POLICIES AND PRACTICES

124

Protection and Punishment : Myths and Realities of Refugee Protection

ROSA LUXEMBURG STIFTUNG SOUTH ASIA

November 2021

Policies and Practices 124

November 2021

Published by:
Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group
IA-48, Sector-III, Ground Floor
Salt Lake City
Kolkata-700097
India
Web: http://www.mcrg.ac.in

ISSN 2348 0297

Printed by:
Graphic Image
New Market, New Complex, West Block
2nd Floor, Room No. 115, Kolkata-87

This publication is brought out with the support of the Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung. It is a part of the research programme of the Calcutta Research Group on migration and forced migration. It is conducted in collaboration with Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, Institute of Human Science, Vienna, and Several Universities and Institution in India.

The Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung (RLS) is a German-based foundation working in South Asia and other parts of the world on the subjects of critical social analysis and civic education. It promotes a sovereign, socialist, secular, and democratic social order, and aims at present members of society and decision-makers with alternative approaches to such an order. Research organisations, groups working for self-emancipation, and social activists are supported in their initiatives to develop models that have the potential to deliver social and economic justice.
The work of Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, South Asia can be accessed at www.rosalux.in.

Sponsored by the Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung with funds of the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development of the Federal Republic of Germany. *This publication or parts of it can be used by others for free as long as they provide a proper reference to the original publication. The content of the publication is the sole responsibility of the partner and does not necessarily reflect a position of RLS.*

Protection and Punishment:
Myths and Realities of Refugee Protection

Nasreen Chowdhory

2021

Protection and Punishment: Myths and Realities of Refugee Protection

Nasreen Chowdhory *

Introduction

The dichotomous concepts of protection and punishment are cast within the mold of state sovereignty and power. For citizens, the institutionalized framework of both protection and punishment that they are subjected to, is by default determined by the sovereign authority and power of respective nation-states. Their right to be protected by the state is equally juxtaposed to the monopoly of the state to punish them, if they digress from the established 'rule of law'. Punishment here, theoretically can be seen justified as retributive- that is to impose a deserved reciprocally sanctioned action or as preventive- so as to create a deterrence against such digressions (Cahill, 2010). Hence for citizens, while protection is embedded in their rights of citizenship, punishment signifies right of the sovereign, both though with qualifiers and conditions. For non-citizens like refugees and stateless, who sustain their "bare life" in the host-state, the dichotomy of protection and punishment manifests differently than for citizens. The causative factors that necessitated their exclusion and displacement from their country of origin more than often were for not fulfilling the criteria for inclusion in that state. Couched in the larger ambit of humanitarian protection, their subjectivity is reduced to that of 'humans' that mandate 'protection'. Here the limited protection accorded to them signify only their "residual rights as human" (Mamdani, 2010: 54) and not the full-fledged protection guaranteed to the citizen by virtue of their citizenship rights. Punishment for them is at once both metaphorical and literal. Refugees and such forced migrants are segregated from the host population and live-in make-shift camps in deplorable conditions, such that the protection accorded to them on humanitarian grounds transmute to a sort of punishment for being the excluded 'other'. The crossing of geographical boundaries not just creates categories such as 'us' and 'other', but also have seen increasingly led to "criminology of mobility" (Aas and Bosworth, 2013:9). Regulation and restriction of mobility hence produces novel forms of illegality and criminalization, apart from turning punishment and criminal justice structure as important apparatuses "guarding the gates of membership" (ibid.). The role of criminal law and policing has been to preserve the internal security, to establish the sovereign's supremacy and the moral order of the society, in short to create a well- ordered and disciplined society (Foucault 1977; Simon 2007).

The paper intends to look beyond the binary of punishment and protection of refugees from the view point of sovereign power of the state and those impacted by the norms. The outline of the

* Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Delhi
Policies and Practices, Issue No. 124, November 2021

paper is as follows; the first part of the paper engages with conceptual category of protection. Here we analyse the intricacies of protection with respect to its differentially- protection of citizens vis-à-vis protection of non-citizens and refugees; state protection vis-à-vis, protection accorded by international law. The entire ambit of protection can be conceived as a spectrum of protection. The second section looks atthe spectrum of protection and the manner in which such can be perceived as punishment, i.e., punishment in the context of refugees-both literally and metaphorically. This section looks at how protection transmutes to punishment in the absence of recognition and membership in host state.

Protection, State & Citizen/Non-citizen

Refugees and other forced migrants are considered an anomaly to the established order of sovereign states largely based on the inviolability of borders. Even though sheltering and safeguarding of the vulnerable become the temporary mandate in the refugee protection framework, it is shadowed by the binaries that accompany the border politics and national security rhetoric of individual states. While taking into account the obligation of states to provide protection to the refugees, these binaries that extends to "inside-outside, self-other, citizen-refugee" (Puumala, 2010) comes into forefront causing those who seek protection to be profiled by the state into these binaries. The Eurocentric core of the discourse here unravels as the prevalent methods of categorizing people in to neatly demarcated territorial groups that subscribes to the "Western epistemology" of "binary logic"(ibid.)The context and the discourse of protection in the case of forced migrants are cast in to these binaries causing two postulations. First, the contextual narrative of "'massive and mixed flows" of population crossing the borders and entering the sovereign territories of the state is perceived as a threat to the imagery of nation bounded by common cultural and historical memory. Second, the contextual narrative is one that anchors the obligatory protection provided by the host state to be a "regime of charity" extended to vulnerable, dispossessed and victimized refugee subjects.

