

Tribhuvan University

Discourse of Trauma in Indian English Punjabi Partition Fiction

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirement of the Degree of M. Phil. in English

By

Dadhi Ram Panthi

M. Phil. Programme

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

December 2012

Approval Letter

The dissertation entitled “**Discourse of Trauma in Indian English Punjabi Partition Fiction**” submitted by Mr. Dadhi Ram Panthi to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University for the partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy in English has been approved by the underdesigned members of the Research committee.

_____ □ □ □

Internal Examiner

Dr. Beerendra Pandey

External Examiner

Head of Department

Dr. Amma Raj Joshi

December 2012

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my thanks to the members of the M. Phil committee of Central Department of English for providing me with the opportunity to write the dissertation. First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Beerendra Pandey, Associate Professor, T.U., without whose suggestions, guidance,

and inspiration, the research would have been impossible. I am highly grateful to him and indebted to him and would like to thank him for his insightful and influential support in completing the research on Indian partition.

I am highly encouraged and would like to thank Dr. Shiva Rijal, my external supervisor, for his insightful comments and suggestions. I am equally grateful to Prof. Dr. Abhi Subedi, Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Dr. Amma Raj Joshi, Dr. Anirudra Thapa, Dr. Sanjeev Uprety, Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. RC Poudel, Dr. Tara Lal Shrestha, Dr. Rebati Neupane, Mr. Jiblal Sapkota, Mr. Puspa Acharya and other intellectuals who provided me their inspiring and critical comments in drafting the dissertation. Similarly, I am effusive in my gratitude to my father Tulsi Ram Panthi, mother Tika Panthi, uncle Lal Mani Panthi, brothers Top Lal Panthi, Muma Ram Panthi, Puna Ram Panthi, Sister Pabitra Panthi, daughter Lochan Panthi and my wife, Jenny Panthi (Mina), who inspired me to keep on writing.

Finally, I would like to thank all my seniors, juniors, relatives and colleagues who supported me directly or indirectly for the completion of the research. I am always thankful to Prof. Dr. Shekhar Gurung, Mr. Umanath Pandey, Associate professor, T.U., Dr. Bishnu K.C., Dr. Ganesh Raj Adhikari, Bishnu Prasad Panta, Prayag Raj Bhattarai, Bimal Wagle, Chandra Prasad Tripathi, Chandra Prasad Panta, Mohan Mani Pokhrel, Purshottam Acharya, Surendra Shrestha, Bhishma Raj Subedi, Prem Niraula, Arjun Baral, Lalita Upadhyay, Birendra Dahal, Mani Parajuli, L. B. Basnet, Gyan Mani Adhikari, Dibakar Sharma, Ghanshyam Kafle, Balram Devekota, Bidur Dahal, Prakash Raut, Achut Dahal, Binod Panta, Narayan Nepal, Narayan Panta, Purna Singh Karki, Hom Nath Khanal, Rajesh Panthi, Lekhnath Panthi, Tara Panthi, Jib Raj Panthi, Uma Pandey, Shiva Pandey, Mira Pandey, Nabin Pandey, Rabin Pandey, Susma Pandey, and all my well wishers.

Dadhi Ram Panthi

December 2012

Abstract

The literary texts on Indian Partition in 1947 condemn the violence that affected millions of lives. The condemnation in Indian English novels by the Sikh writers is ethical in contrast to the condemnation by Hyder and Manto whose

representation is inflected with humanistic moral concerns. The dissertation argues that the representation of the partition trauma by the Indian Punjabi Sikh writers follow the ethical lines to forge a Sikh nationhood while the trauma of the victims of the partition violence in Hyder and in Manto condemns itself. In order to come to the conclusion, the dissertation has applied trauma theory as the tool of analysis. The ethics of Sikhs' cultural trauma is directly related to patch up the tear in the fabric of their identity -- a tear that was caused by the events of 1947. As they try to patch up the tear, they draw on their age-old discourse of demonizing the Muslims. This kind of representation adds to the bitterness even as it leads to a group consciousness. Punjabi Muslim writers like Manto and Hyder do not go for strengthening group consciousness of a Muslim or a Sikh or a Hindu. Their spotlight is on capturing the group consciousness of the victims of the partition violence. That consciousness is the experience of trauma itself. Trauma -- in its pure form -- has agency in their writings. The agency of trauma is a welcome far cry from the discourse of cultural trauma in the writings by the Sikhs

Table of Contents

1. Issues in the Representation of the History of Partition of India	1-21
--	------

2.	A Critical Introduction to Partition Literature from the Perspective of Trauma Theory	22-31
3.	Prose of Demonization in Sikhs' Narrativization of Partition Trauma in <i>The Rape, Twice Born Twice Dead</i> , and <i>Ashes and Petals</i>	32-53
4.	Moral Representation of Trauma in Hyder and Manto	54-67
5.	Conclusion: Discourse of Trauma and the Canonization of Indian Partition Literature	68-70

Chapter 1: Issues in the Representation of the History of Partition of India

The concept of partition emerges from the partition of the Indian-Sub continent, the collapse of the Soviet Union and former Yugoslavia, the reunification of Germany, the continuing feud between the two Koreas, the Irish peace process, and the case of Israel and Palestine. Ranabir Samaddar introduces partition as an “infamous event” (1). He takes it as a phenomenon that generates division and ruptures through which nation dies and re-emerges. Partition is the birth story and end story of nations. Partition in modern times is connected to the interaction between statehood and nationhood. From the perspective of partition, nation is seen as a problem. Partition not only shows how a nation becomes a fully empowered political society but it also shows how a nation emerges as a state. Partition is viewed as a form of transition and transition refers to transgression. The nation loses its federal character and its dialogic space dramatically narrows down. Nation suffers in terms of its dramatic quality in partition. Partition as transition poses challenge to democracy in its historical journey more than it does to the nation truth. Samaddar further defines partition as, “undefinable acts and ...a global process” (142). The unfolding of India's partition in 1947 suggests that partition is not just one singular event. The history leading up to 1947 shows that there are three partitions. First is the idea of partition as a homeland of the Muslims. Second is the partition that entailed the splitting up of the Muslim majority provinces of Punjab and Bengal and third; partition as massacres, mass displacement and the nightmares that people would have to live through for decades to come. Nation, otherness and dialogues combine into the story of how modern states arise out of nationhood, which is only a different way of saying how nations come of age. In partition, personal rules become more powerful than universal moral values. In fact, partition is a dramatic event that destroys families, friendship, and the sense of belonging and ideas of country.

Historiography of Indian partition refers to ideological representation of the trauma of violence in the partition of India in 1947. History of partition is the history of violence and trauma. Partition historiography tries to cover the issues of the concept of partition violence, nationhood, history, civilization, ahistoricity of violence, concept of nation, modern state, memory history and disciplinary history, morality of memory history, illusion of choice, and concept of home and so on.

Partition historiography is the ideological function of partition. For example, in *Remembering Partition*, Gyanendra Pandey explains:

From the 1940s to today, a great deal has been written about the partition of India and the violence and whatever is written is ideological function of partition known as historiography which is very different from that of Holocaust literature. (3)

Partition focuses on a moment of rupture and genocidal violence, marking the termination of one regime and the inauguration of the two new ones. The defective aspect in writing the history of trauma is that community and nationhood are given central focus rather than expressing the victimhood of the victims. In the Indian partition of 1947, several hundred thousand people were estimated to have been killed, unaccountable numbers raped and converted; and many millions up-rooted and transformed into official refugees as a result of what have been called the partition riots. The boundaries between the two new states India and Pakistan were not officially known until two days after they had formally become independent. Partition historiography refers to official history. Official history works to produce the 'truth', the truth of the violence of 1947. It denies the force and eventfulness of partition. Gyanendra Pandey views history of trauma should be written as objectively as possible without normalizing the struggle:

When history is written as a history of struggle, it tends to exclude the dimensions of force, uncertainty, domination and disdain, loss and confusion, by normalizing the struggle, evacuating it of its messiness... I wish to ask how one might write a history of an event involving genocidal violence, following all the rules and procedures of disciplinary 'objective' history... (5)

Gyanendra Pandey's intervention marks an important advance in the process of re-thinking the history of partition, of nationhood and of national politics in the Indian subcontinent. Real trauma of the victims cannot be represented through disciplinary history because it gives emphasis on politics rather than presenting the experience of the trauma of violence. In fact, partition is violence, which is a cataclysm, a world torn apart. This cataclysm must find room in the history books. Literary narratives have trend to write this cataclysm as the history of the partition of India, but its configuration follows the lines of community and nationhood. For Gyanendra Pandey such configuration diverts the focus away from the specificity of the violence to the prose of otherness. In this connection, Gyanendra Pandey says:

I have been concerned with the question of how communities are constructed and how national as well as local traditions are reconstructed, through the language of violence. In its course, we have observed that the reconstruction of community, and of local community, depends upon particular reconstructions of the past and sought to emphasize the instability of new subject positions. (204)

The reconstitution of community and nationhood in partition historiography of India has led to redefinition of Sikhs, Muslims and Hindus as butchers or as devious others; as untrustworthy and antinational; but perhaps most fundamentally, as Sikhs and

Muslims and Hindus alone. Since 1947 men, women and children belonging to different castes, classes, occupations, linguistic and cultural background have been seen in terms of their Sikhness, Muslimness or their Hinduness.

Partition has actually proved to be a trauma from which the Indian sub-continent has never fully recovered. Actual trauma is not reflected in its history writing, a fact that is lamented by many. Rituparna Roy remarks in this connection, "There is not just a lack of great literature, there is more seriously, a lack of great history" (18). So literature seems to be more powerful in the representation of trauma than historiography of the trauma of violence. Indian historiography has focused more on independence than on partition, more on the unifying force of nationalism than the divisive forces that rent the country in 1947. Roy finds faults in the representation of trauma both in elites and subaltern as he asserts, "It is a fact that both elite historiography and subaltern history were geared towards nationalism and Independence what got left out from the narratives of both was partition" (19). It clearly shows that nation, nationalism and community can be defined through the process of construction and re-construction. At the beginning of the twenty first century, it is perhaps time to see and recognize modern nation and the nation state also as alterable, malleable, and historical constructions of this kind.

The Sikhs' view of the history of the Indian subcontinent is rooted in that imaginary for a Sikh homeland. So far as the Sikh view of the history of partition is concerned, it can be said that their demand was a separate state exclusively for the Sikhs to be carved out of the erstwhile Punjab province that was to be divided into India and Pakistan. The idea of the partition was, in a sense, an outcome of the election of the electorates. The right of separate representation was granted to the Muslims in 1909. It was extended to other communities in 1919. It gave impetus to

communal consciousness to different communities including the Sikhs. In this connection, Kirpal Singh says, "Punjab was the only province where the majority community namely, the Muslims had been granted the right of separate representation which was vehemently opposed by the Sikhs and Hindus" (146). The envisaged partition of Punjab was going to benefit the Muslims because they were playing a second fiddle to the Hindu - Sikh combines because the Hindus and the Sikhs dominated the fields of industry, commerce, trade and banking. Kirpal Singh's point is that the Sikhs desired the partition of Punjab for their "decisive voice" (146). They, however, could not get Sikhism, but their stance ultimately saved a brief chunk of Punjab for India. This role of the Sikhs stuck to the gizzard of the Muslims. So, their anger against the Sikhs came out in the form of organized and targeted attacks on them during the partition violence. The Sikhs wanted to pay the Muslims back in the same coin, but Mahatma Gandhi was the war hurdle. So they argue that the whole Indian partition is the result of Mahatma Gandhi's failure where as the partition of Punjab and Bengal is the result of Jinnah's failure who was driven to demand a separate Islamic nation excluding Hindus and Sikhs. Neither the Sikhs supported Nehru's Congress nor Jinnah's League as both were against the interests of the Sikhs. J.S. Grewal, in this sense, strongly agrees with the Sikhs and says, "just as the partition of the Indian subcontinent marked Mahatma Gandhi's failure and the partition of the Punjab (and Bengal) underline Jinnah's failure" (129). Moreover, the act of 1919 introduced separate electorates for the Sikhs with a weightage at the cost of both Hindus and Muslims.

The Sikh leader, Tara Singh, blames the British government of not being aware about the feelings of the Sikhs; instead the government fulfilled the interests of

the Muslims. It is true that the feelings against the Muslims can be read, for example, into his response to the cabinet Mission's plan of 1946:

The cabinet Mission recognizes the genuine and acute anxiety among the Sikhs lest they should find themselves subjected to a perpetual Muslim majority rule. If the British government is not aware of Sikh feelings, the Sikhs will have to resort to some measures to convince every body of the Sikh anxiety in case they are subjected to perpetual Muslim domination. (164)

The central theme of the Sikh policy was to ensure a distinct identity of the Sikhs as a minority community. The congress treated the Sikh position in the Punjab as minor, even an unimportant question. But for the Sikh leadership it was a question of the survival of the community. This becomes amply clear when the Nehru committee Report was published in 1928. Tara Singh's perspective approach to their crisis enabled him to give new direction to Sikh politics. Prithipal Singh Kapur in 'The Role of Master Tara Singh' appreciates Master Tara Singh as, "Tara Singh's perspective approach to this crisis enabled him to give a new direction to Sikh politics. He stood for a vigorous participation of the Sikhs in the freedom Struggle"(61). In 1921, the Muslim population in the undivided Punjab was 55 percent and this increased to 57 percent in 1941. The Hindu and the Sikhs together 43 percent of the total population; the Sikhs constituted 13 percent out of that. This situation compelled Master Tara Singh to depend on congress support and also maintain harmonious relationship with smaller political groups of the Hindus. Master Tara Singh could see clearly that the communal tangle in the Punjab would result in the partition of the Punjab and he mentioned this apprehension to Mahatma Gandhi in 1931. The Pro- British Sikh elite organized the Khalsa National party to challenge Tara Singh's Pro-congress stance at

a time when the Sikhs of large were feeling disgusted with congress leaders' ambivalent approach towards such emotional matters as the Sis Ganj (Lahore) tangle and the conversion of untouchables to Sikhism. Tara Singh still held his ground and did not choose to break with congress. The 1937 election represented a total collapse for the Muslim league. The result of 1937 election showed that the Sikh voters preferred an independent policy to be pursued for the protection of Sikh interests in the face of the danger of the permanent Muslim hegemony in Punjab. Tara Singh wanted the Sikhs to enlist in the army. He believed that India was going to inherit the army that would see action in the war. He even wanted Indian industry to take to the production of war material. Gandhi overreacted to this approach of Master Tara Singh and condemned him for his narrow outlook and concerns for his community only. Both Gandhi and Nehru failed to appreciate this. Master Tara Singh was deeply committed to the Independence of India. Tara Singh's redistribution approach favors the Sikh community as he argues, "Sikhs cannot attain their rightful position or protect their interests effectively unless Punjab is redistributed into two provinces with Ravi forming the boundary between them" (66). In order to salvage the Sikh position, the Akali leaders led by Master Tara Singh began to put forth various proposals aimed at reorganization or partition of the Punjab. From the movement the Pakistan resolution was adopted in 1940; the Muslim league leadership had also been conscious about the possibility of partition of the Punjab.

