CHAPTER I

A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
The phenomenon of refugees in the international realm is as old as the emergence of the state. It was with the birth of the nation-state anchored to religion, race or secular ideology that the phenomenon of forcing people away from their established and known habitat emerged. In this process, minorities (religious, racial) and those groups who did not conform to the ideological tenets of the dominant section were persecuted and pushed out by the new, aggressive and in many respects totalitarian state (Muni and Baral 1996:1).

Today, as we are moving into the twenty-first century, it has been pointed out that we are approaching a post-national era that recedes nationalism and relegates the nation-state into the background, and which therefore would result in the creation of transnationals (Stack 1981:6). However, even today one can find instances of intense conflicts due to the demand for the creation of nation-state. This tends to pose a hindrance to the process of creating post-national states. Thus, until now there are no signs of lessening of ethnic and nationalistic fervour. And till this happens, there will be the constant problem of refugees, which will then continue to remain an important area for research.

While refugee flows have been a constant feature of societies since times immemorial, at an international level, it was only in the twentieth century that efforts have been made to formulate certain universal standards for the protection of such people. Earlier efforts were adhoc and
local in nature (UNHCR 2000:1). It was only in 1950-51 that the office of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) was established. The estimated number of refugees who fall under the mandate of UNHCR as on January 1, 2002 is shown in table I.1.

Most refugee problems have occurred because of identification of people to a particular aspect of identity such as religion, race, secular ideology etc. Refugee problems are created when attempts are made to create a nation based on the invoking of these different factors. Consequently, those with attributes other than the one on the basis of which the nation-state has been created often feel threatened by the attitudes of the 'Other'. Oommen (1994:161) has pointed out that it is social categorization that is the beginning of constructing the 'Other' who are assumed to be different, based on religion, language, caste, gender, age, class, lifestyle etc. Thus, in the case of identity based conflicts the 'Other' can be constructed on any one or more of the identity basis and both the groups see the members of the 'Other' collectivity as different and invariably inferior. Many communities attempt to create nation-state by advocating the values and traditions of their group as that of a nation. In this context when there is an official recognition of cultural difference some of the identities get politicized (Cordell 1999:3).
Table I.1 Number of Refugees in the Various Continents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>Total Population (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Refugees</th>
<th>Number Per Thousand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>8,450,000</td>
<td>2.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>6,072,900</td>
<td>7.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>5,571,700</td>
<td>7.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1,047,100</td>
<td>3.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>575,600</td>
<td>1.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>2.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,137</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,793,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.551</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religion is the most important factor in constructing the external and feared 'Other' in India. When a particular religious collectivity claims to be a political community and poses a threat to the larger polity, it comes to be defined as the 'Other'. Thus in post-partition India, the Muslims are one such religious collectivity that becomes the most despised/or feared 'Other'. Therefore they have been viewed as the 'outsider-unequal Other' who are not only cognized as inferior but also defined as external to the society (Oommen 1994:162). It is the conceptualization of the 'Other' that plays a major role in Hindu-Muslim relations and had even led to the partition and its subsequent events, which is the main focus of this research and will be discussed later in this study.

This chapter has been divided into three parts for better understanding and greater clarity of the theoretical framework that forms the background of this research work. The first part of the chapter deals with the theories of some of the scholars in conceptualizing nation and state formation and their applicability in the Asian case. The second part of the chapter deals with the factors that create refugees in large numbers along with a discussion of the term 'refugees'. The third part of the chapter studies the factors that create religious nationalism in the Indian case. This will provide an understanding about the manner in which refugees are created whenever attempts are made to invoke religious identity of people for state formation and therefore whether this can be a legitimate and sustainable basis for claims as homeland on a particular territory.
I

CONCEPTUALIZING NATION AND STATE FORMATION

While scholars have extensively researched on the topic of nation and nationalism a lot of ambiguity remains about the concept of ‘nation’ itself. Ernest Renan (1991) in his article ‘What is a nation’ holds the view that ‘a nation is a soul, a spiritual principle’. Renan has provided a psychological-moral definition of the nation. He has based his definition solely on subjective factors, with little regard for the objective criteria that constitute an important part in defining and creating a nation.

