

Tribhuvan University

Ethics of Memory in Pritam's *The Skeleton* and Sidhwa's *Cracking India*

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Central Department of English
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master in Philosophy in English**

Dailak Babu Hamal

Roll. No.: 28

Central Department of English

University Campus

Kirtipur Kathmandu

August 2017

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY
Central Department of English
M. Phil Program in English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu
Letter of Recommendation

This dissertation entitled, "Ethics of Memory in Pritam's *The Skeleton* and Sidhwa's *Cracking India*" by Dailak Babu Hamal has been completed under my supervision. I recommend it for examination and acceptance.

Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Beerendra Pandey

Date: _____

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Central Department of English

M. Phil Program in English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Letter of Approval

This dissertation entitled "Ethics of Memory in Pritam's *The Skeleton* and Sidhwa's *Cracking India*" submitted to the Central Department of English, T.U. by Dailak Babu Hamal has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee:

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head of the Central Department of

English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Dr. Beerendra Pandey at the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, for his suggestion and guidance.

I would also like to owe my indebtedness to Professor Dr. Amar Raj Joshi, Head of the Department, for his invaluable suggestion and encouragement. Similarly, my thanks are due to honorable professors, Professor Dr. Abhi Subedi, Professor Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Professor Dr. Anirudra Thapa, Professor Dr. Ram Chandra Poudel, Dr. Dhurba Karki, Dr. Hari Adhikari, Dr. Shiva Rijal and Badri Acharya.

I would like to express my special thanks to my parents Damber Bdr. Hamal and Rudra Kumari Hamal, who encourage me during the entire session. Similarly, I would like to thank to my friends Purnima Rai, Naba Raj Pandey, Ganga Maharjan, Laxmi Aryal, Ujjawal Maharjan for their inspiration.

Last but not the least, I express my gratitude to the University Grand Commission for its financial support.

Dailak Babu Hamal

Abstract

This dissertation examines two partition fictions, *The Skeleton* by Amrita Pritam and *Cracking India* by Bapsi Sidhwa. It undertakes this examination through an application of the theoretical notion of the distinction between morality and ethics in Avishai Margalit's *The Ethics of Memory*. The main argument is that *The Skeleton* comes out as much more qualitative novel than *Cracking India* because the former is flush with the morality of memory whereas the latter is contaminated with the Pakistani national ethics of memory. Whereas morality of memory makes Pritam's *The Skeleton* build on the sense of humanistic responsibility, *Cracking India* degenerates into the language of cultural trauma, which represents national ethics towards the image of Pakistani Muslims. By means of mortality of memory, Pritam succeeds to avoid identitarian politics and 'Prose of Otherness' while Sidhwa cannot move beyond identitarian politics' and, therefore, prose of otherness about non-Prsis and 'non-Pakistanis' has been constructed because of the use of 'ethics of memory.'

Contents

	Page No.
Acknowledgements	
Abstract	
Chapter I. Problematic and Construction of the Dissertation	1-26
Historical Context: Partition Violence on Women	13
Gender, Ethics of Memory and Cultural Trauma	16
Gender	18
Ethics of Memory	19
Cultural Trauma	21
Chapter II. Gender, Cultural Trauma and Thick Ethics in <i>Cracking India</i>	33-38
Chapter III. Womanism, Morality and Cultural Trauma in <i>The Skeleton India</i>	45-48
Chapter IV. Pritam Versus Sidhwa vis-à-vis Traumatic Memory	55-50
Works Cited	57-53

**Chapter I. Partition Violence as the Cause of Cultural Trauma in *Cracking India*
and *The Skeleton***

Problematic and Construction of the Dissertation

The decade of the 1940s marks a watershed in the history of India. It unfolded such events, which saw the independence of India from the British colonial rule. The decolonization, however, was accompanied with the country's partition into primarily Hindu India and Muslim Pakistan. The defining moment of the partition was the massive violence that constituted it. Approximately ten million people took to the road in search of a new home. A million, however, did not make it. Trainloads of Indian and Pakistani citizens were killed. The major bearers of the violence were women. Their suffering has found expression into narratives by women. Two of the most celebrated partition narratives are Amrita Pritam's *The Skeleton (Pinjar)* and Bapsi Sidhwa's *Cracking India*. The traumatic memory is very compelling in both novels.

The 1947 Partition of British India into two independent nations was accompanied by communal violence unspeakable in its brutality and ferocity. The partition of the entire Indian subcontinent into India and Pakistan was caused by a complicated set of social and political factors, including religious differences and the end of the British imperial regime. Sidhwa's home city of Lahore became a border city in Pakistan, and was promptly flooded by hundreds of the females and minor refugees. Thousands of them were victims of rape, mass killing, sexual violence and tortures. There was rehabilitation camp with many of these women adjacent to Sidhwa's house, and she states that she was inexplicably fascinated with these 'fallen women', as they were described to her at the time. She realized from a young age that "victory is celebrated on women's body, vengeance is taken on a women's body. That

is very much the way things are, particularly in my part of the world" (qtd. in Gareber 6). It appears as if Sidhwa's later activism for the cause of women's right.

The Skeleton tells the story of Puro, a young Hindu woman who is betrothed to a young man, Ramchand. A Muslim, Rashid kidnaps her as his family has an ancestral dispute with Puro's family. One night, Puro manages to escape back to her parents, but her parents turn her away, explaining that if she stays, Rashid's Muslim clan would arrive and slaughter everyone. Left with no support, Puro returns to Rashid. Meanwhile, the British colonialists leave India under the effects of partition. Ramchand, his uncle, mother, cousin and sister (Lajjo) leave for India after they found Ramchand's father missing in the Hindu-Muslim riots after the partition. Shortly after, Lajo is kidnapped by thugs, Puro meets Ramchand and tells her about Lajjo. Puro finds Lajo and escapes with Rashid's help. They leave with Lajo for Lahore where Puro's brother, Trilok and Ramchand come to receive her. Trilok explains to her that she can start a new life with Ramchand as he is still ready to accept her. Puro refuses to go back to her home, saying that she is where she belongs. Puro seeks Rashid out and tearfully bids Ramchand, Trilok, and Lajo farewell forever.

In illustrating the partition of India, *The Skeleton* exposes human struggles and Pritam's universalistic behaviour of mankind. As such, the novel is constructed in two levels. One at inner conscious level of Puro where she always fights with her thoughts, between her hatred and gradually developed affection towards Rashid (initially kidnaper, her husband and father of her children), her helplessness and pity on her fate. At other level this novel highlights the situation and status of Indian women living in rural areas. The critical significance of this study is its implications for canonization. Both Pritam and Sidhwa are celebrated women writers. What this study suggests is that literature, even if it is written by women writers, should not

merely be looked from feminist angles only and that if looked at from the perspective of the aesthetics of trauma some significant problems can be seen. If cultural trauma in *The Skeleton* comes out as virtue, the same in *Cracking India* emerges as vice.

While Sidhwa's *Cracking India* has attracted a voluminous amount of criticism, in English there has been only one study of Pritam's *The Skeleton*. Sujala Singh interprets the abduction of Puro by a Muslim boy, Rashid in terms of the Inter-Dominion Treaty in 1947 which had later become the Abducted Persons Act in 1949. She says that the novella's beauty lies in Pritam's foregrounding of Puro's fantasies of simple womanist desires of being a mother.

There have been at least three studies of *Cracking India* from the perspective of trauma theory. First one to do so is Deepika Bahri who critically engages with trauma theory in *Cracking India*, especially in regard to the female victims, but her falling back upon naturalistic accounts of trauma prevents her from seeing Bapsi Sidhwa's "politics of memory" in the novelist's ethical attempt to create a Pakistani identity through the prose of otherness (221). The second critic to apply trauma theory to *Cracking India* is Kamran Rastegar who concludes that the novel "destabilize[s] what is anticipated in the predominant war narrative, by linking the political, often nationalist violence of these stories to the intimate violence sustaining the structures of patriarchal social institutions within which the characters exist" (22). The critic who evaluates this novel from the perspective of the theory of cultural trauma is Beerendra Pandey who remarks that the narrativization of trauma follows largely the lines of Pakistani nationalism—a configuration which Avishai Margalit's *The Ethics of Memory* is very fascinating for the basic normative framework which involves a distinction between morality and ethics. Morality concerns the

responsibilities we have towards human beings as such; ethics involves the responsibilities which we have to those with whom we have special relationships.

Morality works with a “thin” conception of its objects; ethics with a “thick” conception: our ethical concern is with people as they fall under specific descriptions, for example, “as parent, friend, lover, fellow-countryman” (Margalit⁷). Morality is universalistic and impartial; ethics is egocentric and partial. Margalit argues that the responsibilities of memory fall largely, though not quite completely, within ethics. Because morality is concerned with all human beings, it is “long on geography and short on memory” (8). However, ethics is concerned with personal and communal relationships; for this reason, it is “short on geography and long on memory” (8). There are some occasions, however, when there is a moral duty of remembrance. Everyone has a moral obligation to remember “gross crimes against humanity, especially when those crimes are an attack on the very notion of a shared humanity” (9). But generally speaking, responsibility to remember arises in the context of our “thick” relations and is thus an ethical one. The epistemology of Margalit’s theory of the ethics of memory parallels the notion of cultural trauma advanced by Jeffrey Alexander.

Alexander posits that cultural trauma is produced through community ethics and notions of nationhood. It is the experiencing of the violent event through cultural templates that turns it into a trauma. Beerendra Pandey examines the discourse of cultural trauma in Indo-Pakistani Partition literature from the perspective of Saidian humanism that glorifies Enlightenment rationality, “[O]ne can resolve . . . the problem of looking at the possibilities of co-existence, not the notion of separation and partition . . . Saidin humanism, which is centered on peaceful coexistence rather than the manufactured clash of civilization” (136). But the present dissertation I am

going to apply sensibility based humanism, i.e. Margalit's notion of mortality of memory, rather than reason-based Saidian humanism.

