

Tribhuvan University
Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences

Resistance against Colonialism in Kamleshwar's *Partition*

A Thesis

**Submitted to the Central Department of English in partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in English**

By

Deepak Bahadur K.C.

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

November 2010

Tribhuvan University
Central Department of English
Letter of Recommendation

This thesis entitled “Resistance against Colonization in Kamleshwar’s *Partition*” has been prepared by Mr. Deepak Bahadur K.C. under my supervision from June 24 2009 to 24 December 2010. I recommend this thesis to be submitted for the viva-voce.

.....

Mr. Saroj Sharma Ghimire

Lecturer

Central Department of English

T.U, Kirtipur

Date: December, 2010

Acknowledgements

I am very much delighted to express my most heartfelt gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Mr. Saroj Sharma Ghimire, Assistant Lecturer of Central Department of English, TU Kirtipur for his scholarly guidance, genuine suggestion, warm responses and, of course, constant encouragement to bring this thesis into its present form. I am grateful to Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, the Head of Department of the Central Department of English, TU.

I am equally grateful to my respected teachers Mr. Badri Prasad Acharya and Mr. Puspa Raj Acharya, Mr Shankar Subedi for their perpetual advice, encouragement and the support of necessary research materials without which I could have hardly accomplished my goal. Similarly, the passing advice and support of Mr. Ghanshyam Bhandari, Mr. Baikuntha Paudel, also counts a lot.

I am highly indebted to my friend Mr. Tanka Raj Baral for his constant support during this research project. Similarly, Bashanta Paudel, Bijay Sharma, Shiva Kafle, Deepa Baral have also made direct and indirect contribution to this thesis.

Last but not the least, I am most grateful and deeply indebted to all my family members, especially my parents, brother Dilip and wife Pabitra for their inspiration, unflagging support and great emotional encouragement not only for accomplishing this thesis but also in my whole study.

November 2010

Deepak Bahadur K.C.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Abstract

I. Colonization and Partition of India	1-4
II. Postcolonial Theory: Power, Discourse and Hegemony	5-24
III. Resistance to Colonial Discourse in Kamleshwor's Kitne Pakistan(Partition)	25-37
IV. Conclusion	38
Works Cited	39-40

Abstract

The present research attempts to analyse the implication of the discussion of the historical facts of Indian history in the novel *Partition*(2000) by Kamleshwar, an Indian prolific writer. Kamleshwar revisits some of the historical facts in his novel *Partition*. He talks about the demolition of Ram mandir, a famous hindu temple of Ayodhya and the erection of Babari Masjid, the temple of Muslims. Similarly, he remembers the first arrival of the Bretons as trader and their subsequent stay and capture of the administrative power of India making it their colony. Not only that his speaker and other characters give multiple interpretations of the historical facts. All the novel does to resist the colonial discourse. It shows their motive was business oriented in total. In stead of civilizing and saving the soul of people they just made the colonizers more barbaric and even bereft of their fundamental cultures. And their agreement and execution of India- Pakistan partition was also never to teach people democracy and to create the opportunity for self rule but to perpetuate the relentless conflict on which background colonial time could be seen peaceful and harmonious.

I:Colonization and Partition of India

In *Kitne Pakistan (Partition)* [2000], Kamleshwor, an Indian prolific novelist talks about the human suffering of the world in general. And particularly, it deals with the trauma of the people of Indian subcontinent basically those of India and Pakistan resulted by the violent partition of India and Pakistan in the wake of its independence from British colonial rule in 1947. The violent partition had claimed the lives of hundreds of thousand people. In the novel the writer imagines the precolonial India with all peace and harmony among the people. In doing so, he delineates the intrusion of British people onto the subcontinent as the trader and their subsequent interference over the administration of India through foul meanses.

So, in analysing the story which contrasts the pain and trauma of the Indian people with the harmony of the precolonial era it is conspicuous that the focalizer of the novel makes the British raj/rule responsible for the partition of the single and huge India into two fragments. The novel also sheds the light over the motive of the colonization which was definitely business. Thus, the novel resists the colonial discourse which tends to justify the project under the pretext of “civilizing” the “barbaric” oriental people. In doing so, it unveils the true colonial desire.

In recent times, than during its publication, many critics have commented on Kamleshwar’s *Partition* in terms of different issues and applying variety of theoretical perspectives.

Badruddin Umar is right that communalism as a specific form of political use of religion appears in India with the rise of national movement in the fourth quarter of

the nineteenth century. As in the novel Salma reminds Adeb in his court how Lokmany Tilak, “sought to identify the quest for independence with the Ganpathis Utsav celebrations and turned the former into a purely Hindu movement” (94). ‘Pakistan’, thus, stands for a metaphor for division of hearts leading to mistrust when there is lust for power by using religion for political and even today the practice is being repeated. Kamleshwar uses Pakistan as a metaphor for communal divide leading to bloodshed in the name of religion.

The time of independence in 1947 was a time of strange paradoxes. The opening lines in *The Tale of Two Cities* poignantly sum up the state of affairs that prevailed in the wake of India’s independence:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct the other way. (qtd. In Chopra 22-23)

Sadly, the independence brought with it massacre, rapes, abduction, hatred and suspicion, and in the name of religion there was large scale of bloodshed which no religion on earth preaches. *Partition* is the voice of a man who happened to live through, and keenly felt those troubled times.

The mediation, through representations, which gives to cultural trauma, sets off as Eyerman puts it, “a dramatic loss of identity and meaning, a tear in the social fabric, affecting a group of people that has achieved some degree of cohesion”(qtd. In Pandey 125). An application of Eyerman’s theory of cultural trauma as it relates

to the formation of the Indian and Pakistani identities depends largely on the experiential mediation of the partition violence of 1947- a mediation which conjoins collective memory and national identity through cultural templates. The blending comes about, as Alexander says “ When members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, making their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways” (qtd. In Pandey 126). What the theory of cultural trauma by Alexander and Everman underscores vis-à-vis the partition violence of 1947 is that the seminal event is not naturally traumatic, but that the cultural templates through which they are experienced turn it into a trauma.

The revisionist notion of trauma posited by Alexander and Everman makes a departure from the formulations by Caruth, who transfers the psychoanalytic model of individual trauma to the study of collective trauma. It shifts the focus away from the psychological condition of *nachtraglichkeit* to a sociological construction of the belatedness which is supposed to have registered the trauma in the first place. The shift from an inherently psychological to an overwhelming sociological theory of trauma has, however, raised a few critical eyebrows. Hiro Saito, for example, counterargues:

In examining the so-called belated register of a traumatic event in collective memory ...we should not dismiss the utility of psychoanalysis and psychology outright in favor of sociology, for denial, repression, and silence on the part of the individual survivors in the aftermath of a traumatic event could delay their actions to present their traumatic experiences in public arenas. (qtd. In Pandey 126)

Saito, who goes on to reinforce his critical position by reading in Alexander's notion of cultural trauma "an emotional and therefore psychological dimension, which cannot be reduced to discursive construction", correctly settles for a "sociopsychological" perspective of trauma theory (358). A sociopsychological angle of trauma reconciles the standpoint of Caruth with that of the proponents of cultural trauma.

