

Adeeb's Prejudiced Perspective on History: A Study of Kamleshwar's *Partitions*

LEELA DHAR

ABSTRACT

With the beginning of postmodernism and deconstruction, history as the History was not accepted slavishly but challenged, replaced, renegotiated and rewritten. The endlessness of openness and impossibility of closing in a discourse oust the authority of history. History, too, like other disciplines underwent a sea change in the second half of the twentieth century. The thinkers started to inquire the discipline because the failure of a comprehensive history was quite apparent. The discourses and theories that emerged out of production of various reactions accept the failure of historical (re)presentations and celebrate the possibilities of interpretive accounts, problematisations, uncertainties and dilemmas whisked out of the calm surfaces of the history. Fundamental qualities of history such as historical facts, structures, periods, meanings, documents became just other extrinsic attribution. Now, it is accepted as a fact that none has exclusive rights on the past history as final itself. It is considered that history has been written from the perspective of rulers and powerful people. But there have been many hidden facts that remained under the surface. Partition of India is one of the events in the history of Indian sub-continent which need to be studied impartially. Although the event was observed by many writers and historians from many perspectives, yet many enigmatic and ambiguous aspects of history are still unexplored. Therefore, the present paper entitled 'Adeeb's Prejudiced Perspective on history: A Study of Kamleshwar's *Partitions*' is an attempt to explore the truth behind history in the context of Partition. It also aims at

focusing on hidden tricks of the writer who cleverly view history through the lens of his protagonist.

Keywords: Partition Narratives, Historical characters, Hindu-Muslim Relationships, Nationality.

History as legacy and 'grand past' is an inescapable in our society. It is a noble subject that deals with the tale of the past. This tale is to be properly examined, analyzed and explained in the most comprehensible and mesmerizing way. It is history which tells us about the facts, data and certain things concerning the events. History is a Greek word which means enquiry, research, exploration and information. Shah observes that "History in the narrow sense is the science of the human past. In the wider sense, it studies and of the species, as well as of civilization" (Shah 24). To write a history in the traditional sense is to construct a coherent narrative by weaving together parts of a culture with the thread of values which must unavoidably inform the whole. So history has become the source of knowledge for all disciplines. Sometimes it keeps the scholars in confusion what is accurate or what is not. They try their best to peep into the past and to reveal the truth which has been under the dark cloud of forced circumstances.

Nevertheless, with the beginning of postmodernism and deconstruction, history as the History was not only challenged but replaced, renegotiated and revised. The endlessness of openness and impossibility of closing in a discourse toppled the authority of history. History, too, like other disciplines underwent a sea change in the second half of the twentieth century. The thinkers began to enquire the discipline because the failure of a comprehensive history was quite apparent. The discourses and theories that emerged as out of production of various reactions accept the failure of historical (re)presentations and celebrate the possibilities of interpretive accounts, problematisations, uncertainties and dilemmas whisked out of the calm surfaces of the history. Fundamental qualities of history

such as historical facts, structures, periods, meanings, documents became just other extrinsic ascriptions. Now, it is accepted as a fact that none has exclusive rights on the past history as final itself.

If one wants to know about history of our past, it requires a few devices like Time and space which are important tools for us to understand crux of the narrative. These tools are more important than the background essentials in narrative. In some narratives, events are told strictly in the order in which they occur. But they may also be told out of order, for example, using flashback to fill in an important part of a character's past avoiding a lengthy introduction or in order to divulge new facts. Such literary devices are helpful for us to look back and re-evaluate events in the light of current circumstances. The writers are skilled in these tools and techniques to delineate their novels.

