

Forced Migration, Homelessness and the Memory of Home: A Critical Review of the Displacement of Rohingya Muslims

SADDAM HUSSAIN & NAFIS HAIDER

South Asian University & Jawaharlal Nehru University

Forced displacement constitutes one of the most acute humanitarian and sociological crises of the contemporary world. However, the subjective and affective dimensions of displacement, particularly the meanings that displaced communities construct about Home, Homelessness, and Memory, remain comparatively underexamined in South Asian scholarship. To fulfil these gaps, the paper offers a critical review of literature on Home, Homelessness, and Memory in the context of displacement, with special focus on the displacement of Rohingya Muslims from Rakhine State in Myanmar. The objective of this paper is to analyse how Memory works as a sociological process for displaced Rohingya Muslim refugees in negotiating their identities and belonging, and in resisting dehumanisation. Theoretically, this paper utilises the refugee studies paradigm, drawing on Liisa Malkki's concept of "Mythico-history," Pierre Nora's idea of lieu(s) de mémoire (or sites of Memory), and Bhabha's theory of "unhomely," alongside the sociological constructivism of Berger and Luckmann. For displaced Rohingya refugees, the paper argues, Memory is not a passive residue of the past but a creative, embodied, and political resource through which they reconstruct identity and belonging in conditions of ontological Homelessness. The paper is centred on a critical conceptual review of the existing literature, purposively selected to be representative of literary, historical, sociological, and ethnographic sources. This paper finds that memory formation through practices of storytelling, prayer, the spatial arrangement of the camp, eating habits, and narrative traditions among the Rohingya refugees constitutes an act of sociocultural agency that challenges administrative categories that treat them as dehumanised subjects. In conclusion, it shows that paradigmatic change in displacement governance is imperative – one where preserving Memory and making meanings by communities are viewed as valid forms of humanitarianism.

Keywords: Forced Displacement, Rohingya Muslims, Collective Memory, Home, Homelessness, Humanitarian Governance, Cultural Identity

Introduction

Forced migration is not simply a geopolitical or demographic phenomenon. But it is a profoundly human experience that unsettles the most fundamental aspects of social life, such as Home, belonging, Memory, and identity (Malkki, 1995; Turton, 2003). South Asia offers an especially significant context for examining these aspects because of its history of colonialism, the Partition of British India in 1947, the Bangladesh Liberation War of 1971 and more recent phenomena of mass displacement, such as the expulsion of Rohingya Muslims from Rakhine State, Myanmar (Pandey, 2001; Talbot & Singh, 2009). The existing literature has extensively examined the legal, political, and demographic dimensions of forced migration, displacement, and refugees. What remains understudied is the subjective and affective dimension of displacement, especially the ways in which displaced communities and individuals construct the meanings of their lives, Home, and Homelessness. The paper seeks to address this gap by reorienting the study towards a subjective and experiential phenomenon, using Memory as a resource for identity formation and survival techniques under prolonged uncertainty.

This paper addresses this gap through a critical interdisciplinary analysis of existing scholarship, with a special focus on the case of Rohingya Muslim displacement. The paper is organised around three interrelated objectives (1) to examine conceptual debates around forced migration and meaning-making in South Asia, and to critically assess the limitations of dominant administrative and legal categories (2) to situate the concepts of Home and Homelessness within relational, affective, and ontological frameworks rather than merely material ones, and (3) to analyse how Memory functions as a lived sociological practice among Rohingya Muslim refugees in the camps of Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, and what this reveals about the relationship between displacement, identity, and belonging. The broader significance of the research is its role in shifting the refugee paradigm, seeing refugees not only as subjects of legal/administrative categories but also as agents who produce meanings, moral community, and identity.

With regard to its methodological position, the study relies on a critical review of secondary literature to present a review of existing literature on issues of forced migration, Home, Homelessness, and Memory in South Asia. Through a synthesis of select studies that involve ethnography, Oral History, literature and sociology, the review proceeds through a thematic study in which texts are not merely summarised but also interrogated for their theoretical claims and the

arguments they advance. The review specially pays attention to the gap each literature leaves behind and tries to conjoin it with other studies to provide a holistic study of the idea of refugee, displacement and Homelessness. For this, the study takes Rohingya Muslims as a vantage point, not merely as a peripheral illustration but also as a theoretically generative empirical site from which the idea of Memory, Home and Homelessness is developed and tested.

The paper is divided into four main sections. The first section grounds the discussion by introducing a multi-layered theoretical frame, positioning the paper within the broader critical refugee studies. The section also offers a review of different frameworks and what remains underexamined. The second section explores the various conceptual debates surrounding forced migration, displacement, and Memory in the meaning-making process of identity in South Asia. It tries to elaborate on how different dominant administrative categories not only become limiting in the study of heterogeneity of displaced communities, in this case, the Rohingyas, but also enable the suppression of their agency (Turton, 2003). Home and Homelessness within the relational and ontological framework are studied in the third section through a critical engagement with Bhabha's concept of 'unhomely' (1994). The engagement delineated in the third section shows how displacement-induced Homelessness, like that of the Rohingyas, cannot be reduced merely to the absence of shelter but reaches beyond materiality. Lastly, in the fourth section, everyday memory formation of Rohingyas is analysed through the case point of Cox's Bazar. This section focuses on storytelling, spatial reorganisation of the camp, devotional practises, food culture, and inter-generational narrations. Finally, the paper argues that Memory, in the context of displacement, is not merely a mental residue of loss but a generative sociological site where resistance, community-making, and agency are articulated.

Grounding Refugees in a Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

This paper employs a multi-layered theoretical framework that draws on critical refugee studies, memory studies, postcolonial theory, and sociological constructivism. Rather than applying a single lens, it treats these theories as interlocking perspectives that together enable a more comprehensive understanding of displacement as a social, cultural, and political condition. In contrast to the first, administrative approach to refugee studies as described by Fiddian-Qasmiyeh et al. (2014), the paper subscribes to the critical approach advocated by scholars such as Turton (2003) and Stein (1981). These scholars

contend that categories such as “forced migrant” dehumanise refugees by denying their autonomy and heterogeneous identity. In line with this, it further draws on Liisa Malkki's (1995) argument that refugees' identities and memories are socially constructed within particular historical and political circumstances. Her concept, “Mythico-history” or the communal narratives by which refugees tell their own history and claim historical legitimacy, serves as the main theoretical approach in this paper to analyse the communal practices of Rohingya refugees.

The paper engages three frameworks within memory studies that are not simply complementary but stand in significant tension with one another — a tension this paper treats as analytically productive rather than resolved. The first is Maurice Halbwachs's (1992) theory of collective Memory: for Halbwachs, Memory is inherently social, constituted through group interaction and sustained only as long as the social group that bears it persists. Pierre Nora (1989) challenged this position and argued that Halbwachs underestimates the rupture of modernity. He mentioned that when living communities are destroyed and/or dispersed, Memory does not disappear, rather it migrates to sites, i.e. objects, archives, architectures, monuments and rituals, which compensate for the loss of organic social transmissions.

