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**ABSTRACT**

This paper analyzes selected partition novels in the light of affect theory in order to demonstrate how Pakistani writers counter the Indian mainstream nationalist line and offer alternative revisionary perspectives on independence that also led to partition violence. The affective subjectivity of the writers—Abdullah Hussein (*The Weary Generations*) and Bapsi Sidhwa (*Cracking India*)—discredits the mainstream Indian historiography, valorization of the independence struggle, and trivialization of partition issues. The notable affects highlighted in the novels are those of love, hatred, happiness, unhappiness, and rage. One positive affect in favor of one at the same time invites the opposite affect for the other. The paper concludes that the affects evoked in the above-mentioned novels are ethically tilted to the notions of community and nationhood of the respective writers—an ideologically biased orientation that results in prose of demonization and an open declaration of evil on whom they consider the other.
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I. INTRODUCTION

India-Pakistan partition writing has remained a problem literature in scholarly discussion. In one of my previous studies on partition texts from the Indian side, I investigated the affective politics of the authors in representing the independence movement. Writers write from their affective circumstances. For instance, Sikh writer effeminates not only Muslims but also Hindus; and challenges the notion of Hindu India. Hindu writer, in the same way, portrays Hindus, Muslims, and Sikh fighting against the British jointly, but a sudden outbreak of riot makes them each other's enemies (Joshi, 2021). In this study, I investigate two Pakistani partition texts, Bapsi Sidhwa's *Cracking India* and Abdullah Hussein's *The Weary Generations* (one by a Parsee and another by a Muslim) in the light of the affect theory of fear, shame, love, and hatred, particularly focusing on the theories of Sara Ahmed and Elspeth Probyn. I observe affective politics in the target texts staged by the authors from differing affective circumstances.

Indian nationalist historiography line is much debated since it valorizes the independence struggle of the elite leaders. Nationalism in such history is dominated by elitism, while partition has been termed as madness and communal slaughter. Lee (2006) has cited Gyanendra Pandey who argues that “partition and its violence are meaningful [since] they mark the termination of one regime and inauguration of two new ones” (p. 35). With the formation of a new nation, Pakistan has a new setting, new history, new memories, and new identities. They begin to establish their own set of ideologies, their affective subjectivity, different from that of Indian mainstream nationalist historiography. I have argued that partition literature is affective. Sources of affect differ for Indian and Pakistani writing. The area has received considerable critical engagement. Although Indian partition writers claim to be writing without prejudice, not taking a side, from the middle path, critics have explored the line of nationalist historiography in them. Ian Talbot, one of the foremost authorities on the Punjab side during partition, has offered that *Cracking India* is “counterpart writing from the non-Muslim perspective” (Roy, 2010, p. 73) which can be related to the attack on Sikh minority of Sayyedpur in Tamas. Arguments in Tamas and *Cracking India* counter one another.

*Cracking India* has been investigated from various perspectives. Kleist (2011) calls that Sidhwa has offered counter-history to the dominant national history of partition through *Cracking India*. It provides a “nuanced depictions of the variety of ways women influenced partition, and were influenced by the events of partition” (p. 79). Partition and subaltern were paid little attention in nationalist historiography; Sidhwa’s novel is considered as counter history. Lee (2006) has also extended the argument, "subaltern politics had
survived different regimes” (p. 23), partition reshaped new nation, new setting, new history, new memories, new identities, and yet it remains unnoticed in nationalist historiography (p. 35). Sidhwa justifies partition and blames mainstream nationalist leaders for the violence that took place during the partition of the country. Sidhwa’s counter-history suggests partition violence as people’s struggle for making new nation, which is against the idea of the mainstream nationalist line. The nationalist narrative has been critiqued as biased and one-dimensional. But many critics do not see Sidhwa’s representation in Cracking India free from bias. I quote Roy (2010), for instance:

Sidhwa succeeds in ‘providing an alternative version of history’ but not an objective one. Her not being a part of any of the contending communities does not automatically make her dispassionate and detached, as she would like us to believe. Indeed the novel shows that she has merely replaced one bias by another. And this bias is manifest not only in the way she portrays the contemporary political leaders of the subcontinent, but also evident in her depiction of partition violence, where her sympathies are totally on the Muslim side. (p. 65)