M.J. Akbar shows "fanatics on both sides who were equally responsible for dividing people and who brought catastrophe in the life of those who were enjoying their normal life". (qtd. In Chopra 212). At the assassination of Gandhi, the greedy politician Ram Chatterjee drinks rum and gloats, "Ghandhi is dead"! with an exaggerated swivel he asks, "Who will save these Muslim bastards now? At the same time he is not happy as Gandhi's death has led to calm." "No one wants to kill Muslim bastards any more. He asks himself repeatedly, why had not a Muslim killed Gandhi? Life would have been so uncomplicated" (qtd. In Chopra 212).

The above mentioned reviews and criticism indicate that the novel can be studied from manifold perspectives. However these critics do not analyse it in terms of post-colonial perspective. Therefore, the present work aims to analyse the resistance of the novel to the colonial discourse by interpreting the historical events in new way.

The thesis has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter contains the introduction. In it, the central issue is elaborated along with the hypothesis and from the analysis of the literature review the point of departure of this work is clarified in terms of the methodology. It has been hypothesized that the writer reinterpretes the indian history so as to resist the colonial discourse. Similarly second chapter and the third chapter contain the discussion of the theoretical modality i.e. post colonialism

and colonial discourse, and the interpretation of the text consecutively. And conclusion of the dissertation marks the final chapter.

II: Postcolonial Theory: Power, Discourse and Hegemony

Foucault theory of discourse possesses to the theory of German philosopher Fredrich Nietzsche argued that all knowledge is an expression of the “Will to Power (Selden 100) and that we use language to suit our aim. He believes nobody can speak of “absolute truth”, that is all language activities are related to our will to power.

Foucault developed a theory of discourse in relation to the power structures operating in society. His main thesis is that discourse is involved to power. He views that discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operate through discourse. The discourse, therefore, is inseparable from power because discourse is the ordering force that governs every institution. This enables institutions to exercise power and domination. Those who possess the authority to define discourse exclude others who are not in power. M.H Abrams in *Glossary of Literary Terms* writes:

Discourse has become the focal term among critics who opposes deconstructive concept of a “general text” that functions independently of particular historical conditions. Instead they conceive of discourse as social parlance, or language-in-uses and consider it to be both the product and the manifestation not of a timeless linguistic system, but of particular social condition, class structures, and power relationship that alter in the course of history. (241)

Foucault believes we can never possess an objective knowledge of history, “because historical writings are always entangled in tropes” (Selden 102). Discourses

are produced within a real world of power struggle. Discourse is used as a means to gain or sometimes even to subvert power. For Foucault, discourse is a central human activity. He is interested in the process how discursive practices change over time.

The written discourses of texts are meant to be addressed to the reader critic. So, they are not meaningful until they are actualized and made present by reader or critic. Text, being emanated from the author, is meant to be verbal message, which needs to be deciphered by the critic. This helps to formulate an opinion that to engage in an interpretation of a text is to take part in a dialogue with another. Bakhtin School, held similar opinion stating that, “every utterance is dialogue and therefore a contested interpretation” (Selden 75). In such a situation, it is impossible to establish a single authoritative meaning because language “is always contaminated, interleaved, opaque coloured by layer semantic deposits resulting from the endless process of human struggle and interaction” (Selden 75). All interpretations become a power struggle.

Discourse, according to Foucault, is produced in which concepts of madness, criminality, and sexual abnormality and so on are defined in relation to sanity, justice and sexual normality. Such discursive formations massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and the nature of subjectivity, which prevail in a particular period. Foucault argues that the rules and procedures, which determine what is considered normal or rational, have the power to silence what that exclude. His main point, here, is that meaning of any discourse depends on who controls it. For example, the scientist who first claimed “The earth revolves around the sun” was punished and his truth was ignored because for the people who were in power had another version of truth: “Sun revolves the earth”, so truth can be proved wrong by power. People recognize particular piece of philosophy or scientific theory

as true, only if it fits the description of truth laid down by the intellectual or political institution of the day, by members of ruling elite or the existing ideologies of knowledge. Every system of knowledge, we may say, establishes rules for exclusions or discriminations and it always implies taking sides. The discursive practices, however, have no universal validity but are historically dominant ways of controlling and preserving social relations of exploitations. Foucault's interest is in historical dimension of discursive change. System of knowledge establish rules and procedures governing the particular epoch by exclusion and regulation. Foucault regards the nature of discourse as an event in time since it is not only that which and with which we struggle, the power we seek to possess. For him, as for Nietzsche, any attempt to produce and control discourse is will to power. Every instance of discourse embodies the power struggle. As Foucault himself argues. "discourse is a violence that we do to things" (Seldon, 60). Truth itself becomes not an unchanging universal essence but a perpetual object of appropriation and domination.

In "Truth and power" Michel Foucault revisits the major theoretical trends and questions of his career. He is a thinker who knows no bounds of subject of field. His ideas stretch from literature to science. From psychology to labor. He deals a currency that is accepted everywhere: 'Truth and power as they intertwine with the history of human experience. He specially loves to study asylums and prisons because they are close to an encapsulated power structure. Using techniques gathered from psychology politics, anthropology, and archaeology, Foucault presents a highly politicized analysis of the flow of the power and power relations

"Truth and power" is an excerpted version of an interview with Alesandro Fontana and Pasquale Pasquino that initially appeared as "Intervista a Michel Foucault" in *Microfiseca del Poetere* in 1977. The interviewers first ask Foucault to

revisit some of his earlier ideas and trace the path of his career. Foucault began looking at asylums. And tried to create his theories with an eye towards French politics of the left he soon turned to evaluating other sciences such as biology, political economy, and medicine and came up with the concept of discontinuity: “ it seemed to me that.... The rhythm of transformation does not follow the smooth continuity schemes of development which other critics and thinkers applied to him. Much to his dismay. Foucault wanted only to show the susceptibility of the sciences and scientific statements to the pressures of power:

At this level it's not so much a matter of knowing what external imposes it self on science, as of what effects of power circulate scientific statements. What constitutes, as it were, their internal regime of power, and how and why at certain moments that regime undergoes a global modification. (1136).

This idea echoes Thomas Kuhn's ideas about paradigm shifts in science, and eye reverberates back to Dryden's statements about every age's "Universal genius" . Dryden stated that in generation there is a general inclination of thought that affects all disciplines. Kuhn proliferates the idea that major revolutions in science are due to major paradigm shifts.