This dissertation analyzes the ethics of memory as found in Pritam's *The Skeleton* and Sidhwa's *Cracking India*, and seeks to argue that while the former is flush more with the morality of memory, the latter largely shows the presence of the ethics of memory.

It is hypothesized that the drawing of traumatic memory can be on both ethics and morality and if it is profligated by the latter more, then even cultural trauma can turn out to be the virtue rather than the vice of the literature of trauma. The main goal is to evaluate two classic novels on partition violence by two celebrated women writers—Pritam from India and Sidhwa from Pakistan by exploring ethics of morality in *The Skeleton* and *Cracking India* and ruling that as literature of violence Pritam's rendition of cultural trauma scores over that Sidhwa whose narrativization brazenly follows the lines of Pakistani ethics even as she reveals excellent kind of subaltern-cum-womanist subjectivity.

Chapter one undergoes with womanism, morality and cultural trauma in *The Skeleton*. Amrita Pritam presents the pathetic condition of women in such a way that readers feel the problems of their own. This chapter highlights on the protagonist and the narrator Puro, a woman who is victimized by the patriarchal norms and religions where she neither remains Hindu nor Muslim. She has responsibility towards both families. She does not leave Rashida but she bids farewell to her family members. Her humanistic responsibility leads readers to realize the oneness of her act. The author, Pritam in this novel shows the thin ethics representing the middle voice of humanism. She has stressed on the impartiality, morality and universality. Pritam also depicts the affect of cultural trauma through community ethics. Both Hindu and

Muslim communities are aware of their ethics but in the name of partition they are violating the socio cultural norms which destroy the cultural aesthetic of the communities which Amrita Pritam presents consciously.

In the second chapter, the dissertation seeks to mark out the gender, cultural trauma and the thick ethics in *Crackingindia*. Sidhwa in *Cracking India* presents the gender identity which creates hierarchy between men and women that creates cultural trauma foregrounding the Pakistani nationality and Muslim community. Sidhwa narrows down to the incident which are in favor of Hindus but shows the thick ethicality which promotes the cultural trauma. She is bounded with the national territory of Pakistan.

The last chapter is the conclusion which places a spotlight on the comparative overview of Pritam versus vis-a- vis Cultural Trauma. Here, both authors strongly highlights the issue of violation over women in the partition of 1947. Bapshi Sidhwa shows the ethics of memory (thick ethic) by taking the side of Pakistani Nationalhood and Muslim community. She Presents the events of Partition in the sense of nearer and dearer. She doesn't present the events in a balance way, where, Pritam's *The Skeleton* depicts those events in humanistic and universalistic form. She tries to uplift the ethics of morality (thin ethics) by presenting the events of the partition period. Pritam cements the emotional gap of Hindu and Muslim people through humanism whereas Sidhwa highlights the emotional gap of the Hindu and Muslim. So, Sidhwa's *Cracking India* shows the ethics of memory than Pritam's novel *The Skeleton* which highlights the ethics of morality. Therefore, *The skeleton* is virtuous novel but *Cracking India* is the novel of vice.

Historical Context: Partition Violence on Women

The subcontinent was turned into a revengeful region in August 1947 when the British colonial agents announced the division of the subcontinent into India and Pakistan. The story of India's Partition is an effort to create boundaries between the Hindus and the Muslims. The top level leaders negotiated to divide the country because they could not stay together. So, the Muslims turned away from India, and Hindus and Sikhs turned away from Pakistan. Hate involves a turning away from others that is lived as a turning towards the self. Wickedness, violence, and pure evil erupted into powerful mass that soared out of control and consumed everyone that came in its path. The partition harrowed up on people committing a mass killing, rape, arson and loot. The violation made women and children victims. The partition also took the form of horrendous religious agitation which inflicted a huge, brutal and unspeakable violence. Many men of both sides were killed and their women and children became orphans.

Bina Das remarks, "The partition violence brought an unspeakable misfortune among the women of Hindus and Muslims" (43). The violence basically targeted upon women. Das mentions in her article, "[. . .] many women were raped among them old and obstinate were killed even by inserting cleave of wood into their vagina and young women and girl were adopted as wife of the rebellions" (46). This line indicates the historical context in which violence was specially centered on women. The main character and the narrator of the novel *Cracking India*, Leny and the victimized women like Ayah, Poopo and others resemble the erupting and animalistic violence upon women. Similarly, the partition context through the balance narrativization of the violence between Ramchand and Rashida family making

Puroand Lajo as trajectory characters evokes the gap between thick and thin ethicality in Pritam's *The Skeleton*.

South Asian partition literature exposes this defect. Pandey further examines, it “locates the antagonists in the barbaric Muslims or Hindu-Sikhs” (31). As Rituparna Roy also says, “[. . .] they don’t . . . produce anything other than a feeling of disgust in the reader, for all they seem to portray is the demented hatred between the Hindus and the Muslims . . . and more often than not, they betray a bias in favor of one community over another” (20). It is not the case of only ‘the earliest stories’; this trend of the Partition Literature continues even decades later. From Khuswant Singh to Bapsi Sidhwa, the writers are not free of such bias.

The Dominion of India is today the Republic of India, and the Dominion of Pakistan is today Islamic Republic of Pakistan and People's Republic of Bangladesh. The *partition* involved the division of two provinces, Bengal and the Punjab, based on district-wise Hindu or Muslim majorities. The boundary demarcating India and Pakistan became known as the Radcliffe Line. It also involved the division of the British Indian Army, the Royal Indian Navy, the Indian Civil Service, the railways, and the central treasury, between the two new dominions. The partition was set forth in the Indian Independence Act 1947 and resulted into the dissolution of the British Raj. The two self-governing countries of Pakistan and India legally came into existence at midnight on 14–15 August 1947.

The partition displaced between 10 and 12 million people along religious lines, creating overwhelming refugee crises in the newly constituted dominions; there was large-scale violence, with estimates of loss of life accompanying or preceding the partition disputed and varying between several hundred thousand and two million.

The violent nature of the partition created an atmosphere of hostility and suspicion between India and Pakistan that plagues their relationship even in the present.

The term *partition of India* does not cover the secession of Bangladesh from Pakistan in 1971, nor the earlier separations of Burma and Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) from the administration of British India. The term also does not cover the political integration of princely states into the two new dominions, nor the disputes of annexation or division arising in the princely states of Hyderabad, Junagadh, and Jammu and Kashmir. Though violence along religious lines did break out in some princely states at the time of the partition, it does not cover the incorporation of the enclaves of French India into India during the period 1947–1954, nor the annexation of Goa and other districts of Portuguese India by India in 1961.

Other contemporaneous political entities in the region in 1947, Sikkim, Bhutan, Nepal, and the Maldives were unaffected by the partition. The two-nation is the ideology that the primary identity and unifying denominator of Muslims in the South Asian subcontinent is their religion, rather than their language or ethnicity, and therefore Indian Hindus and Muslims are two distinct nations, regardless of ethnic or other commonalities. The two-nation theory was a founding principle of the Pakistan Movement and the partition of India in 1947.

The ideology that religion is the determining factor in defining the nationality of Indian Muslims was undertaken by Muhammad Ali Jinnah, who termed it as the awakening of Muslims for the creation of Pakistan. It is also a source of inspiration to several Hindu nationalist organizations, with causes as varied as the redefinition of Indian Muslims as non-Indian foreigners and second-class citizens in India, the expulsion of all Muslims from India, establishment of a legally Hindu state in India,

prohibition of conversions to Islam, and the promotion of conversions or reconversions of Indian Muslims to Hinduism.

Herself being a Parsi, Sidhwa in her *The Cracking India* presents a civilized Parsi community and the tilt towards Pakistani Nationhood foregrounding on the violence committed by Hindu and Sikh people upon Muslim women. The writer deifies, Mohammad Ali Jinnah but projects a brutal image of Indian Hindus with a close shot. Through this *projection*, Sidhwa ignores that fact that “violence is in all of us” (Ganendra Pandey 176). She looks at the crimes of one side and overlooks those of the other. Thus, she shows unauthentic balance through distortion and exaggeration of facts beyond all reason and logic. It does not represent larger humanity, and fails to contribute in strengthening peace, harmony and brotherhood. Rather, it circulates hatred. It may stoke up more people’s hatred and lead them to conflict and social unrest in South Asia. But Pritam in her novel *The Skeleton* maintains a balance in her voice about violence of partition 1947 which equally blames both Hindus and Muslims. The way Puro and Lajo were victimized due to the horrendous atrocity of the male kinds of both sides, Pritam focuses on the gap between thick and thin ethicality by placing her universal stance of humanism.

Gender, Ethics of Memory and Cultural Trauma

The research work takes theoretical insights from Avishi Margalit’s *The Ethics of Memory* and Jeffery Alexander’s “Towards a Theory of Cultural Trauma.” It uses ideas from *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity* for an insight into subaltern-womanist subjectivity, of Pritam and Sidhwa, Avishai Margalit’s *The Ethics of Memory* (2002) for the basic normative framework which involves a distinction between morality and ethics and Alice Darnell’s “Are Women Really the Fairer

Sex?": *Gender and Ethics at Work* for highlighting on the biased gender ethicality of patriarchy upon women.

