

Refugee Protection and the State in South Asia

By

Akanksha Kapoor

Introduction

Forced migration has become a global phenomena today. South Asia is one such region which has witnessed intra-regional migration owing to forced migration caused by the civil wars and rising tensions between different religions and communities leading to persecution of minorities by the dominant groups. The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) defines forced migration as a migratory movement due to diverse drivers, which involves force, compulsion or coercion. Displacement can be caused due to armed conflict, man-made or natural disasters, development induced, human trafficking among other reasons. Conflict-induced displacement is one of the most prominent factors behind the displacement of millions of people in the South Asian subcontinent.¹ Conflicts and violence compel people to leave their homes in search of safer places. Some cross an international border, while others remain displaced within their own country. The people of the former category are known as refugees, while the latter are called internally displaced persons (IDPs). South Asia has witnessed the mass exodus along with the influx of refugees from the neighbouring countries. The post-colonial societies such as India, Pakistan and Bangladesh have been playing host to millions of refugees from the neighbouring countries.² Even though these countries have not acceded to the international refugee protection and do not have any regional agreement on protection of non-citizens, they have been extremely tolerant towards different refugee groups seeking shelter over the years. But the state does engage in exclusionary and inclusionary practices of protection, which impacts the refugee group at the receiving end of that protection. Protection often gets translated into recognition and the entitlement of certain rights, and often takes years, maybe decades as the state alone has the onus to legitimise the claims of belonging. But until the state takes a decision with regard to the claims of belonging being made, refugees are forced to live in a deplorable state in the temporary

¹ The factors behind conflict induced displacement can be driven by violent oppression, civil war, or other political and social processes leading to violence or persecution (Lischer, 2014; Reed et.al., 2016; Lischer, 2007).

² The refugees in the post-colonial societies had to flee owing to ethnic or religious conflicts, state persecution, economic factors among others.

settlements or camps. Some of the refugee groups continue to live in a protracted state of limbo for decades without any recognition or 'durable' solution. This paper tries to focus on the issue of refugee protection especially in South Asian countries, and therefore is divided into four sections. The first section deals with refugee protection, followed by the second section on the theoretical framework which looks at the concepts of belonging, politics of belonging, the politics of recognition, membership. The third section discusses the different kinds of protections provided in the South Asian countries and finally the conclusion.

Refugee Protection

The 1951 Convention defines refugee as a person who: “owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.” Protection usually refers to legal protection (Steiner et.al., 2003 p.20). According to the UNHCR, refugee protection is about “life-saving interventions, fair treatment upon reception, compliance with essential humanitarian standards and non-return to a place of prospective persecution” (Steiner et.al. 2003 p.11). Refugee protection is provided to those who have been forced to leave their country of origin owing to fear of persecution and are deprived of any kind of protection from the country of origin. Besides the host country, UNHCR is also entrusted with the responsibility to work towards the protection of the forced migrants. Refugees are governed according to the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol. UNHCR provides for three durable solutions which include local integration³, voluntary repatriation⁴, and resettlement⁵. One of the principles that protects the interests of the refugees is the principle of non-refoulement⁶ stated in Article 33(1) of the 1951 Convention.

³ Local integration implies to locally integrate in the host society.

⁴ Voluntary repatriation implies return to their country of origin.

⁵ Resettlement means to resettle in a third country.

⁶ Non-refoulement is an important principle to international refugee law, which acts as a complete prohibition against the forcible return of people to a place where they will be subject to grave human rights violations or where their life or personal security will be seriously endangered. The principle of non-refoulement applies equally to refugees at the border of a state and to those already admitted, and it remains in force until the adverse conditions

Except Afghanistan, none of the South Asian countries are signatories to the 1951 Refugee Convention, which affects the refugee populations living in different countries in the region. These refugee groups have been living in the host countries without any durable solutions for years giving rise to protracted refugee situations⁷. Displacement situations become protracted because no durable solutions have been found or provided by the state to address the concerns of the refugees. This means that refugees' basic rights and essential economic, social and psychological needs remain unfulfilled after years in exile. The protracted refugee situations arise due to political impasses between the countries of origin and host countries (Steiner et.al. 2003). Since a majority of refugees seek shelter in the developing countries, they feel burdened as they provide for their populations along with millions of refugees seeking shelter. The countries of the Global North seldom provide any kind of assistance to the developing countries.

