



## Reading the Pain of Refugeehood and Marginalization in Post Partition India through – *Garam Hawa* , *Mammo* and *Ramchand Pakistani*

*Kamayani Kumar*

### Abstract

This essay looks at the relative absence of representation of Partition in Indian films. Of the small set of films that take up the historical event of Partition fairly centrally, the essays looks at three films, *Garam Hawa* (Hindi, 1973, dir. M.S. Sathyu), *Mammo* (Hindi, 1994, dir. Shyam Benegal) and *Ramchand Pakistani* (Urdu, 2008, dir. Mehreen Jabbar) to see how these films deal with postmemories of Partition – the way in which the experience of Partition has been transmitted generationally. It also looks at the way in which contemporary events in India work to make Partition alive and ongoing, particularly for the Muslim community that chose to stay back in India at the time of creation of the two nation-states, India and Pakistan in 1947.

**Keywords:** *Partition, Trauma, Postmemories, Muslim community in India, Hindi and Urdu films*

Indisputably, Partition of the Indian subcontinent generated an intensive cultural trauma. This unresolved trauma continues to dominate the collective consciousness, rend and invade the national space. Instead of mitigating, this trauma has been handed down as a legacy even to generations born in post Partition India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. Postmemories of Partition trauma through transgenerational transmission have claimed and maimed millions of lives on either side of the truncated Indian subcontinent. Hirsch who coined the term ‘postmemory’ in context of Holocaust identified postmemory as describing the relationship of the second generation to powerful, often traumatic, experiences that preceded their births but that were nevertheless transmitted to them so deeply as to seem to constitute memories in their own right. On a similar trajectory, generations born after 1947 continue to be claimed by postmemory of Partition which has often been defined as the Holocaust of the Indian subcontinent.



Complicating the post partition discourse even further has been the rising tide of communal hostilities within India as well as instances of cross border skirmishes and wars between India and Pakistan. The decade of the 1990's witnessed the demolition of Babri Masjid Mosque and an upsurge of communal riots across the country. The rath yatras by the Hindutva RSS demanding that Ram temple be built on the contentious Ram Janambhoomi Sthal egged on the communal angst which found expression in the insidious Godhra Riots of 2002. Besides these (just to mention a few) instances, the escalation of cross border engagements evidently testify to the Girardian concept of ritual reenactment of violence and scapegoating which eventually mimics Partition. Such has been the impact of these tensions that postcolonial India has gradually witnessed a transition from Nehruvian secularism towards extremism; in fact the language of secularism has lost its neutrality. Amongst a host of factors responsible for this dystopia one definitely is a lack of cathartic resolution.

Several factors can be cited for inadequate mourning in the context of Partition of Indian subcontinent and hence transgenerational transmission of trauma. One major factor was that the majority of partition victim's were unable (either because of the tremendous shock or because of explicit desire to curb undesirable reminders of Partition) to express and thereby attempt at cathartic resolution of trauma. Such survivors, perpetrators, victims (alike) continued to exist in a state of "psychic amnesia" disallowing for mourning and hence possibility of healing.

Having said that, one cannot also deny that in the immediate aftermath of Partition there was an abundance of discourses on Partition (either literary, oral history or official accounts) describing the victims' loss of home and violence meted out to them. Yet in all these accounts a lot has remained unsaid. Instead of attempting to achieve cathartic redemption through expression and sharing of traumatic experiences, victims preferred to defer the horrific experiences of Partition to the realm of unspeakable. Indeed, almost all



discourses on Partition, whether historiographical, literary or cinematic, or other forms of art display an unbroken motif of denial to express, further accentuated by an inability to articulate (a mode displayed alike by the survivors, perpetrators or the state.)

Further, aggravating the ‘silence’ that punctuates Partition accounts is the *kind* of silence – that is, a lack of first person narratives. Testimony of survivors, especially by women is sparse. Till now, the majority of accounts about the sufferings of women assaulted during Partition are from the male point of view. The testimony of children is glaringly absent. Experiences of the minority community that chose to stay back after Partition in India remains unrecorded. Moreover, there is no ‘public memory’ of Partition in India: No memorials mark any places at the Indo-Pak border where millions of people crossed borders of newly formed nations, no plaque or memorial at any of the sites of the refugee camps, nothing that marks a particular spot as a place where Partition memories are collected. This incomplete mourning has allowed Partition trauma to be transgenerationally transmitted to the next generation which although (outwardly) seems to be temporally insulated from the immediate horror of Partition still lives under the long shadow cast by the arbitrary division. In fact as Bhaskar Sarkar observes that even though much time has lapsed since Partition it still isn’t easy to broach the issue without trepidation, as he comments,

Speaking about 1947 remains a difficult task even after the passage of five decades: the corporeal, material, and psychic losses, the wide- spread sense of betrayal, the overwhelming dislocations – in short, the deep lacerations inflicted on one’s sense of self and community – bring up intense and consuming passions (9).

