Chapter: 1

Introduction: Representation of the partition: History, Novel

1.1. The Aim and Scope of the Study:

The present research work is an attempt to explore the representation of history of the partition event as recorded in the literary narratives. By examining Rahi Masoom Reza’s *Adha Gaon* (1966), Bhisham Sahni’s *Tamas* (1976), Intizar Hussain’s *Basti* (1979), Bapsi Sidhwa’s *Cracking India* (1991), Mukul Kesavan’s *Looking Through Glass* (1995) and Shiv K. Kumar’s *A River With Three Banks: Agony and Ecstasy* (1998), the study shows that the selected novels can be read as potential sources of history which can be looked as another way of representing history that allow those to speak whose voices have not been recorded in the dominant discourses of history. The texts are analyzed with respect to their use of different voices through the novelists’ emphasis on how history is a human construct and how they highlight the silenced histories of the marginalized or less privileged people. I argue that it is in these works of fiction that much of the suppressed or silenced history of marginalized people has been recorded; untold stories are told from the experiences of those who witnessed, suffered, resisted and tried to reconcile and refashioned their lives in the changed situations. The selected narratives can be considered as various versions of history which prioritize and mediate personal histories by opening the state-based grand narratives of history to multivocality.

1.2. Objectives of the research work:

The primary objective of this research work is to investigate and explore the representation of partition history in the proposed novels. By probing into the political, historical and cultural milieu of these novels I would like to explore these issues:

* How is the partition event used as the backdrop to represent the history of the marginalized people?
* How does the political history of a nation affect the daily lives of the ordinary men and women?
* How do these novelists reconcile the notions of personal identity and national identity? Is one derivative of the other?
* Whether these novelists conform to the received versions of history or subvert or interrogate them by procuring some alternate histories?
1.3. Significance of the study:

We were ruined in the name of freedom and so were you
We were looted unawares for we were asleep and so were you
The red eyes reveal that we have wept and so have you.

(Ustad Damman qtd in Kothari 11)

The partition of India is the most painful chapter of Indian history. Partition changed the course of lives of many people, which would have otherwise led a life of normality. It was in the bloodbath of the partition that the meaning of Independence was to be found by many ordinary people. It resulted in mass migration of people across the newly created borders and brought unimaginable violence, trauma and destruction along with it. Increasingly, as the long-term consequences of partition are becoming manifest, the perception is gaining ground that partition was not just an event but also a trigger for a chain of other problems. Partition has left a traumatic legacy behind it. Post partition communal clashes prove that partition was not a one time event; rather it has emerged as a crisis in post-partition period especially in the bilateral relations of India and Pakistan. As Kamleshwar has observed in his story How many Pakistan: “O God! You don’t know how many Pakistan were created along with the creation of that one Pakistan. In how many hearts, how many places! The creation of that one Pakistan solved nothing” (Bhalla 173).

Every communal riot, every war, every separatist movement compel us to hark back to the event of partition. However, a big segment of the populace of both of the countries is unaware of the real pains and traumas people underwent in the wake of the partition. The reasons may be varied but it is true that this painful chapter with all its direct or indirect; conscious or unconscious ramifications is still not the part of the syllabi of the common masses. If it were, repetitions might have been avoided, at least the intensity of it could have lessened; sealed off borders could have opened in many senses. Literary history, which not only tells us about the communal disruption but also about the communal ties of love; not only about Nehru, Jinnah and Gandhi but also about ordinary people and their losses, is an attempt to bridge this lacuna. However, this is an epic still truely fully accomplished.
Despite immense research works on the partition event, the potential of its explorations is not exhausted. Even after almost seven decades words of Faiz seem to be appropriate:

“Strangers still, despite so many meetings!
When will closeness return.... after how many meetings!
When will the eyes site an unblemished spring?
And blood-stains washed away after how many rains!!

(Faiz Ahmad Faiz)

Faiz ends his poem *Freedom’s dawn* with a call:

* Najaat-e-diidaa-o-dil ki gharii nahiin aa’ii;
* Chale-chalo ke vo manjil abhii nahiin aa'ii

The darkness of the night have not yet waned,
Heart and eyes their freedom has not yet been attained.
Let us go on, for the goal has not yet attained

(Faiz Ahmad Faiz)

It is assumed that a study of the experiences of common people, lying suppressed within and between the pages of the literary narratives, will lead us a step further towards a better understanding of the partition event.

1.4. Delimitation of the Study:

Partition is a highly scholarly terrain and requires a lifetime and intensive study to understand different aspects associated with it as well as surrounding it. It is my humble attempt to integrate some of the fragments of the partition history as embedded in the literary texts selected for the present study. The selected novels are one of the best examples in which artistic demonstration of historical reality can be seen at its best. All the six narratives are very socio-culturally dense texts and it is a difficult task to analyze their multilayered dimensions in one work. Therefore, the premise of the research work is set around the partition event and is restricted to analyzing the selected six novels only.

Hence, this thesis should be perceived as one way of understanding these novels. The main focus of the work is to draw out the micro-experiences of the marginalized
people whose voices have remained unheard and unnoticed in the domains of macro-narratives of history.

1.5. Hypothesis:

The hypothesis of this research project is that novels also offer crucial insight in understanding history and it is assumed that a literary text is coterminous with history. An analysis of these literary texts allows a scope for re-thinking and re-reading alternative versions of partition history.

1.6. Research methodology:

In documenting the evidences in this thesis, I have followed the rules and regulations of the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, seventh edition, 2009.

The methods and approaches adopted for this research work will include the analytical, interpretative and comparative study of the proposed novels. Historical sources are to be used to strengthen the viewpoint and to heighten the interdisciplinary nature of the study.

The proposed characterization of the research work is as under:

Chapter I: Introduction: Representation of the partition, history and the novel
Chapter II: Home, Nation and Politics

  *Adha Gaon, Tamas*

Chapter III: Partition and the ‘Other’

  *Basti, Cracking India*

Chapter IV: Partition: Agony and Identity

  *Looking Through Glass, A River with Three Banks*

Chapter V: Gendered Violence

Chapter VI: Conclusion: Readings of the partition

The first chapter will set the theoretical, contextual and conceptual background for the research work. The study will begin by exploring the connection between history and fiction. To support the argument of the thesis, the chapter will offer a brief theoretical background of the philosophies of post-modernist as well as postcolonial theories of history. A brief historical background of partition and its representation will be given to understand the specific context in which the novelists are operating. The concepts of
home and nation will also be discussed briefly to establish the ground for discussion. Other cross-reference materials that are relevant to the study will be used in the process of analysis. Besides, library consultation, newspapers, maps, videos, critical reviews and different articles published in different books and Journals and available e-sources will be taken as secondary sources.

The second chapter will offer a close reading of the novel *Adha Gaon* and *Tamas* and will analyze how intervention of nationalism and communal politics disrupted the domestic spaces of the common men and women in the wake of partition.

The third chapter will address texts from Pakistani perspective. It is assumed that partition was a tragedy for India but a celebratory moment to Pakistan. The first segment of the chapter will analyze the text *Basti* by focusing on the major stances adopted by the novelist especially to see whether migration to the desired land fulfilled their dreams or not. The second segment will review the representation of partition in *Cracking India* from the angle of a minoritarian Parsi girl child focussing on the everyday experiences of women, children, the working class, lower castes and ethnic minorities.

The fourth chapter will deal with Mukul Kesavan’s *Looking through Glass* and Shiv K. Kumar’s *A River with Three Banks* to understand the agony of the ordinary men and women and will analyze how these people resist the impending calamity of partition in their lives as well as their efforts and adjustments to reconcile amidst that calamity.

The fifth chapter is provisioned to offer a feminist reading of the partition event by focussing on the victimization and sufferings of women as reflected in the selected novels. This chapter intends to spot not only the victimization but also the agency of the women as embedded and recorded in the selected narratives.

The last chapter will serve as a conclusion. It will sum up the findings of this research work and will attempt to establish the instrumental role these literary narratives can play in understanding and retrieving partition history by opening these local narratives to multivocality.
1.2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.2.1. History and Novel:

Among the various literary forms, the relationship of the novel with history has been the closest. The novel is regarded as the most popular and effective medium for embodying and recreating the complex and varied experiences of mankind. Fuentes opines:

The novel is the privileged arena where languages in conflict can meet, bringing together, in tension and dialogue, not only opposing characters, but also different historical ages, social levels, civilization and other, dawning realities of human life. In the novel, realities that are normally separated can meet...[This] encounter... reveals...that, in dialogue, no one is absolutely right; neither speaker...has an absolute hold over history. Myself and the other, as well as the history that both of us are making, still are not. Both are unfinished and so can only continue to be. By its very nature, the novel indicates that we are becoming. There is no final solution. There is no last word... Fiction is a harbinger of a multipolar and multicultural world, where no single philosophy, no single belief, no single solution, can shunt aside the extreme wealth of mankind’s cultural heritage. (Fuentes qtd in Richard 65)

Writers have used the medium of fiction to explore those areas of political and cultural history that have been unwritten by the dominant narratives of official history. The elasticity of the novel form, to borrow an argument from George Lukacs, lends it the ability to reconstruct the human experience of Partition. At a very fundamental level the novel is unique to other literary forms such as poetry or the short story for allowing the space for writers to develop characters with complex identities. In addition, the formal characteristics of the novel such as voice, prose, and protagonist/antagonist oppositions allow the representation of nationalism via a diametrical system of associations and differences. Benedict Anderson articulates the defence of the novel as the preferred literary form for reflecting nationalism. He writes that about the novel and the newspaper.
that they “provided the technical means for re-presenting the kind of imagined community that is nation” (Anderson 25).

Anderson further emphasizing the importance of the novel writes:

“(…) the old-fashioned novel”, Anderson writes, (…) is clearly a device for the presentation of the simultaneity in homogenous empty time, or a complex gloss upon the world meanwhile” (Anderson 25).

This imagined world “conjured up by the author in his reader’s minds, is a sociological organism moving calendrically through homogenous, empty time is a precise analogue to the idea of a nation.” Through the basic structures of address of novels and newspapers, “fiction seeps quietly and continuously into reality, creating that remarkable confidence of unity in anonymity which is the hallmark of modern nations” (Anderson 25-36)

There has been constant evolution in the nature and scope of the novelist’s dealing with history. The novel form established its base by incorporating history, it advanced by making massive use of history; integrating within the fictional frame a large number of actual, social, political and historical events and in its recent phase it has also interrogated critiqued and problematized the discourse of history. The novelist’s active engagement with history initiated the generic category of the’ historical novel’ which describes, analyses and evaluates the connection between history and fiction. Though the novels which deal with the historical events can be categorized as historical novels, however, due to intensive use of partition event in the novels, a separate generic category of partition novels has emerged.

The novels selected for the present research work can be categorized as partition novels. The theme of partition, the most catastrophic event of Indian history has been used as the main backdrop of these novels. These novels are one of the best examples in which artistic demonstration of historical reality can be seen at its best. In fact, historical and fictional elements are amalgamated very deftly. The novels not only reflect but rather actively participate in the reconceptualization of the historical event of partition. The novels are especially occupied with the moments when personal lives are entangled within the forces of history. The novelists have delved deep into the historical period to
understand the very process of partition: its genesis, the denouement, the ultimate catastrophe and its aftermath. This research work is a humble attempt to explore this moment of literary transformation through a study of the selected novels.