Role of the state and protection norms: A Theoretical Understanding

State as a sovereign entity is solely responsible for providing recognition (in the form of membership) and protection to refugees. Each state has a criteria for providing membership, which can be primarily categorised as *jus soli* (birth) or *jus sanguinis* (descent). The composition of every political community is different and as Walzer puts it, the members of this political community have the right to draw admission policies accordingly, without having to compromise with the nature of the community (Walzer 1983).⁸ But Walzer also asserts that if immigrants enter the community they should be treated as members of that community (Ibid.). He also argues that the principle of justice demands that every resident alien be considered as a citizen or potential citizen (Bosniak 2006). Walzer (1983) considers membership as a social good to distributed to strangers and in order to distribute membership, he focuses on the aspect of mutual aid. States usually provide recognition to members based on some form of shared affinities, which can be based on ethnicity, religion, language among other determinants. On the one hand, certain identities provide the basis for membership, and on the other hand these identities are also

which prompted people to flee in the first place are alleviated (Nair, 1997). The principle finds mention in Article 33 of the Refugee Convention and its Protocol.

⁷ According to the UNHCR, a protracted refugee situation is defined "as one in which 25,000 or more refugees from the same nationality have been in exile for five consecutive years or more in a given asylum country".

⁸ Walzer (1983) contends that the sovereign state has the authority to make its own admission policies and restrain the entry of immigrants but at the same time, he also asserts that the states should consider taking refugees inside in case there is a threat to their life (Chowdhory 2019).

responsible for the exclusion and disavowal of those who seek refuge. Walzer maintains that if national affinity is the basis of recognition, the non-recognition of immigrants should not be the reason for their expulsion. The notion of national inclusion becomes evident when citizenship is granted to those residing within national boundaries (Bond 2006). Residence, birth and ancestry are considered to be the three most prominent markers of national identity. Within any national context, an individual who can claim national belonging on the basis of all three of these markers of national identity will almost certainly have a straightforward claim to this identity. Inclusion and citizenship have been premised on the ideal of shared 'belonging' to a single polity, nation and culture. Membership is often provided based on the notions of belonging (Chowdhory 2012). Belonging, according to Yuval-Davis (2006) is about emotional attachment. Belonging tends to be naturalised, and gets articulated and politicised only when it is threatened in some way. A deep connection with land often provides a sense of belonging and identity among the non-citizens (Chowdhory 2012). State alone has the authority to determine the attributes and claims of belonging. The state materialises the claims of belonging by providing rights to those who belong. Crowley (1999) maintains that belonging is a "thicker" concept than citizenship. It is not just about membership, rights, and duties, but also about the emotions that such memberships evoke.

The politics of belonging comprises specific political projects aimed at constructing belonging in particular ways to particular collectivities. Yuval-Davis (2006) maintains that the politics of belonging involves the construction of boundaries along with the inclusion and exclusion of particular categories of people. Calhoun (2006) points out that belonging is a significant basis on which people are ready to kill or be killed in wars and civil conflicts. The claims to national belonging are often influenced by the beliefs which the majority holds about the validity of such claims. The claims of belonging are also made by non-citizens to gain some form of recognition and protection in the host state.

John Crowley (1999) defined the politics of belonging as 'the dirty work of boundary maintenance'. The boundaries that the politics of belonging is concerned with are the boundaries of the political community of belonging, the boundaries which segregate the people into 'us' and 'them' categories. Adrian Favell (1999) posits that the construction of boundaries and borders that differentiate between those who belong, and those who do not, determines and colours the