In the context of this paper, the debate between Halbwachs and Nora, which primarily revolves around the condition of Memory's survival, is not merely theoretical but has material implications. In the case of the Rohingya, though their community has been forced to migrate and displaced, their Memory is still intact, which supports Nora's view that Memory is contained in sites and objects. However, the experience of Cox's Bazar camps delineates the viability of Halbwachs's position where Memory is continuously reproduced through the living social fabric still alive in the camp life. The Rohingya case thus challenges both positions, pointing toward a third form, transmitted Memory, that neither framework fully captures.

A third layer of tension is introduced by Svetlana Boym's (2001) distinction between restorative and reflective nostalgia. Where both Halbwachs and Nora treat Memory as fundamentally oriented toward the past, Boym complicates this by showing that nostalgia is always partly a construction of the present: restorative nostalgia seeks to rebuild what was lost, while reflective nostalgia dwells in the loss without seeking literal return. For the Rohingya who both yearn for Rakhine and, in the case of the post-2017 generation, have no lived experience of it. Neither restorative nor reflective nostalgia is a fully adequate

category, which is precisely the gap this paper addresses through the concept of “transmitted belonging”, which is a form of identity and attachment to a place sustained entirely through collective narratives, stories, and cultural practices, rather than personal, lived experience of that place.

These memory structures rest upon two more theoretical foundations. The first is that of the 'unhomely' by Homi Bhabha (1994), wherein displacement is not just about the lack of a home but about being in a state of perpetual negotiation of identity and belonging in the context of displacement and liminality. This theory directly contributes to the paper's discussion of Rohingya refugees' ontological homelessness, which is not merely the lack of a physical space to call their own but also the absence of the moral/affective world of Home. Underlying all these theories lies the sociological constructivism of Berger & Luckmann (2016), which demonstrates how the meanings of Home, refugee identity, and Memory are actively constructed through social and cultural interaction rather than being inherent and unchanging. It is the combination of these four theories that forms the basis of this paper's argument that displacement not only shapes the ideas of Home, Homelessness, and Memory, but also transforms them into politically charged sites of identity formation and resistance.

Forced migration and meaning-making in South Asia

This section uses the Rohingya case as its primary analytical lens to examine how meaning-making in South Asia has been understood and where it falls short. Rather than surveying the region's displacement history before arriving at the Rohingya situation, the analysis begins with what is analytically distinctive about the Rohingya experience — the combination of forced displacement, statelessness, historical erasure, and protracted camp confinement — and asks what this distinctiveness reveals about the limits of existing works on forced migration and meaning-making across South Asia.

Forced migration in South Asia has a history that is connected with colonialism, Partition, ethnocultural conflicts, and state policy measures (Bose & Jalal, 2011). The major examples include the Partition of India in 1947, the Bangladesh Liberation War in 1971, and the prolonged conflicts in Sri Lanka. All those events had devastating consequences that produced a vast displaced population, and they shaped political, social, and cultural dynamics for decades. What distinguishes the current case of the Rohingyas' crisis from previous cases is not its statistics, which amount to around 1.3 million people in Bangladesh

(UNHCR, 2024), but rather the nature of this phenomenon. While these other examples of displacement also emerged from conflicts, the displacement of the Rohingyas has a much deeper cause, which lies in the systematic denial of their right to exist as part of the history of Myanmar by the state itself (Lee, 2021; Kaveri & Irudaya Rajan, 2023).

Despite this, Rohingya refugees create meaning of their condition, in which the construction of new identities, the maintenance of culture, and survival tactics take place amidst host communities (Berger & Luckmann, 2016; Farzana, 2017). Even amid the destruction of homes, disenfranchisement, and time spent living in camps, they can recall memories of their Home in Rakhine, maintain their identities, and pass on tales of their identity down to succeeding generations (Uddin, 2020). What makes the Rohingya case unique, which is not sufficiently recognised, is their denial of belonging and citizenship in their native land.

The partition victims who constitute almost 14–18 million people (Talbot & Singh, 2009), in both India and Pakistan, ultimately incorporated them into their respective national narratives. Similarly, survivors of the 1971 Bangladesh Liberation War were integrated into a national memory framework that recognised their loss (Bass, 2013). For the Rohingya, there is no such incorporation. The Myanmar state has sought to erase their historical root through village destruction, document revocation, and exclusion from the national census (Lee, 2021). Consequently, the meaning-making practices identified by Jha and Kumar Singh (2022) — reconstruction of identity and belonging through Memory, narrative, and cultural practice — become more than coping strategies. They constitute an act of historical counter-inscription in terms of the active maintenance of an archive of belonging against systematic state-sponsored erasure. This distinction, the paper argues, makes the Rohingya case a theoretically generative extreme that necessitates the concept of Memory as counter-archive, developed in subsequent sections.

The Concept of Forced Migration/Displacement and the Question of Rohingya Muslims

The plight of Rohingya Muslims shows a critical problem regarding the concept of forced migration. Although the crisis of Rohingya Muslims is mostly approached through the categories of humanitarian and legal statistics, their number and historical-political condition prove that this approach is insufficient within the context of their problem.

More than one million displaced Rohingyas in Bangladesh are not the outcome of persecution but also a long process of marginalisation and denial (Lee, 2021; Kaveri & Irudaya Rajan, 2023). This is what makes this crisis important to investigate as an example of bigger discussions on the forced migration conceptually.

The phenomenon of forced migration has never been easy because of its distinctive nature and the varied causes that compel populations to flee (Muggah, 2003; Reed et al., 2016). Nonetheless, scholars tend to categorise forced migration into two broad categories: conflict-induced and development-induced displacement (Muggah, 2007; Lischer, 2007). While defining conflict-induced displacement, they argue that any situation in which people leave their homes to escape political violence may be termed conflict-induced displacement. This category includes refugees, asylum seekers, and internally displaced persons fleeing civil war, genocide, failed states, or politicide. Other forms of displacement are generally classified as development-induced displacement, including displacement resulting from natural disasters, climate change, and development projects such as dams and roads (Muggah, 2003).

In terms of the debate on forced migration, it can be structured around three competing positions regarding what displacement is and how it should be studied. The first, the administrative-legal position, exemplified by the UNHCR's 1951 Refugee Convention framework and its subsequent protocols, defines displacement juridically: a refugee is a person who has crossed an international border due to a well-founded fear of persecution based on specific protected grounds (Fiddian-Qasmieh et al., 2014).