For the framework of this study the following considerations are kept in the backdrop.

1.2.2. Postmodern approach to history and novel:

Since ancient times from Aristotle to the present day the relationship between history and fiction has been a matter of great concern for writers and critics. Historians have long demarcated a boundary line between history and fiction by considering historical works of not being fictional but are verifiably “true” in a way that fiction does not aspire to be (Southgate 1).

The Postmodern approach to history differs from the traditional approach to history. The scientific aspect of history in the nineteenth century claimed that the past could be reflected as it actually happened. In the nineteenth century history was seen as an empirical search for external truths corresponding to what was considered to be absolute reality of the past events. Thus, it was a scientific and objective search for knowledge.

The postmodernist view of history argues against tradition of history writing and its claims to present historical events in an objective way. The postmodern concept of history is also one of critical confrontation, not taking anything for granted as factual. Since historiography is a scripted fiction, history is also seen as a fictional construct. Therefore, the same considerations that apply to the narrative apply to history and the past may be approached with the same ontological questions with which postmodernism confronts fiction.

Foucault is one of the originators of postmodern approach to history. He offers a new way of thinking about history, writing history and deploying history in current political struggles. For Foucault, truth and knowledge were constructions we offer to persuade others. They need not correspond to reality, for we construct our own reality in such a way as to give us power over others. With this in mind, his assertion in Knowledge /Power is noteworthy in which he gives us a great perspective of postmodern history:
I am well aware that I have never written anything but fictions. I do not mean to say, however, that truth is therefore absent. It seems to me that the possibility exists for fiction to function in truth, for a fictional discourse to induce effects of truth, and for bringing it about that a true discourse engenders or ‘manufactures’ something that does not as yet exist, that it ‘fictions’ it. One ‘fictions’ history on the basis of a political reality that makes it true, one ‘fictions’ a politics not yet in existence on the basis of a historical truth (Foucault 193).

Philosophy of history changed significantly in the 1970s, beginning with the publication of Hayden White's *Metahistory* (1973) and Louis Mink's writings of the same period. These philosophers emphasized the rhetoric of historical writing, the non-reducibility of historical narrative to a sequence of “facts”, and the degree of construction that is involved in historical representation. These scholars examined how literature shaped, reflected and represented history. These critics contributed greatly in popularizing the new historicist approaches to literature and liberating it from the clutches of traditional historiography. One of the most significant ground on which New-Historicism operates is that literature and history are not separable. The poststructuralism and postmodernism changed the idea of history and literature as separate genres and claimed that history is no less interpretative than literature. Affinities with literature and anthropology came to eclipse examples from the natural sciences as guides for representing historical knowledge and historical understanding.

Hayden White argues that historical facts cannot be represented objectively because subjectivity of the historian does have impact upon them. Historical events can only be reached through documents and other texts and historiography turns historical events into historical facts and in this process historian adopts the method of selection of the essential facts while avoiding others. The postmodern philosophy of history constructs its arguments on the basis of poststructuralist theories which claim the textuality of reality. Poststructuralist thought makes it clear that history is a text, “a discourse which consists of representations, that is, verbal formations” (Abrams 183). The past can never be attainable in a pure form as historical events; it can only be reached through chronicles and archival documents. Poststructuralist approaches open the way to a historicist study of literary texts, analyzing literature in the context of social, political and cultural history,
and considering literary history as a part of a larger cultural history. This perception of history in literary studies is developed by Louis Montrose as a concern with the historicity of texts and the textuality of history. He says:

By the historicity of texts I mean to suggest the cultural specificity, the social embedment, of all modes of writing [...]. By the textuality of history, I mean to suggest, firstly, that we can have no access to a full and authentic past, a lived material existence, unmediated by the surviving textual traces of the society in question [...]; and secondly that those textual traces are themselves subject to subsequent textual mediations when they are construed as the documents’ upon which historians ground their own texts, called ‘histories. (Montrose 6)

This conception initiated by Montrose terminates the notion of history as a mere reflection of events happening out there. Even though it may seem to represent an external reality, history as a text is a construct. Therefore, it is claimed that “the cultural and ideological representations in texts serve mainly to reproduce, confirm, and propagate the power-structures of domination and subordination which characterize a given society” (Abrams 184). History is not a homogeneous and stable pattern of facts and events which can be used as the "background" to the literature of an era, or which literature can be said simply to reflect, or which can be adverted to (as in early Marxist criticism) as the "material" conditions that, in a unilateral way, determine the particularities of a literary text. In contrast to such views, a literary text is said by new historicists to be "embedded" in its context, and in a constant interaction and interchange with other components inside the network of institutions, beliefs, and cultural power-reations, practices, and products that, in their ensemble, constitute what we call history. (Abrams 184)

As a result, history, like literature, comes to be a product of language and a narrative discourse that consists of representations of historical conditions and a similar power-structure. Furthermore, historians can no longer claim that their study of the past is objective. The existence of contradictory histories in the plural as opposed to a single “History” has emerged as another subsequent assumption. The postmodernist view of
history “rejects the idea of ‘History’ as a directly accessible, unitary past and substitutes for it the conception of ‘histories,’ an ongoing series of human constructions.

Hayden White discusses this new concept of history, chiefly in his *Metahistory* and determines that narrative form is the only possible form of representation in the writing of history (White 9). White’s thesis in Metahistory and a series of subsequent articles radically challenged the claims of history as scientific and objective. He argues that in structure and form historiography is essentially a literary creation. He suggests in *Metahistory* a theory of narrative that draws parallelisms between history and literature. He argues that conventional historiography uses the narrative form in which historians convey the knowledge of the past and he analyzes the “deep structure of the historical imagination,” claiming that all history contains a deep verbal structure and that a formal theory is needed to analyze the deep structure (White 9).

In “Historical Text as Literary Artefacts,” White calls “historical narratives as what they most manifestly are: verbal fictions, the contents of which are as much invented as found and the forms of which have more in common with their counterparts in literature than they have with those in the sciences” (White 82). He argues that “no given set of casually recorded historical events can in itself constitute a story; the most it might offer to the historian are story elements. The events are made into a story by the suppression or subordination of certain of them and the highlighting of others, by characterization, motific repetition, variation of tone and point of view, alternative descriptive strategies, and the like—in short, all of the techniques that we would normally expect to find in the emplotment of a novel or a play (White 84). He affirms that history writing consists of the process of “emplotment” in which chronicles turn into stories. To him, it is an essential process since histories gain part of their explanatory effect by their success in making stories out of mere chronicles. This process of making “stories out of chronicles” is the reason to claim that history writing has some story elements in it. White explains how these elements bring history writing to the level of literary narratives by indicating that the events are made into a story by the suppression or subordination of some available facts and the highlighting of the others, by characterization, variation of tone and point of view, alternative descriptive strategies, and the like—in short, all of the techniques that we would normally expect to find in the emplotment of a novel or a play. The idea of emplotment appropriates the role of the historian in shaping the stories made out of chronicles according to his choice of the most appropriate structure for ordering events into a meaningful and complete story. White claims that historical facts can be emplotted in a
number of different ways, so as to provide different interpretations of these events and to endow them with different meanings serving different ideologies and worldviews. White argues, following Fyre, that

(...)interpretation in history consists of the provisions of a plot structure for a sequence of events so that their nature as a comprehensible process is revealed by their figuration as a *story of a particular kind*. What one historian may emplot as a tragedy, another may emplot as a comedy or romance. As thus envisaged, the 'story' which the historian purports to 'find' in the historical record is proleptic to the "plot" by which the events are finally revealed to figure a recognizable structure of relationships of a specifically mythic sort. In historical narrative, story is to plot as the exposition of "what happened" in the past is to the synoptic characterization of what the whole sequence of events contained in the narrative might "mean" or "signify"(White 58)

White also draws attention to the fact that the historian can trace past events in historicized records, documents or archives, but he can never reach the contexts of past events in any definite way. The historian, therefore, has to imagine contexts in order to construct past events in a significant and meaningful manner. He indicates that the environ in which those documents take place is not accessible, hence not real but invented as well. As a result of the process of emplotment White argues that historical works are verbal fictions, the contents of which are as much invented as found and, the forms of which have more in common with their counterparts in literature than they have with those in the sciences” (White ).

Acknowledging the role of the historian in narrating past events and discussing the same issues as Hayden White, E. H. Carr describes briefly how the process of transforming past events into historical facts is actually the interpretation of the historian himself. He contends:

It used to be said that facts speak for themselves. This is, of course, untrue. The facts speak only when the historian calls on them: it is he who decides to which facts to give the floor, and in what order or context […]. [T]he only reason why we are interested to know
that the battle was fought at Hastings in 1066 is that historians regard it as a major historical event. It is the historian who has decided for his own reasons that Caesar’s crossing of that petty stream, the Rubicon, is a fact of history, whereas the crossings of the Rubicon by millions of other people [...] interests nobody at all (Carr 11-12).

Aforementioned arguments of Hayden White and those of E. H. Carr bridge the gap between history and literature, the gap which was widened by the attempts of those historians who tried to compare historical accounts with sciences. This blurring of boundaries between history and fiction has generated a new kind of history where history has become “metafictional” rather than fictional only. Therefore, the prefix of meta- in White’s Metahistory, according to Susana Onega, draws a parallelism between the metafictional awareness in fiction and “the metahistorical trend in history” (Onega 12). Metafictional self-consciousness leads to a metahistorical self-consciousness in history writing. The title of Hayden White *Metahistory* embodies parallelism between the metafictional trend in Literature and the metahistorical trend in history.

Whereas, Traditional history defined itself in opposition to literature as a factual search for external truths according to what was considered to be absolute reality of the past events. Contemporary philosophers of history from Hayden White to Paul Veyne are now ready to question the ability of history to reveal absolute truths and to resist what they believe is the artificial separation of history and literature. When Paul Veyne calls history’s true novel” Linda Hutcheon tells us, “he is signaling the two genres’ shared conventions: selection, organization, diegesis, anecdote, temporal pacing and employment”. In other words, he is pointing to the linguistic nature of both literature and history (Onega 12).

It has already been mentioned that traditional history in the nineteenth and early twentieth century is an attempt to reflect historical events in an objective way. In order to reach this aim, it depends on archival research, primary sources, and eyewitnesses; and it enhances its scientific objectivity by accurate quotations, citations, documentation in footnotes and bibliography. The emphasis of the postmodern theory of history on the role of the historian in interpreting past events foregrounds the fact that historical events are
described through a subjective point of view and interpreted through historians’ own perspectives, and that historical information is in no way pure and factual, because historical narratives do not reveal meanings that are always there, rather they construct meaning much as fictional narratives do. Hence, if historical narratives do not represent the external reality, and then they must represent something else and in so doing they will inevitably be political. Official history is believed to be the history of the dominant power and it suppresses the history of those people who are not in power. The postmodern fiction attempts to give voice to the history of the suppressed, marginalised and under-privileged. Therefore, postmodernism is a way of releasing history from the grip of the dominant monologic ideologies and in the process of creating space for the suppressed it supports multiplicity of histories.