In general, the meaning and understanding of two terms "gender" and "sex" seems to be the same. However, these two terms should be observed by two different perspectives. In which sex is defined on natural basis, whereas gender is social construct as Alice Darnell says, "Gender refers to the fulfillment of the role as determined by male and female in the society" (10). However, there is a prevalence of gender inequalities in the society. Therefore, gender studies helps to develop a society based on gender equalities by searching for inter-relationships based on such inequalities.

The term ethics etymologically refers to a system of moral principal, for example, the ethics of culture. In Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary, ethics means, "the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty" (44). It is interpreted that ethics of memory is related with moral and humanitarian duty. A central idea of the ethics of memory is that when radical evil attacks our shared humanity, we as human beings ought to remember the victims. According to Ron Eyreman, "The effect of any traumatic events falls upon the levels and types of ethics which possesses with an individual"(28). Ethics, as Exreman, is guided by traumatic events and its effect has in different levels and types which depend up on individuality. Traumatic event always represents the past event which is on the basis of prior events. If prior event is nearer that becomes thick ethics and if the prior knowledge is guided by humanism that becomes thin and universal ethics. *The Ethics of Memory* "draws on the resources of millennia of healing ideas that will engage all of us who care about the nature of our relations to others" (Erikson 34). Therefore, ethics of memory nears with the nature of our relation to others.

Trauma, in general, refers to pain. But the traditional definition of trauma of having pain on body has been redefined today. The blow of trauma cannot be limited only with the "organs of body and the wound which is transparent to mark out" (Eyreman 37). Placing her own logic, Leigh Gilmore, redefines the word trauma with its Greek meaning "wound". She notes, "wound refers to self-altering, even self-shattering experience of violence, injury and harm" (6). So, trauma is not always physically marked as its primitive meaning; it embodies the internal pain of the body which is instinctive, the pain in soul and mind and the pain which is realized socially and culturally. Socially and culturally realized trauma is cultural trauma. Here, the trauma in question is cultural trauma which occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that, "leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness", marking their memories forever and changing their "future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways" (Alexander 6). So, cultural trauma has communal, public and shared representation of trauma.

Gender

Biologically male and female are not identical. However, based on the roles and status, female can work as male in the society remaining on various designations. According to Alice Darnell, "The patriarchal model of society prohibits female in many aspects" (3). However, if the roles of female and male based on social and family needs could be determined, then social as well as gender equality can be maintained. He further says, "In patriarchal society, the male members establish hegemonic role" (21). Patriarchy refers to a form of model, where the eldest male of the family controls and directs the entire family. In this type of family the male members establish hegemonic role in social, economic, religious, cultural as well as political aspects. The male members of the family enjoy more rights than females on

the basis of gender. Women are exploited in many cases by males. On the other hand, female has to go to her husband's house and live the rest of her life with him. She also has to change her surname. It can be also interpreted that a system of patriarchal structure and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women, the family is ruled by male member.

“Patriarchy is a system of social structure and practices in which men dominate and show their different level of atrocities upon women” (42). The relationship, behavior and activities of gender are not the same in every society. In some places it is more harsh, while in other it is flexible and liberal. The Hindu and Muslim societies are more biased towards females where females are considered to be weak, dependent, emotional and land to household work. But the historical social scenario of its structure was based on matriarchy.

“The gendering of culture therefore is not straightforwardly visible” (Hall, 345). Culture is determined by social, political and religious values. Nobody can escape from the social norms and values. Everyone has to obey the social norms. In this sense, it is questionable that the norms or values are unknowingly visible ideologically. But somehow politics may play an important role in determining the social norms and sometimes religion does have the same role which is taken as universal status.

Ethics of Memory

The Ethics of Memory Avishai Margalit states that ethics of memory is “related subject of the psychology of memory and the politics of memory” (6). It is clear that psychology of memory or memory of an individual becomes biased when it is politicized. The question, “Is there an ethics of memory?” covers these two categories as, “micro ethics” and “macro ethics” referring to the ethics related to

“individuals” and “collectives” (6). He further says that “while there is an ethics of memory, there is very little morality of memory” to demarcate the distinction between ethics of memory and morality. He says that this type of distinctive turn is based on:

A distinction between two types of human relations: thick ones and thin ones. Thick relations are grounded attributes such as parents, friends, lovers, fellow countrymen. Thick relation are anchored in a shared past or moored in shared memory. Thin relation, on the other hand, is backed by the attribute of being human. Thin relation relay also on same aspect of being human, such as being a woman or being a sick, thick relations are in general our relation to the near and dear. (7)

Human beings have two types of relation i.e. ethics of memory –thick relation and ethics of morality-thin relation. Thin relation is more related to humanism, whereas thick relation or ethics is related to nearest and dearest ones. For example, one's relation with parents, friends, lovers and countrymen relationship. On the other hand, thick ethics is short on geography and long on memory. But thin ethics is with respect to humanism.

Elaine May contends in her derisively mocking voice, “I Love moral problems so much more than real ones” (qtd. in Margalit 13). Here, she captures the tedious tendency of moralists to view everything in moral terms. Morality is more important than reality though we cannot cross the reality. It is important to reach in the target but on the other hand, the small problem can create hindrance if it is morally questionable. So social norms or values are questionable if those values are real but morally weak.

Margalit states that “to remember now is to know now what you knew in the past without learning in between what you know now. And you know is to believe

something to be true. Memory, then, is knowledge from the past” (14). Memory teaches the history. Memory is the knowledge of the past events. So we cannot cross the memory because it provides the real situation of certain time or circumstances. Events are always chronological but this chronology may divert according to memory. In the same way, “ethics of belief” may be changed if the past event takes place in the future. At that time, we have to promise and follow the future events.

“The notion of collective memory, one may argue, is doubtful extended metaphor” (16). Collective memory is more related to humanism. It has more ethical and moral implication of the notion of the shared memory and community of the memory. Though it is obscure notion and may not give clear case, it does not apply to its real essence. Collective memory has its notion of its shared communal values.

Moreover, he states that “an ethics of memory is as much an ethics of forgetting as it is an ethics of memory. The crucial question, are there things that we ought to remember? Has its parallel; are there things that we ought to forget? Should we, for, example, forget for the sake of “forgiving”?” (17). Ethics of memory is not only related to remembrance but also related to forgetting. It means, while writing or reading a text or events, we have to remember the important events and have to delete the unnecessary events. For this, we have ethics of morality. So morality is more important and balanced tool than ethics for reading and writing of a text.

Cultural Trauma

Placing his own logic, Jeffery Alexander redefines the word trauma with its Greek meaning "wound". He notes, "wound refers to self-altering, even self-shattering experience of violence, injury and harm" (6). So trauma is not always physically marked as its primitive meaning; it embodies the internal pain of the body which is instinctive, the pain in soul and mind and the pain which is realized socially and

culturally. Psychological and cultural trauma becomes more torturous and painful than a mere visible bodily pain—Erikson contends— which "refers to blow to the tissue of the mind" (183). What Erikson wants to claim that psychological trauma involves a wounding experience of such 'magnitude' that is continually relieved in "dreams, nightmares, hallucinations, and flashbacks" (50) to schematize trauma.

Alexander establishes cultural trauma as a tool to construct a collective memory of the victims of various types of social exploitations, violence, war, genocide, massacre and so on. Here, trauma in question is cultural trauma which occurs "when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways" (6). Cultural trauma, in Alexander's estimation, is the tool to dig up different types of brutal events of murder, rapes, social exclusions and horrendous genocides which frequently victimize women and children. He focuses on the 'group consciousness' and the 'collective feeling' for maintaining their identity and getting relief from such 'indelible marks' of trauma from the body and the memory of the victims. Like him, we can conceive that in any horrendous events like mass killing and rape, many men from minority group, race and culture are killed and their women are raped, tortured and sometimes killed. Women become the witness to such destructive events and lament throughout their lives.

Alexander theorizes that creating group awareness regarding such horrendous traumatic events among the victims becomes easy to heal them from their irrevocable trauma and sensitize them for their group identity. How do the forms of representation affect cultural trauma? There is a gap between the traumatic event and its representation. Trauma theorists call this gap 'a trauma process'.

Alexander evokes "[. . .] for trauma to emerge at cultural level a new master narrative has to be successfully established" by those who aim at projecting the trauma claim to the audience or readers. He argues that a successful process of representation of the collective memory of traumatic event has to "deal with the following questions: (a) the nature of the pain; (b) the nature of the victim; (c) relation of the trauma victim to the wider audience; (d) attribution of responsibility" (qtd. in Tota 85). This model of representing cultural trauma also encompasses the types of the institutional arena with respect to which meaning of trauma can be produced. Alexander classifies six different types of arena: religious, aesthetic, legal, scientific, mass media, and state bureaucracy. Through whatsoever institution trauma gets represented, the act reproduces the collective memory so that trauma takes its shape in the public discourse. Brown reframes, "[. . .] trauma, as cultural process, is mediated through various forms of representation and linked to the reformation of collective identity and the reworking of collective memory"(qtd. in Alexander 10). Borrowing the ideas of Brown, Alexander redefines trauma as a cultural process, it runs from generation to generation but it is changed through while transmission. "Memory is not an object that we can abstract from social processes and that we can then study, analyze or observe. The production of memory is a performativity practice, and inevitably social (Edkins 54). Cultural process that analyzes the human activities with social process and its development leads towards the construction of cultural trauma.

In *The Limits of Autobiography: Trauma and Testimony* Gilmore places a great emphasis on childhood "memoir"(1) of the surviving witness as "culture of confession" and "culture of testimony"(2) for traumatic events. Gilmore points out children are dominated by their cultural memory. Moreover, surviving children who are victimized become more witnessing device for they are not skilled for false or

imaginative memory which she terms as, "bastard testimony" (45). Such testimony cannot provide an exact picture of trauma else the memory of trauma is twisted and becomes more imaginative. Such false memory is also called "less memory" which goes beyond the norms of surviving witness's "culture of confession" and "culture of testimony" regarding the traumatic events. A victim child who is surviving can be both witness to any fearful violence and confessing character to event as testimony.