One reason why this reluctance still holds sway is the fact that the Partition instead of establishing a firm and sweeping break as foolishly envisaged by the arbitrators has instead “spawned a complex web of loyalties and affiliations, transformed existing identities and created new ones, produced a rupture within national history and set a new course for collective destiny (11).”



In this paper, I seek to analyse why cinema in particular has been reluctant to represent the traumatic experience of Partition. As Vinay Lal observes “Barring some other imaginative endeavors over the previous five decades — a couple of films of Ritwik Ghatak, the film *Garam Hawa* ("Hot Wind", director M. S. Sathyu, 1973), the television serial *Tamas* (director Govind Nihalani, 1988), ...the partition appeared to have been avoided rather than confronted (np).” Even a cursory preview reveals an abundance of historiographical accounts drawing primarily from official documents, literary works such as novels, short stories, poetry ( in a lesser degree) autobiographical writings, an spurt of feminist historiography draw on oral testimonies of directly or vicariously victimized women, yet as Sarkar points out, “...all along, and for all practical purposes, visual culture- especially popular cinema – has remained outside the purview of Partition scholarship (18).”

In the decades following Partition very few films were made which explicitly sought to “rend the conformist silence” which it seems was being tacitly endorsed by the state, victims and the perpetrators alike. Apart from a few mainstream Hindi films there is relatively speaking a void in cinema’s efforts to address the trauma of Partition. Nemai Ghosh’s *Chinnamul* and Ritwik Ghatak’s three films *Meghe Dhaka Tara*, *Subarnrekha* and *Komal Gandhar* are a few aesthetic attempts of exceptional merit at representing aspects of post partition trauma. It cannot be denied that visual culture was at a loss when it came to participating in the process of collective mourning. Interestingly, the last decade saw releases of certain sensitive films engaging with the experience of Partition or its aftermath, such as *Pinjar* (2003), *Earth 1947* (1998), *Ramchand Pakistani* (2008) and from across the border *Khamosh Paani* (2003).

While the oeuvre is undeniably sparse it cannot be denied that it is imperative to focus on how cinema has attempted to address the trauma of partition thereby attempting a resolution of trauma, as Sarkar points out yielding cinema as a cathartic tool is also



significant for it helps us to study ways of addressing partition trauma which “are distinct from, say, literature, oral history or truth commission testimonials (19).”

Of all the films made on Partition two films stand apart –M.S. Sathyu’s *Garam Hawa* (1973) and Shyam Benegal’s *Mammo* (1994). While Sathyu’s *Garam Hawa* (1973) “constitutes a category in and of itself (Sarkar 169)” even *Mammo* very sensitively handles the dilemma faced by the minority Muslim community who chose to stay back in India.

These two films apart from the fact that they represent the trauma that partition engendered share another very important aspect; both the films capture the post partition dilemma experienced by the Muslim community (a minority community in a Post-partition India) that either chose to stay back in India (Mirza Salim) or harbored a desire to return (*Mammo*). In doing so these films reveal the conflicts and the challenges that the Muslim community in India, encountered after the arbitrary division. As Radha Kumar observes, “Indian Muslims experienced the Partition dilemma most acutely of all, burdened as they are with a double sense of grief – self-determination for Pakistani Muslims meant the exodus of two-thirds of the Indian Muslim population, and the bulk of the elite, leaving those who stayed behind in a vulnerable position (1160).” These films can be said to mark the emergence of a genre of films within mainstream Hindi cinema which primarily focuses on the Muslim minority of these two, and of these films as Priya Kumar observes, Sathyu’s *Garam Hawa* stands out as a “prototypical text of this genre (180).