Millions of people were forced to migrate and leave their homes. They undertook a sorrowful journey against their desire. They suffered nostalgia for the past, and regretted over the lost culture. Some writers write from the perspective of a nationalist narrative while others write from a counter perspective. Beereendra Pandey’s (2012) observation on Cracking India also reveals Sidhwa’s portrayal of “Pakistani image as civilized nation” (p. 182) under the leadership of far-sighted Jinnah. Pandey comments that Sidhwa’s depiction of Mahatma as “a demon in saint’s clothing” (p. 182) can be seen as a reply to Sarojini Naidu’s depiction of Jinnah as the monster in her film (p. 183).

Abdullah Hussein is not as invective as Sidhwa. Palakeel (2001) has observed Hussein’s novel: “The Weary Generation is hardly about the struggle, about desire for freedom, about moral courage, about growing up amidst the crises, about forging identities, about being destroyed in the process, about the great sacrifices” (p. 601). He further assesses Naim Beg is the “reluctant hero flawed and tired” (p. 589). He moves between peasantry and aristocracy. The hero hated English rulers when he saw white man misbehaving a native in the train, but he decides to join in the English man’s army, to fight for Britain in war. He hated domestic aristocracy but he does not move a step against Roshan Agha’s cruelty in the village.

Pakistani critic Aitzaz Ahsan has argued that the formation of Pakistan was inevitable since it was a different civilization:

Indian subcontinent is made up of two civilizations, Indus and Indic, and Indus has been one large, independent, politico-economic zone for the past countless centuries [having] a rich and glorious cultural heritage of its own (…) and is a distinct and separate nation. (as cited in Roy, 2010, p. 14)

Roy has also cited a Pakistani historian Ayesha Jalal, who has advocated counter thesis to the mainstream nationalist historiography on partition:

Partition was forced upon Jinnah by the Congress High Command in the penultimate phase of British rule in India. The actual reason behind the partition was not the scheme of the British but the constitutional tussle for greater representation of power in the government that had gone on for close to four decades, between the Congress and the Muslim League. (2010, p. 14)

The rallying cry of Indian nationalism blames imperialism for tearing the two communities apart. The British imperial sectarian politics of divide and rule caused communal tension and partition of the country. But Pakistani revisionary critics cited above advocate that the formation of Pakistan was natural. Pakistani writers look at partition violence from this perspective.

Representation of partition violence is multi-perspectival. The same act of partition has been represented differently in the texts created by writers from various affective circumstances. Gandhi has been valorized as a freedom fighter in the official historiography of India and Jinnah as responsible for the partition of the country. The counter perspective from the Pakistani side portrays Gandhi as a violent monger and Jinnah to be far sighted figure. Representation of partition has remained a contentious issue in such literature. The play of positive and negative emotions can thus be investigated along with deep rooted structural problems, also to find out whether they are guided by self beneficiary interest of the respective community to which the authors belonged. This research investigates the emotions staged in Pakistani partition texts to see the efforts of the authors in justifying partition. I have analyzed The Weary Generations and Cracking India in detail at this point.

II. Textual Analysis

Husseinin The Weary Generations depicts a picture of pre-partition feudal society backed up by English ruling class and native Indian aristocracy. He invents a fictious village called Roshan Pur populated by half Muslims, half Sikhs, being Harnam Singh, the chief of the Sikhs, and Ahmed Din, the chief of the Muslims. Roshan Ali was the founder of the village and its feudal lord, the title Roshan Agha was given to him by
English aristocracy. The title was passed down to the heirs, generation after generation. Roshan Agha was responsible for collecting share crops and tax from the peasants. So he was the pillar of the village “on which the governing class of Raj stood” (p. 184). His munshi was the “vampire to farmers” (Hussein, 1999, p. 68). When Roshan Agha bought a car, he imposed “motorana” (Hussein, 1999, p. 133), a sort of tax, on the peasants. The main source of antagonism can be seen between landlords and farmers, feudal lords and peasants. The landlords were backed up by English aristocracy but the peasants could not perform their rivalry against English rulers without first doing with the domestic rulers. Deep rooted feudal system was ravaging Indian society and its people. Hussein portrays the picture vividly in *The Weary Generations*.

