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This thesis delves into a comparative understanding of “Partition” of India in 1947 in the discursive framework of a collective existential crisis that finds its echoes from the absurdity of human existence as described in Existentialism as well as within the body of Post-colonial literary writings. As stated in the initial setting of the problem, the thesis takes into account three specific authors, Kafka as representative existential thinker and Amitava Ghosh and Urvashi Butalia as the representatives Post-colonial authors who have set a benchmark of literary understanding of existential crisis that emanated from an event like Partition. The justification for such a choice lies in not a tautological resemblance among the three authors, rather on a technique of open-ended reading of Existentialism of Kafka that can be re-contextualized in Ghosh’s and Butalia’s narrative rendering of experiences of displacement of victims of partition. Such a recontextualization becomes salutary for its irreversible communicative surplus of ‘crisis of being’ that heightens a sense of desubjectivation. It is worth mentionable here that desubjectivation is an effect of crisis of being that not only silences the subject but benumbs them from carrying an unbroken self-identity. It is a paradoxical
realization of what Existentialists have called non-being in the very being, an alienation of oneself from one's own self and at the same time an experience of being subject—ed to an external process of loss and displacement. The project of this thesis, therefore, is to recast the experiential dimension of desubjectivation as a state of absurdity and suspension of being as it is manifested in the event of Partition.

One can surmise that the three authors provide diverse anchorages to the notion of Partition of the being: Kafka's transformation of humans into non-humans, Ghosh's continuous quest for a settled definition of the being from its forgotten interior and Butalia's play between affirmation and negation as complementary processes to cope with Partition as a global phenomenon are mutually reinforcing and hence can be read together in our attempt to understand the connection between Partition and recreation of being. What emerges is a common pattern, common yet multiple and mutually criss-crossing. The essential vulnerability of the human being cannot be overcome in a mimetic production of experience; rather the wound of existence shall never allow a full representation except in a partial and criss-cross of plural and divergent perspectives on life. It further points to Partition as an event that is able to convoke community around fidelity to the Event.
Partition as an event acts in many different ways, but it primarily constituted the source of re-humanizing oneself. The formation of the Subject, understood as a subject of/to the event, means to bring to closure the long-standing trauma of recovering ‘truth’ from those who need redemption from the scenes of violence. Further, partitioning of the self is a universal existentialist predicament that is not just confined to the event of Partition and displacement, but it represents a perennial reconstruction and deconstruction of the ‘self’ and the being.

Such a criss-cross can be thematized as the possibility of ‘speaking of’ or giving voice to the lived experiences. This arises from the very process of constitution of the Subject, who enters into a negotiation with others in the world in order to overcome the ontico-ontological split. It makes possible only in the sense of dissolving one’s acquired consciousness which most often is owned by an illusion of the self into a contextualized portrayal of one’s first hand experience. It recreates the world and the subject stuck in a primordial relationship of split, which is disclosed in the open by this capability of dissolving the empirical and creating an experiential self. This recreated entity is now grounded in the immanent field of the world as a concrete and embodied subject, whose identity and selfhood does not any more
dependent on 'transcendental structure of consciousness', rather it is limited and determined by the relation between itself and the world. This relation is mediated by language, genre and text, outside which it does not have an existence. So, the philosophical argument takes this route: from a transcendental structure of consciousness to dissolution of groundless self in the concrete to a recovery of the self-world relationship in language and text through the instruments of portrayal, that is, through cognition and imagination. But this explanation does not fully account for the contingency of selfhood in the diverse transactions of the world unless it is described how the self is constituted through this history of loss and recovery. What else can describe this except an inner account of the moving subjectivity that assumes a public, discernible and interpretable language of constitution? Authors themselves get constructed in this process of constitution as if they ironically reinstate the fundamental ontological split between their Subjects and themselves by functioning as authors. There is a reinvention of a thought of essence in the form of the subjectivity of victims and other such narrators of partition after the event. Partition as an event is able to convoke community around fidelity to the Event, certainty in the Event, and love of the Event.
Partition as an event act in many different ways, but it primarily constituted the source of rehumanizing oneself. The formation of the subject, understood as a subject to the event, means to bring to closure the long-standing trauma of recovering truth from those who need redemption from the scenes of violence. Between nihilism and the Event of Truth a strong notion of the real emerges. What is in question is no longer the notion of knowledge of the real, but rather a commitment to the real whose twin poles are the development of a new substantialist metaphysics (Baruch Spinoza is hailed as the hero of the new post/anti-Kantians) and an investment in the universalism of the political memory of “the multitude”. What turned out to be very important is the notion that the political is based on the division of the field of politics between ‘us’ and ‘them’, friends and enemies; the notion that all the important concepts of political theory are secularizations of theological concepts; and the notion that geopolitics, that is, the planetary stakes for an ordering of the relation between peoples, are dependent on a “nomic” structuration of the earth (which needs to be redefined today). Ghosh’s novels present a nomic structuration of the social world by its actors, while Butalia provides elements to that structure by a fidelity to the event. Kafka presents the undecidable interior of the event that transforms the
very subjectivity as a continuous state of emergence and transformation as a counter-guarantee to the fact that human beings are noted-subjectivated by upheavals. Our thought moves along the shadow lines of the description of the figure of the non-subject, that is, the individual not endowed with a fundamental and self-sufficient amount of fidelity, certainty, and love, in the belief that the very basis of shared citizenship hinges on it in contemporary Indian sub-continent.