Prithipal Singh Kapur further highlights the role of Master Tara Singh as he raised the voices of Sikhs to go against the slavery of Muslim and Hindus as he asserts:

Master Tara Singh tried to clear the air by declaring that the Sikhs wanted to avoid the perpetual slavery of both the Hindus and Muslims

and they also wished to have a share in the political power and not merely a change of masters. As the demand for the partition of Punjab grew, this scheme became irrelevant. But the importance of this scheme has to be seen as a first popular formulation of territorial re-arrangement as means of protection of the Sikh community. (67)

During the deliberations, Master Tara Singh did not soften his opposition to Pakistan and contended that he would demand a Sikh state in central Punjab on the analogy of Palestine which had been declared a Jewish homeland even though the Jews formed only ten percent of the population. This made the British official seriously think about the partition of Punjab. Tara Singh emerged from the Assembly building followed by the legislators, the crowd shouted “Pakistan zindabad.” Master Tara Singh and his follower retaliated by chanting “Pakistan Murdabad” which was the spell of Master Tara Singh’s courage. Among the Sikh masses, a rumour spread in the city that Master Tara Singh had torn the League flag but Master Tara Singh denied it. A few days later Tara Singh’s house in his village Rawalpindi district was burnt down and he was slapped with shoes. In fact, the Sikh leader, Tara Singh proved to be the leader of farsighted vision who promised not to compromise with what he called the enemies to the Muslims. However, he did try to get an assurance of the congress leaders.

A distrust of the Muslim and, therefore, a spotlight on their perfidious attitude remains at the centre of the Sikhs’ historiography of the partition of 1947. Sikh writings on Indian partition seem to be represented ideologically that mainly tends to highlight the Sikhs as if they are superior to the Muslims. In representing their issues; they seem to be quite hostile and inimical to the Muslims, where as they are less

critical of the Hindus. They are also wary about the Muslims' ways of life. In this connection, Mc Lead's remark is revealing:

Never associate with a Muslim nor trust his word. Never drink water from a Muslim's hands, never eat his food, and never sleep in his company. Do not be influenced by anything which a Muslim may say. Never touch a Muslim woman. Never eat meat from animals killed according to Muslim rites. Do not distribute or eat Karah Prasad in the company of Muslims. Never eat sweets or any other food offered as an oblation by a Muslim official. Do not hold religious discourse with Muslims. A Sikh should never entrust the management of his household affairs to a Muslim. A Sikh should never entrust his sword to a Muslim and then walk ahead unarmed. Never attend the mourning ceremony for a deceased Muslim. Never touch the feet of a Mughal nor eat food which he leaves. (163)

The major tension of the Sikhs is not merely the tension of territory but of racial as well as religious conflict. They see Sikhism as opposed to Islam and look upon themselves as defenders of the Hindus. This rule became complicated due to the partition of India, more pertinently the division of the Punjab. So this anxiety characterizes the Sikhs' historiography of the event of partition.

What the partition of 1947 meant for the Sikhs was the threat to their homeland - - both cultural and agricultural. So a sense of rootedness to the land of the Punjab is also at the center of the Sikh historiography. If there is a criticism of the Sikh leader in not being able to secure the homeland, there is a sense of acquiescence to bring along with the Hindus rather than the Muslim. So, in a nutshell, alignment

with the Hindus and antagonism against the Muslims mark Sikhs historiography of 1947.

The Sikhs' view of the Partition violence of the Punjab is that of the genocide of non-Muslims by the Muslims. The Muslims and the Muslim League are more to be blamed for the partition violence and its attendant horrors than the Hindus and the Indian National Congress. Their position on Punjab violence is that they take Muslim League as the responsible factor in creating violence and they also give the Congress a clean chit as far as culpability for the ultimate division of the sub-continent. Sixty years of economic rivalry, fostered and promoted by the insidious British Policy of 'Divide and Rule' and generation of separate electorates created and widened the gulf between the Muslims and non-Muslims of India. The efforts of the Congress to bridge the gulf had some measure of success and a final break was avoided for a considerable time. So both the Congress and the Muslim League became failure in maintaining peace and order in the sub-continent of India. The Sikhs had growing tribute to Congress secularism rather than the sectarian policies of the Muslims. The Sikhs argue that the Congress failed due to its rigid ideological or organizational structure. They claim that the Muslim League's failure is none other than their sectarian policy. Generally, the violence of west Punjab refers to the Muslim atrocities against non-Muslim and the violence of the East Punjab refers to the non-Muslim atrocities against Muslims or it is the retaliation against the Muslims. What happened in West Punjab was re-enacted in East Punjab on an equally large scale and with equal ferocity. The same barbarities, inhuman murders, savage outrages, atrocities against women and children were witnessed. The policy of the Muslims in West Punjab was to drive the non-Muslims out of Punjab. Retaliation took place in East Punjab as the non-Muslims could not bear the savagery of the Muslims. The Muslim

League officially proposed two nation theory for the first time in 1940 Lahore resolution but it was opposed by the non-Muslims. The Sikhs claim that Muslims' biggest enemy is their personal law. In West Punjab, there was a sense of frustration rather than actual loss. The Muslim League blew it sky high. Basu Tapan, points out the weaknesses of the Muslim League and the Congress both who failed to maintain unity in Indian sub-continent. In this connection he argues:

The failure of the Muslim League and Indian National Congress, pointing out, on the one hand, the intellectual insufficiency of the former's demand for a Muslim homeland and, on the other, the strategic impracticality of the latter's plans to make the bulk of the Muslim masses feel at home with the idea of an united India. (106)

The glimpse of Punjab during partition India was that a Sikh or a Hindu dared not show his face in the West Punjab where he and his forefathers had lived for centuries and a Muslim was forced to abandon his native soil, his home and his property in East Punjab. Before the partition the Muslims and the Sikhs lived together as neighbours. There was no any doubt among them. There were Hindu villages, Muslim villages and Sikh villages. Religion had never interfered with social relations to any great extent. The unifying force of geographical entity, historical and cultural influences, extending over a period of ten centuries, had welded the various elements into a homogenous whole. This was scarcely surprising for more than 90% of the Muslims and Sikhs population consisted of converts from Hinduism and belonged to the same stock and had the same traditions as the Hindus. The Muslims went to play Holi with their Hindu friends while Hindus always went to their Muslim friends on the occasion of Id festival. Unity in variety had been insisted upon as a peculiar characteristic of India. This was not a piece of wishful thinking but a true statement of

the actual state of affairs. The British officials brought fraction in the communal harmony of the Indians. Gopal Das Khosla, in this connection, writes:

Hindus and Muslims began to assert themselves as separate entities by withdrawing themselves from each other's festivals, by wearing different dress, observing distinctive manners, and by each demanding a separate language and educational institutions. Hindu culture and Muslim cultures were now mentioned as distinct and irreconcilable conceptions. (6)

The Sikhs argue that the desire for power both in Hindus and Muslims is the major cause of Punjab violence and the Muslims were more responsible because they had separatist mentality. It seems there was the sense of communal supremacy rooted both in the Hindus and the Muslims. The Hindus raised the cry of "Hindi, Hindu and Hindustan" (8). The Muslims wanted to dominate the Hindus' demand as they expressed:

There is not an inch of the soil of India which our fathers did not once purchase with their blood. We cannot be false to the blood of our fathers. India, the whole of it, is therefore our heritage and it must be reconquered for Islam. Expansion in the spiritual sense is an inherent necessity of our faith and implies no hatred or enmity towards the Hindus. Rather the reverse. Our ultimate ideal should be the unification of India, spiritually as well as politically, under the banner of Islam. The final political salvation of India is not otherwise possible. (8)

The major concern of the Muslims in this sense is the concern of Muslimness both at spiritual level or at the political but the Hindus opposed their move that led to a growing animosity between the Muslims and the non-Muslims. The British officials

tried to maintain unity between Hindus and Muslims but at this juncture their attempt fizzled out. Hindus and Muslims henceforth began to have distinct and antagonistic political aspirations. The Muslim leader Mr. Jinnah had no desire or intention to come to terms with the Congress. He maintained an arrogant and unbending attitude towards all attempts at settlement. He refused even to formulate concrete demands. The Muslim League, the council of All-India Muslim League is convinced that now the thing has come for the Muslim nation to resort to direct action. It is clearly assumed that the Muslims were really violent during the time of their direct action. In this critical situation Mr. Jinnah did not compromise with the non-Muslims. Instead he expressed, "I am not going to discuss ethics" (43). They started their 'Direct Action' upon non-Muslims. The Muslims Proclaimed, "Direct Action means any action against the law" (43). The Muslims totally opposed Hindu rule and their leaders started their direct action. For the Muslims, Congress rule meant Hindu tyranny and the total annihilation of Muslim culture. The Muslim leaders violently announced, "We shall then see who will play with us, for rivers of blood will flow. We shall have the swords in our hands and the noise of takbir. Tomorrow will be doom's day" (53). The Sikh leader Master Tara Singh in press interview to a representative of the New York Times on 28th February remarks:

I do not see how we can avoid civil war. There can be no settlement if the Muslims want to rule the Punjab. We cannot trust the Muslims under any circumstances. The Sikhs had the ability to keep the Muslims out of Eastern Punjab but why should we stop there. We shall drive them out of the Punjab entirely.... (Qtd. In Khosla 100)

The Punjab violence in Sikhs' perspective is that it was communal and its main purpose was to be free from the domination of the Muslims. Tara Singh strongly

opposed the Muslim League and he called on the Sikhs to prepare themselves to face the Muslim League onslaught and towards this end to organize the “Akal Fauj” (Khosla 99). The major tension for the Sikhs was not the tension of the Muslims; rather they had the tension of the British Government. Tara Singh encourages the mass of the Sikhs and Hindus announcing:

...O Hindu and Sikhs! Be ready for self-destruction like the Japanese and the Nazis. Our mother is calling for blood and we shall satiate the thirst of our mother with blood ...If we can snatch the Government from the Britishers no one can stop us from snatching the Government from the Muslims ...The world has always been ruled by minorities. The Muslims snatched the kingdom from the Hindus and the Sikhs grabbed it from the hands of the Muslims and the Sikhs ruled over the Muslims with their might and the Sikhs shall even now rule over them and we will get the Government, fighting. I have sounded the bugle. Finish the Muslim League. (100)

The Punjab violence was quite fierce. The men were shot or put to the sword. In some places small children were thrown in cauldrons of boiling oil. Men and women who refused to embrace Islam were collected together and after a ring of brambles and firewood had been placed around them they were burnt alive. A woman threw her four month old baby to save it from burning. The infant was impaled upon a spear and thrown back into the fire. In East Punjab the non Muslims had been struggling against the Muslim League both inside and outside. But the policy of the Muslim League members of the Interim Government was to create obstruction and they maintained that they had entered office merely to fight for Pakistan. Though unrest and lawlessness were spreading all over the nation anarchy prevailed in the

Punjab. Mr. Nehru and his colleagues felt tired and helpless. Frustration and chaos stared them in the face. Eventually they were compelled to accept partition. They agreed to partition. They withdrew their opposition to the establishment of a separate independent state carved out of a united India attacks by Muslims in West Punjab and were followed by counter-attacks by Sikhs and Hindus in East Punjab. Muslims and non –Muslims viewed with each other in degrading themselves to the lowest level of the barbarity. What had been happening in West Punjab since March began to happen in East Punjab in August and the grim sport of murder and rapine was played on both sides with equal ferocity. The Government of India and the East Punjab Government mobilized all their resources to quell the disturbances, the West Punjab Government encouraged to the rowdy elements by many official and unofficial acts. The Muslim mob looted the refugees and killed several hundreds of them. The dead bodies were carried in trucks to the canal bank and thrown in the water. A young girl was found on the roadside four days later. She had been raped by several Muslims and then left for dead. The Muslims attacked not only in the cities but also in the villages as well.

Gopal Das Khosla writes:

In the rural areas, village after village was attacked by Muslims mobs...seventy- three different villages and towns were attacked and there were ninety distinct major incidents. In addition, on thirty nine different occasions...The total loss of life was considerable and the value of property looted or destroyed, ran into several crores of rupees.

