

The Configuration of the Partition and the Self in Deepa Mehta's 1947: Earth and Kamal Hassan's Hey Ram: A Study

Dr. Somnath Paul

Assistant Professor English Lal Baba College, 117 G. T. Road, Belur, West Bengal. 711202,

Abstract:

The Partition of India in August 1947 created a new trend of archiving history where the documents tried to construct the notion that Partition and Independence happened together and to ignore the sufferings of millions of people across the border. "The political partition of India caused one of the great human convulsions of history", writes Urvashi Butalia in *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India* (1998: 3). Regarding the sudden irruption of violence in Kolkata in 1946, Nisid Hajari in his book *Midnight's Furies: The Deadly Legacy of India's Partition* writes, "Ultimately, it is not possible to assign blame entirely to one side or the other. What exploded so suddenly in Calcutta in August 1946 were the pent-up fears of communities convinced that they faced imminent subjugation by the other. Riot no longer sufficed as a description (2015: 34). Communal violence seems to be coterminous with Partition and the depiction of this violence in Bollywood movies is a relational negotiations in foregrounding its inclusivity in a problematic construct. In this regard Rachel Dawer opines in *Bollywood's India: Hindi Cinema as a Guide to Contemporary India*, "Like other arts, cinema is about standards of behavior and their consequences, a way of understanding the self and the world which can be interpreted in many ways. However, the Hindi film is also a mighty cultural product, consumed by millions of people in India and worldwide as a global media form (2014:8).

Deepa Mehta's 1998 film *1947: Earth* is set during the 1947 partition of India and is narrated by an older Lenny who remembers how a Parsi family gets embroiled in the violence as the tension of partition rises. Kamal Haasan's 2000 film *Hey Ram* revolves around the issues of the creation of a separate country for the Muslims and the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi who has been made accountable for the riots following the partition. In both these two movies there are attempts to fictionalize history and to showcase how the historical event of partition creates not only rifts in society but also attenuates the idea of selfhood. This paper is an attempt to examine two movies namely Deepa Mehta's *1947: Earth* and Kamal Hassan's *Hey Ram* in the light of the spectre of the Partition conditioning communal relationships among the religious and sectarian groups living within and across the territorial boundaries of India and Pakistan and also interrogates how these two movies bring to light issues that have mostly been silenced in the archival history related with the Partition. The continued impact of the Partition on the notions of nationhood and identity is aesthetically rendered in these two movies. By presenting what is locally contingent these two films display a willingness to confront the trauma of the Partition in a way that simultaneously complement and make distinction from history writing. Retracing the causes behind the Partition of India, Narendra Singh Sarila in the Preface to his book *The Shadow of the Great Game: The Untold Story of India's Partition* writes, Once the British realized that the Indian nationalists who would rule India after

its independence would deny them military cooperation under a British Commonwealth defence umbrella, they settled for those willing to do so by using religion for the purpose. Their problem could be solved if Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the leader of the Muslim League Party would succeed in his plan to detach the northwest of India abutting Iran, Afganistan and Sinkiang and establish a separate state there – Pakistan. The proposition was a realizable one as a working relationship had been established between the British authorities in India and Jinnah during the Second World War and he was willing to cooperate with Britain on defence matters if Pakistan was created. (Sarila 2005)

That Jinnah later in his life was himself critical in his decision to divide India on religious ground can be apprehended from his speech on 11th August, 1947, when Muhammad Ali Jinnah was speaking in the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan in Karachi, deliberating upon the effect of Partition on united India saying “May be that view of a united India is correct. May be it is not. That remains to be seen” (Ibid. 92). The doctor Colonel Elahi Baksh attending the ailing Jinnah is believed to have heard his patient saying, “I have made it [Pakistan] but I am convinced that I have committed the greatest blunder of my life.” (Ibid. 94). Vappala Pangunni Menon who worked as Political Reforms Commissioner to Lord Mountbatten and other Viceroy's advised him to delay the Partition which was to be declared by the Boundary Commission under Justice Lord Cyril Radcliff before 15th August, 1947 (Ibid 327). Historian and critic Suranjan Das in the Introduction in his book Communal Riots in Bengal 1905-1947 writes, “By 1946-7, when the communal conflict had reached alarming proportions, the British were determined not to be 'disturbed into action'. Jawaharlal Nehru thus ascribed the acceleration of communal violence on the eve of India's independence to the British official policy of 'masterly inactivity' (Das, 1991: 3). In the Foreword to the book Remnants of a Separation: A History of the Partition Through Material Memory, Aanchal Malhotra commenting on the trends in the creation of archival history writes:

