has shown how such lines lead to violence, displacement and affects bilateral ties. Borders and borderlands have divided people, influenced economy and cultures and have a bearing on diplomatic relations and foreign policy.

An important case of borders turning into disputed areas and affecting international relations has been between India and Bangladesh. The Indo-Bangladesh region is a contested space owing first of all to the historicity and conditions under which Bangladesh was born. For almost more than half a century, both the nations have been battling over issues that affect both the nations in economic, political and strategic terms. These include issues of human trafficking, informal trade (food, machinery, textiles, consumer goods, intermediate goods etc besides others like smuggling of cattle (worth around \$81,000 every day) and contraband items like arms and narcotics have attained the status of full fledged parallel economy and a lucrative industry for those involved. These issues attain special significance due to the proposed regional economic cooperation called BCIM-Economic Corridor and involve Bangladesh, China, India and Myanmar which will boost the economy and give a fillip to bilateral relations of the nations involved.

My paper tries to address issue of human trafficking on the Indo-Bangladesh border. It will deal with the factors and nodes that contribute to the trafficking infrastructure, insurgency as well as the controversy surrounding 'enclaves' or 'no man's land.' These and many more issues will also focus on the question of citizenship and sovereignty of the two nation states

### ***Mobility across Borders and Continuums of Violence by Rimple Mehta***

The modern state is a gendered state with power and security as its cornerstones (Mohsin, 2004). According to Kannabiran (2005:3-4), "Shame, guilt, honour, chastity, immorality, virginity, lust, bestiality, ravishment, modesty, outrage, molestation, penetration, consent, and rape are words that, by themselves, through usage alone, constitute sexual terrorism, which is deeply entrenched in the discourses of the state." Gender inequality is inherent in the militarist security ideology and practices of a militarised state and society. It privileges homogenising and hegemonising processes geared towards creating a mutually exclusive identity of its citizens, one which distinguishes them from 'foreigners'. Banerjee and Basu Ray Chaudhury (2011: xvii) observe, the border is a 'site where this contest over inclusion and exclusion is played out every day' and in turn 'becomes a zone of endemic violence where masculinity is privileged'.

The trajectory of violence in the lives of women engaging in transborder mobility can be plotted along a continuum where the border becomes one moment and site of violence in a series of violent experiences. Being masculinised and militarised the border becomes the breeding ground for gender based violence. In this context, the paper will discuss the experiences of violence in the lives of Bangladeshi women in Correctional Homes in Kolkata. Their narratives suggest that perpetrators and sites of violence change but the Indo-Bangladesh border remains central to their experiences of violence. This paper will focus on the violence experienced by these women before crossing the border, while crossing the border to come to India, during their stay in India and while returning to Bangladesh; coupled with emotions of fear, anxiety and shame. Their experiences of violence need to be seen in the context of their non-normative ways of being – their challenge to the norms

instituted for women by the family, state and society. Their so called deviations from normative modes of behaviour put them in situations of extreme vulnerability.

Violence, in this paper is being looked at in terms of its structural, material, legal, social and embodied forms. Experiences of violence faced by women at the borders are significantly marked by sexual violence. Their body is perceived as overtly sexualised and easily available. How does one then explain this contradiction with the sacrosanct image of the Bharat Mata that the Border Security Forces believe they are meant to guard? Or is it that the bodies of women who are not Indian can be violated for the sake of India's security? This apart, violence inflicted on these women may not be directly at the border as a physical, geographical site but is induced by its exclusionary and inherently violent nature. This brings us to the question of whether we can look at the border as a merely political or geographical space or does it ramify itself into a normative socio-cultural space? What kind of subjectivities does this multi headed hydra known as the border creates? How does it further marginalise women and create situations of vulnerability? In turn, how do women subvert these situations of vulnerability and create safe spaces for themselves? These are some of the questions through which this paper will navigate.

### ***Economy of Exception: A Political Economy of Violence at the Indo-Bangladesh Border Areas by Swagato Sarkar***

This paper explores the political economy of illegal trafficking and violence on and around the Bengal-Bangladesh border. The border forcefully divides and disrupts the flow of population and commodities. It does not allow normal everyday trade to take place between the two countries. However, there is a difference in prices and availability of commodities between these countries and the suppressed possibility of trade is exploited by the smugglers. Seeing this way, the border divides the land into two mercantile spaces between which profit can be earned. Nevertheless, the border not only creates mercantile division, supported by the development of networks through which illicit goods flow, but it is a site of production of newer commodities (for example, house wives and adolescent girls become sex workers), deployment of labour, and monopolisation or consolidation of smuggling business by reducing autonomous groups of petty smugglers into labourers or contract workers. The presence of networks and the markets along the border facilitate this production process. The very presence of the border renders everything that passes through as illegal unless it has the stamp of approval of the state's authority: it can mark commodities (from salt to heroin and arms) as illicit and illegal. This paper proposes a methodological shift from network and flow to site of production and power and dwells upon the production of spatial and exceptional economies on the border where it can be called a state of exception, non-homogeneous, and under constant reconstitution.



***S. Parasuraman, Ranabir Samaddar and Md. Jalal Abbasi Shavazi***



## Module D

**Date of Presentation: 19 March (Thursday)**

Presenters	Themes of Presented Papers
Madhura Chakraborty	Stateless and Suspect: Rohingyas in Myanmar, Bangladesh and India
Priyanca Mathur Velath and Kriti Chopra	The Stateless People – Rohingyas in Hyderabad, India
Sahana Basavapatna	The contours of “traditional hospitality”: A study of Rohingyas in India
Suchismita Majumder	Rohingyas languishing behind the bar
Suhita Saha	Rohingya Refugees: Background and Evolution

### ***Stateless and Suspect: Rohingyas in Myanmar, Bangladesh and India by Madhura Chakraborty***

The stateless people numbering at least up to 10 million represent a rupture in the very fabric of our imagined geography of a world neatly divided into bordered nation-states. Non-citizens, nowhere people yet in most cases, the stateless populations are ‘subjected non-subjects’: without rights, but not without the state’s disciplinary interventions and discrimination. In my paper I will examine how nation-states treat the stateless population with particular reference to the Rohingyas in Myanmar, Bangladesh and India.

Native to Arakan or the Rakhine State of today’s Myanmar, even the nomenclature ‘Rohingya’ denoting this minority Muslim community is currently the subject of controversy in the country. The Burman and Buddhist dominated leadership of the country has long treated them as illegal Bangladeshi infiltrators. Since the late 1970s, the Rohingyas have been present in large numbers in Bangladesh, particularly in the Cox’s Bazar area across the Naff river separating the Rakhine State from Bangladesh, in refugee camps and elsewhere. Increasing hostility towards the Rohingya under the Awami League Government in Bangladesh and continuing discrimination and violence against them in Myanmar has meant that large numbers of Rohingya are now seeking shelter in India. A large number of the community are also taking to the seas in precarious journeys to reach countries of South East Asia particularly Malaysia. However, the treatment of the Rohingya in SE Asian countries like Thailand and Malaysia lie outside the scope of the present paper.

Myanmar, Bangladesh and India have a shared colonial past that has shaped their present borders and histories to a great extent.

I have relied mostly on secondary ethnographies, newspaper reports and theoretical writings for this paper. I have also conducted group interviews with seven Rohingya girls at a shelter for minors in Kolkata, India and an interview with a member of the Calicut based Relief and Charitable Foundation of India which is a Muslim charitable organisation working with Rohingyas.

In the paper I argue that the history of this region, coupled with the post 9/11 regime of securitisation and the increasing currency of the discourse of terrorism and the concurrent rise of Islamophobia, have combined to make the plight of the Rohingyas precarious in ways that are difficult to redress. The Rohingyas' claims upon citizenship and humanitarian assistance are repeatedly repudiated through the discourses of (il) legitimacy and security that reinforce the tenuous and often arbitrary borders between these three nation-states.

***The Stateless People – Rohingyas in Hyderabad, India by Priyanca Mathur Velath and Kriti Chopra***

Statelessness refers to a phenomenon whereby a person does not have a nationality or citizenship of any country under the operation of its law. There are a number of causes for this phenomenon of statelessness to occur, however one of the reasons maybe the conflict which exists in the laws of Nationality. The term Rohingya has been a matter of debate for a long time now. To some Rohingyas are a group of people who originally belong to Bengal and migrated to Burma during the colonial times whereas the other school of thought states that Rohingyas are a part of Arakan in Myanmar. Whatever their origin might be the Rohingya due to their statelessness have been facing a number of challenges not only in Myanmar but also to the countries they have been migrating to. This paper specifically aims to look into the kind of challenges the Rohingyas face in India, particularly in south India, in Hyderabad.

Rohingya refugees have been crossing the international border and coming into India for a long time now. Delhi, being the national capital and the seat of the UNHCR office is naturally the place they get pulled to. According to UN estimates around 11,000 Rohingyas have moved to various parts of India in the aftermath of communal violence since June 2012. After sustained efforts and coordination with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), 80 Rohingyas have been given refugee status, another 200 are now refugee certificate holders and 700 are yet to receive a letter of appointment from UNHCR. (TOI, 2013) Apart from New Delhi many have moved into Jammu in North India, Pune in West India and Hyderabad in South India. According to Malla Reddy, Joint Commissioner of Police, Special Branch, Hyderabad, many Rohingyas end up in Hyderabad while others move to Delhi, Aligarh, Mathura, Kolkata and other places.

