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Introduction

The meaning of camp is pivotal to understand the life of the refugee along with geopolitical ordering and the strategy of governance in present time. In the recent years, specifically in the subcontinent, the concept of camp has emerged as a tool or destination for this particular category of people. Basic concept of the camp is largely articulated through the question of refugee which is deeply connected to the Partition of India in 1947. In the same proposition the question of caste has been framed in the context of Bengal. Yet, the same question could be thought of in different manners in the same context. The question of caste could be addressed through anthropological, sociological or historical ways of understanding vis-à-vis the structure of the Hindu society. (Bose; Sanyal) This paper aims to think the question of caste spatially where Partition is seen as the ruins of past experiences. Therefore, camps considered here are not only thought of as concentration of the refugees, but it also indicates the phenomenon of caste in Bengal and explores the meaning of camp considering this reality. Later we will explicate how the existence of camp produces a distinct type of discourse which may help us to understand the question of caste in another dimension. Here the concept of camp is sociologically defined as a qualitative direction in which the concept, desire and kind of being is determined (Gasset 14). However, the paper does not consider camp as quantum of masses of the refugees (Agamben “We Refugee” 114); rather it has a specific qualitative character in which it excluded them. The reality of the camp articulated here comes from the exigency of the refugee influx after the Partition of India in 1947 and we are quite far from its systematic history. Refugee camp methodologically is conceived through the ‘language in the words’ which can be interpreted by its expression and unlike physical existence, the camp is looked at spatially. If we try to understand the phenomenon of the refugee, spatial intervention directs us to investigate the ‘as such’ regarding its existence; otherwise it can help us only to interpret the camp ontologically. The discourse of social stratification or the question of caste has largely directed the concept of equality, rights and the concepts of pure and impure. Such type of conceptualization is articulated through the experiences of discrimination of caste where historical events have been prioritized. In Bengal, Partition represents a major event in which caste consciousness plays a distinct and separate role compared to other parts of India. Spatial interrogation will direct us to the experience of caste in terms of the temporal existence of refugees and we will look forward to address the question phenomenally.

Interpretation of Camp

The refugee camp is broadly interpreted in dominant literature as physical space of distinct, spatially confined area. Different types of practices in everyday life and government, or functioning power gets manifested through its spatial consideration. Spatial content methodologically articulated in terms of the development economy of state and equality, on the other hand, has looked at the rights of the refugees through the lens of economy. Description directed towards camp or asylum as the space of protection of the refugees, introduces a corollary obligation for the state to help them and it does so according to the institutionalized
principle of the League of Nations. On the other side, the facts of this spatial consideration have been counted according to the law of physical structure of the camp and policy for the rights of asylum or camp inmates. Otherwise it is likely to be interpreted through the organization of the space and the assistance of government, where the discourse moves around the presence of the state. Methodologically the contribution of Giorgio Agamben makes way to interpret camp in a singular way with separate form of articulation, like camp as ‘paradigm’. It is to look at the camp as a distinct form of knowledge, through suspending, without presupposition of time and its intelligibility, having an ontological character. In continuation to such type of methodological intervention, in itself the camp represented a space of exception which is not bound to follow the systemic form of the history. So, understanding of camp defines different rank of inquirer which makes the phenomenon prioritized for interpretation and life has been described according to such priority. If we focus on the meaning of the camp, basically it reflects a way of life which is not common or of normal form. The debate on the ‘meaning of life’ is a traditional philosophical discourse in Greek philosophy, where the word life itself carries dual entity (Agamben Homo Sacer 1). In continuation to the meaning of life, the camp itself offers through its structural form a kind of life to those who take shelter in that space.