The second stance, known as the critical-agency perspective, articulated by Stein (1981) and Turton (2003), illustrates how the administrative perspective inadequately portrays the idea of displacement by ignoring the agency and differential experiences of the displaced population. According to Stein, the idea of “the refugee” is problematic because it homogenises different experiences and leads to a depoliticised humanitarian subject. On the other hand, for Turton, the binary categorisation of “forced” and “voluntary” migration conceals the continuity of experience that can be properly comprehended only from within a given context.

Thirdly, the perspective of the postcolonial framework on refugees and statelessness is especially useful in the case of the Rohingyas. For instance, scholars like Lee (2021) and Kaveri & Irudaya Rajan (2023) show how statelessness creates a distinct situation from the conventional state, in which the

refugee becomes unrecognised within the existing political system of the host nation as well as the native place.

However, these frameworks have proven immensely significant in offering legal protection and highlighting structural issues. Yet, it suffers from criticism for creating hierarchies of victimhood where the conventional refugee is prioritised above internally displaced people, economic migrants, and environmentally displaced populations, as well as for reducing complex realities into legal and structural frameworks (Muggah, 2003; Reed et al., 2016). Therefore, Jha and Kumar Singh (2022) call for a “demigrantising” approach to the study of forced migration. This involves a focus on agency, subjectivity, and the lived experience of the displaced population. Their focus on Belonging, Memory, and the construction of Home is especially pertinent in relation to the plight of the Rohingya refugee population. But what neither Turton, Stein, nor Jha and Kumar Singh addresses insufficiently is what occurs in cases where the capacity of the displaced population to narrate itself is targeted and erased.

Therefore, the concept of Rohingya refugees cannot be simply seen as refugees who escape from violent events. Rather, they are trapped, whose membership within the national community has been rejected through citizenship policies, bureaucracy, and national rhetoric that excludes them from belonging to their native country.

The construction of meaning in displacement and the Rohingya Problem

In the previous section, the paper has shown how the displaced people create meaning of their displacement. This section highlights how the meaning-making in displacement takes structurally distinct forms depending on the degree to which the displaced community retains access to living memory of the lost place. To better understand it, the paper creates a distinction between the concept of “memorial belonging” — identity anchored in personal, lived experience of a place — and “transmitted belonging” — identity sustained entirely through collective narrative and cultural practice in the absence of lived experience that represents an analytically significant gap in the existing literature. While the existing frameworks, such as Berger and Luckmann's (2016) social construction of reality, Jha and Kumar Singh's (2022) “demigrantising” approach, and Pandey's (2001) work on Partition memory, are important in understanding how displaced people reconstruct identity and belonging through cultural and social practices. However, none fully addresses what happens when a growing

generation of displaced people has no experiential memory of their lost homeland.

If we read the literature on displacement and meaning-making in South Asia, it shows how it is a deeply contested process of Memory, trauma, resistance, and adaptation, expressed through oral histories, religious practices, artistic expressions, and everyday negotiations with exclusionary state structures (Pandey, 2001; Farzana, 2017). And what kind of problems do they face while sitting in the host countries? Madhu Singh (2013) and Ankur Datta (2016) clearly highlight these issues. For example, Madhu Singh, through her literary analysis of Amitav Ghosh's work "The Hungry Tide", indicates how East Bengali refugees in Morichjhapi (1978) sought to conceptualise "home" in an altered reality through continuous processes of locating and relocating themselves while facing a violent suspicion from host countries. In 1978, the East Bengali refugees collectively decided to return "home"-if not to East Pakistan/Bangladesh, then at least to West Bengal, the "tide country" of the Sundarbans. Approximately 30,000 migrants reached Morichjhapi in April 1978 with "a primary desire to settle down to conceptualise carefully what could be called 'home' in an altered reality (Singh, 2013, p. 61).

Ankur Datta's (2016) ethnography of Kashmiri Pandits also shows this dynamic perfectly about the construction of meaning and Home. For Kashmir Pandits, Home remains anchored in direct personal Memory of Kashmir's geography, seasons, architecture, and social fabric. Their meaning-making exemplifies "memorial belonging," often motivated by restorative nostalgia. But the Rohingya case reveals a structurally different reality in terms of their substantial and growing population in Cox's Bazar — particularly those born after the 2017 crisis — has no direct experiential memory of Rakhine. Their meaning-making cannot rely on personal recollection. Rather, it must draw on narrated, transmitted, and collectively maintained Memory. This distinction is not merely demographic but carries profound theoretical implications where Kashmiri Pandits represent "memorial belonging," the Rohingya situation demands the concept of "transmitted belonging", where a sense of belonging and identity is sustained entirely through collective narrative and cultural practice in the absence of lived experience.

What these cases reveal is that meaning-making in displacement is never passive or merely compensatory. It constitutes active social and cultural labour through which communities contest their reduction to objects of need. Kazi Fahmida Farzana's (2017) ethnographic study of Rohingya refugees in earlier

waves confirms this broader repertoire of displaced agency — evident in practices of contestation, negotiation, adjustment, and manipulation. Yet Farzana's work also marks the turning point: the Rohingya are not only displaced but stateless, with their history and legal status actively erased. For them, memory-production is not merely a coping mechanism but a vital act of proving their historical-national existence that their native state has declared non-existent.

Situating the Problems of Home and Homelessness

The phenomenon of Homelessness caused by displacement is analytically different from the phenomenon of urban Homelessness (Somerville, 1992; Wardhaugh, 1999). In the case of Rohingya Muslim refugees displaced from Rakhine State, this distinction is particularly stark. Unlike urban Homelessness, which is concerned with the lack of a material place to live, displacement-induced Homelessness among the Rohingya is associated with a deeper form of disruption in terms of the dissolution of the entire world of morality, affect, and relations that defines the idea of Home for them.

Displacement through conflict and ethnic persecution not only destroys the physical homes of the displaced but also destroys the social world of their family, community, and culture that constitutes one's identity and existence in the world (Taylor, 2013). It is this ontological aspect of Homelessness that will be explored here, with the Rohingya case serving as the centre of discussion, to show that to fully understand the idea of Home and Homelessness, one must go beyond the physical notion of shelter to understand the affective/emotional dimension of Home itself.

This state of displacement-induced Homelessness for Rohingya refugees reflects Mallett's (2004) broader argument that reconstructing a sense of Home in foreign or temporary spaces involves far more than securing physical shelter. Beyond the material dimension, displacement brings about emotional and psychological instability (Eastmond, 2007) and disrupts the social and cultural practices through which displaced persons, such as the Rohingya, make meaning of their lives (Farzana, 2017; Uddin, 2020). Renos K. Papadopoulos (2002), in his chapter entitled "Refugees, Home and Trauma", highlights a similar condition in terms of how a loss of Home signifies a rupture in personal and collective histories and their practices that ultimately leads to feelings of alienation and dislocation among the displaced.

