International Journal of Social Science and Humanities
www.humanitiesjournals.com
Online ISSN: 2664-8628 Print ISSN: 2664-861X
Received: 19-03-2024, Accepted: 09-04-2024, Published: 02-05-2024
Volume 6, Issue 2, 2024, Page No. 18-23

Resilience amidst ruins: Women's trajectories in the wake of partition of India

Vinita Singh Chhetri
Department of Law and Social Science, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

Abstract
Historical events are difficult to date in any precise way for their beginnings and endings are not finite. The Partition of India into two countries, India and Pakistan, is an event that is said to have taken place in August 1947, yet its beginnings go much further back into history. History witnessed the migration of over twelve million people and communal violence to a degree that left over a million dead, more than 75,000 women were abducted and many people were rendered homeless; either on a temporary (ranging from few months to decades) or a permanent basis. Within patriarchal structures, women are often considered as embodiments of the honor of the whole community. Accordingly, in times of ethnic, religious or other violent conflict, they become major targets. To the best of our knowledge there has been no feminist historiography of the partition of India, not even of the compensatory variety. Women historians have written on this cataclysmic event but from within the parameters of the discipline, and still well within the political frame. They are present in some reports and policy documents, and no account of Partition violence for instance, is complete without the numbing details of violence against women. Yet they are invisible. Furthermore, their experience of this historic event has neither been properly examined nor assigned historical value. This paper is about the nature of violence inflicted on women during the Partition of India in 1947. The paper tries to explore women in totality in the context of partition and the legal issues which arose when both the countries tries to take the females of their respective countries back.

Keywords: National honor, patriarchy, female sexuality, legal issues.

Introduction

"At the stroke of the midnight hour, when the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom. A moment comes, which comes but rarely in history, when we step out from the old to the new, when an age ends, and when the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finds utterance."

At midnight on August 14 1947, Jawaharlal Nehru, the first prime minister of independent India, gave a famous speech which hailed the country's decades-long, non-violent campaign against British rule. However, it soon dawned on the leaders of both countries that the hope and optimism of that night would quickly turn to the harsh realities of how to handle one of the largest mass migrations in modern history and the ensuing communal violence. Post partition, thousands suddenly found themselves without a home and effectively without a nation. The lines were drawn and many found themselves on the wrong side of the border. Their religious identities, whether one is a Hindu, Muslim or a Sikh, took precedence over their national identity. The notion of belonging was redefined; you belong to your religion and that defines your legitimate location. The seduction of religion was such that millions got drenched in the bloodbath of communal hatred. For those who were (relatively) lucky and found themselves on the right side of the border, there was a radical shift in their understanding of home as well. Those who stayed behind were left in a barren wasteland that no longer resembled their home. As India and Pakistan celebrate 71 years of independence, we look back at how two nations were formed - and the years of bloodshed that followed.

Within patriarchal structures, women are often believed to be the embodiment of the honour of the whole community to which they belong. Accordingly, in times of ethnic, religious or other violent conflict, they become the major targets as attacking a woman's body signifies an assault on the family and the community. In any upheaval when sectarian passions are aroused or violence reigns supreme whether it is caste or communal violence or inter-state wars, women often become the worst victims of rival groups [1]. In a situation of civil war, where nearly every man is a soldier fighting for his homeland women come to be seen as a 'territory' to be occupied [2]. The sources of my paper are various women-centric studies undertaken by Indian feminist socio-historians such as Kamla Basin, Ritu Menon, and Urvashi Butalia, who have written extensively on partition violence. Basin, Menon, and Butalia (among other scholars) argue that the primary motive behind violence against women was familial, national, and religious honour. Menon and Bhasin claim that approximately eight to ten million had crossed borders with a death toll of 500,000 to 1,000,000 lives [3]. While Butalia writes in The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India [4] that twelve million people migrated and that death counts varied between 200,000 to two million people, it is commonly agreed upon that over a million lost their lives during the exodus. Leonard Mosley estimated that about 100,000 young girls were kidnapped by both sides, forcibly converted or sold on the auction blocks [5]. According to another estimate around 75,000 women were abducted or raped on the both sides of the border [5]. Zia-ul-Islam states that in Eastern Punjab nearly 55,000 Muslim women were abducted [7]. The trauma caused by partition is described beautifully by author Ismat Chughtai in the following words:

"Those whose bodies were whole had hearts that were splintered. Families were torn apart. The bonds of human relationship were in tatters, and in the end many souls remained behind in Hindustan while their bodies started off for Pakistan [8]."