The appearance of refugees in our concern contested the creation of two nation states theory. The existence of camp was very purposive and it was the immediate assistance given to the people whose way of life was disrupted. Therefore, in-itself camp belonged to such a destiny of the being, which is actually the affirmation of the abandonment of home and makes ‘itself of refugee’ known by the essence of the spatial arrangement. In post-metaphysical context of understanding the ‘being’, Martin Heidegger’s articulation of truth of the being, in Letter on Humanism, through its essence and experience is counted not by the systematic historical line (251). Rather, ‘homeland’ is considered by the essence of the ‘being’ and therefore, the question is how the category of ‘refugee’ in the new destination accomplished to encounter themselves, which can indicate us to the essence of ‘being’ in a new direction. If we concentrate on the accomplishment of spatial belongingness of the refugees, here constitution of such spatial arrangement provides some qualitative features. On the other hand, essence of the camp is not historically determined but it appears in terms of the mass phenomena of refugee influx from East Pakistan. In this sense articulation of camp is purposive, and ontologically its belongingness is not asserted in systematic way of history, but it has its own way which can be grasped through the language of the camp. The paper largely focuses on a spatial consideration of how language of the camp indicates the phenomenal existence which may help us to understand the experience of the camp. The spatial consideration of how language of the camp indicates the phenomenal existence may also be useful to understand the experience in terms of the question of caste.

The Camp as its Essence

If we look at the camp without its essence, it directs us towards the history of the being of camp and the narrative largely unfolds the way it takes care of the refugees, or how they overcome themselves from the status of being refugees. To investigate the truth of the ‘being’ of camp in a post-metaphysical way is to understand the reality. Therefore, in-itself camp is a kind of temporal arrangement for the refugee families. In Bengal three types of camp broadly exist - a) Transit/ Relief camps b) Work-site camps and c) Colony camps. Beside these three categories of camp there was a Permanent Liability Institute (popularly known as P. L. Camp) and Women’s camp which was controlled separately (Manual of Instructions 13). The structure of camp was
predetermined, for which refugees were divided into a number of groups, and allotment would be
defined according to their primary existing status. To become a camp inmate is a self-defined
process and, in each phase, they have to rectify themselves as being authentic and the
rehabilitation norms was to define ingenuity of the refugees. Number of check posts was set up
in different parts of border side entries into West Bengal under the control of the police
directorate and those who crossed these check posts had to show their migration certificates.
Then the post had been issuing a token which was an authentic sign to behold as a refugee
(Manual of Instructions 11). Such way of becoming refugee determined their legacy, and
rehabilitation ensured providing shelter, training and education, occupation and acquisition of
land for settlement.

If we try to understand the essence ‘as such’, the camp does not have any definite
direction for the refugee families to determine their foresight. It exists for a kind of groups as the
new destiny therefore. The essence is experienced by ‘there’ in the space and this paper
considers a single camp for understanding this experience. In general, the structure of camp has
some common features. Like most of the camp it arranges abandoned military barrack and it has
separate administrative structure, organization and care for its inmates. If a family became an
inmate of the camp, immediately the administration started the rehabilitation assistance which
was popularly known as dole. It covered the daily assistance like rice, cereal or wheat and very
small amount was allotted for many. In our consideration here is the Cooper’s camp which was
the transit camp and it was initially acquired by the government of India and was run under their
direction. On July 1, 1951 the state government took over the camp. It was the second largest
camp in Bengal and the nature of the camp was based on refugee families taking temporary
shelter in the space and then to be rehabilitated permanently in different parts of West Bengal
and outside Bengal. Apart from this, here we can explicate the ‘being’ as refugee ‘there’ which
possesses a spatial character with respect to time. It is determined by the essence of the ‘they’.
Here understanding the camp is not conceptualized by its physical structure, rather space is
articulated through a kind of existence of the refugee with respect to others. The very specificity,
in our consideration of Cooper’s, exists in distinct entity, which is determined by the nature of
caste. On the other hand, the Cooper’s is not categorically distinct but caste entity made the
space relational and that makes it exist in distinct way.