Naim wants to raise his voice against feudal system; he goes to Hari Chand, then to Kisan Das. They are jointly doing something against the system that brought poverty and slavery to the peasants. Naim suggests Madan who is organizing guerilla warfare against the system. People can be brought together by addressing their issues. Madan and Sheelah are untouchable caste. For them “every single day was a war to stay alive with respect” (Hussein, 1999, p. 151). The activists bring everyone’s issues and organize people against the landowners. Hussein writes of independence struggle at the level of people. Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs jointly organize against domestic aristocracy and English aristocracy. English rulers could not have ruled India without the help of the domestic landowners. Roshan Agha and his feudal system in *The Weary Generations* nourish the English rule.

Hussein highlights the hatred of people against English rulers in *The Weary Generations*. Local landlords are also hated. They are vampires to the peasant. Naim's father Niaz Beg, the descendent of Mirza Mohammed Beg, the Mughal, counters Roshan Agha and his feudal structure. Niaz Beg himself made “ten-chamber revolver that nobody had ever seen” (Hussein, 1999, p. 45). Niaz’s brother Ayaz Beg tells Naim “ours was the only family in Roshan Pur that wasn’t servant of Roshan agha. . . . He [Niaz] started making guns ( . . . ) [with] twelve bore-barrel ( . . . ) [that brought] ruination upon us” (Hussein, 1999, p. 44). Niaz Beg was arrested by police for the act of keeping guns without license and was sentenced twelve years imprisonment with confiscation of all family land. People keeping and making guns illegally, suggests that the rebellion was inherent in their unconscious.

In Naim’s train journey from Ali Kot to Rani Pur he saw the discrimination of a white man on the old peasant with sunburn withered face. Previously when Naim was in war, he had different concept, “to see Indian troops standing side by side with the British in Europe” (Hussein, 1999, p. 98), was the matter of pride for him. Naim remembered the time when police asked the village people to join in army to protect England and British government. Roshan Agha had also asked the youth to join in army. Village youths, Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh, all joined in war, and old people alone remained in the field. They went to serve their masters:

- Mahendra Singh asked suddenly, ‘why are we here?’
- ‘Because of war’, Naim said. ‘The enemy has attacked.’
- ‘What, attacked our village?’
- ‘Attacked the British sarkar and their friends.’
- ‘What is it to us?’
- ‘They are our masters.’
- ‘Our master is Roshan Agha’, Mahendra Singh said.
- ‘Yes, and the English sarkar is Roshan Agha’s masters.’ (Hussein, 1999, p. 117)

Only Naim returned alive from the war with a stump arm, rest of the village youths were killed in the battle field. Now the old man’s sunburn withered face becomes the matter of hatred to the white man on the “dubba fast class, reserved for sahib loge” (Hussein, 1999, p. 49), the first class compartments on a train are only for white people. Mahatma Gandhi also faced similar discrimination in South Africa that he has described in his autobiography. Hussein also mentions of Gandhi’s civil disobedience movement:

Towards the end of the next year, Mahatma Gandhi, on his return from the Round Table Conference in London, launched his civil non-cooperation movement by publicly making salt on the sea shore at Dandi. Afterwards, he walked from village to village, gathering followers on the way. Naim had wanted to go and join the march. (p. 239)

Madan was for armed rebellion but Naim believed in the power of the people. He must have been influenced from Gandhi, who marched from village to village gathering followers. Naim expresses his strong belief on the strength of people. Hussein writes for the joint efforts of Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh in the struggle for independence. All of them have lived together, fought in war from the side of English together, and faced the consequences brought by draught together. The peasants’ target was the wide spread feudal system that pushed the country into slavery and poverty. So the people actively participated in independence struggle. Only towards the later phase of the independence movement developed sectarian politics. United Indian public against the landowners and ultimately against the English rule, are divided by different communal lines.