meaning of the particular belonging. Vikki Bell (1999) has discussed the various performative ways in which such boundaries and borders are constructed and reproduced. It is here that the interrelationships between the politics of belonging and struggles for national self-determination are anchored. Maier (2007) postulates that the territorial organisation helps shape the political identity. Therefore, state territorial borders are one major way in which collectivity boundaries are imagined, dividing the people into those who belong to the nation and those who do not. In her work Chowdhory (2012) discusses how territoriality is the basis on which rights are granted to the members of the state and that citizenship in such cases is based on the grounds of political belonging⁹. The inclusion or exclusion of rights are determined by the state, thus creating the categories of insider and outsider. Isin believes that the pervasive outsider and the citizen are mutually constitutive (McNevin 2006). He also asserts that it is only through the parallel marking of the outsider that the insider identity can exist (Ibid.). These insider/outsider, citizen/non-citizen dynamics are an enduring feature of political communities according to Isin. Citizenship, in his opinion, does not revolve around formal membership of a nation-state alone, but instead focuses on the inclusion of some and the exclusion of others from the political community (McNevin 2006).

Refugees are often considered a burden on the host state or as Agier (2011) portrays them- “the undesirables” are forced to live in an abominable state in the country of asylum. The lack of status in the asylum state, which is linked to the politics of belonging for refugees, forces the refugees to repatriate. Those who do not repatriate continue to live in an abysmal state. As Agamben puts it, their existence is reduced to “bare life” as they are stripped of rights in the host country. Just like the ‘homo sacer’ the refugees are also excluded from the political community both internally as well as externally. Arendt talks about “the rights to have rights” and posits that the stateless should be entitled to certain rights by virtue of being human and that they should not be denied any rights just because they do not belong to a political community anymore. Chowdhory (2012) too advocates that the rights should be granted to non-citizens, especially refugees. She also argues that since the states are the only medium through which the individuals

⁹ The term “political belonging” represents the relationship between political community, political identity and political practice. It entails the physical and conceptual shape of polities, the status attached to members of a political community relative to non-members, and the means through which political claims are asserted and legitimised. Political belonging frames how one is positioned with respect to others and the agency one enjoys in that context (McNevin 2006).

can claim their rights, their claims of belonging should also be addressed so that they not only attain the legal status but their interests are also protected.

Bearing in mind that states are the only actors who have the power to recognise and materialise the claims of belonging, it becomes pertinent to delve into the aspect of politics of recognition. Taylor (1994) in his essay asserts that identity is ‘partly shaped by recognition or its absence ... non-recognition¹⁰ or misrecognition¹¹ can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being’. Taylor refers to recognition as ‘a vital human need’. The importance of recognition lies precisely in the fact that how others see us is a necessary condition in forming an understanding of who we are. Taylor analyses the politics of equal recognition in two different ways, firstly, politics of equal dignity¹², and secondly, the politics of difference¹³. Taylor, through his work on the politics of recognition, tries to defend the protection of cultural minorities by extending rights and respect to them. Honneth, like Taylor, posits that recognition is connected to self-realisation. Love, respect and esteem¹⁴ are the three modes of recognition that have been discussed by Honneth in his work. Of the three modes of recognition, respect is connected to legal recognition. In Honneth’s theory, ‘rights are the only means’ by which respect can be expressed. Honneth postulates that respect places limits on the outcomes and effects of familial and social misrecognition, affording individuals some degree of guaranteed equality. For Honneth, self-respect is a universalising form of social recognition. He contends that respect not only constitutes the ability to participate in a given community, but also constitutes the ability to participate ‘with equal rights, in the institutional order as a full-fledged member of a community’.

Rejecting Honneth’s model of recognition as self-realisation, Fraser contends that individuals are systematically oppressed through social structures, which value certain group identities whilst

¹⁰ Non-recognition, as the term implies, occurs where no identity, right(s) and / or values are assigned to an individual or group.

¹¹ Misrecognition implies that one has not been recognised in the way that one takes oneself to be.

¹² The politics of equal dignity or a politics of universalism, has the aim of the equalisation of all rights and entitlements.

¹³ In the politics of difference the uniqueness of each individual or group is recognised.