The discussion then moves to structuralism, where Foucault makes some major statements about the structure of history. Foucault is ardent in asserting, “ I don't see who could be more of anti-structuralist than me” (437). He claims that structures, formed by the rulers of society, have led to the “event” in their rage to order the general tidy of history. Structuralist historians ignore aberrant event that do not fit into those beautiful structures that are so orderly, intelligible and transparent to analysis. Foucault says that the study of history has been based on a model of

language that focuses on meaning. He recommends a different way of evaluating eccentric historical events rather than writing them off as simply trivial as structuralist historians have attempted.

Here I believe one's point of reference should not be to the great modal of language (langue) and signs, but to that of war and battle. The history which bears and determines us has the form of a war rather than of a language: relations of power not relations of meaning. (1137).

Foucault believes that the seemingly chaotic occurrences of history are conflicts of power. He states that there is an "intrinsic intelligibility of conflicts" that can enlighten us to the reasons behind actions.

Foucault sees every action and every historical event as an exercise in the exchange of power. He has spent a large bulk of his career analyzing the ebb and flow of the power in different situations and with relevance to different aspects of human life. Structure organizes and broadens the web of power. The overall volume of power rises with each individual involved in the play.

The society is a huge web, and much of the power tends to be concentrated towards the higher echelons. Foucault sees the exchange of power in very active terms: "isn't power simply a form of war like domination?" It is difficult to sort out just who is fighting the war, since Foucault seems to lean toward the war of all against all nations. Power flows simultaneously in different directions and different volumes according to the various forms of "power relation" in the network" of power exchange. Regarding power and truth Foucault says,

Now I believe that the problem does not consist in drawing a line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientific

or truth and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing historically how effects of truths are produced within discourse which in themselves are neither true nor false. (1139)

He further states that power is not only repression it is something positive:

In defining the effects of the power as repression, one adopts purely juridical conception of such power, one identifies power with a law which says no power is taken above all as carrying the force of a prohibition.... What makes power old good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. (1139).

The basic problem for non-west in that power, as west has exercised is juridical and negative rather than technical and positive. Foucault's ideas gravitate towards the ultra-highly complex and similarly politicized, leaving one to wonder what the real world impact of his notions might be. The interviewers apparently shared this inquiry, and asked how all of Foucault's analysis of power relations could be used in life, and specifically, what is the role of the intellectual, who he says has gravitated from a "universal" intellectual to a "specific" intellectual. Foucault sees scientists and scholars who remain cloistered to their field as specific intellectuals and cites the writers of old as the universal intellectual: "The intellectual par excellence used to be the writer: as a universal consciousness, a free subject, he was counterpoised to the service of the or capital technicians, magistrates, teachers" (1142).

Even writers have been co-opted in modern society by the structures of the "regime" the group that rules the society, including government and business. The

society now looks to the university for the knowledge because of the intersection of multiple field of study. This had incorporated even written expression into the structure of society and led to the devaluation of two writers of genius and the elevation of the absolute servant “ along with a handful of other, has at his disposal, whether in the service of the state or against it powers which can either benefit or irrevocably destroy life” (1143).

Writers who are sanctioned by a powerful structure now affect reality rather than simply tromping around in ideological terrain. It would seem that an intellectual could not be effective without the support of some structure, but Foucault makes an argument for individual efficacy.

The structure is successful because it creates truth, and it is in this recognition that individual can succeed:

The important thing here, I believe, is that truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power... truth is the reward of free spirits, the child of protracted solitude, not the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is a thing of this world. It is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it includes regular effects of power. (1144)

Each society creates a “regime of truth” according to its beliefs, values; and mores. Foucault identifies the creation of truth in contemporary western society with five traits: the centering of truth on scientific discourse, accountability of truth to economic and political forces, the “diffusion and consumption” of truth via societal apparatuses, the control of the distribution of truth by “political and economic apparatuses” and the fact that it is “the issue of a whole political debate and social

confrontation”. Individual would do well to recognize that ultimate truth. “Truth” is the construct of the political and economic forces that command the majority of the power within the societal web. There is not truly universal truth at all; therefore, intellectual must specialize, specify, so that he/she can be connected to one of the Foucault explains it:

“Truth” is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures of the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements... “Truth” is linked in a circular relation with system of power which produces and sustains it, and to effect of power which it includes and which extend it a “regime” of truth. (1145)

Because of this, Foucault sees the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of science and ideology, but in terms of truth power. The question of how to deal with and determine truth is at the base of political and social strife.

Power and Hegemony

When we talk of power-discourse relationship we recall an Italian Marxist and renown postcolonial critic Antonio Gramsci. Gramscian term “hegemony” is thought to be necessary for studying and analyzing colonial discourse. Gramsci studied and investigated how the ruling class maintains its power in society by winning the consent of the ruled. His most widely accepted concept ‘Hegemony’ describes how culture and ideological domination of the majority-by-majority functions, and how that domination is accepted by both groups. In other words, a social class achieves predominant influence and power within the society, and that the subordinated classes unwittingly accept and participate in their own oppression. Hegemony is not a general domination of one by another. That is to say it is not domination by force

rather domination by consent. For example, postcolonial critics Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin define Gramscian notion of Hegemony in the following words by describing it as: fundamentally, hegemony is the power of the ruling classes to convince other classes that their interests are the interests of all, Domination is thus exerted not by force, nor even necessary by active persuasion but by a more subtle and inclusive force, apparatuses such as education and media, by which ruling class's interest is presented as the common interest and thus comes to be taken for granted. (116)

The dominant class, through hegemony, creates an imperative upon the consciousness or the whole way of social life, value systems, beliefs and attitudes. By doing so, it gets the ink to write those values as general common and indispensable social values which are constructed by power holder's discursive those and incentives.

The ruling classes exercise power upon subordinated or ruled classes not through force and fraud but through shaping the "Common Sense" of people. For instance, another postcolonial critic Ania Loomba redefines Gramscian notion of 'hegemony' by saying "hegemony is power achieved through a combination of coercion and consent" (29). This indicates that power is exercised not only through force alone but also through winning the consent of colonized, in other words, the colonized willingly accept being ruled because they think the ruling class is superior to them.

The term "hegemony" is significant for describing the success of imperial power over a colonial people because colonial regimes achieved domination through manufacturing consent of the colonized. In other words power is not totally exercised from above of below, but it is operated by the consent of both of them.

