

Rewriting History and Making of A Nation: An Odyssey into the Historical Times of India in Kamleshwar's *Partitions*

Ajay Sahebrao Deshmukh

Assistant Professor Department of English Shri. Muktanand College, Gangapur, Dist. Aurangabad, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

History is utilized as an inter-text and co-text by creative writers. Kamleshwar's *Kitne Pakistan* has evoked many discourses on history, nationality and culture. Kamleshwar raises questions on identities based on religion, culture and nation. Present paper is an attempt to travel back to trace the roots of anxieties prevalent in the name of various identities.

KEYWORDS: Cultural Identity, National Identity, Religious Identity, Partition, Partition Literature, Historiography, Historicism.

History is often used as an inter-text, co-text or text by creative writers. Sometimes creative writers take the analytical survey of history. In this process of analysis they touch upon those events in history that have changed the course of national discourse. It also aims to scrutinize historical facts and realities to study the impact of such historical events in the making of that particular nation.

Historiographic metafiction talks about such process of nation making in the cursive discourse of cause and effect that shape the future generations, society, culture, and religious ethos of that specific nation. Every writer has his/her approach to scrutinize history. This approach shapes the merits and demerits of that narrative. In a sense they re-write the history of that nation and record the process of its making. It is necessary to be aware of the fact that it should follow the objectivity while re-writing the history. According to Jaypalan :

Historicism originally meant 'development and continuity' as fundamental characteristics of the historical process, and is connected with the German word 'Historismus'. Friedrich and Meinecke use the word to mean the rise of a new historical outlook to denote the vital importance of intellectual history in the study of the development of nation and culture. [Jaypalan, 111:2008]

Interpretation of history is a difficult task. It is not a causal study of the past event in chronological sequence. It is also not the story of kings and the wars they fought. It has definite purpose. A historian has specific duties and methods while interpreting history as Jaypalan in his book *Historiography* (2008) writes:

Generally the historian is not satisfied with mere facts about the past. But he is interested in finding about what caused these events to take place and attempts to explain the significance of the facts. Some events are classified as historical facts. It is primary duty of the historian to explain

and interpret them in such a way as to appreciate the past. Hence, mere collection of facts, does not constitute history. The task of interpretation has to be taken in the light of some accepted norm which would add sense and meaning to his labours. Unless the story of mankind is interpreted and told in a convincing manner nobody would be interested in the study of the past. [107]

This paper is an attempt to highlight the process of history writing and contemporary influences on writing such history in Kamleshwar's magnum opus *Kitne Pakistan* translated as Partitions by Ameena Kazi Ansari. Kamleshwar's *Kitne Pakistan* is hailed as the cult classic that provoked the critical inquiry into the process of making and writing history of nation.

It tries to analyze the history of making of India. Kamleshwar very meticulously narrates the story from a writers' point of view making Time as a protagonist. It is not judgmental process but tries to see the hidden truth that need to be brought into light to wash out the hatred and misunderstanding of the past havocking the present of the country. This excavation of the history witnesses its journey from the beginning of different civilizations to the present times of hatred, chaos, blood-shed and wars defeating the human values of love, compassion, peace and hope. Kamleshwar has adopted various historical methods such as heuristics, Criticism, synthesis, and exposition.

An unnamed Adeeb or a litterateur expresses his aim in his court of justice pacifying the wounds of dead and sufferings of humanity through the testimonials of historical personalities from Babar to Aurangazeb and historians who write their history takes peep into the historical times of India as he says:

Apart from the past, I do have to keep my finger on the pulse of the present. Or else, the future will simply be a repeat of the past. I only wish to analyze and understand that bit of the past which casts a dark shadow on the present, laying the foundations of hatred and revenge in many Pakistans. [166:2006]