History has always offered a context for fiction, which if fittingly used, can provide a useful perspective. Kirmani observes that "History provide insights into and challenge the dominant, and often state centric, historical discourses and serve as reminders of the far reaching consequences of violent conflict long after the actual events, at both the physical as well as the discursive levels" (Kirmani 58). A momentous national experience generally serves as a great source of literary creativity. The French Revolution, the American Civil war, the Russian Revolution and the two World Wars in the previous centuries provided the basis of great fiction. In the West, many novels have been written on history such as *A Tale of Two Cities*, *War and Peace*, *A farewell to Arms*. Dickens employs the French Revolution in his *A Tale of Two Cities* to fictionalize history and make it an external agent to the narrative. Likewise, in India, too, sensitive literature has been written on the tragedy of the partition, one of the historical events in South Asia. This human tragedy has found poignant expression in Kushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan*, Manohar Malgonkar's *A Bend in the Ganges*,

Chaman Nahal's *Azadi*, Raj Gill's *The Rape*, Kartar Singh's *Twice Born dead*, Bhisham Sahni's *Tamas*, Yaspal's *Jhutha Sach*, Attia Hosain's *Sunlight on a Broken Column*, Bapsi Sidhwa's *Ice-Candy-Man*, Taslima Nasrin's *Lajja*, and Manju Kapur's *Difficult Daughters*. These novelists "poignantly recreate the agony, which victims of the Partition find it difficult to forget" (Chopra 16).

However, a good number of South Asian novelists have shown an enthusiasm in reviving and re-narrating the past in their novels as a new form of expression. These writers have made significant experiments in fictional form and have captured realities of their time by blending imaginative objects with the realities of life. Important landmark in this context which differs from other partition narratives is *The Great Indian Novel* which is Tharoor's first fictional endeavour in the realm of English fiction. Tharoor has set proximity between the Great Indian epic *Mahabharata* and the political history of the sub-continent, with the purpose of emphasizing the fluidity of history. The author observes that the partition needs to be perceived in a broader perspective envisaging the freedom struggle of India that culminated in the achievement of the independence, though simultaneously, accompanied by the partition. Furthermore, Tharoor emphasizes the importance of the political aftermath of the partition. The novel can be considered a historical and political allegory, in which the author allegorizes Mahatma Gandhi, an extremely important personality of the Indian freedom struggle, by calling him Gangaji or Bhishma of the *Mahabharata*. Similarly, Nehru is allegorized by Dhritrashtra, Subhash Chander Bose, by Pandu, and so are many other figures of Modern history by those of the epic and vice-versa. Tharoor also enlists how the hunger for power, which was the cause of the battle of Kurukshetra in *Mahabharata*, was an equally important theme in the political scene of both pre- and post-partition India. The novel depicts how historical characters behave political leaders of the partition period. Mahatma Gandhi's role has been given importance, for

he was the sole author and interpreter of the weapons of 'Satyagraha', Non-violence, non-co-operation and civil-disobedience. Here, Tharoor pays homage to the great personality in one line, speaking vividly about him that "while he was alive, he was impossible to ignore; once he had gone, he was impossible to imitate" (Tharoor 47). Briefly, Tharoor writes his novel with the purpose of highlighting the role of those responsible for the event, as well as those who played a major part in Indian polity after that. To achieve this goal he presents an inset picture of the partition in the framework of the *Mahabharata* and prominently succeeds in it.

Another work is Qurratulain Hyder's *River of Fire*, a landmark effort that explores the wide sweep of historical time. Besides, it is a significant work inspired by Partition of Indian subcontinent. The novel captures two hundred years of Indian history through the lived experiences of four recurring characters: Gautam, Champak, Kamal and Cyril. The novel is staged in four historical periods: first, the expansion of the Mauryan empire under Chandragupta in the fourth century BC; second, the end of Lodhi dynasty and the beginning of the Mughal rule in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries; third, the late eighteenth and beginning of East India company rule until its consolidation in the 1870's, and fourth, the two decades leading up to the 1950 that encompassed national struggle, partition and independence. In his *Nation and Its Fragments*, Partha Chatterji provides a good illustration of how, at one time, "myth, history and contemporary – all part of the same chronological sequence. One was not distinguished from another." (Chatterji 80). Although the beginning of the novel deals with the historical events and culture, yet the final chapters of the novel are an attempt at coping with the trauma of the Partition. The novelist's blending of characters from different periods makes her famous in applying modern techniques in the novel.

