Abstract
Partition of the sub-continent of India in 1947 has been dealt with by many Pakistani and Indian English language novelists. Partition affected millions of people, changed the map of the sub-continent. The countries of the region still live under its shadows. The present study intended to investigate the portrayal of the Partition by two English language writers from India and Pakistan, Bapsi Sidhwa and Khushwant Singh in their novels, with the objective to focus upon and highlight their respective perspectives on the Partition, mainly, in Ice Candy Man and Train to Pakistan respectively. The study was based upon the exhaustive analysis of the texts, from the two novels in the light of postcolonial theory. The study has shown that Sidhwa has her own individual and independent perspective on Partition, while Singh subscribes to official Indian perspective on it. The study has also shown that the view points of certain Indian and Bangladeshi critics about the portrayal of Partition by Sidhwa are unjustified and unfair.
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I. Introduction
Bapsi Sidhwa is a Pakistani Parsee writer. She has written The Bride, The Crow Eaters, Ice Candy Man, An American Brat and Water. Sidhwa defines herself as Pakistani, Punjabi, Parsee woman writer (Monsoon, 2000). Khushwant Singh is a Sikh Indian writer. He has written novels like Train to Pakistan, I Shall Not Hear the Nightingale and Delhi. The present study intends to undertake a comparison mainly between Ice Candy Man and Train to Pakistan for the portrayal of the different aspects of Partition by the two writers in these novels.

II. Literature Review
Though critics like Ralph J. Crane (Inventing India, 1992), (The Early Novels, 1996) and Niaz Zaman (2001) have commented upon the portrayal of Partition by Sidhwa and Khushwant Singh, but there are many serious gaps and unjustified assertions in their analysis and interpretations of these novels, especially in the case of Zaman. The present study aims to fill these gaps and initiate the much needed corrections regarding the interpretation of the portrayal of different aspects of Partition in these novels. The study especially intends to show that in case of Sidhwa the ideology of her country does not affect her response to the Partition as claimed by Zaman (2001, p. 17). However this does apply to Khushwant Singh as the study intends to show, but has not been taken note
III. Discussion and Analysis

a. The Portrayal of the Peaceful Co-existence

The Partition of India in 1947 affected millions of people (Hasan, 1997, p. 1) and continues to affect the people and the countries till today, and is feared to be worse than Holocaust (Sidhwa, Monsoon, 2000). Sidhwa in *Ice Candy Man* shows that before the Partition, the different communities and religions lived in peace and harmony socially, culturally and religiously. She shows that the Muslims and the Hindus could even fall in love with each other across religious distinctions. Shanta, a Hindu girl and Ayah by profession, is desired by a group of her admirers consisting of the Muslim protagonist of the novel, Ice Candy Man, Sher Singh, the Sikh zoo attendant, a Hindu masseur, Hari, the gardener, the Muslim butcher, the restaurant owner and Sharbat Khan, a Pathan and many others. Sidhwa shows that all these people belonging to different communities interact with each other on a normal, human level and live like friends. She describes through Lenny, the child narrator, the harmony between Ayah and her admirers and also amongst themselves, in *Ice Candy Man* (Sidhwa, 1989, p. 19).

As portrayed in *Ice Candy Man*, the Muslims and the Sikhs live in peace and harmony and are not conscious of their religious identities, in the narrow sense of the world. They share each others’ joys and concerns. They regard the children of their friends from other religions as their own. Love and affection permeates the atmosphere. She further shows in *Ice Candy Man* that the Muslims and Sikhs participate in each others religious, social and cultural events before Partition (105).

Khushwant Singh in his novel, *Train to Pakistan*, like Sidhwa, also shows that all the diverse communities in India live in peace and harmony, before politics of Partition shatters it. At Mano Majra, which stands for India, the day begins with the Muslim prayer leader facing west toward Mecca and calling Allah-o-Akbar to the believers. This is followed by the Sikh priest’s prayers (6). Similarly, the day at Mano Majra ends with the Imam calling the faithful to prayers with, “God is great”. Then the Sikh priest leads the evening prayers at the Sikh temple. Khuswant Singh portrays the peaceful co-existence and the fine harmony, at religious, cultural and social levels among the two major communities of India before Partition (6).