The process of addressing any refugee issues has been hindered by the lack of an effective legal framework in India. If issues have been dealt in the past they have often been politically motivated or actions have been taken mainly to improve diplomatic relations with a particular country. The existing laws in India like the Foreigner's Act of 1946 are completely outdated in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In India, refugees are placed under three broad categories. Category I refugees receive full protection from the Indian government (for example, Tamil refugees from Sri Lanka) Category II refugees are those who are granted refugee status by the UNHCR and are protected under the principle of *non-refoulement* (for example, Burmese and Afghan refugees); and Category III refugees who are neither recognised by the Indian government nor the UNHCR but have entered India and assimilated into the local community (for example, Chin refugees from Burma living in the state of Mizoram). Now the question arises that India needs a refugee law what are the advantages of framing this law. Till there is further clarity on the legal framework within which refugees and stateless persons stay on Indian soil, people like the Rohingyas will always be living in a state of

limbo. The paper will try to document Rohingya testimonies through primary interviews and establish the situation of refugees/.stateless persons in India.

***The Contours of ‘Traditional Hospitality’: A Study of Rohingyas in India by Sahana Basavapatna***

This essay seeks to locate the rights of Rohingyas – recognized as de jure stateless but refugees in India – in the context of slums, where a large part of those living in Delhi and Mewat are known to live. Forced migration studies focusing for instance on the city of Delhi has documented in considerable detail the abysmal living condition of refugees. In themselves, they make for a compelling account of the state of refugees but remain largely descriptive, without explaining why the quality of protection of refugees remains arguably in a limbo. While it may be argued that the absence of a national law, with institutions that would define a refugee from a mere foreigner is evidence enough for their precariousness, there is little analysis of what I call the second tier of barriers that impact the exercise of their rights. Thus, reporting on the quality of life of refugee communities in the city has failed to account for the material conditions that are marked by acute poverty, discrimination, and absence of opportunities within the broader legal institutional framework, even while generously employing the language of rights. Relying on existing scholarship that has analysed various actors, institutions and programmes of slum “improvement” and “resettlement”, in the context of Delhi, this essay attempts to comprehend the legal and institutional frame that governs slums, urban spaces that significant populations of Rohingyas occupy in Delhi, Mewat and Jammu. One of the objectives of this essay then is to attempt to answer the following questions: In what ways does shelter of this nature stop Rohingyas from fulfilling their basic needs? What success stories, if any, do experiences of people reveal? In what ways do the refugees' access to these unauthorized/slum areas in the city speak to the body of rights, both under international law as well as its domestic variety? Grounding this research within an understanding of the slum in an urban setting is irrelevant for yet another reason. In the last decade, UNHCR has emphasized urban spaces as the site of care where it also seeks to make “selfreliance” achievable. It must be stated though that this shift in thinking from the “camp” to the “urban areas” is alive not only to the rapid urbanization of cities across the globe but also to the host country conditions, which in India's case is in the nature of a “generous host” and “humanitarian”, in specific reference to India's policy towards Rohingyas.<sup>3</sup> But, to repeat, neither characterizing Indian refugee policy as “generous” nor the aspirations of the international refugee agency for the care of refugees as “humanitarian” can or should be seen in a vacuum. The material conditions of refugees have both, a direct bearing on and reflective of the politics of care and limits of humanitarianism.

This research attempts to cover 4 cities (Jaipur in Rajasthan, Hyderabad in Telangana, Jammu in Jammu & Kashmir, Mewat in Haryana and Delhi) over a period of 5 months. In the first leg of the study, which this paper currently reflects, primary data covers Delhi and Mewat. In the second leg, the study intends to analyse data from Jaipur (Rajasthan), Jammu (Jammu and Kashmir) and Hyderabad (Telangana). However, since the author has been in touch with the Rohingyas in Jammu for the last few years, information from either visits or available documentation has also been used where appropriate. The UNHCR, the Foreigners Regional Registration Office, Delhi (FRRO) and UNHCR's implementing partner, the Socio Legal Information Centre was also contacted on specific queries with respect to their mandate vis-à-vis Rohingyas. Secondary data includes research carried out by UNHCR and

its implementing partners, cases decided or pending in courts as well as RTI information sought from various ministries and departments on the applicable law. At the time of submitting this draft of the essay, replies to the RTI application was not received. The primary data gathered for the purposes of this study is based on unstructured interviews with Rohingyas in Delhi and Mewat. Institutions who have helped provide relief materials to Rohingyas, such as the Social Welfare Trust (affiliated to Jamaati Islami Hind) were contacted.

### ***Rohingyas Languishing behind the Bar by Suchismita Majumder***

Though India is not a signatory of 1951 Convention and it does not have a national policy on Refugees India has long tradition of hospitality. It is reflected over years. India has accommodated thousands of refugees from neighbouring countries ever since it became free. During the last three decades illegal migration from Bangladesh to India are going on unabated. In this background the Rohingyas from Myanmar are the new challenge to the Government of India and also to the civil society.

Rohingya is a Muslim ethnic group from the northern Rakhine state of western Myanmar, formerly known as Arakan state. Rohingyas are an ethnic, linguistic, and religious minority both in Myanmar and in their province Rakhine. They are a group of stateless minority whose status as citizens of that country, and human rights in general, have been severely curtailed by the Burmese government.

Since independence in 1948, governments in the predominantly Buddhist country have routinely persecuted and forcibly displaced the Rohingya population, altering the ethnic profile of Arakan State. They have been subjected to repeated forced displacement along with persecution.

In 1974, at the time of constituting Rakhine State from the former Arakan Division, the Emergency Immigration Act downgraded Rohingya to possessing only foreign registration cards rather than national registration certificates. In 1978, the Myanmar military commenced the Nagamin (or Dragon King) operation which allegedly resulted in widespread violence (Human Rights Watch 1996). Some 200,000 Rohingya fled to Bangladesh. In 1982, the revised Myanmar Citizenship Law excluded Rohingya from the list of 135 national ethnic groups. It caused Rohingya to become stateless and more vulnerable to arbitrary denial of rights. Then in 1991–1992, after the disputed multi-party elections won by the National League for Democracy, the Myanmar military commenced another campaign called Pyi Thaya (or Prosperous Country). The intensified post-election clampdown led to a second exodus. Some 250,000 Rohingya crossed into Bangladesh while another 15,000 ultimately made their way to Malaysia. Violence against Muslims in the state has continued over the years

The number of Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh has increased since violence in neighbouring Arakan State in Myanmar erupted between Muslim Rohingya and Rakhine Buddhists in 2012 which caused some of the 140,000 internally displaced to attempt to flee across the border. A month after the June violence, on July 12, President Thein Sein called for “illegal” Rohingya to be sent to “third countries.”



Anyway Bangladesh has closed its door to one of the most “persecuted minorities” in the world, saying they are not Bangladeshi, while earlier it allowed a restricted number to enter the country (about 30,000 registered Rohingyas, supported by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees). So sandwiched between the Buddhist-dominated Myanmar and Muslim-dominated Bangladesh, the Rohingyas are entering India. In recent weeks, scores of Rohingya-men, women and children have been nabbed in West Bengal and the North-eastern states of Tripura, Mizoram and Manipur.

In this backdrop the present study is conducted among 58 Rohingya people among who 38 are men and 20 are women in West Bengal. The study has also covered 10 people (5 Men+5Women) who are claiming themselves as Bangladeshi but the court is treating them as “Rohingya”. All these people (68) are in the Correctional Homes of west Bengal (North Zone).

- The paper attempts to explore the causes (including gender violence) and consequences of the forced migration faced by the Rohingyas.
- The paper seeks to understand the complexity that arises regarding the identity (Rohingya / Bangladeshi) of individual.
- The paper aims to reflect the missing link between the Judiciary, Police Authority, Department of Correctional Administration, UNHCR and the Victims. The absence of protection regime contributes to vulnerability of a group of the victims of forced migration.
- The study attempts to understand the factors that lead the Rohingya people to come in India. Do they seek refuge temporarily / do they want to live here permanently? What will be the stance of India in this regard?
- Finally the paper seeks to come out with some recommendations to deal with the crisis.

### ***Rohingya Refugees: Background and Evolution by Suhita Saha***

The Rohingya Muslim ethnic minority in Burma have been called “the most oppressed people on Earth”. They continue to suffer vicious attacks and systematic abuse by Burma’s government. Denied use of their name in the recent census, Burma’s government now wants to fully erase their existence, asking the United States, the United Nations and the rest of the world not to even use the word Rohingya. Although during the Burmese post-independence period Rohingya’s claim of separate ethnic identity was recognized by the democratic government of Premier U Nu (1948-1958). If we look at the recent situation, in the beginning of 2015, Arakan Rohingya National organization (ARNO) strongly condemns the recent action of the Commanding Officer of Border Guard Police (BGP) Tin KoKo for threatening the innocent Rohingya villagers into accepting “Bengali” in the citizenship verification under 1982 Citizenship Law as their racial name in accordance with the wishes of the government. The Burma Citizenship Law of 1982 is an oppressive law enacted by late dictator Ne Win in violation of customary international Law and human rights standards. If we go back to history, the Rohingya were full and natural citizens by 1947 and 1974 constitutions and as such they do not legally require applying for citizenship under 1982 citizenship law.