Borders being territorial demarcations of sovereignty, crossing of borders invoke a tension between sovereign rights of the state and the international human rights norms. The rights of refugees, if any in practice currently (and the more which needs to be brought in) are stemming from the international human rights norms. This tension is articulated by Abdilaaty(2021) as the recurrent tension between the right of an individual to leave their country, yet lack of rights to enter any other country. This is at once tension between refugee rights, international human rights /international law on one hand and sovereign rights of the state on the other hand. While applauding the making of a global civil society, Benhabib (2006: 16) had opined on the transition from an international to a rather cosmopolitan nature of justice, where the former one still caters to the primacy of states where as the latter endows individuals as "moral and legal persons". But by virtue of its sovereign authority, state has the prerogative to assert its territorial borders, and by extension controls and regulates individual bodies that encompasses its territory at any given time. How much ever refugee protection regime is emboldened by the principles of the universal personhood derived from the UDHR and global human rights norms, its implementation is squarely based on host state with or without the support of international humanitarian organisations. Their entitlement towards protection and their claim towards rights can be theoretically looked from the issue of legal and political membership in the host state.

The Dublin Regulation, which is a feature of the Common European Asylum System that allows a fixed hierarchy of criteria with regard to the asylum seeker's petition in order to quickly determine which state should be considered the "competent" state charged with the assessment of an

asylum claim[1] (De Genova, Garelli, and Tazzioli 2018). Dublin Regulation allows for European signatory states to deport refugees back to whichever signatory country was first to register them as asylum claimants. In practice, this means that the Dublin convention legitimizes the commonplace deportation of "asylum seekers" from the wealthiest western and northern European countries back to the first country where they were registered, usually the poorer eastern or southern European Border States where they first arrived on EU territory. Notably, the Dublin convention broadens the purview of the European deportation regime, allowing for European states to deport migrants not only back to their countries of origin but also to a so-called "safe third country," (Picozza 2017; cf. Mezzadra and Neilson 2013; Nyers 2003: 1070; Rigo 2005: 6; Khosravi 2016). In other words, protection is 'fashioned as a voluntary submission to a regime' that determines their fate in not in asylum but also whether they will be deported or not.

Protection accorded to refugees in host state transmutes to one of punishment both metaphorically and literally. The very nature of humanitarian protection becomes one in which their exclusion and dispossession in the absence of rights and legal membership that provides them with the 'right to have rights'. While this can be attributed to the emphasis on nation-state's predetermined conditionality of formal or legal membership, international institutions like UNHRC has increasingly started to take into account the aspect of "sociological membership" of the individual vis-à-vis the formal membership(Liss, 2014). Citizenship as the ultimate formal and legal status of membership within a state was designated to the realm of state's sovereign demarcation amongst individuals within its territory. Protection accorded to the citizen is one that is backed by the legality of the rights emanating from this status. It showcases a "natural-law super structure" that caused people to be bound by the "perpetual allegiance"' towards the sovereign "into whose protection they were born"(Spiro, 2011:700). But, international law in general, on whose edifice the implementation and enforcement of refugee protection rests, allocates the discretionary power on matters of nationality and citizenship to the individual states. This tacit understanding on what can be considered to assertions of state sovereignty also carries within it the instrumental power of the state to strip people of nationality, dispossess them of their citizenship rights and ousts them from the ambit of state protection. In some instance as asserted by Sanyal (2011)[2], refugee status can operate as a more effective layer than legal citizenship. On being a forced migrant that leaves their country due fear of persecution and failure to access protection, they cross the borders and essentially become refugees or asylum seekers at the mercy of the host state. The protection availed in the host state is an obligatory protection based on the notion of humanitarianism towards the fellow human, yet distinct from the treatment meted towards a fellow citizen.

As argued in an earlier work (Chowdhory, Poyiland Kajla: 2019) the institution of state is the medium through which an individual can claim rights. The notion of inalienable rights that any individual possesses by virtue of being human renders itself obsolete in the absence of a 'nation-state' as the spatial and temporal variables that form the margins of citizenship are determined by the nation state. It is here that Arendt's differentiation between "right to human rights" and the "right to be recognised as the right to have..." gains significance. Compared to Arendt, whose conceptualisation of rights engages with those individuals who are beyond the margins of nation-state, Agamben examines the denial of rights to those who have been both socially ousted and concurrently subdued by it. According to Agamben, those without citizenship are relegated to "a zone of in distinction between outside and inside, exception and rule, licit and illicit,"[3] where the prerogative to have rights and legal assertion for protection becomes obsolete. In envisioning citizenship as a subset of rights, Agamben suggests that citizens innately possess rights. To Agamben, rather than the human, citizen is the ultimate holder of such rights: "Rights are attributed

to man solely to the extent that man is the immediately vanishing ground (who must never come to light as such) of the citizen"[4]. Consequently, the refugee who is outside the ambit of citizenship is devoid of rights as they violate the liaison between 'man and citizen'. Agamben provides considerable insight on the linkage between evolution of the notion of citizenship and the eventual waning of the construct of 'nation-state'. These in turn raises the dilemma on how we would conceptualise beings who live the "bare life, stripped of"[5] citizenship and their inclusion via membership to the emerging complexity of asylum seekers and refugees. However, state in most instances has failed to accord such rights and have relegated people to this grey area of rightlessness.

