

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY
Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences

The Secondary Citizenship of Indian Muslims in *About Daddy*

**A thesis submitted to the Central Department of English in the partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in English**

By
Amrita Kumari

Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu
March 25, 2007

Tribhuvan University
Faculties of Humanities and Social Science

Letter of Approval

This thesis titled “The Secondary Citizenship of Indian Muslims in *About Daddy*”, submitted to the Central Department of English , Tribhuvan University by Amrita Kumari, has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head, Central Department of English

Date : _____

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Beerendra Pandey for his scholarly guidance, genuine suggestions, essential materials and fruitful encouragement for the existence of this dissertation in its present form. The dream of the completion of this thesis would have never come true had there been not his indispensable comments. His in-depth knowledge and innovative intellectually have enabled me to prepare this thesis. I am deeply indebted to him. Any attempt to express my gratitude to him in words is bound to be inadequate.

I owe my heartfelt gratitude to the Head, and Dr Krishna Chandra Sharma, for the approval of his dissertation in its present form. Special thanks go to Professor Chandra Prakash Sharma for his innovative guidelines. I would like to thank my teacher, Mr Devi Gautam for his co-operation to complete this project.

My sincere sense of obligation also goes to brother Ashutosh Mishra and sister-in-law Bhavna Nand for showing their generosity and helpful manner to complete it. Thanks to my family and especially to my mother Mrs. Manorma Mishra, for her unending inspiration in my academic life. Thanks to Mrs Kalpana Pandey for her encouraging talk and smile that served as inspiration to continue my study. I would like to thank my all the friends for their useful suggestions and encouragement.

March, 2007

Amrita Kumari

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study of the novel *About Daddy* is to show the secondary citizenship status of Indian Muslims, and the effect of partition violence on the next generation becomes fore grounded.

Meena Arora Nayak's *About Daddy* deals with the effect of communal holocaust of 1947 and the effect of partition violence on the post-independent generation. The novel was written at a time when it was a fashion to attribute any subversive act anywhere in India to a Muslim terrorist. The envisaged work proposes to examine the citizenship status of Indian Muslims in the 1990s- the time period that the novel covers. It finds the status as a secondary-- a condition of the marginalized Indian Muslims-- that the texture of the novel criticizes very strongly. Nayak's strong disapproval of the victimization of Indian Muslims stems from her ideology and her unshakable belief in Gandhian politics.

CONTENTS

	Pages
Acknowledgement	iii
I. General Introduction	
An Overview of Meena Arora Nayak and <i>About Daddy</i>	1-5
Literature Review on Meena Arora Nayak's <i>About Daddy</i>	6-9
II. Secondary citizenship status of Indian Muslims	10-23
III. Revising Partition Memory from the perspective of the next Generation in <i>About Daddy</i>	24-39
IV. Conclusion	40
V. Works-Cited	41-42

Introduction: An Overview of Meena Arora Nayak and *About Daddy*

Meena Arora Nayak is a writer and translator. Her first novel, *In the Aftermath* published by Penguin Books, India is an ensemble of contemporary Indian politics, ancient history and timeless mythology. *About Daddy* is her second novel. She has also written a children's book, *The Puffin of Legendary Lives*. Meena is a translator for Hindi, the international journal of Mahatma Gandhi University, Wardha, India. Hindi is devoted to translating acclaimed Hindi writers into English in order to introduce them to rest of literary world. Meena teaches freshman English at Northern Virginia Community College. She lives in Sterling, Virginia. Meena Arora Nayak is almost unknown name in India. She is novelist whose first book caused few ripples. But whose second novel *About Daddy* proves that she has some claims on other's attention. She does not hold a prominent place among younger group of Indian-English novelists. Nayak's work is a part of new style to come out of India which is not conservative as Indian writing has been in the past though. There are few Indian women who show her interest in politics. Her novel is colored by her Personnel views; influence of her parental heritage has been a key to the social biases in her novel. In the novel, she has depicted various changes, which have affected lives since independence. The post-partition Indian Muslims have been radically affected by violence of partition such as the killings, rapes, kidnapping, looting, and banditry. Nayak, being an educated woman of half-American descent, is sensitively situated to record the crisis of Indian Muslims after independence. The crisis leads them to live life of alienation and exploitation. The novel is set in social context and focuses on the life of Indian Muslims at a particular stage. Her characters strive and aspire to get the goals in a complicated and unsystematic world; one of her recurring theme is the struggle of assert their independence in an aggressive Hindu community. Most of Nayak's characters occupy a great space in the world of politics.

Her novel depicts the characters in their conventional roles, man as a father, as lover, as lawyer, as peace-activist and as corrupted police as well and woman as mother, as beloved, as daughter, as sister, as friend and as terrorist too. Nayak's attempt is to explore the inner and hidden world of corruption under the administration and violence against Indian Muslims by the use of supple and suggestive enough technique-the stream of consciousness to convey the fever and fretfulness of her principle character. Her novel is characterized by them who are involved in political activity or become exploited by Hindus in India. The 'existential struggle' of Indian Muslims women who refuse to surrender their individual selves. Even in a very helpless situation, a character struggles for his or her existence. Their inability to compromise and surrender inevitably result in imprisonment with bad treatment. While the protagonist Simran is in the jail, her fellow prisoner Sultana at one place says: "I killed two men," she finally says". "Two Hindu men, they were murderers. The men who burnt my house, they were part of that group" (Nayak101). In their existential struggle, the female characters suffer intensely but refuse to be crushed. Sometimes Nayak depicts the eastern and western cultures and the protagonist's attempt to survive in a new land simultaneously and at other times, she furnishes the analogy of two cultures through the characters occupying two different cultural spaces. Nayak's novel looks at the problem from new perspective and presents the theme in yet another way. *About Daddy* depicts the cultural encounter not between the east and west, rather between Hindu and Muslim cultures. *About Daddy*, Nayak's second novel that deals with the problems arising from racial and cultural difference, tells many miserable stories of Indian Muslims in their own country India and their desperate longing for native land. The novel covers different aspects of India and the relationship between Hindu and Muslim in different parts of the country.

The novel is set at the time of 1990s and it shows the citizenship status of Indian Muslims

at that time. Simran, who belongs to the Hindu culture, is an honest daughter and a lover of peace who desires freedom for every individual either he is Hindu or a Muslim. In India, she finds many Muslims victimized by the Hindus. Nayak shows us the worst side of the system of Hindu community.

About Daddy is marked by Nayak's clear pungent prose, her artistic vision and her preoccupation with the 'revelation of human survival in the world, where values, norms and principals are incapable of guiding the people'. Though every part of the novel covers a small world, but the characters and the world they occupy is 'microcosm of the macrocosm'. Each part of the novel is set in Indian society where Nayak's keen observation examines its system, the individual's exploitation and their efforts to attain selfhood far more realistically. The novelist is fully conscious of her ambition and choice of subject matter and its artistic treatment fully suits her consciousness of Indian society and culture. By bringing Indian characters and 'Indian ness' together with the background of west; Nayak focuses on the mutuality in terms of exclusiveness.

Her novel varies in theme or subject matter, since she covers wide range of human experience and moulds them with her personal experience in order to give the artistic truth rather than mere reality. Though, they bear different subject matter, her stories do have some sort of unity and show a thematic affinity with her novels. In her novel, the characters are incapable of making the connection between the actual and the ideal, between fact and inspiration.

Apart from novels, Nayak has written children's book *The Puffin Book of Legendary Lives*. This book is the collection of twenty-four stories and in these stories, Meena Arora takes us back in time to an India where life was lived according to extraordinary codes; where an emperor's whim could mean the difference between life and death; where a single transgression could lead to banishment or worse; and where an

individual could change the entire course of a civilization. Meena Arora Nayak believes in Gandhian politics. Her belief in Gandhian politics makes her interested in knowing the situation of India and spread the message of peace especially between Hindus and Muslims through her writing. Her novel deals with politics which is well known as 'non-violence' in all over the world. It is Gandhi to lead the vision of non-violence and ahimsa for the achievement of national freedom. Non-violence and non-cooperation are supposed to be universal theme in Gandhi's ideology. Because of her strong belief in Gandhian politics, Nayak gives equal importance to Muslim community unlike the average Indians who grant them only secondary status in India. Gandhian politics never seems to be biased against the Muslims. Gandhi's philosophy of political independence rests on religious and moral foundation. Gandhi emerged as a great leader using non-violent revolutionary weapons for love and truth.