Homelessness is presented as ‘coming to be the destiny of the world’ in Marxist
interpretation (Komel 653). Therefore, destiny is predicated through the history of being. Here
relation between ‘being’ and ‘man’ is conceptualized through the historical accessibility of
‘being’. Praxis School, mainly Vanja Sutlić tries to incorporate the in-itself of the ‘being’
through the Marxist interpretation of the strange character of the ‘being’, with Heidegger’s
interpretation of reality through ‘Being and Time’ (Komel 654). But destiny can be interpreted by
encountering the historical complexity of being and Praxis School is close to such historical
intervention. Refugees coming to the destiny like camp are due to the ruins of Partition. On the
other way, ‘being there’ is actually oblivious about the foresight of interiority or exteriority of
life and such spatial consideration appear by the ruins of the past experiences. It did not follow
the history of the past or any past relational understanding. In such consideration essence it-self
is directed towards the experiences, how inmates of the camp attached themselves in the space
and the way to encounter the spatial order. This type of intervention would help us to understand
the discourse of the camp space in the context of Bengal. The discourse has the constitutional
ground in such spatial condition which may unfold the way ‘being’ speaks and connects with
each other. General structure of the camp is articulated through the policy and it directed
physical essence of the camp after the refugee influx from East Pakistan. On the other hand, transit nature of the Cooper’s represents the aimlessness of the refugee families. As a new destination essence of the space has some possibilities in which discourse has been constituted. As temporary arrangements, the space itself follows kind of rules by the administration which determines the permanent rehabilitation, daily assistance of the refugee families and restrict the movements of inmates inside or outside the camp. In this sense space is unable to possess a definite direction of the refugee families to make their aims. In other words, transit character provides hindrance to think camp not as becoming a ‘home.’

To consider ‘true’ of the ‘being’ camp, it is not a judgment of either success and failure of the governments in terms of the rehabilitation paradigm, nor is it a way to describe the initial condition of the camp as ‘good’ or ‘bad’. The essence of camp actually directs us towards ‘in itself’ of the spatial character which is not simply its physical structure, that is the assemblage of the refugees, organizational structure or the process of rehabilitation of the camp inmates etc. Its essence directs us towards how in that kind of situation the ‘being’ exists and the way it belongs to another. The situational condition did not historically connect, rather it addresses the phenomenon of the camp and in such spatial belonging there is a state of mind in which existence of camp is determined. Here the phenomenon of camp is of major concern for us to interpret the true being of the camp which may open to us a distinct reality in terms of its spatial existence, particularly in the case of Bengal. It appears through certain symptoms of refugee influx, but it is difficult to define its character through the causes of Partition. On the other way, the deterministic character of the camp addressed by the phenomenon directs us towards the entity by which we can understand the strange character of Cooper’s camp as its transit nature. Actually ‘in-itself’, the space has kinds of fear, sufferings and anxieties which could be associated with its environment, obligation, lassitude and memories of loss that may be grasped through discourse of the space. The constitution of the discourse defines its essence with regard to ruins of the past.

**Phenomenon of Death**

We can grasp the phenomena of refugees through narratives or writings about the experience, but our intention is to get an understanding of how in such spatial condition language is constituted. Basic character of the space has a kind of obligation and each of the inmates has to follow the rules of the administration. Therefore, on the one hand such condition where it is difficult to articulate any type of discourse is most significant. On the other hand, here we can make out how the ‘being’ communicates with space. It can tell us something about the internal or external existence of camp but the expression is precisely the concept of ‘listening’ and ‘hearing’. ‘Hearing’ in terms of such spatial consideration is not helpful (Heidegger *Being and Time*, 207); rather ‘listening’ is the only possible way to make an expression of ‘being’ within the camp. In most of the cases expression about the past of the camp indicates as it-self to be ‘listened’. Reality of the space is understood through the phenomenon of death which is common in everyday life of the camp. Some literature about the experience of the life of camp explicating death as the everyday phenomenon and following it explored the existence of the camp. We can take a single narrative about the phenomenon of the camp to understand the way of ‘being’ existing in the space.
Pragabinda Saha joined as cashier in Cooper’s camp administration on the same date when the camp was started. According to him:

At that time, children used to die very frequently. This kind of child death in Cooper’s camp was heavily criticized in newspapers at that time. The child death was estimated by Kali Kumar Dey who had a satkar samiti. According to him at a time ten to fifteen dead bodies were dumped on a single pyre. Sometimes, the attendant used to keep a dead body locked and packed for the next day for his own income from the superintendent. That time was unforgettable when the news of estimated child death was around fifty to sixty per day. A single dead body was destined to be with other dead bodies till its dumping on the pyre. It was like having a burning ghat inside the Cooper’s camp, as identified by Kali babu. He had a room there. After sometime, one obligation was introduced at the time of burning the body, an arrangement was made by the superintendent and a differential rate was legitimized for old inhabitants and young children. The aged people required fifteen rupees and young children required ten rupees up to their ten years of age, and for homage around five rupees was fixed…a separate arrangement had been ruled for each dead body which became imaginary in front of the real condition of camp. In practice, eight to ten dead bodies used to be dumped over each other on the burning ghat. Therefore, officially, it violated the rule to place a single dead body for burning at the same time. The boundary of the camp begins from the high road to Cooper’s camp. Sal forest was there. Besides, we have witnessed a Sal forest in the place of colony which evoked fear in the evening even while walking down from there. It was completely a forest, which is undeniable. Nevertheless, dead body was not thrown into the jungle. Still, the young of us looked after Kali babu to be sure of whether he burnt the dead body or not.3