Also the two films have to be situated and read in context of the political milieu of the times in which they were made. While *Garam Hawa* situated in the 1970s is against the backdrop of 1969 Gujrat riots and Indo Pak War of 1971, *Mammo* was released a couple of years after the demolition of the Babri Masjid and the Bombay riots of December 1992 – January 1993. The import of these events is evident in the films. The Bombay riots had such a profound impact that the demography of Mumbai became heavily ethnically



polarized. An oblique reference to the riots is evident in *Mammo* while both the films depict India's transition from secularism towards a growing intolerance on religious lines. Yet, interestingly in both films the message conveyed is desirable of solidarity. *Garam Hawa* ends with the iconic Balraj Sahni as Saleem Mirza and young Farooq Sheikh as Sikandar joining the mainstream by rallying with the protesters against unemployment and discrimination and revoking the decision to migrate to Pakistan. While *Mammo* revisits Partition violence it also shows the Muslim woman's desire to return to India, her homeland. For her borders do not hold any sanctity and are just shadow lines.

Besides these two films, Pakistani Urdu film *Ramchand Pakistani* by Mehreen Jabbar represents the trauma of a Hindu Dalit family in Pakistan. Released in 2008 the film represents the crossing of the Pakistan India border in 2002 amidst war-like tensions brewing between the two countries mistakenly or rather more aptly innocently by a child of a Dalit Pakistani Hindu family.

The misfortune of this family stems not from their minority status in Pakistan but rather due to the politics of hate spawned by partition. It is uninhibited this legacy of mistrust which allows a child of eight years to be accused of being a Pakistani informer infiltrating the border as a spy into the Indian territory (in his innocence he has crossed a white line marked by stones close to his village little knowing that he has *transgressed* the border.) The fact that he is a mere child does little to absolve him, for his fault lies in his nationality: he is a Pakistani citizen, (just like *Mammo* is a Pakistani national, is compelled to return to Pakistan irrespective of the fact that her personal and familial affections bound her to India). The three films temporally traverse the decades and in effect encapsulate how the violent legacy of Partition instead of resolving/receding is impending itself more and more on the collective consciousness. Another rationale that brings these three films from temporally and spatially different paradigms is the fate shared by the minority community. The Muslims in India and the Hindu Dalit family in Pakistan are twice born victims, one



on account of Partition throes and two because of their minority status. The protagonists in *Mammo* and *Ramchand Pakistani* fare even worse because their identities in the social/cultural/ethnic hierarchy are even more delicately structured. While *Mammo* is a woman *Ramchand* is a Dalit. Thus, three films attend to a host of gendered, ethnic, cartographic, post partition anxieties.

While *Garam Hawa* encapsulates the experience of a Muslim family in the immediate aftermath of Partition, *Mammo* captures the trauma of Mehmooda Begum, a widow who has to resort to illegal means to continue to stay with her family in what had been her own homeland before Partition. Her husband's decision to move to Pakistan becomes her destiny. Indeed, *Mammo*'s tragic state after the demise of her husband illustrates the dilemma of those who had little to say in deciding political destiny at national or local level.

*Mammo* a great human document is a sensitive portrayal of the marginalization of the female subject at multiple levels - a woman, a Muslim woman, a childless Muslim woman, a childless widowed Muslim woman, and a Pakistani woman with an expired visa in what is now an estranged homeland.

In this film Benegal approaches Partition differently, that is instead of evoking the grotesqueness of Partition violence he captures the prolonged impact of Partition upon the lives of those who survived its immediate horror. As Sangeeta Datta writes, "Benegal moves from the immediate history of violence to a tragic tale of an old woman trying to return to her land (182)." The film "...explores the ways in which Partition impinges upon the present of the subcontinent ...it explicitly indicts the coercive violence of the postcolonial Indian state from a subaltern subject – position (Kumar 212)." Unlike several films made on partition such as *Train to Pakistan*, *Earth 1947*, *Pinjar* which largely situate the action during Partition or in its immediate aftermath, *Mammo* through voyeuristic



reference to *Garam Hawa* coupled with Mammo's reminiscing of the horrific days of Partition in presence of Riyaaz not only captures the pathos partition continues to generate even decades later, but more significantly shows how "postmemory" informs and reconstitutes the experiential world of the second generation. Thus, though Riyaaz is born in post partition India he still partakes of the Partition experience, through countertransference, that is via "postmemory". Marianne Hirsch has defined postmemory as

... a powerful form of memory precisely because its connection to its object or source is mediated not through recollection but through projection, investment, and creation-- often based on silence rather than speech, on the invisible rather than the visible, shaped by monumental traumatic events that resist understanding and integration (22).