Under the influence of postmodern innovations in both history and fiction, historical novels have taken new shape. Postmodern texts that refer to historical documents and events reflect the assumption of the postmodern theory of history, which claims that traditional approaches to historiography are no longer valid and that multiple histories are possible. The insertion of historical characters or events into the fictional modes of texts differs in postmodernist novels from classical historical novels of the nineteenth century.

Brian McHale argues that in the traditional historical novel “historical realms – persons, events, specific objects and so on – can only be introduced on condition that the properties and actions attributed to them in the text do not in actuality contradict the ‘official’ historical record” (Machale 87). Therefore, it is only limited to the “dark areas,” to use McHale’s term, of history where there are blanks in the official records (Machale 87). Whereas classical historical novels pay attention to this rule, postmodern fiction does not as it is apparently self-conscious. When there is the presence of historical figures or events in fictions, “an ontological boundary between the real and the fictional” (McHale 89) is transgressed, which is defined by McHale as an “ontological scandal” (Machale 85). The difference between traditional historical fiction and postmodern fiction is that the former avoids anachronism and the contradiction of official history through producing fictional only in “the dark areas,” whereas “postmodern fiction, by contrast, seeks to foreground this seam […] by visibly contradicting the public record of ‘official’ history; by flaunting anachronism; and by integrating history and the fantastic” (McHale 90). McHale’s label for historical novels written in the postmodern era is “the postmodernist
revisionist historical novel,” revisionist because it revises the content of the historical record, reinterpreting the historical record, often demystifying or debunking the orthodox version of the past [and] it revises, indeed transforms, the conventions and norms of historical fiction itself. (McHale 90)

Linda Hutcheon, in *Poetics of Postmodernism* discusses the relationship between literature and history in the nineteenth century and the postmodern objection to their separation into two disciplines. Recent critical viewpoints tend to focus more on the similarities between history and fiction, and Hutcheon discusses the parallels. She writes: “They have both been seen to derive their force more from verisimilitude than from any objective truth; they are both identified as linguistic constructs, highly conventionalized in their narrative forms, and not at all transparent either in terms of language or structure; and they appear to be equally intertextual, deploying the texts of the past within their own complex textuality” (Hutcheon 105). Hutcheon suggests “that to re-write or to re-present the past in fiction and in history is, in both cases, to open it up to the present, to prevent it from being conclusive and teleological” (Hutcheon 110). Subjectivity, intertextuality, reference, and ideology are many of the characteristics of the relationship between history and fiction in postmodernism, and Hutcheon explains that it is the narrative that can encompass them all. She writes: “Narrative is what translates knowing into telling, and it is precisely this translation that obsesses postmodern fiction. The conventions of narrative in both historiography and novels, then, are not constraints, but enabling conditions of possibility of sense-making” (Hutcheon 121). Hutcheon moves on to present the postmodern view that reality is created by “cultural representations” (Hutcheon 121). Again, Hutcheon stresses the postmodern stance that we can only know reality through our own subjectivity and our own cultural experience. Linda Hutcheon labels postmodern historical novels as “historiographic metafictions” because they thematize the theory of contemporary historiography and problematize the distinction between history and fiction and interrogate modern fundamental concepts of subject, identity, gender, continuity, and originality. In her essay —*Historiographic Metafiction—Parody and the Intertextuality of History*, Linda Hutcheon argues that what characterizes postmodern literature is that it usually involves intense self-reflexivity and overtly parodic intertextuality in addition to an equally self-conscious conception of history. Discussing the importance of intertextuality in the texts she states that the intertexts of historiographical metafiction are not drawn exclusively from literature and historical writing. On the contrary, she asserts, historiographic metafiction incorporates a wide
variety of texts including “comic books,” “almanacs and newspapers” (Hutcheon 133). In some cases, Hutcheon contends, the interweaving of multiple intertexts and discourses in postmodern fiction increases the likelihood that writing will “enact” the “totalizing tendency of all discourses to create systems and structures” (Hutcheon 133). Hutcheon’s views foreground the significance of both history and fiction as narrated texts.

Asserting the importance of fiction as historical evidence Southgate writes:

One of the most obvious points of contact between history and fiction lies in the use made of fiction as historical evidence: as one cultural artefact among many, fiction has always provided useful material, especially for social and cultural historians (Southgate 7).

As becomes apparent from the aforementioned discussion that postmodernist theory of history provides us a platform for offering multiple historical possibilities in contrast to a single possibility sustained through the suppression of alternatives in official history which is seen as a monolithic discourse representing only the viewpoints of the dominant ideology which in turn creates history as a monolithic discourse. As we have seen, historiography, while turning real past events into facts, singles out certain real events while leaving out some others. Postmodern historical novels rewrite history from the perspectives of those people who have been excluded, suppressed or marginalized from the process of making or writing of history.

1.2.3. Postcolonial perspective of representing history:

The postcolonial rewriting of history is an attempt to create alternative histories of the colonized as opposed to the official history of the colonizer. John Bill Ashcroft et al in The Empire Writes Back (1989) uses the term postcolonial to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day” (Ashcroft 2). Ashcroft further explains that the literature written in the colonized countries such as African Countries, Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, Caribbean countries and Sri Lanka are all postcolonial because they emerged in their present form out of the experience of colonization and asserted themselves by foregrounding the tension with thee Imperial power, and by emphasizing their differences from the assumptions of the
imperial centre” Ashcroft 2). McLeod considers postcolonialism as historically situated forms of representation, reading practices and values which range across past and present (McLeod 5).

Postcolonial theorists believe that traditional history is used by the colonial powers as an instrument to construct reality on behalf of the colonizer; and such history inevitably leaves out the histories of the colonized. Postcolonial novels that include references to the colonizers’ version of historical facts with a critical distance try to destroy the hegemonic accounts of the past by means of introducing the suppressed voices of others whose histories are silenced under the monology of colonizers.

Postcolonial theory can be said to have started in the mid-twentieth century with the texts of Franz Fanon, Aime’ Cesaire and Albert Memmi. However, writings and speeches of Gandhi in India, Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana, Julius Nyerere in Tanzania, Kenneth Kaunda in Zambia, Amilcar Cabral in Africa and other leaders from colonized nation can be considered as anti-colonial writings in which nationalism, resistance, anti-westernization, and cultural identity were main concerns. Postcolonial discourse explores the ways of representations, and modes of perception that are used as fundamental weapons of colonial power to keep colonized people subservient to colonial rule.

Though studies of Imperialism have been undertaken much earlier, it is with Fanon’s works such as The Wretched of the Earth and Black Skin, White Masks that the studies of the cultural and psychological effects of colonialism really developed. Fanon argued that colonialism dehumanized the native. In The Wretched of the Earth Fanon observes:

Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native’s brain of all forms and content. By making use of a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures and destroys it (Fanon 169).

Fanon’s Black Skin, White Masks examined the mainly the psychological effect of colonialism and The Wretched of the Earth is a broader study of how anti-colonial sentiment might address the task of decolonization. Fanon’s works deal with a range of areas and have been influential in a number of fields, such as psychiatry, philosophy,
politics and cultural studies.

Edward Said’s study of *Orientalism* (1978) is one of the founding books of postcolonial studies, providing a fundamental critique of Western constructions of non-Western societies’s history. Said defines Orientalism (1978) “a way of coming to terms with the Orient that is based on the Orient’s special place in European Western Experience…the Orient has helped to define Europe as its contrasting image, Idea, personality, experience…. Orientalism is style of thought based upon ontological and epistemological distinction made between “the Orient” and (most of the time)” the “Occident”… (Said 1-2). Through *Orientalism* Said exposes the fact that Eurocentric universalism takes for granted both the superiority of what is European or Western, and the inferiority of what is not. “The essence of Orientalism is the ineradicable distinction between Western superiority and Oriental inferiority” (Said, 42). Through ‘*Orientalism*’, Said tries to project the degenerate image given to the Orient by the West.

The publication of *Orientalism* opened up a wide variety of textual analyses which became notable for their eclecticism and interdisciplinarity, combining insights of feminism, philosophy, psychology, politics, anthropology and literary theory. The colonizers imposed their culture, and literature on the colonized people through various means. Said tries to show that West was wrong in treating the East as inferior both culturally and intellectually. Said argues that Western views of the Orient are not based on what is observed to exist in Oriental lands but often results from the West’s dream, fantasies and assumptions about what this radically different place contains. The West has misrepresented ‘the Orient’ as mystic place of exoticism, moral laxity, sexual degeneracy and so forth. Orientalism constructs binary division. The Orient is frequently described in a series of negative terms. Leela Gandhi states “Orientalism is the first book in which Said relentlessly unmask the ideological disguises of imperialism” (Gandhi 67).

Gayatri Spivak is another postcolonial critic whose work *Can the Subaltern Speak?* is the most significant contribution to feminism and subaltern studies. Her question, *Can the subaltern speak?* has become a benchmark to voice the silence of the suppressed or subalterns. In discussing the silence of subaltern as female, Spivak explains that she was not using the term literally to suggest that such women never already talked. It is not so much that subaltern women did not speak, but rather that they are not heard.
The subaltern cannot speak because their words cannot be properly interpreted. It is, therefore, the silence of the female as subaltern is a result of a failure of interpretation and not a failure of articulation.

1.2.4. Representation of History and Subaltern Studies:

Subaltern, meaning ‘of inferior rank’, is a term adopted by Antonio Gramsci to those groups in society who are subject to the hegemony of the ruling classes.

Subaltern Studies Project was inaugurated under the headship of Ranjit Guha in 1982. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and the Subaltern Studies Group introduced the concept of Subaltern. Subaltern is a term that refers to people who are not part of any hegemonic class and who are politically unorganized (Guha and Spivak 1988). The opposite of subaltern is the dominant or the elite group that is in power. Subaltern Studies theory emphasizes writing history from below, seeking to invert the dominant epistemic structures that write the narratives of history from the vantage points of dominant social actors and erase the narratives of those sectors that are constituted at the margins of the margins (Guha, 2001; Spivak, 1988): Guha (1981).

Subaltern Studies Project is the result of an increasing disillusionment with the practice of history writing in general and Indian historiography in particular. Ranjit Guha asserts that there was a need of a new form of history because till then the historiography of Indian Nationalism was dominated by elitism—colonialist elitism and bourgeois-nationalist elitism. Colonialist historiography belittled the history of nationalism to the accounts and actions of the British colonial rulers, administrators, policies, institutions and culture, nationalist elitism dealt with the history of the elites. (Guha, 1997 introduction xiv)

Edward Said in his forward to Selected Studies (Guha and Spivak 1988) explains that the word ‘subaltern’ has political and intellectual connotations. The aim of the Subaltern Studies Project is captured by Said (1988) in the foreword of the book selected subaltern studies, co-edited by Guha and Spivak:

As an alternative discourse then, the work of the Subaltern scholars can be seen as an analogue of all those recent attempts in the west and throughout the rest of the world to articulate the hidden or suppressed accounts of
numerous groups—women, minorities, disadvantaged or disposed groups, refugees, exiles, etc.…This is another way of underlining the concern with politics and power (Said “foreword” 1988).