A line drawn across the lives and homes of people is the initial moment in the formation of an archive – one of the most evocative archives of the history of India. It is an archive of memory, of stories, of violence, of lost friendships and relatives. Lives lived and lost become the stuff of remembrance of things past. The Partition of India in August 1947 is one such moment of separation and uprooting when a new kind of archive began to be formed.

One part of the archive is well known and well mined – the written documents that were prepared for the Partition that came with the birth of two independent nation states. The various narratives that have been constructed to understand how Partition and Independence happened together have used this documentary archive. But these documents, valuable though they are, do not begin to touch the lives of the millions of women and men who were directly affected when the motives of politicians dramatically altered their lives. People were forced to move, to flee, once India and Pakistan became two distinct political entities. This movement of population – arguably one of the largest in the history of the twentieth century and packed, as it was, in a very short period of time – was accompanied by a movement of memories and possessions, sometimes those about which the affected people were unable and unwilling to speak. Silence can also be the material for history writing, and so can objects, which by definition cannot speak. (Malhotra: 2017) Set in Lahore during 1947, which saw independence granted and the Indian sub-continent divided between Muslim Pakistan and (largely) Hindu India, Deepa Mehta's 1947: Earth comprises of two contrasting and complementary halves where in the first half the legacies of the British colonial rule in the forms of class differences, lack of education and the practice of child marriage among the poor along with scenes of harmonious living have been shown, in the second half how the lives of people become restless have been presented. Deepa Mehta's 1998 film 1947: Earth and Kamal Haasan's

2000 film *Hey Ram* project not only the trauma of the geographical division of a single country truncated into two nations following the Radcliff line in August 1947 as planned by Lord Mountbatten, but also the ramification of the notions of identity following the Partition. These two movies show the centrality of Partition in the making of one's identity and negotiate with issues that fracture one's notion of a stable identity. In this regard what Kalathmika Natarajan has written about the Partition in her article *Whose History of Partition? Tamil Cinema and the Negotiation of National Identity* is very pertinent and she writes that the event "is not to be understood as a singular 'moment' in the making of nation-states, but as a 'long' Partition that has embedded itself into our collective psyche (2019: 234)." If Deepa Mehta's film narrativizes the account of an old Lenny (played by Shabana Azmi) sitting in a graveyard and murmuring that she was the one who betrayed her nanny Shanta and recounts her experiences when she was eight year old girl (played by Maia Sethna in the movie) who had the privilege of being a Parsee amidst other religious sects, in Kamal Hassan's film *Hey Ram* the grandson of a eighty-nine year old, ailing and retired archaeologist Saket Ram recounts in Madras the past of the man (played by Kamal Hassan in the movie) to his attending physician Munawar. These two films underscore how Partition expedited the appropriation and otherization of one's identity – most of the time religious identity. Despite every identity being singular, identity is a fluid process having numerous traces that attach a stability to it. Identity is the socially constructed, socially sanctioned (or at least recognized) complex of selfsignifications deriving from an individual's membership in such collectivities as class, race, gender, sexuality, generation, region, ethnicity, religion, and nation. It plays a decisive role in human behaviour: one acts from a certain positionality and in accordance with a certain worldview or set of values, interpreting data with the help of certain parameters – all these deeply rooted in identity. (Irvin Cemil Schick 1999:19) Though identity is a permanent process of construction and reconstruction, this fluid or mutable nature does not mean that it never enjoys any stability. Clearly, a person's identity does not vary significantly from day to day, so that there must be a slowly varying envelope containing (and constraining) the vicissitudes of self-enactment. This envelope is narrative (Schick1999: 20–1). The Partition helped to create a discursive field that would ultimately question the markers of identity and would negotiate with never-ending suffering of people across the border line. One's nationality suddenly remains at stake with the impending Partition and the cataclysmic events of the Partition not only challenged the preconceived notions of nationality but also dwarfed the concept of freedom. The anticipation of peace and happiness in the lives of the people with the Partition was progressively proved to be wrong as with the passing of time mutual exclusivity in society in accordance with the markers of religious identity shattered the dreams of a harmonious living. Soon, the crux of the Partition oscillated between the apprehension of the dissatisfaction of one religious group and the proclamations of superiority in number of the other religious group. The possible discontents of religious sects regarding the Partition were denied and silenced with the help of a narrative promising complete fulfilment of aspirations.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the communal politics in modern India passed from 'community consciousness to communalism' (Das 11) the archival records of which show a particular trend: Reading through this one, a particular astigmatism will become apparent. It has much more on Muslim and little on Hindu communal activity and organization. As a result, a cavilling reader may like to argue that 'the Muslims' as a general category appear more communal, more violent, more aggressive than the community with whom they came into conflict; that the Hindus appear as victims; that the activities of the Hindu Mahasabha are criticized, but popular Hindu communalism has not been adequately discussed. (Das:15) Professor Das was not able to find "the sort of wealth of material, privately generated

