6 Intergenerational justice

Esther Surenthiraraj

Introduction

Transitional justice was born as a temporally limited, extraordinary measure of justice that responded to catastrophic events. Over time, it has become applicable to a variety of political conditions (Teitel 2003). In its current manifestation, however, transitional justice still carries some of the aspects that shaped its birth as an extraordinary form of justice that is time- and context-bound. Given the particularity of its interventions, and their limited and limiting temporal relevance, it is unsurprising that transitional justice measures often draw on existing fault lines that remain entrenched in the context within which they operate. This chapter speaks of the direct and implied transitional justice measures prevalent in post-war Sri Lanka.

The three-decade-long civil war that unfolded in Sri Lanka was fought largely between the Sri Lankan armed forces, generally seen as representing the Sinhalese ethnic majority group, and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), which proclaimed itself the representative of the second largest community in the country, the Tamils. Noting the discriminatory treatment of Tamil citizens, the LTTE waged a guerrilla-type warfare against the state demanding territorial and institutional autonomy for Tamils. Following several attempts at negotiated settlements, the war was finally brought to an end in May 2009 through brutal military action, which left many displaced, disabled, missing or dead. While issues such as gender and class remain embedded in social structures, ethnicity became the overdetermining factor of analysis, especially of the war (see Gunasinghe 1984/1996). Fault lines that became socially entrenched in the context of war took the form of particular ethnic cleavages. War-related issues faced by Muslims, who are classified by their religious identity in a country in which ethnicity takes centre stage, were largely ignored (Haniffa 2007; McGilvray and Raheem 2007). Transitional justice measures largely focused on the two major ethnic groups, Sinhalese and Tamils, often overlooking Muslim communities affected by war (Haniffa 2015).

Communities that emerge during prolonged war are often forgotten during the planning of the transitional justice processes. In long-term, large-scale displacement for example, fresh relations are formed, and existing ones are

reshaped, as groups abandon their homes and either continue to journey from place to place or settle in surroundings different to their origins (on diaspora communities see Orjuela 2020; see also Chapter 8 in this volume). The communities that emerge from these relations are often ignored, and even if considered, are accounted for simplistically, erasing the complexity that their social relations contain. All too often, architects of transitional justice measures overlook how different generations experienced the war and how this shapes their post-war demands. Sometimes these demands overlap across generations; at other times they deviate and complicate transitional justice measures that are envisioned superficially with only one generation in mind.

In Sri Lanka, transitional justice has a contentious history, which can be traced to the development of a troubled Sinhala Buddhist public consciousness during and after the late stages of the war (Dewasiri 2020, see also Chapter 4 in this volume). Post-war transitional justice has been marked by a series of actions, including local and international commissions and reports focused on wartime injustices, United Nations resolutions on Sri Lanka (co-sponsored by the Lankan government for a short period of time from 2015–19), attempts at amending the Constitution in ways that guarantee non-recurrence of the conflict, alongside post-war development projects, with a focus on urban regeneration and the tourism industry. All these were touted by local and international state and non-state actors as panaceas to post-war recovery. Directly related to transitional justice measures was the establishment of the Office of Missing Persons in 2016 and the Office of Reparations in 2018. These offices, however, are largely symbolic measures. Justice, truth-seeking, accountability, reparations and institutional reform remain distant and obscure to local communities, also because the very terms associated with transitional justice that index particular legal procedures are reinterpreted by both the state and local communities to fit specific imaginations of justice (on reparations see de Mel and Kodikara 2018).