Said goes on to refer to Antonio Gramsci, the Italian thinker and writer, according to whom “wherever there is history, there is class and the subaltern and the emergent class of the much greater mass of people ruled by coercive or sometimes mainly ideological domination from above” (Said, “Forward" 1988).

For Ranjit Guha the subaltern is the peasant or the indigenous people of colonial India. Guha’s concentration on the subaltern comes from the fact that the Indian history, whether colonial, national, Marxist, or neo-colonial, has been written by the elite, about the elite, and for the elite and by definition and intent in the process has ignored everyone else, namely, "the people," or, in Antonio Gramsci's term, the "subalterns. “By this denial, elite historians have robbed the subalterns of a conscious will to be themselves, to be actors of purpose in their own history, an autonomy that Guha and his colleagues are committed to restore (Guha 1988).

The history subaltern studies advocate can be defined as the history of the marginalized communities, gender, races, and groups, written with local sources and from their perspectives. This ensures that the elitist bias in writing history is avoided. The project focuses on local sites of resistance within the national freedom struggle in India, writings by Dalits who question the notion of a unified Indian society, the history of gender oppression, the atrocities and struggles of the tribal and communal violence. They work with local language sources and see it as an alternative to mainstream history writing. The history of a region or nation, for the Subaltern historians, is not the history of industrialists, merchants and great statesmen, as projected in traditional histories. It is primarily the history of the common people, the lower classes, the tribal, and the women, whose lives and stories do not figure in the mainstream history.

Thus objective of the subaltern studies project is to document the historiography of the people by documenting their agency and politics. Since subaltern scholars attempt to retrieve the history of the marginalized against the institutionalized system of knowledge constructed by the west and the national elite in postcolonial states, it critiques the dominant system of knowledge production itself, legitimized by the west. At
the same time it is postmodern as it endeavors to bring about” epistemological rupture” (Beverley 2001 15) or what Lyotard considers as interrupting grand meta-narratives. (Qtd in Datta 7-8)

1.3. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.3.1. Home:

The term home is highly complicated, elusive and fluid term. It embraces both a physical and social space. A diverge range of theoretical viewpoints about home reflect that notion of home and belonging are highly complex.

The primary connotation of home is the place from which individual maps the larger arenas of life and to which he or she returns at the end of the day. Traditionally home can be defined as a place where our ancestors used to live, the place of our origin. This interpretation of home foregrounds the entity of home as a passive, static or a fixed place and on the basis of their rootedness people define their identities.

According to John McLeod, Robert Cohen, Avtar Brah and Salman Rushdie home can be imagined in diaspora communities as a ‘Mythic Place” or an “Imaginary Homeland”. Those who migrate see their countries as idyllic place of security and shelter where they are welcome. In this condition as McLeod asserts “…. home becomes primarily a mental construction built from the incomplete odds and ends of memory that survive from the past. It exists in a fractured, discontinuous relationship with the present” (McLeod 211).

The importance of home has been acknowledged since long back. In his Interpretations of Dreams, Freud equated the house with the self. In the preface to an anthology of Irish writers’ literary articulations of home, the president of an anti-homelessness organization, Stanislaus Kennedy, asserts that 'everyone has a right to a place called home and goes on to argue that home is associated with safety, security, dignity and respect. The impacts of homelessness, according to Kennedy, are devastating because ‘being without a home is being without that place in which to be oneself, at ease, secured and at rest. The need for a place like that is deep and urgent in all of us’ (Kennedy 1996: vii-viii) Kennedy envisages home to be a physical place in which a person makes a considerable emotional investment. Witold Rybczynski proposes that throughout history, the notion of home has brought together the meanings of house and household, ‘of dwelling and of refuge, of ownership and of affection’. He further affirms
that since its conception, the notion of "home" meant the house but also everything that
was in it and around it, as well as the people and the sense of satisfaction and
contentment that all these conveyed.’ (Rybczynski 62). Rapport and Dawson state that
"home" is where one knows oneself” (Rapport and Dawson 9) and most often the starting
point of knowing oneself is one’s place of birth. From these views it can be inferred that
home comprises an emotional investment in a particular material space. (Cited in Jones
54-60)

John McLeod argues that “to be ‘at home' is to occupy a location where we are
welcome, where we can be with people very much like ourselves.” (McLeod 210) (Cited
in Heckmann 1-3)

Notions of home and belonging are significant in nationalist representation also.
John MacLeod describes home as a relevant concept of nationalist representation: “
Community, belonging, a sense of rootedness in the land, home-each is relevant to the
construction and purpose of nationalist representation.” (MacLeod 71-72). So in
nationalist representation, home and belonging are defined in terms of belonging to a
nation. McLeod asserts: nations are imagined communities and evoke a feeling of
belonging, home and community for the people. (McLeod 74)

Rosemary Marangoly George, illustrating with an example of the equating of self
and home, relies upon the psychoanalytical theory of Jung to demonstrate these
connection. Jung she writes,’ regarded an individual’s home as the universal archetypal
symbol of the self. According to Jung the different rooms in a house represent a person’s
different selves and states of consciousness. This identification with the house is deeply
imbibed in the human psyche. George explains that this identification is twofold process:
on one side the home not only represents how one perceives one’s self, but also stands for
how others may perceive one. So home is a crucial site for one self and for the perception
of one’s identity. (George 19)

Home is thus woven into the idea of belonging to a place and a community. In this
sense a person derives his or her sense of self from home. Migrants or refugees are never
at home in their host countries because sense of belonging is missing. This is because
home also represents a way of life, a way of being, a culture, and a way of thinking.
Leaving home thus is not a simple act of shifting one’s place of residence. It denotes
parting of the ways with a life that one is familiar and comfortable with because one’s
identity is associated with home. Loss of home signifies loss of self (Saba Gul Khattak
qtd in Behera 116-120)).
1.3.2. Nation:

The word *nation* is originated from the Old French word *nacion*, which in turn originates from the Latin word *natio* (*nātīō*) literally meaning "birth". (Wikipedia)

As a political doctrine, Nationalism originated in modern Europe and then spread to other parts of the world in different periods. (Anderson 1983, Gellner 1994). In European countries the advent of nationalism provisioned to formulate modern sovereign states along national lines aiming one-nation one state formula, in the multi-cultural countries nationalism was perceived differently in different contexts. Concept of nation was brought to the Third World Countries during the colonial period.

Ernest Renan expressed his view on nation:

Nations…are something fairly new in history. Antiquity was unfamiliar with them; Egypt, China and ancient Chaldea were in no way nations. They were flocks led by a Son of the Sun or by a Son of Heaven. Neither in Egypt nor in China were there citizens as such. Classical antiquity had republics, municipal kingdoms, confederations of local republics and empires, yet it can hardly be said to have had nations in our understanding of the term (Renan, 1882).

Renan’s celebrated lecture in 1882 in the light of the bitter dispute over the lands is a classic example of the concept of nation. He addressed the defining qualities of a nation in a speech entitled “What is a nation” which was later translated in 1939:

The nation, like the individual, is the culmination of a long past of endeavours, sacrifice, and devotion. Of all cults, that of the ancestors are the most legitimate, for the ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past, great men, glory (by which I understand genuine glory), this is the social capital upon which one bases a national idea. To have common glories in the past and to have a common will in the present; to have performed great deeds together, to wish to perform still more - these are the essential conditions for being a people… More valuable by far than common customs posts and frontiers conforming to strategic ideas is the fact
of sharing, in the past, a glorious heritage and regrets, and of having, in the future, [la shared] programme to put into effect, or the fact of having suffered, enjoyed, and hoped together (Renan qtd in Bhabha 19).

For Renan this means that the shared suffering is more important than shared joy: “Where national memories are concerned, griefs are of more value than triumphs, for they impose duties, and require a common effort” (Renan qtd. in Bhabha). This brings Renan to his well-known definition:

A nation is therefore a large-scale solidarity, constituted by the feeling of the sacrifices one has made in the past and of those one is prepared to make in the future. It presupposes a past; it is summarized, however, in the present by a tangible fact, namely, consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life. A nation’s existence is... a daily plebiscite, just as the individual’s existence is a perpetual affirmation of life” (Renan qtd in Bhabha 19)

Anderson’s definition of nation has provided a significant theoretical framework for understanding the socio-cultural roots and cultural systems through which nation, nationalism, and national identities are formed. This definition is also important to understand the ways in which nation-state has been naturalized by nationalist myths and stories. According to Anderson,

(Nation) .... is imagined because the members of even the smallest of nations will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in their minds of each lives the image of their communion...The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations.... Finally, it is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.” (Anderson 7)
As Anderson proposes, “nationalism has to be understood by aligning it, not with selfconsciously held political ideologies, but with the large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which-as well as against which-it came into being” (Anderson 12).

Anderson's argument is indeed interesting: the geography of the nation is not only territorial, but also inventive. The nation is not seen simply as a fixed, determinate geographical or sociological structure; rather, it is conceived as a cultural or imaginative construct of a particular kind.

In the introduction to *Narrating the Nation* Homi Bhabha explains how the concept of nation is inextricably linked with the narrations of literature and consequently to the emotional and psychological integration of the hearts and minds of the people of a given country. His views are relevant to quote here:

> Nations like narratives, lose their origins in the myths of time and only fully realize their horizons in the mind’s eye. Such an image of the nation—or narration-might seem impossibly romantic and excessively metaphorical, but it is from the traditions of political thought, and literary language that nation emerges as powerful political idea in the west (Bhabha 1).

In India the debate on constituting India as a nation has been as a contentious issue in the decades both preceding and following Indian independence in 1947. Ambedakar has very clearly articulated the bafflement over the issue of nation as follows:

Whether India is a nation or not, has been the subject matter of controversy between the Anglo-Indians and the Hindu politicians ever since the Indian National Congress was founded. The Anglo-Indians were never tired of proclaiming that India was not a nation, that 'Indians' was only another name for the people of India. In the words of one Anglo-Indian “to know India was to forget that there is such a thing as India.” The Hindu politicians and patriots have been, on the other hand, equally persistent in their assertion that India is a nation. That the Anglo-Indians were right in their repudiation cannot be gainsaid. Even Dr. Tagore, the national poet of Bengal, agrees with them. But, the Hindus have never yielded on the point even to Dr. Tagore.