This was Gandhi's nexus of values: non-violence and tolerance, truth and truthfulness, trust and openness, and connected to both personal and political. His focus is that we become liberated from any physical or mental dictatorship only when we are empowered by truthfulness and non-violent action, that freedom is not merely license because it must also mean a social awareness and responsibility that comes with a sense of human connectedness. Thus Gandhi's thought and action for revolution and independence movement totally rests upon the same premise exclusively of non-violence and truth for he believed that it was only and ultimate path. Nayak was much influenced by Gandhian concept and example of influence can be found in her novel.

Except Nayak's belief in Gandhian politics, she disapproves the victimization of Indian Muslims highly. Her strong disapproval of exploitation against them is found in the novel. She shows us the true picture of Indian society, where the condition of Indian Muslims is really miserable. They had to lead the life as a status of secondary citizen in

their own country. In the novel, she not only talks about exulted moment of India being independent but also about painful and bitter resulted from partition and its pervasive violence.

Nayak shows us many Muslims who become victims by the Hindus in India through her different characters in the novel. Her attempt is to bring the marginal group in the center of her writing is really admirable. She takes the victimization of Indian Muslims as the central issue in her writing.

Literature Review on Meena Arora Nayak's *About Daddy*

Meena Arora Nayak, one of the creative writers of modern life in all its complicated aspects is noted in the national arena of literature. But being a quite recent novel, there are a few criticisms on this novel. In this connection, Nilanjana S. Roy in *Partition Redux* admires Nayak's novel and says about the partition as well "The stories of the worst events in human history-world wars, holocaust, partitions are twice-told: once by the generation that survived them, again by the generation that survived the weight of those memories" (1).

Nayak's storytelling skills are not even, and the emotional tenor teeters between genuine pathos and unabashed melodrama. What distinguishes Nayak from other writers is her preoccupation with the individual and his or her world of sensibility. Unlike others, she does not focus on the social, political, economic, cultural problem, alone. Concerned exclusively with the personal tragedy of the individual, Nayak brings cultural, political, regional and social aspects in order to show how individual life is conditioned. Nayak "carries the power of her message through the reader, as does the character of Simran, who mixes naiveté with courage" (2).

Next to the exploration of underlying truth and the use of stream of consciousness technique, it is style that she emphasizes. By style, she means the conscious effort of uniting language with word. Without this unity, language would remain a dull and pedestrian vehicle. There is hardly any criticism on the novel. However, M.K. Nayak and Shyamla Narayan in *Indian English Literature 1980-2000: A critical survey* (2001) has a paragraph in praise of *About Daddy*.

Very few Indian women novelists have written about the partition of 1947. It is mentioned in Nina Sibal's *Yatra* (1987). Shauna Singh Baldwin's *What the Bobby Remembers* (1999) and Manju Kapur's *Difficult Daughters* (1980). Meena Arora

Nayak's second novel, *About Daddy* (2000) presents the topic in an original way. The protagonist, a young woman born in America, visits India in 1997-1998 to fulfill her father's last wishes: that his ashes should be scattered on the Indo-Pakistan border as a kind of expiation for his sin of killing innocent Muslims before partition. The first person narratives reveal the father's life in series of flashbacks. The daughter's innocent attempt to take a photograph at the border land her in jail; she is released only through the intercession of her American fiancé. Nayak presents a vivid picture of Hindu-Muslim relations in modern India.

The study of exploitation experienced by Indian Muslims in a Hindu dominant society is a significant issue in this novel. In the Hindu society, Muslims are not allowed to play any active role in decision-making. They are ignored or brushed aside. In such situation Meena Nayak tries to focus on predicament of Indian Muslims in the Indian society. As Beerendra Pandey's critical view on the basis of the theme of the novel is :

About Daddy deals with a very sensitive and important subject: partition and its continuing presence in post-Ayodhya communal politics in India. In the novel, that something as innocent as this can easily be seen as a threat to national security. And once the system latches on to such threat, there is no getting out of its trap, something that Meena Arora Nayak amply demonstrates. (1)

Since Meena Nayak is a very careful and meticulous artist is translator for Hindi. Beside it, the choice of medium is very important for her. She presents the thing that makes the treatment of the partition quite original in the novel. Beerendra Pandey says about the author that Nayak touches on something that has not been given much attention in partition narratives and even, to a large extent, in fiction "the question of our (India's) own complicity. Even in the stories survivors tell, they will seldom speak of their own

participation in, or their complicity in consenting to the perpetration of violence on the Muslims. Beerendra Pandey further admires her in these words:

Meena Nayak's book is important in that it looks at the question of partition memory, and the need to lay that memory at rest, from the point of view of the next generation helping to hide the violence. And yet, the question is real: how did families deal with the violence in their own who become perpetrators of violence and who then lived all their lives with regret, the grief, the silence and the guilt? (2)

Thus far much partition fiction has dealt with the experiences of survivors. The passing of a half century, the fact of the many kinds of violence that has so polarized our society in this half century, the passing into adulthood of a second of partition 'children'-all this had contributed to the new kinds of explorations we are seeing. Meena Nayak's book is one among these and important in that it looks at the question of partition memory, and the need to lay that memory at rest, from the point of view of the next generation who suffer from a sense of rootless ness. In this connection, it is also criticized by the Beerendra Pandey, who says:

The unnecessary mixing together of maladies of India- from Naxalite violence in the 1970s terrorism in Punjab in the 1980s and in Kashmir in the 1990s-makes the novel loses focus on partition. Contemporary India, in this portrayal, is an undifferentiated space of hatred, irrationally and communal violence- a portrait counter pointed to an equally ludicrous pre-partition era in which everyone lived with wonderful secular love, and life was an external Hindu-Muslim bhai-bhai (brotherhood) advertisement. (2)

Nilanjana S. Roy says about Nayak that "As for Nayak, she has no answers of her

own, only questions, and that's finally what gives *About Daddy* a forceful, insistent claim on our imaginations". Similarly viewing the novel, another critic Bapsi Sidhwa says "Meena Nayak tells her story about contemporary India with stunning honesty and courage. Informed with compassion and observed with freshness, this brilliant suspenseful novel is bound to disturb the reader and raise questions".

About Daddy opens with the ashes of Simran's father and ends with a funeral process. Nayak truly captures the social context and depicts the problem of Indian Muslims in India where her protagonist strives for an order. Sometimes they succeed and most of the time the system of Hindu society become hostile to them. Because of their hostility, Nayak strongly feels the need of peace and better situation in India.

Secondary Citizenship Status of Indian Muslims

The partition of India causes one of the great human convulsions of history. It is really an apocalyptic event ever happened in the human civilizations having lasting impression of monstrosity and horrific emotional duress. From the killings, rapes, kidnapping, and banditry to the externalization to the extreme form of barbarism, the Indian Muslims suffered in a great extremity. In the sense of truth, while talking about the partition of India, independent movement also comes simultaneously. But the partition and its pervasive violence against Indian Muslims are not much discussed in the history book of India though it is a great event.