This chapter draws on fieldwork conducted in the Puttalam district, with the Northern Muslims of Sri Lanka, to discuss the complexity of justice measures in post-war settings. The case of the Northern Muslims is embedded in the history of war but also has its particularities. The community emerged during wartime, following the expulsion of Muslims living in the Northern Province. In October 1990, all Muslims living in the northern regions under LTTE control were expelled from the province on LTTE orders, with some being permitted only two hours to vacate their homes (Hasbullah 2001). Being formed into a community through the LTTE, rather than through the aggression of the Sri Lankan state, Northern Muslims trouble the Sinhala-Tamil ethnic binary along which the war is generally articulated and analysed. Following their expulsion, a number of Muslims from the North gravitated towards and settled in Puttalam, a coastal district in the North-Western Province. Many of them continue to reside there. Over time, the identity of displaced families who hailed from different regions and villages in the North became sedimented into a communal Northern Muslim

marker. As Thiranagama (2011) observes, the eviction order transformed the Muslims of the North into the Northern Muslims. This marker also formed a distinct socio-political identity through which this group's collective demands are articulated. For the Northern Muslims who have lived away from their homes for over 30 years, displacement has become an orientation, "a way of inhabiting the world" (Thiranagama 2011, 129). The prolonged nature of their displacement means that second and third generations have been born into the community. These generations make Northern Muslims' call for justice and redress complex and multidimensional. Thus, the very factors that mark them – a community that was *born of the specific event of wartime expulsion*, and lives in *prolonged displacement with multiple generations* – often obscure Northern Muslims in transitional justice processes.

Following their expulsion, Northern Muslims were granted assistance by host communities, donor organizations and, to a limited extent, the state. As the Citizen's Commission on the Expulsion of Muslims from the Northern Province by the LTTE in 1990 (2012) reports, the state provided dry rations for this group until late 2010. Under the Unified Assistance Scheme, it facilitated assistance to purchase land and housing on return but also, following an amendment to the scheme in 1995, upon relocation in Puttalam. Later, the state worked alongside a World Bank project that commenced in 2007 to further facilitate housing schemes in Puttalam. Such assistance was generally directly connected to access to state resources through ministerial portfolios held by Muslim politicians. Therefore, the Commission report notes the assistance provided to Northern Muslims alongside the political affiliations of Muslim ministers and their relations with governments in power. Yet, following the end of war in May 2009, as the needs of those affected by the later stages of the war became urgent and pressing, Northern Muslims were forgotten and marginalized as aid recipients (Haniffa 2015).

Where injustice such as expulsion has taken place decades ago, memory becomes a form of validating the demand for rights and, in certain cases, reparations. However, when memory is bound to justice in this way, the transmission of memory onto the next generation can reinforce the *duty to remember* for the sake of justice. This complicates the articulation of specific needs and aspirations rooted in the complex experiences of new generations. Inspired by Hirsch (2012), in this chapter I refer to generations that did not directly experience expulsion yet live in its shadow as "postgenerations" (p. 4). Such reference does not intend to collapse into one the experiences of all successive generations. Instead it shows that, although postgenerations did not face expulsion as a direct order, the impact of expulsion continues to inscribe itself down the generations. I will also critique the assumed demarcation of postgenerations' views from those of the first generation. For those who experienced expulsion directly, it has become a temporally distant event, overlaid by their everyday life in prolonged displacement. As the difficulty of return confronts both those from first and successive generations, first generations too voice complex perspectives that overlap with those of

postgenerations. Hence this chapter speaks of justice as *inter-generational*, as located in the in-between spaces of generations.

Drawing on the concept of postmemory pioneered by Marianne Hirsch, I will reflect on three selected sources of data, gathered during my larger fieldwork between 2014 and 2016 in Puttalam, in and around the area of Palavi, among resident Northern Muslims: (a) an interview with Abdullah (pseudonym), a first-generation Northern Muslim above the age of 60; (b) a four-part focus group discussion (FGD) with mainly women participants from a range of ages, which concluded in the design and implementation of a community-led artwork competition on the expulsion among postgeneration children of school-going age; (c) a FGD with a group of six second-generation Northern Muslim young adults, which explored the idea of home and the option of return to the North. Reflecting on these three sources and participant observation from limited ethnographic work conducted at the field site, this chapter first highlights postgenerations' resistance to the expulsion as their sole dominant postmemory. It then shows that these memories cannot be completely displaced either, as they result in social, political and economic consequences that could limit access to justice. I will argue that postgenerations hold a variety of memories in tension, recognizing the interwoven nature of remembering while resisting singular memories as definitive descriptors of their community. This analysis highlights the complexity that emerges when memory and justice are coupled across generations and sustains the case for a nuanced understanding of how these elements play out in transitional justice processes.