In Hussein (1999), landlords, rulers, and officials who attend Roshan Agha’s aristocratic party are against the idea of independence; one of the landlords, a Kashmiri Brahmin comments:“swaraj, swaraj! What is it?
This is the age of internationalism” (p. 221). The Anglicized aristocrats and landlords are to be blamed for the widespread poverty and slavery of the country. Hussein portrays them to be more dangerous than the English rulers. His politics behind such portrayal is to direct readers to the potential failure of the independence movement that led to the partition of the country. Hussein justifies partition later on the basis of these things. He does not portray harmony between landlords and peasants. Landlords are the vampires, they are asking for their share, asking for thumb print from the peasants. And peasants, on the other hand, are protesting against the landlords throughout the novel, The Weary Generations.

Independence movement was also supported by workers from their side. The labor union of cement factory performed hunger strike, Congress also supported them. The provocative speech of the political activist brought agitators together. The factory was owned by white man. The general manager of the factory, in Hussein (1999), addressed his few faithful workers thus:

Well done men! You have sided with the management and stayed beyond your duty time. For this you will be rewarded. We have one mission and one only and that is to keep the chimney smoking. With your help we shall show the traitors outside the gate to run the factory with the help of the few faithful men. We will lock them out for ever. (p. 291)

‘A few faithful men’ were everywhere. In the land of poverty and slavery the owners succeed in their ventures. Strike in the cement factory is one representative case. There were a few imperialist rulers in India but they were successful in ruling the country with the help of few faithful men. In this way Hussein presents the theme of weariness in this narrative through his weary and reluctant characters.

Hussein invents fisherman as the narrator to narrate about historical place of Jalianwala Bagh, the spot for Khilafat movement. He narrates his witness about different events to Naim and Azra. Through the fisherman, the readers also come to know about the plight of the peasants and about their bad times. The looters looted the white men and then stabbed them to death. White women were raped, or left naked, or stabbed to death. White women came out into the bazaar only guarded by a servant or sipahi with rifle. The agitated rulers transformed the city into a graveyard. People began coming to Jalianwala Bagh from every side to protect themselves as it had already been the “river of heads and bodies” (Hussein, 1999, p. 196). In response to the killing of a few white men and women by looters, the rulers turned the city into graveyard. Hussein portrays this incident in order to justify the independence movement against the ruthless English rulers who punished the rebel city severely.

On the one hand, Hussein invests much of his efforts in justifying the independence movement as the joint venture of Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs, in The Weary Generations. On the other hand, he investigates the prevalent antagonism between peasants and landlords, and the landlords’ relationship to English aristocrats. Hussein has certain affective politics to perform. He justifies partition as has been condemned by Indian partition writers. In reading the novel closely, readers can notice Hussein’s affective ideological tilting. Hussein indicates the cause of communal division as the political awareness of the Muslims. They considered politics as a means of obtaining material benefits. “The political awareness was beginning to awaken a sense of separate identity among the Muslims of India” (Hussein, 1999, p. 231). Hussein portrays a scene of All India Muslim Conference at Jamia Mosque, on the chairmanship of Aga Khan, the international symbol of Muslimhood. The announcement was made on the “merger of Punjab Muslim League into All India Muslim League” (234). The excited political and religious activists reformed their slogan of “Muslim community” with “Muslim Nation” (p. 234). All India Muslim League has been depicted very powerful and united force under the leadership of Jinnah, a vibrant community.

Hussein (1999), in The Weary Generations, shows Muslims to be a vibrant community organizing an armed rebellion against English rulers, but in describing partition violence, he depicts Hindus and Sikhs, here and there, with spears, swords, daggers, and lathis: “hordes of Hindus and Sikhs, sitting by the wayside, their spears, swords, and long-handed cleavers, and also their clothes, covered in blood, as if they were waiting to kill the new arrival” (p. 319). Whereas, Hussein portrays the khaksar rebels to be well organized and disciplined force involved in social service. All these instances in the novel are meant to develop the reader’s sympathy for Muslims, and hatred to Hindus and Sikhs. Hussein is affectively motivated by the Muslim community and morally denunciating Hindus and Sikhs to accumulate reader’s sympathy for the community the belonged.