"Culture of confession" and "culture of testimony"—Gilmore highlights—insist on "the centrality of speaking of pain" for focusing on the "coincidence of trauma and self representation" (3). She evokes self representation, to reveal biographical and semi-biographical narratives which coincide with the representation of childhood memory of the surviving protagonist and her evidential representation in pronoun "I" (17). She cites Foucault and Althusser's interest in "memory, violence, law, and self-representation" as a testimonial device for the traumatic experience. Here, I represent Puro whose trouble touches to us, that transforms to the readers and feel themselves in that problem and want to relieve from it.

She further comes up with the notion of "language" of traumatic memory and "listening" to it for "public forum" (7). Simply, as she contends, the language of trauma can't be spoken or written in any "mode other than the literal" (6). The language of trauma is "unspeakable and intrinsic but it can be speakable and extrinsic" (Das 44). Whenever victim's trauma is carefully listened and made public. As much as people listen to the pathetic story of the surviving victim, this much the trauma gets a public forum so that testifying the traumatic event becomes easy. In *Figurations of Rape and the Supernatural in Beloved*, Pamela Barnett mentions that listening to the victim's painful story as witnessing devices signals "a rethinking of the crucial role, the preservation of the truth" (qtd. in Gilmore 48). Pirtam is survivor of the

partition. She herself realizes the crucial situation of violence, whereas Sidhwa is a witness and her feelings may be different about the violation. So, the truth of presentation may be rethinkable.

Gilmore stresses on the preserving nature of listening other's painful story. It becomes clear that listening trauma and publicizing it gains sympathetic treatment as a testimonial tool. Gilmore further points out that

testimonial projects for any trauma narratives require subjects to confess, to bear witness, to make public and shareable a private and intolerable pain, and entering trauma into a legalistic and political frame in which the efforts can move quickly beyond their interpretation and control, become exposed. (7)

According to her, claim for "subject to confess", it is understood that the "culture of confession" (ibid) by the victim who is surviving becomes more testimonial for the traumatic story of victim. Without "bearing witness", trauma narratives cannot expose proper tool to testify any event as traumatic. Writing a private painful story through narrative and any other academic media and procedures such as news making, taking interview with the victim and mediate it, is meant for unfolding the hidden and encroaching pain in the body of victim in a public sphere. If the painful story of a victim transforms into a public's approach, it becomes more testimonials for the sorrowful event. She points out that witness writers and their semi-biography which is connected to the experience of traumatic events, become testimony to trauma. Gilmore notes that the "legalization" of trauma needs the perspectives of politics in writing trauma narrative.

The politicization of trauma focuses on certain quarter of victims—subaltern, women and racially downtrodden victims— and the verification of their trauma. If

victim's trauma is legalized, it obtains testimonial structure and thereby the evocation of their trauma. Cathy Caruth emphasizes on the repetitively occurring experience of trauma in the mind, soul and on the body of the victim. She contends that the recurring traumatic experience of past painfully affects the victims at the present and they need an abrupt responding to the sorrowful past for releasing trauma out of their (victims') body. Similarly, Daniela F. Sieff's notion of "emotional trauma" concentrates more on the bodily responses of the victim which are rather passionate. As her conceptual claim, the "erotic experience of the past becomes meaningless to the body of the victim at the present" (34), if her "passionate supporter has disappeared. She stresses on having "melancholic impact" for such missing of the supporters.

Alexander contends that cultural trauma can be "mediated" through "various forms of representation" for interconnecting and maintaining collective identity so that the victim's collective memory can be reworked and their suffocative trauma can be released. He states that representation of traumas of the victims needs to be mediated and connected for the collectivity feel of their traumas. He further states that "the language of marginalized victims needs to be standardized as a media of trauma releasing" (6). What he connotes is to prioritize the witness writer of any horrendous events from marginalized women, writing the traumatic event in the standard language, may be English. So that the collective feeling of trauma of the racially, sexually, linguistically and culturally marginalized women can be placed in the mainstream of their identity and, thereby becomes the recovery of their traumatic memory. "Truth" is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it"

(Foucault, 133). Truth is guided by power politics, whether it is related in sex, race or language. It is in circular form.

Alexander places a great emphasis on "feminist discourse of trauma" by quoting Davies's lines from his *Black Women, Writing and Identity: Migrations of the Subject* for issuing women's trauma nationally and internationally. Davies explains as: "Feminist politics of trauma [...] is a resistance to objectification of women in society, in literature, art and culture. It is also the articulation of a critical and an intellectual practice which challenges all patriarchal assumptions and norms. It is also a politics of transformation" (qtd. in Alexander 13). Through Davies, Alexander evokes that feminist perspective of trauma is political in nature. There is the leavening of women regarding the layer of ethicality to publicize their traumas in feminist perspective. For him, if a feminist tone regarding traumatized women is raised through literature, art and culture, a resistance atmosphere among victimized women is formed.

Moreover, he foregrounds that women's resistance to any traumatic event is to objectify them in "society, literature, art and culture" so that their trauma and recurring experiences can be recovered. What Alexander assures on Davies is for the expression of "critical and intellectual practice" (qtd. in Alexander 13) regarding the feminist perspective of trauma. He notes that such intellectual practice not only challenges the atrocious "patriarchal assumption and norms" but also spurs the victimized women for the uprooting movement of such hateful patriarchy. It can be referred that many women in war, massacre, genocide and other disastrous events are more sexually violated than their assassination. As Alexander, we can perceive it as patriarchal ideology for women's trauma. Alexander's concept of "carrier group" (4) is significant for bearing the role of trauma recovery agent. In women's narrative, women

protagonists become the agency for trauma recovery. They can be carrier of the collective women's trauma to publicize. For him, "carrier groups are the collective agents of the trauma process" through which traumatized memory gets recovered. He opines that they are "situated in particular places in social structure" with special "discursive talents for articulating their claims—for meaning making—in the public sphere" (27). Meaning comes from the group of claims that creates truth while structuring the society.

According to Alexander, women's trauma is released by women carrier group in a more convincing way. However, these carrier groups have a particular position in the society with unique 'discursive' talents for expressing their argument of trauma for publicizing in a purposeful cum meaningful way. He evokes that the carrier group that articulates for others may be "elites, but they may also be denigrated and marginalized classes" (64). It becomes clear that the conscious and educated women cannot digest the atrocity imposed upon women else they plot for resistance movement to apply ointments on their traumatic wounds although they represent particular class. As Alexander opines, whenever there is sever atrocity even the people from marginalized class, race, culture and religion may counter against the animalistic realm of any dictator. It can be perceived that such resistance movement regarding the recovery of traumatic event through "carrier group" by Alexander means to politicize cultural trauma. He further places an emphasis saying, "It can be institutional, representing one particular social sector or organization against others in a fragmented and polarized social order" (16). Therefore, Alexander highlights on representative attachment of carrier groups with persons and organizations against other violent persons and organizations. We can interpret that war narratives by women writers

focus on the role of revolting character of the protagonist (female) who often bears the role of agent for trauma releasing from the body and memory of the victims.

Alexander comes up with the notion of memorializing effort to the "victims of the repression" for highlighting "the objective reality of the brutal events" so that the "unconscious" memory of the victims can be conscious of trauma (26). He further puts his view as, "Monuments, museums and memorials are... attempts to make statements and affirmations [to create] a materiality with a political, collective, public meaning [and] a physical reminder of a conflictive political past" (13). This is what his politicization technique of trauma is. He connotatively hints at maintaining collective identity of trauma. "Monuments, museum and memorials" relating any traumatic event, are the politicizing attempt of trauma. Focusing yet on "collectivity of trauma" (13).

Alexander highlights the "collective actors who decide to represent social pain as fundamental threat to their sense of who they are, where they are from, and where they want to go" (15). Alexander provides a historical scenario of trauma questioning as, "Did Germany create the holocaust or was it the Nazi regime? Who injured the victims? Who caused the trauma? What about female victims in the war?" It is clear that establishing "the identity of perpetrator—the antagonist as protagonist becomes equally prominent for creating a "compelling trauma narrative" (19). "Trauma invites distortion, disrupt genres or bounded areas, and threatened to collapse distinctions" (LaCarpa96). Trauma, in its nature is destructive that torments the individual lives into chaosness.

Alexander basically focuses on women victims raising a feminist question. For him, any traumatic event occurs due to the dictators who are compared with

"perpetrators" and these perpetrators often establish the reign of violence, murder and mass killing— of a particular race, gender and culture. Alexander comes with the notion of "mass media" for making trauma distinctive in a dramatized way. He contends that "mediated mass communication allows traumas to be expressively dramatized and permits some of the competing interpretations to gain enormous persuasive power over others" (22). Traumatic events and the victims are publicized through both print and electronic media. We can interpret that if trauma of victims is mediated— for instance through interview, newspaper, radio and TV program their confined trauma outburst in the public forum and heals the pain. He further hints at mass media as having "persuasive power" so that other's trauma can be healed in a collective feel (22)

Alexander focuses on "collective identity and the reconstruction" of the victims to place a spotlight on cultural trauma (51). He says that "experiencing" trauma is meant for an appropriate definition of a "painful injury to the collectivity" (26). He points out that if any painful wound of victims is brought into collectivity, their pain not only gets reduced but also establishes their identity "attributing" her responsibility. This is what he foregrounds saying in his own word as, "reconstruction". This reconstruction means "re-remembering" for compensating the traumatic past of the victim and placing her adjustable responsibility at the present. In Alexander's opinion, "identities are continuously constructed and secured not only by facing the present and future but also by reconstructing the collectivity's earlier life." What he highlights here is on the establishment of identity to the brutally victimized person whose earlier past life is shattered. Moreover, Alexander contends that "once

the collective identity has been soreconstructed, there will eventually emerge a period of "calming down" (26).