Max Weber (1948:176) on the other hand defines the nation ‘as a community of sentiment which would adequately manifest itself in a state of its own; hence, a nation is a community which normally tends to produce a state of its own’. Weber’s definition is inherent with certain flaws. According to him, every nation must build up a separate state and that the nation’s identity can only be manifested when it attains a separate state for itself. While in the European case, the principle of ‘one nation one state’ was used to create nations, India on the other hand provides a good example of how different nations can co-exist within a state and that it is not necessary for them to build a state of their own to preserve their identity. Weber also holds the view that a nation is not identical with a community speaking the same language. Here too, he has failed to recognize that one of the most important attributes of a nation is that people should have a common medium of communication. Both Benedict
Anderson (1983) and Ernest Gellner (1983) have pointed out the need of building a homogeneous society, and that one of the means of doing so is through a common language.

Like Weber, Karl Deutsch (1969) too has been unable to make a clear separation between the concepts of the nation and state. He holds the view that nations are formed when the people who make it acquire the power to back up their aspirations for a separate state. According to him, a nation consists of a group of people who have a state of their own. Thus, he too falls in the same trap as Weber and fails to recognize the existence of a number of nations that do not have a separate state. In fact many nations have not aspired to attain a separate state for themselves.

Anthony D. Smith (1986) is another scholar who has failed to view a nation without it necessarily having a state of its own. Thus he too like the scholars mentioned earlier fails to account for the existence of various nations without a state of their own.

Unlike Ernest Gellner, Max Weber, Karl Deutsch and Anthony D. Smith who have conflated the terms of nation and state, Walker Connor (1994) has been able to register a distinction between the concepts of the nation and state (Oommen1997:55). According to Connor 'nation' creates a psychological bond with a strong sense of belonging associated with a particular territory, considered to be its own, while state is a territorial
political unit. Thus he has rightly pointed out that where the state and nation coincide with each other, the result is the nation-state.

Having critically analyzed the work of some of the scholars in the field of defining and conceptualizing the nation, it is now imperative to conceptualize the nation taking into account the empirical experience in creating nations.

According to Oommen (1997), nation refers to a group of people who have a sense of belonging to a common territory and share a common language. Thus for any nation to exist there must be fulfilled at least two basic conditions, that of a common territory and the existence of a common language among the people. Nation is a psychological-moral entity. The state, on the other hand, is a politico-legal entity and refers to a geographical territory where the political authority has the right to exercise legitimate power. When the nation and state coincide with one another what results is the nation-state. However, a nation need not always aspire for statehood and neither a state need always consist of only one nation, but rather may be a conglomeration of nations as exemplified by the case of India and the United Kingdom (Oommen 1997:20).

The above conceptualization makes the terms, national and citizen clear to us. While the two may co-exist, there are instances where this need not necessarily be so and national citizens would only emerge in cases where the nation and state coincide. All those residing in a territory and
fulfilling certain conditions laid down by law may be regarded as citizens and thus provided equal rights as are provided to other citizens of the state. To be nationals, on the other hand, there is a need to fulfill certain moral-psychological conditions, such as a sense of attachment and belonging to the nation apart from the conditions mentioned earlier.

Having conceptualized the nation and state, it is now important to focus attention on the processes that help in creating a nation. A large number of theories have come up which try to arrive at an understanding of how nations have come to exist. We would like to review here the views of three important scholars, those of Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson and Anthony D. Smith. While it is generally presumed that these scholars have presented global approaches to the study of nation, it is important to see how their work constrains the understanding of the Asian case.

Ernest Gellner (1983) presented a distinction between the agrarian and industrial societies. According to him nationalism comes about in the early stages of industrialization and fades away as society becomes more homogeneous and industrial. He considers education as an important factor that helps in creating a homogeneous and standardized society. Thus for the emergence of a nation, education plays a crucial role. He also presents a typology of nationalism and his first model is called the 'Habsburg' or the 'Balkan' for which he cites the example of Africa, south of the Sahara. The second model comes about if the powerless get access to
education and are able to coalesce into an ethnic majority within a culturally divided society, which is the classical liberal western nationalism as exemplified by the cases of Italy and Germany. The third model is one where only the rest or some have access to education while the others do not. Finally, he points out a situation where neither party enjoys the benefits of such access.