The fact that the Sikh priest waits for his turn and allows the Muslim priest to finish his call to prayers, indicates, the kind of harmonious atmosphere that prevails in India among various religious communities. Singh stresses upon the compatibility of diverse religious communities by showing that the mosque and the Sikh temple stand on the same village common in the center of the village, along with the only brick house of a Hindu money lender. Singh further shows in *Train to Pakistan* that in spite of religious differences they all pay their reverence to the same village deity, the deo (4). He also shows trains going to and from Lahore to other parts of India including Delhi, thereby stressing and establishing the geographical unity of India. Other writers like Attia Hosain, a Muslim Indian writer, (1992, p. 16, 33, 40, 41) and Chaman Nahal in his novel *Azadi* (1975, p. 14, 54) have also depicted the happy and peaceful co-existence
among different religious communities in India before it was rent apart by the political
storm that preceded and accompanied the Partition.

IV. Sidhwa’s Perspective on Partition

Sidhwa’s portrayal of the Partition is not influenced by the official ideology of
Pakistan as claimed by Zaman (2001, p. 17). However, Sidhwa is conscious of the
divisive forces and factors between the Hindus and the Muslims, in the form of social and
cultural difference and biases. She shows, among other things, the Brahmin ideology of
purity contributing towards Partition of the sub-continent. She makes it clear, that in
spite of the co-existence of Hindus and Muslims for centuries, the mountain high social
and cultural barriers separating the two communities remained as insurmountable as ever.
A caste Hindu would not even touch his food in the presence of a Muslim. A Muslim
entering a Hindu kitchen would pollute it. Lenny, the child narrator in Ice Candy
Man describes one such incident when the food of a Brahmin priest is polluted by the
shadow of non-Hindus (116-117).

This reflects the deep hatred and disliking of the caste Hindus for the Muslims,
who were driven by their ideology of purity. The Brahmin thrust on the ideology of
purity made Muslims conscious of their own separate identity. This contributed to the
Muslim demand for a separate homeland.

Hosain (1992, p. 63) also shows the cultural and social irritants between the two
communities. She shows through the narrator that the wife of Balbir Singh would not eat
or drink at the house of Laila. Sita Agarwal refuses the marriage proposal of Kemal on
religious, social and cultural grounds (215). Sidhwa (1989) shows in Ice Candy
Man that communalism and the politics had sharpened the religious identities of the
Muslims and the Hindus and had created divisions and cracks among them (93).

Sidhwa associates Partition with evil and destruction. She in Ice Candy Man offers
her most eloquent and comprehensive response and perspective on the philosophy,
ideology and rationale of Partition through the use of an image of Hindu banya being
partitioned alive by the Muslims resulting in the horrible death of the Hindu banya and
the partitioning of a Punjabi Sikh in The Bride (Sidhwa, 1987, p. 16) again by the
Muslims resulting in the unnatural, violent division and death of the Sikh. Sidhwa
describes the partition of a Hindu banya by a Muslim mob, in Ice Candy Man, roaring
Allah-o-Akbar! (135).