(166)

The non-Muslims experienced great difficulties in travelling to India. All the non-Muslim houses were plundered and the non-Muslims abandoned their houses and took shelter in other's houses .When the Non-Muslims came out they were attacked

and most of them were killed. Some young girls were kidnapped. The non-Muslims were forcibly converted to Islam. The entire property of the non-Muslims was looted after they had left for refugee camp. Muslim houses were displaying Muslim League flags to distinguish them from the non-Muslim houses. People were thrown from the house tops like balls. Young girls were abducted. The non-Muslims could not even go out to ease themselves although Muslims moved about freely. The Hindus found themselves outnumbered. The non-Muslims abandoned their houses and shops. The shops and houses were looted and the mass massacre of the non-Muslims followed. The survivors were forcibly converted to Islam and were made to eat beef. The dead bodies were thrown in the rivers. The non-Muslim shops were looted and many of them were ejected from their houses. Their dead bodies were then taken to a Hindu temple and burnt. A large number of non-Muslims lost their lives and many young girls were carried away. Men and women were searched for valuables on their persons. Many young girls attempted suicide by jumping into wells. Some of them were rescued and carried away. The entire non-Muslim property was then pooled and divided among the rioters. The non-Muslim shops, houses and factories were pillaged. The west Punjab Government was anxious to drive out all non-Muslims and more particularly the Sikhs. In explaining the 'Exodus' of West Punjab G. D. Khosla asserts:

The non-Muslims of the Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Sind and Bengal could never consent to leave their lands, the industry and commerce they had built up with their money and labor....The dream of exchanging populations on a voluntary basis was impossible of realization and the Muslim League had to find another way of resolving the difficulty. (220)

There was a storm of protest from non-Muslims all over India. The Sikhs in the Punjab would not tolerate any more to this end. The Muslims seemed quite optimistic about the principle of the Muslim League and believed that the Muslim League will do everything possible to protect the minorities living in the Muslim majority areas and will even be prepared to give what help is possible for any plans of strengthening the sense of security among Hindus where they happen to be living as a scattered minority. The Sikhs had opposed the partition of India with even greater vigor than the Hindus because they could only expect disaster in Pakistan; it was, therefore, against the Sikhs that the spear-point of the Muslims league attack was first aimed. The Sikhs had asked for the partition of the Punjab and the Congress leaders had taken the matter up with the viceroy and Mr. Jinnah. There was a danger that Pakistan might lose Lahore, as the Sikhs were agitating for the Chenab as the boundary line between the two countries. In the beginning of August the Sikhs began to attack the Muslims in the rural areas. In the city of Amritsar, the loss of Muslim life was almost equal to the loss of non-Muslim life during May and June, though non-Muslims sustained considerably heavier loss of property. In Lahore too, the non-Muslims were fighting a losing battle as the Muslim magistracy and police were openly supporting the Muslim league hooligans.

The Government of India had to cope with, or the difficulties of transporting, feeding, housing, looking after and providing medical aid to four million people. All over west Punjab, the non-Muslims felt the urgency of leaving Pakistan where, within a day or two, conditions of life became impossible and destruction was the only alternative left. Every train was packed inside and outside; people climbed on to the roof and sat balanced precariously on the carved surface. They stood on the footboards, clinging to door –handles, exposed to the hazards of a shower of stones or

a volley of bullets. For hours the trains were stopped, for no ostensible reason, while the passengers suffered the agonies of exposure to the sweltering heat of the Sun. No food was provided, water was unobtainable. Train after train was attacked by bands of hooligans and armed national guards. There was no time to pause and grieve over the dead ones. The caravan had to march on a caravan of a defeated people in flight. The Government of India did all they could to alleviate the suffering of their people. Airplanes carried foods loaded with provisions were sent. There were several attacks on refugee trains. A number of women were raped at the spot and many young girls were kidnapped. One of them was killed and the other was injured; the guns of both were taken away. The passengers were dragged out and done to death. The train was ransacked and thoroughly looted. There was heavy loss of life. Day after day, week after week, the non-Muslims from West Punjab continued to pour across the border in trains, Lorries, aeroplanes, bullock-carts and on foot, till, by the end of December 1947, four millions of them had come to India. All of them had left behind their property and valuables. The majority of them had suffered bereavement; their bodies sick and wounded, their souls bruised with the shock of horror, they came to a new home. There was discomfort in the refugee camps and the future held out uncertain hopes but, at last, their lives were free from danger and the horror of their women folk was safe.

In the newly created province of Sind, the Hindus were mostly petty shopkeepers, poor laborers or tenants of Muslim Zamindars. Their impression once again is that the Hindus had resigned themselves to the theory that the Muslims of Sind belonged to a superior class and were entitled to treat the Hindus as their underlings. Many claimed that Sind is not fit for reform. The Muslim leaders of Sind gave pressure for Hindus expressing:

Let the Hindus of Sind leave Sind and go elsewhere. Let them go while the going is good and Possible, else I warn them that a time is fast coming when in their flight from Sind. They may not be able to get a horse or an ass or a gari or any other means of transport. (244)

The Muslims thought that weapons and their religious principles were the major means of winning war. They expressed, "Take your sword in one hand and your Quran in the other and win for Islam a superior position" (245). The attitude of the Sind Muslims towards the Hindus became increasingly arrogant and overbearing. Hindus were not allowed to sell movable or immovable property. Hindu houses all over the town were attacked. Hindus property and schools were attacked and burnt. Trains of Hindu refugees from the rural areas were attacked and looted. The arrival of the Muslim refugees from East Punjab acted as a spark on this mass of inflammable material and set the whole Province ablaze. The condition of the Muslim dominated North-West Frontier Province was quite miserable. At the census of 1941 the total population of the North-West Frontier Province was 30.38 lakhs of which 91.79 percent were Muslims. It has been said that the Muslim loves his gun more than his personal freedom which he exalts to the level of license. The defeat of the Muslim league in the general election of February 1946, gave rise to a feeling of frustration among the league leaders. They proclaimed that Hindu- Nehru was responsible for the bombing. Pandit Nehru was described as the murderer of the Muslims in Calcutta. The Hindu and Sikh shops were looted and set fire to. The civil disobedience movement started by the Muslim League towards the end of February 1947 and began to poison the atmosphere in the entire Province and disturbances were witnessed in almost all the districts. The Muslim leaders began to convert Hindu to Islam and many of them had to be evacuated under Military escort. The entire Muslim

population withdrew and entrenched themselves in a distant quarter of the city from where they watched the destruction of their property in helpless despair. Business and trade were almost entirely in the hands of Hindus and Sikhs.

G. D. Khosla in 'Retaliation' writes about the revenge against the Muslims by the Hindus and the Sikhs. The violence of the East Punjab means the atrocities of the Hindus and the Sikhs against Muslims. The Hindus and the Sikhs argue, "They related the tales of their sufferings and as their anger mounted, they spoke of revenge and retaliation" (277). The Sikhs made no secret of the resentment they felt at losing their historic shrines and almost the entire rich colony area. The feeling grew that Hindus and Sikhs could now retaliate with impunity and average. Some, at least, of the wrongs suffered at the hands of the Muslims in West Punjab. Muslim life was not less than the loss of non-Muslim life in West Punjab. The attacks on the Muslim were by way of retaliation and began only after several months of a determined and sustained effort to drive the non-Muslims out of West Punjab. The Hindus and Sikhs leaders continued to appeal to the minorities in West Punjab to stay in their homes. The uncompromising Sikh leader Master Tara Singh told the associated press of India on June 26, 1947 that "Non-Muslims of West Punjab should continue to stay on in their homes" (290). The Hindus and Sikhs launched large scale attacks on Muslims by way of retaliation. It was only then that they realized that to drive out the Muslims would furnish an easy solution of their economic problems. They felt that they could not trust the Muslims and their presence in East Punjab was greatly resented. The exodus of Muslims provided them with the opportunity of securing land for the refugees from West Punjab and the drive became wide-spread and relentless till almost the entire Muslim population was evacuated. In the Punjab violence the loss of non-Muslim property is estimated at about twenty thousand million rupees.

Chapter II: A Critical Introduction to Partition Literature from the Perspective of Trauma Theory

The loss of lives and property of the non-Muslims -- Sikhs and Hindus -- from what is today the Pakistani sense of Punjab turned to be quite traumatic for them. Their plight needs to be studied in the light of trauma theory. The nub of trauma theory is that narrativizations of trauma get inflected with cultural politics. The major focus of the thesis is the elaboration of trauma through cultural or communal layers as it focuses on the issues of the Indian Partition of 1947 which was partitioned on the ground of religious-cultural differences.

Trauma refers to a serious bodily injury or shock from an accident or external act of violence. Traditionally trauma is defined as an injury, disturbances and some kind of blow to the body but now trauma does not center just on the body but also on the mind. Sigmund Freud's *Moses and Monotheism*, Cathy Caruth's *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*, Dominick LaCapra's *Writing History*,

Writing Trauma, and *Cultural Trauma* by Jeffrey Alexander, *et al* are considered to be the texts of foundation in defining and elaborating trauma theory and its relevance to the field of literature.

Trauma theory is based on Freud's psychoanalysis that focuses on trauma, repression and symptom formation. In defining trauma Freud raises the issues of dynamics of trauma, repression and symptom formation. So trauma theory is based on Freud's death drive. Freud's theory of psychoanalysis of trauma remains not just on the individual level but it also gives birth to communal consciousness at least to the Jews after the publication of *Moses and Monotheism*. In Freud's perspective trauma can be working through not acting out. About Freudian trauma theory, Allen Meek in *Trauma and Media* writes:

In *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud theorized a trauma that had shaped Jewish identity for over two thousand years...Freud formulated a theory of collective trauma experienced by the Jewish people over long periods of history. This extension of trauma to a theory of history was preoccupied with the tension between the individual (Moses) and the crowd. Moses imposed a demand on his people (Monotheism) that they initially rejected but were unable to free themselves from over time. (18)

Sigmund Freud also highlights the history of the Jews. Jewish history was marginalized history in the past. It refers to the effect of 'latency' of trauma. In terms of trauma theory, there is more realism in traumatic history than in disciplinary history. Moses is the God of the Jews. The Jews were kept in Egypt's prison and Moses liberated the prisoners and sent them into their original places. The work of

Freud is the discontinuity in the history of the Jews. So the Jews have traumatic identity. Their memory is traumatic, so discontinuity continues.

Cathy Caruth appropriates Freud's views on trauma in *Moses and Monotheism* to posit that "trauma describes an overwhelming experience of sudden, or catastrophic events, in which the response to the event occurs in the often delayed, and uncontrolled repetitive occurrence of hallucinations and other intrusive phenomena" (181). Trauma is experience as well as response to a catastrophic event—a response that is delayed. Caruth's argument is that this nature of belatedness makes the access to trauma only constructedly possible. This is why, for her trauma is an unclaimed experience because it cannot be claimed in its originary.

Building on Caruth's notions, Dominick LaCapra's theory of trauma insists on the distinction between working through and acting out the trauma. The distinction is relevant to the aesthetic works that perform trauma without necessarily succumbing to melancholic excess. His insistence on the distinction, however, is far from dogmatic. For LaCapra, in *Writing History, Writing Trauma* (2001) admits that "working through is itself a process that may never entirely transcend acting out and that, even in the best of circumstances, is never achieved once and for all" (148–9). In this vein, literary criticism takes on a special role of "analyzing and 'giving voice' to the past" (186). The most intriguing forms of analysis take the empathic risk of probing trauma without losing the differentiating frame "of an affective relation, rapport, or bond with the other recognized and respected as other" (213–4). LaCapra is not insensitive to the problem of where exactly to locate this fine line between mourning and melancholia. He explains, "...melancholia and mourning are acting-out and working-through-mourning as a crucial mode of working-through and melancholia as a mode of acting-out" (80). Here, he clearly shows melancholia is close to acting-out and mourning is

close to working-through. Working-through of trauma that focuses on mourning is based on Freud's analysis of trauma but acting-out of trauma that focuses on melancholia is the trauma that is deconstructive in nature. About mourning and melancholia, LaCapra further writes:

Mourning should be seen in the larger context of Freud's concept of working-through-a concept that has received relatively little elaboration in important forms of post-Freudian psychoanalysis such as that influenced by Jacques Lacan. Freud compared and contrasted melancholia with mourning. He saw melancholia as characteristic of an arrested process in which the depressed and traumatized self, locked in compulsive repetition, remains narcissistically identified with the lost object. Mourning brought the possibility of engaging trauma and achieving a reinvestment in...life that allowed one to begin again. (81)

Mourning may obviously take collective forms in rituals because mourning represents not only the trauma of an individual but of collectivity. In mourning, there is less possibility of revenge and identity politics. Therefore LaCapra's notion of cultural trauma is that trauma can be acting out which is close to melancholia not mourning which is close to working through. LaCapra does not presume to police the distinction in aesthetic criticism. Instead, he devotes his conclusion to exploring the interplay between performative and analytic modes of literary reading in a highly nuanced consideration of Cathy Caruth's traumatic writing, which remains in many ways exemplary of the kind of "moving rendition" of empathic critique LaCapra proposes (184).

The performative nature of trauma has attracted attention of some sociologists who insist on cultural rather than psychological trauma. For example, Ron Eyerman

defines cultural trauma as, “a dramatic loss of identity and meaning, a tear in the social fabric of a relatively coherent group” (3). This definition of cultural or collective trauma reflects very clearly the common understanding of trauma as a serious form of injury. Cultural trauma is produced and reproduced through media representations; for instance, the trauma of 9/11 in the U.S. The event became traumatic for the U.S citizens but it became the matter of pride for the Muslim community and it was the media that played the role of double standard. Some media represented the event as if it were really traumatic and some represented it as if it were a great blow to the American psyche. So it is clearly seen that cultural trauma itself is not traumatic rather it is the media that makes it traumatic. Jeffrey Alexander, explaining *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, argues:

Cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks on their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways.

(85)

Cultural traumas happen to social groups, national societies, and sometimes even entire civilizations. Cultural trauma is not something naturally existing; it is something constructed by society. Cultural trauma generally tends to follow ethical lines. So trauma theory is the study of the fragmented identity of the self on the basic levels of community and nationhood. Trauma shatters the well- ordered identity of a group or community or nation. The relation of an individual’s trauma to his or her group identity brings up the issues of ethics and morality.