This was because of two reasons. Firstly, the Hindu felt ashamed to admit that India was not a nation. In a world where nationality and nationalism were
deemed to be special virtues in a people, it was quite natural for the Hindus to feel, to use the language of Mr. H. G. Wells, that it would be as improper for India to be without a nationality as it would be for a man to be without his clothes in a crowded assembly. Secondly, he had realized that nationality had a most intimate connection with the claim for self-government. He knew that by the end of the 19th century, it had become an accepted principle that the people, who constituted a nation, were entitled on that account to self-government and that any patriot, who asked for self-government for his people, had to prove that they were a nation. The Hindu for these reasons never stopped to examine whether India was or was not a nation in fact. He never cared to reason whether nationality was merely a question of calling a people a nation or was a question of the people being a nation. He knew one thing, namely, that if he was to succeed in his demand for self-government for India, he must maintain, even if he could not prove it, that India was a nation. In this assertion, he was never contradicted by any Indian. The thesis was so agreeable that even serious Indian students of history came forward to write propagandist literature in support of it, no doubt out of patriotic motives. The Hindu social reformers, who knew that this was a dangerous delusion, could not openly contradict this thesis. For, anyone who questioned it was at once called a tool of the British bureaucracy and enemy of the country. The Hindu politician was able to propagate his view for a long time. His opponent, the Anglo-Indian, had ceased to reply to him. His propaganda had almost succeeded. When it was about to succeed comes this declaration of the Muslim League—this rift in the lute. Just because it does not come from the Anglo-Indian, it is a deadlier blow. It destroys the work, which the Hindu politician has done for years. If the Muslims in India are a separate nation, then, of course, India is not a nation. This assertion cuts the whole ground from under the feet of the Hindu politicians. It is natural that they should feel annoyed at it and call it a stab in the back. (Ambedkar 1940)

Our national leaders and scholars have established India as a land of pluralistic fabric. Supporting and advocating the pluralistic culture, faith in liberal humanism, and true secular way of life. Swami Vivekanand:
I am proud to belong to a religion which has taught the world both tolerance and universal acceptance. We believe not only in universal toleration, but we accept all religions as true. I am proud to belong to a nation which has sheltered the persecuted and the refugees of all religions and all nations of the earth............: “As the different streams having their sources in different places all mingle their water in the sea, so, O Lord, the different paths which men take through different tendencies, various thought they appear, crooked or straight, all lead to Thee.” . . . [T]he wonderful doctrine preached in the Gita [says]: “Whosoever comes to Me, through whatsoever form, I reach him; all men are struggling through paths which in the end lead to me. (Vivekanand qtd in Tharoor 129).

Lala Lajpat Rai articulated his idea of nationhood without any ambiguity in 1920:

The Indian Nation, such as it is or such as we intend to build, neither is or nor will be exclusively Hindu, Muslim, Sikh or Christian. It will be each and all. That is my goal of nationhood (qtd in Sharma & Oommen 8).

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi articulated it greater clarity:

If Hindus believe that only Hindus should people India, they are living in dreamland. The Hindus, the Mohammedans, the Parsis and the christiaians who have made India their country are fellow countrymen… In no part of the world are one nationality and one religion synonymous terms; nor has it ever been so in India (Gandhi 66)

1.4. CONTEXUAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.4.1. A Brief historical Background of the Partition of India

The partition of India is one of the most traumatic and complex event not only in the history of the Indian subcontinent, but also in the world history. The Year 1947 not only marks the celebration of Independence but also the mourning over the partition.

G.D.Khosla, one of the earliest writers to record the violent event, describes it as
‘an event of unprecedented magnitude and horror’. He wrote in his work, which was first published in 1949:

History has not known a fratricidal war of such dimensions in which human hatred and bestial passions were degraded to the levels witnessed during this dark epoch when religious frenzy, taking the shape of a hideous monster, stalked through cities, towns and countryside, taking a toll of half a million innocent lives. Decrepit old men, defenseless women, helpless young children, infants in arms, by the thousands, were brutally done to death by Muslims, Hindu and Sikh fanatics. Destruction and looting of property, kidnapping and ravishing of women, unspeakable atrocities and indescribable inhumanities were perpetrated in the name of religion and patriotism.... Madness swept over the entire land, in an ever-increasing crescendo, till reason and sanity left the minds of rational men and women, and sorrow, misery, hatred; despair took possession of their souls (Khosla qtd in Kudaisya 7)

Bipin Chandra states:

On 15 August 1947, India celebrated with joy its first day of freedom. The sacrifices of generations of patriots and the blood of countless martyrs had borne fruit.... But the sense of joy.... was mixed with pain and sadness... (For) even at the very moment of freedom a communal orgy, accompanied by indescribable brutalities, was consuming thousands of lives in India and Pakistan. (Chandra 305-306)

Ranabir Sammadar considers partition as ‘a concentrated metaphor of violence, fear, domination, difference, separation’. He takes the stance that ‘partition still remains an active category in many ways in the life of the sub-continent’ (Sammadar xi- 4)

Larson has very elaborately articulated the significance of understanding partition in these words:
Partition was a defining event of modern, independent India and Pakistan, and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that partition continues to be the defining event of modern India and Pakistan… 

Partition [moreover] was and is a profoundly religious event for both sides… and most of the agony over religion throughout the South Asian region is to a large extent traceable to it. Partition is at the heart not only of the great regional conflicts…[but] it is also an important component or factor in a whole series of religious-cum-political conflicts reaching down to the present time…To be sure, partition as a defining religious event is not by any means the only event or condition for an appropriate analysis and explanation of [these] great religious controversies currently tearing the fabric of India’s cultural life, but…it is indeed, one of the necessary and central events or conditions for understanding India’s current agony over religion. In many ways it is the core plot in the unfolding narrative of modern independent India. (Larson Gerald qtd in Hasan 104)

British established their rule in eastern India around the mid-eighteenth century, and by the earlier period of the nineteenth century, the British had strengthened their hold over considerable portions of the country. With the suppression of the Indian mutiny of 1857-58 they entered in a period of ninety years, when British directly ruled over India.

Communal tensions heightened in this period, especially with the rise of nationalism in the early 20th century. Though the Indian National Congress, the premier body of nationalist opinion, was secular and widely representative in some respects, Indian Muslims were encouraged, initially by the British, to forge a distinct political and cultural identity. The Muslim League arose as an organization intended to enhance the various -- political, cultural, social, economic, and religious -- interests of the Muslims.

After the Second World War the changed position of Britain in the world became very much apparent and it became urgent for them to settle the matter of the transfer of power which the British had promised the Indians during the Second World War in lieu of their support during the war. In the summer of 1942 the Congress party, single largest
party consisting predominantly of Hindus, which had become dominant in the anti-colonial struggle, had already launched the ‘Quit India’ movement because the British had not kept their promise of giving them more seats in the British viceroy’s executive council. Majority of Congress leaders were arrested and were thrown in jails, the movement degenerated into great violence, and the Congress leaders were kept in detention until the end of the war. When the leaders were finally released after the war, they immediately started to mobilize the people, and large-scale demonstrations in cities and rural uprisings were arranged throughout the country. New elections were held and in these elections the Congress and the Muslim League which till now had become the sole representative of Indian Muslims emerged as two major parties. During the previous decades Hindus and Muslim had fought together against British, but now the situation had become more complicated because the demand for the freedom had been adjoined by the demand for Muslim self-government in a new country; homeland for Muslims: Pakistan. This idea was a recent phenomenon. It was only in March 1940 that the Muslim League had formally proposed to have separate states for the Muslim-majority regions in the north-west and the north-east of India; a plan which was known as the ‘Pakistan Resolution’. In the summer of 1946, the Congress and the Muslim League seemed to agree on the Cabinet Mission Plan which proposed an India consisting of three federating units – two being the Muslim-majority provinces in the north-west and north-east of India and the rest of India the third – but eventually it collapsed due to diplomatic manoeuvres of political leaders. Especially the Congress preferred a completely independent India to a state weakened by the Muslim majority provinces, and the Congress leadership made the British to move quickly to form an Interim Government controlled by representative Indians considering that the transfer of power was most important and thought that the people of India would settle internal matters. The Muslim League grew desperate, and to make sure that the Congress would not ignore their demands, they decided to observe ‘Direct Action Day’. On 16 August 1946, as it is called ‘Direct Action Day,’ violence broke out between Hindus and Muslims in Calcutta. Thousands of people from both sides were killed, and thousands were injured or rendered homeless in the aftermath. The violence spread and engulfed many parts of northern India by March 1947. This violence affected not just the Hindus and Muslims, but also minority groups like the Sikhs, whose historical homeland was the greater Punjab region. This enormous violence compelled a growing number of Sikhs and Congress members to think about the necessity for the partition. In that
month, they voted for a partition of Punjab into Muslim-majority and Hindu/Sikh-majority areas and asked that the same principle be applied to Bengal. This instigated the members of the Muslim League, and by the end of the month the League agitation had succeeded in bringing down the coalition ministry in Punjab. This was in many ways a turning point in Indian History. The League was now determined to form the government in Punjab, demands for Pakistan reached a climax degenerating into communal frenzy, and the Muslim League government became far more militant. In several divisions of the Punjab, Sikh and Hindu ‘minorities’ in the rural areas were attacked by mobs of Muslim peasants and their shops and houses were destroyed, arsoned and looted. Unimaginable atrocities were inflicted upon innocent men, women and children. Forcible conversion of males and abduction of females were common happenings. Many people committed suicide or killed their own family/women to save them from dishonour. In these months a large number of people migrated from their homes to the other places or refugee camps. The events in the Punjab surpassed other violent events in India. People of all communities inflicted enormous atrocities on the people of other community. Thinking that conditions were becoming uncontrollable, the British were now in hurry to transfer power as quickly as possible to successor governments that might be able to restore order, and they appointed the Lord Mountbatten as the last viceroy with instructions to transfer power by June 1948, a date which he soon moved up to August 1947. Radcliffe who was not aware of the geographical and cultural set-up of India was deputed to draw the boundaries and partition the country. On August 14, 1947 and August 15, 1947 the sovereign states of, respectively, Pakistan as an Islamic state and India as a secular state were formulated out of the former British colony.

Whether the partition of these countries was wise and whether it was done too soon is still under debate. Even the imposition of an official boundary has not stopped conflict between them. Boundary issues, Kashmir issues left unresolved by the British, have caused two wars and continuing strife between India and Pakistan. Butalia truthfully comments:

Historical events are difficult to date in any precise way for their beginnings and endings are not finite. The partition of India into two countries, India and Pakistan, is an event that is said to have taken place in August 1947, yet its beginnings go much further back into history and its ramifications have not yet ended. (Butalia 12)
1.4.2. Representation of Partition in History:

The year 1947 is a year of profound significance in the history of South Asia. Two revolutionary events took place in India in that year: Firstly, India attained freedom from British rule, marking the end of colonialism; and secondly, India underwent territorial division on the basis of majority/minority areas of Hindu and Muslim population: Muslim majority areas were constituted into a new and independent state of Pakistan consisting of two units—western and eastern Pakistan,—the latter later became independent Bangladesh, and Hindu majority areas into India. The partition of British India is considered the most traumatic event in the recent history of the Indian sub-continent.

“‘The Partition of India in 1947 recorded one of the most massive peace-time upheavals ever, and it is generally agreed that its reverberations persisted and are still being felt, with varying degrees of intensity, in the three countries most affected by it’” (Menon 2). Approximately 10–12.5 million people moved in both directions across the newly created borders of Pakistan and India and approximately one million were killed in the process. Approximately 75,000 women were abducted in the process (Butalia, 1998; Menon & Bhasin, 1998).

The memory of Partition has long been considered unrepresentable in cultural texts. In official documents the 1947 is portrayed as the country's moment of independence rather than traumatic episode of partition. Such homogenous narratives lack a more comprehensive, more inclusive context for reading partition history.