When the attempt was made to understand these women in totality, some questions and issues remained in the minds (i) in the battle between land (state) and rule (governance), the body of the woman is subjected to all atrocities to show power (ii) in patriarchal set-ups, women and their chastity is considered to be the pride and honour of the family but in contradiction, in war and conflict situations, violation of her chastity becomes a powerful tool to show victory over the rival community (iii) woman as an Individual and woman as a category had been neglected and rejected in the entire process of partition/ conflict.

There is no dearth of written material on the Partition of India: official records, documents, private papers, agreements and treaties, political histories, analyses, a few reminiscences. A vast amount of newspaper reportage and reams of government information exist on the resettlement and rehabilitation of refugees from Punjab and Bengal; on negotiations between India and Pakistan, on the transfer of power and the division of assets; and there are hundreds of pages of Parliamentary debates on the myriad issues confronting both countries and both governments. Partition narratives detail the consequences of violent effects and counter responses providing a legitimate critique of the Communal equation in South Asia. But a resounding silence from standard historical narratives of the partition of India of the year 1947 surrounds the question of women during and after the partition. It may seem a truism to say this, but it bears remembering that at least half of the millions who were dislocated, killed or uprooted were women. Urvashi Butalia in her critical memoir on partition titled 'The Other Side of Silence' metaphorically titles one of its chapters as "History is a Woman's Body," showing how history was played out on women's bodies during the partition and how women became passive, suffering subjects of history without being able to claim recognition of their suffering and even 'martyrdom'. The violence that accompanied partition marked women and women's bodies in particular ways: we know of the rape and abduction that happened on a mass scale, of the cutting off of women's breasts, the tattooing of their bodies. We know too that in many places women were killed by their families, in others they took their own lives, and in some they also participated in the violence [9].

When the partition was announced, to most women (as to men) it meant something very vague -something which happened at the level of high politics. They did not have an idea of what would comprise Pakistan and what would be retained in Hindustan. However, soon panic followed. Many innocently believed it to be a temporary feature. As communal frenzy engulfed the Punjab, people were forced to abandon their homelands to move into strange, alien places across the border [10]. It was surprising for women to discover that borders created upon the partition were to be permanent borders. In different styles, they would state that they had assumed that they were fleeing to meet a temporary emergency but would one day return to their homes. Their earlier stock of experience had taught them that temporary migrations were a means of ensuring survival but no one abandons the home forever'. The partition of India with its permanent division between two sovereign states was a new concept of territory for them, and consequent to this, the migration to a new world with no possibility of return was totally new in their experience [11].

Women were not the ones who were deciding their fate, their killing or living or migrating. Women faced violence at various levels; communal, at family level and at the macro level. They were being abducted, kidnapped, raped, and killed. They were forced to commit suicide in order to protect the family honor. Furthermore, in the name of recovery they were disowned by their families, their children were deprived of basic rights as they were considered illegal and wrong.

Thus, this ethnic genocide witnessed two kinds of gender-based violence. Firstly, the violence inflicted on women by men of the opposite religious group that involved kidnapping, rape, and mutilation of the genitalia or public humiliation. The supposed aim of this kind of violence was to abase the men of the rival religion to which the women belonged. A second form of violence against women included the violence inflicted on women by their own family members. This could vary from honour killings to the insistence of male kin that their mothers, daughters, or wives commit suicide in order to safeguard the purity and chastity of the community [12].