This feeling of detachment is more intensified among Rohingya refugees when they face discrimination in the host society. This discrimination makes

them more alienated and detached, intensifying their sense of dislocation. Roger Zetter (1999), in his study of Greek-Cypriot refugees, indicates similar cases where the social exclusion and xenophobia faced by the refugees have reinforced the feeling of being outsiders for them.

In the context of Rohingya refugees, it becomes clearer that for the stateless population, like them, social exclusion becomes much more than mere discrimination in the host society; rather, it is a structural aspect of the system that makes them permanently liminal (Kaveri & Irudaya Rajan, 2023). This structural production of illegibility compounds psychological Homelessness with legal erasure that makes belonging not simply an emotional aspiration but a politically contested claim. Neikirk (2023) also shows in her study on Bhutanese refugees living in a protracted camp environment that the status of being a refugee is a constructed reality, one that is learned and institutionalised within the specific governance structure of the refugee camp, which is clearly evident in the everyday lives of Rohingya refugees in Cox's Bazar.

The discussion on Home

The idea of Home has no unified definition. It is structured around three fundamentals yet competing theoretical tractions, each pushing for its own understanding. At first, the phenomenological tradition, associated with Bachelard's (1958). It talks about the poetics of space, which was further developed by Saunders and Williams (1988). Here, Home becomes the primary site of ontological security, meaning the place where the self is constituted through intimate, embodied and personal experience. Based on this premise, Home becomes fundamentally an affective condition in relation to what is lost in displacement. It is seen not only as a material shelter but also as the ground of essential selfhood.

Secondly, the Constructivist-feminist tradition, which is represented by Blund and Dowling (2006), Mallett (2004) and Bowlby et al. (1997). It emerges as a critique of the phenomenological approach, which pays a critical eye on the romanticisation of Home and its subsequent suspension of politics within. For these scholars, Home is simultaneously a site of violence and belonging. The idealisation of Home, for them, may reproduce patriarchal assumptions about whose belonging it addresses. Wardhaugh (1999) and Somerville (1992) further distinguish between rooflessness and rootlessness — the absence of physical shelter versus the absence of social and affective belonging — a distinction that

begins to approach ontological Homelessness without fully theorising its political dimension.

The third, relational-political tradition argues that both previous traditions underestimate the role of the state in producing and destroying Home. Douglas (1991) gestures toward this by noting that Home is constituted through social institutions and relations, but neither the phenomenological nor the constructivist-feminist tradition accounts for the case in which the state actively legislates away a community's right to belong to a place. This paper situates itself within the third tradition and argues that the Rohingya case makes its development necessary.

The anthropologist Mary Douglas (1991) also supports the idea that Home is socially constructed and relates to notions of belonging. At the same time, she contends that the separation between private and public spaces, and the differentiation it entails, can only be understood from the perspective of social relationships. Thus, combining these ideas, one may conclude that Home is not only a place or a locale (Saunders & Williams, 1988), but a place where social institutions and relations are created and formed. This synthesis of work indicates fundamental tension in how Home has been understood: the material and relational accounts of Home are not simply complementary but sometimes in conflict. This conflict is very clear for displaced persons, such as the Rohingya.

The material concept of Home implies that if one gives material shelter to the people, one is restoring their Home. The relational concept of home places all meaning into the social and emotional ties of the displaced persons themselves. Neither concept alone is adequate. Crucially, both concepts remain premised on the assumption that the prior belonging of the displaced is at least historically recognised, even if politically contested. Neither Mallett (2004), Blunt and Dowling (2006), nor Douglas (1991) theorises the condition about what happens when the state actively denies that the community ever belonged to a place at all. This lacuna is precisely what the Rohingya case highlights and therefore proposes the concept of “moral geography” — a spatially grounded but not spatially reducible configuration of relations, memories, obligations, and identities that constitutes the normative world within which a person can be recognisably themselves. It clearly captures the condition of the Home and Homelessness in the context of the Rohingya displacement. The destruction of their villages in Rakhine was not merely the destruction of shelter. It was the deliberate annihilation of the moral geography within which their identity was embedded and reproduced.

Ethnographies of Home and Homelessness in South Asia

Urvashi Butalia, in her work titled “The Other Side of Silence” (2017), meticulously elaborates the stories of women and their experience of violence, migration and displacement in the context of the Partition of India. Her work extensively relies on open-ended interviews to fully grasp the dynamics at place in the women's experience of Partition. This work resonates extensively in the experience of Rohingya refugees, who are also specifically made women relatively more vulnerable to violence through their vulnerability to sexual assault and forced conversion, which further complicates their sense of belonging and homeland. For victims of Partition and refugees, the idea of Home becomes fragmented when the memories of villages and regions are gradually lost in the attempt to rebuild life in an alien environment.

Post-violence phenomena and how they affect the objective and subjective lives of victims can also be seen in Nayanika Mookherjee's work, *The Spectral Wound* (2015), in which she examines how rape survivors and their families grappled with Homelessness both physically and psychologically. Many were stigmatised and unable to return to their original homes due to social rejection. The war not only destroyed homes but also disrupted kinship networks and forced survivors to renegotiate their identities in a newly independent Bangladesh. What Butalia (2017) and Mookherjee (2015) work reveals is a dimension of conflict-induced Homelessness that the mainstream work on Rohingya refugees has systematically underexamined: the gendered and embodied experience of losing Home.

In the context of the Indian subcontinent, for women who have survived the violence of Partition and further during the Bangladesh war in 1971, the loss of Home was not merely a spatial and relational rupture but also an embodied one where their bodies became the site of contested belonging, forever negotiating between the past, present and future. This gendered dimension has direct implications for the Rohingya case. In the reports from Cox's Bazar and the hitherto produced documents on the Rohingyas, extensive cases of sexual assault and violence have been reported against women during the 2017 military operations. The document produced by Uddin (2020) and Human Rights Watch (2024) contains multiple testimonies that show that violence has been a part of the collective Memory of the crisis, which has been transmitted within the camps as well. A comprehensive understanding of the Rohingya, their crisis of Home

and Homelessness must therefore be studied not only as a communal practise of storytelling and spatial reorganisation but also as an embodied, gendered and affective dimension of displacement as well.

The interaction between Memory and Home in displacement

The connection between Home and Memory is strongly intertwined, and becomes more concretised in the context of displacement. While Home is usually conceptualised as a tangible space, for displaced people, it extends far beyond the physical to become a construct of Memory. This interaction and relation are much explored in the literature of South Asian displacement, marked by colonialism, Partition, internecine strife, and state violence (Pandey, 2001; Talbot & Singh, 2009).

Home serves as a repository of personal and collective memories that concretise the identity of the displaced, who preserve the Memory of Home through acts of remembrance and forgetting. This is reflected in Pierre Nora's concept of *lieux de mémoire* (sites of Memory) (Nora, 1989), through which they preserve their memories via symbolic representations such as photographs, letters, rituals, and oral narratives.