Personal experiences of common men and women are rarely included in historical narratives of partition. Veena Das confirms in her work *Life and Work: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary* (2007) that partition is an event largely ignored in the public histories of India and Pakistan:

(...) there has been no attempt to memorialize the Partition in the form of national monuments or museums. No attempt was made, for that matter, to use the legal instruments of trials and public hearings to allow stories of mass rape and murder to be made public or to offer a promise of justice to the violated persons. There was no dramatic enactment of ‘putting history on trial’ (Das 19).
The historians’ history of Partition represents Partition as “a history of crisis for the Indian nation and the nationalist leadership” (Pandey, “Prose” 194). What actually happened during Partition, sufferings of the common masses or communal violence is either not represented or under-represented by the historians as the focus remains on India’s freedom struggle and the main leaders. The elitism of this nationalist historiography is seen in the fact that there is never any mention of the experiences of common people, or even any mention of the struggles led by people in the pursuit of freedom. In other words, there is no popular construction of Partition and the violence that constituted it, no representation of its human dimension. Historians’ history is not the history of masses but is a history of causes or origins.

Ranjit Guha’s views in this regard are significant to note:

Elitist historiography is of course not without its uses. It helps us to know more of the structure of the colonial state, the operation of its various organs in certain historical circumstances, the nature of the alignment of classes which sustained it; of some aspects of the ideology of the elite as the dominant ideology of the period; of the contradictions between two elites and the complexities of their mutual oppositions and conditions; of the role of some of the more important British and Indian personalities and elite organizations. Above all it helps us to understand the ideological character of historiography itself (Guha 38-39).

What, however, historical writing of this kind cannot do is to explain Indian Nationalism for us. For it fails to acknowledge, far less interpret, the contribution made by the people on their own, that is independently of the elite to the making and development of this nationalism (Guha 38-39).

Likewise, Gyanendra Pandey also points out, even the historical studies of Partition itself are not a history of the people who lived through it. Their experiences are not charted and the identities and fears that Partition created and reinforced are not considered (Pandey 194). In response to this Suvir Kaul argues that the political and
social causes of Partition have been better engaged with than the human dimension of Partition; which he identifies as the violence and displacement (Kaul 4). This is largely why memory studies and fictional engagements have become so important to discussions of Partition, as people try to glean and represent quotidian experience retrospectively. In many ways fiction has begun to engage the human dimension while history focuses on the political. Kaul continues:

An uncritical humanism that concentrates only on the pain and sorrow of the ‘human condition’ that resulted from Partition will limit our understanding of the political and civic fault-lines revealed then, fault-lines of religion, gender, caste and class that still run through our lives. (Kaul 5)

Ranjit Guha argues:

The ordinary apparatus of historiography…designed for big events and institutions, is most at ease when made to operate on those larger phenomena which visibly stick out of the debris of the past… A critical historiography can make up for this lacuna by bending closer to the ground in order to pick up the traces of a subaltern life in its passage through time. (Guha 274)

Historians have remained silent on partition violence with the conviction that this silence and resultant forgetting is in the interests of the essential unity between Indians. The post-Partition years of the Indian state are marked by an official and historiographical silencing of any discussion of Partition violence. Gyanendra Pandey has argued in “In Defence of the Fragment: Writing about Hindu-Muslim Riots in India Today” (1991), Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism, and History in India (2001) and, most prominently, in “The Prose of Otherness” (1994), that historians’ history of partition declares violence to be non-narratable in order to distance us from it.

Pandey, and others, have made similar arguments that the absence of representations of Partition in nationalist historiography in India can be attributed to the fact that memories of such extremes of violence and devastation can vitiate the construction of a new nation and its quest for modernity and progress. Thus, everything that does not contribute to the building of the nation state is suppressed and restricted.
It was only in the 1980s, a decade of terrible communal violence in India, with anti-Sikh riots taking place in Delhi and its surrounding areas in 1984, anti-Muslim riots in Bhagalpur in 1989, and Hindu-Muslim riots in Hyderabad in 1989, that historians began to seriously consider partition in their works. This violence continued with the demolition of the Babri Masjid in Ayodhya on December 6, 1992 and the Hindu-Muslim riots that followed in Bombay, Surat, Ahmedabad, and Bhopal in 1992-1993. And then there was 1997, the year when India and Pakistan celebrated with great pomp and show fiftieth anniversary of independence.

After 1997 the event of partition has been revisited by many a scholars. As a result enormous literature has been produced by scholars who have opened new vistas to understand the event in multiple ways. Scholars have worked in the direction of uncovering and analyzing the human experiences of Partition that are embedded in various locations and genres. Research works have been conducted on literature, oral testimonies, letters, political pamphlets, parliamentary records, journalistic sources, memoirs, autobiographies, school history textbooks sketches, painting, photographs, political cartoons, websites, cinema, theatre etc. Partition has been main focus of several seminars, conferences archieves and Scholars have discussed the role of literature in contributing to Partition history; they have interrogated the forms and shapes taken by mainstream Partition historiography as well as the way the Indian and Pakistani states have dealt with Partition; they have suggested and introduced new ways in the discipline of Partition historiography and pedagogy; and they have investigated how Partition continues to critically affect the subcontinent and it is not a bygone event but is a present crisis.

Recent scholarly have emphasized the role of literature and creative representations in retrieving, remembering, documenting, and understanding partition by including literary creations in their compilations as well as by providing critical deliberations.

A significant work on how and why Partition happened; the leading up events before Partition is *Inventing Boundaries: Gender, Politics and the Partition of India* edited by Mushirul Hasan (Hasan 2000). The book examines recent historiographical debates and evaluates old theories on how and why Partition happened and suggests fresh research in the field.
Yasmin Khan's Book *The Great Partition: The Making of India and Pakistan* (2007) is an excellent work, which examines the context, execution, and aftermath of Partition. Some of the major concerns in the book are the circumstances surrounding the large number of women who were raped, mutilated, and killed in India and Pakistan. At the end of her book, Khan briefly looks at the accounts of schoolbooks of both India and Pakistan, concluding that both “national histories” in these schoolbooks “come remarkably close in the cursory manner in which they deal with the violence associated with Partition. The horror and suffering that millions of ordinary men and women faced receive no more than a few lines of cold recording.” She finds a great gulf between “these later renderings and the actual experiences of Partition (202–204).

*Pangs of Partition* (2002). Edited by S. Settar and Indira B. Gupta has made a significant contribution by providing significant insights on partition through literature (prose, poetry, theatre), linguistics, painting, film, history, personal narratives, and translation studies.

Jill Didur’s *Unsettling Partition: Literature, Gender, Memory* (2006) has made a significant contribution in partition studies. *Unsettling Partitions* reinterprets the silences found in women's accounts of sectarian violence that accompanied Partition (sexual assault, abduction, displacement from their families) as a sign of their inability to find a language to articulate their experience without invoking metaphors of purity and pollution. Didur argues that these silences and ambiguities in women's stories should not be resolved, accounted for, translated, or recovered but understood as a critique of the project of patriarchal modernity. *Unsettling Partition* examines short stories, novels, testimonies, and historiography that represent women's experiences of the Partition.

Kidwai's *In Freedom’s Shade* (1974) and Kamla Patel’s *Torn from the Roots* (1977) are significant eye-witness narration in Partition memoirs.

*The Partition Motif in Contemporary Conflicts* (2007) edited by Smita Tewari Jassal, discusses the theme of partition and its far-reaching sociological, political and economic implications for communal patterns, generational dynamics and individual lives. The book compares similar processes in the context of Israel and Palestine and East and West Germany.
Sukeshi Kamra has also explained in her seminal work *Bearing Witness: Partition, Independence, End of the Raj* (2002) that August 14/15, 1947 resonates with meaning for Indian and Pakistani people. Kamra attempts to understand this historical moment by considering contemporary and post-event responses to Partition, which Indians and Pakistanis have inherited as one of uncontested significance. From testimonials and speeches by Jinnah and Nehru to fictional and non-fictional accounts by Indians and the British, and political cartoons which appeared in English newspapers at the time, Kamra offers an inductive study of primary texts that have been ignored until now. The work studies the three groups most affected by the events of 1947: the British, for whom this was the beginning of exile; the Indian elite, for whom the moment was a rite of passage; and the survivors of Partition, for whom the event is inextricably linked with trauma and loss of home, family, and community. Author Sukeshi Kamra asks, "Why do we not consider these valid and contesting readings in the teaching and learning of our history? Not doing so means that testimonials to Partition, such as narratives of trauma, autobiographies as personal statements on a public' moment, and political cartoons as a minute-by-minute construction of history have yet to be considered.

*Remembering Partition* (2001) examines what Partition as a moment of nation-state formation means for populations, cultures, and histories, which became nationalized by the 1940s. Zooming in on Partition violence in the areas of Delhi and Garhmukhteshwar, he discusses how the local is subsumed in the national at such moments; Pandey argues that by localizing events and entities and stripping them of their “history, complexity and contested character” (120), historians confiscate from people an entire sense of history.

Suvir Kaul’s edited *The Partition Memory: Afterlife of the division of India* deals with issues as diverse as literary reactions to Partition; the relief and rehabilitation measures provided to Partition refugees. (Kaul 2003)


Works dealing with issues related to women, nation and partition from feminists include Ritu Menon and Kamala Bhasin’s *Borders and Boundaries: Women in India's Partition* (1998) and "*Recovery, Rupture, Resistance: Indian State and Abduction of Women During Partition*" (1993) Gargi Chakravartty's *Coming Out of Partition: Refugee Women of Bengal* (2005) Urvashi Batalia's *The Other side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India* (1998) and community, *State and Gender: On Women's Agency During Partition.* (1993), Shail Mayaram's *Resisting Regimes: Myth Memory and the Shaping of a Muslim Identity* (1997), Farrukh A. Khan's "*Speaking violence: Pakistani Women's Narratives of Partition.*"(2006) and *'The Trauma and Triumph: Gender and Partition in Eastern India* (2003), edited by Jasodhara Bagchi and Shubharanjan Dasgupta. These works have voiced the silenced histories of women hitherto lied suppressed under the pages of history. A recent article by Jasbir Jain, *Daughters of Mother India in search of nation: Women's Narratives About the Nation.*(2006) critiques that the image of "Mother India" has often been associated with the image of the nation, but within this realm the relationship of women to the nation does not find a place. The question of where a woman belongs is one that has many answers but these are hardly ever related to nationhood. This article analyzes how nation and nationhood have been defined in women's writings in India.

Ritu Menon’s (ed.) *No Woman's Land: Women from Pakistan, India and Bangladesh Write on the Partition India* (2004) is the first of its kind, which included writing by women from Pakistan, India and Bangladesh on Partition of India who were forced to migrate across new national borders and women involved in state-sponsored rehabilitation efforts. The book foregrounds the fact that Partition is an ongoing history, as several of the contributors contemplate the continuing effects of Partition on the lives of women across the nation-states of contemporary South Asia.