Avishai Margalit, in *The Ethics of Memory*, writes, “Being moral is a required good; being ethical is...an optional good” (105). Morality is the need as it tends to

follow human line so being moral is required good but ethical line is not compulsory as it gives less focus on human values; rather it gives more focus on culture, politics or religion. Margalit's major concern is the concern of thick and thin relations. Ethical relation is thick relation where as moral relation is thin relation. He argues, "Morality is...disqualifying ethical relations" (86). Morality is the basis for disqualifying ethical relations. All proper ethical relations must meet the minimum standard of being moral. Moral witness is more powerful than ethical witness. In this connection, Margalit asserts, "Being a moral witness involves witnessing actual suffering, not just intended suffering. A moral witness has knowledge-by-acquaintance of suffering."(149). Margalit's message is that morality- rather than ethics- inflected narrativization of trauma is what leads to redemption without further stoking the violence through an appeal to identity politics that is practiced in the name of culture. It shows moral mode of representation of the partition violence is far better than ethical mode of representation of the partition violence because ethical mode follows the line of identity politics.

The Indian Partition of 1947 is the drama of the identity politics of the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs. About this, Beerendra Pandey observes:

An exploration of the language of trauma in Indian English partition fiction reveals the presence of cultural trauma in fictional representation -- a presence this functions as a memory to settle old scores rather than a way to escape from the cycle of communal violence. (126)

So cultural trauma tries to legitimize revenge rather than suggesting a way to escape from the cycle of communal violence. This kind of cultural trauma which whips up identity is a defect in the literature of trauma. According to Beerendra Pandey,

cultural trauma works as a memory which tries to rake up old scars and wounds rather than creating the ways to escape from them. He further argues, “A good piece of traumatic literature, instead of constructing an ideological edifice of identity politics, should help highlight the ways through which surrender to such a politics can be avoided” (130). Ideological representation of trauma is defective as it tends to follow the line of identity politics what makes it stick up to ethical lines. Natural representation of trauma is the need of the present which appeals to universal human values. Much of such Indian partition literature, with some exceptions, fails to rise above identity politics. Referring to the ideas of cultural trauma of Alexander and Eyerman, Beerendra Pandey observes:

What the theory of cultural trauma by Alexander and Eyerman 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. (126)

In fact, Indian partition violence itself is not traumatic. It becomes traumatic due to cultural template after which it is configured. Cultural trauma refers to the interplay between traumatized subject and the State -- a relationship which thrives on melancholia rather than mourning. Cultural trauma is close to melancholia rather than mourning because revenge and identity politics are played up through melancholia.

Larry Ray defines “Mourning” and “Melancholia” as:

Complex processes of remembering and forgetting. Mourning enables reconciliation with loss -- and melancholia, where the loss is continually revisited, is vital, intrusive and persistent. The latter becomes a metaphor of modernity in which genocide cannot be presented within traditional historical perspectives. (144-45)

So mourning means reconciliation with the past, i.e., forgetting and melancholic repression of grief followed by the repetition of trauma that cannot be expurgated. It quite clearly shows melancholia playing up the loss for revenge. Due to the melancholic nature of cultural trauma, revenge and identity politics may take place in it. C. Fred Alford's observation is quite relevant here as he argues, "Hatred is ego structuring. It can define a self, commenting it to others, anchoring it in the world, which at the same time acting as a fortress...Hatred creates history, a history that defines the self and provides it with structure and meaning"(Qtd. in Ray 145). Melancholia makes the history of trauma the history of hatred.

Giorgio Agamben stresses on placing the spotlight on *Muselman* that is the extreme victim of violence -- a living dead, a focus on whom helps avoid being melancholic. The *Muselman* whom Agamben also calls *homo sacer* epitomizes in himself or herself the specificity of the horrific violence done to him or her. Geoffrey Hartman comments thus, in *Scars of the Spirit*, in this regard: "Agamben delegates himself ...to be a proxy for the Muselman. Mute and nameless the Muselman...represent [s] as...one who has seen what cannot be seen without dying" (90-91). A spotlight on such a figure captures the testimony of the traumatic experience in a way that leads to an automatic condemnation of the violence without the usual herorization or villainization. To quote again from the same book of Hartman, a Muselman's "abject, Medusa-struck condition is a call and challenge that the human in us cannot evade. It is part of address, even when mute, Agamben identifies with the truth of testimony" (91). The focus on the *Muselman* at the same time brings to light biopolitics. The production of specifically biopolitical body is what leads to the formation of sovereignty—whether of the state or a group of perpetrators or a violence-monger.

The central protagonist in Agamben's account of biopolitical power is *homo sacer*, as Allen Meek puts it, "who maybe killed and yet not sacrificed" (25). But, for Geoffrey Hartman, the true witness of trauma is the dead. In this connection, he appreciates the idea of Jorge Semprun who argues, "The best witness, the only true witness in reality...is one who has not survived who has gone to the end of the experience and is dead" (Qtd. in *Longest Shadow* 91). The witness's testimony cannot be reduced to the language of facts and documents; it is an event in its own light that ultimately cannot be sundered from the events it recounts. Shoshanna Felman argues that it is for this reason that the witness bears a unique burden: "Since the testimony cannot be simply relayed, repeated or reported by another without thereby losing its function of testimony, the burden of witness – in spite of his or her alignment with other witness – is a radically unique, no interchangeable and solitary burden" (Felman & Laub 3). The burden of the witness is to be both irreplaceable and singular. The vantage point of which the Muselman-witness speaks cannot be assimilated by any other.

Thus, a spotlight on the *Muselman* gets critical attention because it is Marxist in essence. A Marxist writer like Saadat Hasan Manto is an expert at zeroing in on the *Muselman* in his short stories. He does so through what Beedendra Pandey calls a "Metaironic technique" (137-38). Metairony occurs when irony and trauma combine together with the former enhancing the effect of the latter. Vaheed Ramazani defines it as "the shock of irony and the sublime—the contradiction, the paradox, the logical or conceptual violence" (Qtd. in Beerendra Pandey 137). Ramazani further asserts that metairony captures "some real chance of producing melioristic effects" (Qtd. in Beerendra Pandey 138). Metairony has therapeutic effect on the audience because it

evacuates the burden of trauma through a kind of re-traumatization that minimizes the chance of configuration after the notions of community and nationhood.

Manto's use of metafiction in his partition short stories like "Toba Tek Singh", "Khol Do", "Thanda Ghost" and the vignettes *Siyah Hashiye* recreates the trauma of the partition Holocaust of 1947 in a way that the specificity of the trauma is captured and even the readers are traumatized through a vicarious perception of the trauma. The vicarious re-traumatization gives rise to a cathartic identification with the victim often without creating a prose of otherness against the Indians or the Pakistanis. When Manto's partition prose is used as a touchstone to evaluate the language of trauma in South Asian partition fiction, much of the fiction is seen as suffering from what Beerendra Pandey calls "a mediated (and hence inauthentic) deployment of trauma to political ends"(137). Much of the Sikh partition fiction's representation of trauma as the following chapters or textual analysis show suffers from the prose of otherness against the Muslims.

Chapter III: Prose of Demonization in Sikhs' Narrativization of Partition

Trauma in *The Rape, Twice Born Twice Dead, and Ashes and Petals*

The Sikh Partition fictions *The Rape, Twice Born Twice Dead*, and *Ashes and Petals* respectively written by Raj Gill, K.S. Duggal and H.S. Gill deal with the issue of the discourse of cultural trauma. The representation of trauma in these fictions is cultural in nature. They follow ethical rather than moral line in representing the trauma of the violence of the partition of India in 1947. What they lack in their writings is the representation of victimhood of the partition victims. Instead of showing the real pain of the victims, they tend to demonize the Muslims. There is much demonization of the Muslims rather than the representation of victimhood of the partition sufferers. Much focus is given on community and nationhood in these fictions. So these fictions are taken as the prose of demonization.

Raj Gill's *The Rape* shows, religious fanaticism and politics become the leading causes of mass violence in Indian Partition due to which real trauma of the victims gets hidden. The picture of dehumanized society is shown in this novel. Although the Sikh protagonist Dalipjit attempts to show his greatness by protecting a Muslim girl Leila from the planned attack of the Muslims but he himself is confined within his cultural taboos as he is ready to accept Jasmit his lifelong partner who is also from the same Sikh community but he rejects Leila in this sense. Dalipjit's greatness is even challenged by his own father as he rapes Leila. Here, the trauma of Leila is the major issue. Dalipjit should have accepted Leila as his own life partner if

she truly loved him. And Dalipjit's father should not have raped Leila; instead he should have treated her as his own daughter. But just the opposite happens in the novel. Both father and son lack moral values. The Sikhs seem revengeful towards Muslim attitude due to the Muslim brutalities over the non-Muslims. The writer claims that the Sikhs suffered worse than others. For the Sikhs, the Muslims cannot be true Indian; rather they are Christian as they imitate Christians' ways of life. They lack the essence of Muslimness. In this connection, the Sikhs blame the Muslim leader Jinnah of being Christian and say:

Jinnah is not a Muslim...He's basically a Christian. He never says the five prayers. Muslims do not want to be Indians. Let them be aliens. Give them a corner and say good-bye to them forever....The ungrateful ones, who fled their own country, sought refuge here, at their host's table and now are betraying him. They will starve in no time and once again return to the big brother weeping and beseeching. (28)

The Sikh supreme leader Master Tara Singh, in his speech, claims that any partition will not secure the integrity and solidarity of the Sikhs and this attitude is unacceptable to the Muslims. Due to this conflict the Sikhs decide to stay out of Pakistan. The Sikhs are also cautious to their own leader Master Tara Singh because he plays the role of double standard. In front of the Sikhs and Hindus, Tara Singh seems quite radical but he is unable to do anything for the loss of land and property of the non-Muslims when much of the land of Punjab is occupied by the Muslims. The writer speaks the voice of the Sikhs from the mouth of Dalipjit and tries to win the favour even from the Hindus to fight against the Muslims. Dalipjit Says, "Remember your heritage, your history, your Gurus who fought for truth, justice and peace, for the weak and the oppressed. Remember, only a Sikh can sacrifice his life for others. Only

Sikh Gurus could sacrifice for Hindu Rajas” (30). Dalipjit makes people aware that only the Sikhs can give protection to them and even to the Hindus so both Sikhs and Hindus should fight against the Muslims by making joint force. The Sikhs’ nationalism and faith in response to Guru Nanak and Guru Govind can be felt in the expression of Dalipjit as he says:

Brothers, you must vindicate each drop of blood that was drawn from a Sikh. Swear that you will shake the earth, blast the sky, ground the mountains and explode the ocean but you won’t be humiliated. Swear it now; swear it at this very moment if the spark that was lit by Guru Nanak and was fanned into an eternal flame by Guru Govind Singh is burning in your hearts. (30)

The Sikhs treat the Muslims as low caste and untouchable people so they do not want to mix up with them. It also creates the sense of enmity among the Sikhs and the Muslims. Dalipjit is requested to have a drink with Bantu but he rejects this proposal. Bantu urges, “Come, have a sip Dalipjit Singh. Drink is never untouchable. It’s amrit” (42). Dalipjit’s refusal to drink sitting together with Bantu shows the Sikhs are still revolving round the cultural taboos. Until and unless they believe in so they can not touch the humanistic line and moral universal values. Dalipjit, in this novel, speaks the voice of the Sikhs. The Sikhs take even Mahatma Gandhi as the leader of diplomacy. The Sikhs become negative to him as he forgets the contribution of the Sikhs and follows national line. Raj Gill argues, “It was an open fact that Gandhi had come round to accept partition as unavoidable. The Sikhs in the villages of West Punjab were more angry because of Gandhi’s incomprehensible, implicit antagonism for their community” (69). Therefore, Mahatma Gandhi is the betrayer for the Sikhs. So they do not have trust upon his step. His ambivalent attitude is clearly shown here

in the expression of Dalipjit as he says, “Gandhi was a negative one. However; it was much more difficult to understand Gandhi. The little puritan, barely clad Saint, with his eccentric and often devious reactions, was completely unpredictable” (60). Dalipjit is puzzled in his most recent move and he has not been able to understand his diplomacy. It shows Gandhi is the leader who creates confusion among the Sikh community and he is unable to win their heart.

The Sikhs have very cold attitude to the policy of Gandhi. They become quite critical even in Gandhi’s assassination. They argue that his assassination should not be taken as a big issue because Gandhi is already a dead man. The Sikhs view, “How could Gandhi be shot dead? He was not a living. He had shot Gandhi long back, years ago. They could not shoot a dead Gandhi” (Qtd. in K. K. Sharma and B. K. Johri 122). It clearly shows the Sikhs have negative attitude towards Hindus due to the act of Gandhi. The Sikhs seem too much hostile to the Muslims. They take them as their enemies. The non-Muslims in a prayer meeting announced, “Even if the whole of India burns, we shall not concede Pakistan, even if the Muslim League demanded it at the point of the sword” (60). The Sikhs’ claim is that Indian partition violence was caused by the individual interest of the political leaders as well as religious leaders. In this connection Dalipjit speaks:

That denouncement at the time when Patel and Nehru had announced their individual acceptance of the partition formula threw everyone into confusion. Even Jinnah who called the partition of the Punjab and Bengal a sinister move had agreed to it saying...better a moth-eaten Pakistan than no Pakistan at all. (60)

The Sikhs argue that all the political leaders are to be blamed in the creation of the confusion in the mass of common people. Gandhi, Nehru, Patel, Azad, Tara Singh,

Jinnah-all became popular not because of their good action but just because of their inflammatory speech. Dalipjit's father was also the strong supporter of the Sikhism as he frequently used to read in the newspapers, "Sikhs may boycott Pakistan. Sikhs decide to stay out of Pakistan, in view of the massacre of the Sikhs and Hindus in Rawalpindi and Multan" (64).

The Sikhs have cold attitude to Indian Independence as well. In this connection Dalipjit's mother expresses:

Ashes be on the head of such independence... They burn your houses, they take your women and they kill your children, and you call it Independence. Making people homeless is independence! True, it is, in a way, you are made free; no land, no house, no cattle, no work. All the time is yours and all the world is yours to wander about. (65)

Due to the Muslim atrocities, the Sikhs have been fed up with them and treat them as others. The total othering of the Muslims can be felt as Dalipjit argues, "I don't believe them. Muslims are always disloyal; undependable. Their history is full of such instances. Did not they turn against their own prophet and the sons of their prophet? And the Mughals-son dethroning the Father, the brother"(66).