He considers the Partition of India as crucial point in the history of Modern India as the result of increasing drift in Hindus and Muslims and subsequent demand of separate homeland for Muslims i.e. Pakistan, of Muslim League. Indian subcontinent still suffers from the grotesque ramifications of partition such as terrorism as a proxy-war strategy, communal riots, demolition of Babri Masjid, Hindu fundamentalism and questions of Muslim loyalty. Tracing the seeds of such hostility, Kamleshwar's Adeeb takes into the Time Odyssey. He witnesses the debate of historians who argued the authenticity of respective histories of Kings and Emperors. Adeeb examines the important issues such as arrival of Moghuls in India with Babar's invasion, construction of Babri Masjid, Akbar's Din-e-Ilahi, Jahangir and Noor Jahan's approval to British to set the business at the port of Surat, Shaha-e-Jahan reign, Dara Shikho's efforts to follow the path of Hindu-Muslim unity, Aurangzeb's pursuit of peacock throne and dream of Islamic state, battle of Plassey, battle of Buxar, Mutiny of 1857, partition of Bengal,

division of India into Pakistan and India, liberation of East Pakistan and making of Bangla Desh. These are the crucial points in history of Medieval and Modern History of Indian Subcontinent.

A Kashmiri gives the reason of his killing as he was asked to synchronize the time with Pakistani time.

He asserts the fact that Pakistan can be created by pushing back into the time of Babar “when the history of enslavement began” [55: 2006]. Babar caused the enmity by demolishing the Ramjanmabhoomi mandir and constructing masjid on the same place. Babar clarified that he conquered Hindustan for power and not for Islam. He also vouched that he never visited Ayodhya. He also clarified that he was not aware of Ramayana and Tulsidas who created Ram. He asked to call A. Fuhrer, the Director, British archeological survey of India. He was the first who read the inscription on Babri Masjid carrying Babar’s name in 1889. A. Fuhrer felt insulted to be summoned by the liberated citizens of slave nation. He read Inscription goes like, “... in Hijri year 930, that is, near about 17 September, 1523, Ibrahim Lodi had laid the foundation of this mosque. The building was completed on 10 September 1524 and was named the Babri Masjid. This monument has not been destroyed by time, but rather, by people eager to perpetuate and keep alive the Babri masjid Ram Janmabhoomi conflict.”[59-60: 2006]

According to another British historian H.R. Neville, Babar visited Ayodhya in the Summer of 1528. It creates suspicion that Babar must have ordered the demolition of temple to construct the Mosque in his name. Babar blamed British to exploit their position to write such biased and false history. British adopted the Policy, ‘to create rifts between Hindus and Muslims who been united in 1857’ [61: 2006] to keep hold on India. British got frightened of potential threat of unity of both these communities which come together after uprising of 1857. Babar blamed Neveille for misspelling of ‘Oudh’ as ‘Ayodhya’. In his handwritten *Babarnama*, Babar mentioned Oudh. But Neveille spelled it as Ayodhya purposefully. This way British have started dividing Hindustan on religious lines.

Cunningham, Lucknow Gazetteer recorded the riot and killings of one lakh seventy-four thousand Hindus and building of Babri Masjid in his record. As the twenty pages of Babarnama are torn and destroyed, even the Babar’s own truth is not proved as truth. Babar gave the population census of Faizabad-Ayodhya in the year as eleven thousand six hundred and forty three in 1881. It is impossible to massacre one lakh seventy-four thousand Hindus.

Seven Envoys visited Emperor Jahangir. One of them asserted that “...More important than national interests is devotion to one’s faith.”[135: 2006] He focused the importance of religious identity to national identity. He was frustrated that “...attachment to Hindustan override devotion to Islam”[Ibid].

According to Babar, Mahmud of Ghazani, Mohammad bin Kasim, they came to India in quest of Gold. But Rana Sanga accused them that they came here to rule and spread Islam at sword’s point. These contrasting views of conqueror and conquered presented two versions of history of the same period. This subjectivity has harmed the

understanding of future generation incepted many prejudices that disturbed the social and political, cultural and religious structure of the nation as Adeeb cautions

‘It is argument like these... that change the parameters of social, religious and historical realities, and lead to disunity, ostracism and ill will in the future. The vanquished deliberately erase truth and memory. They record in word and deed a history warped to suit their own perspective. ... on the other hand, when the victors are confronted by these collective realities, they take up the weapon of religion. By incorporating religion into statecraft, they go to the extremes of selfish opportunism. This is the reality underlying the initial offensives carried out during the early years of the Middle Ages.’[141: 2006]

Here Adeeb recommends the secular interpretation and cautions to indulge in religious or relativism while interpreting history.