According to him, identifying collectivity of the victim and her "reconstruction" is really a challenging task but for Alexander, if once such reconstruction of collective identity is maintained, a time of "calm down" is formed. The victims get "calm down" when their traumatic tears and wounds are wiped and applied with ointments at their uncertain or unknown present by establishing their collective identity. Alexander assures on his argument of "collective identity" and "reconstruction" that many feminist writers through surviving women victims in their narratives have been marked on the "re-remembering" of the collective past and re-identifying their lost role in the society where they have been surviving with the memory of past melancholia. Collective identity gives the outlet to the pathetic condition of the events which incorporate the individual trauma into collective trauma because collective trauma reconstruct and retranslate to the real trauma into the moral trauma. It is the way of reduction of the intensity of the victims.

Collective trauma is humanistic. It is thin in relation and long on memory and short on geography. It is based on shared community. It has moral duty of remembrance. It is universal and impartial in nature. On the other hand, ethics of memory works with thick concepts and falls under specific description. It is short on geography and long on memory. It has the responsibility which we have to those with whom we have special relation. Cultural trauma is produced through community ethics the notion of nationhood. It is the experiencing of the violent event through cultural templates that turns into a trauma. Human beings are social, political and cultural product of our society because both male and female have their own gender

identity but the powerful agency create their role very importantly. Specially, male-dominated society plays the negative role by hegemonizing their own ideology and creates different types of atrocities over women kinds. However, women also react for the sake of their own gender identity.

Chapter II. Gender, Cultural Trauma and Thick Ethics in *Cracking India*

This chapter analyzes the gender trauma depicting the practice of making women the ground in patriarchal debates over community, their traumatic experiences and the more ethical stance of Sidhwa to describe, restore, and heal their traumas as inflicted by non-Muslims during partition violence through the protagonist and witnessing narrator Lenny who narrates traumatic story of partition violence of 1947 referring the women characters, Lenny's mom, God mother, Papoo and other.

Partition of British India into two independent Nations (India and Pakistan) was accompanied by communal violence unspeakable in its brutality and ferocity. *Cracking India* is narrated from the perspective of Lenny, a young Parsi girl "coming of age at the time of Partition and independence" (9). It is interpreted that as the narrative unfolds, it quickly becomes apparent that her subjectivity is mediated by a community identity and her gender identity undergoing a double-edged crises. The partition was caused by a complicated set of social and political factors, including religious differences and the end of colonialism India. Her home city of Lahore became "a boarder city in Pakistan, and was promptly flooded by hundreds of woman and children refugees" (56). Thousands of these were victims of rape, mass killing, sexual violence and tortures. There was rehabilitation camp with many of these women adjacent to Sidhwa's house, and she states that she was inexplicably fascinated with these 'fallen women', as they were described to her at the time. She realized from a young age that "victory is celebrated on women's body, vengeance is taken on a women's body. That is very much the way things are, particularly in my part of the world" (6). It appears as if Sidhwa's later activism for the cause of women's right. "Violence and community constitute one another but also that they do so in many different ways. It is my argument that in the history of any society, narratives of

particular experiences of violence go towards making the community and the subject of history" (Pandey 3-4). Community determines the violence at the same time the violence determines the community. What type of the culture of community has which determines the types of violence and vice-versa.

From early in the novel, Lenny is aware of women as weak gender in such atrocious male dominant society. From her childhood, she is sensitive about heterosexual attraction, men's sexual hunger, their behaviour with women only for sexuality and her relevant narration portraying the case of her own cousin, Ice-Candy-Man and other males as, "It is cousin who brings the news, and explains to a still-naïve Lenny what this means: There are no real diamonds there, silly. The girls are the diamonds. The men pay them to dance and sing. . . and to do things with their bodies. It's the world's oldest profession" (252). This extract explains that the feminine gender is counted as the gender of recreation for male. The phrase "oldest profession" clarifies that women are victimized in male dominated society no matter of close and distance relation. Again she connects her own gender sensibility with her cousin's remarks, "Every ready to illuminate, teach and show me things, Cousin squeezes my breasts and lifts my dress and grabs my elasticized cotton knickers" (29). Lenny resists at first, but then cousin "succeeds in de-knicking" her and "putting his hand there, trembles and trembles" (29). One can write of Cousin's behavior in this scene as adolescent fumbling, but a subsequent episode brings up a more disturbing picture. "Communication takes place in language and language itself is social and political, not individual" (Edkins 7). Social and cultural activities are presented in language that communicates the real identity of socials and it guidelines the social truth not individual.

The gendered nature of Lenny's perception of herself as ugly as compared to her brother is evident in the derogatory connections she makes between femininity and shame. She explains:

His name is Adi. I call him is Sissy. He is too confused to retaliate the first few times I call him by his name. At last, "My name is Adi", he growls, glowering. The next day I persist. He pretends not to notice. In the evening, holding up a sari-clad doll I say, "Hey Sissey, look! She's just like you!" (32)

Lenny's internalized hatred of her gender identity is exemplified in this passage by the taunts she directs at her brother and the hyper-feminine connotation of the doll she goads him with. Her sense of inferiority in relation to her brother is compounded by her racial gender identity.

Similarly, Lenny notes:

Ayah is so proud of Adis Paucity of pigment she takes us to Lawrence and encourages him to run across the space separating native babies and English babies. The Ayahs of the English babies hug him and fuss over him and permit him to romp with their privileged charges. Adi undoes the bows of little girls with blue eyes in scratchy organdy dress and wrestles with tallow-haired boys in the grass. Ayah beams. (350)

This extract highlights the racial and patriarchal privilege that Adi shares with the white boys when he literally and metaphorically crosses the space separating native and English babies.

Lenny her cousin by being the one who, accompanied by Godmother, gets to visit Ayah at HiraMindi. The Voyeur in Cousin wants to know "everything" that happened, and when Lenny has no proper details, he says, "You would have seen a lot

more if you'd gone there after dark" (67). When Lenny asks for clarification about what she would have seen, the following exchanges ensue: "Girls dancing and singing- and amorous poets. And you would have been raped" What is that? (I never learn, do I?) 'I'll show you someone', says Cousin giving me a queer look" (77). What is peculiar about cousin's hypothetical fantasy is not that Lenny would have witnessed "a rape" but that she herself would have been subject to the experience. The way Cousin tells and she understands refer heterosexual connectivity.

The next day, Lenny awakes to "maddening pain," a new plaster cast on her deformed leg, and her mother crying at bedside (16). Trying to distract Lenny, Mother tells "the story of the little mouse with seven tails," but it only adds to Lenny's misery (16). To appease Lenny, Mother asks Father to call Colonel Bharucha, but later "The bitter truth sinks in" that Father never called the doctor" (17). News of Lenny's operation spreads, and Lenny cries for Godmother, who finally comes and consoles Lenny (17). That evening, amid a crowd of Lenny's relatives and neighborhood visitors, Colonel Bharucha finally makes his house call to check on Lenny. Mother blames herself for "leaving Lenny to the ayahs" (17-18). It becomes clear that one woman knows the pain and problem of other woman. Similarly, Ayah takes Lenny, now free of pain, in her stroller for an outing to the nearby zoo. Invalid Lenny enjoys the attention she gets, momentarily eclipsing even beautiful Ayah's attractions: "I am the star attraction on the street" (18). Internal narration of Lenny's thoughts on her crippled leg reveals that she doesn't want it to be fixed, for then she would have to "behave like other children," who must act out and compete to get adult attention" (18-19). Lenny is "jolted" from her "troublesome reverie" to discover Ayah talking to Sher Singh, "the slender Sikh zoo attendant" [and one of Ayah's many admirers], in front of the lion's cage--the same lion who will

frequent Lenny's nightmares" (19). This portrays the fair gender role of Ayah to console and refresh Lenny."It is my argument that the writing of history- in each and every case - is implicated in political project, whether consciously or unselfconsciously" (Pandey 10). Writing history is the political projection of the society. It may seem individual but guided by social activities.

In general, it appears that Lenny's mother uses her agency in a consensual fashion – in the interest of maintaining her patriarchal patronage- and thus contributes to the preparation of elite patriarchal practices. "Patriarchies" as Sidhwa has meant, "are the mode of cultural trauma embedded in woman social stratification" (112). Rather than confronting her husband about the various inequities in their relationship, Lenny's mother uses indirect gender agency to get what she wants without seriously challenging the basis of her subordination. It becomes apparent that even the privilege during the unrest state of a nation (Partition violence) is not without its costs. The negative effects of this unequal but mutually constitutive relation of subjection are not lost on Lenny who represents the "games" (34) her mother and father engage in over the distribution of the family finances as a playful, but ultimately degrading activity. She depicts how her "mother chases her father around the bedroom attempting to get money from him for some household expenses and comments" (45) for foregrounding the womens' dependency up on men. This type of relation between husband and wife is a sort of masculine ideology which goes on traumatizing women no matter the woman is from poor or rich background. This is a sort of hidden torture.