One more is Rushdie's work *Midnight Children* (1980), a novel about Indian independence, the trauma of partition and its aftermaths. It is widely acclaimed as a comic story of epic proportions imbued with human compassion. The novel looks at the Indian subcontinent through the eyes of a young man born at the stroke of the hour of Indian independence. The novel's narrator, Saleem Sinai, is one of the midnight's children of the title. Midnight is the point of time where past and future coalesce in the present and there is liberation from the clock time. The novel exquisitely allegorized the legacy of partition to make a commentary addressing its reality. By accident of birth, the protagonist, Saleem, is born at midnight on August 15th 1947 the moment of India's independence. Throughout the narrative, Saleem makes repeated references to the legacy left to him by his forefathers, including his extraordinary olfactory powers and the "superb silver spittoon, inlaid with lapis lazuli" (Rushdie 45). The novelist tries to depict the dirty politics of Nehru and other politicians. The author tries to explicate the plight of the Muslims who have been subjected to exploitation by the politicians on the one hand and victimized by the non-Muslims. Partition brought a shock to the Muslims who had inherited a huge landed property from their forefathers.

Lastly, *A Village Divided*, a translation of *Aadha Gaon*, a Hindi version by Rahi Masoom Reza deals with partition of India reflecting the plight of Indian Muslims. The focus of the novel is on the village, Gangauli and its people. Gangauli like Mano Majra of Khushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan*, appears unperturbed by the frenzy of communal riots that engulfed thousands of lives during the Partition. The author concentrates on how the Indian Muslims felt during this man-made catastrophe. Masoom is the narrator of the novel and other significant characters like Phnam Miyan, Tannu, Prithvipal, Phusu Miyan, etc., exist in relation to him. The historical events in the novel take place between 1931 and 1952. They are framed by the first elections to the provincial legislative assemblies and

the first free general elections in free India. The story then winds its way through the different phases of the nationalist struggle against colonialism and the increasing demands for a separate Muslim nation – the Lahore resolution of the Muslim league, the Quit India movement of 1942, the great feminine of Bengal, the Second World War and finally the euphoria and the terror of 1947. Despite all that the Shia of Gangauli during Moharram resanctify their place and their days. Thus Tanu tells one of the educated proselytizers of Pakistan: “I am a Muslim. But I love this village because I myself am this village. I love the indigo godown, this tank and these mud lanes because they are different forms of myself. On the battlefield, when death came every near, I certainly remembered Allah, but instead of Mecca or Karbla, I remembered Gangauli” (Rahi 249). Like historical events, what people do in their daily lives is also subject to judgment by the ideal conduct of Imam Hussain in scared time. The ethical and political actions of the Shia families invite the same criticism as the actions of the other people in the community do.

Coming to the present writer, taken for the study, Kamleshwar is also one of the writers who try his best to delineate history and historical characters through a specific perspective. He projects Adeeb as a protagonist in his novel *Partitions* which is the translation of *Kitne Pakistan*, a Hindi novel. In the novel Adeeb has been presented as a common man who holds his own court in order to make judgments regarding wrong deeds done in the past. In order to achieve his goal the writer applies ‘magical realism’, a narrative technique to present actual victims before Adeeb’s court. Even dead people are ordered to appear before his court. So the select novel is replete with imagination and a mingling and juxtaposition of the realistic and the fantastic elements when it comes to the treatment of corpses in his court in order to know the truth. However, in real life, man and woman who died can never be recalled to show their justification regarding their deeds done in

the past. The novelist also uses mythical characters like Indra and Ahilya, characters from Ramayana and Mahabharata, character like Hitler, Babar and Akbar and sometimes contemporary events like Kargil war etc., in order to have a constructive/ deconstructive study. And the novelist also uses this technique in the novel in order to provide authenticity to the history which has not been written through an impartial perspective.

Before analyzing the character Adeeb in detail, one can look back to those critics who analyzed Adeeb through multiple perspectives. Ameena Kazi Ansari, the translator of *Kitne Pakistan* observes that Adeeb is “a man of many parts and personae. He is introduced as a writer who has lived through India’s partition experiencing the trauma of hearts and minds being divided as the contours of Pakistan are drawn up by the British. He is an articulate voice of the common man’s concerns which have gone largely unheard in history’s relentless march of time. It is this man who embodies the people’s court which sets out to judge human as well as divine acts of omission and commission down the trajectory of history” (*Partitions* ix).