Menon and Bhasin writes, "We begin to discern some specific features of "communal" crimes against women: their brutality, their suffering of extreme sexual violence and their collective nature. The range of sexual violation explicit in the above accounts-stripping; parading naked; mutilating and disfiguring; tattooing or branding the breasts and genitalia with triumphal slogans; amputating breasts; knifing open the womb; raping of course; killing fetuses-is shocking not only for its savagery, but for what it tells us about women as objects in male constructs of their own honour [13]."

Women's sexuality symbolized the opposing "Manhood", its desecrations is a matter of such shame and dishonour that it has to be avenged. Yet, with the cruel logic of all such violence, it is women who ultimately are most violently dealt with as a consequence. The agony of witnessing the near and dear ones dying due to malnutrition, sickness and fight fear of losing home, belongings, dignity and identity wrecked women [14]. There have been numerous cases of honour killing where husbands killed their wives, and fathers killed their daughters to prevent their exploitation by other communities. The women themselves jumped into wells in groups and threw themselves and their girl children in fires to escape abduction and rape by the enemy. In such a conjuncture when the pre-existing social and political divisions were in the course of acquiring new contours and the contending communities that previously shared the same geo-political territory were engaged in fortifying their shares, women in society were subjected to abduction and mass rape due to their metaphoric association with the land. As the "intensely 'private sphere' of women's sexuality was deployed in this major re-drawing of the public borders and boundaries [15]" during Partition, the bodies of women became privileged sites on whose surface the political programs of both states were brutally inscribed. Writing from a relief center in Noakhali after the riots, Muriel Lester thus observed: Several of them had to watch their husbands being murdered and then be forcibly converted and married to those responsible for their death [sic]. Those women had a deadlock. It was not despair. Nothing so active as that. It was blackness [16].

There were rumors about dismembered bodies, trains loaded with heaps of breasts, screams from mosques and temples.

And women weren't only brutalized—they were encouraged to commit suicide, because death was better than being raped by someone of the "wrong" religion. Both communities asked women to kill themselves before they were "sullied"—before their reproductive capacity was given to the enemy. The logic was simple: kill oneself for patriarchy, pro patria. A woman's body became a site where one group tried to prove its religious supremacy over the other. Jisha Menon in The Performance of Nationalism: India, Pakistan, and the Memory of Partition explains the relevance of the female body in communal conflict. She states: "The female body served as the terrain through which to exchange dramatic acts of violence. The gendered violence of the Partition thus positioned women between symbolic abstraction and embodiment. [17]" Moreover, when one interprets the symbolic meanings behind various violent acts, one can claim that branding a woman's body with symbols of the other country or religious group implies that the woman has been tainted by the sinful religious Other. Branding becomes a permanent reminder for the woman, whose shame at losing her honour remains forever ingrained on her body. Bapsi Sidhwa has rightly observed that women were the 'living objects on whose soft bodies victors and losers alike vent their wrath and enact fantastic vendettas, and celebrate victories' [18].

Each one of the violent acts mentioned above has specific symbolic meaning and physical consequences, and all of them treat women's bodies as the territory to be conquered, claimed or marked by the assailant. Some acts are simultaneous or continuous (they may begin with stripping or/and culminate in raping, branding or tattooing); they may take place in public or market places, temples or gurudwaras, the latter two signifying the simultaneous violation of women and sacred space-or privately, but with families as witnesses. Tattooing and branding the body with "Pakistan, Zindabad!" or "Hindustan Zindabad!" not only disfigure the women for entire life; they never allow her (or her family or her community) the possibility of forgetting her humiliation [19]. Anthropologist Veena Das writes that woman's body became as a sign through which men communicated with each other and the political programme of creating two nations of India and Pakistan was inscribed upon the bodies of women [20].