Forms of Protection Construed as Punishment

The discussion on protection of refugees is very critical. The idea of providing refugee status to refugee groups indicate that the same is unavailable in the country of origin. Often the role of international protection is presumed to 'make up for the failure of the State to protect the concerned person against the persecution feared'[6].The core principle of refugee protection hinges on 'people fleeing "persecution"' (on the basis of a protected ground) that constitute the essence of refugee convention and that nearly all states that are parties to the convention. Persecution is only one type of harm that may lead to forced migration. Refugee protection has been regarded by some scholars as the mechanism through which human rights violations can be redressed, while for some it is located it outside the traditional human rights canon (Shacknove 1985)[7]. Incidentally, refugee determination systems have routinely acknowledged an act of gender persecution has taken place, appeared to have denied the link to any notion of state responsibility (Pickering 2004)[8]. Refugees are in need of protection. But the nature of protection is transformed into varied forms of punishment.

Nettleback's discussion on Australia colonial protectorates examines the ways in which Aboriginal people's 'usefulness to the settler' was a point for particular concern, especially when viewed through the lens of acute shortage of 'white labour' that caused 'system of native management'[9]. The author posits that Aboriginal protection through punishment emerged in the relationship between protectors and in the governance in Western Australia in the 1840s. Historically, protectors undermined the rights and privileges of the Aboriginal communities by reconfiguring their identity and issues of race as well. In short, 'they would develop the requisite intimacy with Aboriginal people, including learning their languages, that would broadly promote their material, moral and religious 'improvement'[10].

1. Segregation and Confinement as form of Protection

It was imperative for the imperial powers to convince the people back in their home that civilians in colonies were being protected from the conflicts that emerged as a part of their colonial conquests. As a tool to further their vested interests, "the barbed-wire aesthetic of camps" constituted by the Imperial British administration imposed "heavy labor and penal rations under dire economic restraints" so as to restrain and guard the "problem populations" (Forth, 2015). The seeds of spatial segregation were thus laid by British Empire by promoting administrators to institute the material conditions necessary for the forceful internment of potentially threatening groups of people in colonies. This was in turn based on their racial and cultural attributes, effectively creating the category of "other". The inherent nature of British Empire with its wide variety of political and administrative structures along with correspondingly multifarious colonial subjects functioned as a test room. Forth (2012:2) in *An Empire of Camps* elaborates on how the empire transformed to a

"laboratory" for imperial agents to monitor and categorize mass populations. The attempt to regulate the people in colonies who were dislodged by "war, famine, economic dislocation and European settlement" was showcased in the "established practices" adopted by the empire (ibid). This was reflected in imperial policy of relegating the economically poor of colonial India to relief and labor camps during the famines of late 19th century, segregating the sick and vulnerable to the camps during the plague in India and South Africa (1896-1901), or strategically allocating civilians to camps during the South African war of 1899-1902 (Forth, 2012: 6).

The term 'concentration camp' though is considered to have originated from the Spanish usage of *'reconcenterados'* in Cuba in 1890s (Forth, 2015), our popular memory of concentration camp is associated with the extermination camps instituted by totalitarian Nazi regime. But they indeed learnt the strategy of concentrating civilians into camps- "*Konzentrationslager"*[11] from the precedent established by the British Empire (see Henderson, 1940; Forth, 2012). This historiography of camps in the imperial era is important to understand how a pattern of space delineated exclusion concurrently emerged by phrasing imperial or military strategy[12] in the language of minimalist protection[13] for civilians. What was common to the above discussed situations was also a tacit way of sorting the population by subtly creating a hierarchy of categories- of who were privileged to provide protection and who were allowed to claim that protection. Royle (1998) notes how the camps in South Africa were a part of larger cluster of camps including Boer camps and the internment camps for prisoners. The political leadership in Britain validated the existence of camps in referring to them as "refugee camps" and thereby emphasized that inmates of the camp voluntarily resided there for the protection provided (McConnachie, 2016:403). After which the closest to a functioning refugee camp can be seen in the Armenian camps[14]of 1915 or even the "Dust-bowl" camps[15] of 1930s.