The Ice-Candy-Man and Masseur want beautiful Ayah for sexual contentment. She is very much unhappy with the frequent torture given by Ice-candy-Man. These lines denote such torture:

Half way through the meal I sense a familiar tension and a small flurry of movement. Ice-Candy-Man's toes are invisibly busy. I glance up just as a supplicating smile on his face dissolves into a painful grimace: and I know Ayah's hand is engaged in an equally heroic struggle. (Sidhwa 36)

The protagonist and the narrator of the novel, Lenny depicts her gender maturity with reference of Ice-Candy-Man's and Ayah's sexual reaction. The way she says, "I know Ayah's hand is engaged in an equally heroic struggle" (ibid) shows her gender sensibility to mark out the so-called patriarchal atrocity upon women during the partition violence. The terrific and forceful rape scene as written in the novel:

They dragged Ayah out. They dragged her by her arm stretched taut, and her bare feet-that want to move backwards- are forced forward instead. Her lips are drawn away from her teeth, and the resting curve of her throat opens her mouth like the dead child's screamless mouth. Her violet sari slips off her shoulder and her breast strain at her sari-blouse stretching the cloth so that the white stitching at the seams shows. A sleeve tears under her arm. The man dragged her in grotesque stride to the cart and their harsh hands, supporting her with careless intimacy, lift her into it. Four men stand pressed against her, propping her body upright, their lips stretched in triumphant grimaces. (194-95)

Boils us in outrage towards the rapists and melt us to sexually exploited compassionate women. The abduction of Ayah by a mob led by one of her Muslim suitors, Ice-Candy-Man, and her eventual escape from his clutches portrays animalistic religious revenge upon women kinds. The Ayah's story is paradigmatic:

like her, thousands of women were abducted and/or raped by men of the 'enemy' community during the chaotic months before and after Partition. "propping" Ayah's "Body upright" signals the animalistic passion of atrocious patriarchal male there. This becomes the gender violence upon women kind.

Another minor character Papoo and her heart-rendering story of unmatched marriage makes our eyes water. To generate compassion on her, Sidhwa writes:

The elderly and cynical dwarf permits their embraces and then sits back, his spread legs swinging carelessly, and the women, some of them tittering in a shocked way behind the finger screening their mouths resume their chattering. I remain rooted to the dirty floor, unable to remove my eyes from him, imagining the shock, and the grotesque possibilities awaiting Papoo. (199)

The story of Papoo's coercion into marriage reflects accurately the misfortunes of millions of sub-continental girls routinely married off before the legal age of consent. It draws our attention on both Papoo and the Ayah who are the victims of a system that essentially legitimizes sexual predation. Both Ice-Candy-Man and Papoo's husband are versions of the same male impulse to exercise control over women, a control executed through societal consent. Through the reference of Papoo and the beautiful Ayah, Sidhwa tries to circulate the voice of women right to the public for their sympathetic empowerment bidding a challenge to the rooted patriarchy delving the prevailed cultural trauma there.

Most significant female character is Godmother whose role in the novel is to that of a protector, a judge and equally, a fighter for providing the deprived right of all suffered women during the partition of 1947. It is said that "only the wearer knows where shoes pinch". Her role in the novel seems kind and fair female. It is she who

rescued kidnapped and raped women. The female character “Ayah is rehabilitated and secured by Godmother after being gang raped” (188). She sends her to the right side of the border. Similarly, Hamida also gets shelter and new life with the generous attempt of Godmother. When Ice-Candy-Man roars saying, “we protect our women. We marry our girls ourselves. Noone dare lay a finger on them! They are artists and performers . . . beautiful princess who command fancy prices for their singing and dancing skills!”(259). When Godmother challenges this rhetoric of "protection," which elides the violence by which Ayah was made one of "our women," Ice-Candy-Man, resorting to the language of the love-lorn, declares that he would "do anything to undo the wrong done to her [Ayah] . . . , that noone has touched her since [their] *nikah* [marriage]," and that he "can't exist without her" (262). This shows a womanist tone that Sidhwa has focused in her novel. In *Cracking India*, Sidhwa has presented Godmother as a true source of strength and action, through knowledge instead of pride and rhetoric to highlight the cultural politics of womanish to strengthen them.

The sight of partition evokes cultural and political fear among minority non-Muslim people. “The people are all in the restaurant sitting around two large tables talking about if Lahore will stay in India because of the Muslim majority. The gardener and Massuer argue about money being the important factor for the people because the Muslims own most of the property and businesses” (137). This shows that partition should be fair. Even minority Hindus have given their part while returning to India from Lahore. Similarly these lines below show more atrocious attitude of Sikhs than Muslims as:

Sher Singh argues that there are more Sikhs than Muslims and Hindus and that they hold more farm land than both of them put together in Punjab. The wrestler restaurant owner says that once the line is drawn

across Punjab the Muslims to the east of it will have their balls cut off. The Sikhs prepare to drive the Muslims out of East Punjab. (139)

In the same way the sight also shows the similar ethics of Sidhwa as:

The date is August 11th [1947] and India has been separated. Lahore is now a part of the new nation Pakistan, Amritsar is in India, Sialkot is in Pakistan, and Pathankot is a part of India. Lenny feels she is now Pakistani and has a sense of pride of it. It is also Lenny's 8th birthday. She feels like no one has time for her birthday, only to get quick hugs and brief kisses from mother, father, and Ayah in their living area. (7)

As Sidhwa, the division of territorial part happened not in an unfair way. Lenny even being a Parsi girl becomes happy to be the citizen of Pakistan. The way she feels and utters as “she is now Pakistani and has a sense of pride of it” (ibid) highlights the thick ethical issue of Sidhwa for Pakistan.

Though the separation scene was unspeakable, there was necessary to have separation. This type of hidden theme of these lines below shows ethicality of Sidhwa towards Pakistan. Even being a non-Muslim, she and her family members feel pride to stay in Pakistan. They never join any rally of partition violence and movement. The lines are more relevant as: “It is at dusk on Warris road in Lahore. Mr. Singh is carrying a hockey stick and walking up the driveway with his American wife and their children. They sit on the porch in the wicker chairs” (22). It means Sikhs are more rebellious and demanding than Muslims. Accordingly the lines as, “Mother greets them. Mr. Singh tells us that “The Mehtas have gone! The Malothras have gone! The Guptas have gone!”, show Parsi’s love of being Pakistani. In the same way, “They are all upset. There are no more Hindu families left on Warris Road. There are only 2 Sikh families left; Lenny's family and Pritam Sighs. Father is coming up on the

driveway riding his bike. Mr. Singh is relieved that father is there”, show the Parsi family as the mediator. Lenny narrates that “Father drinks a glass of water and settles in on the porch. He and Mr. Singh talk of the separation of India. Father snaps at Yousaf wanting to have his water refilled. The men become comfortable and relaxed in their discussion. Mr. Singh tells father "Sethi Sahib, we have received orders from our leader . . . We are to leave Lahore forever!" (26). She again says as, “Father is surprised. Mr. Singh continues "I'm meeting with them tonight. They've worked out plans for a complete Sikh evacuation. We'll form our own-armed escort. I'll take our buffaloes . . . And whatever essentials we can pile into a truck. Each family is allotted a truck” (17). Ultimately, in the chapter 7, Lenny narrates that her “Father asked if there is anything that they could do to help? They ask to store belongs at their house in Lahore. Mother says, "Of course, bring anything, we'll keep it with the Shankars' and we'll keep it as long as you want” to depicts the pathetic scene during separation time. Similarly, “Mrs. Singh starts to cry, mother asked Lenny to go outside or inside to play with Rosy and Peter. It is dark now and she turns on the light”(157). These types of pathetic separation are depicted but indirectly Sidhwa is attempting to formulate her thicker ethicality on Pakistani.

In August 1942, the Quit India movement was launched. Gandhi, the Mahatma ("Great Soul") declared:

I want freedom immediately,
 this very night before dawn if it can be had!..
 we shall free India or die in the attempt,
 we shall not live to see the perpetuation of our slavery. (Background
 Section 2)

The British resorted to brutal repression against non-violent protesting *satyagrahis* Gandhi and other Indian National Congress leaders intensified their campaign for immediate self-government, naming it as the price for Indian cooperation in the war effort, and were arrested. “A campaign of civil disobedience was launched in 1940, while the Muslim League and many princely states supported the British war effort” (2). Again, vast numbers of Indian troops participated in war on the British side at home and on the fronts. Here, Sidhwa indirectly unfolds more egocentric and oppressive Indian attitude than Muslims who as her, were not on behalf of war for partition. Again, the lines in background section as, “Ayah is Punjabi, and *Ice-Candy-Man* asks her why she always wears Hindu saris and never wears traditional Punjabi clothes, like “*shalwar-kamize*”. Ayah responds that she would be paid less money if she dressed as a traditional Punjabi, rather than as a Hindu” (38) connotes the partial nature of Hindu males for their women. The *Ice-Candy Man*, Muslim wants to know about her wearing only sari all the time even for being a Punjabi girl and she answers why she wears only sari focuses on her compulsion. “Jinnah is not as orthodox as Gandhi for division” (Background Section 2) for Sidhwa is meant for making Jinnah more rationale regarding Partition violence.

Through her witnessing narrator, Lenny, Sidhwa places a spotlight portraying a Sikh mob attacking the streets, burning buildings, and fighting with Muslims.

Lenny’s eyes focus on a man tied to vehicles and then viciously torn apart:

[Her] eyes focus on an emaciated Banya wearing a white Gandhi cap.

The man is knocked down. His lips are drawn away from rotting, paan-stained teeth in a scream. The men move back and in the small clearing, his legs sticking out of his *dhoti* right up to the groin—each thin, brown leg tied to the jeep. (145)

These referential lines foreground the provoking atrocity of Sikhs or Hindus people upon Muslims. But during Partition, people of the Parsee religion took neutral stance during the religious battle between Muslims and Hindus. Parsees believe that “as long as [they] do not interfere [they] have nothing to fear. As long as [they] respect the customs of the rulers, [they] will be all right. They would not present a threat to either side and would live peaceably with whoever ends up ruling Lahore” (48). Because Parsees are able to be on neutral ground with all religions, it spares them from being targets of hostility and violence.