Colonial Discourse

Said's orientalism represents the first phase of postcolonial theory. Rather than engaging with the ambivalent condition of the colonial aftermath of indeed with the history and motivations of anti-colonial resistance, it directs our attention to the discourse and textual production of colonial time. In "culture", Said advocated calling our attention to see the representational violence of colonial discourses. Said puts his view forward how the expansion and extension of empire went simultaneously with the textual production "Imperialism and the novel fortified each other to such a degree that it is impossibleto read one without in someway dealing with the other", (84). In his famous book *Orientalism* , Said defined orientalism as, the writing from the west about the east, as a 'discourse' i.e. the project of representing, imaging, translating, containing and managing the intransigent and incomprehensible 'Orient' through textual codes and conventions. In writing the 'orient' through certain governing metaphors and tropes, orientalists simultaneously underwrote the positional superiority of western consciousness and in doing so, rendered the 'orient' a playground for western "desires, repression, investment, projection" (8). Thus the texts provided ideological ground for the expire to thrice huge body of writings formed a coherent system of western knowledge about the orient including Africa, and Latin America and it served as a lens for the writers to see the real orient. No writer or the scholar can detach from the circumstances of life, set of beliefs and his position in the society. Orientalism imposed upon thought about the orient.

Even the most imaginative writers of the high imperial era were constrained in what they could either experience of or say about orient. Said alerts us in the very beginning of *Orientalism*: " The orient was almost European invention and had been

since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes of remarkable experiences.” (1)

So, in the texts of the novelists of that era, the underlying pattern or assumption about the orient, Africa or Latin America was very much implicated. Because of these ideological frameworks they could not freely read the people and culture of the alien nations. Said again writes in similar tone:

In brief, Because of the orientalism the orient (and is not) was not free subject of thought or action. This is not to say that orientalism unilaterally determines what can be said about the orient, but that it is the whole network of interests inevitably brought to bear on (and therefore always involved in) any occasion when that particular entity ‘the orient’ is in question. (qtd. In Mongia, 22)

Discussing on the issue about colonial literature and how it produced the stereotypical images of the non-west as ‘other’ of Europe. Colonial Literature, though it is difficult to give precise definition because of its heterogeneity, reflects colonial ethos. In general, the colonial literature exhibits a tinge of local colonial motifs e.g. the quest beyond the frontier of civilization. They exhibit colonial experiences and perceptions, and are wrote from the imperial perspective. It is as Elleke Boehmer writes, “Informed by theories concerning the superiority of European culture and the rightness of empire” (3). In the heydays of empire, writers felt it necessary to write about new places and the people. They began writing about the people who inhabited the lands they (empires) claimed; the natives, the colonized. But the problem was that of truly understanding the alien people, culture, geography and the landscape. They were dumbfounded to see the things in new surroundings, and the attitudes and the behaviours of the people entirely unreadable. They began to represent these people

and cultures in their own familiar vocabularies, their own metaphors and tropes and the strangeness was made comprehensible by using everyday names, dependable textual conventions, both rhetorical and syntactic” (Boehmer, 4). In this process of defining renaming the natives, they started classifying them as barbaric and degenerate, either dangerous or alluring.

This notion of danger was expressed in their depiction of vast and mysterious landscape, wild jungles and swampy lands. Boehmer again writes: “Classifications and codes imported from Europe were matched to peoples, cultures and topographies that were entirely un-European. And having once done the work of interpretation, the imported symbols, even if entirely arbitrary, often stuck” (17).

Colonial writing is important for revealing the ways in which that world system could represent the degradation of other human beings as natural, an innate part of their degenerate or barbarian state. The blacks (representing all African, yellow, Brown and Red) were presented as less civilized, as child or savage or needless mass. Or they were depicted as inferior only because they were different from the whites. Thus overdetermined by stereotypes, the characterization of indigenous peoples tended to screen out their agency, diversity and resistance. During the time of high imperialism, the writers cherished the idea of white superiority; they maintained and celebrated the dichotomy between ‘us’ and ‘them’. They represented the whites as the civilizers of the world and apostles of light, and the ‘black’s as degenerate, barbaric, and in need of European masters to civilize and to uplift them out of their filth. Boehmer reminds us this idea when she writes:

Stereotypes of the other as indolent malingers, shirkers, good for nothings, layabouts degenerate versions of the pastoral idler, were the stock – in-trade of colonialist writing. In contrast the white man

represented himself as the archetypal worker and provident profit-maker. (38)

As the similar way, Nigerian writer and very prominent postcolonial critic, Chinua Achebe, has made a pin critique of Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* in his paper entitled "An Image of Africa: Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*":

Heart of darkness projects the image of Africa as "the other world", the antithesis of Europe and therefore of civilization, a place where man's vaunted intelligence and refinement are finally mocked by triumphant bestiality. The book opens on the river Thames, but the actual story will take place on the river Congo, the very antithesis of the Thames. The River Congo is quite decidedly not a River Emeritus. It has rendered no service and enjoys no old – age pension. We are told that going up that river was like traveling back to the earliest beginning of the world. (*The Story*, 1373)

In the above quoted extract, Conrad, according to Achebe, not dichotomized Thames and Congo, good and bad, but implicated that Thames has overcome its darkness and bestiality, whereas Congo is still in darkness and bestiality, and to take over this, it needs guidance and light from European national civilization. What Conrad cannot see and believe is that Africa has its own intact history and culture distinct from European one.

As Achebe pointed out Conrad's image of Africa as other worldly, in similar analysis, Elleke Boehmer in her study of Colonial Literature and their process of 'othering' remarks:

The Orient, Africa is consistently described as mysterious, grotesque, of malign, and in general hostile to European understanding. It is an

“awful lifelessness”, or vast and stupefying, reminding the British observer, as O. Douglas noted, of the uncertainty of all the things. In Conrad’s East, in his Africa, or in the silver-mines of the South American country of Costaguana in *Nostromo* the hero is stalked by a brooding nemesis, the threat of moral failure or the loss of national control. It is a condition which appears to emerge in part out of the radical incongruity between the individual and the alien world in which he finds himself. (90)

The issue that really interests postcolonial critics is the rejection of colonial writers to include indigenous characters and to reject them any significant role. If any role is given, that is always a negative one. Elleke Boehmer writes: “Where the rest, was assumed to be marginal and secondary to the metropolis” (24). Achebe again braids.

Conrad as a ‘through racist’ and writes:

Africa as setting and backdrop which eliminates the African as human factor. Africa as a metaphysical battlefield devoid of all recognizable humanity, into which the wandering European enters at his peril. Can anybody see the preposterous and perverse arrogance in thus reducing Africa to the role of props for the break-up of one petty European mind? But that is not even the point. The real point is the dehumanization Africa and Africans which this age-long attitude has fostered and continues to foster in the world. (The story 1378)

So, to the readers like us, the world represented in colonialist fiction seems strangely empty of indigenous characters. The important actions and adventures are

that of the colonizers, of white men. As Boehmer writes: “The drama that there is their drama. Almost without exception there is no narrative interest without European involvement or intervention” (69). Even if the natives are represented, they are shown in needless lacking individual identity as human beings. Especially where they were resistant to colonial drama, they were shown in need of leadership, incapable of self-governance and in managing their own resources.