This paper intends to deal with the historical evolution of the identity of “Rohingya” with special reference to the different phases of history starting from Chandra dynasty (788-957 AD) to SPDC Military Government Rule(1988- 1999).

### ***Statelessness and National Security Dynamics: Case Study of the Rohingya Refugees in India by Srimanti Sarkar***

Statelessness can be defined as that state of denial by virtue of which an individual or a group of individuals loses their identity as nationals in a particular country. According to the United Nation (UN) Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons adopted on 28 September 1954 and enforced on 6 June 1960, a ‘stateless person’ is someone ‘who is not considered as a national by any State under operation of its law’. Since everyone has the right to a nationality, lack of effective nationality or lack of formal recognition due to ‘statelessness’ practically leads to negation of the basic civil, political, economic, cultural and social rights of the people who are victims of this legal anomaly. Although the UN Convention entitles a stateless person several rights such as minimum standards of treatment, the same rights as citizens with respect to freedom of religion and education of their children, right to association, right to employment and housing among many others—the same are hardly realized in their true sense of term. Moreover, the intricacies of ‘statelessness’ runs deep. By its very nature, statelessness is not always well understood. As a result, in many countries the magnitude of this phenomenon is indefinable and scope is largely ignored. Nevertheless statelessness impacts the daily lives of over 12 million people all around the world. Stateless people are found in all regions of the world. Most often the stateless people lead ‘invisible lives’ on the margins of society. They frequently lack identity documentation and are often subject to discrimination that adds on to the plight of this vulnerable section of the population.

International migration and statelessness go hand in hand and is a global concern today with significant influence at both domestic and international level. At the domestic level it creates complications by adding dynamism to the demography through unwanted population influx; whereas at an international level it poses a threat to national sovereignty and thereby constrains inter-state relationship. South Asia is a region whose history, territory, identity, cultural vivacity and connections among states are *raison d'être* of widespread international migration. This in turn renders ‘nation-states’ to appear more fluid, malleable and unpredictable than ever before, as a result of which new conceptions about ‘nations without states’ and ‘diasporic nations comprising of a host of new transnational communities’ comes into view before our eyes while older ones disintegrate. Therefore, the issue of ‘statelessness’ in South Asia, challenging the conceptual rubrics of the nation-state system, and having perceivable impact upon politics and international relations is a crucial matter to look at. Accordingly, the paper will attempt to delve into the issue of ‘statelessness’ by considering the particular case of the Rohingyas of Myanmar and their plight as stateless people consistently migrating to neighbouring countries in fear of persecution by the state. Their unfortunate fate in these neighbouring countries in turn pushes them to drift farther away to other neighbouring states and thereby multiplying their plights rather than reducing them. Although the drifting plights of the Rohingyas (the case in point here) seem to add on to the refugee discourse at large; it seldom comes out with a plausible solution to this problem of statelessness. It is perhaps in this context, one has to understand first, ‘why something is needed to be done?’ before envisioning ‘what needs to be done?’ If one critically assesses the

concept of ‘statelessness’ from a national security perspective a significant insight may be obtained. Therefore, linking the concept of statelessness with the security concerns of a polity, the paper will try to appraise whether international migration of the Rohingya refugees in India endangers national security and thereby makes it binding on her to formulate policies and undertake initiatives at an international level. It will be argued that the magnitude of national threat perception is one primary factor that influences the state’s action/inaction towards the issue of statelessness.

## **Module E**

**Date of Presentation: 20 March (Friday)**

<b>Presenters</b>	<b>Themes of Presented Papers</b>
Asma Al Amin	A Conceptual Analysis on Environmental Forced Migration in Bangladesh: Human Rights Perspective
Ajmal Khan	Migration of Muslims from Kerala to Gulf Countries, evidences for forced migration from the villages of Malappuram in Kerala, India
Ushasi Basu Roy Chowdhury	Proposing Methodological Triangulation for a Study on a Diaspora within a Nation-state and Beyond
Simon Behrman	Reconfiguring the Concept of Asylum
Madhurilata Basu	(Forced) Migration, Labour and Care

### ***A Conceptual Analysis on Environmental Forced Migration in Bangladesh: Human Rights Perspective by Asma Al Amin***

Traditionally, the concept of forced migration refers to the coerced movement of a person or persons away from their home on fear of persecution due to war, conflict, repression etc. But there may be situations when environmental degradation and natural disasters forced people to migrate from their home to other place for livelihood. Migration due to environmental degradation is called environmental forced migration popularly known as environmental refugee. The concept of environmental migration within a state which is known as internally displaced person is not a new one. Movement of population due to climate disasters like droughts, floods, riverbank erosion, coastal cyclones and tornadoes is a common phenomenon in Bangladesh. Every year a huge portion of the population is displaced, both temporarily and permanently because of these natural disasters. As Bangladesh is one of the most vulnerable countries of climate change, it faces increasing environmental forced migration within and outside its territory. Because of high growth of population and climate change the poor populated areas are most at risk of environmental destruction. Climate change is itself a threat to the livelihood and security of life of the poor peoples. The International Organization for Migration estimated in 2010 that Bangladesh alone would produce 26 million climate refugees in the future. When peoples are displaced from their home due to climate change and environmental degradation their right to livelihood, right to adequate housing, and right of equal access to education and right to development are severely affected. There are a number of legal instruments and frameworks

at the international level such as International refugee laws, Human rights laws, environmental laws and international humanitarian laws, but, the status, treatment and protection of people displaced by climate change are uncertain under the current international laws. This issue is not addressed by the policy makers in most of the case both nationally and internationally. There is no clear and general definition of environmental displaced person. Neither the rights of the environmental displaced person are guaranteed by specific laws. There is a need to recognize the displacement of people within the country so that proper action can be taken to address their problems. In the context of Bangladesh it has signed, ratified and acceded most of the international conventions, treaties and protocols related to environment but still the supreme law of the land does not guaranteed environmental rights as a fundamental right. Although Art.18A of the Bangladesh Constitution tells about protection and improvement of environment and biodiversity but Article 31 and 32 together incorporate the rights to life which extended to the right to a healthy environment. But unfortunately it remains silent about the rights of the environmentally displaced persons and about their rights which is a clear and straight ignorance of their fundamental right to life. In this context we would like to show the harmony between environment and human rights. The paper will focus on the forced migration of people within Bangladesh due to climate change and environmental degradation. The paper will discuss the legal and human rights status of environmental forced migrants under national and international law frameworks. It will also make recommendations for the protections of right of the environmental forced migrants.

### ***Migration of Muslims from Kerala to Gulf Countries, Evidences for Forced Migration from the Villages of Malappuram in Kerala by Ajmal Khan***

Though Indian subcontinent was historically connected with the Persian Gulf Countries, there was never a large migration of labor until the 1970s. Subsequently, huge number of labour from India started to migrate, out of which migration from the southern state of Kerala attracted much attention because of the large number of migrants from the state. Migration from Kerala to Gulf Countries is one of the important studied component within the migration and development literature in India. However, even when Muslims are one of the leading migratory community, studies on the various aspects of them is considerably less. In this context, this paper investigates some of the basic questions about the reasons of migration of Muslims from Malabar to Gulf Countries. Migration of Muslims from Malabar is very significant due to various reasons. Muslims from Malabar had their own reasons for the migration to Gulf Countries apart from other reasons that we find in the literature regarding migration. Various factors within community and outside have forced the Muslim youth to migrate and remain at the destination countries to which they have migrated.

On the basis of the fieldwork that is carried out in a Muslim populated village in Malappuram district, the paper argues that, the larger causes or the reasons those were explained and given to us in the literature and studies about the causes of migration to Gulf countries is not sufficient to understand the migration of Muslims from the state. Considering the larger contexts and socio-economic and political situations that have existed during the initial and peak period of migration is also very important. Inquiring from the larger learning that the literature provide about migration from the state of Kerala to Gulf countries and the socio-economic and political situations that existed in during 1970's and 1980's and the conditions of Muslims in Malabar in the wake of these periods, especially poverty and unemployment has to be seen as one of the very crucial reason for why people

had to migrate anyhow to Gulf Countries, especially to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Youth have migrated from Malabar by even selling the gold that their mothers or wives have, selling whatever small laden property they have, borrowing from available sources and even taking loans or money from moneylenders. They were never educated or skilled to get higher paid professional employments in the destination countries and they had to satisfy on the unskilled, semi skilled lower paid jobs. Rampant unemployment throughout the last three decades, Umra and free visa facility to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, dowry and expensive marriages existed in the village, the modernization of the occupation of Oossan castes and demand for the hairdressers, the extreme aspirations and the dream of Gulf from the suffering life and poverty at the village, family, village and other net works were the crucial reasons which made their migration to Gulf Countries rather than many other explanations given to us. It's evident that, there is nothing much religious about the why Muslims migrate from here to Gulf countries, but the economic reasons behind those comes out when one go for a deep analysis of the socio-economic and other conditions of the migrants. Thus, the migration to Gulf countries from the villages here in Malappuram has to be argued as a forced migration.