¹⁴ Love is the mode of recognition which, all being well, we receive from our small circle of significant others. Respect is that mode which we experience when our fellow citizens regard us as rights-bearing individuals. Esteem is the sort of recognition we enjoy when we are valued for our distinct contributions to society’s collective goals.

devaluing other groups, which strongly resembles Taylor's group-centred multiculturalism. For Fraser, injustice in the form of both misrecognition and maldistribution is deleterious as it impedes participatory equality. In case of the refugee crisis in the post-colonial societies, the misrecognition of stateless persons is perhaps the clearest evidence of the arbitrary and exclusionary power of the state. Though politics of recognition provides a critical framework, the works of Fraser, Honneth and Taylor have been criticised as they have relied greatly on recognition for the resolution of misrecognition and non-recognition of the minorities. Scholars like McBride (2013) and McQueen (2015) suggest that recognition cannot help fix the issue as recognition is regulated by the state, which often favours the dominant culture.

Refugee Protection and the case of South Asia

Two of the largest refugee crises and protracted refugee situations in the world today, that exist in the South Asian subcontinent are the Rohingyas and the Afghans. Rohingyas are considered to be the most persecuted minority in the world and have been subjected to widespread human rights violations.¹⁵ The largest number of Rohingyas (911,000) are hosted by Bangladesh and can be found in the Kutupalong-Balukhali expansion site near the town of Cox's Bazar in Bangladesh, which is now the world's largest refugee camp. Large-scale influxes of Rohingya refugees occurred in 1978, 1992, 2016, and most recently in August 2017, when over 800,000 people fled due to the atrocities committed by the military in Myanmar. The reception and treatment of refugees by the government of Bangladesh has been largely ad hoc and discretionary in nature, determined primarily by the central government rather than prescribed by legislation. In the absence of a legislative framework recognizing refugees, refugees' presence in Bangladesh is governed primarily by the Foreigners Act of 1946. Besides Bangladesh, Rohingya communities have sought refuge in other South and Southeast Asian countries namely, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan and Thailand.

Besides Bangladesh, India has hosted multiple refugee populations throughout its independent history, including some 150,000 Tibetan refugees, an estimated 80,000 Sri Lankan Tamil refugees, and approximately 14,000 Rohingya refugees. Refugee policy in India has evolved

¹⁵ Rohingyas (from Myanmar) have historically sought refuge in Bangladesh from government persecution and disenfranchisement.

from a mix of ad hoc federal and state-level policies. The absence of a legislative framework for the recognition and governance of refugee populations has resulted in a fragile set of practices, granting varying levels of protection on a group-by-group basis (resulting in prima facie recognition for certain groups). While some refugees are forced to live in camps with restricted mobility, others may be close to getting citizenship in the host country. The 2019 amendment of the Citizenship Act extended pathways to Indian citizenship for refugees from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, and Pakistan belonging to minority religious communities, but excluded Muslim refugees of the same countries from the possibility of attaining a legal status. This disparate treatment of Muslim minorities is indicative of the exclusionary approach that is often applied in India with regards to legal protection, administrative orders, or directives. Pakistan too has been among the top five host countries of refugees for the last several decades. The country currently plays host to 1.4 million Afghan refugees. Afghan nationals have been seeking refuge in the countries across the region for decades.

Chowdhory (2013) believes that the intolerance towards the accommodation of minority rights in some of the South Asian countries can be attributed to the processes of state building. While some states focused on having a homogeneous population, where the majority could dominate, countries like India adopted a more pluralist policy of accommodation. Refugees face a variety of challenges concerning their legal identity, particularly in host states lacking formal frameworks to establish a distinct legal status for refugees or procedures to identify them. In India, refugee determination is based on the evidence produced by the refugee to support his/her claim implying that the burden of proof lies on the claimant.

The South Asian countries are neither party to the 1951 Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol nor do they have any regional framework to abide by in their states, instead Pakistan, India and Bangladesh are all dependent on the colonial law i.e. the Foreigner's Act of 1946 to handle the refugee crisis. These post-colonial societies have still managed to engage in the positive practices of protection. Countries like India have undertaken an obligation by ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to accord equal treatment to all non-citizens. Additionally, India also accepted the principles of non-refoulement as envisioned in the Bangkok Principles of

1966, which were formulated for the guidance of member states in respect to matters concerning the status and treatment of refugees. With regard to concerns of repatriation of refugees, India engages in a bilateral arrangement with the countries of origin alone.