Gyanendra Pandey, one of the great historicist talks about many communal riots occurred in India like ; the Hindu-Muslim Moradabad in 1980, Meerut, 1987; the anti-sikh riots in Delhi in 1984; the anti-Tamil riots in Colombo in 1983 but he overemphasizes about the worst instances of recent violence- Bhagalpur in 1989, which have amounted to pogroms, organized Massacres of hundreds, thousands and even in places, tens of thousands have attacked the houses and property and lives of small, isolated and previously identified members of the “other” community. Pandey in his essay ‘In Defense of the Fragment: Writing About Hindu-Muslim Riots in India Today’ reveals not Only the violence and cruel act against Indian Muslims but Hindu Community crossed every limitations, moral boundaries and Proved their relation with the Muslim people as a great enemy. Pandey makes considerable use of personal impressions and Insights gathered as a part of ten-member team sent out number Under aegis of the people’s union for Democratic Rights (PUDR), to investigate the situation in Bhagalpur.

In any event, Bhagalpur was indeed one of the most devastating examples of Hindu-Muslim strife in the country since partition. This round of violence began in the last week of October 1989; Arson, looting and murder spread from the city to the

surrounding countryside and regard practically unchecked for several days:

Possibly as many as a thousand people were killed in the course of the violence, most of the time he estimates of the casualties still very enormously. During the first days of the “riots, “trains were stopped repeatedly at different places in Bhagalpur and its neighboring districts; from several of these, Muslim travelers were dragged out and lynched. Noone can say for certain how many were killed in this way- not even disturbed Hindu travelers who happened to be caught on one of these trains and saw people being pulled from their particular carriage. In the major attack in rural areas as well as in the city, neither old people nor infants, neither women nor children, were spared. There is widespread feeling that women were abducted and raped on a large scale, but none of surviving victims will talk about rape. (34)

Pandey focuses on the victimization of Indian Muslims without any guilt and by bringing the real event against Muslims, he himself feels too much poor and miserable condition for the Indian Muslims who are forced to live under the threatening in their own Country by Hindus:

At the worst stage of the violence in October-November 1989, some 40,000 people were forced to leave their homes and live in makeshift relief camps. Destruction and looting of property occurred on a massive scale for several weeks. The fears generated among the heavily outnumbered Muslims were such that a great many were unwilling to return to their homes even three months after the initial outbreak of violence; an estimated 10,000 were still in “relief camps” toward the end of January 1990, apart

from those who had moved in with relatives or Friends in “safer places in or outside Bhagalpur district. (34)

Pandey went to Bhagalpur three months after the outbreak of this violence with PUDR team. He faced a further difficulty to ask the victims of such barbarism-the father and son, or the mother and four little children, who one was away and others managed somehow to hide in the fields from where they could see elders and young ones, kith and kin and neighbors, women and infants in arms, everyone was found in the Muslim quarter of their village being slaughtered. He says that – “how does one ask such victims of terror for details of what they saw?” (36). While asking, one of the Muslims says “we live under constant threat and may will be killed before anyone bothers to take down our evidence” (37).

Pandey brings the references and records from another historicist as well. He focuses not only the crime and torture against Indian Muslims rather how the administration encourages such inhuman acts and even suppressed many events. He further talks about an independent and enterprising filmmaker, Nalini Singh who shows a documentary film on the Bhagalpur violence on national television in March 1990 although the most reliable estimates suggest that seven people were killed and some seventy houses and huts partially burned and looted in Jamalpur against 115 killed and the entire Muslim basti looted, burned, and destroyed in Logain. (38) Through such references, it becomes clear that Logain is the site of one of the worst massacres of Muslims among many riots. With close observation to Indian nationalist history, one sees that there is no real means of representation of tragic loss, bloodshed, martyrdom, communal or religious conflict etc. during independence movement:

. . .the call to leave not a single Muslim man, woman, or child alive, which was acted upon in several places in Bhagalpur; the massacre of all eighteen

Muslim passengers traveling in a tempo-taxi along with the Hindu taxi driver, when they were stopped on a major country road two-and-a half weeks after the cessation of general “rioting,” and their burial in a field which was then planted over with garlic; the chopping off of the breasts of women ;he spearing of infants and children, the spears with the victims impaled on them being then twirled around in the air to the accompaniment of laughter and shouts of triumph. (42)

The above-mentioned paragraph clearly suggests the discord between Hindu and Muslim, lootings, killings, vandalism and other anti-social activities rampant in society during the horrendous events of partition of India. Hindu demands from Muslim in India to adopt their name, their language, their dress if Muslim wants to stay in India, they must learn to live like the Hindus “ Hindustan mein rahna hai to hamse milkar rahna hoga, Hindustan mein rahna hai to Bande mataram karna hoga” (44).

This was the central message of all Hindus to Indian Muslims. In this circumstances how can a Muslim think to live freely in India? It was really a misfortune for all of them to face such a critical circumstances. The majority of the people were Indian Muslims, who were primary victims of the “riots” of Bhagalpur. The essay “Citizenship and Difference: The Muslim Question In India” by Gyanendra Pandey concerned with the question of citizenship and difference, or more precisely nationalism and the management of difference. This essay deals with the notions of minorities, marginal community or the elements around which the question of boundaries – geographical, social, and cultural will then be negotiated or fought over. Indian Muslims lived under the sign of a question mark in India, “who do not inhabit this core-the minorities and marginal groups who might be allowed to be part of the nation, but ‘never quite” (101). Pandey, a great historiography revisionist, envisages and evaluates

Indian history that best suits for this discussion:

...Could any substantial body of Indian Muslims stay on in India in these conditions? ... by recognition that killing and counter killing, massacre and counter-massacre could not go on endlessly without destroying everything and everybody, by the fact that in some areas there was no one left to kill (except in fairly well-guarded refugee camps), and the awareness that the entire body of Muslims in India could not be driven out anyway. (105)

It is likely that half a million or more people lost their lives; incalculable numbers were maimed, looted and raped; and some fourteen million were uprooted and turned into refugees for a long time to come.

Partition really was the dark side of Independence. Under the so-called veil of independence, thousands of Muslims got traumatic experiences; lost their relatives, homes and so on. The Muslims belong to minority group and Hindus belong to the ruling class in India where, all Indian Muslims were patently unjust and loaded with dangerous implications:

The regional, caste and occupational and occupational markers by which generations of Muslims had been known – privileged, denigrated, or even declared to be only ‘half-Muslims’ – seemed to lose much of their significance. The Muslims were now, ‘Muslims; and all of them were suspect-as open or closet ‘Pakistanis’. (106)

The suspicion spread everywhere in India on Indian Muslims with the partition. Their loyalty could not be counted upon. Partition produced a whole range of ideas on the question of what would constitute an adequate proof of loyalty to India on the part of Indian Muslims. Many called for the disbanding of the Muslim League, and the giving up of any demand that smacked even remotely of ‘separatism’-- such as appeals for

separate electorates or an assured quota of legislative seats for Muslims (110). Pandey has discussed the truth of traumatic, genocidal violence of partition and has also discussed how several different techniques are employed by politicians, Ministers to encourage Hindus for violence against Muslims. Babu Sampurnanad, the education Minister in the congress government of U.P. illustrates the point that: ...the 'we' is constructed as 'Hindu': today 'we' (Hindus/Indians) are going to recover that freedom which we lost with the coming of 'Muslim' power (107). The congress leader says this explicitly in his next sentence: "with the defeat of Prithviraj [at the hands of Mohammad Ghori]at the battle of Thanesar, Bharat [India]lost its swa [one's own or self] (107).

Finally sampurnanad mentioned a lurking fear about the potential loyalties of Muslims in Independent India. The fear expressed here grew in strength in weeks and months that followed, as partition worked itself out and large numbers of Indian Muslims were pushed into a corner. Different parliamentarians, able administrators, the men of large Govind Ballabh Pant, Congress Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh declared "Every Indian Muslims should 'realize clearly' what loyalty to the nation would mean if Pakistan invaded India. Every Muslim in India would be required to shed his blood fighting the Pakistani hordes, and each one should search his heart now' and decide whether he should migrate to Pakistan or not (109).