Difficult choices were forced upon women who were pregnant or had children with their abductors or companions in order to restore them to their families, and to acceptable social purity. They were led to abortions or to giving-up their children, either to the men who had fathered them or to orphanages. Most often, those women who kept their children did not return to their families and lived in ashram-style institutions as wards of the state. Usually, rape and sexual assault were invariably followed by abduction of the victimised women. These abducted women typically became domestic servants and sex slaves. Many abducted women were sold into prostitution and some, in very rare instances, were married to their abductors and later claimed to be leading happy and respectable lives. Forceful marriages during the partition upheaval were another dimension of the women sufferings. The women were forced to live with a person whom they were not ready to accept. In certain cases, after being raped or molested, women had to accept their ravishers as their husbands. The issue of abducted women was so widespread that the governments of India and Pakistan established the Inter-Dominion Agreement on November 1947 for the recovery of abducted women from both sides of the border. Recovered women and girls were thrown-out of the Hindu-traditional families. They were ill-treated by all people; their parents did not allow them to rejoin their families. They were frustrated and psychologically depressed; it was inevitable to make the choices of suicide, to lead independent life or inevitably, to become prostitutes.

The programmes for recovering and rehabilitating women to their original homes initiated by governments of both sides have always remained the subject of criticism. These programmes furthered the pain of abducted women who had settled into families of other communities and had children, as they did not want to get uprooted again. Despite the appeal of Jawahar Lal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, to the people of his country to accept back the abducted women as their intent was as pure as of others, family members of many denied to recognise them due to fear of getting defamed in society. This resulted into 13,133 unattached women and children on Indian side, who were provided shelter at 30 homes [21]. The issues of purity, acceptance, pregnancy, honour and shame, fear of rejection, trust, accepting the fate as it was/is, apprehending the fears and insecurities of future were the factors of refusal. There were instances as Kidwai [22] records when Hindu women had been recovered from Pakistani Muslims, their relatives had refused to take them.

> Santokh Singh Dhir wrote in his book 'Oh Din' about partition, "The blood soaked body of the woman would be lying on the ground... This happened in the country of Guru and Kabir. Who did this? Their own followers. Mohammad Sahib said that it was wrong to raise a hand on the women and children. But his own followers killed the woman and children with glory and raised the slogans. Where is Mohammad Sahib? His followers have overrun him. Not only Mohammad Sahib there are so many great men. But who cares for their words?" [23]

Another aspect of the partition relating to the women was the recovery operation. On September 3, 1947 leaders and representatives of India and Pakistan met and resolved that steps be taken to recover and restore abducted persons [24]. By September 30, 1957 the number of abducted women and children recovered from Pakistan stood at 10,007 and from India at 25,856 [25]. But all the women were not fortunate enough to be accepted by their families. Thousands of women were rejected by their husbands and families and they had no option but to live out their lives in ashrams and brothels. A large number of women had either surrendered to their fate or they were pushed by the patriarchy into the vicissitudes of time. There was fear of rejection by their families and the continuing stigma of being abducted and molested. Women had memories of the events of 1947 that they were forced to suppress, stifle or store away but the literature can somehow liberate these stories from hiding. Given the overwhelming stigma still attached to women who were perceived to have been sexually contaminated by men of 'other' community during the sectarian violence that accompanied the partition, it was unlikely that they would ever testify about their experience. In the face of this silence it may well be the task of literary historiography to unveil, uncover, liberate from silence and oblivion, these women's stories [26]. The significance of the narratives of thousands of

brutalized women cannot be undermined. What cannot be shared through reports, documents, diaries and memoirs can only be narrativized. The absences, silences and different kinds of psychological deaths of women find essential voice in these narratives. Memory recreates the inherent fears of the mind, and victimhood becomes the soul of the nation. The stories are endless, the pain is everlasting, as while talking to these women it seems like yesterday only for them. Pain is personal and it depends upon the loss (human and material) and their traumatic experiences. All these women were of the strong opinion that their memories should be preserved and written and recorded or they will die with them. Public libraries could provide a common platform for the survivors to get together, exchange notes and these could be recorded along with all personal information for future generations. However, it can be asserted that within the ideological framework, women during the partition riots were seldom seen as subjects. These women were treated as objects through which a community's idea of purity and pride was orchestrated by controlling their sexuality and bodies. Hence, the aspect of violence against women during partition not only highlights gender differences in the Indian Subcontinent but can also be seen as one of the primary examples that deconstructs Jameson's [27] notion that Third World experiences can all be categorized as one. In fact, even today, the lives of women in South Asia still continue to unfold in a manner very different to those of South Asian men. Women's sexuality, as it had been violated by abduction, transgressed by enforced conversion and marriage and exploited by impermissible cohabitation and reproduction was at the center of debates around national duty, honor, identity and citizenship in a secular and democratic India. The figure of the abducted woman became symbolic of crossing borders, of violating social, cultural and political boundaries. The extent and nature of violence that women were subjected to when communities conflagrated, highlights not only their particular vulnerability at such times, but an overarching patriarchal consensus that emerges on how to dispose of the troublesome question of women's sexuality.