So these issues reveal that the idea of evolutionary theory of race was implicate in these writers. The writers were always at the apex of everything, and source of every significant activities.

Post-Colonial Discourse and Re-Construction

Each and every discourse is produced either to support rule or to subvert the rule in a society. In the process of reverse continuity of rule emerge the new from power structure of a society. By which enables to recreate the re-construction self. In history of sexuality Foucault writes:

We must make allowance for the complex and unstable progress whereby discourse can be both an instrument and effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; reinforce it: but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and make it possible to thwart. (101)

As he describes in his book *History of Sexuality*, the knowledge produced to control over the ruled itself creates its resistance. The discourse produced to support the colonial rule, not only perpetuated the rule of the colonialists, but also helped to re-construct the “reverse” discourse against colonialism. That is the cause why anti-

colonial movements began to raise voices when the colonial power was in its supreme height.

The anti-imperialist nationalist writers thought that the lost values of indigenous culture could be achieved by an inversion of colonial values. They display the first instance of upturning colonial perspective. These writings try to subvert the colonial misrepresentation and glorify what were earlier degraded. They gave spiritual vitality to degrading stereotypes, celebrating all that had been identified as negative and inferior. In her analysis of postcolonial literature Elleke Boehmer brings that point home as: "Mixing, upturning, and dismantling negative representation, the strategic line of attack taken by the colonized was to turn the identities ascribed to them into positive self image" (105). The post-colonial writers strongly believe that the identity of the natives, though long suppressed lay embedded its culture origins was recoverable intact unadulterated by the depredations of colonialism. The colonialist had developed lots of negative images of the colonized which have to be upturned to form the real identity of the indigenous culture. To this end, the nationalist writers have made various attempts to develop the images of their country to replace those generated in Europe. To achieve their goal, these writers have glorified their local traditions, the mythologies and national situations in their writings. But, in dismantling the images created by the Europeans, the postcolonial writers, at first, have to work within the framework of the imperial cultural representations. This type of anti-imperialism movement was started among from the British territory itself.

Boehmer writes:

Culturally in exile, the effort of nationalist writers was to retrieve or invent endemic homelands, lost spiritual traditions set in an un-spoilt pastoral past... writers attempted to transform their experience of

culture schizophrenia into a restorative dream of home, a healing myth of origin, or consolatory lyric combining diverse melodies. (117)

The nationalist writers were concerned with recovering an identity fragmented, displaced, or discredited under colonialism in order to reconstitute a vision of an independent indigenous land. Talking on the efforts of the expatriate nationalist elites to re-construct their 'real' identity, Boehmer further writes:

Generic intrusion had the potential for powerful transvaluation. Reworking from their own historical position Europe's fantasies of new worlds, or high-flown propaganda for colonial settlement, nationalist conversion followed two main lines of approach. First writers might combine genres associated with the special grittiness or quality of their own cultural experience. Romanticizing the past, nonetheless tried to represent their societies accurately from within. (119)

Receiving English the colonial tongue, writers in their attempt, sought to rework the meaning of their myths and their ancient stories like Mahabharata, Ramayana and Puranas. The educated elites who have migrated to foreign lands have added more energy to national awareness. There are the people who have deep sentimental connection with their native land, but have to surrender themselves to their imaginative creation to create the 'image' of the nation. Salman Rushdie in his essay "Imaginary Homelands" discusses the problems of migrated people and states:

It may be that writes in my position (migrated), exiles or emigrants or expatriates, are haunted by some sense of loss, some urge to reclaim, to look back, even at the risk of being mutated into pillars of salt. But if

we do look back, we must do so also in the knowledge which gives rise to profound uncertainties-that our physical alienation from India almost inevitable means that we will not be capable of reclaiming precisely the thing that was lost; that we will, in short, create fiction. Not actual cities or villages, but invisible one, imaginary homelands, Indian of mind. (10)

The efforts of these expatriates to portray the 'real' picture of country prove to be futile because they have already lost the chance to be 'real' native, and get the experience. In such situation, they have nothing to do except to take the help of memory. The "real images" of their country are stored, in their mind. So, their 'image' on their native lands depends on 'their' own memory. This is the cause why, the image of Salman Rushdie on India may differ to the image of India created by V.S. Naipaul. Because he codes the very image of his land, which he had experienced in his land long before. All expatriates try to reflect their own native land. Rushdie thus confesses: "The Indian writer who writes from outside Indian tries to reflect that world: he is obliged to deal in broken mirrors, some of whose fragments have been irretrievably lost" (11).

Since these writers have to work in fragmented memory, which is to be reconstructed, they cannot picture the 'perfect' image. However, their image bounds all the expatriates as well as indigenous in the single thread of a nation. Thus; the 'memory' interacts with the present situation of writer. Present situation, i. e. immigrant or exile, struggles with the past, and the suitable description that matches to the present need is depicted in the writings of such scholars. The description of the natives by the European elites differs to the images created by the nationalist writers. These writers re-describe their land in their own words because "re-describing a world

is the necessary first step towards it” (Rushdie 14). Such describing helps the indigenous to uplift themselves to build their autonomous identity.

The expatriates are always in-between their own native culture, and the culture they are living with. Therefore, there is always struggle between the cultures within themselves and the influences at work upon their societies. For example, the Indian expatriate, in England is in the struggle between the Indian and the English cultures. According to Salman Rushdie, such writers are the true writers because they can give us “whole sight” instead of stereotyped vision because they gave the experiences of the both cultures, and have knowledge on he perspectives of the both.

The Europeans were free while there was writing about the orient. They had the feelings of superiority. So they created the “images” as they wished. Rushdie asks the nationalist writes to work with the freedom of mind, so that they can recreate the images as powerful as those generated in Europe. He further explains in his book, “Art is the passion of mind. And the imagination works best when it is most free to be eclectic in their selection of theme, setting and from” (20).

It is the creative work through which, we can create the powerful images. The written discourses are much mire powerful, because it is considered as the embodiment of the truths. As the colonialist writes exercised their power through discourses, want to reclaim their true identity. Because, in the notion of power-elite, the subaltern cannot represent themselves as thru should be represented, or described. Spivak also admits, “...in the context of colonial production, the subaltern has no history cannot speak” (83). That is why the question is to make the history of the oppressed by themselves because “the relationship between woman and silence can be plotted by themselves because “ the relationship between woman the silence can be plotted by themselves” (82). As the male can never depict the ‘realities’ of woman (actually male elite have

silenced the women's realities as the colonizers silenced the colonized), the history and culture of the oppressed never be described truly by the dominant group. That is why, the post colonial writers, asking the native writers to describe their land and cultures in their own words freely, have made vigorous attempted to create the 'real' homelands. The central motif of the post colonial literature is to subvert all the images of the orient created by European scholars; and to re-create the indigenous culture and history for the identity of the natives. The post-colonial writers, through cultural self-descriptions, have made fadeless efforts to re-construct the history and the culture of the indigenous. By producing such discourses, they are making a position for the marginalized, or the once colonized, in the world that is dominated by the first world. Constructing reverse discourses though the transgression of colonial boundaries and binaries, the post-colonial writers have proved that lost values also can be re-captured.