The concept of postmemory

In her most recent iteration of the concept, Hirsch defines postmemory as follows:

Postmemory describes the relationship that the 'generation after' bears to the personal, collective, and cultural trauma or transformation of those who came before – to events that they 'remember' only by means of the stories, images and behaviors among which they grew up. But these events were transmitted to them so deeply and affectively as to seem to constitute memories in their own right. Postmemory's connection to the past is thus not actually mediated by recall, but by imaginative investment, projection, and creation ... To grow up with such overwhelming inherited memories is to risk having one's own life stories displaced, even evacuated, by our ancestors. It is to be shaped, however indirectly, by traumatic fragments of events that defy narrative reconstruction and exceed comprehension. These events happened in the past, but their effects continue into the present.

(2019, p. 172)

For Hirsch, postmemory is distinct from the memory that stems from first-hand experiences of trauma. She states that it is important to distinguish between these two forms of memory so as to avoid appropriating experiences of the first generation while not invalidating memory by proxy. Critiques of her conceptualization of “generation” and the theorization of intergenerational transfer of memory confined to family (Çalışkan 2019) urged a revised definition of postmemory. Hirsch thereafter began to distinguish between familial and *affiliative* postmemory, where the latter is not confined to familial transfer but “can encompass a larger collective in an organic web of transmission” (Hirsch 2019, p. 173). Affiliative postmemory therefore extends the scope and reach of postmemory.

Of importance is not only Hirsch’s argument that postmemory can be so powerful that it constitutes memories *of one’s own*, but also the idea that these memories are sustained by “imaginative investment, projection, and creation”, which is a deliberate form of remembering. For postgenerations, especially when memory becomes an imperative for justice, memories of previous generations can become a burden they are obliged to bear. Their own hesitancy to remember or carry on certain memories may be marginalized. Postmemory can thus become a duty, which subsumes the complexity of postgenerational experiences in its bid to remember a singular past.

Tied to Hirsch’s concept is Hoffman’s discussion of loss and its connection to postgenerations. For Hoffman, it is “[t]ransferred loss, more than transferred memory ... [that] children of survivors inherit” (2010, p. 411). She posits that the affective components of experiences – “the imprint of various personal and historical experiences, as these are traced on individual psyches and sensibilities” (pp. 407–8) – are transferred to successive generations. Condensations of loss that are transmitted through survivors’ psychological states become, for Hoffman, a second-generation condition. Drawing on Freud, she also argues that, in order to move on from loss, one must first *know* what was lost. Although second generations do not have an experience of *what* was lost, dealing with transmitted loss can be all-consuming – which is reminiscent of Hirsch’s argument. However, such experiences also hold heuristic and educational potential. For Hoffman, the second generations’ condition offers a way forward that does not diminish or disregard loss, but incorporates it into envisioning a transformed (collective) way of life.

Memory as connection and burden

The expulsion of Muslims from the Northern Province of Sri Lanka by the LTTE was a form of violence against a community. The eviction order implied that Muslims did not belong in the North, in the Tamil nation-state for which the LTTE claimed they fought. Reactions by expelled Muslims to this extreme measure by the LTTE focused on emphasizing their right to return to and live in the North. Over time, these reactions solidified as a need to show binding connections to their origins. Memory – of expulsion, but