One more critic is Ajay Sahebrao Deshmukh who analyzed historical characters in such a way as to provoke the critical inquiry into the process of making and writing history of nation. “His unnamed Adeeb expresses his aim in his court of justice pacifying the wounds of dead and suffering of humanity through the testimonials of historical personalities from Babar to Aurungzeb and historians who write their history takes peep into the historical times of India” (online interdisciplinary Research Journal 314). He further believes that Kamleshwar’s Adeeb witnesses the debate of historians who argued the authenticity of respective histories of Kings and Emperors.

Another critic is Vinod K. Chopra who observes that “Adeeb is playing the role of an unrequited lover whose mistress lives across a volatile border. He is a historian who questions

pantheons of divinity as well as civilizational myths and history and finally he is an activist who rails against massacres, in imperialism and nuclear proliferation" (The Criterion, 3). He further states that the Adeeb rebuked the historian Shibli Nomani for his biased version of history as he defended the cruel ruler, Aurangzeb. The Adeeb is right in asserting, "History written in blood and recorded under coercion can never be other than suspect. Such accounts are written by professional historians who are paid to do so" (*Partitions* 195). The biased version of history by some historians is responsible to pave the way for the rise of these grotesque "Pakistan's". That is why in Egypt, Tunisia, Turkey, Algeria, Somalia, Lebanon and Iraq Muslims are pitted against Muslims. Thus, the Adeeb, through arguments tries to brush aside such history and wishes love, peace and harmony across the world.

Although the character, Adeeb, has been analyzed as a writer who tries to re-write history; as a reformer who believes in reforms in conventional society; as a common man who suffered a lot at the hands of wars, terrorism conflicts and colonialism; and as a judge who checks the authenticity of historical events, yet a perspective that was missed by the critics and novelists is the prejudiced view of history by Adeeb. It is reflected when he treats Hindus and Muslims differently in the Court. How Adeeb reacts to the Hindu *Rajas*, Muslim Kings and Emperors becomes the subject of exploration. The present paper aims at focusing on the Adeeb's prejudiced perspective on history in *Partitions*. It also focuses on how the historical characters are brought to the court of Adeeb in order to encompass reforms in history.

If one looks at Adeeb from a distance, many religious based differences in his outlook can be observed very clearly. It is well known that Partition took place on religious lines. This religious difference has been apparent since the time of Babar in India. The common masses of India were not aware about their

religious differences but “religion divided them into communal groupings almost separate identities” (Dhawan, 21). Similarly Adeeb summons the Muslim rulers in his court and starts asking questions as if they were culprits in the past. He seems to be indignant towards the Muslims and looks at them suspiciously. It is Babar who is questioned by the trident wielder, one of the corpses: “You yourself are the root cause of all our disputes! Had you not destroyed the Ram Mandir, this dispute would not have arisen at all” (*Partitions* 57). These lines are suggestive of the fact that the author tries to show Babar as a ‘Sunni’ and is supposed to be behind demolition of Ram Mandir at Ayodhya.

Interestingly, Ibrahim Lodhi was also a Muslim ruler in Indian history but he is not blamed by Adeeb. It may be due to the fact that Ibrahim Lodhi’s grandmother has been a Hindu. It appears that Muslims who have blood relations among Hindus are spared in his court. This situation appears in the novel: “The court wanted to know why no one had ever held Ibrahim Lodhi accountable for laying the foundations of this mosque. No one blamed Ibrahim Lodhi because firstly, no Mandir had existed there. Secondly, Lodhi’s paternal grandmother was a Hindu. In her veins flowed Hindu blood. So, obviously, he could not be blamed” (60). These lines are suggestive of the fact that Kings like Akbar and Ibrahim Lodhi have been Hindu descendant. Akabar’s mother has been a Hindu while Ibrahim Lodhi’s grandmother was also a Hindu. It is quite natural for them to incline to the Hindu religion. “A large number of temples were built all over the country by him” (Mahajan 90). Hence we cannot ignore the contribution of generous Muslim rulers.