or officially recorded, on Hindu communalism, as has survived on its Muslim counterpart” (Ibid 15). To frame a universally accepted theory of nationalism from archival records is thus elusive and theorists remain divided over the relative importance of nationalism’s political and cultural dimensions. The entry on ‘nationalism’ in the book *Cultural Theory: The Key Concepts* edited by Andrew Edgar and Peter Sedgwick defines the term in the following way: Ernest Gellner’s definition of nationalism as ‘a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent’ is an example of a position stressing the former aspect, whereas so-called ‘primordialists’, exemplified by the anthropologist Clifford Geertz, argue that nationalism stems from patterns of social ordering deeply embedded in all ethnic psyches. By contrast, Eric Hobsbawm and Elie Kedourie have proposed that nationalism is an invention on the part of social elites which fails to address the arbitrary and contingent formation of nations, instead positing invented traditions which thence constitute a superficial cultural heritage. (2008: 221) What these two directors have done is to reconfigure the archival records into a narrative based on individual experiences and questions the validity and importance of the notion of nationalism in one’s life. Lenny the only daughter of Rustom Sethna (played by Arif Zakaria) and Bunty Sethna (played by Kitu Gidwani) hails from a rich family background living in Lahore, then a part of undivided India. Her ayah or nanny, Shanta (played by Nandita Das) is a young Hindu woman and she draws her male suitors every time she travels to the nearby Queens Gardens along with Lenny. Shanta’s suitors are Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs. Lenny’s world is a pleasing one comprising of an Ayah a Hindu, a cook (Kulbhushan Kharbanda) a muslim, Dil Navaz and Hassan (played by Rahul Khanna) a masseur whose massage oil is based on his experiments from pearl dust and fish eggs and an intelligent cousin Adi. As violence creeps in Lahore, it becomes clear that partition is all this film is talking about. Historian William Dalrymple in the *New Yorker*’s June 2015 article opines that in August, 1947, when, “after three hundred years in India, the British finally left, the subcontinent was partitioned into two independent nation states: Hindu-majority India and Muslim-majority Pakistan. Immediately, there began one of the greatest migrations in human history, as millions of Muslims trekked to West and East Pakistan (the latter now known as Bangladesh) while millions of Hindus and Sikhs headed in the opposite direction. Many hundreds of thousands never made it.” Dalrymple continues to write: Across the Indian subcontinent, communities that had coexisted for almost a millennium attacked each other in a terrifying outbreak of sectarian violence, with Hindus and Sikhs on one side and Muslims on the other—a mutual genocide as unexpected as it was unprecedented. In Punjab and Bengal—provinces abutting India’s borders with West and East Pakistan, respectively—the carnage was especially intense, with massacres, arson, forced conversions, mass abductions, and savage sexual violence. Some seventyfive thousand women were raped, and many of them were then disfigured or dismembered. (Dalrymple, *The Great Divide: The Violent Legacy of Indian Partition*) In the Prologue to his book “*Midnight’s Furies: The Deadly Legacy of India’s Partition*” Nisid Hajari writes, ...Partition has become a byword for horror. Instead of joining hands at their twinned births, India and Pakistan would be engulfed by some of the worst sectarian massacres the modern world has ever seen.