### ***Proposing Methodological Triangulation for a Study on a Diaspora within a Nation-state and Beyond* by Ushasi Basu Roy Chowdhury**

People moving out of their native place and settling elsewhere due to certain compulsions become diaspora. At present, the term diaspora is used for describing any group of dispersed population. A diaspora undergoes cultural and economic challenges in a receiving society until a complete assimilation takes place or the collective memory of the original identity decomposes.

This is a review paper on the choice of methodology adopted for studying negotiations by a diaspora of such challenges in the relevant international scholarship. The literature review suggests that methodological triangulation is appropriate for this kind of a study.

This paper reviews methodology used in a select set of research papers by scholars working on forced migration, mainly on the refugees. This is evidently incomplete in view of the fact that it has not taken into account books and papers produced by Indian scholars, particularly the researchers of the Calcutta Research Group. The necessity of such review has arisen out of my project on the Rajbanshi diaspora in Rajasthan Noida and Nepal. Thus, the search for a conceptual vocabulary and an appropriate research practice is dictated by my interest in understanding the dynamics of negotiation of a diaspora of challenges from the culture of the people of the places of their arrival. It is conceivable that the receiving people have also to respond to the new cultural encounters with the 'outsiders'.

### ***Reconfiguring the Concept of Asylum* by Simon Behrman**

There is much careless talk in forced migration studies and elsewhere about a 'right of asylum'. Usually this is framed in terms of its supposed grounding in international refugee law. As a result it is commonly assumed that this legal regime, underpinned by the 1951 Refugee Convention, and supplemented by the quasi-customary principle of *non-refoulement* and various human rights treaties, represents the *sine qua non* of protection for forced migrants today. But as just a few commentators have noted from time to time, insofar as a right of asylum exists it is a right of the State to grant asylum, not the individual to receive it. This is evidenced by the complete absence of any mention of such a right in the 1951 Convention along with other regional legal instruments, and by the insistence by states that

the original draft of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights which talked of a right to be 'granted' asylum be changed to the mere right to 'seek and enjoy' it. Indeed, I would argue, how could it be otherwise in a system of international law underpinned by the fundamental principle of State sovereignty?

My paper addresses this issue in two ways. First, by uncovering the origins of international refugee law squarely within the desire of states to manage and control the movements of forced migrants, rather than 'humanitarian' concern for them. Second, by discussing the concept of asylum as it has been understood and practiced from antiquity up until the modern age, which was grounded within its etymological root as 'freedom from seizure' by sovereign power and the law. This tradition is a rich one, which has drawn variously on theological, spiritual and political notions of justice and contestability. It is a tradition that, in contrast to law, directs itself to the protective principle.

The refugee today has been reduced in political, legal and everyday discourses to what Guy Goodwin-Gill has referred to as a 'unit of displacement', as someone who is categorised, controlled and warehoused; this process is, I argue, facilitated by law, not in spite of it. Thus the legal regime of refugee law has not created spaces of protection, but has instead extended ever further the grasp of the State over the refugee. In a world in which security paradigms such as the 'war on terror', the Pacific Solution and Fortress Europe, along with an archipelago of detention centres and camps largely determine the experience of the forced migrant, it has become an urgent necessity for academics, practitioners, activists, and not least forced migrants themselves, to recover and reassert the tradition of asylum as freedom from sovereign power not subjection to it.

This paper, therefore, engages principally with the theme of Conceptual Issues in Forced Migration Studies, by interrogating the central concept of asylum. In addition, it also gestures towards certain questions relating to research methodologies in the field. In particular, my research draws upon and calls for a much greater emphasis on critical historical and genealogical frameworks in dealing with the issue of asylum and its relation to law.

### ***(Forced) Migration, Labour and Care by Madhurilata Basu***

The paper inquires into the gender dimensions of migrant labour, specifically focusing upon women who are compelled, by the urge to have a "better life" (and "better life" at times mean an escape from hunger) to migrate elsewhere, sometimes to a big city within one's country, sometimes in abroad. Unfortunately, this category of female labour or female migrants, do not have a central place in forced migration studies. While some like nurses, or trained health workers cater to the demands stemming out of an unevenly structured world economic system, others like ayahs or domestic helps with little or almost no education, skills, often find themselves in precarious situations and end up working in the informal sectors. Both these categories are growing and hence warrant a special place. The paper mainly examines the case of India, specifically because recent times have witnessed a mushrooming of myriad forms of agreements/contracts advertised in the internet by recruiting agencies which help in supplying various kinds of labours from India to the West and the West Asian countries. In the USA and other Western countries, the business of supplying nurses and other people involved in care economy has also proved to be a lucrative one. The paper also states that women in large numbers are migrating to big cities or nearest cities or towns to work as ayahs, domestic help, and cooks. This phenomenon is mainly the result of the process of decolonisation that began with the end of Second World



War. The process of replicating the western model of development by most of the newly born states took a toll on nature and the people. Thus, big dams, highways, big industries and a self-sustaining agricultural sector were seen to be important. On the other hand, the business and the industrial sectors were also promoted with unprecedented speed. Against this background, the paper tries to analyze the process of women being identified with the word 'care' where women as a category are further more marginalized and the linkages between care industry and migration. Her study mainly examines the steady flow of women from India to OECD countries or even South East Asian countries who work as nurses in these countries where the work conditions are extremely challenging. Hence, the paper urges the scholars/agencies/activists working on Forced Migration to seriously take note of the situation and also "care giving" as a work should fall under the category of "labour".



*Anita Sengupta*



*Anasua Basu Ray Chaudhury*



*Debarati Bagchi*



*Arpita Basu Roy and Purabi Roy  
(from left to right)*



*Mandira Sen, Swagato Sarkar and Subir Rana  
(from left to right)*





## 9. Film Screening

The session on film screenings on day 2 (module B) by Professor Rashmi Doraiswamy from Jamia Milia Islamia focused on central Asian films that showed the human side to the tragedy of displacement and forced migration. As the participants' evaluation (Section 12) shows, the participants found this to be a deeply enriching session which helped them reflect on their academic and theoretical learning on the topic of forced migration. The films, sections of which were showed and discussed at length were:

1992: *Little Angel, Make Me Happy* by Usman Saparov (Turkmenistan)

2008: *Song of the Southern Seas* by Marat Sarulu (Kyrgyzstan)

2008: *Tulpan* by Sergei Dvortsevoi (Kazakhstan)

2009: *Gastarbeiter* by Yusup Razykov (Uzbekistan)

2010: *Another Sky* by Dmitri Mamulia

2010: *Reverse Motion* by Andrei Stempkovsky (Russia-Tajikistan)



*Sucharita Sengupta and Paula Banerjee  
(from left to right)*



*Ragini Trakroo Zutshi and Sahana  
Basavapatna (from left to right)*



*Nasreen Chowdhory and Atig Ghosh  
(from left to right)*



*Ranabir Samaddar and Prasanta Ray  
(from left to right)*



## 10. Round Table Discussions

A roundtable discussion on the plight of Rohingya Refugees on day 4 (Module D) of the workshop saw the participation of three eminent scholars and practitioners—Ravi Hemadri (Development and Justice Initiative, New Delhi), Ragini Trakroo Zutshi (UNHCR, New Delhi) and Meghna Guhathakurata (Research Initiatives Bangladesh). They contributed with rich insight on the plight of Rohingyas in India and Bangladesh and gave indication to new ways that policy can be, and is being, formulated to address the problems. Ravi Hemadri spoke about the Rohingyas in New Delhi, Jammu, Mewat and Jaipur as well as in some rural areas in North India. He spoke about their livelihoods and how the ad hocism inherent in Indian praxis actually works more to the benefits of such refugees than an actually hard coded law. Ragini Trackroo Zutshi spoke about how this massive flow of stateless asylum seekers has made the UNHCR evolve in its practice and outlook. The Rohingya refugees are the most numerous among the refugees being sheltered in India and they are also spread across the country: a phenomenon not seen now. The community is also facing immense challenges such as systematic detention in correctional homes of West Bengal which is a new challenge that UNHCR is still grappling with. UNHCR is constantly reformulating its policies to cope with the new challenge such as setting up a process to ensure asylum interviews to Rohingyas in Hyderabad. Meghna Guhathakurata spoke about the Rohingyas in Bangladesh and the manifold challenges they are facing because of the political climate. She supplemented her talk with video recordings from the camps in Cox’s Bazar.



*Ranabir Samaddar and Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury (from left to right)*



*Ruchira Goswami and Anita Sengupta (from left to right)*



*Simon Behrman and Iman Mitra (from left to right)*



*Madhura Chakraborty and Suchismita Majumder (from left to right)*



## 11. Inaugural and Valedictory Sessions

The inaugural lecture was given by S. Parasuraman, Director, TISS, Mumbai. He talked about his engagement with forced migration in his PhD and later during his work on Sardar Sarovar project resettlement and rehabilitation and as a member of the World commission of dams. He concluded by stating that politics and ideology of development are the core determinants of forced migration in contemporary times and recognition of this fact is necessary to accelerate academic and other engagements on forced migration.