The suspicion that came to be attached to a section of Muslims is not altogether surprising with the establishment of Pakistan. Pandey quotes the remarks to the Indian Muslims ,made in course of speech by Vallabbhai Patel 'you must change your attitude, adapt yourself to the changed conditions...don't pretend to say 'oh, our affection is great for you. We have seen your affection ...Let us forget the realities. Ask yourself whether you really want to stand here and cooperate with us or you want to play disruptive tactics...' (113). Muslims Leaguers and Muslim bureaucrats who remained in India,

amidst all these accusations and suspicions, scarcely proved their loyalty in the eyes of their interrogators by taking the difficult decision to stay on. Indian Muslims would of course have to be prepared to lay down their lives for the country if it came to war, as we have noted; but even before war broke out, they prove their loyalty by taking up arms their ‘Pakistani brothers’! (113).

The Muslims were the ‘minority’ that had fought over, had to prove their loyal to India and hence worthy of Indian citizenship. The Indian Political discourse that the partition or Independence fixed clearly in their meaning were ‘minority and majority’. Partition and Independence (not only the divisions on the map, but the divisions on the ground and in the mind – the uprooting and looting, the rape and the recovery operations) marked a moment of enormous uncertainty in the political and social life of the people the subcontinent (122).

Gyanendra Pandey very implicitly discusses the percolated violence during the partition of suffering of the Indian Muslims in his essay ‘Can a Muslim Be an Indian?’ Alongside this emerge notions of minorities, marginal communities, or elements, the fuzzy edges and grey areas around which the question of boundaries-geographical, social, and cultural-will be negotiated or fought over (608). Pandey also explores the clamor that arises at the same time for loyalty, for proof of genuine belonging from those who do not inhabit this core: the minorities and marginal groups who might be allowed to be part of the nation, but “never quite”(608). He analyzes the simultaneous construction of the hyphenated one-Indian Muslims who lived in India under the sign of a question mark. They were demanded for proof of loyalty. It is rather, an indication of their brand of nationalism, a brand in which the “Hindu” moment has considerable weight. It is a nationalism in which the Hindu culture, Hindu traditions, and the Hindu community are given pride of place (609). Politically active Muslims were not divided in “Muslims

nationalists” and “Secular Nationalists.” They were divided instead into “Nationalist Muslims” and “Muslims”-and here the proposition extended of course to more than just those who were politically involved. Whether they were Hindu nationalists or secular nationalists was a subsidiary question. All Muslims were, however, Muslims (610).

The Muslims were now the ‘minority’ that had fought for or wanted, Pakistan, and they now had not only to choose where they belonged, but also to demonstrate the sincerity of their choice : they had to prove their loyal to India and hence, worthy of Indian citizenship (611). Loyalty to the nation-the most generally touted test of true, unquestioned citizenship-becomes loyalty to an already existing state and the interest of that state. There is, however, generally a catch: the test of loyalty is in fact required only of those who are not “real”, “natural” citizens (611). The point which Pandey focuses on the realizable quality of nationalist search for clarity, uniformity, and “purity” in the midst of manifest uncertainty, fluidity and inequality which is actually existing condition of all nations and nationalisms. Are we entitled to claim the status of true citizens, who have sacrificed family, caste, community, and religion in the name of the nation? Indian nationalists repeatedly asked in 1947. Are all citizens asked to sacrifice the claims of family, caste, community and religion”? (612).

Partition-marred Independence-15 August 1947 was the moment of establishment of the two new nation-states of India and Pakistan. But it also thrown the moment of congealing of new identities, relations and histories into question once again. The particular circumstances attending this birth scarcely require restatement. Practically the entire “minority” population of certain areas was driven out. Muslim from East Punjab and several neighboring tracts in India. While the figures will never be established with certainty (612). Particularly the moment of independence was made bitter that neither of the two new states turned out to be quite what is proponents had hoped for.

Pakistan has perhaps had the more anguished history in this respect. “On the Indian side, the ongoing transfer of populations in the midst of unimaginable violence and bloodshed provoked angry questions” (613). With the partition it was demanded that most of the major places of India should be cleared of Muslims. Substantial sections of the north Indian population, especially Hindu right wing and leaders of the Sikh community, also demanded that India should be cleared of Muslims (613).

The violence, whether physical or psychological, was brutally perpetrated during the aftermaths of the partition of India in all segments of society along the lines of class, gender, culture, age or religion. Hindus were in the dominant positions and they take Muslims all different from all those of Hindus in language, appearance, religion and practices. Pandey’s political consciousness that ironically shows how the Hindus remains at its strongest in each society of India. “The Muslims stayed, constituting ten percent of the new nation-state’s population. But the question remained: can a Muslim really be an Indian” (614)? Muslim Leaguers in those provinces that remained in India, where Muslims were a minority-having obtained a partition which they had certainly thought little-were at a loss (614). This was one of the enduring legacies of partition in India. The partition of India was the causes of loss, displacement, dispossession, abduction, rape, trauma, pain, death and other forms of violence that all the Indian Muslims suffered. Few people now cared to differentiate carefully among the Muslims of India. The regional, caste and occupational markers by which generations of Muslims were now, more and more-in official documents, in journalism and in common conversation-simply “Muslims and all of them were suspect as open or closet Pakistanis” (615).

Amongst the reality of Indian politics, Gyanendra Pandey stresses for the upliftment of all fragments of Indian society. The violence, whether physical or psychological, was brutally perpetrated during and aftermaths of the partition of India in

all segments of society along the lines of class, gender, culture, age or religion. “The fear expresses here grow in strength in the weeks and months that follows, as partition worked itself out and large numbers of Indian Muslims were pushed into a corner”(617).

Partition produced a plethora of ideas on the question of what would constitute an adequate proof of loyalty on the part of the Indian Muslims. The All-India Muslims League Council, declared that his community of Andhra Muslims was loyal to the Indian Union and “shall defend it against anybody to the last drop of their blood.” The last contention had become a password that has been demanded of Muslims in India, in one form or another, ever since” (618). Even Pandey tells that it is very difficult to point out all the errors of fact and the blatant half-truths that pepper vartman’s analysis of the Muslim condition. The Anglo-Indians, unable to attain the numerical strength of the Muslims, never constituted a threat. The Parses remained different in religion, culture, and “language”, as the Hindi paper had it, but they had contributed significantly to “our” political, economic, intellectual and social development. The Muslims had on the other hand, put forward their own, separatist demands, and had stood in the way of the united struggle against the British. They had not accepted “our” conception of India: they were therefore not Indians (624). It is Pandey’s fragmentary point of view that speaks on behalf of marginal stance of Indian Muslims. He further says that Muslims in India came to be marked out as a minority.

Pandey in his book *Remembering Partition* focuses on the violence and aggression against the Indian Muslims in the title of ‘Folding the national into the local’: Delhi 1947-1948. In this essay, Pandey insists about the acts of abusive and unlawful exercise of physical or ideological power exerted for the abusing, violating, damaging and destroying the victims and those victims were mostly Indian Muslims.

There are moments in history when whole Muslim communities comes to be refugees,

and the members of an entire population (or section of a population, depending on one's point of view) are rendered faceless, undifferentiated, suspect and hunted (121).

There was the extreme form of aggression in the use of force to cause physical harm, death or destruction, the causing of severe mental or emotional harm through humiliation, deprivation, brain washing, profaning, desecrating, defiling or showing disrespect. "This is what happened in Delhi and its environs, as of course it did elsewhere in India and Pakistan, for many months in 1947 and afterwards" (121).

Pandey examines the new discourses that arose among those who were banished from one part of the subcontinent and transported to distant places in another, as well as those who were uprooted even as they stayed in their own habitations-becoming refugees at home, as it were. It reflects also on how one of the most unusual political figures of twentieth-century India responded to what he saw as the vivisection of his land and his people, and how his actions and utterances affected the way in which the national came to be folded into the local at this critical juncture (122).

Pandey brings such information, exact details about the year 1947 to 1948 from different reports. One of the reports notes;

On 3 September 1947, violence broke out in some villages neighboring Delhi on the South-West. From Palam airport, three or four miles away, military officers saw smoke rising from these habitations. As Muslim residents were looted, killed and driven away, 300 of them sought refuge in the airport precincts where a number of Muslims were stationed (123).

