

Three Perspectives on Partition

A Hindu, Muslim and Western View on the Decolonization of India and
Founding of Pakistan

Felix Verhagen
Political Science Department



Radboud University Nijmegen

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Master of Science

Nijmegen, 2017

We want to be a single People of brethren
Never to part in danger nor distress
We want to be free, as our fathers were
And rather die than live in slavery
We want to trust in the one highest God
And never be afraid of human power

The Rütlichschwur (1291 A.D.)

Abstract

Postcolonialism assumes that knowledge is not simply a mirror which represents the real, but is rather a potent force that shapes our reality. This assumption informs this thesis by comparing historic books on the decolonization of India from a Hindu, Muslim and Western perspective. The discourse of their works are compared within a deconstructive discourse framework and related to postcolonial theories concerning: Eurocentrism, Orientalism, Occidentalism, Violence and Psychoanalysis. The discourse of the authors shows great diversity on the decolonization of India and founding of Pakistan. The authors deviate in their descriptions on the years preceding independence, the transfer of power in 1947 and the consequences of decolonization. The Western authors (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) pay most attention to the year 1947; just before the transfer of power, whereas the Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) analyzes British-Indian relations pre-1947 and the Muslim author (Abid, 2013) devotes much discourse on the consequences of independence. Secondly, the postcolonial literature concerning Eurocentrism and Orientalism are confirmed in the Western book. Their view contrasts with the Hindu and Muslim discourse on colonialism which is imbued with occidental generalizations. Furthermore, the authors differ in their books on descriptions of violence. The Western authors portray violence during- and after decolonization as barbaric, whereas the subaltern authors conclude that violence broke out as emancipatory acts to counter British colonial rule.

Keywords: Decolonization, Eurocentrism, India, Occidentalism, Orientalism, Pakistan, Postcolonialism, Psychoanalysis, Violence

Contents

List of Abbreviations	8
1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical Framework	6
2.1 An Introduction to Postcolonialism	6
2.2 Eurocentrism.....	11
2.3 Orientalism	12
2.4 Occidentalism	18
2.5 Violence.....	20
2.5.1 Decolonization	21
2.5.2 Colonialism and Psychoanalysis.....	24
2.6 Postcoloniality	29
3. Method	31
3.1 Expectations.....	31
3.2 Background Information on the Authors and the Books	32
3.3 Deconstructive Discourse Analysis	35
4. A Hindu, Muslim and Western Perspective on the Decolonization of India	39
4.1 Structure of Analysis	39
4.2 Period 1 - Discourse Comparison of Western, Muslim and Hindu books	41
4.3 Period 1 - Discourse in Relationship to Postcolonial theory	43
4.4 Period 2 - Discourse Comparison of Western, Muslim and Hindu books	51
4.5 Period 2 - Discourse in Relationship to Postcolonial theory	53
4.6 Period 3 - Discourse Comparison of Western, Muslim and Hindu books	57
4.7 Period 3 - Discourse in Relationship to Postcolonial theory	58
5. Conclusion.....	63
Reference list.....	67
Appendix 1 - Background Information till the Appointment of Viceroy Mountbatten	72
Discourse Western book	72
Discourse Muslim book	77
Discourse Hindu book.....	79
Appendix 2 - Appointment Mountbatten till Independence Day of India.....	84
Discourse Western book	84
Discourse Muslim book	90
Discourse Hindu book.....	94
Appendix 3 - Discourse of the Books after India's Independence Day	97
Discourse Western book	97
Discourse Muslim book	102
Discourse Hindu book.....	108

List of Abbreviations

C.M.P.	Cabinet Mission Plan
C.R.O.	Commonwealth Relations Office
C.W.	Commonwealth
E.I.C.	East India Company
E.U.	European Union
F.L.N.	Front de Libération Nationale
G-G	Governor General
H.M.S.	Her Majesty's Ship
I.C.S.	Indian Civil Service
I.N.A.	Indian National Army
I.R.T.	International Relations Theory
N.W.F.P.	North-West Frontier Province
N.Y.T.	New York Times
P.M.	Prime Minister
R.I.N.	Royal Indian Navy
R.S.S.	Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh
S.E.A.C	South East Asian Commander
U.K.	United Kingdom
U.N.	United Nations
U.P.	Uttar Pradesh
U.S.	United States
U.S.S.R.	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
W.W.	World War