If one tries to apply Gellner's theory to the Asian case, one finds a number of limitations. His theory presents a picture that the Asian and African nationalism are just delayed forms of European nationalism. Thus, Gellner fails to account for the role played by local cultures and also the capacity of standardized systems of education in pre-industrial societies.

The second scholar, Benedict Anderson (1983) whose theory is considered a global one, puts forward the view that the nation is an imagined political community – imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. According to him, this community comes into being because of the important role played by print capitalism. He classifies the three types of nationalism as Creole, Linguistic (vernacular) and Official. These models according to him first took shape in Europe and then spread to Asia and Africa. Thus he too denies any originality to Asia and Africa in constructing their own models of nationalism; rather he speaks of these continents as ‘pirating’ the European models.
Anthony D. Smith (1986) in his model puts forward the view that modern nations have ancient ethnic origins and were not invented or imagined. While many scholars share the modernist view, Smith does insist that nations have roots in pre-modern ethnic communities.

The approaches to the study of the formation of nations have been classified into the modernist, post-modernist and ethno-culturalist (Tonnesson and Antlov 1996:13-19). While the modernist scholars are of the view that nationalism would encapsulate the local cultures and create the modern society and that would ultimately lead to the creation of a global culture, the post-modernists disregard historical facts. Therefore, in this approach nations would lose the little regard that modernists have for history. The third approach, that is, the ethno-culturalist approach, roots nationalism in pre-modern times. Thus here a full account is taken of historical facts. Therefore in trying to understand the case of Asia we need to adopt a synthetic approach and not any one single approach.

Nation and Nationalism had first emerged in the western world, in America and Europe. It has been pointed out that for some it was Christianity that prepared the way, while for others it was education and the printing press. A large number of theories are thus ethnocentric, based on western experience where nations emerged with the process of modernity. But in the case of Asia and Africa it was more a result of colonialism and imperialism. Thus these theories seem inadequate if one
applies them singly, but would provide a better understanding when applied in combination to understand the case of Asia and Africa. It is now important to turn one's attention to the factors in identity construction that are an important basis in nation creation and play a major role in creating refugees, that is outsiders, in large numbers.

II

FACTORS THAT CREATE REFUGEES AT AN INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

It has been pointed out earlier (see table I.1) that Asia followed by Africa and Europe have the largest refugee population in that order. It is when attachments related to primordial factors gain predominance and pertain to the non-rational domain of human attributes that it leads to social turbulence and violence.

In Europe the post World War I settlements based on the principle of national self-determination assigned tens of millions of people to nation-states other than 'their own'. Millions of Germans were left as minorities in the region's new or reconstituted states, especially Poland and Czechoslovakia. Though they were citizens of these new states by national identity they still belonged to the powerful external national homeland. Similarly, many Hungarians became national minorities in Romania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Bulgarian and Macedonian minorities were assigned to Yugoslavia, Greece and Romania but were linked by shared aspects of nationality to Bulgaria. Ukrainians and Belarusians in Poland
were linked to larger populations in the Soviet Union (Brubaker 1996:6). Thus in all these cases while people were linked by citizenship to one state they shared identity links and attachments with people in other states as well. Thus there came about dissociation between citizenship and nationality in a large number of cases.

It is useful to highlight the case of Albanians in Kosovo and those in Albania. These groups had identity ties that cut across state boundaries. But with the break up of federal communist rule in Yugoslavia after Tito’s death Kosovo came under increasing Serb repression with the result of Albanian alienation from Serbia. Therefore, what is required is a framework, which recognizes both the validity of Serb interests in Kosovo and the aspiration of the Albanian community to govern itself and to develop relations with other Albanian communities (Miall 1999:135).

In the absence of the unlikely event of such reconciliation of different interests taking place, there will be much greater emphasis on one basis of identity, which demands for the creation of nation-state. This therefore leads to majority-minority conflicts. It is then the majority-minority issue that plays a crucial role in determining the presence of refugees in large numbers. In the case of Macedonia one finds that when Macedonia became independent in 1991, it was declared to be ‘a national state of Macedonian people’, this turned the Albanian and Turkish people into a minority group.
threatened by inter-group relations (Miall 1999:140) of different identity associated collectivities.