This is more than a mere portrayal of violence against the Hindus by the
Muslims. Sidhwa uses human beings as symbols for ideologies and countries. The fact
that the banya, “divided” by the Muslims is wearing a Gandhi cap, stands for Hindu India
under Gandhi’s influence with his focus on religion. Sidhwa suggests that Gandhi’s
emphasis on religion has alienated the Muslims to the extent that they have no feelings
and sympathies left for it. Therefore, India cannot keep Muslims, within it. Thus the
Muslim’s partitioning of banya at the personal level mirrors the Partition of India at the
public and political level. This shows Sidhwa’s viewpoint on Partition. Sidhwa regards
the Partition like tearing apart a living human being with all the cruelty, barbarity and
the inhumanity attached to it, in addition to the pain and anguish attendant upon it. Sidhwa
presents Partition of the sub-continent as an undesirable, cruel and inhuman act. The
perpetrators of this act are called goondas by Sidhwa. Crane (1996, pp. 41-63) does not
focus on the serious implications of the “partition” of Hindu banya by the Muslims. Similarly Zaman does not say anything about Sidhwa’s independent and impartial perspective on Partition expressed through these metaphors. This perspective of Sidhwa on Partition is in total contrast to the Pakistani perspective on Partition. On the other hand, Zaman repeatedly mentions the so called Sidhwa’s Pakistani perspective on Partition (2001, p. 257). Shortly afterwards, Lenny “partitions” her own large life-like doll with a china face and blinking blue eyes, with the help of her brother Adi. The beautiful doll of Lenny “cries” before she is torn in two halves by the partition, described by Adi as the pointless brutality. These cries could be the cries of Mother India. The elder brother Adi (Hindus) and the younger sister Lenny (the Muslims) enter into a fierce tug of war and after a big struggle they split the doll (India). The impact of separation throws both the children off balance, suggesting that the event of Partition was a destabilizing exercise for both India and Pakistan. The inner stuff of the partitioned doll, Sidhwa suggests, stands for common social, historical, political fabric of undivided India. Sidhwa conveys the message of the cruelty, inhumanity and the futility associated with Partition and terms it as pointless brutality, amidst the cries of Mother India (139).

Interestingly in spite of all this, Crane, as said earlier, in an essay (1996, pp. 41-63) claims that Sidhwa, a Pakistani writer, writes against Indian version of Partition. This is not a correct and objective interpretation of Sidhwa’s writings. In The Bride she also makes Punjabi Muslims partition a twenty years old Sikh (Punjab) (Sidhwa, 1987, p. 16). Actually it was not the Muslims who asked for the division of Punjab. Sidhwa makes the Muslims look barbarians, who can go casually for the partition of the living human beings and the countries as well. This can hardly be called a Pakistani perspective on Partition as claimed by some diehard Indian nationalists (Shashi Tharoor, New York Times, October 6, 1991) and non-Pakistani critics (Zaman, 2001, p. 246). It could be her own independent perspective on the Partition. Sidhwa wants the readers to take the Partition of the sub-continent as inhuman, unnatural, and atrocious, undesirable and pointless act of brutality as the “partitioning” of Hindu banya by the Muslims.

Sidhwa in Ice Candy Man uses Hindu Ayah Shanta as a symbol for India. Sidhwa makes the Muslim protagonist, Ice Candy Man, disgrace, shame, humiliate and ruin Shanta (India). Led by Ice Candy Man, the Muslims abduct and manhandle Ayah (India) while she is in a condition of shock and trauma at the hands of her one time lover (183).

The treatment meted out to Hindu Shanta, by her one time Muslim lover is more than a personal and isolated act of violence. The Hindu Ayah is a symbol of India and she is abducted and taken away by the Muslims against her will. Sidhwa, instead of revealing her Pakistani identity, and presenting Pakistani perspective, questions the Muslim demand for Partition after centuries of their rule over India. She presents it as the worst betrayal. The fact that Ayah is taken to the red light district, is meant to show the disgrace and shame heaped upon Shanta (India) by her own lovers. Sidhwa is suggesting that Ayah (India) deserved a better treatment from her one time lover and wooer, Ice Candy Man, the Muslim. This is the worst one can expect from the lovers towards their beloveds, both at the personal and public level.