Mammo, thus functions as a conduit through whom Riyaaz experiences the horror of Partition. The voyeuristic reference to the film *Garam Hawa* is extremely significant for the scene where Mirza's family is forced to evict their ancestral haveli and the consequent pathos of grandmother's futile defiance on one hand preempts Mammo's eventual coerced eviction, and on a deeper level Mirza's and Mammo's predicament configures the trauma that millions of displaced refugees had to suffer and are still facing as a consequence of Partition, as .....says, "...the film uncovers partition history's disfiguring and grotesque invasion of the minor home (Daiya 134)." The films reflect on how the state of exile constitutes one of the most enduring trauma of Partition, as Claude Markovits observes,

Above and beyond the massacres and terrible physical and psychic pain suffered by many of the survivors,...the major legacy of partition was the identity based-rift which came about in the lives of millions of individuals suddenly torn from their familiar frame of life, their lands, ... and their ancestral homes in the name of an utterly abstract principle: the principle of nationality which had only limited significance for them...(56).

Besides, representing the dilemma of a refugee, Benegal through an intricately developed and sensitive rendering of the relationship between a childless but effervescent Mammo





and Riyaaz captures the plight of a Muslim woman caught in the web of familial, gender and national politics.

Mammo was born in an undivided India, in Panipat, is married in India but is compelled to settle in Lahore after partition following her husband's decision to migrate. Her childless and widowed status leaves her vulnerable and dependent on her husband's callous relatives who spare no time in throwing her out of their home. Hapless and homesick she returns to her homeland – 'India' with a desire to spend her last days in peace with her sister Fayyazi and her grandson Riyaaz. However, the 1947 division does not give credence to the fact that she was born in Panipat India, or that she desires to stay in the land of her birth; rather what is relevant is the choice that her husband had made on her behalf when he decided to migrate to Pakistan after the division. Now her identity has been *redefined* – she is a Pakistani national entitled to live in India for a period of three months extendable by a few weeks.

Mammo's dependence on adolescent Riyaaz for her visits to the visa office to persuade the inspector to extend her visa beyond the stipulated time highlights her vulnerability as a widowed woman in a patriarchal set up. The film raises issues about her plight – marginalized several times over on account of her religion, gender and nationality – as a Muslim in a Hindu dominated yet secular India, her being childless, a widow and above all a Pakistani National in India. The film is loaded with subtle nuances all evoking a deep sense of loss and nostalgia – the reference to the Panipat Haveli where the three sisters had spent their childhood and which eventually becomes a source of discord between them is reminiscent of the political differences that materialized into the division of the nations with a shared legacy of memories of a relatively happier past. In the opening scene an adult Riyaaz is rudely awakened by a nightmare in which he sees his Mammo nani being forced into a train bound for Pakistan. The trauma that Riyaaz experienced as a child when Mammo was forced to leave India for Pakistan has stayed within him even years later



establishing that partition generated such intense repercussions that they have ruptured the social fabric beyond repair.

The most significant and ironical scene in the entire film is the last scene when Mammo after years surprisingly returns. Mammo returns - never to return to Pakistan for she has declared herself as dead. She chooses to obliterate her identity as a Pakistani national who is allowed to stay in India only for twenty five days on a visitor's visa to be followed by forced evacuation by getting her false death certificate made. According to Kumar,

The movie closes with a radical disruption of state authority through a manifest act of subaltern agency. In a triumphant rejection of the borderlines imposed by the two states, Mammo forges her own death certificate and submits it to the Pakistani and Indian authorities...Mammo's story then embodies a very corporeal act of resistance to the cartographies of Partition; she affirms her right to *be* in India. By inserting her very body into the place that she calls home, she disallows the state authority to interpellate her as a citizen-subject and to define her identity solely in national terms, thus wresting for herself the power to affirm her own embodied subjectivity (Kumar 214).

The film testifies to how the enduring inheritance of Partition tries to ensure that survivors like Mammo will not be allowed to transgress the boundaries that have been demarcated for them, at least not within the rationale of nations and states. But Mammo reasserts her subjectivity by repudiating the state-decreed frontiers that attempt to separate her from her home and family. Left with little choice, Mammo, "...rendered subaltern by Partition and an oppressive patriarchal society in modern nation state ... must effectively disavow the abstract promise of both Pakistan and Indian citizenship in order to survive Partition and its new nationalities (Daiya 135)."