Babar claims in his autobiography, *Babarnama*, that Rana Sanga invited him to invade India. Babar wanted to continue his rule in India but his soldiers wanted to return home. They resisted all the temptation of power and wealth. Ultimately, religion came handy tool to stop them from going back to their home. Thus he was bestowed the title of Ghazi. Mohhammad Bin Kasim also came in search of gold. To get gold he demolished the temples where tons of gold was stored. He smashed idols also. He claimed that Hindus never believed in one god, ‘When one god plundered, none of the others came to his rescue.’[144: 2006]

In the court of Adeeb, when Aurangzeb was summoned, the historians of his time i.e. Kazim Shirazi, Sahib, Mohammad Saqi Mustad Khan Sahib, Khafi Khan Sahib and Aqil Khan Sahib too accompanied him. Aqil Khan in his *Vaqaat-e-Alamgiri* tried to be objective as Kazim Shirazi says, “He is not one of those historians accused of being a royal lackey!”[151: 2006]

Aurangzeb is presented as a villain who embarked on his mission of Islamic state. The views about Aurangzeb are extremist:

Though Aurangzeb strove hard to change the history of south Asia, it would have been infinitely better had he not exploited religion to fulfill the goal. ... he killed off relatives he regarded as threats to his authority and kept dreaming of creating an Islamic state. Ironically, the foundations of this state were not based on solidarity between fellow human beings, but on hatred. In his quest to fulfill his dream, Aurangzeb rejected the multi-religious and multi-cultural strengths of a kingdom stretching from Tibet to Golconda-Bijapur, on the one hand and from Bengal to Kabul and Kandhar, on the other. That is why he ended up as the last Mughal Emperor [124: 2006]

Lenpool English Historian, hailed Aurangzeb as wise and just monarch as he allowed British to establish trading posts at the ports of Bombay and Surat. [125: 2006]

Aurangzeb is accused of being bigoted ruler and a radical *sunni*. Aurangzeb denied defending himself. He asked to corroborate the facts of his time by historians of his era. But the voice of Rajput Warrior Rao Chhatrasal Bundela of Malwa opposed it:

These men were historians at his court. They were not given the license to think or write independently. Whatever they placed on record was done under the supervision and patronage of the state. Don't trust his historians. Alamgir-Nama, Mathir-e-Alamgiri, Muntakhabul-Lubab and Waqat-e-Alamgiri are all accounts written by his slaves. These versions of history are thoroughly unreliable. [154-155: 2006]

Rajput Raja Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur doubted the authenticity of these historians. Rao Chhatrasal Bundela expressed that, "this man is responsible for condemning Hindustan's emerging history to the gallows. The death of Dara Shikoh marked the death of Hindustan." [155: 2006]

Aurangzeb is charged with the demolition of Hindu Temples. He was bitterly criticized to demolish *Kashi Vishwanath Mandir*. Pandey referring to *Pattabhi Sitaramaiah's* book, "*Feathers and Stones*", reveals the real reason of Aurangzeb's act. It was found that a queen was molested and robbed of jewellery. Aurangzeb declared that "a place where rape and robbery could take place could never be deemed as sacred" [160: 2006]. It was demolished. The queen pleaded to reconstruct the temple but being Muslim he built masjid on the same spot and fulfilled the queen's wish. Pattabhi Sitarammiah provided the information that the incident was recorded in a handwritten manuscript belonging to Muslim gentleman from Lucknow. But his death failed to authenticate this document.

Shibli Nomani Sahib tried to defend Aurangzeb on intellectual level. But other historians like Shriram Sharam doubted the objectivity of Shibli Nomani. He asserted the fact that historian of Aurangzeb's time were influenced by the emperor's will, desires and decisions and "conform to his point of view" [Ibid].

Aurangzeb calls his actions as "just or unjust" [Ibid]. He gives two perspectives of interpretation of his actions, first, Hindustani and second, Islam. According to him, he might be "guilty of wrongdoing" from "Hindustan's point of view" [Ibid]. But from Islam's point of view, his actions would be justified. Thus Aurangzeb affirms the religious point of view in the compilation of historical records and writing of the history. This theological aspect of history writing proves dangerous especially the history of India where plurality is celebrated as a basic principle of public life.

