

# History of Indian Partition

**Kolli Syama Sundara Ratna Prasad**

Research Scholar,

North East Frontier Technical University, Arunachal Pradesh (India).

**Dr. Gomatam Mohana Charyulu**

Professor of English, Department of Science & Humanities,

VFSTR Deemed to be University, Vadlamudi Guntur, Arunachal Pradesh (India).

## Abstract

This research pointed to a deduction – the literature is changing and drifting, Cultural studies history. Further debates would definitely be placed in a more cultural, historical, sociological, feminist, and social anthropological sphere. There is and will always be the question of the Indian subcontinent partition that was selected for research. The Indian Partition should not only be considered as a crucial and significant moment in history. It's connected to the Nation birth and is also a permanent "self" and "other" marker on a giant National scale and material. The Indian Party has raised many questions and problems Citizenship, national identity and national and sub-national mentalities development.

Therefore, while often studied, we still have to continue in the search for many vital answers. The Partition of India was the division of British India in 1947 into two independent Dominions: India and Pakistan. The Dominion of India is today the Republic of India, and the Dominion of Pakistan the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and the People's Republic of Bangladesh. The partition involved the division of two provinces, Bengal and Punjab, based on district-wide non-Muslim or Muslim majorities. The partition also saw the division of the British Indian Army, the Royal Indian Navy, the Indian Civil Service, the railways, and the central treasury. The partition was outlined in the Indian Independence Act 1947 and resulted in the dissolution of the British Raj, i.e. Crown rule in India. The two self-governing independent Dominions of India and Pakistan legally came into existence at midnight on 15 August 1947.

**Keywords:** *Partition, India, History, Citizenship, Anthropological & British Raj.*

## Introduction

The first attempt of this research is to learn about the epistemological study of history. It includes various historical approaches, followed by a brief overview of the purpose of history and the historian. The discipline of history vis-à-vis art and philosophy of history was also considered necessary. This constitutes the third part of the epistemology study. The fourth part deals within the context of the historical discipline with concepts of truth, validity and precision. The research follows the literal views and the literature, which fiction places itself on the space between truth and imagination. This became all the more importantly, this paragraph discusses certain key concepts which are useful for the current research topic.

A study of selected partition history texts, which are grouped into two headings, is discussed in the next paragraph: The first group consists of traditional or mainstream texts on history. The texts addressed the independence and division of the Indians with the eyes of a historian. The events and material realities were focused largely. They cover the entire spectrum of events - alliances, meetings, announcements, officers involved, statistics on the whole of the Partition operations and partition violence. The second group consists of scholars who strive to discover the 'side' of history. They differ from the scholars of the first group in their parameters of understanding partition event. The parameters, goals, focus, sources used and conclusions drawn put them in a different group than the previous group.

Compared to the previous group, this study of selected texts on history is followed by an examination of the issues arising from the study of historical texts, which are the different aspects of that partition study. Things are grouped and analysed as follows:

- Preparation for Partition
- Partition
- Repercussion of Partition

These include announcements, plans, missions and committees established and so forth. It also includes a study of real estate exchange, mobile real estate division, geography, military forces, prisoners, 'citizen' - material possessions and human beings. The study also examines the initial

exodus stages and then the later stage, i.e. migrant travel by train, autobus, other vehicles, through air and sea, and in the foot convoys. The next major factor is the dislocation and removal of the individual and community, as well as the physical, emotional, mental and social traumas. Trauma also encompasses memory and erasure phenomena. The materiality of the partition has entailed an examination of the process of resettlement, of the refugee camps, of their residents and of possession and disposal of property. Finally, it attempts to synthesize the division by places and hierarchies of religion, sex, caste and class.

### **The relationship between history, language and literature**

An English-French historian's experience. Althusser's narrative postulation of history never known before his textual portrayal emphasises the relationship between history and language. A structuralist perspective redefined the relationship between history and language; This reduction of history to his discourses led to the distinction between history and literature being evenly distinguished, for example by seeing history as a different form of literature, and it is in that place that partition literature can stand in contrast to partition history. On the other hand, it is inconvenient because the time perspective isn't there. This is because history, as a narrativist, is seen as a set of static and timeless, dynamic or a-temporal relations.