Hussein sees deep-rooted rivalry between domestic aristocracy and peasants. As the independence movement will lead to a conclusion, there is strong possibility that the same landlords were likely to climb the ladder of power. He predicts the continuation of the saga of oppression upon the peasants by the ruthless landowners even after the independence. The peasants will be falling down into the fire from the frying pan. However, mainstream nationalist narratives keep silent on the issue. Hussein uses this argument in order to justify partition. Hussein supports independence struggle and goes along with nationalist narrative line, but his point of departure from the nationalist narratives is necessary in order to pave the way for the justification of partition. In this way, he highlights Indian feudal society and the inherent antagonism between peasants and feudal lords in it. Moreover, Hussein portrays Muslims to be organizing vibrant movements like Khaksar movement and Khilafat movement during independence struggle.
movements are portrayed to be very powerful armed rebellion led by peasants, to free India from colonial rule and revive Islam. He evokes an affect of rage against Punjabi feudal society, the beneficiaries of which were minority Hindus and Sikhs at the cost of majority Muslims who, barring a few, were Muslim peasants.

Bapsi Sidhwa’s Cracking India offers yet another alternative perspective to the mainstream nationalist narrative of India. She portrays horrible side of partition that mainstream history sought to conceal. Sidhwa (1990) in one of her interviews claims about the objectivity of the novel that uses the voice of a “Parsee child narrator” (p. 519). Parsee, a minority community in India, has been portrayed as impartial during partition violence, in Cracking India. Sidhwa (1991) invests much efforts in establishing impartial role of the Parsees, “how wise and civilized they were when they came to India 1300 years back” (p. 47), to “hunt with the hounds and run with the hare” (p. 26). Sara Ahmed (2004) postulates about multicultural love that the immigrants must learn “sticking to the nation” (p. 134) and embrace language, ethos, and values of the majority. “Love binds multicultural nations together” (Ahmed, 2004, p. 136), and the absence of love or failure to integrate results in “race riots” and “segregation” (p. 137).

Colonel Barucha in Cracking India tells that the Parsee refugees in India “absorbed into the country like sugar in the milk” (Sidhwa, 1991, p. 47). Barucha further claims about the Parsee community’s indifference to power and politics, “Let whoever wishes rule! Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Christian! We will abide by the rules of their land!” (p. 48). If Parsees do not interfere, they will have nothing to fear. Hindu, Muslim, Sikh quarrel among themselves but Parsees remain impartial. They get “love for love”, borrowing Ahmed’s (2004) idea (p. 136). Lenny’s mother in Cracking India says, “Christmass, Easter, Eid, Divali. We celebrate them all” (p. 78).

Nationalist historiography celebrates independence movement and valorizes the freedom fighters, whereas Sidhwa presents a revisionary perspective through the narrative and characterization. Lenny hears Colonel Barucha declare: “Gandhi says, we must stop buying salt. We should only eat the salt manufactured from the Indian Ocean” (Sidhwa, 1991, p. 44)! Parsee audience trivializes Gandhi and makes nasty comments about him. They support the English when they are in power and support Muslims when they are vibrant community during partition and its aftermath. I quote a passage from Cracking India at length:

Colonel Barucha raises restraining hand, “no doubt the men in jail are acquiring political glory(…) But this short cut fame and fortune is not for us. It is no longer just a struggle for Home Rule. Who is going to rule once we get swaraj? Not you”, says Colonel (…) “Hindu, Muslim, and even Sikh are going to jockey for power: and if you jokers jump into the middle you will be mangled into chutney!” (p. 45)

Independence struggles are seen to be fights for ‘political glory’ and ‘power’, and not only for freedom of country from the clutches of English imperialism. The perspective got justified when independence movement led not only to end the empire but also to the ruthless killing of communal violence and partition of the country. The outcome of the independence movement also justified that they were fighting for power and political glory, and not for freedom of the people.