The final session of the workshop had the valedictory panel speak on the theme of 'Resource Crisis and Migration'. Subhas Ranjan Chakravorty, former professor, Presidency College, spoke about land tenure system during colonial period and its effect on migration, particularly indentured labourers. The next speaker, Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury, Vice Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University, spoke about environmental refugees and migration reflecting both on the controversy surrounding the term as well as the need for developing academic research as well as policies to address the growing needs of those displaced by disasters caused by environmental and climate change. The last speaker was Paula Banerjee, Associate Professor, University of Calcutta, who spoke about women who embody resource in their physical selves yet never control resource. She reflected on this paradigm with particular reference to crossing borders. The day concluded with a vote of thanks by Atig Ghosh, Assistant Professor, Visva Bharati University.



*Ajmal Khan, Ranabir Samaddar and Subir Rana (from left to right)*



*Neamatullah Neamat, Jennifer Cieslewitz, Paula Banerjee and Suchismita Mazumdar (from left to right)*



*Audiences in Research Workshop on Interrogating Forced Migration*



*Participants in Research Workshop on Interrogating Forced Migration*

## 12. Module Wise Discussion Report

### Day 1 (March 16)

#### Session 1 (Introductory Remarks)

At the start of the session Sreeradha Dutta, Director, MAKAIAS, welcomed the participants of the workshop on behalf of MAKAIAS. Sabyasachi Basu Roy Chaudhury, Vice Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University and member, CRG, in his introductory remarks, sketched an outline of the evolution of the workshop. Paula Banerjee, President, CRG and Associate Professor, University of Calcutta, pointed out that, in the earlier workshops, the focus was exclusively on South Asia but from this year onwards the workshop would also focus on West and Central Asia as well and such a comparison would yield more fruitful result. The session ended with participants and resource persons introducing themselves.

#### Module A

#### Session 2 (Keynote Lecture by Ranabir Samaddar, Director, CRG, on the Theme Concepts and Methods of Forced Migration Studies 1)

Ranabir Samaddar in his lecture averred that a concept can oftentimes work as a metaphor like the one of 'refugee-hood' and asked if the situation of refugee-hood could be called an exceptional situation? He argued that the concept-metaphor of 'refugee-hood' when collocated in the post/colonial context may not seem exceptional insofar as suspension of rights and law are the governing sign of the post/colonial situation. At a further level, Samaddar spoke of the question of ethics in Forced Migration studies. Invoking Derrida, he argued that ethics cannot be explained, but can be felt and/or individually understood as an indefinable gesture like hospitality. In the postcolonial context, a large number of refugees were given shelter privately or societally – a phenomenon often overlooked in refugee studies. Post-Derrida, Samaddar asserted, we need to re-theorize this social world of care and hospitality, especially in the context of neoliberalism where one sees a basic change in the orientation towards humanitarianism from burden-sharing to resource-optimization.

#### Session 3 (Participants' Research Papers)

In this session, we had two papers by Byasdeb Dasgupta, Professor, Kalyani University, and Samata Biswas, Assistant Professor, Haldia Government College. Dasgupta's paper linked the concepts and issues of forced migration with the phenomenon of involuntary unemployment in economics and proposed a novel framework of analysis in terms of overdetermined class processes. Samata Biswas, on the other hand, argued against use of literary sources in forced migration studies only as repository of evidential information and proposed a more creative use through her reading of Amitav Ghosh's novel *Sea of Poppies*, revealing many instances of unequal treatment and representation of different classes, castes, races and genders. The discussions that followed included inquiries about the essential attribute of a literary text which could interest a social scientist and the theoretical implication of distinguishing sites of capital and non-capital.

#### **Session 4 (Special Lecture by Pradip Kumar Bose, Former Professor, CSSSC and Member of CRG)**

Pradip Kumar Bose presented a review of a vast array of literature on Migration Studies collected over a period of two decades (1990-2010), relating aspects like economy, society, development, displacement, environment, gender, partition studies, internal displacements, refugee-hood, memory studies, governance and law. He also spoke on migration from the gender perspective, explaining how the increasing feminization of migration in contemporary times problematises the narratives of 'victimhood' in the recent context of globalization. The lecture was followed by discussion over a range of issues including counter-examples of social subversion effected by migration, effects of technocratization on the female workforce, and representation of male migrant workers in cases of gender violence.

#### **Day 2 (March 17)**

#### **Module B**

#### **Session 1 (Keynote Lecture by Ozlen Celebi, Assistant Professor, Hacettepe University, on the theme Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration I: Central and West Asia)**

The title of Celebi's presentation was 'Forced Migration in Central & West Asia'. She presented and compared a set of data on UNHCR's activities in Central and West Asia. In a nutshell, UNHCR in West Asia focuses on developing national asylum systems, seeking solutions for refugees and stateless people and supporting the implementation of emergency measures. Global economic slowdown, removal of subsidies and intensified international sanction have caused hyperinflation, affected the delivery of the basic services, and resulted in a dramatic rise in the living costs which have also had an impact on UNHCR's ability to provide assistance to the asylum seekers. She concluded by saying that international migration is likely to increase in the coming years. It will generate novel possibilities along with aggravating existing problems and posing new challenges.

#### **Session 2 (Participants' Research Papers 1)**

The three papers presented in this session were by Anita Sengupta, Diloram Karamat, and Priya Singh, all Fellows at MAKAIAS. Sengupta's paper focused on the movement of skilled and semi-skilled labour in, from and across Kirghizstan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan after the disintegration of the USSR and collapse of collective farming. Diloram Karamat's paper explored lives of undocumented people in the Central Asian countries despite having acceded to the 1951 Refugee Convention. Priya Singh's paper chronicled stories of shared spaces and shifting identities across various layers of dispossession in Central and West Asia. The discussion that followed churned out various issues including the assumed voluntariness of migration, indeterminacy of impacts of migration on the host country, and conditions of statelessness.



### **Session 3 (Participants' Research Papers 2)**

The first speaker, in this session, Ozlem Pehlivan, Research Assistant, Hacettepe University, spoke about the current situation in Turkey in relation with refugees, specifically the Syrians. The second speaker, Neamat Neamatullah, an independent researcher from Afghanistan, talked about forceful deportation of Afghan nationals to Iran. His research is based on various life stories of Afghan families facing adverse conditions and treatment. The third speaker Arpita Basu Roy, Fellow at MAKAIAS, spoke about the returnees in Afghanistan and various impediments to their re-integration. The discussion shed light on the necessity of comprehensiveness of research and effects of poverty and other socio-political conditions on migration.

### **Session 4 (Special Lecture by Md. Jalal Abbassi Shavazi, Professor of Demography, University of Tehran and Director, National Institute of Population Research, Ministry of Science, Research and Technology, Iran)**

Abbassi's lecture was titled 'Demography of Refugees and Forced Migration with Focus on Asia' and it elucidated the fundamental analytical/conceptual categories and tools deployed by migration studies and strongly argued for the need for a collaboration between systematic science such as demographic research and migration research. The first section of his lecture illustrated that demographic research with its orientation towards evidence, better system of data collection, analysis of characteristics and ability to bring about a multi-disciplinary approach has greater ability to generate empirically driven policy. The second section dealt with the application of demographic research in understanding adaptation, fertility behaviour and return strategies of second generation Afghan refugees in Iran. Several questions were raised during the discussion such as the one about the relationship between government policies and other socioeconomic factors and scientific research.

### **Session 5 (Films on Forced Migration)**

In this session, Rashmi Doraiswami, Professor, Jamia Milia Islamia, New Delhi, showed clippings from six films from Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan and explained how issues of forced migration play as a context to the post-socialist politics of cultural reproduction. In all these films, Doraiswami argued, the longing for a lost home culminates into search for a new house. These films also want to question the socialist narratives of pre-Soviet history and invoke pre-Soviet cultural icons as markers of new national identities. Use of long shots of beautiful landscape also points to the eagerness of making claims on the spatial imaginary that was once solidified by the Soviet state but now scattered all over the Balkan region.



*Participants in Research Workshop on Interrogating Forced Migration*





## **Day 3 (March 18)**

### **Module C**

#### **Session 1 (Keynote Lecture by Sreeradha Dutta, Director, MAKAIAS, on the theme Violence in the Borderlands and Forced Migration II: West Bengal-Bangladesh Border)**

Dutta started her presentation by emphasising the fact that state and its borders remain important actors in international relations and borders are perceived by the state as an instrument of state policy. Speaking about the theme of the day, she observed that in spite of a friendly political relationship between India and Bangladesh, the Indo-Bangladesh border remains in a constant state of hostility. Non-demarcated border along with enclaves, adverse possessions and presence of villages closer to international border make the situation more complex. Migration and unofficial trade activities complicate the situation further. The ground reality will take years to change, Dutta concluded, until and unless the governments of these two nations change their outlooks and see these territories on their own that need development and care.

#### **Session 2 (Participants' Research Papers 1)**

This session had three speakers: Sucharita Sengupta, Research Assistant, CRG, Atig Ghosh, Assistant Professor, Visva Bharrati University and Paula Banerjee, Associate Professor, University of Calcutta. Sengupta's paper looked at the experiences of Bangladeshi women in Indian prisons arrested on the charge of cross-border migration without necessary documents. Ghosh's paper explores the lives and livelihood practices of de-facto stateless people in chhitmahals or enclaves along the border of India and Bangladesh. Banerjee's paper studied different forms of violence as an endemic attribute of border existence with specific focus on the Indo-Bangladesh border. The discussion session vibrated with issues and concerns such as the sudden surge of interest in border violence in media and academics, ethnographic predicaments and cartographic anxieties while studying border and borderland, the politics of production of data and relation of border realities with policies of border management and institutional prerogatives.