Like India, different countries had initiated different provisions to accommodate or recognise the varied refugee groups seeking protection. In Bangladesh, the Births and Deaths Registration Act of 2004;¹⁶ the 2008 judgement in *Md. Sadagat Khan (Fakku) v. Chief Election Commissioner*¹⁷ were significant developments towards the recognition of refugees. The judiciary in these post-colonial societies have recognised the principle of non-refoulement as binding customary international law, which became evident through the rulings in different cases in these countries. In Bangladesh, the High Court Division's 2017 judgement in *RMMRU v. the Government of Bangladesh*¹⁸.

India's Supreme Court too has affirmed the binding nature of the norm of non-refoulement on the Indian government through various judgements. This includes the landmark case of *Malavika Karlekar v. Union of India*¹⁹. Moreover, other cases including *Bogyi vs. Union of India*, *Kfaer Abbas Habib al Qutaifi vs. Union of India*, and *Dongh Lian Kham vs. Union of India*. In Pakistan, a 1996 judgement declared that family courts have plenary jurisdiction to hear cases brought by non-citizens and citizens alike. The *Anil Mussarat Hussain v. Muhammad Anwar Naseem* judgement further upheld in *Majid Hussain v. Farrah Naz*²⁰ were significant judgements too. In 2011 India provided long-term visas (LTVs) to Bangladesh and Pakistan nationals who

¹⁶ The Births and Deaths Registration Act of 2004, introduced compulsory birth registration for "any Bangladeshi or any foreigner living in Bangladesh and also any refugee taking shelter in Bangladesh."

¹⁷ In the 2008 case *Md. Sadagat Khan (Fakku) v. Chief Election Commissioner* the Bangladesh Election Commission (Supreme Court of Bangladesh High Court Division) held that, according to Bangladesh's laws, Urdu-speaking habitual residents of Bangladesh could not be deprived of Bangladeshi citizenship.

¹⁸ The *RMMRU v. the Government of Bangladesh* judgement recognized Bangladesh's obligation under the norm of non refoulement, which was a part of customary international law. The decision declared unconstitutional the arbitrary detention of Rohingya prisoners after the completion of their prison terms and directed they be accommodated in the refugee camps. This limitation on the state's ability to return foreign nationals applies not only to Rohingya refugees, but to individuals of any nationality who would face torture or other inhumane treatment, or even persecution of other kinds, if returned to their country of origin.

¹⁹ In the case of *Malavika Karlekar v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court recognized the principle of non-refoulement as customary international law.

²⁰ These rulings clarify that the nationality of plaintiffs is immaterial to the question of the jurisdiction of Pakistan's family courts, and it is possible that Afghan refugees and other non-citizens in Pakistan may be similarly impacted by these rulings.

belonged to minority religious groups (mostly Hindus).²¹ LTV holders are provided with a legal identification and status, which provides them access to health care, education, employment, banking, and other benefits and services.

In the absence of a legal framework, post-colonial countries follow ad hoc policies of accommodation and protection and therefore, the judiciary plays a significant role to keep a check on the arbitrariness of the government. In India, refugees and asylum seekers are vulnerable to arrest and detention under the 1946 Foreigners Act. Refugee populations in India that fall under the UNHCR's mandate are, at the discretion of the courts, and are often permitted to request refugee status determination while in detention. The cases such as *U Myat Kayew v. State of Manipur*²², the *Yogeswari v. State of Tamil Nadu* case²³ are examples.

In Bangladesh, *Faustina Pereira v. State* (2001) case²⁴ and the *Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit (RMMRU) v. the Government of Bangladesh* (2017)²⁵ were critical cases which advocated in favour of the refugee groups. Similarly, the *Awais Sheikh vs. Secretary Ministry of Interior Islamabad* (2012)²⁶ ruling in Pakistan.

In India, the judicial practices do constitute positive developments by asserting limits on government powers to detain and reinforcing the recognition of every person's right to personal liberty. The Indian constitution does have certain provisions which act as safeguard to the

²¹ This depicts that the government has the means to provide meaningful access to rights and benefits for communities in need of protection.