Psychological approach of historiography would bring the psychological dimensions of historical times of particular Emperor. Shriram Sharma tried to focus the complexity of Aurangzeb's psychology. According to him, to seek the salvation,

Aurangzeb turned to religion and became fanatic and foe to Hindus. He demolished temples and killed Sadhus who resided there. On the other hand, intellectual approach of historiography adopted by Shibli Nomani gives different perception altogether. He defended Aurangzeb's actions as, "These places would gradually come to resemble fortified camps. ... the emperor may well have issued order for the demolition of mandirs in a bid to curb sadhu militias"[161: 2006]. He further argued that temples and mosques in that era were turned out to be the "hotbeds of intrigue and conspiracy" [Ibid]. He criticizes Iranian, Hindustani and English historians who perceived the notion that demolishing of temples caused rebellion, on the other hand "it was to quash rebellious that temples were pulled down." Considering above fact, it is interesting, that there are no records that Aurangzeb demolished any mosque to curb the rebellion of maulavis.

He defends the charge of closing Hindu schools as pundits have started to preach Hindu lessons to Muslim children on Dara's encouragement. For him, Dara was anti-Islamic, 'it was at his behest that the policy of appeasing Hindus had been introduced in Hindustan'[Ibid]. The same is being repeated in post-independence India where policies to appease Muslims is implemented. He criticizes the policies of Akbar, Shah-e-jahan and Dara who tried to treat Hindus on equal status. Aurangzeb by levying jaziya on Hindus, has shown their status "as subjects of the Mughal conquerors of Hindustan" [162: 2006] and to fill up the coffers emptied out of Tajmahal construction.

Aurangzeb focuses on the limitations of these historians for their narrow mindedness. He wittily comments on writing histories where historians analyze it from the perspective of their age. He defends his course of action to get power by citing the examples of his forefathers, "As the Mughal had established no clearly defined laws of succession... I merely followed the precedent he had set. You should judge the misdeeds of each age in terms of the prevailing conventions of the time" [163: 2006]

Mohammed Habib, a professor of History at Aligarh Muslim University in Hindustan contests Shibli Nomani's argument that all invaders coming to India came for fame and gold. In his opinions Hindus of India were attacked by converts to Islam by "...Recognizing the strength Islam lent to the power of the state, they felt they could raise armies in the name of their faith." [166: 2006]

Shahjahan wanted to narrate the history of his era. He does not believe in the historiography of Shibli Nomani, Kazim Shirazi, Saqi Mustad Khan and Kafi Khan. He calls Aqil Khan's historiography as "fabrications". Though his *Darbar ke Azaad Itihaas* celebrates the spirit of freedom. He condemns his writing as "a slave of his era, an era which itself stooped before the authority of the court"[183: 2006].

Shahjahan expressed the sorrow of conspiracy of his son Aurangzeb and daughter Roshanara. Shibli Nomani rejects it and needs proof, "Historical evidence of the time does not support your statements'[Ibid]. This is the great limitation of the art of writing history that demands proof from the victim of such atrocities. Considering the importance of history, Adeeb scolds Shibli Nomani, "History is greater than the historian!" [Ibid]

Adeeb travels into the times of Shahjahan. He sees many history book of the contemporary time such as *Badshanama*, *Amal-e-Sualeh*, *Alamgirnama*, *Latiful Akhbar*, *Tarikh-e-Shujai*, *Muntakhabul Lubab*, *Masirul Umara*, *Dabistanul Mazahiboshi*, *Miratul Khayal*, *Waqat-e-Alamgiri*, *Faiyyadul Qawaneen* and the *Mathir-e-Alamigiri* and many others.