#### **Session 3 (Participants' Research Papers 2)**

The three speakers in this session were Subir Rana, Associate Fellow, Institute of Chinese Studies, Swagato Sarkar, Associate Professor, Jindal School of Government and Public Policy, and Rimple Mehta, Assistant Professor, Jadavpur University. Rana's paper dealt with the confusions and complexities regarding concepts like borders, frontiers and borderlands often used interchangeably both in common and academic parlance and explored the challenges and potency of regional economic co-operations like the BCIM-Economic Corridor involving Bangladesh, China, India and Myanmar in these contexts. Sarkar's presentation focused on trafficking of illegal goods across the India-Bangladesh border and construction of border economies as 'economies of exception'. Mehta's paper explored narratives of Bangladeshi women incarcerated in Indian jails and tried to locate a continuum of violence concretized through their journeys across the border. Issues and concerns raised during the discussion included the interaction between agency and victimhood in ethnographic narratives, deep structures of cross-border trade and its relation with violence,

and impacts of regional economic cooperation on the economy and ecology of border regions.

*In the evening, the participants attended a lecture by the Pakistan High Commissioner in India, Abdul Basit, who spoke on the possibility of improvement of the relationship between India and Pakistan for the sake of development in South Asia.*

## **Day 4 (March 19)**

### **Module D**

#### **Session 1 (Keynote Lecture by Sabyasachi Basu Roy Chaudhury, Vice Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University, on the theme Birth of a Stateless Community: Rohingya Refugees in India)**

India, Basu Ray Chaudhury informed us, is hosting Rohingya refugees who have left Myanmar to avoid violence for quite some time. Both registered and unregistered Rohingya refugees are living in cramped camps in Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Delhi, Jammu and Uttar Pradesh. Their largest settlement is in Jammu where 6000 Rohingyas live in makeshift tents in subhuman condition with no or very little access to food, clean water and medicine. India has no comprehensive policy regarding the Rohingyas. Some of them have been detained under the Foreigners' Act of 1946 and languishing in jails in different parts of India including West Bengal. Basu Roy Chaudhury also explained the historical context of migration of the Rohingyas to the neighbouring countries and discussed the problems they face because of their statelessness. The conditions of precarity that they have to endure because of increased securitization also add to their plight. The lecture was followed by a lively discussion which enquired about the registration process of the Rohingyas in India and their official status.

#### **Session 2 (Participants' Research Papers 1)**

This session had three speakers, Madhura Chakraborty, Research Assistant, CRG, Suchismita Majumder, Research Associate, CRG, and Srimanti Sarkar, Researcher, University of Calcutta and MAKAIAS. Chakraborty's presentation contextualised the issue of the Rohingyas within the broader framework of security, territoriality and islamophobia which leads to brand them as a threat to security. Majumder's paper dealt with experiences of Rohingyas in three jails in West Bengal and described their predicaments and survival strategies. Sarkar, on the other hand, presented the issue from the perspective of national security and terrorist networks that the Rohingya community in both Bangladesh and India is alleged to have been implicated in. In the discussion that followed, concerns were raised about the problems of using national security as a framework for analyzing forced migration and information gap in terms of doing research on the Rohingyas both in Bangladesh and India.

#### **Session 3 (Participants' Research Papers 2)**

This session had three presenters – Sahana Basavapatna, Lawyer, Supreme Court of India, Kriti Chopra, Researcher, St, Joseph's College, Bangalore, and Suhita Saha, Researcher,

Jadavpur University. Basavapatna's paper looked at the refugee situation in urban Delhi, Mewat and Jammu from the perspective of legal rights and within a legal framework of settlements in urban slums. Chopra's paper explored the experience and representation of Rohingya refugees in Hyderabad from primary ethnography of the communities and NGOs (such as COVA and Salamah Burmese Refugee Relief Trust) and newspaper reports and articles. Saha's paper was presented from a historical perspective looking at the evolution of the Rohingya and Rakhine identities in the Arakan region. The discussion that followed included issues like the specificity of the Rohingyas among other marginal groups in Myanmar, distinction between refugee-hood and statelessness, involvement of various interest groups in providing relief to the Rohingyas, and contrast and conjunction of ethnic conflicts and ethical considerations.

#### **Session 4 (Roundtable Discussion on Rohingya Refugees)**

The speakers in this session were Ravi Hemadri, Secretary, Development Research Initiative, New Delhi, Ragini Trakroo Zutshi from UNHCR, New Delhi and Meghna Guha Thakurta, Executive Director, Research Initiatives, Bangladesh. Hemadri talked about the political economy of the Rohingya's existence in India – their occupations, educational possibilities, and rent structures. Zutshi stressed on the role played by UNHCR and civil society organisations in working closely with local administration to enable resettlement of the Rohingyas. Guhathakurta, through three different discursive constructions of the Rohingyas, described the challenges inherent in working for the resettlement of the Rohingyas in Bangladesh. The discussion around the presentations mostly consisted of seeking information and clarifications, such as the exact asylum procedure in West Bengal, to which it was noted that there is no such procedure in place.

#### **Day 5 (March 20)**

#### **Module E**

#### **Session 1 (Special Lecture by Prasanta Ray, Emeritus Professor, Presidency University, on the theme Anxieties of Research)**

The focus of Ray's lecture's remained on epistemological anxieties of the researcher: her anxiety about the appropriate choice of a conceptual framework. As Ray argued, one has to continuously reconceptualise to prevent herself from falling into an epistemological trap. It is necessary for the researcher to be aware about the epistemological options available in her field of research. He mentioned that a conceptual framework is an array of concepts framed by logic derived from theory, ideology or moral position. In this context, he pointed out that the positivist framework excludes migrants as rational choice actors. But migrants do have subjectivity; they have desires and aspirations. Similarly, the border can be treated both as an institution and as a set of social relationships. The discussion following the lecture was especially intense, focussing on many of the concerns that had been raised by the participants during the previous four days. Key themes that featured in the discussion were: the precarious balance between the need to open up categories as well as the need to achieve closure; the necessity or impossibility, and for some, the danger of an "Indian system of knowledge", the notion of rigour in research and its constructed-ness; and the role of 'undisciplinarity' or 'chaos' in the production of new concepts.

## **Session 2 (Participants' Research Papers 1)**

The three papers in this session were presented by Simon Behrman, Lecturer, University of East Anglia, Asma Al Amin, Lecturer, BGC Trust University, and Ajmal Khan, Researcher, TISS Mumbai. Behrman's paper focused on the many imperfections and inequalities embedded in the international refugee law regimes. Al Amin's paper dealt with forced migration induced by climate change and natural disasters with a special focus on Bangladesh. She also spoke on the absence of specific legal frameworks to address this issue. Khan's paper brought into focus the involuntariness of out-migration from one village in Kerala to the Middle East and how these movements are inextricably linked with various financial and quasi-institutional networks. A range of issues were raised during the discussion including those of production of the refugee subject through legal frameworks, need of new legislation in the presence of existing legal parameters, role of foreign aid in disaster management, distinction between flows of skilled and unskilled labour, amorphousness of the category of climate refugee, and interconnectedness of the questions of ecology and resource crisis.

## **Session 3 (Keynote Lecture by Atig Ghosh, Assistant Professor, Visva Bharati University, on the theme Historical Methods and Migration)**

Arguing that migration and the figure of the migrant have always been central to historical inquiry, Ghosh's keynote address insisted on the methodological flexibility of the term 'migration' over the more recent coinage 'forced migration'. Tied to this was the insistence that migrational processes have to be historicized and recasting a moment in their long history artificially, as the use of 'forced migration' perhaps does, engenders a blinkered understanding of their textures and tangles. Further, a historical approach sets aside the nation-statist approach and makes other, more creative as well as critical approaches possible. This was however not an insistence on disciplinary formalism but a move towards 'systemalness' understood as holographic. Carrying the argument forward, through discussions on the two concepts of 'refugeeness' and 'illegality', Ghosh proposed that perhaps the time had come when the figure of the citizen should be replaced by the figure of the migrant as the organizing principle of the social sciences, particularly migration history. Finally, Ghosh interrogated the concept of hospitality through the ethico-philosophical lens to showcase its historically aporetic nature and how it involutes within itself the very ideas of alienness and otherization that it pretends to dispel.

## **Session 4 (Participants' Presentations 2)**

The three papers in the session were authored by Madhurilata Basu, Researcher, Presidency University, Ushasi Basu Roy Chowdhury Researcher, Calcutta University, and Jennifer Cieslewitz Researcher, University of New York, Oswego. Basu's paper was about the inter-linkages between international migration and female workers in both and informal sectors of care economy, such as ayahs, nurses and domestic workers in India. Basu Roy Chowdhury's proposed to study triangulation as a method of studying diasporic groups like the Rajbanshis. Cieslewitz's presentation dealt with her experiences in the field of refugee resettlement Utica, New York. The discussion that followed raised issues like the involuntariness of even perceivably voluntary migration, stakes of the NGOs in resettlement processes, and specific locationality of diasporic mobility.