also of harmonious, tolerant lived experiences in the North prior to expulsion – served this purpose. During interviews that I conducted in Puttalam with respondents from the first generation of expelled Muslims, memories of living on the land (the North) animated conversations about the past. Of particular interest is the interview with Abdullah, who was a retired educator and leader in the community. He was resident in Puttalam although he originally hailed from the Mannar District of the Northern Province. Abdullah spoke of some personal experiences, but during most of the interview he adopted the perspective of a spokesperson for the community. Consequently, this interview took the shape of a vehicle for communal memories. Abdullah's use of the word *piLLai* ("child") in Tamil, to address me or to tag his sentence, gave an added veneer to the transmission of memories, as Abdullah saw in me a younger woman migrant from a different community, a person interested in the histories and experiences of Northern Muslims unlike most youth from the postgenerations he encountered in Puttalam.

In reference to return and postgenerations, Abdullah says:

After '90, it is the children born here [in Puttalam] who are getting married now. Those children have no thought for that village [in Mannar]. They think only of this village, the facilities and opportunities in this village ... I don't also criticize them. But ... we go there [to Mannar] ... our goods are there – our goods are all there, right? Our coconut fields, paddy fields are all in that place. It is people like us [from the first generation] who go and tend to it [property] or look after it ... These children ... they ask "where are you taking us?" As soon as we came here if we asked "shall we go to Kandy?", they say "yes", if we ask "shall we go to Mannar?", they ask "what is there?" ... It [Kandy] has an attraction to those who go there. What attraction does it have for us? Our interest lies in seeing our village, we go to the area of our village as we have our lands and properties, we will see those things. Now my goods, thank God, still remain, it is hereditarily ours. None of my sons are interested in it ... They were married there, have had children here and if our grandson is sitting for the G.C.E. O/L here in the English medium, what interest will he have in it? Is it the village he was born in? No, right! So if *Appa* [reference here to grandfather] was born there, *Appa* was born there, that is ... history. That is history ... They are not personally interested, no?

For Abdullah, postgenerations have no vested interest in their origins. Yet he provides a nuanced understanding of the circumstances under which such a lack of interest is displayed. For the first generation, continued ties to the land lie in their memories and assets that remain. For postgenerations, the same memory cannot animate rootedness in the North. When memory serves as a connection to what was left behind, postgenerations struggle to relate their own experiences to the loss experienced by those who precede them, as they themselves have no tangible memory of living in the North. As Hirsch

argues, memories of the first generation tend to displace one's own memories in postgenerations and replace them with ones that were transferred by the first generation. What we see here, however, is a resistance to such memories, and the acknowledgement of this resistance by the first generation.

If those of the first generation recognize that their memories are burdensome to later generations, why is their renunciation by postgenerations problematic? Often, resistance to postmemory is understood as willful “forgetting”: that is, a deliberate displacement of memories from the past. The sections that follow question this simplistic understanding, by bringing into the picture two factors that complicate Northern Muslim postgenerations' resistance to postmemory: they remain socially marked by the experience of previous generations and they hold a transgenerational right to redress. These factors highlight the complex subject positions articulated by respondents when dealing with postmemory and problematize “moving on” as supplanting past memories. They also challenge an understanding of remembering and forgetting as a binary opposition. Engaging with these factors therefore urges a deeper conceptual engagement with justice and memory.

Social markers of trans-generational experiences

Even if postgenerations may wish to move away from remembering expulsion as a dominant narrative, they remain socially marked by the experiences of their ancestors. This is apparent in interviews with respondents, but also in the four-part FGD that concluded in the community-led intervention of an art competition. In the first of the FGDs, participants discussed whether the intervention should be about remembering the past or “moving on”. During this conversation a female participant voiced the following opinion:

We were displaced in '90 and came [here]. We are the refugees. Our children are not refugees ... they resist the “refugee” label. They don't fear as much as we do. Because from their birth certificate onwards, everything is [registered] here.