The emergence of refugee camps as a response to the large influx of migrants and displaced people occurred in the aftermath of World War II. The massive redrawing of boundaries resulted in the one of the largest migrations. The Post World War II, Soviet government along with Allied powers founded administration and processing centres for facilitating the repatriation of over 11 million people displaced[16] due to war (McDowell, 2005). According to Slatt (2002), the multiple relief and aid organisations in charge of "post war rehabilitation and reconstruction" assigned the category of 'displaced persons' to a widely heterogeneous group of people[17] who were now compelled to cohabit under a single aid plan and course of action[18]. The administrative governance of the camps sheltering displaced persons was later taken over by United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) in 1945, which in 1947 got reorganized as International Refugee Organization[19] (IRO) (McDowell, 2008; Hilton, 2009). The makeshift structures and lurching buildings that were overcrowded with the refugees- all were appended to the construct of 'refugee camps'. The tacit consonance amongst the new powers that the stability of modern nation-state is contingent on maintaining or re-carving homogenous nations advertently promoted "unmixing of peoples[20]" (Gatrell, 2013). Hence, as much as the conflict itself, even the peacemaking attempts during the end of World War II also generated a lot of chaos that aggravated the displacement of millions[21]. The Cold War era compounded the existing chaos of bordered and boundaries by inducing a new set of conflicts based on geopolitical agendas and ideologies. Despite of generating a large number of migrants and refugees across most of the continents, it also deeply entrenched the need to preserve the inviolability of territorial margins rather than the incumbent people.

2. **Protection Leading to Restrictions on Mobility**

The discourse on human mobility is inextricably linked with the nation-state's monopoly to regulate and control it. The Westphalian system, not only upheld the territorial sovereignty of nation-states, but also gave the states the authority to demarcate its citizens from the non-citizens based on the same territorial sovereignty (Hollifield, 2004:888)." This eventually resulted in states invoking an elaborative administrative system that institutionalized the inclusion of citizens and exclusion of non-citizens. Even those included citizens were subject to the state's monopoly of regulating their 'to and from' movement across the national borders through a well lubricated surveillance mechanism enabled through documentary perquisites like visas and passports. This also emboldened the linear hyphenation of an individual's national identity with a single country. Mobility being a pervasive phenomenon that aided the socio-cultural evolution of human being, there was a continued movement of people between states causing the state to develop the narrative of non-citizen being the 'outsider' (Weiner, 1996:442; Geiger, 2013: 17; Behr, 2004). Hence transnational mobility of individuals that enabled their inter-state migration posed a threat to the construct of homogeneous nation-hood based on uniform ethnicity/culture/religion (Zolberg, 1991:301; Agnew, 1994; Geiger, 2013). The citizens were full-fledged members of the body-politic, whereas the migrants were casted to the zone of being denizens (Hammar, 1990) or partial citizens (Baubock, 1995) who were precluded from accessing the rights offered by the state. More than often, the welfare of the migrant in the host state was juxtaposed with the safeguarding of rights and privileges of the citizen. In Foucauldian terms this instituted a "governmentality" that involved the bio-political control of migrant bodies so as to secure the wellbeing of citizens. Hence the restrictive migration policies brought about by the state to curtail the influx of foreigners should be seen as the exclusionary policies directed at the non-citizens (Hammar, 1990; Brubaker, 1989). Geiger (2013) postulates that the state's "organized control and regulation over access, stay, employment and return" of migrants that constitutes the "government of migration" can be reduced to what Jurgen Mackert (1999 cross cited in Geiger, 2013) refers as the "struggle over membership" in the nation-state. It is to this context that the onset of COVID pandemic cause additional complexities. The measures of lockdown and border closures although prima facie is an attempt to regulate human mobility (regardless of the underlying causes that necessitate the mobility- economic or humanitarian) so as to contain the spread of virus, eventually divulges the state's rationality of protecting those individuals that it deems worthy. This effort to maneuver human mobility as a response to the pandemic reflects Antoine Pecoud's (2013:2) observation that controlling mobility is an attempt to preserve the "national order of things" (Malkki, 1995) where state reasserts its sovereignty in not just determining who can enter and who cannot, but also in mandating who qualifies for protection of the state by the same logic. Regardless of the type of migration involved, the mobility becomes the single most important element that underpins the notion of migration. Increased mobility of individuals across borders is not just a phenomenon that can be reduced to its geographical understanding. Along with individuals, it simultaneously entails the mobilisation of discourses linked to comparatively static constructs such as states, territories and boundaries. The transnational mobility of individuals across borders complicated the linear understanding between people and the territories they occupy, thereby generating fear and insecurity among nation-states on the impact of such mobility. The drive to control migration has resulted in a gamut of measures adopted by the state which go beyond the traditional border control strategies and increased surveillance practices which Antoine Pecoud (2013) refers to as "disciplining of transnational human mobility". Such attempts showcase the effort to align the patterns and practices of migration with the interests and goals pursued by the state.

These objectives of the state include preserving the status-quo so as to not instigate obstructions to the autonomy and sovereignty of the state in control of its people. It also entails state's reassertion of its freedom and authority in determining who needs to be included and who should be excluded. This does not suggest that the state is the single actor in controlling the mobility of people through the administration of migration policies. Rather, various non-state actors and specialized international organisations like International Organisation of Migration or UNHCR work independently or in collusion with the state to augment its capacity or ameliorate its burden in managing the people who crosses over to its borders for a variety of reasons. Scholarship on migration studies have widely acknowledged the formation of a "migration industry" (Betts, 2013; Hernandez-Leon, 2013) where multiple stakeholders with varied agendas associate with the state often to pursue their own interests, inside the evolving "political economy of mobility management" (Geiger, 2013:15).