In his quest for truth buried under the dust of time and history, Adeeb requests Time, “I wish to probe all the hidden histories that lie buried beneath History itself” [190: 2006]. Time philosophizes his existence and relevance of truth:

Adeeb, I am that invisible truth you call ‘eternity’. You have made me omnipotent and immortal. Yet, for your own convenience, you have split me up into ages, epochs, centuries, decades, phases and moments. That history, through which you travelled back into the past as a historian, is a mere fragment of all these time spans. It shouldn’t be difficult for you now to get the heart of the truth. [190: 2006]

As everybody indulge in the assessment and authenticity of past. The anachronism in historical understanding causes biased outcome. It is necessary to apply contemporary logic while passing any judgement over any action or event of the era. Elderly Ulema focused this dimension of interpretation of history, “Sir, that was a different era altogether. All the people present here now judge those turbulent, feudal times from the progressive political perspective prevalent today. Where statecraft was concerned, Islam never regarded the right of succession as a ruler’s divine prerogative. That is why succession in Islamic dynasties has always been decided at the point of sword” [192-193: 2006]. Other Ulema assert the fact, ‘the battle between Dara and Aurangzeb was fought for the throne’ [193: 2006]. It was not conflict between Hindus and Muslims. He also rejects Shibli Nomani’s view that Dara had renounced his religion. He brings the witness, historian Bernier to acknowledge the fact that Dara was a devout Muslim, and had some differences with mullahs.

Peon was taking the notes of the proceeding for Adeeb as it would help him to compile his history. Nomani objected the action “... let no falsification of history be put on record.” [193: 2006] Shibli Nomani affirms that his “historical insights, [...] explanations, [...] arguments as the final word...” [194: 2006]. He focuses on the religious identity of Shahjahan important one over national identity. But his view is crossed by the fact of Shahjahan’s support to Dara, who concerned national identity and not Aurangzeb, who believed in religious identity. Adeeb intervened and raised many questions on the portrayal of Shahjahan as an Islamic fanatic king than Aurangzeb. Shibli Nomani does not have any answer to the question that why then Shahjahan didn’t support the fanatic like Aurangzeb. Adeeb focuses the need to free history from the havoc of contemporary rulers who influence historians. Such history is never beyond suspicion :

History written in blood and recorded under coercion can never be other than suspect. Such accounts are written by professional historians who are paid to do so. Far more

authentic are accounts written by professional historians who are paid to do so. Far more authentic are accounts that record the thoughts, aspirations and remorse of the every people who actively participated in historical events. That is why Babar's Babarnama is an accurate and reliable historical record. [195: 2006]

Shibli Nomani narrates the childhood incidents when, Dara, Shuja, Murad and Aurangzeb were witnessing the elephant combat on 28th May 1637. Two elephants Sudhakar and Suratsundar were fighting and then Sudhakar attacked Aurangzeb. He criticizes Dara for being passive from saving his brother. According to him it shows that Dara tried to kill Aurangzeb. But the same event is interpreted differently by Kanungo, "That happened because Dara was behind the elephant. From his position, there wasn't much he could have done" [197: 2006]. This fact is sanctioned by Aurangzeb's official historian. He has recorded it as, "Despite his eagerness to do so, Dara could not have helped Aurangzeb in his moment of crisis, as he was at the opposite end from the spot where the incident occurred. Besides, it was all over in a few moments"[Ibid].

It is necessary to understand the futuristic implications of any event that happens decisively. Partition of Indian subcontinent still haunts the great loss of composite culture, eruption of terrorism and fundamentalism destroying the harmony of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. The River Chambal narrated the effect of Samugarh battle that sealed the future of India as Dara was assassinated by Aurangzeb. Peacock throne was captured by Aurangzeb. It was the battle that had severe ramifications as River Chambal narrates it:

...the battle of Samugarh was not fought for the throne! Its goal was to decide the future of the country. It marked the end of Akbar's era. It was he who had created a nationalistic empire, not on Islamic one. It was in interest a united realm, that he had sought the path of unity – unity of faiths, minds and people. He did not believe in confining Islam to the believers of *shariat* alone. The unifying spirit of the *shariat*, he felt, transcended all religions, and aspired to transform it into an infinite faith without boundaries or borders that would be relevant for all men, including non-Muslims.[211: 2006]

Time underscores the impartiality of Time and History: "History stands witness to the fact that rulers and dynasties were neither Hindu nor Muslim. It was their vested interests and ambitions that turned them into bigots. Each time they failed to realize these overriding ambitions, they sought refuge in religion. ... but no one is willing to abide by its principles!"[216: 2006]

Dara Shikoh was betrayed by his Hindu Raja Rajrup of Jammu. He defended his act of treachery. He denied the concepts such as 'country, 'nation, 'homeland' or 'realm' or 'Hindustan' [221-222: 2006]. According him, "Hindus had no nation, no homeland, no

Hindustan!” [227: 2006]. Hindus were afraid of only powerful kings who can threat the security and peace of their kingdom.