While studying the victim of Partition, Urvashi Butalia (2017) shows how their memories of Home and belongings were preserved through oral histories, family heirlooms, letters, and rituals carried across borders, including letter exchanges that maintained relationships and identities. Similarly, Ritu Menon and Kamla Bhasin (1998) highlight the relationship between Memory, Home, and loss among Partition survivors. Not only the Partition, but this interaction can also be seen in the 1971 Bangladesh Liberation War, which produced millions of refugees. In this context, Yasmin Saikia (2011) shows how the Memory of Home among victim-turned-refugees was shaped by both longing and the violence that forced them to leave.

These Partition and 1971 studies reveal a pattern — the co-constitution of Home and Violence in displacement memory — that existing literature has described but not fully addressed. For the women documented by Butalia, Menon, Bhasin, and Saikia, the Memory of Home is inseparable from the Memory of the violence that destroyed it. Home is remembered not in innocence but as a site of both belonging and catastrophic loss.

This “memory of Home” in displacement contexts differs structurally from the nostalgic idealisation in Boym's (2001) restorative nostalgia. It is a complex entanglement of longing, grief, anger, and identity that dominant

memory-studies literature — often centred on Western or other postcolonial contexts — has not adequately conceptualised. The Rohingya clearly represent such an entangled phenomenon. It should be noted that the Memory of Rakhine, which is present in the camps of Cox's Bazar, does not reflect any idea of peaceful existence. Instead, this Memory has to tell a lot about persecution, discrimination, and even violence, even before the outbreak of the 2017 crisis (Lee, 2021). For Rohingya refugees, therefore, the Memory of Home must be understood not as simple nostalgia for a lost past but as what this paper proposes to call “Contested Memory of Homemaking”: the insistence on belonging to a place from which one was never fully welcomed, and the claim of Home over a space that the state has long sought to deny.

Nostalgia and Reconstruction of Home

The concept of nostalgia presents a particular theoretical problem when applied to the Rohingya case. Existing frameworks, such as Svetlana Boym's (2001) distinction between restorative nostalgia (which seeks to rebuild what was lost) and reflective nostalgia (which dwells in the loss itself), and Kathleen Stewart's (1988) view of nostalgia as public cultural expression, assume that the lost Home and community were at some point recognised as legitimate. The concepts fail to stand firm when it comes to the case of Rohingya refugees. The Myanmar state not only rejects them at present but also erases any history of their presence from official narratives, as per the Citizenship Laws, such as the 1982 Burma Citizenship Law, and state historiography (Lee, 2021).

Thus, nostalgia in this context is not just an act of psychological coping with the recognition of losses but a politics of remembering and reclaiming a past denied by the state authorities (Lee, 2021). Hence, this paper proposes the notion of counter-juridical nostalgia - an act of claiming the right to remembering and reclaiming the past when faced with the denial of the state regarding its very existence. The theoretical framework proposed by Boym (2001) and Stewart (1988) is helpful yet insufficient for such cases in which the past itself is challenged by state power structures.

If we look at other cases of displacement in South Asia, we find that restorative nostalgia has been driving movements for restoration. Alison Blunt (2003), for instance, explains how the Anglo-Indians used Memory and productive nostalgia to create a homeland at McCluskieganj. The Bangladeshis who became refugees in 1971 created pieces of their lost homeland through culture, including the celebration of Language Days and Muktijuddho, thereby

creating an identity associated with the homeland (Bass, 2013). Similarly, the Kashmiri Pandits also retained their connection with Kashmir through festivals, food, and storytelling traditions (Kak, 2011; Datta, 2016).

They are structurally distinct from the situation of the Rohingyas. In the case of Kashmiri Pandits, the Indian state has never ignored their historic presence in Kashmir even as they dispute their right to return (Datta, 2016). There is a politically recognised structure to their nostalgia. For the Rohingya, by contrast, the very basis of nostalgia — the claim that Rakhine was their Home — is ontologically denied by the Myanmar state. Rohingya nostalgia thus functions as counter-judicial practice: not simply cultural consolation or a political claim for return, but a fundamental assertion of historical reality against organised state erasure. This distinction — between nostalgia as a claim within a recognised order and nostalgia as a claim against an order that denies their existence — indicates a gap in the existing literature on displacement and Memory that the Rohingya case makes theoretically necessary.

The Memory of Home in literature and Oral history

Literature and oral histories play critical roles in remembering Home and creating belonging within the displaced community (Pandey, 2001; Butalia, 2017; Farzana, 2017). Literature and personal narratives become ways in which the displaced recreate a sense of identity and belonging through Memory, thus creating a connection between past and present (Chowdhury, 2021; Sa'di & Abu-Lughod, 2007).

It has been an especially effective tool through which victim narrates their stories and reclaim their identity and belongings. Gyanendra Pandey (2001) and Urvashi Butalia (2017) use this method perfectly to explain how Partition victims relied on oral histories and literature as a means of narrating their experiences of loss, violence, and belonging. Saadat Hasan Manto's *Toba Tek Singh* (1955) is an especially striking allegory in relation to the impossibility of finding Home within displacement: “On one side was India, on the other Pakistan, and in between was Toba Tek Singh” (Manto, 1987, p. 17).

On the day of the exchange, Bishan Singh refused to move to either India or Pakistan. He stood in the middle of the no-man's-land until he lay down and died: 'On one side was India, and on the other Pakistan, in between lay Toba Tek Singh' (Manto, 1987, p. 17).

Similar dynamics can also be seen in the ethnic conflict of Sri Lanka, where Tamil victims use oral histories and sustain their memories of Jaffna

through narratives of exile (Thiranagama, 2011; McDowell, 1996), and in Tahmima Anam's *The Golden Age* (Anam, 2011), which depicts families of victims clinging to pre-war homes during the 1971 Bangladesh Liberation War. These works function as counter-histories that resist state-sanctioned amnesia and preserve personal and collective memories of Home (Bass, 2013).

However, a structural limit emerges when it is seen in the context of the Rohingya case. The narratives in Partition, Tamil, and 1971 literature are largely rooted in first-generation, eyewitness experience. For a growing proportion of Rohingya refugees in Cox's Bazar — especially those born after 2017 — the stories of Rakhine are not direct testimonies but inherited, transmitted narratives. This shifts the role of oral Memory from testimony to pedagogy, and from personal recollection to institutionalised intergenerational transmission. The following section examines how this transmitted Narratives and Memory operate in everyday Rohingya camp life as counter-history, identity anchor, and political resistance under conditions of state-denied belonging.