3. Criminalisation of Refugees and Punishment

Criminalisation of refugees refers to the "criminological description and categorization of state responses" towards refugees and thereby helps us to understand how the dynamics of borders and mobility are shaped by such criminological narrative of refugees and asylum seekers (Pickering, 2008:169). This produces an image of the refugee as the "criminological other" (Garland, 1996) whose depiction is not limited to that of a criminal, but a potential national security threat to "us" (Banks, 2003). For a refugee, the mere process of acquiring the recognized refugee status itself is akin to punishment. In Refugee status determination, the disproportionate burden of a refuge is that he/she has to clarify the ambit of persecution that he has been subjected in the country of his origin, so as to as to acquire the recognized refugee status in the host country. Refugees are linked to criminal acts by discounting international legal institutions like ICC's emphasis that acts of persecution subjected in the state of origin should be accounted as acts of crime. Despite of being at the receiving end of such crimes, rhetoric on them is biased towards depicting them as potential perpetrators of crime. In global north, the criminalized depiction of refugees has caused the blurring of distinction between asylum seekers/ refugees and illegal immigrants/illegal residents (Banks, 2008). In South Asian counties like India, this distinction does not seem to apply at the outset itself. Devoid of the refugee status, the prevailing law of the land conflates any refugee to "illegal immigrant" and by default casts them into the realm of criminality. While their demonization is achieved through the media and public discourse, this criminalization is instituted by realigning "coercive force" of host state largely constitutes them as "new criminals" (Pickering, 2008). This also subjects refugees to the punitive measures ordained by the law and order of the state. Hinged to the rule of law, it subjects them to detention or state imprisonment, but without the protection, rights and guarantees accorded to the citizen of the state against the arbitrary and excessive nature of state power. UNHCR along with other humanitarian organizations have repeatedly pointed out the usage of detention and other criminal measures on refugees and immigrants[22]. Despite of conventions like Amsterdam treaty and UNHCR's *Global Strategy to Support Governments to End the Detention of Asylum Seekers and Refugees* through Alternative approaches to Detention (ATD), situation looks rather bleak. The intersectionality of race and gender causes certain segments of these refugees such as women and other ethnic minorities to be subject to more precarity than others. The wealthier countries of global north to institute restrictive policies against immigrants of particular ethnic identities and in this the countries of South follow suit by invoking equally discriminatory laws and policies against their minorities and refugees rendering borders as the locus for instituting discipline and punishment based on racial bias (Richmond, 1994). In problematizing the contours of the notion of state

punishment, its legitimacy, the procedures and places in which it is imposed, Aaas & Bosworth (2003) argue that borders emerge as the 'location of punishment' inducing a "criminology of mobility". The modes and methods of data collection, status determination, biometric assisted aid delivery, detention hubs, camps and accommodation centers, ad-hoc protection measures instituted for refugee administration in various countries indicate how they are "undesirable" bodies who are to be constantly under segregation and surveillance rather than protection. Thus, the sovereign right of territorial integrity and consequent securitization and protection of border has been at the heart of criminalization of refugees (Pickering, 2008).

The author would like to acknowledge Shamna Thacham Poyil for assistance in research of this paper, especially when dealing with post COVID complications.

Notes

[1] See Nicholas De Genova, Glenda Garelli, and Martina Tazzioli, Autonomy of Asylum? The Autonomy of Migration Undoing the Refugee Crisis Script, The South Atlantic Quarterly 117:2, April 2018 doi 10.1215/00382876-4374823

[2] Sanyal, Romola. 2011. "Squatting in Camps: Building and Insurgency in Spaces of Refuge." Urban Studies 48 (5): 877–890

[3]Agamben, G. (1998) Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life, Palo Alto, Stanford University Press, p.169

[4] Ibid p.128

[5] Ibid

[6] See James. C. Hathaway, The Law of Refugee Status, Butterworths (Toronto: Vancouver, 1991).

[7]Shacknove, A. (1985). Who is a Refugee? Ethics, January, 274–284

[8] Pickering, S. (2004). Narrating women and asylum. In S. Pickering, C. Lambert (eds), Global Issues, Women and Justice. Sydney: Institute of Criminology Monograph Series/Federation Press

[9] Amanda Nettelbeck 'A Halo of Protection': Colonial Protectors and the Principle of Aboriginal Protection through Punishment, *Australian Historical Studies,* Sept 20, 2012 (http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1031461X.2012.706621).

[10] Lord Glenelg, 31 January 1838, Despatches of the Governors of the Australian Colonies, with the Reports of the Protectors of Aborigines, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers (HCPP), no. 627 (1844), 1667 as cited in (Ibid).

[11] "After reprimanding Hermann Goering for Germany's burgeoning network of concentration camps on the eve of World War II, the British Ambassador to Berlin, Sir Nevile Henderson, received a sharp rebuke. Walking to his bookshelf, the Nazi leader pulled out the 'K' volume of a German encyclopaedia and read "Konzentrationslager: first used by Britain in the South African War [of 1899-1902]."- Nevile Henderson, Failure of a Mission: Berlin 1937-1939 (New York: G.P. Puntnam's Sons, 1940), 21 as quoted in Aidan Forth (2012).