III: Resistance to Colonial Discourse In Kamleshwar's *Kitne Pakistan (Partition)*

In Kamleshwar's *Kitne Pakistan (Partition)* [2000] A. Fuhrer, the director general of the British Archaeology Survey in India of the late nineteenth century confesses that the age-long conflict between Hindus and Muslims regarding the demolition of Ram Mandir of Ayodhya was caused by the British colonial mission. He says :

As part of our changing policies, we had decided that in order to keep the British government from collapsing, it was necessary to create rifts between Hindus and Muslims who had been united in 1857. It was what motivated me to deface Ibrahim Lodi's inscription on the Babri Masjid. The translation of this inscription still lies in the files of Archaeological survey of India. No one has thought of destroying it. However, the two crucial pages of the *Babarnama* which prove the king had gone to Avadh, not Ayodhya, mysteriously disappeared. Having played this dirty trick, the British and, particularly, H.R. Neville, the Faizabad Gazetteer, went a step further. The latter placed on record the falsehood that Baber had stayed in Ayodhya for a week and ordered the demolition of the Ram Mandir. (61)

In the aforementioned paragraph, the writer makes the historically real character A. Fuhrer to speak the stunning fact about Hindu- Muslim conflict on the destruction of Ram Mandir which is supposed to have superseded by Babri Masjid. In the historical record, it has been mentioned the Muslim emperor Baber had got the temple destroyed and erected the Masjid after his name. But, in the extract this fact is denied. Instead, the British colonizers of India are made responsible for the manipulation of the fact to perpetuate their regime by destroying the solidarity of the native people. As

early as 1857, the chief communities of India- Hindus and Muslims had exhibited a firm unity fighting against the colonizers together. After that they devised the plan to dismantle their solidarity and found the politicization of religious faith the surest way. So, for the matter they misread the inscriptions and made the history where religious community established its center of faith to the complete dilapidation of another, thus sowing the grain of ever continuing conflict between Hindus and Muslims. After all why the writer tries to uncover the mask of dead facts; why does he regard the British colonizers as the manipulator of history and the instrumental agents of Hindu- Muslim dual? Does it not go against the colonial discourse?

Civilizing the brutes was one of the chief colonial discourses. They had justified colonization in India and elsewhere in this line. Oriental people, being barbaric and brutes, the European (mainly the Bretons) colonial powers had regarded it their duty to “civilise’ and thus they were said to have intervened in foreign lands. But does civilizing indicate instigating people for perpetual dual? Is it not teaching people to live in harmony and perform solidarity even at times hard? So in the novel the novelist having written the novel in the aftermath of India- Pakistan- Bangladesh partition (2000) seems to have resisted the colonial discourse and mission. In fact civilizing the indigenous people was just their pretension and the mask to evade their looting motive.

Furthermore, the novel unveils the hidden contradiction in the recorded and disseminated history by the British colonizers, which was done to aggravate the Hindu- Muslim conflict:

In the Faizabad Gazetteer the British officer Neville has recorded that the population of Faizabad- Ayodhya rose from nine thousand nine-hundred and forty-nine in 1869 to eleven thousand six hundred and

forty- three in 1818. This implies an increase in the population by two thousand in a mere twelve years. Honourable Adeb, it's up to you to guess what the approximate figure must have been in my time that is in the year 1528. How then could one lakh seventy-four thousand Hindus have been killed at the time? It should now be quite clear to you the Britishers have played a trick on us. (62)

This above mentioned paragraph bluntly attacks the colonial discourse. It also shows the hidden contradiction in the colonial historiography of India. To intensify the conflict and rift between Hindus and Muslims they had served the fictitious and terrorizing data during the stated demolition of Ram Mandir by Baber emperor. In the extract, Adeb, the poet who is also the chief justice of the court of time makes Baber, the Muslim emperor to defend the charge laden upon him. He presents data of the historical population of Ayodhya which is far less than the casualty supposed to have occurred during the incident. This categorically shows the vile nature of the British colonizers.

The nature that is vile is also depicted in the novel through their transportation of European whores to lure and hypnotise the Indian emperors, so that they could extend their influence over political and administrative domain. In the novel the peon of the court of adeeb says:

Just observe, illustrious adeeb, how the representatives of the East India Trading company have misused the Hooghly river's estuary. In exchange for indigo, opium, black pepper, cloves, cardamoms, ginger and cinnamon, they have offloaded scores of European prostitutes on the shores of Bengal. This is the perverted vision of beauty blighting India's shores. (288)

This extract is the precise indication of the opposition to the colonial discourse. It also says their project was entirely business oriented. Actually they had come for the spices like indigo, opium, black pepper, cloves, cardamoms, ginger and cinnamon. Civilizing was never their goal. What does the transportation of European sex-workers to Indian soil indicate? Does civilization mean to involve in a wild intercourse with prostitutes? Were they not making Indians more barbaric instead? Of course they tried to turn the civilized Indian people in to savage beings.

Likewise, the spreading of the capitalism and the extension of market for European products was another end of the colonizers according to this novel. This purpose of imperialism is described in the novel as :

It is for the sake of market that imperialism is born. Conversely, it is to keep imperialism alive that markets are created. An umbilical chord binds the two. Imperialism manifests itself in different ways. There can be democratic economic imperialism that needs to subsist on the markets that generate profit. Markets! Markets! Markets! Markets alone define the principles and parameters of industrial progress. This is known as capitalism. Imperialism is another name of it. As is colonization. (292)

This extract theoretically makes the mission of every colonial and imperial project clear. There can be no benevolent and philanthropist motive in either of these two. Imperialism and markets are intricately connected. In fact these two have mutual existence. Imperialism is born in the quest of market to disseminate the products of the Europeans. It was also emerged in their search for the low price raw material and the cheap labours. When market is extended it becomes easy for the imperialism to sustain. So, the colonial discourse of civilizing people is a bogus argument; when

there is colonialism there emerges the motive of material gain naturally; the British Raj can be no exception.