Sidhwa’s narrator is worried about the effects of partition. She parodies both independence movement and partition. I quote a conversation from Cracking India at length where Lenny is involved in the conversation with cousin and Ayah:

There is much disturbing talk. India is going to be broken. Can one break a country? And what happens if they break it where our house is? Or crack it further up to Warris Road? How will I even get to Godmother’s then?
I ask cousin.
“Rubbish”, he says, “no one is going to break India. It’s not made of glass!”
I ask Ayah.
“They’ll dig a canal…” she ventures. “This side for Hindustan and this side for Pakistan. If they want two countries, that’s what they will have to do…” (p. 101)

The serious issue is presented very lightly from the perspective of child narrator and the subaltern character Ayah, the technique what Thapa (2014) calls “parodic subversion” (p. 321). The big leaders’ issue is given child’s perspective. Breaking a country by digging a canal sounds humorous and satirical. The leaders’ fight in the name of movement can do nothing other than breaking the country into Hindustan and Pakistan. The child’s curiosity, ‘how would I ever get to Godmother’s then?’ sounds very serious. The child’s argument challenges the debate of partition and trivializes the whole issue.

Gandhi is deified in Indian nationalist narratives of Raja Rao, R. K. Narayan and others. They place him above the level of human beings. In their narratives, Gandhi is treated as saint, source of radiating truth, the advocate of non violence, almost the god. In nationalist history he is the father of country. But Sidhwa, in Cracking India, intervenes into the official history of partition. Masseur, in the novel calls Gandhi “a politician” (Sidhwa, 1991, p. 169), and reduces his image from the father of the country. In the novel, butcher says, Gandhi is “non-violent violence-monger” (p. 100). Inspector General Rogers calls him “old bag of tricks” (p. 70). In this way, Sidhwa offers a counter history to the nationalist historiography. Beerendra Pandey (2012) has also analyzed the views of “a sizeable number of people” (p. 171) in partition
literature that Gandhi was responsible for partition, since he didn’t use his sincere efforts to avert it. Readers do not abject to Sidhwa’s argument in Cracking India. If Gandhi was responsible for independence of India, as the nationalist narratives claim, then how we can say that he was not responsible for the partition. Nationalist narratives demonize Jinnah and defey Gandhi. M. M. Sankhdher, as cited in Pandey (2012), also judges Gandhi: “he rejected two nation theory, in practice he accepted it” (p. 173). Sidhwa portrays Jinnah to be the forward looking and civilized, whereas, the Hindus and Sikhs are violence monger, uncivilized, and barbaric. The partition writers attempt to project their community as civilized and others as barbaric. Hence, partition writing is seen as blaming game and full of nationalist bias. Sidhwa’s attempt is to give clean cheat to Muslim community and to justify partition.

Sidhwa (1991) portrays the Sikhs to be the “fighting arms of Hindus” (p. 140). She makes Mr Rogers comment on Gandhi, “he first declares Sikhs fanatics! Now suddenly he says: oh dear the poor Sikhs cannot live with the Muslims if there is a Pakistan (p. 100)!”. On the basis of these things, self rule is predicted to be leading to dangerous consequences. And hence, separate nation for Hindus and Muslims has been suggested. Sidhwa (1991) makes Rogers justify his argument further by saying that “Jinnah has the backing of seventy million Indian Muslims” (p. 71). Both the parties are depicted equally powerful. Hindus were more dangerous than the Muslims, as they were led by ‘civilized and forward looking’ Jinnah; Hindus and Sikh by ‘violence monger’ Gandhi. So Sidhwa (1991) make Rogers say, “if we quit India today, old chap, you will bloody fall at each others’ throats” (p. 71). This is obviously Sidhwa’s ideological affective tilt, the act of giving ethical comfort to Muslims and Parsees, and moral denunciation to Hindus. Sidhwa’s narrator Lenny’s acknowledgment about Jinnah’s wife being a Parsee, leads her to be defensive to Jinnah. But this is only the context created by the author. Here and there, Sidhwa herself intervenes into the narrative, making political idea and sometimes giving her perspective through Lenny. She makes her position clear by favoring Jinnah.