Non-Muslims on one side of the new border in the Punjab and Muslims on the other descended with sword and spear and torch on the minorities who lived among them. An appalling slaughter ensued.

Gangs of killers set whole villages aflame, hacking to death men and children and the aged while carrying off young women to be raped. Some British soldiers and journalists who had witnessed the Nazi death camps claimed Partition’s brutalities were worse: pregnant women had their breasts cut off and babies hacked out of their bellies; infants were found literally roasted on spits. (Hajari, 2015: 5) In the opening

scene of the movie 1947: Earth eight-year-old Lenny in her attempt to understand the complexity of the Partition about which she might have listened to while accompanying elders, wittingly breaks a porcelain plate and draws the attention of her ayah first and later of her mother whom she asks whether a country be broken just like the plate. This initial question of Lenny makes us aware of the apprehension of the little girl about tension prevalent in the locality about the possible fractures among different religious sects mainly the Hindus, the Muslims and the Sikhs. The bond of friendship that is evident from the conversation among Dil Navaz (Amir Khan), Hassan (Rahul Khanna), the butcher (Pawan Malhotra), all Muslims and Sher Singh, a Sikh along with Shanta, a Hindu gradually moves to fissures as members of all religious sects become apprehensive of the probable reconfigurations of their interests and safety. Shanta's question to Lenny's mother whether the news that the British would dig a long canal to offset India and Pakistan was true indicates an iterability (the capacity to be repeatable in different contexts) casting a deep disbelief in the prevailing bonhomie among people. The small group of friends never think the Partition as political desiderata. Instead, they consider the decision as foolish resulting only in making one suspicious about members of other religious sect. Thus, when the group of friends listens to the radio broadcast of Jawaharlal Nehru's speech on the midnight of 14th August, 1947 echoing "At the stroke of the midnight hour when the world sleeps India shall wake to light and freedom ... [followed by] Long years ago, we made a tryst with destiny" they remain bewildered at the prospect of the Independence when nobody holds the other in complete trust. When Lenny finds no one to attach special importance to her on her birthday, she feels isolated till her mother somehow manages to celebrate the day inviting Adi to give Lenny companion. Everyone else is bogged down with the impending Partition. There is a scene where Lenny is tearing her doll apart with the help of her cousin Adi and the scene interrogates how the innocence of a child suffers a heavy blow. Though her family ensured that they are Parsee's and are safe because of their position of neutrality, the assurance fails to calm Lenny. When Lenny interrogates Dil Navaz what he wants to be in life he answers her that he wants to be the servant of her ayah. But when he comes to know from Shanta that she will never marry him the latent lion about which Lenny has been so afraid of becomes active all the more at a time when already he had seen the body of his butchered sister in the train from Gurdaspur bearing bodies of Muslim women. As Shanta had already given her heart to Hassan, he promises Shanta that they will move to India and he will become a Hindu. Lenny overhears and also witness their love making along with Dil Navaz. Hassan makes arrangements to send Sher Singh's family to Amritsar from Lahore. Next morning Hasan's body is recovered from a jute bag. The Sethna household witnesses the heat when a group of Muslim men headed by Dil Navaz attacks their household in search of Shanta and Dil Navaz takes Lenny into confidence to learn about her hideout. Based on the novel "Cracking India", by Bapsi Sidhwa, Mehta keeps the Partition in frame-of mind and directly presents the construction and reconstruction of identity after the Partition.