The instance of Ice-Candy-Man’s sisters’ murder on a train by Hindu activist and “stuffed in gunnysacks” (159) as witnessed by Lenny shows the compassion to the victimized Muslims in Lahore. Lenny accompanies Ayah and Masseur to Ice candy Man’s home to give him their condolence. In the film version, the first thing Lenny says is “did you see your sister in the gunnysacks?” indicates how curious is Lenny to know what happened and they looked like, she fails to realize the inappropriate nature of Sikhs and Hindus. The more heinous and hateful example relating to atrocity of non-Muslim people in Lahore is, “what she watches Lahore going up in flames. As homes and buildings are burning to the ground, Lenny is mesmerized by the spectacle. It is to her like a gigantic fireworks display” (147). Here, Sidhwa through Lenny interweaves pleasure in the demonstration of violence. She compares the mass burning of Lahore city to firework for proving that violent images inflicted by Sikhs and Hindus. These references above show Sidhwa’s thick ethicality towards Muslims or Pakistani.

Chapter III. Womanism, Morality and Cultural Trauma in *The Skeleton India*

The chapter places the spotlight on the traumatic memory of partition violence evoking the sorrow and compassion of women of both Hindu and Muslim side making women experience as agency through the narrator Puro which is recounted from the perspective of womanism, morality and cultural trauma.

The novel opens with the market view where Puro is selling peas. The market is described as colourless gray. Puro is in the market and opens a case and pushes out the paddle of peas. These lines as:

The sky was a colourless grey. Puro sat on her haunches with a sack spread beneath her feet. She was selling peas. She pressed open a pod and pushed out the row of peas with her finger. A slimy little slug stuck to her thumb. She felt as if she had stepped into a cesspool; she ground her teeth, flicked off the slug and rubbed her hands between her knees. (1)

It is noticed that Puro stars at blank wall facing her and at the meanwhile she is caught by the memory of the past days came crowding into her mind. These lines aforementioned show the opening context of the novel and the memory of the peas selling in the colourless market of the protagonist and the woman Puro.

Puro remembers arrangement of own wedding with her fiancé Ramchand. That means all is well for Puro. She memorizes the ceremony plan. The barber is slipped wedding bangles in Puro's arm. In Hindu culture, "The wedding bangles were the symbol of marital bliss. If one broke, it was a sign of disaster to come- perhaps of an early widowhood" (1). According to Hindu culture, a girl gets married only once otherwise it does not do better for her and society.

Accidentally some wedding bangles broke. Puro become afraid and prays for Ramchand live to a great age. At the same time, partition hits the country. It is a painful period in the lives of many Indians. Puro's family engages in arrangement of Puro's wedding and Puro and her friend enjoy the wedding customs. One day, Puro is lost in her thoughts with her friends; suddenly Rashida stood in front of her way and watch her. Pritam writes, "Rashida's eyes were glued on Puro's still unformed breasts. Puro become tremble with fear and run past Rashida. She caught up with her friend on the outskirts of village. She was out of breath and terrified" (3).

In this scene, Pritam shows the fearful incident with Puro which is symbol of male dominated culture. Puro's friend make joke with her. She says, "You are lucky it wasn't a bear! A tiger devours its victims. A bear is said to take a woman to his cave and behave towards her as if she were its wife" (5). Here, both tiger and the bear are the symbol of males who victimize women. Tiger is made so cruel that a bear which becomes rather violent to woman.

Puro after being kidnapped by Rashida says, "Take me to Thailand with you!" and "Then destroy me with your own hand" (14). Though she escaped from Rashid's home, she became helpless even from her parents. Her father says, "Who will marry you now? You have lost your faith and your birthright if we dare to help you; we will be wiped out without a trace of blood left behind to tell of our fate" (14). In the same way, her mother says as "Daughter, it will be better if you had died at birth" (14). These quotes above portray that she remained helpless from where she had to get support. ". . . survivor testimony has been overwhelmed and revised by the dominant culture" (Tal 11). The dominant culture does not present the truth of the testimony. It dilutes the realities of the testimony because the dominant culture always takes the side.

Puro symbolizes the skeleton in the male dominated society during Partition period. She was compelled to lead a double life, i.e. as Hamida and Puro in the patriarchal atrocious society. “It was a double life: Hamida by day Puro by night. In reality, she was neither own nor other. She was just a skeleton, without a shape or a name” (15). The writer shows the pathetic condition that she has no space even to live and die. Women were compelled to live without in proper shape and space where the existence of the patriarchal society remains.

Pritam presents the irony of women, “The midwife came out said congratulations, son. Your home has been blessed with a son” (20). The midwife is herself a female. Hamida or Puro is in her unconscious situation while giving birth to a baby. The midwife herself had noticed that she could die or live but she has blessed to Rashida congratulations, son. It clearly represents the women are for the sake of men. But in reality, Puro had to get congratulation. She had crossed the pathetic condition to beget a baby.

The author states “People often say that when a mother dies, even a real father becomes a stepfather. It was Hamida’s ill luck that her real father became a stepfather before coming a widower and her real mother had without being a widow become like a step- mother” (23). It clearly shows that she is unluckier than a normal woman because she has parents. She is a daughter and her father has a wife and she has a father but ironically neither she is a daughter nor does she possess parents. Indeed, parents become parentless, daughter becomes lifeless. In reality, neither she has a life nor her parents. It is more awful than getting stepfather and step mother.

As Pritam quotes:

Hamida has suffered much; the suffering had aged her. She was not twenty years old, but those twenty years had taught her more than she

could ever learn in age. She has become as serious as thoughtful as an old philosopher. Only she could not put her many thoughts into words or emotion raise like foam on the crest of a wave, were battered against the rock of experience and subsided once more into the water. (25)

Now, she has no suffering at all. She has no words to express the philosophical thoughts. Equally, she has become like a *saligram* (a pure stone). She has no personal sufferings and interests. She is condemned to do according to the circumstances.

The reference below shows a massive cultural and gender trauma of women as mentioned by Pritam. They are, “Once we give away a daughter our lips are sealed. It’s up to her husband to treat her as he likes. It is a man’s privilege” (28), explained the mother. Though women are humans as men, they are not as privileged as men. Their decisions cannot become final decision. They are counted as supplementary being. But men have supremacy both in power and in decision. Rashida, the male protagonist, has kidnapped Puro, it has become okay for the society. Puro’s parents have fear of being attacked by Rashida. In the other way, Puro has no space to stay at her own home.

Partition violence was mainly laden upon women. Even the mad women became the victim of such male atrocity as Pritam states, “What sort of man could have done this to her?” the women of Sakkar asked each other. They ground their teeth in anger.... “He must be savage beast to put a mad woman in this condition” (31). She is senseless, out of sight and out of mind. Her lunatic laughter is heard around Sakkar where many women bind their teeth in anger and present their hidden womanish wrath towards the men and their rapist women. Accordingly, Amrita says that “Hamida’s breast filled with milk. She offered them to the child of the madwoman of Sakkara as if he were her own child” (34). These lines clearly

foreground that women are more humanistic in nature. Hamida knows that the son of madwoman resembles Javed who might have raped the madwoman. She is protecting to the son like her own son though the rapist father and the unknown son were men. She has no hatred towards men but respect for humanity.

The religions and patriarchy cause jeopardy to women's feelings and their gender right. As Hamida has recounted as:

This is however a matter of religion and one should not stand in its way. Why put your life in jeopardy? If someone takes it into his head to do you harm, don't say we did not warn you! You should realize what is best for you and give us the child of your own free will. If you want to be reimbursed for the expense you have incurred, we will pay you.

(38)

Amrita Pritam presents a balance role of humanism through Puro to Hamida. She says that religion creates crises in the society or in humanity. Though the crises is in between Hindu and Muslim, the crises have created a problem to the unknown child and Hamida who are in Jeopardy. But here, Hamida is appealing for humanity indirectly bearing the agency of a mother.

As the going on conversation between Taro and Hamida regarding their traumatic experiences, "For two years I have had to sell my body for a mess of pottage and few rages. I am like a whore....like a common prostitute . . ." (42) shows the horrible picture of madness of partition violence in which majority of women of both Hindus and Muslims became like whores who fulfill the sexual passion of males. The narrator suggests in the partition period women were mostly targeted. They are forced

to lose their chastity and gender identity. They were like the skeleton that has to bear the double life.

Pritam, through the narrator Puro, represents the lost identity of woman where Ramchand has even accepted to Hamida as Puro after many years as Rashida accepted Puro as Hamida. These lines as “Puro has been dead a long time,” she replied. She went away without turning to look back” (46). In reality, Puro has not changed. She wanted to introduce to Hamida as Poooro but the circumstances have changed. Now, she has become Hamida because she has got love and affection of Rashida and given a birth to a baby child. She has spent many years with Rashida. So, she is condemned to say she has been dead but she is universal.