The Sikhs not only blame others in creating confusion but they also accept the weaknesses of their own leaders as the novel describes:

The Sikhs were steadily losing the game. Their only leader –representative at the centre, Baldev Singh, that large, lethargic Sikh of colorless personality, was a complete failure in safeguarding their interests. He did not even grasp the situation and was completely blank about what was happening around him. The Sikhs committed the greatest blunder in nominating him to the centre. (70)

Blood is whole and soul for the Sikhs. Dalipjit intends to write letter to Jasmit with red ink –neither black, nor blue nor green. The writer expresses, “...Red, the color of blood –blood that a loving heart bleeds with pleasure. Blood was life, blood was purity, blood was sincerity, and blood was the substance of the soul. Blood was the answer. He must write his letter in blood, in his own blood”(112). The symbolic meaning of the love of ‘blood’ in this novel refers to the quest for Sikhism. They claim that everything lies in blood. In this way, they take blood as means and end both. So the nature of the novel follows ethical line not humanistic line or moral line.

The writer also paints the pathetic picture of the refugees during Indian partition violence in 1947. In this connection, Raj Gill writes:

Refugees from the riot-beset regions were already pouring in from all corners. They say it was the animal at bay, tired and rendered helpless that was most dangerous. A refugee had nothing to lose if he killed. He had no conscience left, no heart, no feeling. He did not even have hope left. His escapade was instructive and not from volition. His survival was incidental and not planned and fought for. (120)

Killing became a kind of wedding ceremony during the time of Indian partition violence. Killing was as common as a game that anyone can play and enjoy. Human values were totally lost and the condition of human beings was not greater than the pariah dog. Dalipjit gives the vivid picture of inhuman life to the audience as he speaks:

Value of human life had fallen below that of the pariah dog. A pariah dog was allowed to live even when it became a downright nuisance. If ever one did come to kill one it was never without a feeling of guilty for having done something wrong...killing was a wedding. Killing was

a sport of the cannibals. Killing was witches' sabbath. It was debased, perverted, sickening. (191)

The ironical death of Dalipjit's mother has weighed rather heavily on his father. She dies right inside the doorstep of India and not from a Muslim bullet. Depicting the picture of violence Raj Gill further writes, "People died like moths at street lights in the monsoon" (217). The novel not only gives the glimpse of violence but it also shows love triangle of Dalipjit (Dipu), Leila and Jasmit. Dalipjit is a Sikh boy and Leila is a Muslim girl. Dalipjit is in love with Jasmit and she is also the Sikh girl. Leila wants to be the life partner of Dipu but Dipu does not express love to her. When Leila knows Dalipjit does not love her then she defines her relation with him differently. Leila expresses:

You don't have to be, Dipu. Your love's Jassi and not me. I love you in a different way, the way one loves God. The love of God though, of course, is as strong as the carnal love and does crave for a complete consummation as in the other love. The only difference is it is not a demanding love. It gives. It gives all without the hope of return. It's a complete surrender, a total effacement of the ego. (224)

It shows the Sikhs' love is just for Sikhism. Leila's expression shows she is the follower of humanitarian love but Dalipjit cannot understand it. End of ego is the essence of humanitarian love but the novel shows it is not the end of the ego of the Sikhs; instead it is just the expression of the ego. The love presented in this novel is not humanitarian love. Dalipjit cannot listen the inner voice of Leila. For Dalipjit, love for Leila is less powerful than the love of Dalipjit to Jasmit. Dalipjit does not accept Leila. If Dalipjit follows moral line he should accept Leila. But he lacks it. It shows he cannot imagine the world beyond Sikh community. He sees the possibility

of love and life both only in Sikh community. In fact, Dalipjit's refusal of Leila and his acceptance of Jasmit refers to Sikh imagination. Leila is totally devoted in love with Dipu but Dipu cannot accept her as his life partner as she is the girl of different religion. The love event between Dalipjit and Jasmit in this novel is not quite appropriate in terms of the representation of morality. It would seem better if it were the successful love between Dalipjit and Leila. Leila demands unconditional love from Dalipjit but Dalipjit strongly supports conditional love and it has been possible only from Jasmit as she is from the same religion. Dalipjit rejects to accept Leila not because of other reasons but just because she is from Muslim family and Muslims are the enemies of the Sikhs.

The Sikhs' claim is that the Indian partition violence is not merely the matter of killing; rather it is the matter of living or existing. Raj Gill writes, "One killed to live. Strange it was but true. People killed to live. Muslims killed the non-Muslims and Hindus and Sikhs killed the Muslims all in a bid to live, not to die" (296). It shows killing was the matter of existence both in Muslims and non-Muslims. The major concern of the novel is the issue of existence of the Sikhs, so it fails to represent victimhood. Beerendra Pandey observes, "The *Rape* strongly suggest(s) the adoption of violence to finish the unfinished business of the partition of India" (152).

K. S. Duggal's *Twice Born Twice Dead* communicates the trauma of partition in west Punjab. The novelist, by presenting the characters Alladitta and Sohne Shah, tends to create communal harmony between the Muslims and the non-Muslims. Allahditta loses his own life in saving Hindus and Sikhs of his village and Sohne Shah loses his daughter Rajkarni in the violence. No matter their attempt is praiseworthy but instead of representing the trauma of Rajkarni, Sohne Shah and Allahditta, the

novel just talks about the loss of communal harmony and the loss of friendship in between them and their family members. Instead of depicting the real trauma of the victims, the writer gives much focus on making the bridge between the Muslims and the non-Muslims first, by establishing friendship between the Sikh and the Muslim family and second, by presenting love affair between a Sikh boy Kuldip and a Muslim girl Satbharai.

Sohne Shah, a Sikh village headman and peasant of Dhamyal, a village near Rawalpindi stands for perfect religious harmony but he loses his daughter Rajkarni in communal violence. The trauma of both Muslims and non-Muslims is shown in this novel. Rajkarni, Sohne Shah's daughter is kidnapped by the Muslim rioters and killed. Before she is killed, Sohne Shah escapes with Satbharai searching her from camp to camp. He suffers quite a lot but he is unable to find her. Allahditta, a Muslim friend of Sohne Shah, on the other hand, loses his own life in saving the Hindus and Sikhs of his village. Both Sohne Shah and Allahditta face the loss. The love romance between Kuldip and Satbharai shows the novel gives major focus on religious integration rather than presenting the actual trauma of Sohne Shah, Allahditta and Rajkarni. The novel lacks the presence of victimhood of the sufferers. K. K. Sharma and B. K. Johri analyze the novel and argue that the division of the country was on the basis of "religious ground" (143). So representation of trauma takes ethical line here.

The novelist presents Sohne Shah, a Sikh protagonist of the novel who gets terrified as the violence is about to commence breaking the aged long harmony in his village:

Sohne Shah was struck by the unusual stillness all around. The fields where farmers came to plough and graze cattle, laugh and Sing-why were they deserted? A solitary myna sat on a bedraggled babul tree; the

wind howled through the ruins of the ancient tomb. With his milk white beard disarranged, Sohne Shah tiptoed to scan the distant horizon with wide open eyes, but saw not a single soul. (3)

The loss of Rajkarni is the loss of Sikh identity. The intimacy between Sohne Shah and Allahditta and the loving bond between Rajkarni and Satbharai is clearly seen as all of them move around the tomb of Rajkarni expressing sympathy. It was the place where Allahditta and Sohne Shah had exchanged their turbans as the symbol of love and intimacy. It was the place where both families flourished their friendship and it is the same place now where Rajkarni is resting in the tomb. The novel describes:

Within the four walls of that tomb Rajkarni and her bosom friend Satbharai had pledged their friendship. Here, too Sohne Shah and Satbharai's father, Allahditta, had exchanged turbans. Their friendship had lasted full fifty years now. Within three months of the death of Allahditta's wife, Sohne Shah's wife also passed away. (4)

The Sikhs claim that not only the Sikhs but the Hindus were also fed up with the Muslims atrocities in Punjab violence and the Muslims were most responsible in creating unusual situation. Even the small and innocent babies were affected in Punjab violence. In this connection, a small baby Channo Mehri says, "Mother, where have the people of this village disappeared...?" (4). Sohne Shah wants harmony but he surprises in the chanting of the slogan from the Hindus, Sikhs and even Muslim children, "Pakistan Zindabad...Long live Pakistan" (8-9). He fears because the slogan might break their unity. And the most surprising thing is that they were trained to shout 'Pakistan Zindabad'.

The writer argues that even the Hindus were very badly affected with Muslim atrocities in Bihar during the time of partition violence. It describes:

The Hindus of Bihar complained that the Muslims were like thorns in the road of India's march to freedom. They looted the crops of their neighbors, snatched away their women and outraged their modesty before the very eyes of their menfolk. Rifles were fired, hoodlums indulged in insensate massacre. The bullets came to an end, not the Muslims. (8)

Similarly, the condition of the Hindus and Sikhs of Pothoar in Punjab was quite miserable and they were compelled to live uncertain life as the novel describes, "Every Hindu and Sikh was to be killed, their properties destroyed, cows were to be slaughtered in their Gurdwaras and temples, their wives and daughters were to be raped...old men, children were to kill children, youths were to murder youths..."

(13). The rioters in the village come from the distant horizon. Many think of hiding in the fields, many say that they should seek refuge in the main gurdwara. Some exhort each other to fight from their house tops in their lanes and kill or be killed. They think if the rioters are bent upon looting or setting fire to the village, they should let them do so, but they will not be allowed to lay a finger on any non-Muslim of the village. There is turmoil in the whole village. Sohne Shah is restless but the Muslim youths assure him and say, "As long as there is blood in our veins no one can harm a hair on your head" (14). But Sohne Shah is not confident in their sayings. The writer tries to be as objective as possible in painting the vivid picture of Punjab violence.

The impending attack of the Muslims makes the villagers be alert. The situation is quite unimaginable so the village youths start to prepare for the retaliation. Their preparation is for their self-defense from the Muslim rioters as the novel describes:

One thought, one would jump into the well; another decided to dive off the roof. Some secreted a packet of opium, others a doze of arsenic; while quite a few implored their brothers or fathers to strangle them to death. Some kept kerosene ready, others resolved that before dying they would send a few to their death, and sharpened three-foot kirpans to a razor's edge. Young boys collected stacks of stones on their roofs; the sharp and steel-hard stones of pothoar. Gun owners laid in stocks of ammunition, swords were polished and knives-sharpened. (14-15)

Before the rioters approach the Sikh leader Master Tara Singh assembles all the Sikhs and warns them:

My people! Either leave the villages and come to the towns or if you have to stay on, then make yourselves strong. Dig trenches round your homes, build compound walls, learn the use of swords, or one day you will be wiped off the face of the earth. There I feel that it will burst here first. A severe trial of the Sikh community is ahead. (19-20)

Allahditta is very badly misbehaved by the rioters in Dhamyal village though he does not have any biasness to the Muslims and non-Muslims. The novel describes:

Allahditta listened to it all, then got up and started up-braiding them. While he was speaking thus, some goondas caught hold of him, tied him up and shut him inside a room. With great difficulty he had succeeded in loosening his bonds and escaping somehow. Allahditta thought that Sohne Shah and Rajkarni should leave the village at any cost. But Dhamyal was now surrounded, villages all round were ablaze, goondas were in control of the entire area, the roads were littered with corpses. Then Allahditta said that no one could lay a

finger on Dhamyal. As long as there was breath in his body none dared harm the village to which he belonged. If Rajkarni had to get out, Satbharai too would leave the village, he would have to advance over Allahditta's dead body. (22)

The novel also gives a glimpse of post-war scenario of the partition violence in Punjab through the event of Dhamyal village as the writer remarks:

All the villages had been reduced to ashes. Smoke rose from a few places, the sound of walls crashing could be heard. All the men-folk had gone to take part in...and arson in the neighboring villages. Their women cowed inside their houses. They were still wondering what was happening... (42)

Not only the human beings but even the animals like buffaloes and dogs were very badly affected in the violence of Indian partition. Killing in Punjab violence was as common as the death of insects. The writer argues, "people died like flies..." (56). The whole village was burning but the villagers did not lose their hope. Sohne Shah becomes very weak and he refuses all food. The doctors give him many injections. A Muslim League leader while visiting the refugee camp in Rawalpindi delivers in his speech:

Our demand, our birthright is Pakistan. We will not rest till we have attained it. This is the unalterable decision of the Indian Muslims. But that does not mean that there will be no place for Hindus and Sikhs in Pakistan. It is also not implied that all the Muslims of India should leave their belongings and homes and migrate to Pakistan. Pakistan will be independent country like India. The British shall quit...The future of the Muslims is bright. (75)

The Muslim rioters are quite confident for the formation of new nation through violence and expresses, "Our religion do not teach us to bear enmity towards anyone....No country can survive without peace. We have to build Pakistan..." (75). The Sikhs blame the Muslims that they wanted to form a new nation before achieving peace. It shows the ultimate aim of the Muslims was not to attack non-Muslims but their major interest was to form a distinct Muslim nation, Pakistan with distinct identity. On the one hand, the Muslims were dreaming about a new nation but on the other hand the non-Muslims were living quite uncertain and difficult life in Punjab. So they were even ready for counter attack. The writer expresses:

Whole localities were ablaze, burnt to ashes, and fire engines rushed from place to ringing bells. Police whistles, exploding bombs, madly burning cars...there was a curfew from dusk to dawn. The people trapped inside... the houses and cried for help in vain. The police shot anyone trying to escape. The Hindus and the Sikhs went on jeeps and attacked the Muslim locality as a counter attack. (109-10)

In response to *Twice Born Twice Dead*, the description of the post-war scenario of west Punjab in the words of K. K. Sharma & B. K. Johri can be summarized as:

The condition of the villages deteriorated immeasurably. The fires were seen almost regularly. The villages burnt and the helpless spectators of Dharmyal wailed, wept and burst into loud lamentations. Old Hindu-Muslim friendship met a disaster; it was completely disregarded. (147)

The novelist seems quite aware about the power of love as well. He may be indicating that love may even challenge cultural and religious obstacles. So he tries to

make even impossible things possible through the power of love between Satbharai and Kuldip. He writes, “Whenever Satbharai was alone, Kuldip’s love overwhelmed her. She felt a fire consuming her. As far as possible, she kept herself busy, avoiding leisure and loneliness.”(160). The pain of losing Rajkarni is unbearable not only for Sohne Shah but it shocks all. Loss of Rajkarni is a great loss for the Sikhs. The presence of Rajkarni is a moment of joy for them all but her absence gives shock to everyone. It is not just the shock of her death for the Sikhs. In fact, it is the shock of Muslim atrocities. Sohne Shah’s mind is in turmoil. He has nothing much to do this evening. The Muslims attack the Sikhs with lances, spears and hatchets. Sohne Shah cannot understand why his heart is sinking. When he reaches home he collapses on his bed. Every Muslim has been armed with lances, spears, hatchets and guns. The situation is so dangerous that Allahditta thinks that Sohne Shah and Rajkarni should leave the village at any cost. His guess is right as Rajkarni is killed in the violence. By observing the situation Allahditta forecasts the possibility of revenge from the non-Muslims as well. The novelist is quite sure that there is no any existence of the non-Muslims in Pakistan after the formation of the new nation as Pakistan because the non-Muslims will be forcefully converted into Islam. In this connection he writes, “British rule has ended. Pakistan was formed. Now, not a single Hindu or Sikh can survive. The command has come from above to convert to Islam or murder them”(55).