If we turn our attention to the movie Hey Ram the script takes us back in the past and shows what happened fifty-three years before with Ram and his Muslim colleague Amjad (played by Shah Rukh Khan in the movie) when as members of an excavation team working at the graves at Mahenjo Daro in Karachi under the direction of the British archaeologist Mortimer Wheeler. As the day of the Partition nears and the site falls to Pakistan the team decides to stop their excavation and Ram gets order to return to Calcutta. In Karachi the relation between businessmen Indians like Lalwani and the British is shown to be fine and they do not have an iota of information what had been happening in the year 1946 in Calcutta where Saket Ram's Bengali wife Aparna (played by Rani Mukherjee), a school teacher, lives. On the day when Saket reaches Kolkata to meet his wife he is shocked to see the communal violence on the streets of Kolkata and

perhaps he would have been murdered as he was a South Indian Brahmin in the hands of a Muslim mob but for the timely intervention of Altaf, their Muslim tailor. This Altaf a few moments later proves to be a traitor when he guides a group of Muslim rioters to Saket Ram's residence where Aparna was alone and she was raped. The reason behind Altaf turning a traitor seems to be the enraged Muslim mobs from whose hands Saket Ram saves a Punjabi woman. In retaliation Altaf shows the mob the residence of Saket. The spectacle of violence shown in the movie exactly corresponds with the narratives of riots and communal violence in Bengal that has remained a witness to pogroms following Muhammad Ali Jinnah's call of "The Direct Action Day".

Explaining the reasons behind the violence in Kolkata in the month of August 1946, historian Suranjan Das writes that "the city fell prey to a communal upsurge of an unprecedented dimension" (Das 163) and the declaration of The Direct Action Day when "Muslims throughout the country were 'to suspend all business and to observe complete hartal'" (Das 165) escalated the tension and the city's Muslims were organized and motivated by multiple meetings for all necessary sacrifices on the Direct Action Day (Ibid 166). On the other hand, The Bengal Provincial Congress Committee campaigned against 'the prostitution of the government authority' by the League to advance its political aims' (Ibid 167) and created an environment, according to one member of the Muslim League, of fear of Muslim violence in the minds of the Hindus in Calcutta (Ibid 167). "A Sikh and a Gurkha leader promised their community's support to the Congress and prophesied a 'good thrashing' for the Muslims" (Ibid 167). The violence continued from 16th August till 19th August (Das 171) and on 16th August disturbances "started in the early hours of 16 August when League volunteers tried to force Hindu shopkeepers in North Calcutta to close their shops and Hindus started interfering with Muslim processions proceeding to the Ouchterlony monument" (Ibid 170). In the movie the desperation of Saket to take her wife who was raped and her throat slit to a hospital or to even call a doctor is foiled as the Muslim mob cut the telephone line and blocked any vehicular movement. The death of his wife turns Saket a maniac and he avenges his wife's death by killing every grown-up Muslim in sight. Here the film director questions how effective religion is to function as an identity marker that often puts life into trouble. When Saket comes across a bunch of right-winged Hindu fundamentalists, led by Abhyankar (Atul Kulkarni) he is identified as a Hindu because of his sacred thread and subsequently he is preached about the need of the Hindus to unite and save their brethren from the Muslims. Thus, one marker of identity pitches one against the other and creates a perception of threat from the 'other'. The chance meeting of Saket Ram with Abhayankar and his subsequent transformation exemplifies what the Jewish philosopher Emmanuel Levinas wrote about 'Other and the Other': The relationship with the Other, the face-to-face with the Other, the encounter with a face that at once gives and conceals the Other, is the situation in which an event happens to a subject who does not assume it, who is utterly unable in its regard, but where none the less in a certain way it is in front of the subject. The other 'assumed' is the Other. (Levinas: The Levinas Reader 1989. 45)

The Other as Other is not only an alter ego: the Other is what I myself am not. The Other is this, not because of the Other's character, or physiognomy, or psychology, but because of the Other's very alterity. (Ibid 48) Saket Ram soon joins fanatical Hindus and perceives the Muslim as the 'other'. His indoctrination to the ideology of duty towards the country makes him lose the sense of himself. His marriage with his second wife (Vasundhara Das) is a compulsion under the family pressure.