Benegal lays bare "... Mammo's gendered, financial and familial exploitation articulated within the modern violence of South Asia's ethnicized citizenship's, turns her into a liminal



subject shuttling between India and Pakistan, disallowed the belongings desired by her (Daiya 134).”

While *Mammo* “...depicts a situated and manifest act of resistance to the geographical and political divisions created by Partition...(Kumar 201)” M. S. Sathyu's *Garam Hawa*, a remarkable statement of the early 1970s, sensitively portrays “the collective insanity, the uprooting, the meaninglessness of existence, and the fear-laden searches for new meaning "elsewhere" that became the lot of so many people in the aftermath of Partition (Pandey 23).” “*Garam Hawa* is as much a film about Partition refugees and their relation to minoritized Muslim citizens in middle class Agra, as it is a story of those who refused to become refugees (Daiya 143).”

*Garam Hawa* stands apart by the virtue of its simplistic yet intense portrayal of the pathos of the Muslim community that chose to stay back in India. What had been the homeland of countless Muslims for centuries was rendered an alien homeland by one arbitrary drawn line. Through a multiplicity of perspectives *Garam Hawa*, reflects the agony Partition engendered – the bewilderment of the old grandmother unable to comprehend how and why she is forced to evict her ‘home’, the stoic attitude of Mirza Saleem, the vulnerability of Amna, and the defiance of the young generation against political forces inclined towards disruption of peace in a postcolonial India through the persona of Sikander Mirza. The film sensitively captures the changing social milieu, the breach of trust in friendships that Partition engendered. The absurdity of dividing the subcontinent is captured in the innocent query of the child who wonders if kites can fly in the Pakistani sky? The decline in the family’s fortunes, the struggle, the loss of prestige, the loss of ‘home’ in their own homeland are tropes through which Sathyu subtly delineates the unfavorable conditions towards the Muslim community in a post partition India. This process of ‘othering’ is consistently displayed through the patriarch’s struggle in finding funds to continue the



production in his shoe factory, through Sikander Mirza's struggle in finding a job, heightened by the slights extended continuously by the Hindu community.

One of the most intense moments in the film is the forced eviction of the family from their ancestral home. The grandmother's attempt to hide herself so as to avoid leaving her 'home' echoes the trauma of millions, forcibly estranged from their homes. The sense of 'exile' experienced by the grandmother is heightened through her choice of the room in the new house from where she could capture a glimpse of her 'home'. That she breathes her last in her 'home' evoke the intense sense of loss suffered by millions who were ruthlessly forced to leave their hearth due to the compelling circumstances generated by the violent division. The moral anguish experienced by millions is best expressed in this film. The humiliation suffered by the patriarch of the family in finding a house on rent after his ancestral home is given to displaced Hindus from Pakistan is heartrending. Mirza repeatedly faces slurs on account of his being a Muslim staying back in India. He is charged with the offence of being a traitor, and even kept in confinement for having sent a detailed layout of his 'haveli' to his brother in Pakistan, what had been a issue of family inheritance assumes proportions of national security being put to stake and the Haveli's layout plan amounts to confidential information being leaked to the 'enemy' state. The decline in his fortune and reputation indicates the distrust that was spawned between the two communities in the post partition scenario. Though the family of Salim 'feels totally 'Indian' ...' they are forced to face such challenges that towards the end even Salim is coerced into deciding to leave for Pakistan. As Thorval says *Garam Hawa* remains "The most thoughtful Indian film on one hand about the anxiety and the 'trauma of minorities' and on the other, about Independent India's ability...to infuse confidence into her Muslim subjects (Thoraval 373)." The bank refuses overdraft, orders for shoes are cancelled, a near riot occurs when the family tonga upsets a fruit cart in the Hindu Mohalla.



Although apparently *Garam Hawa* through its last scene where Mirza revokes his decision to migrate to Pakistan and joins along with Sikander and the protesters demanding equality of rights speaks of the possibility of a positive future, a close reading of the film reveals the falsity of the promise. The procession demanding equanimity of social rights is a procession of communist party, in itself a minority in mainstream Indian political scenario. The last dialogue of Salim Mirza – “ I cannot live alone any more” challenges his “minoritization as ethnicized citizen. Salim Mirza chooses to stay in India and become a resisting, political subject (Daiya 143).”