Such interpretation of the novel is not the expression of victimhood but it’s the mere description of the loss of harmonious relation among the Hindus, Sikhs and the Muslims. It can also be clearly concluded that the novel just sings the songs of the inflammatory speeches of the Muslims and the non-Muslims. This is the novel of partition violence but its description does not tell in detail about the actual pains of the

victims. It lacks cathartic effects on the audience. It can't make the audience feel the trauma of the victims. It just forces the audience to listen about the speeches of identity politics of the Muslims and the non-Muslims.

H. S. Gill's *Ashes and Petals* gives a glimpse of train tragedy. The novel explores the idea of Sikh community and nationhood that is represented through the role of the protagonist Risaldar Santa Singh who explicitly and directly rejects the proposal of Ajit Singh, his grandson who intends to marry Salma. Santa Singh's refusal of Salma to accept her as his daughter-in-law shows his revengeful attitude towards the Muslims. He has developed this type of negative attitude towards the Muslims because of the trauma of the past. In the event of train tragedy he had to shoot dead his granddaughter Baljeeto to save her from the inhuman acts of the Muslims. Ajit's acceptance of Salma reveals the change in Sikhs' attitude towards the Muslims. This change emerges in Ajit as Salma's brother Aslam sacrifices his life in saving him. It shows Ajit is not willingly ready to accept Salma as a life partner. He does so because of Aslam's help in the past. He intends to marry her not because she is from Muslim family but because her brother truly helped him in the past. In this way, her intention to marry Salma is not purely unconditional. But it is conditional love and his desire to marry her is also conditional. Although Ajit seems quite radical in his mission and wants to marry a low caste girl but still he has not easily accepted the girl. If Ajit was true lover of the Muslims he would accept Salma without any permission from Santa Singh. On the surface, Ajit seems radical but in depth his attempt is nothing but just the expression of Sikhism and Sikh ideology so he asks permission from Santa Singh. Finally, Santa Singh gives him permission unwillingly.

Everything happens in terms of the interest of the Sikhs. So the novel fulfills the interest of Sikh community and Sikh nationhood.

The Muslims attack a trainload of Hindus and Sikhs. In this severe violence, Risaldar Santa Singh shoots dead his fourteen years old granddaughter Baljeeto to save her from dishonor and disgrace of the Muslims. Santa Singh can never reconcile with a Muslim but his grandson Ajit Singh falls in love with a Muslim girl Salma. Ajit tries to impress upon the mind of the aged Risaldar that all the persons, belonging to different communities, fought for the dear motherland and Aslam lost his life in saving him. Ajit expresses his firm determination to marry Salma. Salma's brother Aslam dies in saving Ajit. So Ajit praises the adventurous and noble act of Aslam. Ajit convinces his grandfather and requests him to forget the enmity with the Muslims. Risaldar Santa Singh has been too indifferent to the Muslims because he cannot forget the trauma of the past as he is compelled to kill his own daughter due to the atrocities of the Muslims. Ajit intends to marry Salma and wants to maintain harmony between the Sikhs and the Muslims. The writer wants to break the enmity between the Muslims and the non-Muslims through the attempts of love affair between Ajit and Salma.

The novel states the loss of goodwill among the Muslims and non-Muslims. It describes the end of communal harmony in partition violence in 1947 and it also shows the quest for communal harmony as the writer shows love affair between Ajit and Salma. There was the bond of communal ties before the partition between the Muslims and non-Muslims and such bond ended in partition and the writer again tries to establish such communal harmony though the job is difficult and challenging as he describes:

In the pre-partition days...the Muslim and the Jat Sardar had toiled

together and appreciated each other's ways, even though so divergent. The Muslim was the artisan, the cobbler and the potter. The Jat farmer needed all this help in his fields. The two grew up in the village, helping each other. In 1947, when partition came about, the Muslims moved away. The village ties between the Muslims, the Sikhs and the Hindus broke and such ties cannot be restored overnight. (128)

The novel begins from the attack on the train by the Muslims. When the train comes under heavy attack and the fear of the people in the flight comes true as the novel describes:

The sleeping mass of humanity that was barely visible in the dark coaches had by now woken from its fitful slumber. The few open windows were quickly pulled down, and the women and children huddle into the farthest corners, away from the windows and the danger. Some of the elderly people who were more cautious had already made a rush for the space below the seats and tucked themselves away from prying eyes and direct firing rifle shots, some of the brave ones drew out their kirpans and inched towards the doors. The few lucky ones with rifles moved off to the two exits that had been kept in case the train was set on fire. (3)

The novel describes the train tragedy vividly and diligently. The travelers stand in utter confusion. The actual atrocity of the Muslim attack in the train is described:

On the train, all was utter confusion. The marauders came with spears, swords, bamboo lathis, rifles and muskets. When the first wave rushed on to the stricken train someone fired into the big engine loco light and after that there was no light anywhere. There were more than two

hundred goondas on foot and horse-back, camels and cycles, letting off blood curdling cries of “Allah-o-Akbar”, abusing their mothers and their fathers and sisters, laughing sinister laughs that rang far into the night. The sweat of fear trickled down the necks of the people in the train. (7)

The train tragedy gives a glimpse of the dangerous days of the post-independence period as well.

Remembering the event of train tragedy, Sardar Santa Singh expresses surprise, bitterness and embarrassment when his tall, brave and gentle Ajit seeks his permission to marry Salma, “...what have you come down to, my grandson? Have you forgotten Baljeeto, your sister? Your poor sister. I had to shoot dead in the train? Have you forgotten the partition and the Musalmans?”(180). It shows Santa Singh never wants to compromise with the Muslims due to the deep-rooted trauma of the past but Ajit requests him to forget the past and continue the harmonious relation with the Muslims. Ajit says that basically there is no distinction between the Muslims and non-Muslims and hence should live together just like in pre-independent India. Ajit expresses his firm determination to marry Salma. He thinks that she is the best girl of his choice. He says that the contribution of her brother Aslam is not of less importance as he saves him from the attack of the Muslims. So he asks his grandfather to extend his blessings to marry Salma:

Her brother died saving me. I owe my life to him. And you say She is a Musalman. Is that a crime? After '47 aren't we all here? All sitting and eating, living and dying together. Before partition weren't we all the same? Have you forgotten Mida, Gama and Rauf, all your friends in the village in Pakistan? Are we any different, any of us? Bapu just

think. You think I have forgotten Baljeeto. Or even a single moment of that bloody train. But how long will we keep on simmering and poisoning each other's minds? Out there, on the front, I have seen all the blood mingle. But never did anyone say it was Hindu, Sikh, Parsi, Jat or Muslim blood... (180)

Ajit argues that Aslam and his Sister Salma should not be seen as others. If Aslam was not positive to him he would not save him even by sacrificing his own life. Praising Aslam's adventurous and noble sacrifice Ajit Speaks:

Out there we all have fought together and carried each other's sorrow. Major Aslam could have sat still in his tank and come home safely to his sister today. But he saved me and gave himself away. And he was a Musalman, not a Sikh or a Hindu. Did he ask himself then, why he was dying for a Sikh? No. Because he was one of us. And that is how he saw himself. Bapu; Salma is not one of us. She is us. I have vowed before the great Guru Govinda Singh. I will marry her and her alone. Bapu, I beg of you. Please understand. Give her your blessings, and accept her as your own. Bapu, please. (180)

Santa Singh sees the saving figure of dead Aslam. He again remembers the bloody train. He fears his neighbours. Such thought makes him strong and he leaves the scene in tears without responding to his grandson's request. For Santa Singh, Salma is alien. Ajit's insistence makes him feel very unhappy. Salma feels hurt at Santa Singh's contempt for her community. Ajit regrets that his Bapu still lives in 1947. Ajit wants Salma to stay as his wife and he accomplishes his desire by going in for civil marriage. Salma shows her awareness of inter-caste marriages and she knows there should be no marriage between the Sikhs and the Muslim. She makes no secret

of her unhappiness at Ajit's affairs. Referring to inter-caste marriages of this kind, she says:

But how many such marriages are there? You read what you like to read. Sure, I have read of the golden wedding made especially in heaven for the Sindhi marrying the Goan girl. Or the modern Bihari marrying the foreign- returned Punjabi. But never in my life have I heard of Muslim marrying a Sikh....You seem to forget '47. Anyhow, I tell you, I am not very happy with all this. Best if the Sikhs marry Sikhs, and the Muslims, Muslims. These things just don't work out in our country, no what you say. (116)

Sardar Santa Singh's final presence at the grand ceremony where Ajit Singh is posthumously awarded The Mahabir Chakra for lying down his life gallantly for the motherland gives him great relief. He affectionately asks Salma to proceed to receive the award. His sense of relief and joy, emanating from the acceptance of Salma as his granddaughter- in- law becomes obvious. The novel asserts that the spirit of love is stronger than that of hate. Salma's bold expression of love in front of her brother Aslam shows she is ready to sacrifice for the sake of love and she seems quite radical in her mission and then intends to challenge the religious obstacles placing love in supreme position. Her bold and radical attitude can be felt in her expression as she exposes her feelings with her brother Aslam before he is killed:

You can abuse your sister and curse her. When you come back, you can drag her out of the house and throw stones at her. But Aslam, there is only one I will ever love and that is Ajit...If ever I marry, in this world or next, it will be Ajit. Aslam Bhaiya, please look after him and he is still with you. Please. (169)

In this way, discourse of trauma is very clearly depicted in this novel. The writer is less concerned about the trauma of Santa Singh. His trauma is less exposed here. Similarly, Aslam's trauma is also less exposed. The novel highlights the need of religious integration rather than focusing on the trauma of the partition victims. It does not say much about the pain of Santa Singh, his granddaughter Baljeeto and Salma's Brother Aslam. It just tries to make the bridge between the Muslims and non-Muslims by presenting love affair between Ajit Singh and Salma. The expectation of the audience is not to see the love affair of Ajit and Salma as it is intended to be the novel of partition violence rather they intend to know much about the trauma of the victims—namely the trauma of Baljeeto, Aslam and Santa Singh. If it had been presented keeping the victimhood in the centre, then the novel's representation of the trauma would have been more powerful. The focus is on the communal/national politics rather than the subjectivity of victimhood itself.

Chapter IV: Moral Representation of Partition Trauma in Hyder and Manto

The fictional writings of Punjabi Muslim writers like Saadat Hasan Manto and Qurratulain Hyder are very powerful in the representation of trauma. They focus on morality rather than ethicality of the partition violence. They both write about Partition violence through moral line. They write keeping human values in the centre. Their major concern is not the concern of religion or culture rather it is the concern of victimhood. While writing about partition violence they write about the pains of the victims and also present openly about the cruelties of the victimizers. They write what they see. They write about Muslims, about Sikhs and Hindus. Richness in their writings lies in the representation of victimhood.

Saadat Hasan Manto not only exposes the idea of trauma of the Indian partition violence but he also highlights the universal moral values in his writings. In his short story “Toba Tek Singh”, he presents an extreme victim Bishan Singh who neither supports India nor Pakistan. He expresses his voice neither of India nor of Pakistan but from no man’s land. He is the representative of extreme victim of Partition violence and is forced to leave Pakistan but he doesn’t cross the border and says, “I want to live neither in Pakistan nor in Hindustan- I will live on this tree” (15). So, Manto, being neutral, wants to show real trauma of the victim of the partition violence. Manto takes literature as the powerful and authentic testimony of Indian partition violence as he expresses:

Literature is not a malady but a response to malady. It is a measure of the temperature of the country, of the nation. It tells us of its health and disease ... We (the writers) tell others what they are suffering from, but we do not own the Chemist’s shop....The warehouse is itself a corpse which society carries on its shoulders. Until society buries it somewhere, there will be discussion about it... Why should I take off

the blouse of society? It is naked as it is. Of course I am not interested in dressing it up either, because that is the job of drapers not writers.