As testimony to aforementioned theory, the writer in the novel talks about the supply of opium to China during the colonization in India. The great Chinese writer and historian Lu-Xun, speaking before the court of Adeeb says:

Adeeb, perhaps you aren't aware that after consolidating their position in India, the men from the East India had begun smuggling opium in China. Those pirates would load their streamers with cartoons of opium that had been produced in Calcutta. On reaching the island of Macao, they would hide among the sand dunes. From there, these men would smuggle out opium via either Wangxia or Kuancha. Stealthily, their streamers would glide up the Pearl river estuary, eventually reaching Canton, Linting or Whampra. The routes of these smuggling vessels were charted very carefully so as to allow them to enter the mainland undetected. It is from there that this narcotic was smuggled to every corner of the country. (293)

This excerpt is the graphic detail of the opium trade of British colonizers in India. After all why the writer invests so much of his energy in this description? Can it be to dismantle and deconstruct the colonial discourse that justifies colonization in the name of educating the uneducated and making pious of the "heathen" people? It is nothing other than to show the irony in that discourse; to demonstrate they were doing exactly of what they were claiming.

Irony of colonial discourse is also seen in their arrival in the foreign land with gun and explosives for the "civilizing mission". Gun, explosives and horses were

claimed to have brought to “save the soul of people”. In the context of the colonization of America (New World) the novelist remarks:

Do not overlook the fact that the New World came into your hands in the course of your quest to discover India. You had no religion; you merely wore the mask of one. Hypocrites that you are, you claimed that these explorations were undertaken for the spiritual salvation of the people who inhabited the countries you set foot in. You certainly didn't venture forth with horses and explosives to save souls; your actual intention was to enslave them. (296)

So, this extract demonstrates the inherent contradiction laid in the colonial justification to colonization. Being spiritually barren and devoid of any religion the native peoples were, the colonizers claim they had intervened the different states to “save their soul” by making them pious people forcing them to follow Christianity. But their logic is mocked here giving the account of how they came. So, this is yet another resistance to colonial discourse which deconstructs the colonial justification of colonization. People aiming to teach religion i.e. peace, non-violence and compassion ought not to go anywhere with violent and destructive instruments. Referring to the diffusion of Buddhism the novelist says that born in India it had spread to the rest of Asia, but not a single drop of blood was shed when that happened. That Buddhist preacher did not go about their business like warriors on horse back carrying explosives as baggage. They crossed the sacred Himalayas on foot. When they chose sea routes, they did not carry weapons of war. Their hands did not bear spears, swords or guns; their sailing vessels were not fitted with cannons (296).

Resistance to colonial discourse is made in the reference to slave trade and its dehumanization. Slavery is another name of colonization. During colonial time the trend of treating human beings mainly of Africa as inhuman had begun. People were enslaved and transported to Europe and America mainly for cheap labour in industries. Besides, they were made domestic slaves where they were sexually exploited. Like commodity they would be sold from one master to another. In the novel, “ashruvaid”, the person who studies the tears of people narrates the aadeeb about the slave trade as:

The physique of the male slaves determines the price the condition of the teeth, the price of the slave children. As for the price of female slaves, it is decided by subjecting their breast to a humiliating physical scrutiny. They are then transported by boat to the huge vessels that lie off the shore and finally shipped across to America. (289)

This extract too greatly makes irony of the colonial discourse and activities. The persons supposed to have gone to Africa to save the soul of African people were rather caging their souls. Their freedom to live in their native soil was snatched. They were treated inferior than a commodity. Human body was staked, sold and bought in money and the substance for their price was to be their physical soundness. In case of women it was a fiasco in total- their bodily parts were keenly scrutinized before they stitched the price tag. Thus by depicting the condition during slave trade the novelist has poked a bitter criticism on colonial discourse.

Furthermore, instead of civilizing the people the colonizers made them bereft of any civilization adulterating their fundamental civilizations. In the novel *Montozuma*, the ruler of Aztec Empire says to Bernal Diaz, the colonial historian-

Are you aware, he thundered, Before your arrival, these Inca tribes cultivated potatoes and maize on a large scale? That theirs was an agrarian society with its own granaries? They had turned the vast valley of the Andes mountain into arable land. They had a king, a council of ministers, a bureaucracy and an army. Their granaries overflowed with grain that sustained the royal household officialdom and the army. Each one of the Incas worshipped the sun as soon as they awoke in the morning. Can you deny any of these facts? I don't deny them- to a large extent they are not wrong. (305)

The afore given extract not only blames the colonizers for destroying the native civilization; but by showing the non- European cultures already civilized with the advent of their own system of carrying out different things- administrative, social, agricultural and others, it also abuses them for destroying them. It is the truism that due to colonization many cultures in India, Africa, and Latin America have lost their fundamental and profound cultures and have developed a hybrid variety. So, this has proven the colonial discourse an outright lie.

The novel rampantly rebukes the unfair means used by the westerners to colonize different parts of the world. In saying so, it has shown them the most uncivilized persons of the world. In course of the colonization of India they performed the lack of ethics of war. They came masking themselves as traders but swallowed the whole country. Likewise in Mexico they came as the refugees. When the refuge was granted they instead unleashed havoc upon the country. In the novel Montezuma, the ruler of Aztec empire narrates their diabolic nature thus:

'I am Montezuma, the ruler of the Aztec empire. I had welcomed Cortez as an honoured guest when he arrived in Mexico. But in return,

he unleashed havoc on our clan. As a result, my council and my people turned against me. In spite of it all, I tried to save the Spanish conquistadors from the offensives launched against them by our newly elected King Coahetomac. Fearing that violence would beget further violence, I did not oppose my clan or the new king. Instead, I advised Cortez on how he could escape from the new ruler's army by taking the royal route down south and from there, return to the safety of Spain. (298)

This extract resists the colonial discourse of self-superiority in two ways. Firstly it exposes how deceitful the colonizer people are who betray the one who helps them in hard times. Secondly, it does so by showing the so called uncivilized people being more human than the self proclaimed civilized people. The colonizers are so civilized that they regard the guests as god and help them once they come on their refugee eventhough they are their enemies. But the westerners wait for hard times to smother the helpless.

The novel mocks the inability of westerners who could not understand the significance of many cultural things of the colonizers and thus regarded them as barbaric. So through this instance also the novel resists the self proclamation of colonial superiority. In the novel Montezuma, the Aztec ruler tells to Diaz, the colonial historian-

'Hear me out, historian Bernal Diaz! You were a meat-eating race and so were we. You slaughtered your animals in abattoirs, because you did not owe your gods an account of the animals of you slaughtered. We, the Aztecs and the Incas, were, on the other hand, bound by an oath. We had to account for the number of animals we slaughtered for

our own livelihood. It was why we preferred to slaughter our animals before our gods. What you claim to be human sacrifice was, in reality, animal sacrifice. By sacrificing beasts in our temples, we sought to earn the benevolence of our gods. Such were the fundamental differences between our two civilizations'.(305)

The extract shows that both Christian civilization and Aztecs and Incas were the meat eating civilizations. So, on that ground all of them are equal. But the Europeans regarded themselves supreme because they do not slaughter animals publicly. It does not matter where you slaughter the animals but if you slaughter animals to eat or not. If the people of any civilization do not kill to eat they are the wisest because it shows the respect to all forms of lives. In this ground they can be regarded superior against those meat eating people. But phoniness lies their in the Europeans' rationalization of superior on the basis they eat meat butchered in abattoirs. It merely shows the childishness and absurdity in colonial discourse. In the extract the writer has shown the non- Europeans more civilized because at least they show their faithfulness to god by slaughtering them before god.