V. Singh’s Perspective on Partition

Khushwant Singh in Train to Pakistan presents his opposition to the Partition and establishes the indivisibility of the cultural, social and political heritage between the
Sikhs and the Muslims after centuries of intermingling. He reveals his Indian identity and projects the official ideology of India. Interestingly Zaman and Crane do not take notice of this aspect of *Train to Pakistan*. He maintains that the Partition was unnatural, artificial and illogical. Singh suggests that the two communities were the product of the same inseparably intertwined social, cultural and political past. Singh presents the Indian perspective at the broader and political level through a metaphor of purely personal relationships. Nooran, a Muslim girl and the beloved of Sikh protagonist, Juggat Singh, Jugga, carries his child (1988, p. 115). Singh uses this child inside the body of a Muslim girl fathered by a Sikh as a metaphor for the intermingling of the Hindu-Muslim strands and the Hindu Sikh contribution to it. The child inside the body of a Muslim girl fathered by a Sikh is a metaphor for the joint social, cultural and political past of the Hindus and the Muslims, their peaceful co-existence, suggesting the indivisibility of the combined and hybrid identity of the Hindus/Sikhs and the Muslims, but threatened to death by Partition. Zaman does not highlight the significance of this symbol of child in the body of a Muslim girl fathered by a Sikh. This is nothing but the presentation of official Indian perspective on Partition. India, being an indivisible entity, consisting of combined Hindu-Muslim heritage.

It will be interesting to see the portrayal of the conduct of Sikh Juggat Singh towards his Muslim beloved by Singh in *Train to Pakistan*. The Sikh protagonist of the novel sacrifices his life for the sake of Muslim refugees and his Muslim beloved. The dacoits at Mano Majra plan to attack a Muslim refugee train in revenge for many train massacres in Pakistan (72). They have strung a thick rope across the bridge over which the train is to pass. This is their additional arrangement to sweep off the people sitting on train roof. Singh casts Juggat Singh in a heroic mould. Jugga knows that his beloved Nooran is on the train and no matter what might happen to him, he must ensure the safety of his beloved and that of the other Muslim refugees from his village. He keeps hacking at the rope, indifferent to the hail of bullets which are rained upon him by Malli and his men as the train is rushing towards him (157).

Khushwant Singh shows that the Sikh protagonist sacrifices his life to save the lives of the Muslim refugees and that of his Muslim beloved. Crane in *Inventing India* calls it the portrayal of the essential humanity of the individuals by Singh. Crane believes that Singh shows that love and humanity can win against all odds (1992, p. 148), but this display of generosity and humanity on the part of Sikhs during the Partition riots is not recorded by other non-literary discourses. Singh creates a new identity of the Sikhs. This is the portrayal of the Indian perspective on Partition.

**VI. Portrayal of the Violence by the Two Writers**

Sidhwa’s portrayal of the violence that accompanies the Partition is impartial and objective. She blames both the communities for it. On the other hand Singh in *Train to Pakistan* projects and highlights the details of the violence committed by the Muslims against the Sikhs. Singh on the surface blames both the Muslims and the Sikhs equally for killings and murders (3). However, he suggests that the riots are started in the Muslim majority areas and the Sikhs kill only in retaliation. Singh makes the deputy commissioner make it clear that the Sikhs attack the trains only in retaliation of the train massacres by the Muslims in which thousands of Hindus and Sikhs lost their lives (19). Singh conforms to the persistent pattern running through the novels by Sikhs. The Sikh writers admit to Sikh atrocities against the Muslims, but argue that it is only in retaliation
for what the Muslims did to them (Saros Cowasjee, 82), but this contention is not supported by independent observers. Collins and Lapierre refer to Sikhs as the most vicious killers of all at the time of the Indian Partition (1975, p. 361).

Singh in *Train to Pakistan* dwells upon the sufferings and the misery of the Hindus and the Sikhs, but makes only one sentence reference to panicky swarms of Muslims fleeing to safety in the West. On the other hand he provides the detailed accounts only of the atrocities and crimes committed against the Sikhs by the Muslims (3).

Therefore, *Train to Pakistan* practically becomes a charge sheet against the Muslims and Singh tries to establish the innocence, large heartedness and generosity of Hindus and Sikhs. Through a police sub-inspector, Singh highlights the killings going on in the Western Punjab. The sub-inspector is angry with the government in Delhi for trying to protect the Muslims and Muslims refugees (20).