Rohingya Muslims and Everyday Memory in Displacement

The mass displacement of Rohingya Muslims from Rakhine State in Myanmar created a humanitarian disaster that destroyed their sociopolitical and cultural world (Uddin, 2020; Lee, 2021). Their lives, in terms of their relationships with the village, kin, agrarian life, and religious devotion, were historically disrupted (Farzana, 2017). Moreover, their settlement as refugees in the busy camps of Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, in which life is measured in terms of density, material constraint, and humanitarian and state surveillance (Amnesty International, 2023), creates a situation in which Memory does not merely exist as a nostalgic residue of the past but functions as a social practice that tends to create a sense of belonging, morality, and historical rootedness among them.

Maurice Halbwachs (1992) states that social frameworks enable collective Memory. In this context, memory-making among the Rohingya should also be understood as occurring within the framework of camp-based interactional life. Articulating the Memory as social practices in the camp, Nasir Uddin (2020) states that evenings spent under bamboo shelters often provide the elderly Rohingya with opportunities to narrate stories of their village life, such as the stories of paddy fields, mosques, seasons of harvest, and genealogies. These stories function not only as memories of the past, but also as collective Memory and as resistance to statelessness and its attendant oppression. Through repetition, this Memory serves as a normative apparatus that differentiates

between the Home as a moral landscape and the camp as an interruption. In this sense, the memory formation among the Rohingya is similar to what Liisa Malkki (1995) refers to as “mythico-history” among refugees.

Uddin's broader ethnographic contribution in *The Rohingya: An Ethnography of 'Subhuman' Life* (2020) goes further, theorising the Rohingya condition as one of 'subhuman' life, which is a condition actively produced by the Myanmar state through what he identifies as genocide, ethnocide, and domicide. This framework helps to understand the memory culture of the Rohingya people not only as a cultural reaction to displacement but also as a form of resistance against the process of dehumanisation. By telling their stories in the refugee camps, the elderly Rohingya people affirm their identity and history in spite of efforts by the state to deny both. This is precisely what Lee (2021) demonstrates that the systematic exclusion of the Rohingya from the national narrative of Myanmar, through citizenship laws and hate speech, renders the act of reasserting their identity a political act of resistance.

While documenting the everyday life, architecture and space of the Rohingya Camp in Bangladesh, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM, 2025) demonstrates that Memory is also spatially performed in the Rohingya camps. While houses are built with similar humanitarian materials such as tarpaulin, bamboo, and corrugated iron sheets, families often design the interiors of their camps to resemble their original village settings, with separate areas allocated for cooking, praying, and socialising. These spatial transformations of Rohingya camps from administrative spaces to lived spaces with mnemonic potential can be seen through the lens of what Pierre Nora calls *milieux de mémoire* (environments of Memory). Nora states that when the traditional environments of lived continuity are disrupted, memory forms around places (Nora, 1989). This is particularly evident in the Cox's Bazar Rohingya camps, where makeshift mosques, madrasa tents, and even a family's cooking area serve to consolidate and evoke the Memory of the refugees' past.

Devotional activities within Islam help to structure the process of everyday memory-making for the Rohingya refugees. Ritual prayer, religious recitations, and religious schooling at informal madrasahs not only serve to reaffirm religious faith but also trigger memories of religious practices in their villages in Rakhine (Farzana, 2017; Uddin, 2020). This social practice is also pointed out by Kazi Fahmida Farzana (2017). In her ethnographic study of the refugees, she found that the memories of their sufferings and displacement are expressed through religious vocabulary. The *du'a* for their return, justice, or

recognition is not only a pious act but also a way of creating Memories. The pollination of devotional and mnemonic is analytically significant here. It reveals that religious practises for Rohingyas are not merely a parallel track on which Memory is constructed, but also work as the primary vehicle which carries it forward in the absence of any formal educational and cultural infrastructure.

Rohingya Foods, Intergenerational Transmission, and Comparative Contexts

Food and the act of cooking food itself become an important site of mnemonics in the everyday life of Rohingya Muslims in a displaced setting. By their very act of preparing food and dishes that recall the life of their villages, even in the constrained resources of a humanitarian ration, they reinvigorate Memory. They cook food to remember their home region and the place of their belonging (Navile & Rahman, 2025). The consumption of food and sharing during festivals acts as a generative practise in which sensorial and visual affect transcend physical absence. This shows the multifarious ways through which Memory is not only an articulation of the past but also inhibits itself in the bodily, sensory and affective qualities.

Food, architecture and spaces which form the social and cultural materiality thus function not only as a necessary everyday experience but also contribute to building the foundation and reimagination of Memory. However, the intergenerational transmission of stories adds another flavour to this process. In the case of Rohingyas, for the children in the camps of Bangladesh, their native place is often far from the lived experience; the stories they hear of the Rakhine (their native place), the images stored on mobiles, photographs, and the sermons of the older generation serve the pedagogy of identifying oneself. This is similar to what Malkki (1995) found in narratives of refugees that produce a historically grounded subjectivity that resists reducing refugees to humanitarian subjects.

The construction of Memory is not devoid of power dynamics, especially in the case of the Rohingyas. The structures of governance, surveillance, and movement regulation shape the spaces and practices of collective gatherings. The practice of collective mourning, documentation of atrocities, and the testimony of the human rights agencies politicise the Memory. In doing so, the Memory takes on an intimacy and a geopolitical dimension at once, maintaining its coherence while being validated within the universal discourse of human rights (Uddin, 2020).

While emphasising the multidimensional nature of Memory, Kazi Fahmida Farzana (Farzana, 2017) shows that Memory is not merely a one-dimensional, monolithic reminiscence of the past. However, it goes through the negotiations that take place within society in terms of generational differences and gender disparities. Although some stories focus on the importance of farming practices to establish their identity, others revolve around issues of systemic oppression.

Nonetheless, it is important to note that Farzana conducted her work before the August 2017 crisis, when the number of camps was considerably lower, and the newer generations of refugees had little knowledge of Rakhine as a lived place. Thus, the dynamics of Memory and identity in the post-2017 camp setting are markedly different. The recent work, done by Kaveri & Irudaya Rajan (2023), indicates this difference, that there were distinct dynamics of memory identity creation, shaped by the specific context in which the humanitarian governance regime after 2017 was situated. In particular, these include limited mobility, surveillance, restrictions on education and employment (UNICEF, 2024), and revocation of refugee status by the Bangladesh Government. Based on their work, it is clear that for the generation of refugees who were born in or came to the camps after 2017, the experience of Rakhine is not derived from direct living but is constructed through narration and shared social and cultural practices.

Placing the Rohingya refugees within the comparative context of other refugee situations provides further insights. One particularly relevant case is that of the Palestinians, whose memory culture in the aftermath of the Nakba is exceptionally well-organised and politically conscious, with memories passed down from one generation to the next via oral history, literature, art, tangible objects, and commemoration (Sa'di & Abu-Lughod, 2007). These two cases share significant similarities in terms of statelessness resulting from discriminatory laws, long-term camp displacement with inadequate repatriation, and the oral transmission of Memories as a means of sustaining identity. There are also, however, important differences between them.