The question of migrants, and their treatment across the border was a critical factor in shaping the politics of the two new nations. The influx of migrants from across the border was frequently linked to a critique of the policies of the neighboring government with regard to their minority population. Such criticism was voiced particularly strongly by leaders in the provinces of India and Pakistan, which were the destinations for large numbers of migrants. Both Nehru and Liaquat faced attacks from powerful provincial leaders over how the refugee crisis was to be handled, and threatened the stability of their government [28].

A series of treaties, ordinances, agreements, resolutions, bills and acts were passed during 1947- 50 covering various aspects of the transfer of power and populations [29]. After the exchange of populations came the exchange of women. Having agreed to an apportioning of assets and a division of the armed forces, civil services and the CID, India and Pakistan entered into an inter-dominion agreement on December 6, 1947, to recover all women and girls who had been abducted in either country and restore them to their families: Hindu and Sikh women from Pakistan, Muslim women from India. In four years, 30,000 women were recovered. In April 1948, an Inter-dominion conference was convened with the purpose of framing an inter-governmental response to the flow of minorities. The main issue at the conference related to inter dominion travel along the eastern border. The flow of travelers across the eastern border needed to be acknowledged, incorporated, and if possible, curtailed by both the governments. In the discussions, H. M. Patel urged that the question not be addressed 'in terms of the prestige of either government', but rather something which needed to be seen as a 'big, human problem [30].' What was more difficult, however, was finding a compromise acceptable to both sides, as to how the problem could be addressed. A bland Communiqué issued at the end of the conference stated 'The Conference met and had a fair and frank discussion on the various issues involved in an atmosphere of cordiality and understanding [31].' This, however, betrayed nothing of the detailed, often combustible, and exhaustive perusal of questions related to the flow of minorities. Afterwards it was felt that a more binding agreement was necessary for satisfactory progress. Accordingly, an agreement was reached between India and Pakistan on 11 November 1948 that set out the terms for recovery in each dominion [32]. Women were certainly affected by destitution, in one way or the other by the events following the Partition, though their experiences varied. Amidst forced migration, violence, abduction, recovery and readjustments, most of them lost their identity, which was subsumed by identities like 'community', 'religion' and 'nationality'. In their memory the predominant picture is one of confusion, dislocation and the severing of roots, as they were forced to reckon with the implication of Independence, which to them meant Partition. It was generally assumed that all abducted women were captive victims and wanted nothing more than to be restored to their original families as soon as possible [33]. Despite the urgings of some members that some mechanism be devised to ensure that no unwilling woman was forced to return to her country, Nehru declined to do so. He simply gave a verbal assurance that no compulsion or coercion would be used, and added, 'I have not come across a single case of an adult abducted woman who had been recovered and who was pushed into Pakistan against her will [34].'

"The policy of abduction as a part of the retaliatory programme has given a setback to the basic ideals of a secular state," said Mridula Sarabhai. Recovered women were seen as missing members of a community, not as adult citizens of a country. The State assumed the role of a parent patriarch and relocated the women where they 'rightfully belonged'. The only response to forcible abduction, it seemed, was forcible recovery. Since such marriages had been declared illegal, the only way to reconstitute the legitimate family was by dismembering the illegal one and removing the women from its offending embrace. Pregnant women were obviously more vulnerable than others. Kamlabehn told us that lists of all the pregnant women would be made and sent to Jalandhar; there, the women would be kept for three months or so, be given a complete 'medical check-up' (a euphemism, we soon learnt, for an abortion, illegal at the time) and only then be presented to their relatives, "because"' she said, "if they came to know that the woman is pregnant, they would say, let her stay in the camp and have her child [35]." Regarding the children borne by abducted women, as Veena Das maintains, the state refused to recognise them as legitimate since they were born of 'wrong' sexual unions. As a result, as Patel states,