This participant voices an important tag that continues to haunt postgenerations – *ahathi* (refugee). Used indiscriminately in Tamil to refer to both the internally displaced and the stateless, this label is complex. On the one hand, it enables a political and humanitarian demand that forces the state to recognize Northern Muslims' right to return (Surenthiraraj and de Mel 2019). On the other hand, it hinders meaningful social integration of the Northern Muslims and their postgenerations who wish to remain in Puttalam into the district's populace (Brun 2003, 2008). In the extract above, the continued use of the word “refugee” to label postgenerations is resisted by a first-generation participant. A similar sentiment was echoed by another woman during the second of the four-part FGDs:

But from now onwards it should be [our goal] to eliminate that refugee label. It is not an issue for us, but we have children. They are registrants of Puttalam. They didn't come [here] as refugees! They were born in Puttalam, studied and grew up all in Puttalam. When they go somewhere there is no necessity to inquire if they are refugees [or not]! ... Though [those] children are born in Puttalam – when they go somewhere and are asked “where are you from?” those children say “Puttalam”. [When they are asked] “then where are your mother and father from?” they say “Mannar”, [then they are asked] “then are you a refugee?” The label returns, the refugee label.

Both of these women who resist the social marking of postgenerations as “refugees” are first-generation Northern Muslims. Here we find an acknowledgement by them that the experiences of their descendants are different to their own. Yet in social settings postgenerations carry this weight which places their own experiences in the shadow of those of their predecessors. Second-generation Northern Muslims offered a complementary narrative to the sentiments expressed. In an FGD conducted with a group of six second-generation respondents, when the question of home emerged, two women expressed the following thoughts:

- E: We are not in the state of mind yet to accept Puttalam as our hometown ... although [I was] born and raised here, I cannot accept this [as my home].
- B: But when we are outside [the district], we say [we are from] Puttalam. There is some attachment in saying [we are from] Puttalam. Inside [the district] there are confrontations with Puttalam people.

Second-generation Northern Muslims typically experience oscillation between two locations. For them, postmemory remains strong enough that they still acknowledge the North as their home, in spite of being born and raised in Puttalam. However, they also display a firm attachment to Puttalam, given that their experiences are rooted in this locality. Their experience nuances an outright rejection of postmemory, and offers instead a spectrum of responses that holds multiple memories that are in tension with each other. They refuse a binary reaction to remembering or forgetting the experiences of their predecessors, asking instead for a nuanced process of remembering the distant past while not overlooking the more recent one.

Memory and right to redress

Returning to the question of resisting postmemories, a second source of complication is that justice in the present remains connected to the past. In this sense, it is important that memories are transmitted and retained actively as pathways to reparations. Redress can be material or symbolic, and

accessible whether one chooses to return to the North and/or remain in Puttalam. Materially, it can be compensation for loss of assets, and symbolically it can mean belonging and therefore having the right to return.

During the interview with Abdullah he articulates the dilemma of remembering as follows:

Now everyone has put up [settled] here [in Puttalam], has gone to school here, has friends here, has married here. After this it has come to a state where they ask is there such a village [in Mannar], is there such a place. But at the same time we cannot lose the land on which we were born [in the North]! Cannot lose our heritage!

Here, Abdullah formulates a link between remembering and land. Land was a symbol of autonomy in the war between the LTTE and Sri Lanka government armed forces, and the demand for a geographic territory for Tamils became a significant demand of the LTTE. Post-war, it continues to occupy discussions in relation to Sri Lanka's constitutional amendments. Land remains a symbol of belonging and a path to citizenship rights. It is thereby a terrain on which communities' demands for recognition and transitional justice are articulated (see Fonseka and Raheem 2011; People's Alliance for Right to Land 2020).

Land in this context speaks to both material and symbolic belonging. The crux of the argument Abdullah makes is that if memories are not transferred to successive generations, land and all that it entails will be lost to the evicted Northern Muslims. He does not deny that for generations born and raised in Puttalam memories of the North are vague. However, in a system that links justice to the past, the transmission of memories remains crucial to accessing compensation for loss, whether one chooses to return and/or remain. For postgenerations who struggle between maintaining a transferred memory of origins and their own lived memories in Puttalam, such a linking of justice and remembering to achieve redress for past atrocities remains fraught. Their resistance to postmemory thus becomes complicated, as the right to material and symbolic compensation remain tied to actively remembering and emphasizing the event of expulsion.