[12] The main argument in the case of camps instituted during South African Boer war (1899-1902) was to protect the civilians from the conflict. This pattern can be seen in the later camps instituted by Spanish government during the military invasion of Cuba, Germany's attempt to create camps in erstwhile Deutsche Sud-West Africa (Namibia) or yet again establishment of "concentration zones "in Philippines by United States.

[13] It was considered to be the basic humanitarian protection that was 'benevolently' provided by the imperial masters to the colonial subjects as in the case of aforementioned Famine in British India in 1870s and 1890s or during the plague conditions prevalent in Africa and India in 1896-1901.

[14] These camps were created for the Armenians fleeing the genocide orchestrated by then Turkish government in 1915-1923 (Kaprielian-Churchill, 1993).

[15]Dust bowl camps in California were created for the American labour migrants from the Great Plains and Midwest fleeing the environmental cataclysm in the drought struck 'Dust bowl region in 1930s. Roughly 2.5 million people left the Dust Bowl states—Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas and Oklahoma—during the 1930s. It was the largest migration in American history"-See https://www.history.com/topics/great-depression/dust-bowl

[16]The defeat of German forces by Allied powers simultaneously precipitated the voluntary return of 7 million people to their homeland who had earlier fled the totalitarian Nazi regime (Cohen, 2008)

[17]Most of the people residing in these camps were reluctant to be repatriated to their homelands in countries such as Lithuania, Poland, Russia, Yugoslavia etc. along with the "Soviet prisoners of war and French civilian soldiers"(Slatt, 2002).

[18] Also see https://collections.museumvictoria.com.au/articles/13619

[19] Despite of its conceptualization as temporary establishments for protection of displaced populations, most of them went on to last for longer duration "providing accommodation, employment, education, medical care, recreation and transit"[19] for the vulnerable (Shephard, 2011). The attempt by the camp administrations to the rearrange the disorganized camp structure according to the identity and national affiliations of the inmates did not effectively materialize.

[20] A usage made by Lord Curzon as quoted in Gatrell (2013) in The Making of a Modern Refugee.

[22]UNHCR - UNHCR concerned at detention of asylum-seekers, releases new guidelines

References

Aas, K. F. & Bosworth, M. (eds.) (2013) Migration and Punishment: Citizenship, Crime Control, and Social Exclusion. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Abdelaaty, L. E. (2021). Discrimination and Delegation: Explaining State Responses to Refugees. Oxford University Press

Agamben, G. (1998) Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life, Palo Alto, Stanford University Press, p.169

Agnew, J. (1994) 'The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Today', *Review of International Political Economy*, 1(1): 53–80.

Banks, J. (2003) The Social Construction of Asylum Seekers and Refugees by English National Newspapers. University of Leicester:Unpublished MSc Dissertation.

Banks, J. (2008) 'The Criminalisation of Asylum Seekers and Asylum Policy', Prison Service Journal, 175: 43-49.Bauböck, R. (1995) 'Ethical Problems of Immigration Control and Citizenship', in R. Cohen (ed.) *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 551–556Behr, H. (2004) *EntterritorialePolitik: Von den internationalenBeziehungenzurNetzwerkanalyse* (Wiesbaden: VS).

Benhabib, S. (2006). Hospitality, Sovereignty, and Democratic Iterations. *In Another Cosmopolitanism* (pp.147-177).

Cahill, M. T., Punishment Pluralism (September 3, 2010). RETRIBUTIVISM: ESSAYS ON THEORY AND POLICY, Mark D. White ed., Oxford University Press, Forthcoming, Brooklyn Law School, Legal Studies Paper No. 215.|

De Genova, N. Glenda Garelli, and Martina Tazzioli, Autonomy of Asylum? The Autonomy of Migration Undoing the Refugee Crisis Script, The South Atlantic Quarterly 117:2, April 2018

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Garland, D. (1996) The Limits of the Sovereign State. British Journal of Criminology, Vol.36(4): 445-471

Geiger M. (2013) The Transformation of Migration Politics. In: Geiger M., Pécoud A. (eds) Disciplining the Transnational Mobility of People. International Political Economy Series. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Hammar, T. (1990) *Democracy and the Nation State. Aliens, Denizens and Citizens in a World of lnternational Migration* (Aldershot et al: Ashgate).

Hathaway, J.C. (1991) The Law of Refugee Status, Butterworths (Toronto: Vancouver,).