*Translating Partition,* a collection of stories and critical commentaries, brings out the trauma of Partition. Apart from offering a perspective on displaced people and communities, the stories talk about people as religious and linguistic minorities in post-Partition India and Pakistan. These narratives offer insights into individual experiences,
and break the silence of the institutionalized discourse of history.

Frank Stewart & Sukrita Paul Kumar (Eds.) in Crossing Over, Partition Literature from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh depict the experiences of ordinary people caught in the tragedy of Partition in 1947 and its aftermath, including the Bangladesh war in 1971. Written by some of the best authors—in Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, and English—these works make us aware of the possible responses to ethnic, religious, and national divisiveness.

Vishwajyoti Ghosh the curator’s This Side That Side is a recent innovative work which comprises varied graphic narratives from comic book writers, graphic artists, filmmakers and illustrators on partition from India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh which despite the loaded theme of loss, despair and nostalgia enriches us. The narratives included in this book are creative explorations by those who may not have witnessed Partition, but who continue, till date, to negotiate its legacy.

Such recent efforts to revise the known, hegemonic state narratives of Partition and incorporate into the field a human history by introducing a comparative element that brings together different communities and countries to confront and cope with the past and present trauma of Partition are important archives for offering alternative history of Partition event.

1.4. 5. Representation of the Partition in Film and Literature:

The cataclysmic event of Partition deeply affected the social, economic and cultural lives of millions of people. Dominant historiography of the partition event has remained concerned with nationalist interests and has focussed mainly on the origins and causes of the partition event; debates among the leaders, elite groups or decision makers; main national leaders like Nehru, Gandhi, Jinnah etc. and about their roles and contribution in freedom struggle or their efforts in bringing about freedom; their arguments and disagreements, main political parties such as the Muslim League and the Congress, or the communists; the role of British in effecting the division of the country and the subsequent transfer of power to the Government of India and Pakistan. Such historical scholarships whether it be official records, documents, private papers or political historical resources, they have been unable to encompass the personal and social histories of the people who really were churned into the whirlpool of 1947. Preoccupied
with statistical analysis, data and the objectivity, the official historiography imposes a narrative that does not resemble people’s real life experiences. To retrieve and recover the real experiences of people and suppressed human suffering, writers have emphasized the centrality of personal narratives, testimonies, eyewitness accounts, the role of memory and literary narratives.

A great numbers of writers have made massive use of history by incorporating social, cultural, political events of their interest into the fictional frame of history. The historical process of partition and its holocaust had profound impact on contemporary culture, literature and history. This is the most cataclysmic event in the history of 20th century India. The impression left on the minds of those who lived through those traumatic times persists even today.

The bulk of the scholarly literature on the partition has focussed on the political processes that led to the division of India, the formulation of Pakistan, and the accompanying violence. Many scholars have attempted to establish who the guilty parties might have been, and how far communal thinking had made inroads into secular organizations and sensibilities. Scholarly attention has been captivated on the political negotiations, and their minutiae, leading to partition as well as on the personalities of Gandhi, Nehru, Jinnah, Azad, Patel, and others, and a substantial body of literature also exists on the manner in which the boundaries were drawn between India and Pakistan, on the western and eastern fronts alike.

In recent years, the scholarly literature has taken a different turn, becoming at once more nuanced as well as attentive to considerations previously ignored or minimized. There is greater awareness, for instance, of the manner in which marginalized people especially women or children were affected by the partition and its violence, and the scholarship of several women scholars and writers in particular has focussed on the abduction of women, the agreements forged between the Governments of India and Pakistan for the recovery of these women, and the underlying assumptions -- that women could scarcely speak for themselves, that they constituted a form of exchange between men and states, that the honour and dignity of the nation was rested on its women, among others -- behind these arrangements. Earlier generations of scholars hardly bothered with oral histories, but lately there have been a number of endeavours to collect oral accounts, not only from victims but even from perpetrators.
The event of Partition has stirred the sensibility of creative writers inspiring them to write novels, poems, short stories and dramas. A significant body of literature has been produced in Punjabi, Urdu, Hindi, Bengali, English and Sindhi highlighting above other things the trauma of Partition. There has been some writings even in Dogri, Gujarati and Marathi languages also. These fictional writings on the partition provide important insights into the human realities of the 1947 upheavals. They point to the complexity of experiences which the event of partition generated and to the psychological implications which are still unexplored in official accounts and even after six or seven decades of the partition of India are still being worked and explored. Let us have an overview of some of the important Films and creative writings which represent the partition event:

Films:

The catastrophic event of partition has been recorded and documented from historical, political, sociological and literary perspectives. Nevertheless, the partition also inspired filmmakers in both countries: India and Pakistan.

While official narratives of the Partition provide politically coloured and biased stories of nationalism, films like literary productions locate stories within the context of families and provide a human dimension to the political process of nation formation.

Bhaskar Sarkar’s *Mourning the Nation: Indian Cinema in the Wake of Partition*, offers an important insight into the significance of cinema to the specific task of mourning Partition. Anchoring itself in three elements, the Indian nation, and trauma, and cinema, Sarkar’s book states:

Cinema, in particular, provides a powerful and captivating means of cultural memorialisation; it pulls together the fragments and reassembles the past via considerable acts of reimagining. This form of cultural recall entails, beyond a simple recovery of the past, the creative revivification of an archive of inert data and fragmentary evidence. (Bahskar 301)

The works of several writers across the borders such as Khushwant Singh, Quarratulain Haider , Saadat Hasan Manto, Bhisham Sahni, Bapsi Sidhwa, Kamleshwar et.al. have been adapted to films, thus creating an interesting fusion of literature with popular cinema.

According to Bhaskar, the work on partition really began after 1984. Before that, there were novel, short stories but there wasn’t any sustained discussion on these issues in films. She divides works on “Partition in Indian Cinema” into three phases. The initial 15 years after the partition forms the first phase. The common films in this phase were those of migration, abducted women and their recovery. Manmohan Desai’s *Chalia* (1960) dealt with the tragic aspect of the abduction, rape, killing and suicide of women during partition.

Yash Chopra’s *Dharamputra* (1961) deals with pre and post-partition era where a Muslim unwed mother had to leave her son behind in the refuge of a Hindu family friends due to the fear of defame in the society and marries thereafter. She latter on comes back only to find that her son has become a Fascist & Extremist with anti-Muslim principles. And the things turns up to become worse after partition leading the protagonist to further follow the path of destruction and communal carnage.

The second phase is that of 1970’s which gave rise to those issues which were not taken into consideration so far. Among the prominent film makers of this period who documented the trauma of partition in their films are: Kumar Shahani, Mani Kaul, M.S. Sathyu, Shyam Benegal, Govind Nihalani. M. S Sathyu’s *Garam Hawa* (1977) and Govind Nihalani’s television serial *Tamas* (1988) are the most notable creations of this period.

*Garam Hawa* [Hot Wind] was the first film that dealt with the perplexed dilemma of Muslims who had decided to stay in India. Set in Agra, Uttar Pradesh, the film deals with the plight of a North Indian Muslim businessman and his family, in the period post partition of India in 1947.
*Tamas* is the first Hindi cinematographic work that dealt in a direct not idealized or disguised or allegorical manner with the tragic events of 1947. The televising of *Tamas*, therefore, became an event that dismantled the shroud of silence around the partition violence.

The third phase is that of the 1990’s with the destruction of Ayodhya Mosque followed by the Bombay riots, which negotiated issues of identity, secularism and citizenship. The films openly dealt with the subjects which were considered taboo for nearly 40 years; preconceived stereotypes and prejudices against one another, communal and racial sentiments, rise of Hindutva and erosion of secular values. *Mammo* [1994 d. Shyam Benegal]; *Naseem* [1995. d. Saeed Akhtar Mirza ]; *Train to Pakistan* [1997 d. Pamela Rooks ]; *1947-The Earth* [1998, d. Deepa Mehta ]; *Karvan* [Caravan, 1999, d. Pankaj Butaliya] ; *Gadar* [2001, d.] *Pinjar* [2003, d. Chandra Prakash Dvivedi], *Veer Zara*[ 2004 d.] *Refugee, Hey Ram* [2000. d.], *Partition* [2007 d.] are films of this period.

In the recent Hindi movie *Bhag Milkha Bhag* (2013) directed by Rakesh Omprakash Mehra, the trauma of partition is depicted poignantly with help of a narrative based on the real life of a Sikh child who somehow ends up in India after losing most of his family in the violence and then proceeds to become a celebrated athlete. More than the primary events of partition itself, this movie explores the sexual exploitation of the displaced girls and women by the people from the same community and the psychology of young people.

In these films we find the same features as in the literary works: bewilderment, dismay, loss of home, migration, violence, frustration, in-between dwindling of the innocent folks, hope, despair, cases of humanity amidst brutality etc. The recurrent themes in most post partition cinema in both India and Pakistan are separation within a single family, or between lovers - both of which could be considered as metaphors for the division of land and people during partition. A romanticised pre-partition era, the apportioning of blame to politicians, the heroisms of individuals, the triumph of love, violent and bloody scenes of Partition – these are some of the recurrent themes the partition films have dealt with.
Literature:

The Partition of India has been a major thematic concern of creative writers. Several writers have considered the partition of India and its aftermath as potential literary material and have turned to this historical event for the purpose of their creations, history providing them the necessary inspiration as well as richness and depth.

There is a large number of short stories about partition anthologized by various scholars.

Saadat Hasan Manto’s stories are the superb example of the tragedy of the partition. Alok Bhalla-edited anthology of Partition stories is among the well-known anthologies on Partition. Bhalla’s anthology is a 3-volume collection titled *Stories about the Partition of India* (1994). In his Introduction to the anthology, Bhalla states that he turns to literature, he says, because “Contrary to the communal histories, the stories about the Partition have more to do with the actualities of human experience in barbaric times than with ideologies (...)” (p.xiv).


*Fires in an Autumn Garden: Short Stories from Urdu and the Regional Languages of Pakistan* (1997) represent an alternative view of Pakistan.

Representation of partition is not confined to prose only. Among poets who expressed their agony over the tragedy are Faiz Ahmad Faiz, Josh Malihabadi, Sardar Jafri, Akhtarul Iman, Ahmad Nadeem Qasmi, Ahmad Riyaz, Ahmad Faraz, Sahir Ludhianvi etc. Anju Makhija and Menka Shivdasani’s translation of Sindhi partition poetry, ‘Freedom and Fissures’ (Sahitya Academy, 1998) along with Arjan Shad is a pioneering attempt to document the voice of an entire community which suffered loss of homeland in 1947. Amrita Pritam’s most cited poem pours out the agony of victimized women:
And turn to the next page in your book of love,
Once, a daughter of Punjab cried and you wrote an entire saga,

Today, a million daughters cry out to you, Waris Shah,
Rise! O’ narrator of the grieving! Look at your Punjab,
Today, fields are lined with corpses, and blood fills the
Chenab.  

(Amrita Pritam).