Thus it cannot be contested that “*Garam Hawa* remains a remarkable cinematic attempt at what Adorno called “coming to terms with the past” –in unveiling the objective conditions that produced the religious strife and that continue to inscribe a post-Partition Muslim-Indian subjectivity (Sarkar 199).”

Further the anxiety expressed in this film is enhanced in *Mammo* where Mammo as a Pakistani Muslim can continue to stay on in India only through a self imposed effacement of her identity. She has to become *invisible* to remain in India, she is compelled to chose a exile within the borders of her ‘home’ to be in the country of her birth.

Thus while *Garam Hawa* is about the pressure on the Muslim community to leave India - it portrayed the struggle for employment and equal opportunity for those Muslims who decided to stay back, Mammo “redefines the notion of home. For Mammo, her home is where her sister is but she is not allowed to stay. The film also questions the notion of nationality (Bhaskar np). Together these two films provide a succinct appraisal of the crisis of identity, the dilemma faced by the Muslim community in India in the context of post partition scenario. To quote the words of Sunil Sethi, in the *Junior Statesmen* dated October 23, 1973,



The film remains one of the most sensitive and evocative studies without the slightest contrivance of a minority group in India...It is the story simply of what a breaking up of a nation does; not only to human relationships but to individuals themselves, who begin to crumble under the obtuse pressures as things around them begin to fall apart (<http://www.upperstall.com/films/garamhawa.html>)

*Ramchand Pakistani*, temporally situates itself in the immediate aftermath of Kargil war – the latest of a series of cross border engagements in post partition context, each of these wars and continuous cross border hostility question and challenge the very efficacy of borders; instead of containing hostilities these wars serve as ‘reenactments’ where the hostility engendered by Partition is the dominant trope. They conform that Partition did not end, rather initiated an era of communal and territorial hostility. According to Sankaran Krishna, India is a child of Partition that has “... cartographic anxiety inscribed into its very genetic code. In the years since, history can be (and often is) read as a series of encounters with this anxiety...(Sankaran 507)”. A similar argument has been extensively developed by Aamir R. Mufti who in his work, *Enlightenment in the Colony: The Jewish Question and the Crisis of Postcolonial Culture* says that Muslims as minority community in India are like Jews in Europe, victims of “social exclusion” and are facing a crisis of Muslim identity in Modern India. He also goes on to point that with the demolition of the Babri Masjid Mosque, India has in a postcolonial scenario moved from being secular to more communalistic in its orientation. One of the fallout of the demolition of Babri Masjid mosque (besides inciting similar instances of razing down of temple edifices across the border) has been an enhancement of communal riots, the most horrifying of it being the Godhra riots which almost made one ponder, “as if the nation-state boundaries implemented in 1947 had ceased to exist. Once again communities all across the subcontinent seemed to be communicating with one another in the only language permitted by the postcolonial states, that of collective violence—violence now becoming the only act of communication that could not be interdicted at the borders of the nation-state (Mufti 1)”



The film reveals the absurd proportions this cross border hostility tends to cultivate for it allows a child of seven years to be taken as a Pakistani spy and be kept in a jail meant for adult crime offenders for over a period of five to six years. Ramchand's fault lay in his inability to discern the *border* between Pakistan and India demarcated by a series of roughly strewn white stones at the very edge of his village, where, in the carefree ways of the child, he used to play with abandon. At being roughly frisked and with his catapult and whistle being seized by the Indian army men posted on the border to prevent Pakistani infiltrators from breaching the line of control, Ramchanda grows desperate at the loss of his toys, in his innocence little does realize that these toys are being seen as possible threat to the national security. As one of the army men sarcastically comments "Haathiyar laaya hai saath mein, Kashmir azad kareyga," even though the army men realize the ridiculousness of presuming that a child could be a spy the spirit of mutual hatred and mistrust does not allow room for any exhibition of humanitarian concern and the child is not allowed to walk back into his village territory which he had so casually violated. His father who sees the child unknowingly walking towards the border runs after him to prevent him from transgressing the border but is too late, his attempts to convince the army men of the child's innocence and his own are futile and both father and son are sent to jail. The rest of the film represents the trauma being experienced (on either side of the border) by Ramchand's mother who refuses to believe as the village folks do that Ramchand and his father have crossed the border and like others before them would never return alive and the sufferings of the father and son who live and die in the hope of being released. Ramchand's exposure in the jails to untouchability, sexual exploitation and other vices rob the child of his innocence while both father and son waste away in the jail for several years. Several years later Ramchand is released and goes back to Pakistan to his village. There he finds his mother burdened by age and hardships engaged in her fight against her community who regarded her vigil for her husband and son's return to their hearth as a futile one. The scene is extremely poignant for the mother whose last memory of Ramchand is of an eight year old child who petulantly clamors for a full cup of tea and when denied leaves in a huff