the women were separated from their children, and forcefully if they resisted, with the children being recognised as citizens of countries they were born in and staying with their fathers. She also gives the example of a woman who didn't want to part from her child but had to for fear of not being accepted by her natal family [36]. The women were afraid of being rejected by their families, unwilling to leave their children behind--this is what the Indian government required of all children born of Muslim father--and in no frame of mind for another upheaval. In a curious twist, the governments themselves became abductors. The women were given no choice regarding where they wanted to live or with whom; and no right to decide the fate of their children. Worse, the Abducted Persons (Recovery and Restoration) Bill, was enacted, denying them their rights as citizens--it remained in force till 1956. The recovered women themselves although promised a free environment and liberty were by the very terms of the Bill, divested of every single right to legal recourse. Their marriages were considered illegal and their children illegitimate; they could be pulled out of their homes on the strength of a policeman's opinion that they were abducted; they could be transported out of the country without their consent; confined in camps against their wishes; and as adult women and citizens, be once again exchanged, this time between countries and by officials [37]. It is rather unlikely that we will ever know what exactly abduction meant to all those women who experienced it because it is rather unlikely that they will ever talk of it themselves, directly; society still enjoins upon them the silence of the dead around an event that, to it, was shameful and humiliating in its consequences. Yet society and state, father, husband and brother, virtually to a man, placed upon them the special burden of their own at- tempt to renegotiate their post-Partition identity, 'honourably' [38].

In conclusion, it can be said that women's link to nation not only lies in their biological role of birthing citizens of a country or a religious group, but women are also seen as signifiers of religious/cultural ideology and honor where their bodies operate as ethnic/national boundaries [39]. In the aftermath of partition, much like the Indian Subcontinent, gender itself was territorialized, meaning that "[w]omen's bodies represented both the inner core of patriarchy — couched in the language of honor and prestige — as well as marking boundaries of social and national reproduction [40]." In spite of the utter confusion, psychological imbalance, deep pain, emotional strains and losses, women "picked up the pieces" of their lives to adjust to new places. Many women, who had never before stepped outside domesticity, now out of sheer exigencies of survival, joined the workforce after the Partition in a scenario when most of them were not adequately skilled or equipped to undertake the arduous task of sustenance (at times single-handedly). They rose up to act as direct sustainers, carving out new avenues of earning and supplementing family income, to cope up with new challenges. Many of them became dependent on state help who set up various transit camps, relief centers, rehabilitation homes, vocational or training centers and cooperative societies for this purpose. Or still others were helped by various voluntary and social organizations, but most significant were women's own endeavors to resettle themselves [41].