Thus, Levi-Strauss defines the story as a 'temporary matrix' that is not historic. Even Roland Barthes argues that temporality exists in a narrative in the form of a system, 'true' time being simply a linguistic effect. As mentioned earlier, the problem of time is evaded by Nietzsche instead of time units. He looks at the horizon of the moment, together with other Supra historians – Kierkegaard and Schopenhauer as historical. Suprahistorians look at the historical horizon of the eternal repeat of the moment. The Superhistorians (Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard) view history as random, self-absorbing, intense moments. 4 There is no attempt to integrate it all into History. These 'moments' can be accessed only from the living experience (of the individual subject), and attempting to objectively locate the significance 'out there' is an error. In the "objectivity of history," Paul Ricoeur is enclosed by four subjective contingencies: choice in data choice, theories of explanation used, imagination used in bridging history between now and then and the historian's subjective experience.

### **Accuracy and Validation of History**

Foucault is not about the absolute truth of history, but about the provisional, fragmentary and plural forms of historical knowledge. According to George Simmel, the historical truth that can be produced is not just a reproduction, but an intellectual activity. The Aristotelian idea of Mimesis is comparable in that art is not a mere imitation, but a refined and modified imitation of the physical world with the benefit of an artist's position. An artist uses fantasy and a historian uses imagination. A poet and a historian use imagination in this way. A historian uses his imagination by filling disjointed observation fragments and connecting them. However, Wilhem von Humboldt points out a crucial difference between the use of the imagination of the historian and the poet. A historian subjects his imagination to reality, and imagination is not pure fantasy. The role of presuppositions in philosophy and history has also been emphasised by Collingwood and Gadamer. Many thinkers recognise that total accuracy in history might be a hypothetical opportunity. Kierkegaard believes that every knowledge of history is just an approximation. Kierkegaard says that final history is impossible and all the knowledge of history is only an approximation. Goal is not final, because it is only introspectively possible to access absolute. And Kierkegaard calls for this very reason 'dialectic of interiority,' he propagates a personal effort to become subjective for the correct historical perspective. History is not dogmatically insisting on precision. Some historians may fail to produce the enhanced insights that should be their ultimate purpose although technically painfully correct.

### **Traditional history**

The acquisition of independence, the division and formation of two nations were a rich basis for the writing of history. The formation of two nation states and the end of the colonial rule led to a whole debate about the events of these historical books, speculations, theories, arguments and other issues. The first wave of books, which conform to traditional history, The various independence and partitioning issues, namely treaties, agreements, contracts, events and leaders, were more focused on. Pakistan Ian Talbot: Modern history shows Pakistan as a nation that seeks its national identity. It describes the clashes on the individual, social and national levels of regional, religious, cultural, ethnic and Pakistani Identities. In the declaration of the Pushtoun nationalist, Wali Khan - he's been a Pushtoon for four thousand years, a Muslim for quarter-

century and a Pakistani for forty years - this clash of various conflictual identities comes out very clearly. The facts are: the untold history of India's division Jinnah's weak near-existing popularity with the masses was emphasised by Wali Khan as well. Wali Khan argues that Jinnah and the UK complemented each other perfectly for their own egoistic motives. The British saw Jinnah as an important pawn in their strategy for division and rule. This is why the British are supporting the Muslim League and depicting Jinnah as its sole authority. They had been trying to divide and rule in different factions: the Sikhs, the Dalits, or even the Hindu Mahasabah. By negotiating for power in return Jinnah made use of his power as a breaker. Jinnah cannot be ignored because of the British influence he enjoyed and flaunted in his role as leader with no popularity or rooted in him. The study of Wali Khan is very valid. He used his findings from a rare but important source. Wali Khan has access in London, as British legislation places every document in the Indian Office library as a public property after a period of 30 years. When in London, he is given access to certain top secret and extremely confidential documents.

### **New History**

The written history of modern history definitely differs from those of the 1950s and 1960s. The histories of today are more subjective and less decisive. The stories focus now on women, minorities, children and the displaced—the margins. Another striking feature. they also attempt to explore alternative narratives, which consist of characteristic representations and local and marginal experiences. The latter years' stories try to look with a more humane commitment at Partition. An overview of the works of Urvashi Butalia, Ritu Menon, Suvir Kaul, Vazira Fazila, Mushirul Hasan, Menon, Alok Pandey etc. must be carried out, as each one has chosen to explore unexplored aspects of the partition in previous works. In addition, the approach is different; various historiographical sources, cultural materialism and new historicism are used.