Another instance where one can have a glimpse of Adeeb’s inclination towards Hindus and his superiority of Hindi language in the novel. It is a moment when a Muslim character, Gulbadan, is praised for her proper use of Hindi phrases. The situation appears when Gulbadan greets her father Babar in this way: “How was I to know that my Hindustan would be divested

like this', she began, 'and that your name, my honourable father, would be sullied' (*Partitions* 63). Her greeting her father, Babar, is reflective of her patriotic feeling towards India which her father lacks. Pandey says that "Sikhs, Muslims and Hindus were all redefined by the process of Partition: as butchers, or as devious others; as untrustworthy and antinational; but perhaps most fundamentally, as Sikhs and Muslims and Hindus alone. All over the Subcontinent, for extended periods, at many times since 1947, men, women and children belonging to these communities – yet belonging to different casts, classes, occupation, linguistic and cultural backgrounds – have been seen in the terms of little but their Sikh-ness, their Muslim-ness or their Hindu-ness" (Pandey 16). After the partition even community's language became to be perceptible. Urdu became the language of Muslims and Hindi of the Hindus. The language, Hindi, spoken by the Muslims enables Adeeb to argue that it is Muslims' loyalty to their country. This view suggests the superiority of Hindi language over colonial language, English and Urdu, a language which signify Muslim identity.

Significantly, History is the witness to the facts that Islam took a negative turn during the regime of grant ruler called Aurangzeb. It was he who imposed 'Jaziya' tax on the non-Muslims and never acknowledged Hindustan as his country. "The expansion of Islam further took place with the conversion of the local people during the Mughal rule in India" (Hussain 2). Most of the Hindus became the victims during his time. Adeeb is a common man who raises questions against Aurangzeb saying "Almigir! 'many charges have been levelled against you. The most serious of them describes you as a bigoted ruler and a radical Sunni. That is why you destroyed the Shia kingdoms or Golconda, Bijapur, Khandesh, Birar and Ahmednagar, it is alleged. You are also accused of persecuting your Hindu subjects, converting them to Islam under duress, banning their festivals and demolishing their Mandirs. You fought with the Marathas who could have been your greatest allies. You had

your father Shahjahan, thrown into prison and your brother, Dara Shikah and Murad Murdered" (*Partitions* 152). Adeeb asks satirical questions to Aurangzeb because Marathas were Hindu descendant. So far as Shahajahn is concerned he "had many Hindu musicians in the court" (Chopra 13). That is why Adeeb takes much interest in asking sardonic questions to Aurangzeb.

Besides, it was not only Muslim rulers who become the object of censure and criticism in Adeeb's court but also those who favoured them. It is Shibli Nomani who is introduced as historian appreciating Aurangzeb's far-sightedness in murdering his brother Murad. At her appreciation of Aurangzeb, Adeeb shouts in the court in such a manner: "Shibli Nomani Sahib! instead of being a rational, thinking human being, what you are, first and foremost, is a Muslim. That is your failing" (*Partitions* 164). It is need for the historian to "recover the voices of the marginal", so that history does not end up as the celebration of certain victorious concepts" (Hansen 13). Secondly, it is generally believed that Muslims are irrational, for they are not as much educated as to understand the concepts like religion and community. Since the Muslims were lacking modern education, most of the government jobs went to the Hindus who were ahead of the Muslims educationally. The communalists also often distorted or misinterpreted economic struggle against landlords, social tension, class conflict between the exploiters and the exploited belonging to different religions as a communal conflict. C.J Shah has rightly asserted: under the pressure of communal propaganda, the masses are unable to locate the real causes for their exploitation, oppression and suffering and imagine a fictitious communal source of their origin" (Shah 405). They seem to be deeply rooted in their religion. So Muslim rulers like Aurangzeb had no sympathy for the non-Muslims. Even Kamleshwar remarks on Shibli Nomani while conversing with Alok Bhalla, "He saw Aurangzeb only as a Muslim, but failed to recognize that he used Islam for his own reasons of state. He also did not understand the psyche or a man like Aurangzeb. Yes,

Aurangzeb was a fundamentalist, a chauvinist” (qtd in Alok Bhalla, 203-4). That is why Aurangzeb became the victim in Adeeb’s court.