Whereas for Palestinians, the creation of memory culture has been enabled by the existence of a globally recognised political struggle as well as a diaspora system spanning over seven decades, Rohingya identity formation takes place in the context of international neglect, severe mobility constraints, and active repression of Rohingya political organising within the camps. A comparable protracted South Asian refugee case is that of Bhutanese refugees in

Nepal, whose story provides yet another relevant angle. It is evident from Neikirk (2023) that, after spending two decades within the camps, the identity of the Bhutanese refugees changed owing to humanitarian governance, resettlement policies, and intangible cultural heritage management activities, which are markedly different from their original identity before displacement. One may similarly argue that an analogous transformation of refugee identity through the camp experience is taking place among Rohingya Muslim refugees, especially among those born post-2017, for whom the camp has been their only Home.

After analysing memory formation in the everyday lives of Rohingya Muslims in the context of displacement, many theoretical points emerge that go beyond what the existing literature indicates. First, the Rohingya case reveals that the humanitarian camp is not simply a space of containment that suppresses Memory, but also a space that, paradoxically, intensifies and formalises it. The very conditions of enforced immobility, material constraint, and institutional surveillance that structure camp life create the social density in the form of evenings together under bamboo shelters, shared mealtimes, and collective prayer, within which oral memories are continuously reproduced and transmitted.

Second, it should be noted that there is an intergenerational element to Rohingya memory, whereby Memory linked from personal experience is a form of social activity distinct in nature from Memory found in experience, more overtly didactic in character and more politically precarious due to potential interruption. Third, and most significantly, the Rohingya memory practices reveal a limit in the existing theoretical vocabulary: neither Malkki's mythico-history, nor Nora's *lieux de mémoire*, nor Halbwachs's collective memory framework is designed to understand this situation of Rohingya refugees in which the state has not only displaced a people but actively sought to erase the historical evidence of their prior belonging. For the Rohingya, Memory is not only a resource for identity maintenance; it is a form of counter-archiving against state-sponsored historical erasure. It is in this sense — Memory as counter-archive — that the Rohingya case demands and contributes a new conceptual category to the broader literature on forced displacement and collective Memory.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that forced displacement cannot be adequately understood through legal, administrative, or demographic categories alone. Although frameworks of this nature remain relevant for identifying those who require protection, they are frequently inadequate for understanding the

subjective elements of displacement, as well as the sociocultural mechanisms by which displacement enables displaced individuals to construct notions of self and place in response to their rupture. This interdisciplinary review of literature related to forced migration, Home, Homelessness, and Memory, focusing specifically on Rohingya Muslim refugees in Bangladesh, makes clear that displacement entails more than territorial displacement, loss of citizenship and material security; rather, it disrupts the world(s) by which people make sense of themselves and their place in society.

The example of the Rohingya community highlights the drawbacks of mainstream approaches to refugee research. Administrative and humanitarian discourses tend to view refugees as legal persons who should be protected and helped. It is important to recognise that these approaches do not provide a complete view of displacement, as they do not sufficiently account for how displaced communities construct meaning and identity in a long-term state of uncertainty. The experience of the Rohingya shows that the displaced are not merely subjects of humanitarian intervention but rather social actors who continually reinvent their community and history through practices such as storytelling, worship, spatial organisation, eating practices, and narrative exchange across generations.

The paper engages with broader issues in the study of Memory by showing that current understandings of collective Memory, sites of Memory, and nostalgia cannot adequately capture cases in which displacement entails not only exile but also an effort to obliterate any memory of the group's historical presence. The case of the Rohingya demonstrates that Memory is not merely a storehouse of history. It is a practice in which communities affirm their historical existence in the face of deliberate acts of forgetting by the state. Memory here serves as a counter-archive: an archive preserved collectively through the telling of stories and enactment of traditions.

Three conceptual insights emerge from this work. Firstly, the paper introduces the idea of moral geography, a relational and normative world composed of memories, obligations, identities, and relations that give meaning to a place. Displacement-induced Homelessness cannot be thought of as a lack of shelter, but as the destruction of this moral geography. Secondly, the paper identifies two different kinds of belonging – memorial belonging and transmitted belonging. Memorial belonging refers to experiences of place directly experienced by individuals, while transmitted belonging pertains to forms of belonging created through narratives inherited through culture in the absence of

first-hand experience of the place. The example of the Rohingya people demonstrates how the next generation establishes an attachment to the homeland through inherited narratives of collective Memory. Thirdly, this paper introduces the concept of Memory as a counter-archive to capture its role in preserving collective existence amid political exclusion and historical denial.

These concepts also imply more than just the case of the Rohingyas. Displacement is understood not merely as the movement of populations from one place to another, but as a struggle of being, as well as the struggle for history and narrative of existence. The same principles apply in other cases of statelessness, persecution, and protracted refugee situations where memories and identity formation are maintained through intergenerational practices. Thus, in this context, the Rohingya situation is both theoretical and practical.

Finally, the analysis highlights important implications for humanitarian governance. Current responses to displacement remain heavily focused on legal classification, security management, and material provisioning. However, the evidence reviewed in this paper suggests that cultural Memory, storytelling, communal gathering, religious practice, and the transmission of historical knowledge are equally important to the survival and well-being of displaced communities. Thus, humanitarian interventions ought to acknowledge that memory-formation and meaning-making are central elements of human dignity and social rehabilitation, rather than secondary cultural matters. The maintenance of an environment conducive to the continued existence of collective Memory and belonging among displaced communities is not an additional aspect of humanitarian protection, but rather a basic element of it.

The emphasis on Memory, belonging, and meaning-making as the focus of analysis in this paper contributes to existing attempts to move refugee studies away from its current focus on administration toward a more sociologically grounded framework for analysing forced migration. As the case of the Rohingya illustrates, people can build social worlds even when there are statelessness, imprisonment, and erasure of history. Such processes must be understood not only to explain the Rohingya dilemma but also to formulate a theory of displacement for the modern world.