## **Day 6 (March 21)**

### **Session 1 (Rapporteurs' Presentations)**

The day started with Iman Mitra, Research Associate, reading out a short report on each of the earlier sessions. He also thanked all the participants for fulfilling their rapporteuring duties promptly and thoroughly.

### **Session 2 (Evaluation Session)**

Presided over by Paula Banerjee and Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury, this session was held to have an open discussion with participants and resource persons on their suggestions about the workshop and any of its perceived shortcomings. Most of the participants stated that the workshop was well structured and organized. Few opined that a field visit during the workshop would have been helpful to grasp the practicality of the issues of Forced Migration in a better way.

### **Session 3 (Play and Certification Ceremony)**

This and the following session was held at Swabhumi, Kolkata. The evening began with a dramatic performance by the group Chaepani who enacted a play called Guns and Roses. Based on Tagore's short story Kabuliwala and an Urdu reinterpretation of it, the story is set in present day Kabul and was a moving performance incorporating music, dance and a trilingual script. The play was followed by the certification ceremony where Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury, Vice Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University, presented the participants with certificates for successfully participating in the workshop. Finally, four of the participants – Subir Rana, Neamatullah Neamat, Samata Biswas and Asma Al Amin – were invited to reflect on the workshop and their experiences in it.

### **Session 4 (Valedictory Session)**

The final session of the workshop had the valedictory panel speak on the theme of 'Resource Crisis and Migration'. Subhas Ranjan Chakravorty, former professor, Presidency College, spoke about land tenure system during colonial period and its effect on migration, particularly indentured labourers. The next speaker, Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury, Vice Chancellor, Rabindra Bharati University, spoke about environmental refugees and migration reflecting both on the controversy surrounding the term as well as the need for developing academic research as well as policies to address the growing needs of those displaced by disasters caused by environmental and climate change. The last speaker was Paula Banerjee, Associate Professor, University of Calcutta, who spoke about women who embody resource in their physical selves yet never control resource. She reflected on this paradigm with particular reference to crossing borders. The day concluded with a vote of thanks by Atig Ghosh, Assistant Professor, Visva Bharati University.

## 13. Evaluation by Participants

There were twenty eight participants in the Workshop. Of them, twenty-one were female. The participants were from six different countries from three different continents and represented a vibrant mix of professionals and students, activists and academics. The largest number of participants was from India. However, the participants were from all parts of India and their research was similarly covering diverse areas within the country reflecting and highlighting issues from many states. A conspicuous absence was that of participants from the North East which should be remedied in the coming workshops. The foreign participants spanned Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Turkey, Uzbekistan, United Kingdom and United States of America.

A large number of participants were students and researchers. However there were also a fair number of participants who were human rights activists themselves, their research informing and drawing from their professional work. Some of the participants had attended and been part of previous Workshops and Winter Courses organized by Calcutta Research Group reflecting a continued critical engagement with the issues and with the organization.

The questionnaires circulated among the participants were designed to be more qualitative in nature so that the participants had space for reflections and suggestions. The questions were:

### 1. **Participatory Sessions (Face-to-Face Meetings, Round Tables, and Panel Discussions and Workshops)**

- a) How do you rate the participatory sessions?
- b) Comment on how the participatory sessions were relevant to your module.
- c) Did you come adequately prepared for the participatory sessions?

### 2. **Film and Cultural Sessions**

- a) How did you like the film/s and session on music?
- b) In what ways did these sessions help you in understanding the course?

### 3. **General**

- a) Do you have any other comment or suggestion on the overall design of the course?
- b) State clearly in what ways the course will be of relevance to your concern and work on human rights?
- c) Did you visit the CRG website regularly to update yourself on the course? Did you find it useful?
- d) Do you have any other suggestion or comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the course?

### 4. **Follow-up**

- a) Please suggest clearly any measure that you would like to take as follow-up of your participation in the course?



## 5. Arrangements

Were arrangements for the workshop satisfactory in terms of:

- a) Accommodation
- b) Food
- c) Classroom arrangement

## 6. Future Contacts

- a) In what ways do you think your collaboration with CRG can be strengthened?
- b) Would you like to receive the priced publications of CRG, particularly, the journal *Refugee Watch*, research papers and reports?

Of the twenty eight forms circulated eighteen were returned. Below is a summary of the findings from the submitted forms.

- **Participatory Sessions:**

All participants had very positive comments on the participatory sessions and wrote that the discussions were informative and helpful in helping them understand the issues as well as in improving their own research. All the participants said that they had come prepared for the session and many also added that they had read the circulated material, particularly for their own module.

- **Film Session:**

All participants found this session useful and a break from the routine. They felt that the visual medium was especially helpful in creating a break in the workshop as well as a different and in some ways more effective way of understanding issues on forced migration.

- **Comments and Suggestions on the Workshop:**

Many participants suggested that the workshop be expanded to include at least a day of field visit to better appreciate issue of forced migration on the ground. Another suggestion was that there should be more time allotted for library work and referencing. Participants also suggested that there should be more cultural sessions in such workshop. Another suggestion was that the key note and special lectures delivered during the workshop should also be circulated among the participants through email or through the website. One participant felt that there should be more space allotted for discussions and conversations. In suggestions for follow-up to the workshop, most participants felt that it would be good to have a detailed published report of the workshop as well a collection of selected papers from the workshop. Also, another suggestion was that there should be a follow-up workshop for the presentation of the finalized papers.

Many participants felt that one of the biggest strength of the workshop was its interdisciplinary character and the fact that it challenged many concepts within Forced

Migration Studies through the papers and in the discussions following them. Another strength that was pointed out was the micro level research by most participants who presented at the workshop. Participants also highlighted the fact that researchers were from diverse geographical backgrounds, thereby helping to highlight issues from different parts of the country as well as the world. A shortcoming that was pointed out by two participants was regarding the impact on policy and the applicability of the researches in a practical way. There were some overlaps in pointing out shortcomings in the workshop and the suggestions offered by the participants: many felt that there should have been a field trip and it should have been a longer workshop with more space for discussions and library work. One participant pointed out that the study material reached the participants fairly late and this reduced the preparation time for the workshop.

- **Logistical Arrangements:**

There were no complaints from the participants about the arrangements and most wrote highly about the food and accommodation provided.

- **Future Contacts:**

All participants were eager to continue their association with the Calcutta Research Group and expressed wish to be included in future workshops and programmes and all indicated their wish to receive copies of the publications.

#### **A. Table of Evaluation by the Participants:**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Excellent/ Good/Yes</b>	<b>Bad/ No</b>	<b>No Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
How do you rate the participatory sessions?	16	0	0	16
Were the participatory sessions relevant to your module?	15	0	1	16
Did you come adequately prepared for the participatory sessions?	16	0	0	16
How did you like the film/s session?	12	0	4	16
did these sessions help you in understanding the course ?	12	0	4	16
Did you visit the CRG website regularly to update yourself on the course? Did you find it useful?	13	3	0	16
How were arrangements for the workshop in terms of Accommodation?	8	0	8	16
How were arrangements for the workshop in terms of Food?	16	0	0	16
How were arrangements for the workshop in terms of Classroom arrangements?	14	2	0	16
Would you like to receive the priced publications of CRG, particularly, the journal <i>Refugee Watch</i> , research papers and reports?	11	2	3	16

## 14. Observations and Suggestions by Resource Persons

The six day course was conducted by an experienced faculty. There were five module tutors for each module to guide the participants through their study material, suggestions etc. The theme lectures were also delivered by eminent persons and were much appreciated by the participants. The modules were also generally appreciated. Most of the faculty members were from India and some from West Asia. Below is the summary of the evaluations forms filled by most of the faculty members:

All the faculty members who have filled up the forms unanimously opined that the Course was very well designed with a combination of both conceptual and specific case studies. The modules were well planned, thought provoking, substantial and as writes one faculty member – extremely rich in substance. The faculty members from abroad also found the titles of the modules very interesting and praised the selection of the participants as perfectly fitting into the Course and respective modules that they were part of. The sessions where participants presented their papers were rated mostly as very satisfactory. There were good questions raised and the most of the participants were well informed and involved with the course. Many of them have also attended the course with full preparations. Some faculty members also praised the discussants of the sessions saying they were mostly experts on their fields and contributed significantly to the proceedings. The accommodation, food and class room arrangements were rated as excellent and very good respectively by the faculty members who returned the evaluation forms. Some said it was a very good idea to book the accommodation in hotels which were within the walking distance of the Conference Venue.

### Recommendations

On suggestions regarding the improvement of the Workshop/study sessions – One faculty member felt that incorporation of few more regions in the course would be good for comparative purpose. Most were of the opinion that both the workshop and the study sessions were very well organized and satisfactory. The course could continue with the same structure in future as well. Some faculty members suggested a one day short field trip to either refugee camps or borders would also be helpful in enriching the workshop. The study sessions and course material were mostly rated as good and according to one faculty member, separate time should be fixed for library work as well. Many faculty members were in praise of CRG publications and some of them also subscribed for CRG's biannual journal *Refugee Watch*.