The decision to return to the North and/or to remain in Puttalam further complicates this link between memory and justice. In the community-led intervention discussed earlier, the tension between choosing to remember the expulsion or not, and how and what to remember exactly, marked the entire process of its planning. In the first of the four-part preparatory FGDs it was suggested that the resulting intervention should involve children. Discussions thereafter circled around how much attention should be given to the event of expulsion itself, and whether it was opening up old wounds that would be transferred to children, who did not experience the event themselves. Parallel to this discussion was the need to recognize the current situation in Puttalam and that the intervention should be future-oriented. The intervention

eventually became an artwork competition for children. Thematically it married the past to the present, touching on displacement but recognizing the generosity of the host community in the Puttalam district in sharing their resources with the Northerners.

The conversations that took place during the FGDs reveal the tension that exists between remembering the North and focusing on Puttalam. For the group that wishes to remain in Puttalam, the memories of living in there takes precedence over memories of the North. Their views overlap, but also diverge from those who wish to return to the North. According to the general perspective, however, among the postgeneration, the latter seems to be a small minority. For example, in the FGD conducted with second-generation Northern Muslims, of the six participants involved, only one woman expressed a wish to return to the North. For those from postgenerations who wish to return, however, transmission of memories are important facets of access to the North, as these memories support their right to live in this province. They also facilitate their transition and settlement as individuals from postgenerations who choose to return, but who have no personal memories of the North that they can draw upon to support this process. Therefore, their desire to return forms around their parents' memories, helping them to navigate their transition to the North. Return based on memory is not without its problems. Discrimination against Muslims grows on segregated experiences of public life that were present previously. Return is complicated, therefore, not only because of the changed demographics and landscape of the North – which have been transformed significantly due to war, internal displacement and more recent post-war reconstruction – but also because of segregated ethnocentric living patterns (see Thiranagama 2018). However, as postmemory remains tied to the justice of return, Northern Muslim postgenerations are unable to completely discard memories of living in the North. Expulsion, and subsequently living in displacement without abandoning the idea of – and the right to – return, constitute their condition.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed the complexity of remembering by focusing on memories transferred to postgenerations of Northern Muslims in Sri Lanka. While the first generation recognizes the resistance of postgenerations to the memory of wartime expulsion and the experiences surrounding this event, such resistance does not simply mean a displacement of the dominant memories of expulsion, as these are linked to justice and access to rights and reparations that stem from the original event. Northern Muslims offer, instead, complex subject positions as a response to the hegemonic influence of this postmemory. They recognize that memories of and around expulsion are part of a network of multiple interlinked memories, which are potentially in tension with each other. In this way, they counter the effects of a dominant memory on expulsion at risk of displacing their own lived experiences.

In arguing the above, the chapter troubles the coupling of justice with memory in transitional justice processes. The experiences of the Northern Muslims in Sri Lanka pose a challenge to this coupling. For them, access to justice requires that memories be transmitted to the next generation, as these memories are crucial to the demand for redress. However, such transfers can also result in sustaining memories related to expulsion from the North as the dominant form of memory, over-shadowing memories of living in Puttalam. Northern Muslims navigate this dilemma by presenting a complex understanding of, and critical engagement with, remembering. Their responses can inspire scholars and practitioners willing to engage more deeply with the entangled nature of the different pillars of transitional justice and to develop a more holistic approach to how the notions of memory and justice are understood and mobilized in post-war situations.

Acknowledgements

Fieldwork for this paper was funded by the Pluralistic Memories Project, which was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (r4d – Swiss Programme for Research on Global Issues for Development, Project Pluralistic Memories, SNSF grant number: 400240_146955 / 400240_171188).