References

Amnesty International. (2023). *“We feel like we are cursed”: Life is miserable for Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh.*

- <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2023/09/bangladesh-rohingya-refugees-endure-miserable-conditions/>
- Anam, T. (2011). *The golden age*. HarperCollins.
- Bachelard, G. (1958). *The poetics of space* (M. Jolas, Trans.). Beacon Press.
- Bass, G. J. (2013). *The blood telegram: Nixon, Kissinger, and a forgotten genocide*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (2016). The social construction of reality. In I. McIntyre & K. Mills (Eds.), *Social theory re-wired: New connections to classical and contemporary perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 110–122). Routledge. (Original work published 1966)
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Blunt, A. (2003). Collective memory and productive nostalgia: Anglo-Indian homemaking at McCluskieganj. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 21(6), 717–738. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d314t>
- Blunt, A., & Dowling, R. (2006). *Home*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429327360>
- Bose, S., & Jalal, A. (2011). *Modern South Asia: History, culture, political economy* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Bowlby, S., Gregory, S., & McKie, L. (1997). Doing home: Patriarchy, caring, and space. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 20(3), 343–350.
- Boym, S. (2001). *The future of nostalgia*. Basic Books.
- Butalia, U. (2017). *The other side of silence: Voices from the Partition of India* (Rev. ed.). Penguin Books. (Original work published 1998)
- Chowdhury, I. (2021). Geographies of memory and spaces of belonging: Journeys of the mind and displaced populations. *Words & Silences / Palabras y Silencios*, 10(1), 1–15. https://www.ioha.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/IOHA_Chowdury_English-1.pdf
- Datta, A. (2016). Dealing with dislocation: Migration, place, and home among displaced Kashmiri Pandits in Jammu and Kashmir. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 50(3), 339–363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0069966716659339>
- Douglas, M. (1991). The idea of a home: A kind of space. *Social Research*, 58(1), 287–307.
- Eastmond, M. (2007). Stories as lived experience: Narratives in forced migration research. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2), 248–264.

- Farzana, K. F. (2017). *Memories of Burmese Rohingya refugees: Contested identity and belonging*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-58360-4>
- Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., Loescher, G., Long, K., & Sigona, N. (2014). Introduction: Refugee and forced migration studies in transition. In E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, G. Loescher, K. Long, & N. Sigona (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of refugee and forced migration studies* (pp. 1–13). Oxford University Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory* (L. A. Coser, Ed. & Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original works published 1941, 1952)
- Human Rights Watch. (2024). *World report 2024: Bangladesh: Events of 2023*. <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2024/country-chapters/bangladesh>
- International Organization for Migration. (2025). *Timeless Arakan: Houses, elements and stories*. Rohingya Cultural Memory Centre. <https://rohingyaculturalmemorycentre.iom.int/>
- Jha, S., & Kumar Singh, P. (Eds.). (2022). *Home, belonging, and memory in migration: Leaving and living*. Routledge.
- Kak, S. (2011). *Until my freedom has come: The new intifada in Kashmir*. Penguin India.
- Kaveri, & Irudaya Rajan, S. (2023). The politics of statelessness, refugeehood, and humanitarianism of the Rohingyas. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 4, 921461. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2022.921461>
- Lee, R. (2021). *Myanmar's Rohingya genocide: Identity, history and hate speech*. I.B. Tauris.
- Lischer, S. K. (2007). Causes and consequences of conflict-induced displacement. *Civil Wars*, 9(2), 142–155.
- Malkki, L. H. (1995). *Purity and exile: Violence, memory, and national cosmology among Hutu refugees in Tanzania*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mallett, S. (2004). Understanding home: A critical review of the literature. *The Sociological Review*, 52(1), 62–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00442.x>
- Manto, S. H. (1987). Toba Tek Singh (K. Hasan, Trans.). In K. Hasan (Ed.), *Kingdom's end and other stories*. Verso. (Original work published 1955)
- McDowell, C. (1996). *A Tamil asylum diaspora: Sri Lankan migration, settlement and politics in Switzerland*. Berghahn Books.

- Menon, R., & Bhasin, K. (1998). *Borders and boundaries: Women in India's Partition*. Rutgers University Press.
- Mookherjee, N. (2015). *The spectral wound: Sexual violence, public memories, and the Bangladesh war of 1971*. Duke University Press.
- Muggah, R. (2003). A tale of two solitudes: Comparing conflict- and development-induced internal displacement and involuntary resettlement. *International Migration*, 41(5), 5–31.
- Muggah, R. (2007). *No refuge: The crisis of refugee militarisation in Africa*. Zed Books.
- Navile, T. E., & Rahman, S. (2025, September 29). *The Rohingya recipes and food practices of the stateless Rohingya community in camps of Bangladesh*. Endangered Material Knowledge Programme, Durham University. <https://www.emkp.org/stateless-rohingya-bangladesh-camp-food-recipes/>
- Neikirk, A. (2023). Learning to be refugees: Identity formation and intangible cultural heritage in protracted displacement. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 37(1), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feac045>
- Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, 26, 7–24.
- Pandey, G. (2001). *Remembering Partition: Violence, nationalism, and history in India*. Cambridge University Press.
- Papadopoulos, R. K. (2002). Refugees, home, and trauma. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 1(3), 165–178.
- Reed, H. E., Ludwig, B., & Braslow, L. (2016). Forced migration. In D. Lucas & E. Bell (Eds.), *International handbook of migration and population distribution* (pp. 605–625). Springer.
- Sa'di, A. H., & Abu-Lughod, L. (Eds.). (2007). *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the claims of memory*. Columbia University Press.
- Saikia, Y. (2011). *Women, war, and the making of Bangladesh: Remembering 1971*. Duke University Press.
- Saunders, P., & Williams, P. (1988). The constitution of the home: Towards a research agenda. *Housing Studies*, 3(2), 81–93.
- Singh, M. (2013). No place to call home: Representation of forced migration and exile in South Asian literature. *South Asian Review*, 34(1), 57–76.
- Somerville, P. (1992). Homelessness and the meaning of home: Rooflessness or rootlessness? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 16(4), 529–539.

- Stein, B. N. (1981). The refugee experience: Defining the parameters of a field of study. *International Migration Review*, 15(1–2), 320–330.
- Stewart, K. (1988). Nostalgia—A polemic. *Cultural Anthropology*, 3(3), 227–241.
- Talbot, I., & Singh, G. (2009). *The Partition of India*. Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, H. (2013). Refugees, the state and the concept of home. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 32(2), 130–152.
- Thiranagama, S. (2011). *In my mother's house: Civil war in Sri Lanka*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Turton, D. (2003). *Conceptualising forced migration* (Working Paper No. 12). Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford. <https://www.rsc.ox.ac.uk/files/files-1/wp12-conceptualising-forced-migration-2003.pdf>
- Uddin, N. (2020). *The Rohingya: An ethnography of 'subhuman' life*. Oxford University Press.
- UNHCR. (2024). *Bangladesh: Rohingya refugee response*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. <https://www.unhcr.org/rohingya-emergency.html>
- UNICEF. (2024). *Rohingya humanitarian crisis: Education response*. United Nations Children's Fund. <https://www.unicef.org/rohingya>
- Wardhaugh, J. (1999). The unaccommodated woman: Home, homelessness, and identity. *The Sociological Review*, 47(1), 91–109.
- Zetter, R. (1999). Reconceptualising the myth of return: Continuity and transition among the Greek-Cypriot refugees of 1974. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 12(1), 1–22.