1. Introduction

Authors of Western historiography refer to the decolonization of India and the creation of Pakistan in 1947 with the term 'partition'. This contrasts with non-Western authors of historiography who claim that 'partition' relates to the vivisection of the Punjab and Bengal regions in Northern India. Both regions were included with four other provinces to form the new state Pakistan. The different interpretations of the word 'partition' shows that historic discourse is produced in a specific political, social and historical context. At the same time, shapes our understanding of the past our interpretations of present and possible future. Founder of the postcolonial discipline Edward Said claims: "there is no way in which the past can be quarantined from the present" (Said, 1993: 2).

This thesis is related to the subject of historiography by focusing on the causality of three authors on the decolonization of India and the founding of Pakistan in 1947. A Hindu, Muslim and Western perspective will be compared on this tumultuous period in India's history. The perspectives of these authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000, Lapierre & Collins, 1975) are chosen because all three parties were involved in the transfer of power. The British governed the state of India for 300 years. After World War II (WW II), the new elected Labour Prime Minister, Clement Attlee initiated the withdrawal of British overseas empire in India. The question remained how the state would be transferred to the Indian government. Multiple plans were written by the British on how the independent state of India would be governed. In the end, the British, Indian and Muslim party leaders found a compromise. The Northern Muslim provinces would secede together with a partition of Punjab and Bengal districts in an independent Muslim state called Pakistan. The consequences of this decision were devastating. Hindus and Sikhs were forced to flee to their 'mother country' and conversely, Muslims were driven out India to the new Muslim state. More than a million people were killed, and twelve million people were displaced in the process of partition (Butalia, 2000). Hence, the Muslim, Hindu, and British were all involved in the process of partition. They all have their story to tell on this historic period. Can the British be blamed for their divide and rule politics? Did Muslim party leader Jinnah force partition or not? Was British power already eroding in India after WW II and partition a legacy saving tool? Did the Indian party elite neglect cooperation for a united India? Or was the plan for partition an Anglo-Hindu pact ratified by viceroy Mountbatten and Indian

leader Jawaharlal Nehru? The common denominator of these questions results in the following research question:

How is the decolonization of India and founding of Pakistan described in historic books from Western, Muslim and Hindu perspective?

The Western book: *Freedom at Midnight* is written by Dominique Lapierre and Larry Collins in 1975. Their book has been widely published in predominantly Western countries. The book has been hailed for its accurate and detailed description, but also criticized for its overdependence on interviews with the last viceroy Louis Mountbatten and its overtly romanticized picture of British colonial rule in India. The second book is written by Muslim author Massarrat Abid. She is the director of the Pakistan Study Center at the University of Punjab in Lahore, Pakistan. Abid wrote several academic articles on partition, Pakistan – India relations, foreign policy strategy and on the subject of communalism in the region. In 2013, Abid wrote the book *Britain, India & Pakistan: Partition and After, 1947-1951* which will be used for this thesis. The third book is written by Hindu author Sucheta Mahajan. She works as a professor at the center of historical studies of Jawaharlal Nehru University in New Delhi. Mahajan wrote *Independence and Partition: The Erosion of Colonial Power* in 2000 and claims that her empirical findings are based on rigorous examination of primary sources to give a nuanced and critical perspective on India's decolonization.

The decolonization of India is related to the academic discipline of postcolonialism. This discipline examines the age of colonialism and its influence on our contemporary world. Four postcolonial fields are of interest to answer this study's research question and will be further described in the theoretical framework. First is the subject of Eurocentrism. Chakrabarty (2009) explains how the West remains the sovereign theoretical subject of historiography in- and outside Europe. The West approaches history as a transition narrative of modernization with attention to development and economic growth (Sylvester, 1999). Chakrabarty (1998) argues that this contributes to a dichotomy of pronouncing places as 'not yet' versus 'now'. The categorization and stereotyping of differences between the West and East is the second field of interest of this thesis. Edward Said (1978) describes how the West created a myth outside its realm where people were essentialized as: irrational, uncivilized and barbaric. He explains how the West represented their identities from ancient Greece till our modern-day societies. Conversely, the East has stereotyped the West by referring to it as a: "machine civilization,