References

- Brun, Cathrine. *Finding a place: Local integration and protracted displacement in Sri Lanka*. Social Scientists' Association, 2008.
- Brun, Cathrine. "Local citizens or internally displaced persons? Dilemmas of long-term displacement in Sri Lanka". *Journal of Refugee Studies*, vol. 16, no. 4, Dec. 2003, pp. 376–397, doi:10.1093/jrs/16.4.376.
- Çalışkan, Dilara. "Queer postmemory". *European Journal of Women's Studies*, vol. 26, no. 3, Aug. 2019, pp. 261–273, doi:10.1177/1350506819860164.
- Citizen's Commission on the Expulsion of Muslims from the Northern Province by the LTTE in October. 1990. *The quest for redemption: The story of the northern Muslims*. Law & Society Trust, 2012.
- de Mel, Neloufer, and Chulani Kodikara. "The limits of 'doing' justice: Compensation as reparation in post-war Sri Lanka". *Violence and the Quest for Justice in South Asia*, edited by Deepak Mehta and Rahul Roy, SAGE, 2018, pp. 39–73.
- Dewasiri, Nirmal Ranjith. "Historical consciousness and transitional justice in post-war Sri Lanka". *International Public History*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2020, doi:10.1515/iph-2020-2013.
- Fonseka, Bhavani, and Mirak Raheem. *Land issues in the Northern Province: Post-war politics, policy and practices*. Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2011.
- Gunasinghe, Newton. "May Day after the July Holocaust". *Newton Gunasinghe: Selected essays*, edited by Sasanka Perera, Social Scientists' Association, 1984/1996.
- Haniffa, Farzana. "Competing for victim status: Northern Muslims and the ironies of Sri Lanka's post-war transition". *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2015, doi:10.5334/sta.fj.

- Haniffa, Farzana. "Muslims in Sri Lanka's ethnic conflict". *ISIM Review*, vol. 19, 2007, pp. 52–53.
- Hasbullah, Shahul H. *Muslim refugees: The forgotten people in Sri Lanka's ethnic conflict*. Research and Action Forum for Social Development, 2001.
- Hirsch, Marianne. "Connective arts of postmemory". *Analecta Politica*, vol. 9, no. 16, 2019, pp. 171–176, doi:10.18566/apolit.v9n16.a09.
- Hirsch, Marianne. *The generation of postmemory: Writing and visual culture after the Holocaust*. Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Hoffman, Eva. "The long afterlife of loss". *Memory: Histories, theories, debates*, edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, Fordham University Press, 2010, pp. 406–415, doi:10.2307/j.ctt1c999bq.31.
- McGilvray, Dennis B., and Mirak Raheem. *Muslim perspectives on the Sri Lankan conflict*. East-West Center Washington, 2007.
- Orjuela, Camilla. "Passing on the torch of memory: Transitional justice and the transfer of diaspora identity across generations". *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2020, pp. 360–380, doi:10.1093/ijtj/ijaa005.
- People's Alliance for Right to Land. *"Our Land, Our Life": People's Land Commission Report*. People's Alliance for Right to Land, 2020.
- Surenthiraraj, Esther, and Neloufer de Mel. "'Two homes, refugees in both': Contesting frameworks – the case of the northern Muslims of Sri Lanka". *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, vol. 7, no. 2, Dec. 2019, pp. 1044–1064, doi:10.5964/jssp.v7i2.850.
- Teitel, Ruti G. "Transitional justice genealogy". *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, vol. 16, 2003, p. 69–94.
- Thiranagama, Sharika. "The civility of strangers? Caste, ethnicity, and living together in postwar Jaffna, Sri Lanka". *Anthropological Theory*, vol. 18, no. 2–3, 2018, pp. 357–381, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499617744476>.
- Thiranagama, Sharika. *In my mother's house: Civil war in Sri Lanka*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.