(25)

It is undeniable that Manto's stories deal with the partition of India and its aftermath. "Toba Tek Singh", "Cold Meat", "Open It", "Black Margins" all depicts unbearable anguish, trauma and savagery of Partition. Manto's stories look at the violence and barbarity of Partition as a plain and simple descent into the heart of darkness inherent in man. In Manto's stories, directly or indirectly, the subject of Partition is first the human being, not the Hindu human being, nor the Muslim, nor the Sikh. "Cold Meat" and "Open It" highlight the fact that in times of fratricidal war and violence, the female body becomes a contested site subject to assault and conquest. It serves as a trophy of victory or a blot on the collective honor. "Toba Tek Singh" is a story of dislocation and exile-exile from one's natural home and habitat. It is about arbitrary boundaries and borders that divide people, history and culture. The story is about lunacy and madness. It is the madness of the sane which is a million times more destructive than the madness of the insane. Bishan Singh, the mad protagonist of the story contemptuously rejects the verdict of the politicians to be divided between India and Pakistan and prefers to die on the strip of land that belongs to neither. This is Manto's symbolic rejection of the vivisection of the country, and his considered comment on the stupidity of the entire exercise. "Cold Meat" shows the transformation of human beings into beasts. The protagonist Ishar Singh murders six members of a Muslim family and quenches his lust for blood. To satisfy his lust for sex he carries off a young girl Kulwant Kaur of the murdered family on his shoulders. She is also dead but he intends to copulate with the corpse. Ishar Singh's love making with Kulwant Kaur is as violent as his treatment of the Muslim family. In the story,

“Open It”, Sirajuddin asks eight volunteers at a refugee camp in Pakistan to find his daughter, Sakina, from whom he got separated during the chaotic journey from India. They rape her repeatedly and then abandon her to her fate. She is brought to the doctor’s office in the camp. When the doctor says, “Open It” (meaning the window), Sakina, lying inert on the stretcher, opens her shalwar involuntarily. She has been so brutalized and her relationship with language has become so tenuous that henceforth the phrase ‘Khol Do’ (Open It) will carry just one meaning for her to the exclusion of all others.

Saadat Hasan Manto’s vignettes collected in *Black Margins* are notable for their macabre humor, their subversive intent, their tongue-in-cheek mode and their freewheeling irreverence. In this context, M. Asaduddin argues:

In these vignettes, Manto tried to capture man’s descent into Hobbesian jungle by recreating some apparently funny and absurd, but in fact, deeply disturbing situations. Narrated in a dead pan, emotionless tone, they depict murder, rape, slaughter and thuggery as the most natural preoccupations of men. (32)

The flippant tone of the vignettes conceals their serious intent. The vignettes are a kind of genre which might be called “existential belle lettre” (32). It exists in some literature though it seems to be unusual in Urdu. In this sense, Manto’s *Black Margins* is taken as a great document of great importance in terms of representing human tragedy during the period of communal violence. Manto’s *Black Margins* consists of twelve pieces of vignettes and each vignette deals with victimhood representing Indian Partition violence of 1947. Apparently the vignettes seem to be humorous but they are, in fact, written in tragedy. Absurdity of violence or the grim reality of violence is expressed in these vignettes.

Saadat Hasan Manto in “Wages of Labour” exposes how the laborers have to face extreme economic crisis during the time of extreme violence. An innocent Kashmiri laborer is arrested by the police inspector. He takes out his pistol and fires at him though he seems to be innocent as he asserts, “Sir why arrest me? I am poor. I only took a sack of rice. Something I eat to keep myself alive. You have shot me unfairly...Sirs; other people were after big game...I eat rice everyday....It’s all right Sir. Keep the sack...just give me my wage...Four annas”(114). The Kashmiri laborer is tired of pleading and he gives up his attempt. He takes off his dirty cap and wipes the sweat from his forehead. He gives the sack to the police inspector and asks his wages. The vignette gives the picture of grim reality of the common people like the Kashmiri laborer during the time of Partition violence. In “Sharing the Loot” Saadat Hasan Manto presents a frail middle aged man who presents himself as a member of the rioter groups and tells all the looters to loot his house in a systematic manner. He says, “Brothers, this house is filled with wealth, filled with innumerable priceless objects. Come on, let’s take it over and divide up the booty”(114). He requests them to take out all the precious things out of the house but they should not break any of the items. He also requests them not to fight to each other while looting. He goes on announcing:

Brothers, everything inside the house is yours. But remember, don’t rush around and no fighting either. Come on...Easy, brothers, easy. Everything in the house is yours. Why this scrambling? Brothers, easy. There is no need to fight among yourselves. There is no need to grab and yank at things. Co-operate with each other. Don’t be jealous if someone has found something valuable. This is a big house. Find something precious for yourself too. Don’t act like savage. If you

scramble, things will probably get broken and that will be your loss....Look, brother, this is a radio. Handle it carefully otherwise it will break. Take the cord too. Fold it up, brother, fold it up. It's a walnut tea-table, inlaid with delicate ivory work. It's very fragile. Well, it's all right now...No, no, don't drink here. You will get tipsy. Take it home....Wait, wait, let me turn off the main switch so you don't get an electric shock....You will tear this priceless fabric to shreds. This house has everything; there must be a yard-stick lying somewhere...Find it so you can measure the cloth and divide it among yourselves. (116)

Till the end he does not identify himself to the rioters. All the rioters vanish in no time at all due to the sudden appearance of a dog and a tiger. One of the rioters is still on the spot and asks the frail man who he is. Now, he introduces himself to be the owner of the house with a smiling face and he also advises the rioter to take a crystal vase carefully as it may break if it falls from his hands. In this way, his house is looted in a systematic manner by the rioters. Apparently, the vignette makes us laugh but in depth it is not the matter of laughter. It is the issue of extreme violence that creates seriousness among the readers. The piece is quite ironical and it is the picture of grim reality which was common during the time of Indian partition in 1947. Outwardly the frail man seems to be happy but in fact he is not so and his pain is unbearable because the rioters have made his house empty. In the piece of his vignette "Fifty-Fifty" Manto presents two characters. The first man picks out a large wooden chest for himself. But when he tries to lift it he cannot move it even an inch. Then he asks help from the second man in lifting the wooden chest. The first man is ready to share at least one-fourth of the item kept in the wooden chest. Again the second man demands

more share from the first. They make agreement to share for fifty- fifty. When the chest is opened, their expectation fails as a man comes out of the chest with a sword in his hand and cuts both and changes them into four with his sword. It symbolizes the partition violence in 1947 was so violent that both the victims and victimizers lost their conscience and violated human values. His attempt seems to be the revolt against the rioters. It shows the unbearable situation of the common people in the presence of the cruelties of the rioters. So, even the common people were compelled to retaliate against the rioters and wanted to live a happy and peaceful life in 1947 in India. The rioters killed the innocent people and sometimes even innocent people became aggressive and started to take revenge in the partition violence in 1947. Both the victims and victimizers lack humanity in this vignette. In fact, it expresses the extreme nature of partition violence as he writes, "The chest was opened. Out came a man with a sword in his hand. He turned the two claimants into four" (117). The surprising thing in this vignette is that the victim kills the victimizers. In "Appropriate Action" Saadat Hasan Manto present a starving couple and their pain during the time of violence. The couple hide themselves in their basement for four days without eating anything. As their hunger grows their fear of death lessens. Their need for food and water becomes more pressing. They no longer care whether they are alive or dead. They come out of their hideout. The husband, in a feeble voice tries to attract people's attention expressing, "We have come to surrender, please kill us" (117). The problem is that killing is a sin in their religion. They are all Jains. They consult among themselves and hand over the couple of another mohalla for appropriate action. It shows the partition violence of 1947 was religious in nature because the practice of killing was the practice on the basis of religious principle. Religious principle was greater than the principle of humanity during the time of Indian partition in 1947.

Similarly, in Manto's "Correction" a person introduces himself that he is Har Har Mahadev. Then the second man asks he needs some proofs to believe in him that he is Har Har Mahadev. The first man replies that he is Dharamchand. The second man asks him the proofs again then he says that he knows everything from four Vedas. The second man does not agree with him and announces, "Kill him! Kill him!"(118). Then the first man stops the second man from killing him saying, "Wait, wait I am one of you. I am your brother. I swear by Bhagawan, I am your brother" (118). Now, he is saved. It clearly shows Manto's major focus is not on religion but on humanity. In "An Enterprise" Manto shows the naked picture of inhuman world. The vignette describes the violence as, "fire broke out; the entire mohalla went up in flames. Only one shop escaped. The Signboard on the shop reads...A complete range of building materials is sold here" (118). Here, the irony lies as some people are crying for the loss of their properties where as others are getting benefits from the loss and are celebrating. This is metaironic effect of trauma. In "A Raw Deal" Manto gives a picture of sexual violence upon women. Two friends select a girl from a group of ten or twenty and buy her for forty rupees. After having spent the night with her one of them asks the girl, "what is your name?"(119). The man is furious when he hears the girl's name and says, "We were told you belong to the other religion's community..." (119). Then the girl replies, "You were told a lie" (119). The man ran to his friend and Says, "That bastard is a double-crosser...come on, let's take her back" (119). So the piece of vignette tells us how people lose their morality and humanity in violence. Rationality fails and they involve in irrational manner. The rapists think that they have raped the girl of another religion but she is the girl of their own religion. They realize it only after committing the crime. In Manto's "Beastliness" it is shown that there is no difference between animals and human beings. A couple has managed to save

household possessions during the time of violence. But their younger daughter is missing for a long time. They have another baby girl. The mother saves her by keeping her in her breast. They have a brown buffalo but the rioters take that away. They have also a cow but the rioters do not notice about it. Her calf is also lost. The husband, the wife, the baby girl, and the cow save their lives by hiding in a secret place. The baby girl starts to cry but the couple manages to control her. After a while they hear the sound of a calf in the distance. The cow becomes restless by hearing the sound of the calf and begins to run up and down to find the calf. The couple plans to make the cow calm but it is just a vain. Having heard all the noises the enemies close in. Light from their burning torches flash in the distance. The wife snaps at her husband, "Damn it! Who asked you to bring this wretched beast along...?"(120). The symbolic reference of the vignette is that common people lost their conscience during Indian partition violence in 1947. In his "Humility" Saadat Hasan Manto writes about train tragedy. The passengers belonging to other religions are killed by the rioters but those belonging to their own religion are treated quite positively. The moving train is forcibly brought to a halt by the rioters. Those who belong to the other religion are dragged out and killed with swords or bullets. The rest of the passengers are treated to halva, fruits and milk. Before the train continues on, the chief organizer of the hospitality addresses the passengers, "Brothers and Sisters we found out about this train's arrival rather late. That's why, even though we wanted to, we were not able to treat you in a more befitting manner" (120). The vignette gives the picture of laughter and pain both at the same time. It gives the sense of metaironic effect. Some passengers are highly respected who belong to the same religion but those are dehumanized who belong to other religion. It clearly justifies that the moral values were lost during Indian partition violence in 1947 because the partition was made in

religious ground. "Sorry" by Manto explores the loss of human values during the time of violence. Instead of regretting the loss of human lives the knife-wielder regrets for the damaging pajama cord. The rioter slashes the stomach of an innocent man all the way to his navel with the knife. His pajama cord is severed. Words of regret escape from the knife-wielder's tongue, "Tsch, tsch, tsch, tsch...I've made a mistake!"(120). The knife-wielder regrets not because his knife has slashed the stomach of the victim but because his pajama cord has been severed. He does not think that slashing the stomach is his mistake but damaging the pajama cord is the mistake. In "Jelly" Manto writes how even the innocent kids are affected in partition violence. It symbolizes that the partition violence in 1947 became so common that even the small kids took human blood as jelly; a kind of jam made of fruit juice. Human blood became as common as jelly of the market. Early in the morning, a vendor who sells ice from a pushcart is stabbed to death near the petrol pump. It is the event at six in the morning. His corpse lies on the road till seven. Drops of water from the melting ice trickle down on it. At a quarter past seven, the police take the corpse away. The ice and the blood remain on the road. A child riding in a Tonga notices the patch of fresh, congealed blood glistening on the road. His mouth begins to water. He tugs at his mother's sleeve and points at it, "Look Mummy, jelly!"(121). In the vignette entitled "What's the Difference" Manto writes how killing was taken as a game; just the way of entertainment during the time of Indian partition violence in 1947. Killing was common but its ways were different in terms of religious principles. In this vignette, a Muslim slaughters a person in the halal manner prescribed by Islam. Then his friend asks, "What have you done? He says, 'why?' He again asks, 'why did you kill him that way?' He replies, "I enjoy it that way" (121). He says, "To hell with your enjoyment. You should have just hacked his neck off with a single blow the way they

do in Jhataka. Like this” (121). And the one who has slaughtered in the prescribed manner is himself slaughtered in the Jhataka way. In Indian partition violence, some killed in halal manner prescribed by the Muslim and some killed in Jhataka way. It did not matter how they killed to each other but they killed human beings. So killing was totally wrong act. The surprising thing is that the one who killed in halal manner is himself killed in Jhataka way.

The Muslim writer Qurratulain Hyder’s novella *Sita Betrayed* explores the violence perpetrated on women’s bodies, inescapability of patriarchy and fragmented sense of belonging. Sita marries a Muslim Jamil but he betrays her and marries another woman before he gets divorce with Sita. When Sita gets a divorce letter from Jamil she makes a bold decision to marry with Irfan, her ex-lover. She meets all her friends before she leaves for Paris to meet Irfan. While leaving for Paris she intends to take her son Rahul with her but she is not allowed to do so. She reaches Paris intending to marry Irfan but she finds Irfan with his mistress Madame Kazmi in their honeymoon. Thus, Sita’s dream fails.