By mid-September, perhaps 60 percent of the Muslims of old Delhi and 90 percent of those in New Delhi had fled their homes, seeking refuge where they could. Between 20,000 and 25,000 were said to have been killed.

Contemporary and later accounts give us a clear indication of the transformation

of Delhi into a 'refugee-istan,' with a staggering number of people displaced from elsewhere seeking to find new homes or safe haven in the city, and an equally staggering number of other-local-refugees imprisoned in their own homes or refugees camps nearby (124). Pandey presents the two views of Partition and Independence. Indian observers and analysts draw a distinction between them also because, for many of them, partition diverted Indian politics and society away from 'the normal course of history'. Independence changed lives too, but only by carrying them forward in their 'familiar channels', and only gradually-over time (125).

To conclude this historiography, Gyanendra Pandey sees the dominance of nationalistic Indian history where there is celebration of Independence. At the same time partition issues are side-lined. The two faces of partition and Independence, represented by the 'ruling' and the 'refugee' classes respectively –reflected in joy or sorrow, celebration or consternation-are commonly encountered in recollections of the time (125).

Pandey further says about the divided city Delhi and the miserable circumstances of Muslims who were wondering and did not know where they would be the next day.... It reflects the state of Muslim refugees all over northern India, and that of other communities now designated minorities. Pandey talks about a few references who have written of those tortured days by some of Muslims like Abul Kalam Azad, Shahid Ahmad Dehlavi, Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi and etc. this was the time when 'murder stalked the town' and Muslims found it hard to move out of their homes (and then, at some point, to remain in their homes too), when 'men and women of all kinds and condition-rich and poor, young and old-huddled together in sheer fear of life' and 'no Muslim house holder could go to sleep at night with the confidence that he [sic] would wake up alive the next morning (128). In the same context, a British resident wrote at the beginning of October, 1947 'September, 1947 will be remembered by Delhi residents as a period of horror.

Another wrote 'Moslems were being systematically hunted down and butchered'.

Thousands of them were herded into camps...The dead lay rotting in the streets, because there was no one to collect and bury them. The hospitals were choked with dying and wounded, and in imminent danger of attack because of the presence of Moslem staff and Moslem patients...Appeals for protection poured on from every side...(128).

In the same essay, Pandey assists on the violence that occurred in Delhi in September 1947 conveys something of the terror that Muslims had to live through. On 5 September, widespread and concerted attacks upon Muslims occurred in several areas. The attacks in Qarol Bagh included one upon a high school where students were sitting in their matriculation examination (129).

Other reports suggested that the Muslim examinees were separated from the start, and asked by the invigilators to write the examination in another room-where they were massacred. The attacks spread to some of the best guarded areas of New Delhi and Pandey quotes a Muslim military officer's statement, 'the Muslims of Delhi lost their morale, and the will to resist , because they had not only to resist the well-armed Sikhs but also found the Police and Military against them' (129). A European witness reported seeing 'car loads and lorry loads of armed Sikhs freely going around'; and the Daily Mirror of 9 September reported that the Paharaganj area was 'like a battle-field with blazing houses, horses and the rattle of automatic weapons' (129). Contemporary records as well as later recollections gives picture of how as protective gates went up at the boundaries and preparations for 'defense' were made around, targeting mainly the Muslims-a whole community came to feel defenseless, isolated and increasingly suffocated (131). One senior British Official wrote about the conditions in the purana Qila 'defined description': no food, no water, no sanitary arrangements, and not even assured security (131).

In course of close observation of Indian history, Pandey asserts on India, of a new Indo-Muslim culture, of a new 'Delhi,' and a new 'India' over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It's Pandey's fragmentary point of view that speaks on behalf of marginal stance of Indian Muslims. Dilli ki bipta is perhaps, from this point of view, not the calamity of Shahid Ahmed's family-the calamity of India (136)? Pandey focuses on the misery of Delhi during partition. India, of a new Indo-Muslim culture, of a new 'Delhi', and a new 'India' over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Dilli ki bipta is perhaps, from this point of view, not the calamity of Delhi alone :it is the calamity of India's Muslims , the calamity of Shahid Ahmad's family-the calamity of India (136)?

The major conflict arose especially between the local Hindus and Muslims, sought to return on the re-establishment of peace. Dalit ('untouchable') cultivators, who had been among the chief tenants of local Muslims, especially suffered, since the immigrants-themselves cultivators-had no need of tenants on their newly occupied lands (140). The violence and crime against Indian Muslims is presented by Shail Mayaram in *Resisting Regimes: "Myth, Memory and the shaping of a Muslim Identity"*. He reveals about the condition of Muslims who were staying in Mewat called Meos during the partition. The Indian population is now estimated at 1.2 million. Partition violence left 82,000 Meos dead and surviving population severely traumatized. A third of surviving population is estimated to have left for Pakistan and now consists of over 300,000 persons. In the post-partition period Indian Meos were called 'displaced persons' in officials, over whom 'refugees' were given priority although it meant the deprivation of land for those who had been in possession of it for centuries preceding the formation of regional states. Clearly, Mewat which meant 'land of the Meos', was no longer for them (5). This site in the story underlines the dominancy inherent in Hindu society that has provided the Hindus recourse to perpetrate the communal violence on Muslim during the partition.

Revising Partition Memory from the Perspective of the Next Generation in *About Daddy*

The novel *About Daddy* is about the effect of partition of India half a century after the event. The novel depicts the feelings of enmity that remain in the heart of people belonging to the enemy communities. The novel captures the time period of the turbulent 1940s when India at the time of independence, was subjected to vivisection. Simran, an American of Indian origin is a young woman of a sensitive and open nature. She happens to be at the Wagah border between India and Pakistan because it is the wish of her father to scatter his ashes on India-Pakistan border after his death. Her father belongs to the time of 1940s when the horrendous events of partition occurred in India and people start to kill each other on the basis of religion, caste, community. The violence reaches at its extreme level at this time and Simran's father has to participate in the communal riots. He kills many Muslims during partition and lives his remained life very nostalgic in US and his heart fills with the memory of communal bloodbaths and the violence. He feels repentance for those murders of innocent people and for the crimes which he has done in his past life. Because of feeling of patriotic and self guilt, he decides to scatter his ashes on the border after his death.

Here to fulfill the last wish of father, Simran comes to Wagah border between India and Pakistan from US. Simran, totally unknown about India observes the border interestingly which is secured by an ordinary military post. Totally unprepared for the attitude of the Indian people and unaware about the security and restriction of the border, she takes photograph at the border while carrying her father's ashes in the rosewood box. As she thinks to lay ashes on the ground, suddenly the sound of hard voice with cyclic siren trembles her. She finds armed guards begin to line up one by one to form a semicircle at the periphery of light, their heavy guns pointing directly at her. She is arrested there not only because of any actual crime but only out of hostile relation

between India and Pakistan. Because of the relation of these countries, even the innocent people are suspected there as spy, criminal or terrorist.

The situation is clearer in the novel because Simran reaches there only as a tourist and she has only one purpose to go to the border so that she can fulfill her father's last desire. She does not know that border is restricted area and even it is prohibited to visit there and take photo. But the question arises here why even the innocent people are suspected and they have to be prisoner there? It reveals the hostile and hatred attitude in the heart of every Indian for other communities, castes and religions. It is all because of the bloody partition of India, which had taken on the proportions of war, is the history of violence in colonial and post colonial India. The partition of India has become the cause of loss, displacement, dispossession, abduction, rape, trauma, pain, death and other forms of violence that people suffered from all the communities : Hindu, Sikh and Muslim, during and aftermaths of partition.

She comes to the border from US to fulfill her father's last wish to scatter his ashes on the India-Pakistan border. But unfortunately she is arrested at the border and has to live in prison which is radically different from her former environment. She tries to be free from getting imprisoned and discomfort but she is forced to live in the jail. She could never imagine about the forthcoming danger. It proves that the system of security is very rude and it does not leave even an innocent person easily. With the partition, their mentality has become suspicious. The situation of border is so horrible that the policeman around the border takes anyone as a threat to the national security. It is mainly because of the ancient enmity in their heart for others.