Urvashi Butalia says that she is categorically opposed to being a historian in the *Other Sides of Silence* and emphasises her personal and political commitment to history, modern communalism and a deep and lasting faith in feminism. Butalia says that her goal is not to question the truthfulness but the adequacy of facts when looking back. It rejects the list of broad political negotiations only while considering the history of the division. Her feminist position is illustrated by the combination and juxtaposition between personal and political issues They ask whether the

history of the partition only matches the history of a state or whether the documentation also gives meaning to events (feelings, emotions, indefinable things).

The Government has not been very supportive of its attitude to the Muslim refugees who return from Pakistan. It was for Hindu/Sikh, because any government attempts to "support" Muslims were considered to be directed against them by Hindus and Sikhs. The question is here: why does the relationship have to be either or why can the relationship not be both 'and'? The areas established by these Muslims' refugee camps were regarded as a key obstacle to the rehabilitation of Hindu and Sikh refugees. That gave rise to a lot of bureaucracy politics. Sahibzada Khurshid Ahmed, for example, the chief commissioner, represented the marginal voice, was one of the few senior Muslim officials in the Indian Civil Service (ICS) who had chosen to work for India and, by post-partum violence, remained Chief Commissioner in Delhi. He has been criticized for his weakness; he has been accused of cowardice and not of supporting or favoring Muslims. Having surrounded him with Deputy Commissioner Randhawa to collect orders from his supervisor, on the other hand, he felt a deep frustration. As a consequence, when the allowance system was imposed, He was transferred to a less significant post of head of an ICS training facility from his position as Chief Commissioner of Delhi. In the process of rehabilitation, minorities were marginalised and political legitimacy on both sides of the nations was chilling.

A key clause in the agreement on evacuating the property was that people who had moved and separated their immovable property were still linked to the displaced in what would have come to be known as "imaginative property." The problem of compensation and dispute between India and Pakistan was thus raised. The Indian government claimed that non-Muslims' evacuee property in Pakistan was much larger. A rough estimate of Rs. 500, compared with a total of 100 crores in India was evacuee property in Pakistan, a ratio of 5 to 1. The farmlands left were 48,00,000 hectares in India and 31,39,000 hectares in Pakistan. 17 Pakistan submitted that the Indian claim was not based on reliable figures, the evacuees left on both sides were equivalent to more or less, and therefore the refugees had to sell or transfer property individually without the State intervening. The argument of Pakistan was favoured by a considerable section of the Indian Government It was only after Mahatma Gandhi, who was dismayed by the damage to Indo-Pak relations caused by Karachi's not paying duties, that India paid Pakistan's share, that it became deadlocked.

## **Preparation for Partition**

The draught constitution for India was organised at the all-party conference in July 1928. The Muslim demand for separate electorates was the most discussed issue in this conference, which Hindu members opposed. Jinnah set some conditions, including Motilal Nehru's acceptance as a separate province of formation of Sindh; the introduction of reforms in the province of the North West Frontier and Baluchistan; and a certain fixed share of representatives of Muslims in downtown and in Punjab and Bengal Provinces. This is an ambivalent position taken by the Congress.

With his request "Fourteen Points," Jinnah came out. The following Jinnah requests were brought about by a careful scrutiny of the 14 points: i) the centres for less power and autonomous provinces, as well as the powers of State and self-government bodies. ii) To highlight the minorities. iii) One third of the Islamic representations in Central legislature and the cabinet with one third of the Muslim ministers in order to safeguard the interests of Muslims in the fields of religion, culture, personal law and education, iv) Separate communal identities which are thus to be maintained in the political fields of difference. v) Sindh is separated from the presidency of Bombay and thus separate areas of leadership are marked. vi) NWFP and Baluchistan reforms (iii) Free and identity in religion.

In Britain the crucial post-war change was Attlee's replacement for Churchill, opening the way for the freedom of Indians. Attlee ordered a general election in India immediately, indicating the cooperation with power transfer of newly elected representatives. So it was not a question of 'if' anymore, it was a question of 'when.' Lord Mountbatten at the start of 1947 replaced Wavell, who realized that the Partition was inevitable and urgent when he took office. He also knew the coronation of thorns, but didn't worry about it. He told Khushwant Singh after the partition. "What people say about me doesn't matter, I'm judged by history bar." The political muddle became more confused, or the leaders were hidden. The impression of Ram Manohar Lohia about this is vital because he, together with Jaiprakash Narayan, had been a special inviter to the congressional management (work) committee meeting to decide on party membership. During this meeting, Jaiprakash Narayan, Ram Manohar Loheia, Gandhi and Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan spoke to the leaders who spoke against the party. Maulana Azad was so distracted that during the meeting he didn't speak a single word; only he was smoking in a corner. The President Kriplani

was in a pathetic state, complaining of serious head ache and either dozing or bending his head. He was in a pathetic position. Lohia rightly points out that Congressional leadership at such a crucial moment had a shadow of old age and fatigue.