Qurratulain Hyder is one of the leading writers of Urdu fiction in India whose contribution in representing moral values in literature is unquestionable. Qurratulain Hyder’s protagonist Sita Mirchandani, a Hindu refugee from Sind, now living in India has been betrayed everywhere and she has been taken as a playing doll by Jamil, Qamar and Irfan. Sita’s friend Bilquis seems quite worried when Sita is betrayed by Jamil. After the divorce from Jamil Sita intends to meet Irfan but her friend Bilquis seems suspicious even with Irfan and says, “Darling, he is a bachelor. Lives by himself. You cannot go to his home” (53). When Sita meets Irfan then he becomes quite sentimental with her and expresses the voice of rejection:

Listen, Sita...you want everything to be different and original...unique and profound. But life's tale has been repeated millions of times. It has always been like that, and that's how it will always be. People will fall in love just like that –then they will be disappointed in each other. Hearts will break; people will suffer. Sita you and Jamil and Qamar are not unique. The likes of you have been seen before. You think I'm superficial, that I'm without sentiment. But I know how you must have left Jamil's house which was also your house. How Jamil must have refused to let you take Rahul with you. How you must have gone to Qamar for help and how perhaps he, too, refused. Perhaps such things should not have happened to all of you, for you and Jamil and Qamar were brilliant people. But the wheels of life turn evenly for all. As they grind us down they don't distinguish between intellectuals and non-intellectuals. (85)

Sita claims that she has been betrayed by Jamil not because of other reason but because of being non-Muslim. She argues, "...I became a Muslim, and we had a Muslim marriage...Muslim, non-Muslim. I don't believe in all that. On the marriage contract, my Muslim name was Sayida Begum"(86). Then Sita goes to meet another ex-lover Qamar and asks his favour. Then Qamar too shows his indifference to her and replies:

'What brings you here in this rain?' He asked, 'Are you all right?' ...He was silent for a while then said: 'Sita, I made a mistake. I'll never be able to give you a happy life. I'm an utterly irresponsible person. Please go back and ask Jamil to forgive you. He is a good man; he will definitely forgive you. I'll ask his forgiveness. We let ourselves

get carried away by temporary feelings. Sita dear, you can find true peace in life only with a solid person like Jamil. (87)

Sita is lost in the dreadful jungle of today's world. She was abducted by the Ravana of today's world. The world which is prey to Anglo-American imperialism; in which innocent people are tortured but no Hanuman comes to rescue them. So many Muslim Sitas were abducted in 1947. Finally; Sita's hope of getting married with Irfan also ends as she finds Irfan and Madame Kazmi in their honeymoon. Now, Sita realizes that time is quite powerful as she expresses, "No one has been able to measure time...it checks your worth, it checks my worth, this ruthless money-changer Time...This measuring of days and nights...life is not one of your documentary films" (173). For Sita, the chain of day and night has been a two-toned thread of silk. The final line of the novella is quite symbolic as Hyder writes, "A gust of wind banged the door shut" (173). The shut of the door symbolizes the lack of alternatives in Sita's life on the one hand and on the other it indicates that there is no vacancy for Sita in Irfan's heart as well. He has been a married man and it is impossible for him to accept Sita now.

Qurratulain Hyder, in fact, worries about the loss of human values. Her novella, in this sense, is the quest for human values in this faithless world. The protagonist frequently changes her lovers. On the one hand, different patriarchal agents like Qamar, Jamil and Irfan are themselves immoral and on the other hand Sita is made immoral through their immoral acts. She gets married with Jamil and he betrays her. Then she searches shelter in her ex-lovers. They don't care her now and she becomes homeless. Irfan, Jamil and Qamar all lack moral values. They accept Sita in the past as a beloved but these patriarchal agents are not ready to accept her as a wife. All the characters, including the protagonist Sita are playing selfish role. She

becomes modern. She becomes global agent. She is far from narrow and confined space. She gets married with Muslim though she herself is non-Muslim. She becomes quite radical in her attitude. She changes her Hindu name Sita into Sayida Begum after she gets married with Jamil. Despite her effort she cannot integrate herself in the Muslim family of Jamil. Instead of getting love and care she is betrayed from the Muslim. Jamil marries another woman without informing Sita. It means moral values are degraded due to religious fanaticism. Jamil should not have married with another woman. Sita should not have established love relation with multiple partners. Irfan should have waited her longer if he was a true lover of Sita. He should not have married Madame Kazmi without informing Sita. Qamar should have accepted Sita. Sita has not been treated as human in the home of Jamil. Jamil and his family members give more priority for religion rather than moral values. Sita is treated as if she is the woman from another world. She has been homeless both physically and spiritually. Sita is in no man's heart and she is dislocated due to her own fault as well as the cruel acts of her betrayers. Qurratulain Hyder presents Sita, as a new woman, who wants to break cultural, religious and social boundaries and obstacles but she has been betrayed everywhere. She has been unfit in the eyes of the Muslims, her ex-lovers, society and culture. The protagonist Sita as well as other characters seems to forget moral values. They do not seem to contribute for the sake of morality. No one is ready to sacrifice in love as well as in family duty and responsibility. At least, Sita tries to search human values beyond religious boundary but she is made failure in the world of religious fanaticism and patriarchal world. Anyway, her quest for morality is praiseworthy.

Qurratulain Hyder's moral line is very clearly depicted in her novella due to the representation of victimhood of the protagonist, Sita Mirchandini, in a vivid

manner. In representing the pains of Sita, Hyder just paints the picture of the trauma of her rejecting all types of cultural and religious principles. She highlights Sita's trauma in this novella. The novella is all about how Sita is betrayed by Qamar, Jamil, Irfan and others. The novella just sings the sad song of Sita's tragic life events. So the fiction follows moral line. Similar attitude can be felt in Saadat Hasan Manto's collection of vignettes in his *Black Margins*. Manto, in his vignettes, does not describe about the ideology of the victims and victimizers. He just captures the pictures of their cruelties and inhuman acts. The vignettes are quite meaningful due to the presentation of the events in darkly humorous manner. His representation of trauma is also moral because nothing but the subjectivity of victimhood is represented in his writings.

Chapter V: Conclusion: Discourse of Trauma and the Canonization of Indian Partition Literature

In conclusion, the epistemology with which the representation of trauma in three so-called canonized Sikh partition novels -- Raj Gill's *The Rape*, H.S. Gill's *Ashes and Petals*, and K. S. Duggal's *Twice Born Twice Dead* comes from the notions of Sikh community and nationhood. It is this epistemology which makes the representation ethical in contrast to the moral representation by Hyder and Manto.

Raj Gill's *The Rape* is the depiction of dehumanized society. The dehumanized act of the Muslims and non-Muslims is clearly depicted in this novel. First, the attack upon Leila is the picture of dehumanization in which Dalipjit struggles hard to save her and the second, the rape upon Leila by Dalipjit's father is the picture of dehumanization. The novel problematizes Sikhs' attitude as Leila is shown in the role of weak and fiddle character who lacks agency to fight for her rights. But Jasmit and Dalipjit are shown as active and virtuous agents here in this novel. Therefore; the essence of the novel is the quest for Sikhs' nationhood but not the expression of victimhood. The partition scenario depicted in the novel is the common event of partition violence but it has been made the means of politics in Sikh community as they are using the cultural template of the Sikhs to analyze the partition events. H. S. Gill's *Ashes and Petals* is the picture of the trauma of train tragedy. The protagonist, Risaldar Santa Singh, rejects Ajit's proposal to marry Salma due to his deep-rooted trauma of the past with the Muslims. The presentation of love affair between Salma and Ajit refers to the quest for Sikh's identity and nationhood. Using Ajit as an active agent in love refers to the feminization of Muslim culture. The major issue in this novel is mainly the issue of train tragedy. But it becomes a serious issue as it is exaggerated and valorized unnecessarily by using the cultural template of the Sikhs. K. S. Duggal's *Twice Born Twice Dead* depicts the violence particularly in Noakhali and Bihar. The end of communal harmony and the beginning of anarchy is the central issue here. The presentation of love affair between Kuldip and Satbharai seems to be the attempt of the solution but it becomes problematic as it follows the line of Sikhism. Kuldip is presented as an active agent in love where as Satbharai's representation refers to the feminization of the Muslims. The novel is just about the

glimpse of the violence in Bihar and Noakhali but it is highlighted as if it is a big issue for the Sikhs.

Qurratulain Hyder's representation of trauma of the protagonist Sita Mirchandini in the novella is moral as it discusses about the victimhood of her. Her pain is elaborated in a vivid manner. It tells very clearly about her struggle. Sita is treated as savaged being by Qamar, Jamil, and Irfan and whole patriarchal agents. She is used and thrown in the world of patriarchy. In fact, Sita needs a shelter to live a happy and peaceful life finding a suitable partner but she is unable to find suitable life partner who understands her feelings. She intends to feel the presence of someone in her life but she frequently suffers from the sense of absence and the sense of loss. All her loved ones have been betrayers. She is dislocated while exercising her free will. She suffers and struggles alone. Hyder encourages the readers to listen the pain of Sita Mirchandini forgetting their personal ideology. Similarly, Saadat Hasan Manto's collection of vignettes in *Black Margins* reflects the loss of moral values as it is the expression of victimhood of the sufferers of diverse sectors. The events described in these vignettes are humorous. They create laughter among the audience in the beginning but in depth they make the audience cry in listening the pains of the victims. There is loss of human values both in victims and victimizers. The collection gives the glimpse of Indian partition violence. The inhuman acts like-rape, loot, kidnapping, arson, killing etc. are mentioned in these vignettes in humorous and ironical way.

So far as the relevance of methodological tool in studying Indian Punjabi Sikh partition fictions as well as Punjabi Muslim partition fictions is concerned, the tool of cultural trauma is highly applicable in analyzing and elaborating them. Trauma as a discourse is defined differently by different theorists and writers such as Giorgio

Agamben, Jeffrey Alexander, Cathy Caruth, Ron Eyerman, Shoshanna Felman, Geoffrey Hartman, Dominick LaCapra, Saadat Hasan Manto, Avishai Margalit, Allen Meek, Larry Ray and so on. In analyzing the given partition fictions by the Sikhs and the Muslims, the ideas of the above mentioned theorists are quite relevant as their analysis mainly focuses on cultural trauma, the configuration of which takes ethical rather than moral lines in their representations. The ethics of Sikhs' cultural trauma is directly related to patch up the tear in the fabric of their identity -- a tear that was caused by the events of 1947. As they try to patch up the tear, they draw on their age-old discourse of demonizing the Muslims. This kind of representation adds to the bitterness even as it leads to group consciousness. However, Manto and Hyder do not go for strengthening group consciousness of a Muslim or a Sikh or a Hindu. Their spotlight is on capturing the group consciousness of the victims of the partition violence. That consciousness is the experience of trauma itself. Trauma -- in its pure form has agency in their writings. The agency of trauma is a welcome far cry from the discourse of cultural trauma in the writings by the Sikhs.

Works Cited

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Means without Ends: Notes on Politics*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2000.
- Alexander, Jeffrey, et al. *Cultural Trauma and collective Identity*. Berkeley L: U of California P, 2004.
- Bianchini, Stefano, Sanjay Chaturvedi, Rada Ivekovic and Ranabir Samaddar.

- Partitions: Reshaping states and minds*. Oxon: Frank Cass 2 Park Square, 2005.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience-Trauma, Narrative and History*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins U P, 1996.
- - - . *Exploration in Memory*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins U P, 1995.
- Duggal, K.S. *Twice Born Twice Dead*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1979.
- Eyerman, Ron. *Cultural Trauma and Collective Memory*. London: Cambridge U P, 2004.
- Felman, Shoshanna and Dori Laub, M. D. *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*. New York and London: Rutledge, 1992.
- Gill, H.S. *Ashes and Petals*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1978.
- Gill, Raj. *The Rape*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1974.
- Grewal, J.S. "Punjab Muslims and Partition". *The Partition in Retrospect*. Ed. Amrik Singh. New Delhi: Anamika Publishers, 2000. 129-144.
- Hartman, Geoffrey H. *The Longest Shadow: In the Aftermath of the Holocaust*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1996.
- . *Scars of the Spirit: The Struggle Against Inauthenticity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Hyder, Qurratulain. *A Season of Betrayals: A Short Story and Two Novellas*. Tr. Naim, C. M. New Delhi: Kali for women, 1999.
- Kapur, Prithipal Singh. "The Role of Master Tara Singh". *The Partition in Retrospect*. Ed. Amrik Singh. New Delhi: Anamika Publishers, 2000. 60-73.
- Khosla, Gopal Das. *Stern Reckoning Survey of Events Leading up to and Following the Partition of India*. New Delhi: Oxford U P, 1989.

- LaCapra, Dominick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins U P, 2001.
- Manto, Saadat Hasan. "Black Margins". *Inventing Boundaries: Gender Politics and Partition of India*. Ed. M. Hiral Hassan. Delhi: Oxford U P, 2000.
- Margalit, Avishai. *The Ethics of Memory*. New York: Harvard U P, 2004.
- Mc Lead, Hew. "Sikhs and Muslims in the Punjab." *South Asia* 22 (1999): 155-165.
- Meek, Allen. *Trauma and Media*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Oren, Stephen. "The Sikhs, Congress and the Unionists in British Punjab, 1937-1945." *Modern Asian Studies* 8 (1974): 397-418.
- Pandey, Beerendra. *Historiography of Partition*. New Delhi: The Study Publication, 2012.
- . "Pedagogy of Indian Literature in the Light of Trauma Theory." *Southern Postcolonialism: The Global South and the New Literary Representations*. Ed. Sumanyu Satpathy. London: Routledge, 2008. 124-38.
- Pandey, Gyanendra. *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2004.
- Ray, Larry. "Mourning, Melancholia and violence." *Memory, Trauma and World Politics: Reflections on the Relationship Between Past and Presented*. Ed. Duncan Bell. New York: Houndmills, 2006. 135-153.
- Roy, Rituparna. *South Asian Partition Fiction in English: From Khushwant Singh to Amitav Ghosh*. Amsterdam UP, 2010.
- Sharma, K. K., and B. K. Johri. *The Partition in Indian English Novels*. Ramnagar Ghaziabad: Vimal Prakashan, 1994.
- Singh, Kirpal. "Partition of Punjab and the Sikhs." *The Partition in Retrospect*. Ed. Amrik Singh. New Delhi: Anamika Publishers, 2000. 145-156.

Spyra, Ania. "Is Cosmopolitanism Not for Women?: Migration in Qurratulain

Hyder's *Sita Betrayed* and Amitav Ghosh's *The Shadow Lines*." Frontier: A

Journal of Women's Studies 27. 2 (2006): 1-26.

Tapan, Basu. "Review of *Stern Reckoning & India's Partition: Process, Strategy and*

Mobilization." *Seminar*. Issue 420 (August 1994). 103-106.