The reference below highlights on the prevailing cultural trauma during partition period marking on Hindu and Muslim riots as:

Hamida realized that she belonged to the people whose year’s harvest had been reduced to ashes. How could she identify herself with one who was the perpetrator of the crime! Or maybe it was done by someone else and her poor brother was the innocent victim of suspicion! Her brother in the clutches of the police! Hamida lay on her Charpoy staring at the dark sky. In her mind arguments followed each other like the buckets of a Persian wheel. (49)

It is interpreted that Hamida even being the wife of Rashida and getting lost her harvested crop by her own brother’s act of arson seem his innocent. She could neither directly blame him nor become happy on the great loss of Rashida’s property. The criminal and heinous act of arson caused by her own brother as taking revenge with her husband Rashida makes her blind even to identify the known perpetrator. The

suspicion of the villagers towards her brother for the act of fire on her wheat crop could not become a reasonable and lawful argument to blame him. Equally, the victims were victimized as a revengeful task of Hindu perpetrator. For such suspicious rumor of firing on the sack of Rashida's wheat sack, Hamida's mind whirls like a Persian wheel with numbers of arguments. Indeed, Hamida is unhappy towards the act of her brother of causing fire in her wheat sack; she is equally responsible for the act. Indirectly, she is predicting the possible forthcoming atrocity due to the riots between Hindus and Muslims. The women become the victims in such riots.

The lines as, "He also told her to the government proclamation ordering people to hand over all abducted women, so that they could be exchanged for others similarly abducted by Indians. Parents had been exhorted to receive back their abducted daughters" (58), are the ultimate realization of the males of both Hindu and Muslims which they had done up on the women of both sides. They feel guilty on their inhuman acts which they did upon women of both sides. Though they are legally free for their nationality and religion, they are bound socially and morally because they may have begotten children and shared with social love and affection. Individuality also makes the cultural community that may represent religious community and nationality.

Pritam presents the traumatic incident of partition as with these lines:

One morning they decided to assault the house in which the Hindu had sought refuge. They poured kerosene oil over the window and doors and put burning faggots to them. The flames shot up in the sky. The trapped men and women began to scream.... The village looked deserted. The only non-muslims left in it were the three charred

corpses in the street. In two days, the crows and pie-dog had torn away the flesh. Only the skeleton remained in front of the burned down house. (70)

Amrita Pritam highlights the dark side of partition of 1947 when many Hindus were killed, raped and looted their properties. They became helpless though they wanted to refuge the prevailed anarchy. Such incident presents the loss of humanity that describes the holocaust of partition. This extract describes the term “skeleton” and “flesh” which is the madness of human beings in the name of identity.

The author adds, “It was a scene to be alive in the world so full of evil through Hamida. It was a crime to be born a girl” (71). Though Hamida is herself weak, she is hated by the so-called patriarchal society. She managed to live a life where many victim women like Hamida committed suicide. More than this Lajo is also facing her problem due to the partition. She is pathless, helpless and humanless being a daughter. She cursed herself that it was a crime to be born a girl.

Rashida tells Hamida that men are crossing into India to find their wives and bringing them back. The quote highlights the picture as:

Some have even had children born to them. Lajo did not know why she had not conceived. It was a mercy; otherwise she would have been in a worse plight than at present. So far our families have been mourning the loss of one, now they can mourn the death of two. Puro I have nowhere to go. What face will I show to anyone? I will look after your children and you can feed me. (69)

Humanism is for the sake of next generation that has begotten child, can get humanity and those women who are physically appropriate want to give birth their child and can

get the real opportunity. Here, Puro has parents, husband and child but she is in dilemma to which she has to respect. Lajo is also in the problem. She wants to marry and give birth to a child but she is beyond opportunity due to partition. She is compelled to stay as a servant of servant (Hamida). Both women have no way to go anywhere although both the separated countries have announced their free will according to their national identity.

The novel ends with the line, "The bus started on to journey leaving the deserted road in clouds of dust" (73). Amrita Pritam shows the ethics of morality in the end of the novel too. She has given clothes to Lajo and requested his brother to grab her by the arm. She also knows that she is a Hindu woman. Like her, many women are going to separate leaving the deserted place but she catches her son, looks at Rashida and requests her brother to release his hand. It clearly concludes that though she is Hindu, she loves to Hindu culture and people that is her hidden identity but she has the responsibility of human being so she does not leave her husband and her child. So she says that her home is now in Pakistan.

Narratives have been marked on the "re-remembering" of the collective past and re-identifying their lost role in the society where they have been surviving with the memory of past melancholia. Collective identity gives the outlet to the pathetic condition of the events which incorporate the individual trauma into collective trauma because collective trauma reconstructs and retranslates to the real trauma into the moral trauma. It is the way of redemption of the real trauma of the victim. "Within the society, there may be several targeted groups, whose members are subject to traumatization in greater or lesser degrees. Targeted groups can and should be examined both in relation to the dominant group and to each other" (Tal 9). As

described by Kali Tal, in the text, several female such as Puro, Lajo and other females are targeted groups. They are victimized in their own home by their society. Race based society is the root cause of their trauma. "I wanted to demonstrate that at the same time they are political, they are intensely personal- that the personal is political, without exception" (247). Tal defines that trauma is always political or cultural. Sometimes, it may seem personal but that person is guided by political thrust without keeping any exception.

Chapter IV. Pritam Versus Sidhwa vis-à-vis Traumatic Memory

Amrita Pritam and Bapsi Sidhwa, celebrated womanish writers of partition literature, express the critical scenario of the 1940s. The novels *Cracking India* and *The Skeleton* highlight the traumatic memory of women who are killed, raped, kidnapped and looted their womanish identity where Amrita Pritam tilts towards humanism, responsibility and universality. On the other hand, Bapsi Sidhwa shows thick ethics towards Pakistani Nationalism and Muslim identity. The dissertation seeks to reestablish the new community which highlights welfare of humanism and redemption of violation questioning on the issue of representation to the events of partition in partition literature especially in *Cracking India* and *Skeleton*.

Cracking India catches the ethical side of Parsi community which shows dear and near relationship towards Muslim or Jinnaha, whereas *The Skeleton* balances the Hindu and Muslim community by showing the responsibility of human being through the main character Puro taking the events of violation in partition. *Cracking India* is based on short on geography and long on memory. On the other hand, *The Skeleton* is about long on geography and short on memory by depicting the condition of the main character Puro where she has lost her real identity in the reference of religion, home and gender identity. Along with this perception, Puro has helped to mad woman, Lajo and majority of the victimized people. Likewise, Bapsi Sidhwa's *Cracking India* depicts the trackless condition of Ayah who is homeless and beyond her social and gender identity. Ayah, the protagonist is a representative character who has lost identity in the riots of Partition. Through the character Lenny, Bapsi Sidhwa takes side of Pakistan saying that she feels so proud to be a Pakistani after being the country as an independent country, Sidhwa takes the side of Muslim community by showing more

traumatic condition of Muslim women where sister of Ice-candy-man is killed.

Similarly, the Muslim people and their community are badly attacked by the Hindu and Sikha agitators.

Works Cited

- Alexander, C. Jeffrey. *Cultural Trauma: A Social Theory*. USA: Polity Press, 2012. Print.
- . -. "Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma." *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Eds. J.C. Alexander, et al. Berkeley: California UP, 2004. Print.
- Bachetta, Paola. "Reinterrogating Partition Violence: Voices of Women, Children/Dalits in India's Partition." *Feminist Studies* 26.3 (Fall 2000). Print.
- Bahri, Deepika. "Telling Tales: Women and the Trauma of Partition in the Sidhwa's *Cracking India*." *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 1.2 (1999). 217-234. Print.
- Caruth, C. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, and the Possibility of History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996. Print.
- Darnell, Alice. "Are Women Really the Fairer Sex?" *Gender and Ethics at Work*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.
- Das, Veena. *Trauma and Testimony: Implication for Political Community*. London: Sage, 2003. Print.
- Derby, Lauren. "Haitians, Magic, and Money: Raza and Society in the Haitian Dominican Borderlands: 1900-1937." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16.3(1994): 22-24. Print.
- Edkins, Jenny. *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Print.
- Erikson, Kai. "Notes on Trauma and Community." *Trauma: Exploration in Memory*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 1995. Print.
- Eyerman, Ron. *Cultural Truma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.

- Foucault, Michel "Truth and Power." *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings 1972-1977* by Michel Foucault, ed. Colin Gordon, Brighton: Harvester, 1980, 109-133. Print.
- Gilmore, Leigh. *The Limits of Autobiography: Trauma and Testimony*. London: Cornell University Press, 2001. Print.
- Hall, Stuart. "*Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. New Delhi: Sage Publication, 2002. Print.
- Margalit, Avishai. *The Ethics of Memory*. Harvard: Harvard UP, 2002. Print.
- Pandey, Beerendra. "Pedagogy of Indian Partition Literature in the Light of Trauma Theory." *Southern Post-colonialism*. Ed. Sumanyu Satpathy. London and New York: Routledge, 2009. 125-381. Print.
- . "Exploration of the Language of Violence in South Asian Partition Fiction in English." *Ph.D Dissertation*. Stony Brook University, 2014. Print.
- Pandey, Gyanendra. *The Gyanendra Pandey Omnibus*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. 2008. Print.
- Pritam, Amrita. *The Skeleton and Other Writings*. Trans. Khushwant Singh. Bombay: Jaico Publishing house, 1964. Print.
- Rastegar, Kamran. "Trauma and Maturation in Women's War Narratives: The *Eye of The Mirror* and *Cracking India*." *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 2.3 (Fall 2006): 22-47. Print.
- Roy, Rituparna. *South Asian Partition Fiction in English: From Khushwant Singh to Amitav Ghosh*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. 2010. Print.
- Seiff, F. Daniela. *Understanding and Healing Emotional Trauma*. New York: Routledge, 2015. Print.
- Sidhwa, Bapsi. *Cracking India*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 1991. Print.

Singh, Sujala. "Nationalism's Brandings: Women's Bodies and Narratives of the

Partition." *Comparing Postcolonial Literatures: Dislocations*. Eds. Ashok

Bery & Patricia Murray. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. 122-33. Print.

Tal, Kali. *Words of Hurts: Reading the Literatures of Trauma*. New York: Cambridge

University Press. 2004. Print.