Hindustani political leadership is shown as superficial and weak around a critical time, in addition to the inferences made at this meeting by Lohia; Gandhi, Patel and Jinnah were the only exception. There was no sense of clarity about objectives or a well-drawn-up plan or policy.

In these very words, Nehru and Patel asked Mountbatten:

*"Coming over the country, please. The Emergency Committee. You must take it. You must take it. We commit ourselves. We commit ourselves. We're going to do anything you say. We are much more obedient than you were when you were viceroy..... We're going to find ways to cover it up."*

No wonder, they were described by Mountbatten as 'a chastened schoolboy's pair.' Mountbatten was on vacation in Simla in the midst of all this chaos and massacres. Nehru and Patel finally urged him to mediate with the VP Menon immediately. "If your Excellency isn't down (from Simla) within 24 hours, don't bother to come. I've been very blunt and direct with Mountbatten." It's too late, we're going to have lost India."

The British Parliament finally passed its Bill of Indian Independence on 18 July 1947 and became law. Ten expert committees have been established to deal with different aspects of the partition.

- Organization, records and staff of government
- Assets and responsibilities
- Main income
- Contracts
- Currency, Coinage and Exchange
- Economic Relations-i
- Economic Relations-ii
- Domicile
- Foreign Relations
- Armed Forces.



## **Partition**

### ***The Migration and the Journey.***

There were no monolithic categories for the Muslims affected by the partition. Zakaria groups three segments of Muslims of undivided India who have been subjected to division: i. Muslims in India who are now almost 140 million. ii. Mohajirs mainly migrating from Eastern Punjab and Indian majority Hindu provinces. iii. In Bangladesh, the Biharis are unwanted, including Muslim immigrants from Bihar and parts of Uttar Pradesh as well as (and due to their harmonisation with Pakistani forces during the 1971 war of liberation).

### ***Arrival and Relocation of Refugees***

The "Own Country" refugee arrival and settlement? What's this bird's plumage? And tell me where is one finding it, good people? The place in which one is born can a dwelling place for several days hope for it if that is not our country? Then, who knows, we should also be pushed away and told that we would find a new home, a new land. I'm in my life's end. One last flutter and the countries will no longer be in dispute. And then, it doesn't even have fun to remove and resettle everything. It was time, the Mughals left their country and came here to build a new country.

### ***Restoration of abducted persons***

The recovery of abducted persons was an important step in the resettlement process. This was the subject of Urvashi Butalia's stories. In their work *Borders and Boundaries: Women in the India Partition*, Ritu Menon and Kamala Bhasin have done a comprehensive study. Kamala Patel wrote about her direct recovery and rehabilitation experiences. This review draws from the texts chosen for study in the provision of factual information.

### ***Migration and Counter Migration:***

It would be an error to assume that migration was linear during partition. People have gone back and forth and moved back and forth. It was sometimes voluntary and sometimes State enforcement. Furthermore, voluntary counter migration was not entirely voluntary, nor was it implemented. The only difference was that it was not implemented by an external agency. The reasons were mostly material, family or psychological in the case of voluntary counter migration.

The material reasons related to property, in particular property problems. Many people have returned to dispose of their homes, fields, companies and other property. Family reasons included looking for and recovering missing family members, persuading those who remained behind to move and meet and join the divided family. Then people found it too difficult to cope with the psychological trauma of the changing location. Their own land remained indecisive, home was left behind or snatched away, and they had to take on a new place. So, they continued their journey through the two countries. In many fiction narratives, this trauma is deftly depicted.

### **Repercussion of Partition**

When there is a crisis or a decisive event at both national and local levels, the consequences of the partition are not removed, but evocated and revoked. It is a continuum that is changed and reinvented over time and strongly present in private and public debate. If one continues to pin the length of the sequel, the migrants become citizens and eventually become locals but in fact it doesn't happen. Although the passage of time has worked so hard to heal and change things, it cannot be abolished because it is linked to our nation's genesis. To put an end and deny today's partition would be to deny the nation's existence with the lame excuse that the nation was built up a long time ago. If you regret the partition, you still need to recognise that it was a turning point of our past, whose presence remains in the present and will be an important factor in shaping the future. Nearly all the studies examined reflect this tone in the end.