It must be pointed out here that identity of one kind may be used as a predominant factor in certain contexts. Some identity factor may be used for collective mobilization of one kind at one time and others at another time for another kind of collective mobilization. Thus there may be context-related changes (Gupta 1996:1) with regard to the basis of identity. This has been especially true if one looks at the case of creation of Pakistan and subsequently that of Bangladesh. In 1947 both these states were a unified unit where religion was considered as the binding factor and by emphasizing their Muslim identity they wanted to separate from India. Yet, a little over twenty years later, language became an important factor leading to their separation. It must be pointed out here that two factors became dominant in the separation of Bangladesh from Pakistan. The first was that the two parts of Pakistan were divided by more than a thousand miles, thus the geographical contiguity between the two areas was missing. The second fact was that there was an attempt to impose Urdu on East Pakistan. This was a means to club together the linguistic and religious dimensions as Urdu was identified with Islam in the Indian subcontinent.

Thus as the context changed there was a change from religion over to language as the basis of identity. Invoking the aspect of a shared language has created most nations in Western Europe. Therefore here a
coterminality is established between language and territory in cases such as Italy, Germany etc. However in Eastern Europe, it was the religious factor that has played an important role. The persecution and mass displacement of Jews in Europe during the Second World War is a well-known example. The number of Jewish refugees was in time greatly reduced by emigration to Israel by uprooting the Arab population of that new state. This in turn created a large refugee population in the Middle East with the two conflicting groups being the Arabs and the Jews (Nutting 1969:51).

De-nationalization has also been there in Yugoslavia where the warring groups are the Catholic Croats, the orthodox Serbs and the Bosnian Muslims. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbs forced Muslims to flee the area so that ‘Greater Serbia’ could be carved out (Griffiths 1993:38). This all started when Muslims announced the creation of an Islamic Republic in the heart of Europe. Thus religion has been one of the important aspects in nation and state formation. Sometimes a coterminality of religion and language may be used to create nation-states as is happening in the case of Sri Lanka.

In the island state of Sri Lanka there has been a situation of conflict between the two major religious and linguistic groups, the Buddhist Sinhalese and the Hindu Tamilians. One set of Tamil rebels has been demanding a merger of the northern and eastern areas, which are the
Tamil majority areas into one province with greater autonomy for themselves. While another set of them demand a separate 'Tamil Eelam', that is a sovereign Tamil state. This religion-language coterminality has therefore resulted in a section of Srilankan citizens to take refuge elsewhere.

A similar process has been going on in Africa, especially Ethiopia. Many individual interactions are organized around an identity idiom and the government has redrawn the map of Ethiopia in order to fit more properly with perceived ideas of identity and sense of belonging. Therefore in tune with this, people are being reinstated in their 'home' areas to make the regions homogeneous in terms of identical identity aspects (Poluha 1998:31). Here more than one set of identity factors are important – religious as well as cultural.

It needs to be pointed out that ideological difference over the issue of communism versus capitalism has also generated refugees. Those who had non-communist propensity found themselves persecuted in the Asian communist countries such as Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. In East Asia, the partition of Korea in 1948 as a result of ideological conflicts led to large migration between North and South Korea. This was compounded by the 1950-53 Korean war when some 3,60,000 Koreans from the North sought refuge in South Korea (Muntarbhorn1992:4). Concomitantly, there was a
large-scale movement of people from North to South Vietnam as a result of armed conflicts and the partition of the country (Muntarbhorn 1992:4).

Further if one turns one's attention to the case of United States, one finds that a number of groups such as Blacks, Hispanics, Jews etc. are present. Here again, different factors such as physical type, national origin, religion etc. have been responsible in accounting for their presence (Oommen 2002:128).

In studies of refugees (Muni and Baral 1996:9) the following causal factors have been identified as responsible for creating refugees:

1. Anti colonial wars and self-determination movements.
2. International conflicts.
3. Revolutions, coups and regime changes.
4. Ethnic, communal and religious conflicts.
5. Creation and restructuring of state boundaries.