As an official staff in Cooper’s camp, Pragabindo Saha described death as an objective concern, but it unfolds the actual reality in the initial phase of the space.

If we try to understand the basic ontological inquiry about the doctrine of ‘being’, ‘death’ can open up the loss of the experience of ‘being’ (Heidegger 1962, 282). The existence of the loss of experience is a peculiar way to understand the reality in terms of ‘being’ with another in the space. Therefore, existing as ‘being’ in the space with understanding of the loss of the experience is an objective concern which produces different types of reality in post-metaphysical interpretation. The reality of the camp largely articulated in the dominant literature in a categorical way in terms of a group of people. It is concentrated on spatial ground and the future of the camp is mainly drawn by that policy. Here we understand the reality through the question of the essence of the camp and it manifested in terms of the ruins of Partition either as experience of the past or as the way of life. The basic ontological investigation is to understand the truth through essence of Being and Time.4 To continue with Martin Heidegger, the ‘being’ does not belong as systematic history, rather it is a house of language, therefore in-itself truth of being can be interpreted by the constitution of discourse. In this sense the way ‘being’ exists in camp and the way it is expressed can direct us to investigate the constitution of the language in such spatial condition. The basic character of the ‘being’ particularly in this specific camp concentration is more religious in nature regarding the question of caste. The environment of the camp has its own distinct form of construction for temporal existence of the homelessness of ‘being’ where fear and anxiety is the basic state of such existence. It is separate in terms of its live time5,
because ‘being there’ in such spatial relation was totally dependent upon rehabilitation assistance. In that sense it had no future, while on the other hand the phenomena of death opened the loss of the experiences.

As a separate entity, existence of the ‘being’ in the camp is conceived in terms of the future in the order of live time (Blanchot 1995, 2) which is an indeterminate condition, and initially the life of the camp went through such condition. It was locked by the administrative organization of the camp; inmates formally were not allowed to move outside the border. Such spatial condition is outside the beliefs and faiths of the refugees and detached from them. It solely depends upon rehabilitation assistance. The multiplicity of the way of the ‘being’ gets determined by either the proposal of the rehabilitation or it is confronted with death. The narrative of the camp gets expressed in the following way: “(in camp life) disease, mourning and line of death is common and we grew up seeing this” (Roy 155; emphasis mine). It directed existence of the ‘being’s’ ‘way to be’ in camp towards loss of experience. Here existence is not ‘as such’ directed towards end, rather existence contested with the death which counters totality of the ‘being’. Loss presumably determined the potentiality which could be articulated through the narrative. Manomohini Mallick came into the Cooper’s Camp when she was sixteen years old along with her husband, mother-in-law, two sons, and one daughter and spend a few years in the warehouse. According to her:

We were staying together in the ‘Nissen Hut’. My mother-in-law passed away there. I had one girl child and she also died in that place. Then, I was only left with my elder son and one daughter. At that time, I didn’t think they will live; my only concern was how we can survive together. In such condition they (my sons) didn’t want to eat rice. What could I have done? That time from Cooper’s camp market I bought a new plate with six paisa. Then I showed them the new plate and told them to eat their rice in the new plate as the taste would be better. In such a way I used to make them eat their food. That time in ‘Nissen Hut’ (warehouse) hot air blew all time and it burned the body. At present where there is the market, there was a banyan tree and I used to go there and sit under the tree with my children. Those people who were living inside the ‘Nissen Hut’ had mostly lost their children. Inside ‘Nissen Hut’ the air was very steamy, so most of those who had children under eighteen, had died. The ‘Nissen Hut’ was constructed by tin, so in summer the whole place became too hot. Sometimes blister appeared in the skin of our body because of the heat. (Mallick)