Hernández-León, R. (2013) 'Conceptualizing the Migration Industry', in T. Gammeltoft-Hansen and N. Nyberg-Sørensen (eds) *The Migration Industry and the Commercialization of International Migration* (London and New York: Routledge), 25–44.
Hollifield JF. The Emerging Migration State. *International Migration Review*. 2004;38(3):885-912.
Liss, R. (2014) Right to Belong: Legal Protection of Sociological Membership In The Application Of Article 12(4) Of The ICCPR, International Law And Politics, Vol 46 Pp1094-
Mackert, J. (1999) *Kampf um Zugehörigkeit: NationaleStaatsbürgerschaftals Modus sozialerSchließung* (Opladen and Wiesbaden: VS).
Mamdani, M. (2010) Responsibility to Protect or Right to Punish? Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, 4:1, 53-67.
Nettelbeck, A. (2012). 'A Halo of Protection': Colonial Protectors and the Principle of Aboriginal Protection through Punishment, *Australian Historical Studies*.
Pécoud, A. (2013) '*Suddenly, Migration Was Everywhere': The Conception and Future Prospects of the Global Migration Group* (Washington D.C.: Migration Policy Institute)
Pickering, M. (2008) Research Methods for Cultural Studies. Edinburgh: EdinburghUniversity Press.
Pickering, S. (2004). Narrating women and asylum. In S. Pickering, C. Lambert (eds), Global Issues, Women and Justice. Sydney: Institute of Criminology Monograph Series/Federation Press
Puumala, E.(2010). Bodies out of line? Corporealities of Border Practicing and the Politics of Refugee Protection, Refugee Watch ,35.
Richmond, A.H. (1994) Global Apartheid: Refugees, Racism and the New World Order. Toronto: Oxford University Press Canada.
Sanyal, R. 2011. "Squatting in Camps: Building and Insurgency in Spaces of Refuge." Urban Studies 48 (5): 877–890
Shacknove, A. (1985). Who is a Refugee? Ethics, January, 274–284
Spiro, P.J. (2011), A New International Law of Citizenship, 105 AM. J. INT'L L. 694- 695.
Weiner, M. (1996) 'On International Migration and International Relations', in R. Cohen (ed.) *Theories of Migration* (Cheltenham and Brookfield: Edwar Elgar Publishers), 441–511.
Zolberg A. R. (1991) 'Bounded States in a Global Market. The Uses of International Labor Migrations', in P. Bourdieu and J. S. Coleman (eds) *Social Theory for a Changing Society* (Boulder et al.: Westview Press), 301–325.

CRG Series on Policies and Practices

113. The Invisible Migrant Workers: In Life , In Death
114. Biometric, Notion of Governmentally and Gender Relations in Rohingya Refugee Camps
115. Media on Migrants : Reports from Field -I
116. Media on Migrants : Reports from Field -II
117. Transition without Justice in the Postcolonial World: Protection Discourses for Refugees & Migrants in South Asia
118. Media Discourses on the Bengal Bangladesh Border
119. Culture, Migration and the Time of an Epidemic: The Nautanki Theatres/ Bhojpuri Nataks in 1990s
120. COVID-19, Migrants, Media
121. Refugees and Migrants as Subjects of Economy and Politics
122. COVID-19 and After: Work, Life and Salience of Primitive Accumulation
123. Two Essays on Ethics and Practices of Care and Solidarity

CRG Series on Policies and Practices

74. Cities, Rural Migrants & the Urban Poor-III: Migration & the Urban Question in Delhi
75. Classes, People, and Populism
76. Logistical Space I: Logistics and Social Governance
77. Logistical Space II: Mobilities and Spaces
78. Logistical Space III:Hubs, Connectivity and Transit
79. Logistical Space IV: The Asam Paradigm
80. People, Politics and Protests I: Calcutta & West Bengal, 1950s - 1960s
81. People, Politics and Protests II: Bengal and Bihar
82. People, Politics and Protests III: Marxian, Literary Debates and Discourses
83. The Importance of being Siliguri, or the Lack therof: Border-Effect and the "Untimely" City in North Bengal
84. Logistical Space V: Representations of Connectivity
85. Logistical Space VI: Logistics and the Reshaping of Global Governance
86. Logistical Space VII: Finance Capital & Infrastructure Development
87. Logistical Space VIII: Trade, Capital & Conflict
88. Logistical Space IX: Conflict & Social Governance in Northeast India
89. People, Politics and Protests IV: Occupy College Street: Notes from the Sixties
90. People, Politics and Protests V: The Creative & Cultural Dimension of the Naxalbari Movement
91. People, Politics and Protests VI: Karporri Thakur
92. People, Politics and Protests VII: The Radical Rural
93. People, Politics and Protests VIII: Left Front Government in West Bengal (1971-1982)
94. Population and Rent in *Capital*
95. *Capital*: Value & Translation
96. The Urban Turn
97. Peasants, Students, Insurgents and Popular Movements in Contemporary Assam
98. Migration and Governance I: Promises and Paradoxes of a Global Gaze
99. Migration and Governance II: Responsibility to Protect- Questions of Race, Religion, Resource and the Unspoken Fourth
100. Migration and Governance III: Population Flows, Refugees, and the Responsibility to Protect in the Global Protection System
101. Migration and Governance IV: Global Capitalism and Refugee and Migrant Labour
102. Migration and Governance V: Statelessness, International Conventions and the Need for New Initiatives ? Addressing the New Frontiers of Statelessness
103. Migration and Governance VI : Migrants and Movements across Asia : Mobility, Global Migration Governance and the European Response
104. Global Capitalism, Informal Economy and the Question of Labour
105. Reflections on the Mediterranean Refugee Crisis
106. Populism- I :Politics, Policies and Social justice
107. Populism- II: States and Political Parties
108. Populism- III: Leadership and Governmentality
109. Interrogating Citizenship: Perspectives from India's East and North East
110. Auto-Ethnoraphy as a Research Method: Evidence from Field Research on Ethiopian Irregular Migrants in South Africa
111 Borderlands, Migration and Labour
112 Two Writings on Climate, Disasters and Displacement