Saket Ram's travel to Madras entrusts him with a duty towards his countrymen and that is to assassinate Mahatma Gandhi, after his friend Abhyankar is left paralyzed in a freak accident. He has a change of heart only when he falls prey to a bunch of Muslims, where he also meets old friend Amjad Khan (Shah Rukh

Khan), an ardent Gandhi admirer who resists him from killing Gandhi. He later realizes the importance of Gandhi and begs for forgiveness. When Gandhi is about to leave, a young man approaches and kills Gandhi with a gun. The movie ends with the old Saket Ram, slowly dying on his death bed. The way Gandhiji's last hours have been portrayed in the movie exactly corresponds what Stanley Wolpert in his book *Gandhi's Passion: The life and Legacy of Mahatma Gandhi* has written: On January 20 Gandhi was carried out to a platform at the back of Birla's garden, but the microphone wasn't working. His feeble voice would only reach the ears of Manu and Sushila, who bent beside him and repeated aloud what he said. "I have no doubt that one who is an enemy of the Muslims is also an enemy of India," he said. Then a hand grenade exploded behind him. The crowd ran in every direction. Gandhi alone stayed calm, unmoved by the terrifying sound. He thought some soldiers were practice firing. The explosion behind his back had been meant as a diversion by a terrorist Hindu gang who had come up by train from Poona and Nasik and were hiding in the Birla servants' quarters behind the platform. ... Gandhi woke, as usual, before dawn on Friday, January 30, 1948. ... "From the same direction a stout young man in khaki dress, with his hands folded, pushed his way through the crowd and came near us. I [Manu] thought he wanted to touch Bapu's feet." But hate-crazed Nathuram Godse, whose small pistol was cradled in his chubby hands, was not interested in Gandhi's feet. He aimed his gun point blank at the Mahatma's bare chest and fired three bullets as fast as he could press the pistol's trigger. "The atmosphere was charged with smoke and the sky resounded with the boom. Bapu still seemed walking on. . . . 'Hei Ra . . . ma! Hei Ra . . . !' On his lips." (Wolpert, 2001:254-255)

In the movie *Hey Ram* the protagonist Saket Ram is shown to be confounded by the spectacle of Gandhi's assassination and later he followed Gandhiji's teachings in his life preserving his spectacles and sandals. Now he is projected as somebody who has come to terms with life. The demonization of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs have been given various shades: the Hindus in Kolkata tried to pass the day which has been called 'the Direct Action Day' by the Muslim League normally and went on with their usual routine, they received threats and forceful closure of their business and to defend their interests they began to resist the Muslim mob. In a way the reaction of the Hindus was just like a compulsion. For the Muslims their eagerness to respond to the call of their leader was propelled by their latent wish to have a separate nation for themselves and to bring out their plight in a Hindu dominated place they made the 'Direct Action Day' a restive one. The Sikhs on the other hand made pacts with the Hindus and confronted the rioters. In these two movies the volatility of identity markers is negotiated with adroitness. If in the movie *1947: Earth* the transition of characters like Dil Navaz from a friend to resorting to falsehood and deception and Haria a Hindu to a Muslim, shows that the construction of identity is contingent to one's environment and need of the hour, in the movie *Hey Ram* it is shown also as a compulsion in the character of the protagonist Saket Ram who is continually put into shifting markers of identity. While initially in the movie *Hey Ram* the protagonist is shown to be a devout family man gradually his motivations are controlled by Abhyankar who urges him to complement his intention of avenging the death of his wife with his duty towards his country by being an assassin. Unlike the group of male friends who perceive each other in disbelief in the movie *1947: Earth*, in the movie *Hey Ram* the friendship between Saket Ram and Amjad remains unbreakable despite their differences in opinion regarding Gandhi's contribution to the cause of the country. In the book *Partition of India: Postcolonial Legacies*, the editor Amit Ranjan writes, "It is not always the self or the group that constructs one's identity; it is sometimes the 'others' who do so. ... Hence, both self-identification and the construction of identity by others have kept the issues related to Partition alive (2019:12)." Thus, these two movies are about large events and tiny ones and about people, their joys,