Refugees may be created due to any of the above mentioned reasons. The International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences (Sills 1972) describes them as involuntary migrants, victims of politics, war or natural catastrophe. Thus, every refugee is naturally a migrant but not every migrant is a refugee. Here it is important to refer to Keller's (1975:5) work. He has tried to develop a typology of refugees based on a number of variables. The first are those who have become refugees due to economic causes, the second are those who became refugees due to war and thirdly,
according to him, are those who owe their refugee status to political, religious or ethnic reasons.

However, Keller’s typology suffers from a flaw as the first category in his classification are not really refugees for they are voluntary migrants and not forced by circumstances which made their existence at the original place of habitation life-threatening. Here a personal motivation on the part of the migrants to move is also present along with the anticipation and time for preparation for movement which is unlike the case of refugees forced by political, religious or war-like situations to move. In fact, it must also be pointed out that the psychological-moral condition of the economic refugees of Keller’s classification is different as compared to the latter two. In the case of the former the anticipation for a better future and lifestyle makes people leave their original place of habitation. There is also present an attitude of hopefulness and ‘looking forward to the future’ in this case which is far from present in the latter two and therefore makes for a faster psychological rehabilitation in the former case.

Therefore what needs to be emphasized here is the fact that economic causes for migration can also be of varied nature. Here the first category could be of those who migrate due to life-threatening situations posed by natural catastrophes such as droughts, earthquakes etc. and for them the above-described conditions do not hold true. The second category includes those who migrate for better economic prospects and for whom the
previously described conditions are applicable. In fact, the former could return when normalcy returns, while the latter generally do not return and continue to stay in their new place of habitation.

Based on the above factors (Muni and Baral 1996:7) one can identify the movement of refugees into India due to partition as a result of a combination of the fourth and fifth factors. In fact, the refugees of the present study may be classified as 'political refugees' (Buehrig 1971:3) who have been defined as the product of an incompatible juxtaposition whether of faction, class, religion, ideology or nationality.

United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) in its 1951 statute (Subba 1988:8) has defined a refugee as any 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...’

In the light of the above definition, the migrants who came to India from Pakistan due to partition upon whose case this work is based are no longer strictly speaking refugees because, they have been granted citizenship of India. However, the cause for their fleeing from Pakistan was purely one that can be identified with refugees and thus they continue to be called and defined as such by the host community. Therefore, they are viewed as refugees in this work.
III
UNDERSTANDING RELIGIOUS NATIONALISM IN THE INDIAN SUBCONTINENT

The attempts to create a nation are based on the invoking of a large number of factors such as language, religion, race, tribe etc. In the case of Asia and especially India, which is a multi-religious country, we find the growing emphasis on religion to create a nation.

Oommen (1998) has identified seven ways in which nation in South Asia has been defined. These are as an ancient civilizational entity; a composite culture; a political entity; a religious entity; a geographical/territorial entity with a specific cultural ethos; a collection of linguistic entities and lastly, as a unity of great and little nations. The first three according to Oommen are predominantly pre-partition conceptualizations, while the last three are largely conceptualizations that belong to the post-partition period. It was the fourth one that initiated the impulse of partition and is still used by some collectivities to claim that they are a nation. Hence their claim for a separate state on that basis stands as legitimate to them. The claims in the Indian case have been articulated by three major religious collectivities – the Hindus, the Sikhs and the Muslims. However such claims are untenable because of a lack of coterminality between religion and territory. No religious collectivity can demand an exclusive territory for itself, as other religious collectivities too have an equal claim over the same territory as their homeland.
The demand by the Hindus for a Hindu rashtra (nation) is unsustainable, as there are various ways in which Hindu identity can be defined. The first and foremost is the geographical dimension where the Hindus claim that they are the original inhabitants of India. According to this view all the people who inhabit the geographical territory of India are to be considered Hindus. Second is the view that India is the homeland of those who profess religions of Indian origin. Thus here a distinction is made between the Indic and non-Indic religions. Therefore, a coterminality is assumed between the territory of India and the Indic religions. The third conceptualization considers Hindus as those belonging to the 'Aryan race' and here the people of Dravidian South are excluded. Also, in this conceptualization there is no place for the ritually unclean castes of North India. Further, the practice of ritual purification, that is, shuddhi, is not applicable in the case of the Dravidian clean caste Hindus. Thus when the very definition of Hindu is ambiguous, with various ways of conceptualizing, one can imagine that the creation of the Hindu nation would in itself be inherent with contradictions (Oommen 1998:7).