Thus the attitude of Adeeb towards the Muslims seems to be ambiguous. He is seen scolding the Muslim rulers who have suppressed the other community. Interestingly, he speaks against the ‘Sunnis’ like Babar and Aurangzeb whereas Akbar and Ibrahim Lodhi are left without rebuke. Perhaps, it may be due to the fact that Akbar and Ibrahim Lodhi have been kind to the Hindus, for they had blood relation with the Hindu community.

On the other side, the attitude of Adeeb towards Hindus seems to be Hindu-centered and friendly. There are many episodes or moments in the novel where Adeeb’s deep sympathy for the Hindus is reflected. Again looking back in the Court of Adeeb, when Babar was being questioned, for his being a ‘pirator’, ‘exploitor’, and intruder etc., he replied that he had heard about India and its gold mines. He gives a few reasons of his coming that he came to India on invitation extended by Lodhis’ uncle Daulat Khan, the Subedar of Punjab. At that moment Rana Sanga enters and shouts: “you bear false witness, Babar!” Rana Sanga shouted back. Like Mohammed Bin Quasim and Mahmud Ghazni, you too had come to wage war on the Kifirs! You came to spread Islam by the power of your sword (*Partitions* 141). After hearing these arguments, Adeeb says that it reveals social, religious and historical realities. But he does not rebuke Rana Sanga for interrupting in the process of hearings of the court. It is this feeling that Rana Sanga has been a Hindu ruler and is allowed to speak freely in the court. But the Muslim rulers are not privileged of having such freedom in the same court. It suggests that Adeeb’s psyche seems to be Hindu construct. He favours the Hindus by remaining silent in the court.

Another view which stands for Hindu view of Adeeb is the sudden appearance of Vishwa Hindu Parshad and Bajrang Dal

in the court saying: "In their strident tones, the leaders of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the Bajrang Dal joined in the Knocking. The Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir will be built, was their message. "In fact, we shall not rest till we liberate Krishna Janmabhoomi and the Kashi Vishwanath Mandir" (51). Adeeb is seen issuing the sympathetic orders that the doors and the windows be opened to everyone who has arrived at the doorsteps. Adeeb does not stop them but compels them to come in the court. In contrast, when the Muslims are about to speak in such a manner, they are scolded by the court. The appearance of Vishva Hindu Parishad is shown in such a manner as if they were the legitimate members of this court. This partial treatment meted out by Adeeb is reflective of the fact that in Hindu majority country, the minority community and its voice is neglected and unheard to some extent.

Like Vishwa Hindu Parishad, R.S.S. is another organization which lays stress on Hindu view of life. The role of R.S.S. appears on the surface when Ghulam Mehmood Banatwala, the president of the Indian Union Muslim League is questioned by the Adeeb in his court. The court asks him why he has not gone to Pakistan. Another man interrupts supporting the courts question saying "Me? I'm Chandrakant Bhardwaj, chief of the R.S.S. in Aligarh. You communal-minded Muslims have a long tradition of being traitors. You are incapable of patriotic feelings" (101). The leaders of R.S.S. reacted in such a manner as if they were planning to avenge against the Muslims. Even Kamleshwar clarifies on Hindu organization while conversing with Alok Bhalla: "I think it has to do with the desire for power by some Hindus who were influenced by the fascists. People like Hegdewar, Moonje, and other leaders of the R.S.S. were certainly impressed by what they thought were the achievements of Hitlers' Germany. They wanted to create a Hindu India in that image. The difficulty is that these people don't understand that we have had a long and composite history for centuries" (Bhalla 217-18). Through these lines one can understand how a feeling of

hatred between the Hindus and Muslims is still found in their hearts.

In the context of Britishers, Adeeb and his peon do not spare the Lord Mountbatten, the then, the Viceroy of India. He is criticized for his policy of 'divide and rule' and division of India into Pakistan. Muhmad Ali shouts: "You will certainly have to hear it all – you are responsible for the world's biggest and bloodiest migration! It is you who callously presided over the ocean of tears flowing in the country at that moment in history" (*Partitions* 274). In the novel he criticizes scientists who made Atom bomb. It seems that he is against those who are enemies of humanity.