hopes, sufferings and anguish. The large event is the Partition and its aftermath and tiny ones consist of the bearing of the historical event on individual life. The real battle in the lives of Shanta and Saket Ram is not with the force of communal violence but with the individual's notion of identity and the social configuration of it. Though it can be argued that there can be no definite point of time for migration to happen in the pre and post Partition period (Ghosh: 2019, 172), it is to be realized that the train of migrating people to and from India just after the declaration of India's Independence was unstoppable and thousands of beleaguered men, women, children, elderly people along with domestic animals crossed the border line to get an access gradually to peaceful living. These two movies show the insignificance of the all the efforts to create homogenous nation states catering to the interests of one religious group and present how these efforts actually make some subjects into minorities who find themselves on the wrong side of the border or with wrong identity markers like religion or ethnicity. All these happenings precipitated to leave large numbers of people in new nations/countries that "they can no longer call their own, with the choice of having to seek refuge somewhere else or to remain where they are as second-class citizens. Many are forced across frontiers and become refugees or asylum-seekers in other nations (Chatterjee, 2007: 105)". These two movies also point to the unpreparedness of the governments to handle the social unrest that preceded and followed the Partition. Without a proper plan to negotiate with millions of migrating people the governments on both sides of the border displayed their myopic political acumen that provided a vantage point to appreciate these two movies.

References

1. 1947: Earth. Dir. Deepa Mehta, Anne Masson & Deepa Mehta, 1999.
2. Hey Ram. Dir. Kamal Haasan, Raaj Kamal Films, 2000.
3. Amit Ranjan. Editor. Partition of India: Postcolonial Legacies, Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2019.
4. Andrew Edgar and Peter Sedgwick. Editors. Cultural Theory: The Key Concepts, Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2008.
5. Chatterji, Joya. The Spoils of Partition: Bengal and India, 1947–1967, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
6. Dalrymple, William. "The Great Divide", The New Yorker, June 22, 2015.
7. Das, Suranjan. Communal Riots in Bengal 1905-1947, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.
8. Ghosh, Subhasri. "1950 Riots and Fractured Social Spaces: Minority Displacement and Dispossession in Calcutta and Its Neighbouring Areas" in Partition of India: Postcolonial Legacies. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2019.
9. Hajari, Nisid. Midnight's Furies: The Deadly Legacy of India's Partition, Boston and New York: Houghton Muffin Harcourt, 2015.
10. Malhotra, Aanchal. The Other Side of Silence: Voices From the Partition of India, New Delhi: Penguin, 1998.
11. Natarajan, Kalathmika, "Whose History of Partition: Tamil Cinema and the Negotiation of Identity" in Partition of India: Postcolonial Legacies. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2019.
12. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2019.
13. Sarila, Narendra Singh. The Shadow of the Great Game: The Untold Story of India's Partition, New Delhi: Harper Collins, 2005.
14. Schick, Ervin Cemil. The Erotic Margin: Sexuality and Spatiality in Alterist Discourse, London: Verso,

1999.

15. Sean Hand. Editor. *The Levinas Reader: Emmanuel Levinas*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

16. Wolpert, Stanley. *Gandhi's Passion: The Life and Legacy of Mahatma Gandhi*, Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 2001.