### **Analysis on History of Partition**

The previous criticism or analysis shows the complex nuances involved in the whole partition process. There are two trends in partitioning studies: One is to highlight more of the political events that lead to partitioning - official policies, pacts, talks, procedures, etc. In response, the later (around 80s) second trend was to look back on violence and displacement. The second trend is not prominently characterised by factors of religion, gender, caste, and class which persist on a social scale.

That leads to 'lessons to be learned' and hence the spirits of visiting and revisiting partitions. In other words, without identifying, analysing and solving the structural differences that instigated violence during the partition, the violence would always erupt and assume the nature of an inert volcano.

## Conclusion

The experience of partitioning ordinary people can never be free of its ambiguities and ambivalences. The partition is always remembered for its potential to destroy the 'notion of community.' (Kamra, 303 Bearing) In Kamra's words: "At the same time, the divide seems to have assumed the power to show the India's own civilisation break experience in European cultures." (Kamra, 303 Bearing) The concept of the human person has also been devastated. It is a summary failure in all forms of possible human relations.

The Indian subcontinent's current shape —as the legacy of the partition history— is impressed by the disruptive experiences of trauma. There are no parts of the planet that are divided. It includes much more than just human hearts, human identities, memory and survival resources. Above all, psychic reorientation is forced into being with the value system rooted in barbaric revenge, mutual distrust and, moreover, an ongoing sense of retaliation, that continues to have an impact on the current: the present of a generation of the past and injured.

With a specific reference to the narratives discussed in my study, it could be concluded that, in their integrity, the identity of the victim can never be emphatically situated on a specific side of the border if it is regarded as part of the state's historical building process.

A further study, as a natural development of this thesis, would even challenge the logic behind the creation of Pakistan - the land of pure on the basis of the purity, whether personal or national, of identity itself. Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* is the narrative that really expresses this position. Rushdie questions the historically reconstructed simplistic formula.

## References

[1] Some scholars have refuted this fact. For instance Arjun Mahey in *Translating Partition*, "Relative to the wealth of Urdu, Punjabi and Hindi writings which existed before, and since the partition, the Partition itself is little represented: at best only a handful of stories, novels and poems."

[2] Alok Bhalla, "Memory, History and Fictional Representation of the Partition." *Narrating India: The Novel in Search of the Nation*, ed. E.V. Ramakrishnan (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 2005) 87.

- [3] Alok Bhalla, *Partition Dialogues: Memories of a Lost Home* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- [4] Joe Moran, *Interdisciplinary: The New Critical Idiom* (London: Routledge, 2002).
- [5] Wilson Scott, *Cultural Materialism: Theory and Practice*. (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1995).
- [6] Robert M Burns and Hugh Rayment Pickard eds, *Philosophies of History: From Enlightenment to Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).
- [7] Ritu Menon and Kamla Bhasin, *Borders and Boundaries: Women in India's Partition* (New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1998).
- [8] For this illumination, I am indebted to an informal talk that I was fortunate to have with Uma Chakravorty during lunch on the 1st March, 2011 at a National Seminar on "Addressing Gender in Research: Debates and Challenges" organized by the Krantijyoti Savitribai Phule Women Studies Centre, University of Pune.
- [9] Band, Michiel and Willam Van Schendel. 1997. "Towards a Comparative History of Borderlands." *Journal of World History*. Vol: VIII: No. : 2
- [10] Bhalla, Alok. 1994. *Stories about the partition of India*. Vol.-I New Delhi Harper Collins.
- [11] Bhattarcharya, Ajit. "Cyril Scalpel" In *Out Look* 23 July. 1997: 8. Chandra, Bipin. 1987. *Communalism in Modern India*. New Delhi: Vicking Publishing Pvt Ltd.
- [12] Chugtai, Ismat. 1994. "Jaden". In Bhalla 1994.
- [13] Gandhi, Mahatma. 1997-84. *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*. Vols- LXXVIII-XC. New Delhi: Publication Division.
- [14] 1977-84. *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*. Vols. LXXXVIII-XC. New Delhi: Publication Division.
- [15] Das, Durga. Ed. 1971-74. *Sardar Patel Correspondence*. In Ten Vols. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.
- [16] Dhawan, R.K. 1985. Ed. *Three Contemporary Novelists*. New Delhi: Classical Publishing.
- [17] Duggal, K.S. 2002. "The Half Shut Door in Punjabi Writing." In Settar and Gupta. 2002.