Not only this by resisting the western essentialist notion too the novel resists the colonial discourse. By civilization they meant westernization and regarded as the sign of civilization even the debase and the mean thing. In the novel the writer makes the irony of the western people who claim the wild perverted sex as the tinge of civilization:

Mahmood ali summoned prospective witnesses. As he called out them, the curtain rose on a scene of centuries-old cemeteries. As everyone looked on, the gravestones moved aside. From within them emerged intimately entwined naked corpses engaged in sexual intercourse. A

crowd of these corpses was seen making its way to the court. It was a titillating sight, mesmerizing, yet obscene, like a documentary on unbridled lust. It depicted every perverse variation of sexual positions. The fair-complexioned Pandava men were engaged in copulation with the dark-skinned women of their tribes .leading them all was Hernando Cortez, coupled with the dark Marina.

Montezuma squeezed his eyes shut, as did everyone else in the court.

They cried in unison, ‘What is the meaning of this?’

‘We are in the process of civilizing them’, came Cortez’s answer in his harsh voice .(306-7)

This is the most succinct irony of colonial discourse of civilizing the brutes and universalizing tendency. People do have their own technique of immersing into sexual intercourse. But the western colonizers regard their perverted way- involving in intercourse with more than a person at a same time- as civilized and in the name of civilizing they are teaching the debased technique of sex to people. Thus the writer mocks the colonial discourse which equals sex with civilization.

Similarly, another false assumption of colonial discourse is shown in their hasty and unwise partition of India and Pakistan- the division that brought unnatural division of many villages and communities. The writer gives the glimpse of the partition of India and Pakistan thus:

It was a sultry day in July. Cyril Radcliffe was in Mountbatten’s study. He was neither a sociologist nor a geographer. Yet, Mountbatten had assigned this lawyer the task of drawing up the boundary lines between India and Pakistan. Radcliffe had been tersely told: ‘You are to divide

both Punjab and Bengal into two separate parts, following which you will demarcate the international boundary separating and Pakistan.’

‘But I am not suited for this task,’ Radcliffe had protested.

Where are Punjab and Bengal located?

‘You can find them on the map’, was Mounbatten’s reply.

If I am to follow your directives, I must undertake an extensive tour of the region. I have to visit all these places.’

‘That’s not possible. We have no time for that. It’s July now, by 15 August, all the formalities of partition to be complete. Mountbatten’s tone was crispy.(319)

This extract directly opposes the colonial discourse. It says that they were in foreign lands, among other things to teach the people the system of governance or democracy. The act of parting a colossal country in to fragments, in order to grant people the opportunity to rule their land can be justifiable. But the insensitivity and foolishness shown in the extract proves just the opposite. They were never in favour of peace and harmony in their former colonies. They wanted chaos and turmoil there so that their mission and interference could be justified. So, the partition act was accordingly devised. The person who had never visited India, who had neither the knowledge of sociology nor geography was assigned to separate the nations .Likewise what can be the motive of dividing the same places like Panjab and Bengal into two parts each and assigning the parts to separate countries? Is it in favour of harmonious relation between two countries in after partition time? It is never so: it is only to perpetuate the never ending conflict between the countries.

To conclude, Kamleshwar's novel *Kitne Pakistan (Partition)* written in post India-Pakistan partition period (2000) resists the colonial discourse. It shows their motive as business oriented in total. Instead of civilizing and saving the soul of people they just made the colonizers more barbaric and even bereft of their fundamental cultures. And their agreement and execution of India- Pakistan partition was also never to teach people democracy and to create the opportunity for self rule but to perpetuate the relentless conflict on which background colonial time could be seen peaceful and harmonious.

IV:Conclusion

In *Kitne Pakistan (Partition)* [2000], Kamleshwar, an Indian prolific novelist talks about the human suffering of the world in general. And particularly, it deals with the trauma of the people of Indian subcontinent basically those of India and Pakistan resulted by the violent partition of India and Pakistan in the wake of its independence from British colonial rule in 1947. The violent partition had claimed the lives of hundreds of thousand people. In the novel the writer imagines the precolonial India with all peace and harmony among the people. In doing so, he delineates the intrusion of British people onto the subcontinent as the trader and their subsequent interference over the administration of India through foul means.

Kamleshwar, the prolific Indian writer revisits some of the historical facts in his novel *Partition*. He talks about the demolition of Ram mandir, a famous Hindu temple of Ayodhya and the erection of Babari Masjid, the temple of Muslims. Similarly, he remembers the first arrival of the Bretons as trader and their subsequent stay and capture of the administrative power of India making it their colony. Not only that his speaker and other characters give multiple interpretations of the historical facts. All the novel does to resist the colonial discourse. It shows their motive was business oriented in total. In stead of civilizing and saving the soul of people they just made the colonizers more barbaric and even bereft of their fundamental cultures. And their agreement and execution of India- Pakistan partition was also never to teach people democracy and to create the opportunity for self rule but to perpetuate the relentless conflict on which background colonial time could be seen peaceful and harmonious.

Work cited

- Abrams, M.A. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th ed. USA: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1993. Bangalore: Prism Books, 1993.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Introduction. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Postcolonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.1-3.
- ,eds. General Introduction. *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995. 1-4.
- Beadle, Gordon B. "George Orwell's Literary Studies of Poverty in England." *Twentieth Century Literature*. 24.2.(Summer 1978): 188-201.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.
- Crick, Bernard. *George Orwell: A Literary Life*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1996.
- Drabble, Margaret. Ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Rev. Ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.
- During, Simon. "Post Modernism or Postcolonialism Today." *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London: Routledge, 1995. 125-129.
- Fanon, Franz. *Black Skin White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lamb Markmann. New York: Grove Press, 1967.
- The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press 1967.
- Foucault, Michael. "Method." *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1. Trans. Robert Hoxely New York: Vintage, 1990. 92-102.

---Truth and Power. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York:

Harcourt Brace, 1992, 1134-1145.

Kerr, Douglas. "Colonial Habitats: Orwell and Woolf in the Jungle" *English Studies*

78.2 (1997): 149-161.

Rusdie, Salman. Ed. *Imaginary Homelands: Essay and Criticisms*. 1981-1991.

London Grant and Penguin Books, 1992. 9-21.

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1993.

---, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. 3rd ed. Harmondsworth:

Penguin, 1991.

---, *The World, The Text and The Critic*. Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1983.

Selden Ramen and Peter Widdeson. *A Reader's Guide to contemporary Literary*

Theory. New York: Wheat Sheaf, 1993.