Once we have explicated such a condition of the way the ‘being’ exists, the narrative gives us some clue to understand the possibility actualized by the potentiality of the existence in such a condition. The ontological presupposition of the camp shall be intelligible by its totality. Here temporal existence of the Cooper’s camp is an indefinite form for considering the existence of the refugees. Therefore, in-itself the spatial belonging is not a definite way to articulate its end, but it is a phenomenon made close to us to define the specific character where significance of death helps us to interpret the ‘as such’ of the camp. On the other side, phenomenon of death opens up the discourse of the pure and the impure and make us ponder over the question of caste in spatial relational way.
The Language of the Camp and Passivity

The existence of camp is not the only way in which we can determine its definite character, rather ‘as such’ camp has its own way to belong to itself and we can interpret that by its functionality. In the context of Bengal different types of camps were established. The main concern of this paper is a specific type of camp which begins with temporary shelter but in the later phase it becomes a destination for the refugees. If we investigate the becoming of the space, it actually informed us about resistance, attachments, encounters and finally movement of the space. General interpretation of such ‘becoming’ can be made through refugee rehabilitation policy in West Bengal and it is the department of the rehabilitation who has taken the decision to rehabilitate specific category of the inmates permanently in the camp. The category was made in terms of the profession of the refugee families, and agricultural families were proposed to be settled in Dandakaranya which is currently in Chhattisgarh. To understand the becoming of the space through in-itself, the camp that we articulated in terms of ‘being’ the refugee ‘there’ is the space where the ‘as such’ of the space gets indicated by the way the being expressed themselves, to be grasped only by language. On the other hand, the way language of the discourse constituted specifically in these spatial circumstances may indicate the becoming ‘as such’ of the space.

Existence of the camp ‘is’ a kind of qualitative direction which has specific norms, rules and definite direction but our investigation largely is motivated to understand the way of ‘being’ in the space attached. Actually, becoming a refugee destroys everything of the ‘being’ in terms of the language, time, faith, belief and the past, and makes the phenomena outside the continuity of past event. So, by the consciousness of caste discrimination or historically specific forms of suffering and exclusion such story gets transformed in terms of the spatial relationship. It directed singularly the ‘being’ in the camp. The suffering, disempowerment, death and temporality of the character indicate appearance of the space eluding the history of the ‘being’; it makes intelligible the existence of the present. Narrative of the ‘being’ in camp explicated only the lived time of such spatial belonging, and here Manomohini Mallick makes sense of how the belonging is itself accomplished ‘in this condition and finds the possibility in her own way. It indicates a qualitative character of the camp where ‘being’ cannot be measured by its failure or simple loss. On the other hand, environmentally it functioned by ‘listening’ to the administration of the camp. Otherwise determination of the camp cannot be articulated. To understand the determinable character of camp, phenomenally it has a kind of fear which is constituted by the way the refugees were taken care of by the administration of the camp, and on the other side, by the arrangements of the refugees familiar with disease, bad hygiene and phenomenon of death. Therefore, existence ‘as such’ of the ‘being’ in the space rehabilitation assistance would continue if ‘being’ obeys the direction of the camp administration.

Maurice Blanchot’s articulation in The Writing of the Disaster helps us to understand the camp more critically and it directs us to interpret the life in the camp beyond the meaning of the ‘being’ (2). Actually, the text has no such definite qualitative direction; it is accomplished by some principles which in a certain way cross each other. Most significant thing of the text is making sense of the ruin of Disaster without ontological priority of the ‘being’ and marking the principle of how it can be interpreted. Basic interpretation of the Disaster according to Blanchot, could be made known to us in the light of the language (5). However, structure of the camp appears as the consequence of the influx of refugees, its actually an inconsolable condition to understand ‘being’ truly in terms of its existence by the formal knowledge of the past. On the
other hand, initially by involvement of the refugees such condition is unattached with the space and obeyed the rules and regulations of the camp administration. The question is how potentiality has developed to make the possible ground for attachment with the space and formed the discourse in a relational way. If we focus on how discourse constituted, Heidegger in *Being and Time* proposed to look at it through understanding of the reality by disowning the judgment and tried to make it through the language to understand the phenomena (208). In this sense, his main concern is not to understand the reality through the category of judgment but rather to understand a kind of ‘being’ by the language. Accordingly understanding ‘being’ is not to unfold its history but to exhibit in a way of its own and defining entities by the ‘being’ who has some possible entity. Therefore, investigation follows through the basic state of the ‘being’ and focusses on how the language of everyday existence has been diverted by talking to another (208). It may communicate through, according to Martin Heidegger, in discourse or talking (203).