The Hindu deputy commissioner especially recalls, Sundari, the daughter of his orderly. She had been married only four days and both her arms were covered with red lacquer bangles and the henna on her palms was still a deep vermillion. Her husband was taking her to Gujranwala where he worked as a peon. Sundri was gang raped by the Muslims (154).

Singh comes up with another such account of violence against the Sikhs by the Muslims. He shows that the train carrying the Sikhs is held up at a station for four days. The Sikh children cry for water, but there is no water for them. Singh shows that the father of the children gives them his own urine to drink and then in desperation killed them along with his wife and then shoots himself dead (155).

Sidhwa in *Ice Candy Man* rises above Pakistani ideology and perspective on Partition. Sidhwa suggests that the celebrations and festivities marking the birth of the new nation are very low key and short lived as is the case with the birthday of Lenny, which coincides with the creation of Pakistan (141). The birthday party of Lenny is celebrated with used and borrowed items, without true enthusiasm, the card-board cake box is “dented” and the cake itself is “squashed” (141). This shows that she does not present Pakistani perspective as claimed by some of her disclaimers. She has her own independent perspective, and she sticks to it.

Due to Sidhwa’s impartiality and objectivity in the portrayal of Jinnah, she is accused of presenting a Pakistani perspective on the Partition of India and portrayal of Jinnah. Zaman claims that Sidhwa reveals her Pakistani identity, among other things by reappraising the character of Jinnah and by her attempts to improve his image. Zaman calls it the defence of the father of the nation by Sidhwa (2001, p. 260, 264-271). Sidhwa never attempts any “improvement” of the image of Jinnah. Even Jaswant Singh calls Jinnah as “a nationalist Muslim” and acknowledges his contribution towards Hindu-Muslim unity, till he was pushed towards his demand for Pakistan (2009, p. 123) by the “Himalayan blunder” of the Congress leadership (2009, p. 233) and the “misdemeanors of local Congress men” (2009, p. 258). Other independent and impartial sources (Collins & Lapierre, 1975, p. 129) also support the portrayal of Sidhwa. Even Stanley Wolpert (1989, p. 27) quotes Sarojini Naidu to describe the personality of Jinnah. All these narratives reinforce that Sidhwa has her own independent perspective and she does not
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present official Pakistani perspective on Partition. This confirms the independence of her perspective and rejects the contention of her critics.

VII. Portrayal of the British by the two Writers

Khushwant Singh in *Train to Pakistan* does not say anything on the conduct and role of the British. Sidhwa highlights the controversial role played by the British during Partition in *The Bride* and *Ice Candy Man*. Like a postcolonial writer, Sidhwa (1987) in *The Bride* blames the British for sacrificing the cause of Jinnah at the altar of their shifting allegiances. She shatters their image of being competent, capable and neutral. She blames the rulers of the empire for not paying enough attention to issues concerning Partition. Postcolonial Sidhwa holds them responsible for the bloodshed and massacres, staining the dawn of freedom with the blood of millions of people. Sidhwa (1987) in *The Bride* shows the British in a rush and hurry to wind up. The departing rulers are shown more concerned with acquiring and transporting items of personal use, than bothering about the details accompanying the division of India. They fail in their duty to India, which they ruled and exploited for about two hundred years (1987, p. 14). This shows that postcolonial Sidhwa does not cast the British in favorable light.

Sidhwa dwells upon the irresponsible conduct of the British during Partition and condemns them for their neglect and crimes of omission and commission. Postcolonial Sidhwa writes back to the empire. Her portrayal of the role of the British regarding their failure towards India is verified by Wolpert in *Shameful Flight* (2006, p. 152, 156). Interestingly, Crane (1996, pp. 41-63) attributes at least partially, the creation of Pakistan to the presence of the British Raj, which is in line with the Indian version of Partition but not supported by independent historians including Jaswant Singh who attributes the creation of Pakistan to the blunders of the Congress leadership (2009, p. 233).