*Participants in Inaugural Session*



## 15. Evaluation by the External Evaluators

*The two external evaluators invited by CRG were Dr. Dipankar Sinha and Dr. Ritajyoti Bandopadhyay. Below is the text of their joint report.*

“The six days-long research workshop was held at Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies (MAKAIAS), Kolkata. It was primarily organized by Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group, in collaboration with Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute of Asian Studies, Indian Council of Social Science Research and Taft Foundation. At the very outset it may be mentioned that the coming together of four major organizations in such collaborative venture has set in an example of synergy, which seemed to have served well the academic purpose of the workshop.

“The format of the workshop had a well crafted logic. Each module started with a Keynote Lecture, followed by Participants’ Research Papers and Special Lecture. The placement of the Participants’ Research Papers between the Keynote Lecture and Special Lecture, the latter two having well-known experts and specialists of the theme of the workshop, is to be welcomed because it goes against the general trend of relegating’ the participants to the last slot. A specific mention may be made of the first module because the initiating session always has vital importance in firming up the whole programme. This module justifiably concerned the conceptual and methodological dimensions of the main theme. Ranabir Samaddar in this module set the ball rolling by problematizing forced migration in conceptual terms. He also provided a ‘debate setting’ by challenging the argument that “there can be no methodology in the study of forced migration”. The intense discussion that followed his lecture revealed that the issue is intellectually provocative enough. One can add that the module went beyond the realm of methodology to raise some vital epistemological questions and issues.

“The paper presenters in various modules came from diverse professional backgrounds and it established and strengthened the international and interdisciplinary character of the workshop. Scholars came from Turkey, Afghanistan, Iran, Bangladesh, United Kingdom, and from various parts of India. A number of the participants were young social scientists who had a rare chance to interact with senior and highly experienced academics in the field. The panels had competent discussants and most of the presentations were followed by intense discussions marked by probing questions and relevant observations.

“Apart from having the scope for interactions with academics and activists the workshop also provided the opportunity to interact with the High Commissioner of Pakistan to India, Mr. Abdul Basit. This was definitely an event of much importance. The workshop has also done well in giving due importance to the audio-visual media by focusing on music and film clippings dealing with its main theme. This way it has made a departure from the ‘conventional’ mode of academic workshops in India. The staging of drama was also a welcome departure in this context. All these make us familiar with alternative modes of expression of the same theme.

“The theme-related spatial range of the workshop deserves a special mention. It encompassed not just a ‘problematic’ and hyper-dynamic space like India and the

pluridimensional space of South Asia; it went much beyond in having covered the Central and West Asia. Some participants also brought in their firsthand experience of Europe, which enriched the discussions further. Forced migration being a process which is bewilderingly diverse in nature such spatial range helps to make comparative estimates and serves one of the foundational purpose of research in social science/studies.

“One of the evaluators, Dr. Ritajyoti Bandopadhyay, a historian, takes keen interest in the histories of motion without which ‘nothing crosses anything’. He was intrigued by the title of the workshop— ‘interrogating forced migration’ because if we consider all migration as forced migration—as indeed one key participant puts it—then perhaps, we miss the analytical purchase of force as a concept and as a metaphor (the dialectical relation between the two as explicated by Ranabir Samaddar in his keynote address). It appears to him that force in the context of this workshop stands in conceptual opposition to the ‘flows’ metaphor that, as Augustine Sedgwick mentions, deliberately points to a ‘worldview in which everything is already liquid, already money’. We very often hear that people migrate to more prosperous areas responding to the benign call of the market and that the host societies/countries/regions bear the cost of ‘relative prosperity’. He thinks that a strategic deployment of force in the central statement of the workshop becomes a political and an ideological intervention to the often market oriented-abstract-tabular and teleological understanding of migration. More importantly, it refers to the structural logic of capital: that accumulation of capital entails and is constituted by violent dispersal and accumulation of laboring bodies.

“One of the major outcomes of the workshop is the affirmation that there is no single and unilateral way to analyze the complex process of migration. The workshop not only provided much attention to both the Positivist and the post-Positivist schools and the number of techniques such schools are associated with, it also paid attention to the researchers’ predicament when it comes to the methodological orientation. To Bandopadhyay, the workshop was an important moment for both methodological and epistemic reorientation of the migration studies. He thinks that this was done in two significant ways. First, the workshop unequivocally rejected what Andreas Wimmer famously called ‘methodological nationalism’ in the study of migration. Second, accumulating wisdom from its long career at the Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group the workshop was able to provide a framework for transnational interrogation in which one national context was used to ask questions of another. I may add that yet another major outcome of the\ workshop was the contention that forced migration is not a ‘stand alone’ process as it has a close linkage with the politics and ideology of the dominant mode of development.

“Last but not the least, in the Evaluation Session the organizers took care to induce the participants to identify the limitations and constraints of the programme. It goes to the credit of the organizers that the participants were largely appreciative of the workshop.

“Some suggestions/recommendations for further enhancing the value of such workshops in future can be made:

“The number of participants should be more. It would intensify the debates and discussions by bringing in greater number of perspectives. Also, more participants can take advantage of such a workshop for sharpening their own critical thinking.

“Field trips (as also mentioned by some participants) need to be part of such workshop as there can be no evident conflict between a ‘programme of conceptual orientation’ and direct experience ‘out there’. Fields are animated spaces and they can intellectually provoke the participants.

“Overlapping of sub-themes in various modules may be minimized.

“Films, rather than film clippings, may be shown. It would provide much broader scope for individual interpretations and freedom to prioritize select segments on individual basis, as distinct from ‘imposed’ selection of scenes. The organizers need to ensure that there are no ‘dropouts’ among the speakers/resource persons even if it may not necessarily be in their hands.

“Care also needs to be taken to ensure that all the participants remain physically present in the Evaluation Session, which is held last. Evaluation by circulation of forms is a necessary but not sufficient procedure in this regard. There is no denying the fact that the workshop has been quite successful in achieving its goals. The organizers are to be congratulated for their sustained endeavour, and one would suggest that they should continue to organize such workshops periodically for the benefit of researchers and activists.”



*Ushashi Basu Roy Chowdhury and Jennifer Cieslewitz (from left to right)*



*Prasanta Ray and Sreeradha Dutta (from left to right)*



*Arup kr. Sen, Shyamalendu Mazumdar and Sibaji Pratim Basu (from left to right)*



*Madhura Chakraborty, Ruchira Goswami and Anita Sengupta (from left to right)*





## 16. Outcome of the Course: Publications

As an outcome of the workshop, selected final papers relevant to the programmes will be published. Selected research papers will be published in CRG publications *Refugee Watch* and *Policies and Practices*. Further, special lectures and keynotes are also set to be compiled in order for to make available to wider audiences. There is a plan for publication of a volume on *Concepts and Methods in Forced Migration Studies*.



*Ranabir Samaddar, Prasanta Ray, Paula Banerjee and Atig Ghosh (from left to right)*



*Participants and Resources Persons in workshop*



*Neamatullah Neamat, Md. Jalal Abbassi Shavazi, Arpita Basu Roy and Purabi Roy (from left to right)*



*Participants and Resources Persons in workshop*



*Prasanta Ray and Samir Kr. Das (from left to right)*



*Priya Singh, Suchandana Chatterjee and Ozlen Celebi (from left to right)*



## 17. Organising Team

- Sreeradha Datta
- Ranabir Samaddar
- Paula Banerjee
- Atig Ghosh
- Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury
- Anita Sengupta



*Sabyasachi Basu Ray Chaudhury*



*S. Parasuraman and Ranabir Samaddar*



*Valedictory Panel: P. Banerjee, S. B. Ray Chaudhury, P. Ray and S. R. Chakraborty  
(from left to right)*



*Participants are receiving certificate*



## 18. CRG Team

- Ashok Kumar Giri
- Iman Kumar Mitra
- Madhura Chakraborty
- Manjuri Chatterji
- Prasanta Ray
- Raj Kumar Mahato
- Ratan Chakraborty
- Rajat Kanti Sur
- Samaresh Guchhait
- Sucharita Sengupta
- Sibaji Pratim Basu
- Suchismita Majumder



*Samaresh Guchhait, Ashok Kr. Giri, Ratan Chakraborty and Rajkumar Mahato (from left to right)*



*Ruchira Goswami, Samaresh Guchhait and Sucharita Sengupta (from left to right)*



*Vote of Thanks by Atig Ghosh*



*Participants in Valedictory Panel*





## Some other Pictures during the Research Workshop



# Collaborators

Indian Council of  
Social Science Research



Indian Council of Social  
Science Research



Maulana Abul Kalam Azad Institute  
of Asian Studies

Taft Foundation

For details visit our website <http://www.mcrs.ac.in>



## Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group

GC-45, Sector- III, 1st Floor, Salt Lake City  
Kolkata 700 106, West Bengal, India  
Phone : +91-33-23370408, Fax : +91-33-23371523  
E-mail : [forcedmigrationdesk@mcrs.ac.in](mailto:forcedmigrationdesk@mcrs.ac.in)

Follow us on facebook : [www.facebook.com/MahanirbanCalcuttaResearchGroup](http://www.facebook.com/MahanirbanCalcuttaResearchGroup)