In custody, Simran has to live under physical and mental severe. She is just surrounded by many policeman and they start to check her body:

I stumble towards the mental curve, explaining urgently.' please listen to me. You have made a mistake.' Even as I reach within the semicircle, I am seized by numerous hands. Hands rough and curt probe everywhere-my legs, my inner thighs, my waist, my arms, my underarms, my breasts. 'Stop it! I scream in outrage wiggling my body to dislodge them. 'Stop it'. I slap away their lingering violation. (5)

It is very natural for a lady to feel humiliated and tortured when somebody touches her hardly even on the sensitive organs without asking her at once. She faces with many troubles in jail and has to give lots of clarifications for her defense with many officers like Colonel and others. 'Alone and on a mission. What else are you? carrying Miss Mehta ? he says as though he has already classified Daddy's ashes as incriminating material (7). In jail she is forced to live the life of despair and isolation with very gloomy atmosphere. She is given not only physical torture but mental too. Through her miserable condition, she reveals the crime under administration and misbehavior with the people who belong to the other communities or other countries.

From the partition it has become the tradition of India as well as Indian people to do the partial behavior with the people of other castes or religions. She reveals the evil system of administration or government. Arundhati Roy tells in her book 'An ordinary person's guide to Empire' with the subtitle of Ahimsa about police and administration and it's insensitivity from inhuman acts with the common people. She says that "the total number of displaced people is 600. People have even identified land that is available and could be bought and allotted to them by the government. And yet the government refuses" (5). In the novel About Daddy, Simran has to lead very terrible and disappointed life in jail with lack of everyday comfort and misbehavior done to her by the Officers and workers of prison make her sick both physically as well as mentally. Police and

administration do not have humanity and they never care about the feeling and sentiment of common people. Due to the evil system there are tears of anger, frustration, trepidation and real fear among the people. Roy shows the relationship between power and powerlessness and the endless conflict between them in her writing. Talking about police and administration, Roy says:

In Madhya Pradesh, the police and administration entered Adivasi village with bulldozers. They sealed hand pumps, demolished school buildings, and clear-felled trees in order to force people from their homes. The world over, non-violent resistance movements are being crushed and broken. If we do not respect and honor them, by default we privilege those who turn to violent means. (7)

Such inhuman and cruel act is done by administration especially with the people of other community and religion only because of partition. The partition includes the communal violence in which Indian Muslims always remained at the receiving end as primary victims. The violent hostility that erupted between Hindus and Muslims at that time cannot be separated from the violence against Muslim woman during and after the partition. In *About Daddy*, the dominant position of Hindus in India underlines the victimization of Indian Muslims that provides the Hindus with the wherewithal to perpetrate the violence on Muslims during the partition period. In the novel, she does not only talk about exulted moment of India being independent but also painful and bitter experiences resulted from the partition and its pervasive violence.

Simran starts to take an active interest in other prisoners around her, where she finds very miserable and sympathetic situation of Muslims and especially Koki, Kubrma and Sultana there, who are victimized by poverty, religion, corruption under the administration and the feelings of enmity between Hindu and Muslims. Simran could

know the entire story of many prisoners who are getting punishment without actual guilt. Koki, one of the Simran's fellow prisoner is also the victim of poverty. She tells Simran about Kubrima :

Koki tells me Kubrima poisoned her daughter and husband thirty years ago with rat poison to save them from starvation. Even though she took some of the same poison herself, she somehow survived. The police broke the bones in her shoulder during interrogation and they set all wrong, giving her a humpback. (56)

It is very usual behavior of police to make someone disable or handicapped permanently while he or she is under custody. They do not only ignore these powerless people but even they do not count them as human being and simply misuse their power on these helpless poor people. While we look at the history of India, it is full of violence especially against Muslims. There is nobody to think over their situation. Roy talks about the Muslims of not only India but of all over the world. What sort of situation Muslims have to face during the attack by Hindus? "Grief, failure, brokenness, numbness, uncertainty, fear, the death of feeling, the death of dreaming. The absolute, relentless, endless, habitual unfairness of the world" (21).

So the tragic and horrendous situation which they have to face is very difficult to explain in words. In fact, Muslims in India have to lead the life as secondary citizen. They have not got anything in the name of right.

Gyanendra Pandey, a great historian tells about the victimization of Muslims in 'Voices from the Edge: The struggle to write Subaltern Histories'. He tells about those miserable days of partition "the memories of people (and especially of women) who lived through the partition of India, relating to the history of rape and abduction, murder and looting, to the recovery of abducted persons" (230).

Nayak presents the same situation in her novel. While Simran is in jail, one of her fellow prisoners called Sultana, a Muslim woman has become the victim of communal violence. In this novel Nayak describes many misfortunate events occurred due to partition and because of it, one community has become thirsty for the other's blood. Simran comes to know that actual reason behind every tragedy is communal riots and Muslim women could not keep themselves secure from it:

I must have nodded off because I am awakened by the sound of a key turning in the lock. My eyes dart to the main gate. Once again the smaller gate opens and Sultana is pushed through it. She falls to the ground lying prone. A ballad-up white sari follows her. I see the warden shake her shoulder urgently. (86)

Here is the description of violence against one of the Muslims lady in the prison. She is forced to be raped by the help of matinee Malti, who is corrupted and exploits the prisoners, all these thing is watching by Simran when she is living there like one of the prisoners. She observes Sultana in the mid night:

In the light of the moon, I sees her blouse is hanging over naked breasts, and just over thighs, a stain is spreading wide on the thin material of her petticoat. I know it is blood. The warden picks up the sari and taking Sultana's arm, tries to steer her towards the cell, but Sultana pulls her arm away and losing her balance, falls back on the ground. (87)

The above-mentioned paragraph clearly suggests the discord between Hindu and Muslim, rapes, looting, killing and other anti-social activities in India even after many years of the horrendous events of partition. Muslims have been dominated by Hindus and Sikhs for a long time. The oppressive Hindu community is not limited within community of

Muslims, village or a particular area but also in the jail. Pandey further says that “perhaps the most obvious sign of the partition of Indian in 1947 was the massive violence that surrounded, accompanied or constituted it. It is estimated that some 600,000 people were killed in the partition ‘disturbances’. Another 14 million were uprooted and became refugees for long years to come. An uncounted number were raped and abducted. (233)

When somebody tries to raise his or her voice against the exploitation and crime done by oppressive society, he or she has to face with more problems and finally he or she has to give up the idea for justice to victimized people. The relation of hostility arises between matinee Malti and Simran because Simran wants to reveal the event applied on Sultana which becomes mystery for outside people. There is no one to listen the victimized people of other communities. Every time the people who are in power hide their true crime behind their frailties. Simran somehow manages to talk with Sultana to know about her. Sultana says: “To the Hindus, we Musalmaans are all terrorists trained by Pakistan. They hate us and they hate the idea that we are Indians just like them” (103). Pandey brings the references of Bhasin and Menon 1993; Butalia 1993; Das 1995 (ch.3)

The history of partition is the history of rape and abduction and killing and of the state-sponsored drive that followed to evict ‘aliens’ and recover ‘nation (especially abducted women and children), irrespective of their personal wishes! For the meaning of partition is disturbingly captured in these acts”. (234)