Sidhwa in *Ice Candy Man* shows that the Radcliffe Commission members were dealing out Indian cities between the two countries like a pack of cards. Sidhwa is extremely conscious of the criminal negligence and lack of seriousness on the part of the British Raj, while undertaking and supervising the Partition. The arbitrary act of division by which some cities are wrongly given to India, has far reaching consequences both for India and Pakistan and their people (1989, p. 140).

Sidhwa accuses the British of siding with the Hindus and the Congress. She stresses how the British and India deprived Pakistan of its rightful share of land and assets. She refers to the very controversial boundary award given by Radcliffe. This involves violation of accepted majority population formula. In *Ice Candy Man* (140), Sidhwa suggests that the British are not neutral between the two major communities which they should have been; they go out of their way to support and favour the Hindus. Postcolonial Sidhwa blames the British for sowing the seeds of hatred and bloodshed that precede and accompany the division of India. She cites the example of Kashmir. Their decision to grant Kashmir to India is described as against logic and reason. The British do not bother to pay attention to the consequences of bequeathing a Muslim state to the Hindus, which later on led to many wars between India and Pakistan. To add emphasis, Sidhwa repeats that they grant Gurdaspur, Pathankot, without which they could not have achieved the Muslim Kashmir (159). Here Radcliffe has elected to
take “other factors” into account, leaving the city and the Muslim villages around it inside India (159).

Mehr Nigar Masroor, in her novel, *Shadows of Time*, also refers to this arbitrary act on the part of Radcliffe. Masroor ascribes the violence in the Punjab to the unfairness of the division (1995, p. 321).

On the other hand Khushwant Singh in *Train to Pakistan* does not say much about the controversial role of the British and their failure towards India and its people, in maintaining peace and neutrality between the major communities. This shows that Singh could not grow out of the impact of the colonialist ideology. Like Sidhwa he never rejects the colonialist ideology in his novel.

**VIII. Portrayal of the Price of Partition by Sidhwa and Singh**

Sidhwa repeatedly projects the price of Partition, to show its undesirability. This is very important and symbolic. She wants her readers to have a fresh assessment of Partition. She shows that the millions of victims of Partition pay a terrible price for freedom, and that price would leave its bitter imprint for years to come. She presents the reader with picture after picture of human suffering and misery. However she holds both Muslims and Hindus responsible for the Partition related violence, without taking sides. Sidhwa instead of opposing the Partition openly, like Nahal does in *Azadi* (1975, p. 369), wants the reader to come up with the final judgment on Partition.

Sidhwa in *Ice Candy Man* depicts the greatest migration in the human history as a result and price of the Partition. Sidhwa is sad that as a result of population exchange, Lahore is stripped off its diversity and variety in addition to the emotional vacuum created by this phenomenon (175). Singh in *Train to Pakistan* also depicts the migration that accompanied the Partition. He highlights the misery and the suffering of the Hindus moving towards India and the Muslims coming towards Pakistan (1988, pp. 3-4).

Sidhwa in *Ice Candy Man* focuses upon another aspect of Partition, the fires spawned by it. She uses the fire as symbol. Both Hindus and Muslims in equal proportion contribute to the fires of Partition. The fires ignited by the Partition spare nothing, the buildings, the human beings, the history, the heritage, the relationships, the humanity and human values; all are eaten up and consumed by the fires of the Partition. Either part (India and Pakistan), is left poor and stripped off its past. She portrays the Partition as a human tragedy on an unprecedented level and proportion (1989, p. 137, 139). Sidhwa is conscious of the collective loss suffered by the Hindus and the Muslims in the form of their lives, homes, dreams and above all hopes for future, as a price of the Partition.