CRG Series on Policies and Practices

31 Local Dynamics, Universal Context : Border Trading through Moreh, Manipur
32 Two Studies on Asylum Seekers and Other Immigrants in Finland
33 Endangered Lives on The Border: Women in the Northeast
34 Globalisation and Labouring Lives
35 Right to Information in a Globalising World
36 Bengal-Bangladesh Border and Women
37 Between Ecology and Economy : Environmental Governance in India
38 Incomplete Citizenship, Statelessness and Human Trafficking: A Preliminary Analysis of The Current Situation in West Bengal, India
39 Place of Poor in Urban Space
40 Law and Democratic Governance: Two Studies from Europe
41 Finding a Point of Return: Internally Displaced Persons in Sri Lanka
42 Colonialism, Resource Crisis and Forced Migration
43 Situating Transit Labour
44 Two Essays on Security Apparatus
45 Governing Flood, Migration and Conflict in North Bihar
46 A Gigantic Panopticon: Counter-Insurgency and Modes of Disciplining and Punishment in Northeast India
47 Public Interest Litigation in India: Implications for Law and Development
48 Governing Caste and Managing Conflicts-Bihar, 1990-2011
49 Emerging Spaces and Labour Relations in Neo-Liberal India
50 Peace by Governance or Governing Peace? A Case Study of the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA)
51 Women, Conflict and Governance in Nagaland
52 Tripura: Ethnic Conflict, Militancy & Counterinsurgency
53 Government of Peace
54 Bengal Borders and Travelling Lives
55 Financialisation, Labour Market Flexibility, and Global Crisis
56 The Chronicle of a Forgotten Movement: 1959 Food Movement Revisited
57 The Religious Nature of Our Political Rites
58. Social Impact of the City Planning Machinery: Case Study of Road-Widening in Bangalore
59. In Search of Space: The Scheduled Caste Movement in West Bengal after Partition
60. Stateless in Law: Two Assessments
61.Failed by Design? : The Limitations of Statebuilding
62. Contesting Ideas on Peace (A Report & Some Reflections)
63. Body/Law/Technology: The Political Implications of Society as Apparatus
64. Accumulation under Post-Colonial Capitalism-I: An Overview
65. Accumulation under Post-Colonial Capitalism-II: War, Debt, and Reconstruction of Economy
66. Accumulation under Post-Colonial Capitalism-III: The Arab Question in Post-Colonial France
67. Accumulation under Post-Colonial Capitalism-IV: Mobile Labour and the New Urban
68. West Bengal-Bangladesh Borders: Humanitarian Issues
69. Policing a Riot-torn City: Kolkata, 16-18 August 1946
70. Labour, Law and Forced Migration
71. Rohingyas in India: Birth of a Stateless Community
72. Cities, Rural Migrants & the Urban Poor-I: Migration & the Urban Question in Kolkata
73. Cities, Rural Migrants & the Urban Poor-II: Migration & the Urban Question in Mumbai

CRG Series on Policies and Practices

1 People on the Move: How Governments Manage Moving Populations
2 Resources for Autonomy - Financing the Local Bodies
3 Peace Accords as the Basis of Autonomy
4 Debates Over Women's Autonomy
5 Unequal Communication: Health and Disasters As Issues of Public Sphere
6 Globalisation, State Policies And Sustainability of Rights
7 Autonomies in the North and the North East: More Freedom or the Politics of Frontier Management?
8 Examining Autonomy : The 73rd Constitutional Amendment in Assam
9 Democracy, Autonomy and the Community Media
10 Women and Forced Migration
11 Flags and Rights
12 A Status Report on Displacement in Assam and Manipur
13 Weapons of the Weak: Field Studies on Claims to Social Justice in Bihar & Orissa
14 Towards a New Consideration: Justice for the Minorities
15 Conflict, War & Displacement
16 The Draft National Rehabilitation Policy: A Critique
17 Limits of the Humanitarian: Studies in Situations of Forced Migration
18 Prescribed, Tolerated, and Forbidden Forms of Claim Making
19 Three Studies on Law and The Shifting Spaces of Justice.
20 Primitive Accumulation and Some Aspects of Work and Life in India in The Early Part of The Twenty First Century.
21 Citizens, Non-Citizens, and The Stories of Camps
22 Tales of Two Cities
23 Ways of Power, Minorities, and Knowledge on Minorities: An Assessment of Research Policies and Practices.
24 Whither Right to Food? Rights Institutions and Hungry Labour in Tea Plantations of North Bengal
25 Hunger, Food Scarcity, & Popular Protests in West Bengal
26 Cyclone Aila & the Sundarbans: An Enquiry into the Disaster and Politics of Aid and Relief
27 View from India: Media & Minorities in Europe
28 Protecting the Rights of the Tsunami Victims: The Sri Lanka Experience
29 Nation Building and Minority Alienation in India
30 Environment and Migration Purulia, West Bengal

POLICIES AND PRACTICES is the research paper series brought out by the Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group (CRG). Writings under this series can be referred to and used for public educational purposes with due acknowledgment.

ISSN 2348-0297