The horrendous events of partition of India in 1947 are saturated with cold blooded violence perpetrated on Indian Muslims. Hindu starts to kill the Muslims when they just manage to leave India and they become extreme sufferer in the whirlpool of violence. In the network Hinduism in Indian society, Muslims were very much suppressed from the hands men of the other community in their own country. In this novel, the dominant

position of Hindus in India underlines the victimization of Indian Muslims that has provided the Hindus recourse to perpetrate the violence on Muslim during the partition period. In India, there is majority of Hindus and there is no place for the other communities and especially Muslims. Hindu thinks that Muslims are opposite to them and they can live together with each other. Hindu never takes a Muslim as a patriotic to the nation India. They could not understand that why after partition some Muslims remained in India. In fact, they do not want to think that Muslims love their country. Many Muslims feel very difficult to leave India because they have attachment not only with the nation but with the place, with the neighbor and with everything surrounding them. They could never think the consequence of not leaving India out of love. Hindu people do not want them in their country. They want to make India free from all the Muslims. Gyanendra Pandey presents a real situation of conflict between Hindu and Muslim in his essay 'Hindu and others', and Hindu's mentality towards Hindus:

Once again, much that has lain dormant for a while has surfaced with vengeance. Recent outpourings from the Hindu Right-wing work on the basis of a brazen division of India into the civilized (Hindus) and the barbarian (Muslims). The former are said to be educated, rational 'modern'. The latter are declared congenitally incapable of attaining these conditions, and unwilling even to try. The civilized are concerned about the problem of rapid population growth, and attentive to the needs of hygiene, science and medicine. The barbarians choose to live in ghettos, dirty, over-crowded, and unventilated; they multiply like rabbits, and spread filth and disease. For all these reasons, the pronouncement goes as well as on account of their innate religious bigotry and aggressiveness, the Muslims are a source of grave danger to society, 'modernity', 'civilization'. (2)

In India, it does not matter that how many Muslims have been killed by Hindus but it does a very big matter there that Sultana, a Muslim lady has killed two Hindu men. It is intolerable for not only the Hindus but even for the administration in India. There is nobody to consider her situation that why has she killed the two Hindu men? Though everyone knows her miserable story but she could not be forgiven because it is India and there is not sense of forgiveness in Hindu people for the people of other communities, religions, castes and cultures. It proves here: ‘Sultana is sentenced to vigorous life imprisonment for terrorist activities and first degree murder of two young Hindu males and is transferred to the maximum-security central prison’ (112).

It is the concept of all Hindus in India that whoever is Muslim and he or she does any crime either situational or out of the feeling of revenge, is definitely a terrorist. Simran feels very helpless for Sultana but even she has desire to do something, she could not do. Simran is forced to think about communal bloodbaths, individuals who forge paths of communal harmony in the labyrinth of hatred. She thinks about her Daddy and Sultana, youth loses in blind rage and revenge, India the country of her father laments in his dreams and loves in his death. And she thinks about herself, an unwilling participant forced into the midst of it all and now helplessly involved. Pandey further says about the belief and superstition of Hindus about Muslims:

This narrowly-constructed ‘Muslim ness’ of the Muslim comes, then, to define every aspect of ‘his’ being. Every Muslims is fanatical, licentious and aggressive. It is a faithful echo of a line strongly plied by British and French imperialism in the late-nineteenth century, and by their American foreigner (Babar ki aulad), ‘the progeny of Babar,’ is the collective designation most commonly employed, in remarkable disregard of the parallel argument – also often made Hindu propagandists-that the majority

of Muslims in the subcontinent came from the lowest castes and classes, ignorant and innocent, who were forcibly converted to Islam. (14)

Pandey visits Ayodhya with a team of six University teachers because there occurred an event of firing in which some Hindus were killed and finds the atmosphere in Ayodhya is transformed and the demand for Muslim blood becomes hysterical. The Hindu mass is not ready to listen that who is the responsible of Firing? The actual responsible for the firing and deaths of those people are the government officials or the policemen and paramilitary forces posted around Ayodhya. But the aggressive Hindu society never wants to find the real cause behind such painful events. In any event, if the Muslim is killed, then it is obvious for the Hindus that it is done by Muslim. 'It is repeatedly said by the Hindus spokesperson; Narsanhar hua hai ; aur narsanhar hoga' (A massacre has occurred; another massacre will occur)' (17).

Simran, from the help of lawyer Arun, and fiancé Scott, could be free from jail but due to her father's last wish and her commitment to Sultana to help her, she takes shelter in the house of peace-activist Kalida, where she decides to do something to reduce the hostility of two communities. Somehow, she manages to meet with the brother of Sultana called Iftekhar and one of her relatives Fatima. Through their conversation, the state of Muslims in India is revealed clearly. The hatred attitude and agitation fills the heart of Fatima, she says: 'These harami policemen will catch the people they're not supposed to and won't even touch the real criminals' (154).

In response to simran's question that the person who destroy their family, the police catch them or not, Fatima laughs mirthlessly and tells: 'The police didn't even look for them. They arrested Sultana for killing two of them and closed the file. We are Musalmaan, behen. This is not our country. The police are not concerned about what happens to us.'

The police here only catch those they want to, and the rest is all politics. We don't count as citizens, except, of course, when it is time to ask for votes' (155).

Here the laughing of Fatima is targeted at those Hindus who have killed many Muslims, including her husband, son and daughter-in-law, by knowing or unknowing their communal identities in their blind frenzy of revenge. From this paragraph, the state of Muslims in India becomes clear. They have to lead a life as secondary citizen. They have to lead life of exploitation and they are forced to live an oppressed life in Hindu oppressive society. There are unending and uncomfortable tragic stories of Muslims. Pandey focuses on the violence against Indian Muslims to convey his political message about minority. While he is in Ayodhya, observes very pessimistic situation for the Muslim community. Hindu activists produce an audio-cassette, one of the several that blared out of shops and showrooms in Ayodhya, and that were sold all over northern India during the following weeks and months, underlined the poisonous message:

There are too many Babars in India-

Arrange to wipe them out.

We want no habitations of enemies of Ram-

Turn all such habitations into burning-ghats [cerematoria].

Hindu activists declared that 'They have taken 1,500 of my children. I want 15,000 Muslim 'children', in return!. (17)

Therefore, the event in the novel turns to be political as it is directed at the subversion of the traditional Hindu society and it takes Muslims as irrational, backward, uneducated and fragile. Similarly, simran goes to meet with one of the Muslim women named Khala, to know about her and her children. The traumatic agony reveals of all the Muslims who have been victimized in different familial and communal violence.

The novel *About Daddy*, presents a tragic situation to foreground the victims have undergone by Hindu community, khala tells about her past misfortunate life to Simran : 'I found the bodies of my children in the rubble. Allah! She brushes the water out off her eyes with the tips of her fingers. 'There is no justice'(162).

The writer, therefore, by telling the story highlights the in secular nature of the communal violence that has always made the living of an independent individual despicable in the society. Throughout such issues in novel, Nayak focuses on personal struggles and problem of contemporary life that her characters must cope with. She trays the cultural and social system that India has undergone as she follows on the incredible power of Hindu society, paying close attention to the trials of Indian Muslims victimized by Hindu society. Mukul Kesavan in his book *Secular Common Sense* highlights on the definition and meaning of secularism in the Indian context and focuses on the violence based on revenge, and severely criticizes the aggressive Hindu community for killing 'Muslims are seen as victims of partition and the prejudices that it institutionalized. The secularist inclines to assume that Muslims are discriminated against in every sector of employment' (11).

To show their poor state clearly, Kesavan brings the reference of Sarsaghalak, Guruji Gowalkar in a tract called ' We, Or Our Nation Defined,' in which he argued that Muslims living in Bharat should be second-class citizens living on Hindu sufferance, with no rights of any kind:

From this standpoint sanctioned by the experienced of shrewd old nations, the non-Hindu people in Hindustan must either adopt the Hindu culture and language, must learn to respect and revere Hindu religion, must entertain no idea but the glorification of the Hindu nation, i.e. they must not only give up their attitude of intolerance and ingratitude towards this

land and its age-long traditions, but must also cultivate the positive attitude of love and devotion instead; in one word, they must cease to be foreigners or may stay in the country wholly subordinated to the Hindu nation claiming nothing, describing no privileges, far less any preferential treatment, not even citizens rights.' (101)

Such ideas of imposing violence has been further presented by dominating the Muslims and suppressing their ideas irrespective of their communal belongingness. Simran's determination to live in India and spread the message of peace and feelings of humanity between Hindu and Muslim becomes a curse in such a violent, aggressive community. In this circumstance, she is forced to go underground. Hiding from the police and immigration officials, she joins a peace organization where she meets Kalida, whose actions seem to epitomize Simran's desire to bring peace between Hindu and Muslim communities. As the plot unfolds, her father's story becomes Simran's own as she begins to realize the complexity of a culture in which there are no simple principles of crime and punishment, guilt and innocence, and oppression and submission.