²² The Gauhati High Court allowed a Burmese asylum seeker to be released from detention in order to access UNHCR to present their claim.

²³ The Madras High Court held that detention under Section 3(2)(e) of the Foreigners Act of 1946 may not violate Article 21 (right to personal liberty) or Article 22(4) of the Constitution of India (providing limits on preventive detention).

²⁴ The High Court of Bangladesh stated that holding a non-citizen prisoner in jail after they have served their sentence violates the rights conferred upon them by the Constitution of Bangladesh.

²⁵ The High Court held that indefinite detention of foreigners is unlawful, ordering the release of five Rohingyas and directing the petitioner to take appropriate steps to accommodate them in Rohingya camps in Cox's Bazar.

²⁶ The Lahore High Court ruled that indefinite detention is not in accordance with the Foreigners Act. A non-citizen may, following the expiry of their sentence, be kept in custody for no more than an additional three months where necessary in order to make arrangements for their deportation.

refugee groups.²⁷ On the other hand, in both Bangladesh and Pakistan, where the Foreigners Act gives law enforcement agencies broad authority to detain foreigners on the grounds of lack of documentation and/or illegal entry, judicial precedents have imposed limits on those powers.

The South Asian countries namely Pakistan, Bangladesh and India have taken a step further by catering to the needs of refugee children's education. In these countries legislation has been adopted to implement Article 28(a) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child at the national level, explicitly recognizing that the right to education extends to non-citizen children. Provisions such as the Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2012²⁸ in Pakistan; Article 17 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, and the Primary Education (Compulsory) Act, 1990²⁹ in Bangladesh; and Article 21A of the Constitution of India³⁰ depict the responsibility taken by the post-colonial societies for the refugee children.

Yet there are several barriers to the full implementation and universal realisation of children's right to access education in these countries. In Bangladesh, the Primary Education (Compulsory) Act falls short of explicitly setting out access to education as a guarantee (despite the constitutional guarantee under Article 17), and the government of Bangladesh has demonstrated resistance toward providing refugee populations, including Rohingya refugees, access to formal schooling opportunities. In Pakistan and India, the costs associated with schooling have created a barrier to access for citizen and non-citizen children alike.

²⁷ The provisions in the Indian Constitution include - Article 14 - the right to equality; Article 21- the right to personal life and liberty; and Article 25: the freedom to practise and propagate one's own religion, which are guaranteed to citizens and non-citizens alike (Chowdhory, 2013).

²⁸ In Pakistan, the Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2012 guarantees the fundamental right to free and compulsory education in a neighborhood school to all children, regardless of sex, nationality, or race, making no mention of immigration status.

²⁹ In Bangladesh, Article 17 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, and the Primary Education (Compulsory) Act, 1990 deals with the state's obligation to provide free and compulsory education to all children is affirmed in provides the government with the power to issue orders declaring primary education mandatory for all children ages six to ten who live within the area specified in these orders.

³⁰ Article 21A of the Constitution of India establishes the fundamental right to free and compulsory education to all children ages six to fourteen. The 2009 Right to Education Act establishes that ensuring the enrollment of school-age children is a responsibility of the state. Further, the Act establishes a set of procedures for reporting violations of the right to education.