Thus, the writer very cleverly projects a Muslim character Adeeb in the novel in order to protect himself from the censure of the masses. Basically, Adeeb, is a Muslim baby name in Arabic language. So the novelist projects this Muslim baby who is in a state of anger and scolds those who have been cruel to the human civilization. Besides, he tries to scold those Muslims who were not devoted to India.

In summing up it may be said that the character, Adeeb, has criticized those who have exploited, suppressed and crushed the Indian people. He also reacted against those rulers who did not consider India as their motherland and also spoke against those who were responsible for the partition. Even he never spared scientists who had hand behind nuclear explosion and became the victims in his court. He raised a voice against conflicts like Kargil War, Philistianian problems etc. Even a nationalistic spirit is reflected in his depiction of some characters and simultaneously he seems to be in favour of unity and integrity. He proves to be a social reformer. But when he comes to the treatment of the Hindus and the Muslims, he seems to be prejudiced to some extent. In his court, Muslims are censured whereas the Hindus are given freedom what they really long for. This partial treatment by Adeeb is emblematic of the inclination

of the novelist himself. At last but not least, the novelist has tried to depict his feeling by projecting Adeeb as a judge who propagated reforms in our history and highlighted the hidden truth behind history. Convincingly, he condemns partition and those perpetrators who are actually behind it. His emphasis on history and need of its re-examination invites many writers' perspectives on this issue in order to bring truth to the surface. This is a new way of deconstructing history with proper justification. Subsequently, this way of understanding the 'significant past' would definitely lead to a comprehensive understanding of the possibilities of establishing and sustaining harmonious, civilized society in the present as well as in future.

WORKS CITED

- Bhalla, Alok. *Partition Dialogues: Memories of a Lost Home*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *Nation and Its Fragments*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Chopra, Vinod. K. *Partition Stories: Mapping Community, Communalism and Gender*. New Delhi: Anamika Publishers and Distributors, 2009. Print.
- Chopra, Vinod. K. Use of Pakistan as a Metaphor: A Study of Kamleshwar's *Partitions*. *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*. 3.3 (September, 2012) 2-11. Print.
- Deshmukh, Ajay Sahebrav. "Re-writing History and Making of a Nation: An Odyssey into the Historical Times of India in Kamleshwar's *Partitions*." *Online International Interdisciplinary Research Journals* (March, 2015) 313-25.
- Dhawan, R.K. *Three Contemporary Novelists*. New Delhi: Classical Publication, 1985.
- Hansen, Anders Bjorn. *Partition and Genocide: Manifestation of Violence in Punjab, 1937-47*. New Delhi: India Research Press, 2002.
- Hussain, Sabiha. *The Changing Half: A Study of Indian Muslim Women*. New Delhi: Classing Publishing Company, 1998. Print.
- Hyder, Qurratulain. *River of Fire*. New Delhi: Women Unlimited, 1998. Print.

- Kamleshwar, *Kitne Pakistan* (Hindi), trans. *Partitions* by Ameen Kazi Ansari. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2006. All Subsequent references to the novel are to this edition and have been incorporated in the text.
- Kirmani, Nida. "History, Memory and Localized Constructions of Insecurity". *EPW*, 43.10 (March, 2008) 57-64
- Mahajan, V.D. *India Since 1526*. New Delhi: S. Chand and Company. Ltd. 1986. Print.
- Pandey, Gyanendra. *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India*. U.K : Cambridge University Press, 2001
- Reza, Rahi Masoom, *A Village Divided*. Trans. Gillian Wright. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2003. Print.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight Children*. Great Britain: Jonathan Cape Ltd., 1981. Print.
- Shah, Nila. *Novel as History*. New Delhi: Creative Books, 2003. Print
- Sharma, Neeru. "Revisiting History in Qurratulain Hyder's *River of Fire*". *An International Journal of Literary Explorations*. 2.1 (February 2014) 157-62.
- Tharoor, Shashi. *The Great Indian Novel*. New Delhi, Penguin Books, 1989. Print.