On the occasion of Shivratri, there starts again declaration of revenge, riots, bloodshed by Hindu community. One of the Hindu leaders says:

'My Hindu brothers, the time has come for revenge'. There is loud applause from the crowd. 'Show them, my brothers, that Hindus are not eunuchs.' A war-like yell breaks out as if the revenge would be melted out this instant. People fall upon each other, beating and clawing. Women start screaming. Policemen raise their batons to lash out. (236).

Because of their hostility, Simran strongly feels the need of peace and better situation of India. It always happens in India whenever there is any occasion or anything occurs

related with the particular community. Finally, Simran reaches to Haridwar to scatter her father's ashes in Ganga River and gives up her idea and plan for the reformation. She becomes know that it is not possible to spread the feeling of brotherhood between Hindu and Muslim in India because most of them have the feeling of ancient enmity and revenge. Nayak's sharp political conciousness that show how the tradition of Hindu community remains at its strongest in society.

Nirendra Dev in 'Godhra-A Journey to Mayhem' shows the victimization of Indian Muslims and the consequence of communal violence to some extent. The nature of such a communal violence was so cruel that the death or killing of Muslims was glorified as an act of bravery in Hindu society. Hindu-Muslim riots lack logicity. Their violence is just the madness of their communal obsession. Nirendra Dev says:

It is in the interest of minorities that there is peace and harmony. All communal disturbances in the country have only harmed Muslims than anyone else. The Muslim of post-partition India, do not want to face the reality that they are in minority. They should shun the confrontational line which only provides oxygen to the Hindu fundamentalist forces. (78)

Poor Muslims are betrayed by the leaders. Some of the leaders have promised them to give security, in the time of election when they need votes from Muslims. But after election, they did not get anything, therefore, responses angrily that the secularists and communalists "had only exploited the weaknesses of Muslims to take care of the vote banks" (72). They realize that they have been cheated by leaders and treated badly by the majority.

The event in the novel functions to show the insignificant mistakes that have turned out to be the serious cause of the communal riots. It is also used to intensify animal rationality that outweighs the sensibility of human beings. Numerous Muslims women

have been the target of many Hindu and Sikh even for their revenge against Muslim community. *About Daddy* is also examination of the legacy of distrust and communal strife that continues to haunt India fifty years after the partition. This novel opens with the ashes of Simran's father and ends with a funeral process. Nayak truly captures the social context and depicts the problem of Indian Muslims in India where her protagonist strives for an order. Sometimes they succeed and most of the time the system of Hindu society becomes hostile to them. Rudrangshu Mukherjee writes in 'The Penguin Gandhi Reader' about violence and its problem 'violence which is inevitable does not therefore cease to be so and become non-violence. The mouse is not non-violent towards the cat. At heart, he always has a feeling of violence towards the cat'(107).

About Daddy is divided into two parts: part first, which can be termed as "the novel half deals with the problems of relationship between Hindu and Muslims within the country and their respective roles in traditional Indian society. The norms, values and the traditions of Indian society are continued but with attempt to bring change. In second part, which may be termed as we find "Simran's attempt to both fulfill her father's wish and make better situation in India. Tariq Ali, a scholar of the world history and politics, in his novel 'The Clash of Fundamentalism' presents the ruling and dominating mentality of the oppressive class. He makes it very clear that behind every violence and conflict, the actual reason behind it is powerful country or organization or the ruling class people. He says:

The fight tyranny and oppressive by using tyrannical and oppressive means to combat a single-minded and ruthless fanaticism by becoming equally fanatical and ruthless, will not further the cause of justice or bring about a meaningful democracy. It can only prolong the cycle of violence. (3)

In this way, Ali shows his concept clearly that how power plays a vital role in the place of crime and violence. Throughout her novel, Nayak focuses on personal struggles and problems of contemporary life that her characters must cope with. She traces the cultural and social system that India has undergone as she focuses on the incredible power of Hindu, paying close attention to the trials of Indian Muslims victimized by Hindu society. Nayak is a genius for she portrays the situation of India with the relationship between Hindu and Muslim so vividly.

Conclusion

The novel *About Daddy*, that I have analyzed, deals with the massive and dreadful communal partition violence. It shows the status of secondary citizenship of Indian Muslims. The novel presents a political and social reality in India. It helps to excavate the painful memory of trauma and agony that the Muslims have undergone. The writer, while retrieving the violence to convey the political message about minority, that represents the violence resurfaced in the name of an inevitable cultural-religious movement. The use of examples in the context of through many characters in the context of elliptical and discontinuous nature of violence in the novel gives it a political edge where the tragic unsaid voice of suppressed replaces of the said voice of suppressor.

The novel attributes the repressive rhetoric to official India after the Babri Masjid demolition of 1992-- a time after which even an innocuous looking activities such as scattering a dead father's ashes of the India- Pakistan border is seen as threat to the national security of India. The threat perception itself which is inextricably linked up with legacy of the partition of 1947, spread sheet Octopus-like tentacles, trapping innocent next generation Indians, especially Muslims.

Works Cited

- Ali, Tariq. *The clash of fundamentalism*. UK. 6; publisher 2002.
- Dev, Nirendra. " *Godhara: A Journey to Mayhem*". Samskriti. C-9020 Vasant Kunj, New Delhi; Author 2004. In *Communal violence-A socio -political analysis* : pages -71-92.
- Gandhi, Karamchand, " *Problem of Non-violence*" : *The Penguin Ghandhi Reader*. Edited by Rudragngshu mukherjee. New Delhi: Penguin, 1993.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. " Ghandi: A very short Introduction".US:Oxford University Press Inc., New York, 1997.
- Pandey, Gyanendra. *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India* London: CambridgeUP,2001
- - -. " Citizenship and Difference: The Muslim Question In India". *The Unfinished Agenda*. Eds. Mushirul Hassan and Nariaki Nakazato.Eds. New Delhi: Manohar, 2001: 101-127.
- - -. *Memory, History and the Qwestation of Violence: Reflections on the Reconstruction of Partition*. (Sakharam Ganesh Deusker Lectures on Indian History and Culture, 1995). Cacutta:K.P. Bagchi and Company, 1999 In *Reconstruction of the History of the Partition of India*: 124-155.
- - -. "Can Muslim Be an Indian?" *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 41.4 (October 1999): 608-629. In *Hinduism and National Identity*: Pages: 49-59.
- - -. " Hindus and Others: The Militant Hindu Construction." *Economic and Political Weekly* 32.32 (August 9-15, 1997): 2037-2045. In *History and Historiography of Partition of India*: Page 113-137. Also in *Dissertation on the Partition of India*, Vol. 3: Pages :124-31.

- - - . " Voices from the Edge: The Struggle to Write Subaltern Histories. " *Ethnos* 60.3-4 (1995): 223-242. In *Independence and Partition*: Pages 50-60.

- - - . " Which of Us are Hindus?" *Hindu and Others: The Question of Identity in India Today*. Ed. Gyanendra Pandey. New Delh: Vikling, 1993;238-272. In *Postcolonial India: Identity, Religion and Violence*: Pages: 181-198.

- - - ." In defense of the Fragment: Writing about Hindu Muslim Riots in India Today." *Representations* 37.1(Winter 1992): 27-55. In *Historiography of Partition*: Pages 6-20.

Roy, Arundhati. "An Ordinary Person's guide to Empire"; the loneliness of Noam Chomsky. New Delhi,2003.