Though Sidhwa never challenges the partition openly, like for example Nahal does in *Azadi* (1975, p. 39, 40), but in a subtle way she conveys the futility of Partition. Towards the end of *Ice Candy Man*, she makes the protagonist, Ice Candy Man, who is an activist for the Partition, cross over into India in search of his Hindu beloved, Shanta and turns his back on his country, raising many questions about the rationale and ideology of Partition (277). Sidhwa, in *The Bride*, also challenges the basic ideology of Partition and makes Qasim an isolated observer of a train massacre, because the people being murdered by the Sikhs are Punjabi Muslims, and not his people from the mountains. Therefore, Qasim watches the massacre as in a cinema (28) and though
horrified by the slaughter, he feels no compulsion to risk his own life (29). This is Sidhwa’s own independent perspective on Partition, and not the official Pakistani version. The main stream Pakistanis do not take the Partition as it is presented by Sidhwa, first in The Bride and then in Ice Candy Man. Crane (1996, pp. 41-63) also agrees in a limited way that Sidhwa questions the basic philosophy and the rationale of the Partition and the creation of Pakistan. Nahal, belonging to majority Hindu community makes a Muslim character challenge Partition in Azadi (1975, p. 276). Sidhwa conveys her reservation and perspective on politics and Partition in a very subtle way.

**IX. The Portrayal of Train Massacres by Sidhwa and Singh**

Sidhwa projects yet another price of Partition in the form of train massacres. She presents the train massacres as the most horrible association of the Partition of India for dwellers in Punjab. The Muslim protagonist of Ice Candy Man is expecting relatives from Gurdaspur, instead he meets with mutilated bodies and the bags full of breasts cut off from Muslim women (149).

Singh in Train to Pakistan also refers to the repeated massacres of Sikhs by the Muslims, which brought about chaos and kalyug (Dark Age) (74). He dwells on the process and the way thousands of Sikhs murdered by Muslims are disposed off by burning with wood and kerosene oil collected from the village. The whole village witnesses the cremation of Sikh bodies. Singh creates an overall atmosphere of Muslim cruelties against Sikhs. Singh does not provide the reader with the pictures of Muslims killed and women raped by the Sikhs but a picture after picture of Muslim atrocities against the Sikhs (75).

Singh shows in Train to Pakistan that ghost trains arriving from Pakistan are full of Sikh and Hindu corpses. Singh tells the reader that a bulldozer is used to dispose off the corpses of Sikh and Hindu refugees (126). In the midst of all these killings, Singh portrays the Hindu deputy commissioner, Hukum Chand, full of concern for the safety and security of the Muslims (88). Repeatedly, Singh refers to the rapes of Sikh and Hindu women in the Western Punjab (199, 129).

Singh shows in Train to Pakistan that ghost trains arriving from Pakistan are full of Sikh and Hindu corpses. Singh tells the reader that a bulldozer is used to dispose off the corpses of Sikh and Hindu refugees (126). In the midst of all these killings, Singh portrays the Hindu deputy commissioner, Hukum Chand, full of concern for the safety and security of the Muslims (88). Repeatedly, Singh refers to the rapes of Sikh and Hindu women in the Western Punjab (199, 129).

Singh, through Sikh refugees, who are keen to rouse the sentiments of the Sikhs, reminds his readers, how Muslims killed the four sons of the last Sikh Guru Gobind Singh, but the guru forbade the Sikhs to touch the Muslim women (130), though he was killed by a Muslim while he was sleeping. Through a reference to this piece of history he suggests the historical cruelty of Muslims and the large heartedness and the nobility of the Sikhs. Therefore, in the face of all these provocations, Singh shows that the Sikhs of Mano Majra behave in an honourable and dignified way like their last guru. They refuse to either harm the Muslims or touch their property (188). This is the portrayal of the Indian ideology and perspective on Partition. Collins and Lapierre say some thing different about the Sikhs (1975, p. 406).

Singh shows that at the time of Muslim evacuation of Mano Majra, the Sikhs weep and are very sad. Singh further shows that only criminal gangs are involved in isolated crimes against the Muslims. The general Sikh response according to Singh is of peace and love (130). He shows the Muslims of Pakistan as killers and the Sikhs as noble and dignified souls, quite in contrast to what independent narratives say about appalling Sikh
atrocities (Collins & Lapierre, 1975, p. 362). These writers provide us with graphic
details of the Sikh atrocities against the Muslims.