Conclusion

Continued instances of forced migration across the world have compelled people to leave their homes in search of haven. Therefore, after being dispossessed of the rights and protections of their country, those who seek refuge in other states need to be ascertained some form of protection. The state as a sovereign institution alone has the power to determine its membership and engage in the politics of belonging by including some and excluding others. The states in the South Asian subcontinent have been playing host to millions of refugees over the years on an ad hoc basis, in the absence of any legal arrangement. The South Asian region lacks a consensus on the definition of refugee, and its states have made meagre attempts to address this issue. The case of the post-colonial societies is different from the other cases across the world as the historical experiences of these states include colonisation, decolonisation, partitions and various other developments, which have shaped the very nature of these societies and therefore, it becomes difficult to see these societies devoid of their past. The South Asian states have tried to ensure some kind of protection to the refugees in the form of certain rights and privileges. The judiciary too in these countries keeps a check on the repressive nature of the state. In order to curb the arbitrariness of the states, they should accede to the 1951 Refugee Convention and also put together a regional framework to cater to the refugee crisis as refugees in these countries continue to live in precarious conditions without any legal status or recognition. Since the Global South hosts a majority of the refugees, the Global North countries need to assist them to lessen the burden on the developing countries alone.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelman, Howard. 2008. "Protracted Displacement." In *Protracted Displacement in Asia No Place to Call Home*, edited by Howard Adelman. Routledge.
- Agamben, Giorgio. 1995. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Agier, Michel. 2011. *Managing the Undesirables*. Polity Press.
- Anderson, Kay, and Affrica Taylor. 2005. "Exclusionary Politics and the Question of National Belonging." *Ethnicities* 5 (4): 460–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796805058095>.
- Banerjee, Paula. 2014. "Forced Migration in South Asia." In *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long, and Nando Sigona. Oxford University Press.
- Behrman, Simon. 2019. "Laws of Asylum and Protection: The Indian Experience in a South Asian Context." *Refugee Watch* 54: 15–28.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 2011. *The Rights of Others : Aliens, Residents, and Citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Bond, Ross. 2006. "Belonging and Becoming: National Identity and Exclusion." *Sociology* 40 (4): 609–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038506065149>.
- Bosniak, Linda. 2008. *The Citizen and the Alien : Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Burra, Srinivas. 2022. "India's Refugee Protection Obligations beyond the 1951 Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol." In *The Routledge Handbook of Refugees in India*, edited by S.Irudaya Rajan, 183–91. Routledge.
- Calhoun, Craig. 2007. "Social Solidarity as a Problem for Cosmopolitan Democracy." In *Identities, Affiliations and Allegiances*, edited by Seyla Benhabib, Ian Shapiro, and Danilo Petranovic, 285–302. Cambridge University Press.
- Chowdhory, Nasreen. 2012. "Assessing 'Belonging' and Claims of 'Home' among Refugees: A Note on Repatriation in South Asia." *South Asian Journal of Peacebuilding* 4 (1).
- Chowdhory, Nasreen. 2013. "Marginalisation and Exclusion: Politics of Non-Citizen Rights in Postcolonial South Asia." *Refugee Watch*, no. 42 (December): 1–16.
- Chowdhory, Nasreen. 2018. *Refugees, Citizenship and Belonging in South Asia : Contested Terrains*. Springer.
- Chowdhory, Nasreen. 2019. "Citizenship and Membership: Placing Refugees in India." In *Deterritorialized Identity and Transborder Movement in South Asia*, edited by Nasir Uddin and Nasreen Chowdhory, 37–54. Singapore: Springer.

- Chowdhory, Nasreen, and Shamna Thacham Poyil. 2019. "The Global Compact of Refugees: A Viewpoint of Global South." *Refugee Watch* 54 (December): 1–14.
- Chowdhory, Nasreen, Shamna Thacham Poyil, and Meghna Kajla. 2019. "The Idea of Protection: Norms and Practice of Refugee Management in India." *Refugee Watch* 53: 36–54.
- Crowley, John. 1999. "The Politics of Belonging: Theoretical Considerations." In *The Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe*, edited by Adrian Favell and Andrew Geddes, 15–41. Ashgate.
- Derrida, Jacques. 2005. "The Principle of Hospitality." *Parallax*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 6-9.
- Gottwald, Martin. 2014. "Burden Sharing and Refugee Protection." In *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, edited by Elena Fiddian Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long, and Nando Sigona. Oxford University Press.
- Hayes, Sherrill, Brandon D. Lundy, and Maia Carter Hallward. 2016. "Conflict-Induced Migration and the Refugee Crisis: Global and Local Perspectives from Peacebuilding and Development." *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1-7.
- Islam, Sumaiya, Zaid Hydari, Coline Schupfer, and Kevin Cole. 2021. "Undoing Precarity: Elevating Positive Practices for Refugee Protection in South and Southeast Asia." Refugee Solidarity Network.
- Lischer, Sarah Kenyon. 2007. "Causes and Consequences of Conflict-Induced Displacement." *Civil Wars* 9 (2): 142–55.
- Lischer, Sarah Kenyon. 2014. "Conflict and Crisis Induced Displacement" In *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long, and Nando Sigona. Oxford University Press.
- Loescher, Gil. 2008. *The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) : The Politics and Practice of Refugee Protection into the Twenty-First Century*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Loescher, Gil, Alexander Betts, and James Milner. 2008. *The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: The Politics and Practice of Refugee Protection into the Twenty-First Century*. Routledge.
- Maier, Charles. 2007. "'Being There': Place, Territory and Identity." In *Identities, Affiliations and Allegiances*, edited by Seyla Benhabib, Ian Shapiro, and Danilo Petranovic, 67–84. Cambridge University Press.
- Martineau, Wendy, Nasar Meer, and Simon Thompson. 2012. "Theory and Practice in the Politics of Recognition and Misrecognition." *Res Publica* 18 (1): 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11158-012-9181-7>.