(only to return after five or six years) is unable to relate the adolescent Ramchand as her own son. Eventually Ramchand's father is also released and the family is reunited, however the ordeal endured by them can never be compensated. The film subtly comments on the continuing legacy of Partition which manifests itself in the daily lives of citizens on both sides of the border redefining their lives forever.

Thus, these three films illustrate the various ways in which Partition's traumatic legacy continues to manifest itself; how it through a process of "othering" continues to redefine the identity of those who chose to stay back and were rendered refugees in their own homeland by a politically determined decree. In fact, *Mammo* and *Ramchand Pakistani* comments on how Partition continues to hold sway over the next generation as well as the second generation on either side of the border, a border apparently drawn to insulate one nation from the "other" but which instead serves to bound the two nations in a state of perpetual conflict. Thus, while historiographical and official discourses tend to project Partition as an event that began and ended in 1947, these films are testimony to the fact that Partition "...is a *process* rather than an event with a clear beginning and end. Partition has not ended as its memory "haunts" people, creates, reproduces and helps to obliterate identities. Besides, and importantly, Partition memory is re-enacted again and again (Sinha-Kerkhoff np)."

#### Works cited

- Bhaskar, Ira "Film makers refused to portray partition" *Indian Cinema News*.  
[http://movies.monstersandcritics.com/indiancinema/news/article\\_1216957.php/](http://movies.monstersandcritics.com/indiancinema/news/article_1216957.php/)
- Daiya Kavita, *Violent Belongings: Partition, Gender and National Culture in India*(Temple University Press, 2008) 143.
- Datta, Sangeeta. *Shyam Benegal*. Roli Books. 2002. New Delhi p. 182
- Hirsch, Marianne, *Family Frames, Photography, Narrative and Postmemory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997) 22.
- Krishna Sankaran, "Cartographic Anxiety: Mapping the Body Politic in India," *Alternatives* 19 (1994) : 507





**CAESURAE: POETICS OF CULTURAL TRANSLATION VOL2: 1, (ISSN 2454 -9495)  
SPECIAL ISSUE, JANUARY, 2017**

- Kumar Priya. "Testimonies of Loss and Memory Partition and the Haunting of a Nation"  
*Interventions* Volume1, Issue 2 1999, p 214.
- *Limiting Secularism: the ethics of coexistence in Indian literature and film* University of  
Minnesota Press, 2008. 180
- Kumar, Radha, "A Messy History and its many "Messy" Texts: An Essay on Partition (India,  
1947) and its Narratives" *Literature Compass* Volume 3, Issue 5 1160- 1185
- Markovits, Claude, "The Partition of India" *Divided countries, Separated Cities The Modern  
Legacy of Partition* ed. Deschaume and Ivekovic (New Delhi: Oxford University Press)  
56.
- Lal, Vinay. *Partitioned Selves, Partitioned Pasts: A Commentary on Ashis Nandy's Death of an  
Empire* <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/southasia/History/Independent/Partitionselves.html>
- Mufti, Aamir R., "*Enlightenment in the Colony: The Jewish Question and the Crisis of  
Postcolonial Culture*" Princeton University Press 2007.
- Pandey, Gyanendra, *Routine Violence: Nations, Fragments, Histories* Stanford University Press  
2005 p 23
- Sarkar, Bhaskar, *Mourning the Nation Indian Cinema in the Wake of Partition*. Orient Black  
Swan, New Delhi 2010 Page 9
- Sinha-Kerkhoff, Kathinka, "The Dangers of Memory and Endangered Memory." 12/12/08  
<http://www.sephis.org/pdf/kathinka.pdf>
- Thoraval, Yves. *The Cinemas of India* Macmillan India Limited 2000 New Delhi. P 373

**Bionote**

Dr.Kamayani Kumar is Assistant Professor, Department of English Aryabhata College,  
University of Delhi. She has worked extensively on Partition narratives and is currently editing a  
volume on Child and Trauma, and authoring a book on Partition.