Singh shows that the Sikhs and the Hindus are concerned for the safety and
security of the Muslims. The Hindu deputy commissioner releases Jugga, a Sikh budmash
(bad character) to ensure the safety of the Muslim refugees on board a train going to
Pakistan, for he does not have enough force, to frustrate the designs of the
miscreants. Jugga sacrifices his life to save the lives of the Muslims and frustrates the
plan of the Sikh criminals of a massacre of the Muslim refugees. But the deputy
commissioner, Hukum Chand, while working on his safety plan for the Muslim refugees
very vividly recalls the Muslim atrocities against the Sikhs and closes the novel with the
most horrifying details.

Khushwant Singh in *Train to Pakistan* reveals the Hindu/Sikh biases against the
Muslims by his portrayal of the Muslims characters. Singh shows that all the Muslims at
Mano Majra were the tenants of the Sikh landlords. Singh also shows that the prostitute
who goes to give company to the Hindu deputy commissioner is a Muslim. The daughter
of Muslim village imam (priest) is shown having a relationship with a Sikh bad character
and the Muslim imam is shown belonging to the lowest social order of the weavers. On
top of it, the Muslim priest is depicted as blind, suggesting his ignorance (4, 90,
114). Singh tries to establish the inferiority of the Muslims in the novel. It is significant
that this aspect of the portrayal of Muslim characters by Singh is not commented upon by
Crane and Zaman. Nahal also in *Azadi* depicts train massacres of the Muslims by the
Hindus (327). Nahal never ever shows Sikhs sacrificing their lives to protect the Muslims
refugees.

X. Conclusion

The study, based upon the exhaustive analysis of the texts from the two writers in
the light of postcolonial critical theories, and ample references to other texts for the sake
of comparison, has shown that both Bapsi Sidhwa and Khushwant Singh associate the
Partition with evil and destruction. They both stress upon the peaceful harmony that
existed between Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs before Partition. However, both writers also
show that there were difficulties and challenges involved in the Hindu-Muslim
synthesis. Singh, conforming to the official Indian perspective on Partition, has
presented Partition in *Train to Pakistan* as artificial, unnatural, illogical and undesirable.
Sidhwa, in violation of the official Pakistani perspective on Partition, has shown the
undesirability of the Partition, through a number of metaphors and symbols and raises
questions about the rationale and the ideology of Partition, especially by highlighting the
price of Partition in more than one ways. Sidhwa comes up with her own independent
perspective on different aspects of Partition, which is very different from official
Pakistani perspective on Partition, and establishes her intellectual honesty and integrity.
The study has shown that Sidhwa does not subscribe to the national ideology of her
country (Pakistan) while responding to different aspects of the Partition as claimed by

The study has further shown that Sidhwa like a postcolonial writer focuses upon
the controversial role and the conduct of British during Partition. She rejects the
colonialist ideology of superiority and describes the British from the Indian
perspective. Sidhwa emerges as a superior writer, compared to Khushwant Singh due to
her intellectual honesty, integrity, impartiality and objectivity in portraying different aspects of Partition in *Ice Candy Man*.

Khushwant Singh does reveal his Sikh/Indian identity in the portrayal of different aspects of Partition. He presents the official Indian perspective on Partition and reveals his Sikh identity by portraying the Muslims in the novel as lesser and lower people.

The study has also shown that Singh portrays the Sikhs and Hindus in *Train to Pakistan* as nobles and dignified human beings and the Muslims as low born monsters. His handling of Partition and Partition related issues are not balanced and impartial. At the best, *Train to Pakistan* can be called an attempt in defense of the Sikh community and Indian perspective on Partition. Most of incidents depicted by Singh in his novel are not supported by independent sources. It only strengthens Singh’s Sikh and Indian identity, along with his bias against the Muslims in his novel. He does not say much on the conduct and role of the British in the novel.
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