Sidhwa portrays communal harmony in villages and towns. Imam Din’s village is depicted to be free from communal trouble. Sikhs and Muslims live together in harmony there. The Sikh granthi of the village says: “our village comes from the same racial stock, Muslim or Sikh, we are basically jats. We are brothers. How can we fight each other” (Sidhwa, 1991, p. 64)? There is deep love between them. The Lahore community, consisting of Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Parsee people, is also living together in harmony. Hindu, Muslim, youths, and olds all hover round the Hindu girl, Ayah. She becomes the symbol of unity. Women characters like Ayah, Lenny, Godmother, and Electric Aunt are given roles of holding communities together. Women are given agency. Ice Candy Man discloses: “A train from Gurdaspur has just come in. Everyone in it is dead. Butchered. They are all Muslims. There are no young women among the dead! Only two gunny-bags full of women’s breasts” (Sidhwa, 1991, p. 159)! Everything changes abruptly. Fire and killing takes place in Lahore. Hindus and Sikhs either leave Lahore, or convert themselves into Islam. Hari changes himself into Himat Ali, gets his pennis circumcised (Sidhwa, 1991, p. 172). Lenny becomes aware of religious differences in people around her: “It is sudden. One day everybody is themselves, and the next day they are Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, or Christian. People shrink, dwindling into symbols. Ayah is no longer just my all-encompassing Ayah-she is also a token. A Hindu (p. 101).” This can be read as an instance of everydayness of the people during partition violence, and how such everyday events affect people into particular shape. Certain emotions contagiously affect the people according to the values and affinities of their communal identity.

The section of “Ranna’s story” (p. 207) in Cracking India, is significant. The section portrays the ruthless violence that took place in Imam Din’s village by the Sikhs. Ranna’s story diverts reader’s attention from Ayah’s suffering:

- They are like swarms of locust, moving in marauding bands of thirty to forty thousand. They are killing all Muslims. Setting fires, looting, parading the Muslim women naked through the streets- raping and mutilating them in the center of villages and in the mosques. (p. 209)

Sidhwa’s portrayal of Ranna’s story is strategic. In Lahore community there were Parsees who performed the role of mediator, rescuer, and benevolent. They safeguarded the belongings and property of Hindus and Sikhs, and advised them to go to the safe destination. Even though the Parsees were minority, they were powerful, since they sided with none.

Sidhwa flashes the light of camera on Parsee community throughout the narrative of Cracking India. She claims of her objectivity by offering a minority community, its historical glory of impartiality, portraying the eight year old child narrator with “truth infected tongue”, however, she performs her ethical tilting to her own community and the Muslims, and moral denunciation on Hindus, Sikhs, and the independence fighters like Gandhi and Nehru. Cracking India inspires nothing but develops the feeling of disgust in the readers. Hence, it lacks “constitutional optimism” (p. 87), the term used by Premo Levi, as cited in Probyn (2007), the writer’s duty to serve the reader or humanity. Sidhwa portrays the deep rooted hatred between Hindus and Muslims, favoring and disfavoring communities, and hatching biases.
III. CONCLUSION

Partition writers are found to be involved in the play of affective politics. Ben Highmore mentions of Gregory Bateson’s anthropological research on schismogenesis. Such type of research had helped strengthen colonial administration. The research began with Bateson’s query on “how and why groups don’t undergo some sort of cultural osmosis when they come into contact with one another, why cultural mixing does not result in ‘melting pot’ cultures, and why distinction and rivalry are often intensified through contact” (Highmore, 2007, p. 127). Imperialists used such research in strengthening their administration, and intensifying rivalry and antagonism among communities. Communities are based on certain ethos, aesthetics of social life, or social patterns. And these “configuration of culture” are affective. Ethos is transmitted through affective pedagogy. Since partition literature is affective, rather than enhancing acculturation in a multicultural society it helps intensify rivalry. An affective argument can only help poison the young mind. It is recovering rather than forgetting the trauma of the past.

Partition literature is not actually writing shame. There is nothing like a strong and painful sensation in it, neither has the affective subjectivity been placed against the subject. Rather it is the process of ethical comforting of the self and moral denunciation of the other. The perpetrator community does not feel shame in it; rather efforts have been made to justify the atrocity ratio justifying the self and moral denunciation of the other. It is nothing like the South African practice of Truth and Reconciliation of communities. “Levi describes those eyes that will induce shame in it; rather efforts have been made to justify the atrocity ratio comforting the self and moral denunciation of the other.

It is recovering rather than forgetting the trauma of the past. Partition novels fail to represent larger humanity and fail to contribute to strengthening peace, harmony, and brotherhood. Rather they circulate hatred. The hatred contagiously circulates far and wide affecting people and leading them to conflict and social unrest.
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