Peon supports this view as: ‘Though Hindus were in a majority in the country, Hindustan was never a Hindu state. No visible or religious evidence of a Hindu nation existed at the time. Power politics in Hindustan was never grounded in Hinduism. There was no state religion as such. Hindus revered their faith, but were free from the politics of religion.’[226: 2006]

Raja Rajrup cites the example of Maharaja of Jodhpur Raja Jaswant Singh who also betrayed Dara. Historian Constable approved Raja Rajrup’s argument. He mentions Brenier’s travelogue as a proof to it. He refers to a letter from Mirza Raja Jaysing to Jaswant Singh to withdraw his support to Dara Shikoh. He emphasized “to refrain from shedding Rajput blood” [223: 2006]. He also highlighted the shifting of power into Aurangzeb’s favor. Considering future security and prosperity under his reign, he should withdraw support from Dara.

Even Malik Jivan whom Dara Shikoh saved from the wrath of Shahjahan betrayed him. He also defended his treachery as “an established practice, a tradition that allowed overriding ambitions to soar” [235: 2006]. He differentiates the point of views of his period and present interpretation of history by Adeeb and other historians as “... what you describe as “treachery” today was, in our time, no treachery at all.”[Ibid]

Peon gives in that Hindustan had never been the territory of religious warfare. He criticizes Shibli Nomani for trying “to make the history of Hindustan lean on the crutches of religion by declaring the Aurangzeb-Dara Shikoh feud to be the battle of a believer against a “kafir” [227: 2006].

Dara was shocked by the treachery of Hindus. He was wronged by those for whom he was fighting. He felt sorry for his failure “...to evolve a composite culture” [229: 2006]. He hails Aurangzeb responsible for “Hindustan’s cultural decline” [Ibid].

Desperate for peacock throne and sovereign power of Hindustan, Aurangzeb turned to Islam to justify his act of killing Dara, who tried to bring Hindu-Muslim unity as an unIslamic act. His murder was hailed as jihad of supreme kind. On Roshanara’s instigation he got issued fatwa by Ulemas declaring Dara as a kafir and sentencing him to death. The fatwa worked as one of the most glorious acts of jihad. It was feared that if Dara would have taken over the power, the Hindu influence would have increased in every walk of life, their status as equal subjects of Moghual Empire would have threatened their superior status as Muslims. In this way it would have come to an end. This was the fear that Jinnah and his supporters had during the freedom struggle of India. Thus to secure their place they opted for Pakistan and cut the bonds of composite culture. After Dara’s murder, Aurangzeb’s despondency caused converted Muslims to get alienated emotionally from his kingdom. It germinated the seeds of partition that was caused after two centuries.

Political manipulation of history by cunning politicians and rulers caused great damage in the process of making nations. The distortions of facts, subjective

interpretation and selfish implications endangered the integrity of the nation states. To save national integrity, humanity Adeeb focuses on the importance of proper process and objective historiography:

...the history that is on record or has been recorded under duress, the views expressed during interviews for public consumptions and the “reality” that is created by so-called “documentary evidence”, can never represent historical truth. Authentic history is that which is engraved on hearts and minds and erased the moment it is put in writing. The worth of erased words is appreciated solely by scholars who understand the language of Socrates, Gautama Buddha, Christ and Gandhi [264: 2006]

Kamleshwar goes back to the arrival of East India Company and its gradual expansion into empire. He traces history way back to Jahangir when granted English to set up their warehouses for business. He also mentions the battle of Plassey in 1757 where Mir Jafar, Siraj-Ud-daulah’s commander in chief betrayed him. In 1764 at the battlefield of Buxar, Robert Clive firmly established the colonial rule. In the South, Hyder Ali and his son Tipu Sultan tried their best to secure their mother land. Emperor Bahadur Shah Jafar claims one national identity relegating the religious identity on the eve of 1857s mutiny, “Hindustan has been awakened! In this spirited nation, there are no Hindus and Muslims – we are all Hindustanis and nothing but Hindustanis” [312: 2006]. Uprising of 1857 and subsequent defeat of Bahadur Shah Zafar, due to treacherous Indians, is emphasized.