In this context discourse may unfold the existence as ‘being’ of either the inmates of the camp who belong to the lower caste and our inquiry will follow on how to constitute their discourse in the space and its obscurity. In dominant discourse to understand Indian society, in the colonial and post-colonial project, the idea of India had a constant engagement with the question of caste. Few bodies of work tried to analyze the existence of the truth of caste in ancient Hindu practice and such type of understanding helped to create a historical continuity between pre-colonial and post-colonial times. On the other side, to focus on the colonial intervention in the question of caste in India is in the line of social transformation by this interrogation. Most common methodological concern of such type of interpretation is that both schools of scholars largely focus on the ‘chronological necessity’ to analyze the question. Here in this essay the spatial investigation and discursive way of analysis gives us the clue to interpret the question of caste according to the meaning of the camp in Bengal.

The basic formation of the discourse is marked by hearing and talking, which is a distinct interpretation and does not care for the history of the ‘being’, rather language explicates ‘as such’ of the ‘being’ to consider its phenomena. As transit nature, the phenomena through listening open the possibility to make sure the ‘being-with’ can resist this condition. Initially phenomena of the camp have followed such direction, and the everyday experience of the camp indicates a kind of silence in terms of this situational condition. It does not mean as such the ‘being’ doesn’t understand the phenomena; rather, ruin of everything in the life of the refugees actually is a kind of existence in the camp, where ‘being’ does not have the potentiality that is open to understand the other. It is in a certain way separate from its existential unity and always passes through the ‘suffering’ in the environment of the camp. In this sense, language of the camp does not accommodate the phenomena to indicate something about the way discourse constitutes in specific time. Its constituted by encountering the ‘other’ of the camp and in Cooper’s Camp constitution of the discourse gets manifested by the existential ‘suffering’ of the ‘being’. As such it is ambiguous to understand the meaning of the phenomena which is expressed by the language because discourse of the camp does not indicate the active possibility of the refugees in the space. Religious existence and rules of the administration unfolds the possibility of discourse with certain coherence to the rule. Therefore, the discourse in the camp has no such definite direction of either making sure or indication of development of their condition.

The phenomenon of death in everyday life, depends on the rehabilitation assistance (dole) delivered in terms of restriction of the movement in the space. Suffering and existence as religious determination actually carry the meaning of life. On the other side, the space appeared
as the ruin of the past of ‘being’, and ambiguous suffering in the space as such does not refer to a conscious mind either in religious direction of the existence, or in class direction. It does not mean camp cannot speak, rather language of the camp phenomenally directed extenuation of the presupposed subject. Therefore, if we interpret the movement of the spatial relation, potentiality of the refugee indicates the passivity which is determined by the existence in the camp. Passivity indicates particular type of qualitative character of the camp that refused not to exist with the other and belong as separate. The language of the demand, public gathering, and rally for particular demand in everyday life was not conscious of the separate belonging or voluntary prolonging of the presupposed subject. Passivity actually maintained itself either as ‘being’ or in terms of spatiality, therefore if the language cognized the other there would be a unity and social movement in the camp constituted by such type of unity. It can be addressed either by the movements against the sudden stopping of the rehabilitation assistance by the camp organization, demand for better quality of food, demand for rehabilitation to be given not outside of Bengal, participation in food movement, and giving support to other state protests. The obscurity of the language evokes the phenomenon which is unity with different kind and articulated in terms of the loss, death and silence. On the other way, it is not so simple that this unity is a kind of consciousness to understand the reality of the camp and its outside or it is constituted by the social discrimination. Rather, unity is closed by the entity which is related to the physical structure of the camp.