The case of Sikhs too needs careful analysis as they claim to be a nation based on religion. Their claim for a separate state is untenable as no coterminality exists between territory and religion. The Sikhs including those who migrated to India from Pakistan have claimed that Indian Punjab is their homeland, and on that basis they want to secede from India by creating the state of Khalistan. But as religion was not acceptable as a
basis for state formation in India, the Sikhs invoked language to carve out a Sikh territory. Since in this case Punjabi language (written in Gurumukhi script) and Sikh religion are coterminous, their attempt to build a Sikh homeland was considered legitimate by some. However in actuality the inhabitants in the state of the Punjab are people belonging to both Hindu and Sikh religions, and so if the creation of Khalistan is undertaken the Hindu population in the Punjab would be turned into ‘outsiders’ by disinheriting their right on the Punjab, as their homeland. If the Punjab is declared the Sikh homeland, it would imply an imposition of the culture of one set of religious collectivity on those belonging to the other religious collectivity inhabiting the same geographical territory (Oommen 1990:40).

The claim by the third religious collectivity, the Muslims, has had serious implications for understanding nation and nationalism in South Asia. This collectivity claimed a separate Muslim state for itself before independence and thus in 1947, Pakistan, the Muslim state was created.

However this very state created on religious lines could not sustain itself for long due to lack of geographical contiguity and the fact that religion failed to bind together the people of East and West Pakistan. In fact, the linguistic factor became significant in their separation. Secondly, while Pakistan was conceived as the Muslim state and large number of non-Muslim population was turned into outsiders, the Muslim section of the population who migrated from India to Pakistan are also not accepted
as natives and remain ‘Mohajirs’. Thirdly, even to this day religion cannot
bind together the people of Pakistan, as they are divided on linguistic lines
and also because there is no one single Muslim identity as pointed out by
the constant tension between the Shia and Sunni sections of the
population. The partition of India did not resolve the demands of the
Muslims, as they claim Kashmir too as their homeland. This results in
turning the Kashmiri Pandits who are Hindus into ‘outsiders’ even though
they too have an equal claim over Kashmir as their homeland (Oommen

Callard (1957:235) has pointed out that the Ulema opposed the
creation of Pakistan because they believed nationalism was incompatible
with Islam. Pakistan was for them too narrow an aim since it was not to
include all Muslims, not even all the Muslims of India. Now that Pakistan is
in existence they are trying to narrow the effective composition of the state
to exclude all but the body of true believers. Thus they wish to establish
loyalty to the ‘one true God’ through the state of Pakistan, and this in effect
means that it would leave no place for those who are loyal to the state and
nation alone.

Thus all the three attempts to build religious nationalisms and then
claim a separate state on that basis are carried on but, on analysis, one
finds that these claims are untenable and unsustainable in the long run
because of the following three reasons:
Firstly, there is no coterminality between religion and territory not only because people of different religious collectivities occupy the same territory but also because they are spread in different parts of the world.

Secondly, there are more significant factors other than religion, which play an important role in creating a nation. These are language and territory as exemplified by the case of Bangladesh and the European experience.

Thirdly, in the event that any one religious collectivity is able to stake claim over a territory as its homeland, it would try to gain hegemony over other religious collectivities and attempt to homogenize the culture, which would be against the democratic ethos.

Thus when religion was invoked to create Pakistan, it first of all turned all Hindus into aliens to the land that was officially declared as the Muslim state. Consequently, the Hindus did not feel safe in an area where they were turned into a minority group and communal riots broke out. The Hindus therefore had to flee the territory of Pakistan and move into India in order to save themselves from the threat to their lives and this thereby turned them into refugees. Conversely, a section of Muslims left the Indian territory because of the insecurity they faced, although India did not become a Hindu state. This study focuses on the refugees who came from Pakistan to India.