Next important figure that was needed consideration was Jinnah. He is shouldered the responsibility of creating his own Pakistan for his fellow Muslims. Mountbatten is summoned as a culprit in this conspiracy against united India. Jinnah was in a political exile in England. These three years have played vital role in framing the mindset of Jinnah further to materialize the idea of Pakistan. Mountbatten is summoned to provide the information of those three years of Jinnah in England and his secret interactions. Adeeb blames colonial historians for tearing pages from Babarnama as well as Jinnah’s exile in England because these two events together caused the great chaos in the modern history of India. Adeeb demands answer from Mountbatten:

‘Listen, Mr. Mountbatten, Just as your agents made twenty pages of the Babarnama disappear, your nation and its historians connived in obscuring those three crucial years of Jinnah Sahib’s sojourn in England. Could you throw light on the policies and strategies adopted by British government when it found itself unequal to the challenge posed by Gandhiji’s andolans and Bhagat Singh’s martyrdom?’[281: 2006]

British projected Jinnah as the leader of Muslims in India. Even Jinnah motivated by his political ambition fall prey to British policy. He too was tempted by separate “homeland—a country named Pakistan.”[282-283: 2006]. Adeeb also raised the question

of Jinnah's terminal illness which was kept secret as he was the only capable leader of Muslim League who can materialize Pakistan. Mountbatten opposed Adeb's views. He asked to "...stop playing cheap games with history!"[286:2006] His use of "cheap game" for Adeb's court connotes the colonial approach towards oriental historiography. It questions the authenticity of Adeb's court. But Kabir, a victim of partition explains Mountbatten the difference between this occidental and oriental approach while writing the history of colonies:

Mountbatten Sahib, real history is not the version written by the imperialist powers. [...] It is that which has come to be engraved down the years on the souls of oppressed nations. Our history courses down the centuries like mighty rivers. Yours flows like canals. .. Canals you have dug with spades of distorted logic and self-interest. So don't your sermonize to us about history! You have written your history and we have lived it! [287: 2006]

Kabir questioned about the haste in declaring India's independence. He said, "Nehru and Patel were to be handed a crippled India and on Jinnah would be bestowed a termite-infested Pakistan.'[Ibid]. By doing so, British have left the legacy of divided self and avenues to re-write the history of subcontinent. It compelled historians, writers, politicians to interpret and learn from what history has taught as a voice echoed, 'Moments had erred, centuries were punished...' [288: 2006]

Imperial and colonial historiography has its own features. As it conforms the Eurocentric ideas of worldview, it has traces of prejudice based on race, religion and civilization. Adeb's efforts of re-writing history are objected by Bernal Diaz, Royal historian of Spain. With colonial arrogance and bitterness he scolds, "Now you oppressed peoples have established your own court, I have come to caution you against distorting history that is already on record.'[298: 2006] On the other hand, Lu-Xun, Chinese writer justifies the efforts of cleansing history as:

"Honourable Bernal Diaz, by analyzing the history you have chronicled, we are attempting to explore the realities underlying the history of mankind. ... There is no reason why this endeavor of ours to better understand the past of oppressed peoples should upset you. The truth, as you know, is indestructible. You have succeeded in masking it with your words. By cleansing your words of their blood, sweat and tears, you have tried to purify your writings and make them more palatable for posterity. You have camouflaged the stench of slaughter, of rotting corpses, with the fragrance of your words, so that your writings do not reveal a hint of atrocities perpetrated by you on peoples and civilizations. Colonial and imperialist powers tom-tom the news of how they have civilized "savages". They seem oblivious to the fact that it is the skins of those savages that

are tautly drawn across the very tom-tom they beat upon.
[Ibid]