**Conclusion**

The phenomenon of the camp specifically in Bengal broadly look through the larger refugee policy in Bengal and it is articulated in a comparative way to define the distinctness of the camp. Existence of the camp has its own way and the paper mainly concerns particular type of single camp which appears during refugee influx from East Pakistan to West Bengal. Mainly the paper considers the phenomenal priority of the camp and tries to interpret obscurity of the camp embedded in its language. To extend further the discourse of the camp constitutes itself through its spatial condition and passivity explicated in the nature of the camp. The concept which is drawn here from Maurice Blanchot’s *The Writing of the Disaster* in the context of crushing force of totalitarian state and passivity evokes the situation to understand the ‘loss of itself’ and allows us to interpret separation from power of consciousness (17). The existence of the refugees in the camp is actually loss of everything, and belonging to the space without definite future of their life. If we look at discourse of the camp, it actually indicates us the way of speaking about themselves which is constituted by the condition of the space and its passivity or silence. On the other side, experience of the camp as such relates to a particular kind of condition with distinct reality and speaking about them actually never happen or just passes through. It is not presupposed or a kind of story that can be narrated because silence of the camp ruptured way to explicate that speech. So, writing of the experience as such of the ‘being’ in camp itself describes entity or outside of the entity in the space and particular religious character which makes the silence in a separate way. In this sense religiosity of the space may constitute a kind of syntax which is not marked by the dominant discourse of refugee study in Bengal. On the other side, the way refugees resist and its discourse which constituted such separate form of ‘listening’ and ‘speaking’ and passivity determine the phenomena considering in time the facts. It is not a
historical order rather transit nature of the camp which indicates its temporal existence and loss of the possibility to articulate and write.

The discourse of caste largely articulated particularly in the context of Bengal is either through the Partition of 1947 where the event dismantles the question of violence, displacement, making refugee and breaking the continuation of the event of the past. On the other side, it is constituted by the history of its past and how reality of the consciousness of caste gets transformed after Partition in West Bengal. Considering such type of historical intervention in the question of the caste, the spatial priority methodologically gives us a chance to investigate the question of caste by the language. By concentrating on a single camp, the paper tried to understand the truth of the refugee camp in terms of its essence. It is an investigation to make sense of the reality through a kind of stationary condition and unfold the discourse of the camp. Here understanding of the caste is represented not by the historical continuation of the past because the existence of the camp itself appears through discontinuation with the past. The discourse of the life of camp indicates to us the language which is a different kind of silence closed by the spatial relation among the refugees and the paper tries to address basic structure of the reality of caste in Bengal by understanding such language through spatiality.

Notes

1Niklaus Steiner has pointed out that after First World War refugee issue has been included into the international norms and he refers to Collinson’s comments on the League of Nation’s work on the refugees that established the three important standards for refugees. The last-mentioned standard is the league’s institutionalization of the principle of asylum. See Niklaus Steiner’s Arguing about Asylum (15).

2The concept of ‘strange’ nature of the camp is borrowed from Martin Heidegger’s basic ontological inquiry of the Being. (Heidegger The Basic Problems of Phenomenology, 163)

3Interview with Prangabinda Saha conducted by Prafulla Kumar Chakraborty.

4The basic ontological investigation conceptualized here by Martin Heidegger’s concept of ‘Being and Time’ in terms of understanding the reality (Heidegger Being and Time).

5The concept of ‘live Time’ is drawn from Maurice Blanchot’s articulation in The Writing of the Disaster. ‘Live Time’ has no such definite indication about the future and on the other side, it has no continuation of the past (Blanchot The Writing of Disaster, 2).

6Presence of death is everyday experience in camp life. See interview with late Manomohini Mallick, and Jogendra Nath Roy, “Cooper’s Campe Chhelebela.’

7Here the word ‘accomplished’ indicates the essence of action as ‘something into fullness of its essence’. Here ‘accomplished’ did not indicate the thinking, rather it is directed to the fullness of her essence. (Heidegger Letters on Humanism, 239)

8This particular type of existential proposition has been drawn by Maurice Blanchot in the essay “Everyday Speech”. Oblique existence is kind of belonging which is articulated in the aftermath of French revolution. (Blanchot “Everyday Speech”, 12)
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