The poet W. H. Auden in his poem Partition voices one of the best criticisms of Radcliffe
and his 1947 job:

Unbiased at least he was when he arrived on his mission,
Having never set eyes on this land he was called to partition
Between two peoples fanatically at odds,
With their different diets and incompatible gods.
'Time,' they had briefed him in London, 'is short. It's too late
For mutual reconciliation or rational debate:
The only solution now lies in separation.
The Viceroy thinks, as you will see from his letter,
That the less you are seen in his company the better,
So we've arranged to provide you with other accommodation.
We can give you four judges, two Moslem and two Hindu,
To consult with, but the final decision must rest with you.'
Shut up in a lonely mansion, with police night and day
Patrolling the gardens to keep assassins away,
He got down to work, to the task of settling the fate
of millions. The maps at his disposal were out of date
And the Census Returns almost certainly incorrect,
But there was no time to check them, no time to inspect
Contested areas. The weather was frightfully hot,
And a bout of dysentery kept him constantly on the trot,
But in seven weeks it was done, the frontiers decided,
A continent for better or worse divided.
The next day he sailed for England, where he quickly forgot
The case, as a good lawyer must. Return he would not,  
Afraid, as he told his Club, that he might get shot.  
*(Partition, 1966 by W.H. Auden)*

Set in the context of the partition of India and Pakistan in 1947, the poem *At the Time of Partition* by a Pakistani poetess Moniza Alvi weaves a deeply personal story of fortitude and courage, as well as of tragic loss.

Creative artists have poured their grief of partition over canvas also. Satish Gujral’s paintings express the pain of bloodshed of partition. During the 1950s’ Gujral produced a series of works that reflected the butchery of partition and its aftermath. *Days of freedom, Mourning, Return of the Abducted, Dance of Destruction, The Rehabilitated* and *The Condemned, Snare of Memory* and much later *The Shrine* are some of his most famous works.

Jimmy Engineer is a renowned artist of Pakistan. Regarding his partition paintings he says: “There was a fire in me to paint massive things,” says Jimmy, “I wanted to paint for people to remember that pain and agony, for them to understand that these things should not happen again.” Intertwined with this was another desire: “I wanted to honour those men, women and children who died, who never even saw the flag of our country,” he says. *(qtd. in Daniel 2012).* ‘*Refugees Resting Under a Tree in 1947,*’ *Struggle for Independence, In honour of the men, women and children who laid down their lives in the struggle of 1947* are some of Jimmy’s most famous creations.

Some important novels written in regional languages which have treated the theme of partition have been translated into English. Among them most notable are: S. Duggal’s *Nahun Tey Mas*, a Punjabi novel, translated by Jamal Ara as *Twice Born Twice Dead* (1979), Amrita Pritam’s *Pinjar* in Hindi translated by Khushwant Singh as *The Skeleton* (1987), Bhishma Sahani’s *Tamas* (1973) translated by the writer himself in 2001 under the same title, Ramanand Sagar’s *Aur Insan Mar Gaya* (1948) translated by the writer himself as *Bleeding Partition*, Rahi Masoom Reza’, *Aadha Gaon* translated by Gillian Wright as *A Village Divided*, Joytiremoyee Debi’s *Epar Ganga, Opar Ganga* (1967) in Bangla translated by Enakshi Chaaterjee as *The River Churning* etc.

A number of short stories and novels are written in Hindi and Urdu. Short stories by Krishan Chander, Rajinder Singh Bedi, Saadat Hasan Manto, Bhisham Sahani,

Among writers who wrote about the carnage and made it a part of their own sensibility are: Krishan Chander, Rajinder Singh Bedi, Ramanand Sagar, Hayatullah Ansari, Khawaja Ahmad Abbas, Ismat Chughtai, Ram Lal, Zafar Pyami, Abdus Samad, Qurrutulain Haider, Intizar Husain, Khadija Mastoor, Adbullah Husian, Ghulam Abbas, Asfaq Husain etc.


The last two decades of the 20th century and the present decade of the 21st century have witnessed a considerable growth in the fiction of Indian Writing in English. Among them there are a few novelists who have dealt with the theme of partition in their novels. Most notable among these are briefed here:

One of the earliest reaction to the terrible tragedy of partition Khushwant Singh’s *Train to Pakistan* (1956) offers a realistic depiction of the inhumanities perpetuated and tremendous losses caused by large scale riots and killing on a village community. The novel is distinct in its delienation of the note of humanism. The novel ascertains the universal value of love and compassion by transcending the barriers of communal prejudices and hatred.

Rajan’s *Dark Dancer* (1958) uses the freedom movement and, later, the partition as a meaningful backdrop. Rajan shows how Gandhi’s concept of non-violence tacitly
provides the heroine her source of strength while the riots at the time of the Partition enable her to demonstrate the triumph of her ideology.

Attia Hosain's novel *Sunlight on a Broken Column* (1961) is the first Muslim woman writer to depict the trauma of the Partition and communal riots through her narrator-heroine Laila. The novel portrays the effect of partition on an aristocratic Muslim family in Lucknow. Having been involved in the nationalist movement herself, she chooses to exemplify the changes brought about by independence and partition while constructing a tale about the coming of age of an emancipated girl.

Chaman Nahal’s *Azadi* (1975) depicts the trauma of the Partition in terms of the displacement, communal discord and indignities that had to be endured by the people driven to find a new home and a new identity.

Set in the locales of Lahore and Pir-Pindo Bapsi Sidhwa’ novel *Cracking India* (1988) offers a panoramic view of partition event through a Parsi girl child narrator. Narrated through the eyes of a marginalized female Parsi girl narrator, the novel presents a gendered perspective of Partition. Moreover, Sidhwa’s novel provides a comparatively inclusive view of the different feminine roles during Partition, roles in which the female characters the ones who are victimized as well as given agency too.

*The Shadow lines* (1988) of Amitav Ghosh is regarded one of the significant texts on Partition of India. Set against the backdrop of historical events like Swadesi Movement, Second World War, Partition of India and communal riots of 1963-64 in Dhaka and Calcutta, the novel, through the web of personal stories of a Bengali family, examines and interrogates the division of the country.

Guru Charan Das’s *A Fine Family* (1991) traces three generations of a Punjabi family from 1942 till the second tenure of Indira Gandhi as Prime Minister. The novel deals with the life history of a Punjabi family that is uprooted from its settled existence in Lyallpur by the violence of partition and forced to flee to India. Everything is lost in the transition, but when a son is born into the family, hopes revive of rebuilding the family's fortunes, the efforts towards which reflect those of India itself as it struggles to build itself anew.
The Night of the Seven Dawns (1979) by Anita Kumar presents a unique aspect of partition that is the separation of the mother and the son during partition and brings out its long term ramifications.

Anita Desai’s novel Clear Light of Day (1980) explores the trauma of partition on a symbolic level by depicting the disintegration of an old Delhi family. The parallel plot lines—the family conflict on one hand and the historical plot of the division of India into Pakistan and India on the other---are intricately woven to retrieve the trauma and agony people underwent during partition days.

New phase of Indian writing in English was inaugurated in the 1980s with the publication of Salman Rushdie’s metafictional novel Midnight’s Children (1981). It received the Booker Prize in 1981. It is centred on the life of the protagonist and narrator of the story, Saleem Sinai, who was born in the night of India’s Independence. The novel draws a picture of the time since around 1915 and explains India’s situation after it gained its Independence from the British colonizers; it describes Gandhi’s Quit India movement, the violent partition of India into the new states India and Pakistan, and the State of Emergency from 1975 to 1977 through the eyes of Indian people.

Anita Desai’s Baumgartner’s Bombay (1988) deals with the memories of the violent histories of the Holocaust and the Partition of India and Pakistan, and on the shattering effect that these events have on the victim Baumgartner’s life. Baumgartner, a German Jew, has to flee pre-war Germany to India to escape the atrocities of Nazi regime. However, in India also he witnesses and confronts partition violence. By approaching partition violence through a German-Jew’s eyes, Desai interrogates the Eurocentric view of the Holocaust as a unique catastrophe and foregrounds the suffering of other minorities and establishes war as a universal crisis. This novel offers a chance for a comparative study of war within war theme.

Shashi Tharoor in his novel The Great Indian Novel (1989) has blended the elements of history and fiction and has represented the political history of the 20th century India through a fictional recasting of events, episodes and characters of Mahabharat. The story is narrated from the point of view of Ved vyas, the author of the epic Mahabharat and Lord Ganesh respectively. Set in the state of Hastinapur soon to be joined to the Raj, the story moves swiftly through historical events, which led to partition and independence.
Mukul Kesavan’s *Looking through Glass (1995)*, set amidst the turbulence of Indian partition and independence, deals with the life of an unnamed narrator who while testing out his new brand camera is transported to the era of 1942 through magical realist mode where he becomes part of a Muslim family. Through various characters Kesavan offers various versions of 1942 a crucial chapter of history to understand the division of the country.

Shiv K. Kumar’s *A River with Three Banks (1998)* revisits India of 1947 with all its brutality, romance, agony and ecstasy. Along with human depravity and hatred, there is also a vision of universal fraternity and a commitment to cherished values like love, compassion and forgiveness.

Another significant novel written on the theme of partition *What the Body Remembers (1999)* very vehemently foregrounds the gendered aspect of Partition. It retrieves partition from Sikh Perspective.

Manju Kapoor’s *Difficult Daughters (1998)*, set against the backdrop of India of 1940’s, presents the problems of an upper middle class urban Arya Samaj Punjabi family in Amritsar. In this novel Manju Kapoor analyzes the psyche of Indian women living in joint families under male domination and writes about multiple Indian experiences in colonial and post colonial times, reflecting upon the tragedy of partition and the problems of women in particular.

Meena Arora Nayak’s *About Daddy (2000)* reveals the protagonist’s father's life in a series of flashbacks. The protagonist, a young woman born in America, visits India in 1997-1998 to fulfil her father's last wishes to immerse his ashes on the Indo-Pakistan border as a kind of expiation for his sin of killing innocent Muslims before Partition. The daughter's innocent attempts to take a photograph at the border cause her arrest by the police; she is released only through the intervention of her American fiancé. Nayak presents a vivid picture of Hindu-Muslim relations in modern India.

*Partitions* (2011) by Amit Majmudar is a latest addition in the genre of partition novels. The novel is set during the violent year of 1947 partition of India about uprooted children and their journeys in search of a safe place. Poet and diagnostic nuclear radiologist Amit Majmudar explores the theme of partition through the lives of four displaced individuals, each of whom is fleeing to his or her new homeland. Two Hindu
twin boys, Shankar and Keshav, are separated from their mother on a crowded rail platform. They begin a harrowing search for her, only to fall in the hands of an evil man who tries to sell them. Simran, a quiet but clever Sikh girl, whose father would rather see her dead than be defiled, somehow manages to run away from home. Her intention is to reach Amritsar, a predominantly Sikh city. But she is captured by three Muslim men who take her to an unknown destination. Meanwhile, Dr. Masud, a kindly, aged Muslim physician, finds himself cornered by the police and senses danger. Finally these four meet accidentally and form a new family.

***************
Works Cited:


Ambedkar B. R. Pakistan Or The Partition Of India. Web.

http://www.ambedkar.org/pakistan/40B.Pakistan%20or%20the%20Partition%20of%20India%20PART%20I.htm


Spivak, Gayatri. *Can the Subaltern speak?*


****************