- McNevin, Anne. 2006. "Political Belonging in a Neo-Liberal Era: The Struggle of the Sans-Papiers." *Citizenship Studies* 10 (2): 135–51.
- Milner, James. 2014. "Protracted Refugee Situations." In *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long, and Nando Sigona. Oxford University Press.
- Nair, Radhika. 2021. "Refugee Protection in India in the Absence of Specific Legislation: An Overview CURATED VOICES." Social and Political Research Foundation.
https://sprf.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/SPRF-2021_CV_Refugee-Protection-in-India_Final_1.pdf.
- Nair, Ravi. 1997. "Refugee Protection in South Asia." *Journal of International Affairs* 51 (1): 201–20.
- Ong, Aihwa. 2006. "Mutations in Citizenship." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23 (2-3): 499–505.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276406064831>.
- Paddy McQueen. 2015. *Subjectivity, Gender and the Struggle for Recognition*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York, Ny: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parivelan, K.M. 2022. "Reimagining Refugee Protection in India Vis-a Vis Global Compact on Refugees." In *The Routledge Handbook of Refugees in India*, edited by S.Irudaya Rajan, 202–10. Routledge.
- Reed, Holly E., Bernadette Ludwig, and Laura Braslow. 2016. "Forced Migration." In *International Handbook of Migration and Population Distribution*, edited by Michael J. White. Springer.
- Sales, Rosemary. 2002. "The Deserving and the Undeserving? Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Welfare in Britain." *Critical Social Policy* 22 (3): 456–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/026101830202200305>.
- Samaddar, Ranabir. 2016. "Forced Migration Situations as Exceptions in History?" *International Journal of Migration and Border Studies* 2 (2): 99–118.
- Samaddar, Ranabir. 2020. *Postcolonial Age of Migration*. Routledge.
- Sami, Bernard D'. 2022. "The Refugee Convention of 1951: India's Persisting Dilemma." In *The Routledge Handbook of Refugees in India*, edited by S.Irudaya Rajan, 192–201. Routledge.
- Staples, Kelly. 2012. "Statelessness and the Politics of Misrecognition." *Res Publica* 18 (1): 93–106. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11158-012-9188-0>.
- Steiner, Niklaus, Mark Gibney, and Gil Loescher, eds. 2003. *Problems of Protection: The UNHCR, Refugees, and Human Rights*. Routledge.

- Turk, Volker, and Rebecca Dowd. 2014. "Protection Gaps." In *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*, edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Gil Loescher, Katy Long, and Nando Sigona. Oxford University Press.
- Walzer, Michael. 1983. "Membership." In *Spheres of Justice*. Basic Books.
- Whittaker, David J. 2006. *Asylum Seekers and Refugees in the Contemporary World*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2004. "Borders, Boundaries and the Politics of Belonging." In *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Minority Rights*, edited by Stephen May, Tariq Modood, and Judith Squires, 214–30. Cambridge University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. "Belonging and the Politics of Belonging." *Patterns of Prejudice* 40 (3): 197–214.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2011. *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations*. Sage.