References

1. Singh IN. Communal Violence in the Punjab (1947) [PhD thesis]. Amritsar: G.N.D. University, 2002, 211.
2. Major AJ. The Chief Sufferers: The Abduction of Women During the Partition of the Punjab. In: Low DA, Brasted H, editors. Freedom, Trauma, Continuities: Northern India and Independence. New Delhi: Sage, 1998, 59.
3. Menon R, Bhasin K. Borders and Boundaries: Women in India's Partition. New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1998, 35.
4. Butalia U. The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India. Navi Mumbai: Penguin Books India, 1998, 76.
5. Mosley L. The Last Days of British Raj. Bombay: Jaico, 1971, 284.
6. Butalia U, 1998, 132.
7. Singh IN, 2002, 233.
8. Bhalla A. Memories of a Lost Home: Partition in the Fiction of the Subcontinent. In: Jassal ST, Ben-Ari EB, editors. The Partition Motif in Contemporary Conflicts. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2007, 189.
9. Butalia U. Abducted and Widowed Women, Questions of Sexuality and Citizenship during Partition. In: Thapan M, editor. Embodiment: Essays on Gender and Identity. India: Oxford, 1997, 91.
10. Bhardwaj A. Partition of India and Women's Experiences: A Study of Women as Sustainers of Their Families in Post-Partition Delhi. Soc Sci,2004:32(5/6):85.
11. Das V. Composition of Personal Voice: Violence and Migration. Stud Hist,1991:7(1):71-72.
12. Dey A. Violence against women during partition of India: Interpreting Women and their bodies in the context of ethnic genocide. ES. Rev Filol Inglesa,2016:37:104.
13. Menon R, Bhasin K. Borders and Boundaries: Women in India's partition. India: Rutgers University press, 1998, 42-43.
14. Mehdi SS. Chronicles of sufferings-'Refugee women of South Asia' [Internet], 2010 [cited 2019 Sep 13]. Available from: www.mcrg.ac.in/rw%20files/RW10&11.
15. Bagchi J, Dasgupta S. The Trauma and the Triumph: Gender and Partition in Eastern India. Kolkata: Stree, 2006, 5.
16. Lester M. Indian Annual Register, Vol. II, 1942, 199.
17. Menon J. The Performance of Nationalism: India, Pakistan, and the Memory of Partition. India: Cambridge University Press, 2013, 121.
18. Sidhwa B. Defend Yourself Against Me. In: Bahri D, editor. Colours of New Day: Writing for South Asia. New York: Pantheon, 1990. Quoted in: Bahri D. Telling Tales: Women and Trauma of Partition in Sidhwa's Cracking India. Interventions, 1999, 1(2):218.
19. Menon R, Bhasin K, 1998, 43.
20. Kudaisya G, Tan TY. The Aftermath of Partition of South Asia. London: Routledge, 2000, 22.
21. Sengupta A. Looking back at partition and women: a factsheet [Internet]. Peace Prints: South Asian Journal

of Peacebuilding, 2012 [cited 2018 Sep 4]. Available from: http://wiscomp.org/pubn/wiscomp-peace-prints/4-1/ANEWESHA.pdf.
22. Kidwai A. In Freedom's Shade. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2011.
23. Dhir SS. Oh Din. New Delhi: Aarsi Publication, 2004, 52-53.
24. Singh IN. Communal Violence in the Punjab, 1947, 231.
25. Singh IN. Communal Violence in the Punjab, 1947, 233. Menon R, Bhasin K. Borders and Boundaries, 99.
26. Didur J. Lifting the Veil: Reconsidering the Task of Literary Historiography. Interventions, 2001, 3(3):447.
27. Jameson F. Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism. Social Text, 1986, 15:65-88.
28. Raghavan P. The Finality of Partition: Bilateral Relations between India and Pakistan 1947- 1957 [PhD thesis]. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2012, 64.
29. Kannabiran K, Singh R, editors. Challenging The Rules(s) of Law: Colonialism, Criminology and Human Rights in India. Delhi: Sage, 2008, 281.
30. Raghavan P, 2012, 64.
31. Raghavan P, 2012, 64.
32. Kannabiran K, 2008, 282.
33. Kannabiran K, 2008, 282.
34. Kannabiran K, 2008, 283.
35. Menon R, Bhasin K. Recovery, Rupture, Resistance: Indian State and Abduction of Women during Partition. Econ Polit Wkly, 1993, 28(17):7.
36. Das V. Critical Events: An Anthropological Perspective on Contemporary India. Delhi: Oxford Univ., 1998.
37. Menon R, 1998, 283.
38. Menon R, Bhasin K, 1993, 11.
39. Anthias F, Yuval-Davis N. Woman-Nation-State. In: Hutchinson J, Smith AD, editors. Nationalism: Critical Concepts in Political Science. Cornwall: Routledge, 2002, 1475-1488.
40. Abraham I. How India Became Territorial: Foreign Policy, Diaspora, Geopolitics. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2014.
41. Datta AB. Gendering Oral History of Partition Interrogating Patriarchy. Econ Polit Wkly, 2006, 2229.