Bernal Diaz calls tribal civilization as cannibals after witnessing too much blood in the temple of Aztecs and the Incas deity. But Montezuma, native American, denied the charge and gave the real situation (“animal sacrifice”) what Diaz interpreted as cannibalism. He said, “You slaughtered your animals in abattoirs, because you did not owe your gods an account of the animals you slaughtered. ...By sacrificing beasts in our temples, we sought to earn the benevolence of our gods. Such were the fundamental differences between our two civilizations” [305: 2006]. Adeeb demanded another witness from Spanish historian Bernal Diaz to prove his statement. But being misinterpreted, he failed to prove it. Adeeb voiced, “...the testimony of a single witness is hardly enough when the reputation of two civilizations is at stake!”[305: 2006]

Adeeb criticized Bernal Diaz the great damage, bloodshed and violence havocted on the colonies all over the world in pursuit of power and hegemony. It is an effort to redeem them from this guilt, the very act of guilt is depicted as benevolence as Adeeb says, “You have tried to absolve yourselves of guilt by tarnishing the reputation of tribal civilizations, accusing them of cannibalism. To arrive at the truth, we need further evidence.”[306: 2006]

When Hernado Cortez was summoned in the Adeeb’s court, he was engaged in copulation with a dark woman Mariana. He answered back, “We are in the process of civilizing them’[307: 2006]. It proves the biased and subjective presentation of the fact in colonial historiography while depicting the colonized or orient. On argument with copulating with cannibals he said, “Oh, let the accounts remain in books... the greatest truths are half-truths. Empires are not built on truths”[Ibid]. Finally, he admitted the fundamentals principals of writing imperial historiography that helped them to build the great empires. The debate does not end. The historical excavation does not culmination point as Kamleshwar himself has said, “Like all novels, this one, too, had to culminate somewhere. So it ended. Yet, in my mind, the debate carries on...”[vii:2006]

To conclude, the paper has attempted to study the various approaches of historiography, the authenticity of historical documents, records, travelogues, biographies, autobiographies etc. It also highlighted the various impacts on historians while writing the history of particular era, empire, emperor or nation. It also underscores that no history is authentic unless it is assumed. Being the court of adeeb, it re-writes this history from the point of views of human sufferings, oppression. It also talks about cultural assimilation, religious harmony and harmonious co-existence and need of love, compassion and value of friendship. Because of this only, Kamleshwar has shown repenting Aurangzeb in this novel. It cautions all those who may turn the winds of history in their desired direction. Such people should think before acting on their whims keeping in mind the future generation would never forgive them.

Aurangzeb repents his deeds after listening the views and counter views on his actions. Kamleshwar imagined the situation where Aurangzeb wrote letter to his son Azam from his grave. The letter reveals the mind of Aurangzeb:

“.....I am guilty of many sins. Whatever I did in the name of religion was undertaken in the belief that it would unite the country. I realize now that I had erred. But never would I allow the country to be divided. I did not regard myself as a foreigner. I conceded there were differences in faith, but ensured that no breach would ever divide national sensibilities.”[267: 2006]

It is a precautionary advice to those entire in quest for power, to keep them aloof from the use of religion for the sake of achieving power. This is the critique of present political situation of India where political parties are aligned on religious and caste lines. It shadows the bright future and progress of India or every nation on the earth.

Thus, Kamleshwar talks about the missionary colonialism, capitalism, imperialism, slavery systems, propagated by colonial powers in African continent and America. He also focuses on cultural, civilization and language erasure of tribal and aboriginal peoples from Africa and America. He also traces the lust and greed; selfish and myopic vision caused the war at Kurukshetra and destroyed the Hiroshima and Nagasaki, gave birth to Hitler, Islamic fanatic in Islamic countries.

References:

Bhattacharya, Bikash. (2011) *An Introduction to Historiography*. Dominant Publishers & Distributors Pvt. Ltd.: New Delhi.

Jayapalan.(2008) N. *Historiography*. Atlantic Publishers: New Delhi.

Kamleshwar. (2006), *Partitions*, Tr. Ameena Kazi Ansari, Penguin: New Delhi.

Sharma, Tej Ram.(2005) *Historiography*. Concept Publishing Company: New Delhi.