coldly rationalist mechanical and without soul” (Buruma & Margalit, 2004: 32). The essentialization of Western identities is called Occidentalism. Both images will be used to compare the West and non – Western authors on the decolonization of India. The third field of interest concerns the concept of violence by analyzing the historical process of decolonization as described by Frantz Fanon (1961), who claims national liberation is always a violent phenomenon. Furthermore, this study will focus on the psycho-analytic effects of colonization on the identity of the colonized (Fanon, 1951) and describe how the colonized subject can regain recognition through emancipatory acts of symbolic violence. Last, is the topic of postcoloniality. This concept refers to the idea that colonialism does not stop after national liberation. The independent state will become economically dependent to the former colonizer and suffer from unequal trade relations.

After analysis of the postcolonial literature, I will explain how the three books will be compared in the Method chapter of this thesis. The discourse analysis will be related to the concept of deconstruction described by French post-structural scholar Jacques Derrida. Deconstruction can be viewed as a method to discover dominant and immanent structures in texts. Derrida argues that immanence can be overcome through a process of re-inscription. This means that the subverted is re-inscribed and becomes dominant. Deconstructive discourse analysis in this thesis will focus on the first part of Derrida’s concept. Hence, I seek to view the relationship between power and language and demonstrate where certain events in the historic discourse on India’s decolonization are privileged at the expense of others. Deconstruction is used as a method to find out where the authors elaborate extensively on certain events, limit their descriptions on other or elicit them all together. Furthermore, when certain events are described, it is a key question in this thesis to find out how it is interpreted by the authors. This question relates to the assumptions of postcolonial theory. The second step in this thesis involves how the transfer of power from Hindu, Muslim and Western perspective relates to the postcolonial theories on Eurocentrism (Chakrabarty, 2009), Orientalism, (Said, 1978), Occidentalism (Buruma & Margalit, 2004) the concept of violence (Fanon, 1961), Psychoanalysis (Fanon, 1951) and Postcoloniality. The theories will be addressed in a framework of three tensions. The tensions will involve the subjects of European predominance in historic discourses versus subaltern explanations. Second, stereotypizations and generalizations of the West on the East – otherwise referred to as Orient – and vice versa, and third, whether violence in the three books can be described as either barbaric or emancipatory.

Societal relevance

In February 2017, the movie *Viceroy's House* was released in Dutch cinemas. The movie describes how the last viceroy of India, Louis Mountbatten, was tasked to oversee the transition of power between the British and Indians before independence. The directors' main inspiration for *Viceroy's House* was based on the book studied in this thesis; *Freedom at Midnight* (1975). The centerpiece of the work is the point of view of viceroy Mountbatten on India's future. The attention to India's decolonization in this movie, makes the research question of this thesis relevant for two reasons. First, there is societal attention to the history of India, and in this case, the period of decolonization and independence. The movie is reviewed in Dutch newspapers (de Volkskrant, NRC) where it was criticized for its overtly romanticized picture of British rule in India. The movie, its reviews and debate concerning India's history make it a socially relevant subject. Secondly, although Dutch newspapers review this movie and criticize it, the large majority of people in society watch the movie, accept it as 'the truth' without further analysis. From a postcolonial perspective this is disturbing. Said (1978) claims in his book *Orientalism* (1978) that already in the 18th century, Western scholars would inherit material of the past and modernize it uncritically, repeat it and propagate it as truth. Said (1978) wishes to counter this systematic accumulation of knowledge. This thesis makes a small, but from a postcolonial perspective, important contribution in this endeavor. The study gives voice to perspectives of authors outside the West. The Hindu and Muslim authors have included sources of small Indian publishers (Mahajan, 2000) or sources published in Pakistan (Abid, 2013) in their historic books to give their account on India's decolonization. In a society which insufficiently addresses its colonial heritage in books or canon (Oostindie, 2008), it remains of societal importance to foster the narratives of the people who experienced, or who were closely involved with colonialism.

Scientific relevance

In 2003, postcolonial scholar Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak wrote a book on the detriment of comparative literature, area studies and ethnic studies called *Death of a Discipline*. Spivak (2003) argues that the discipline of humanities and social science should supplement each other. Nowadays, the field is market driven and culturally dominated by the West. She challenges this reality and envisages a "redefined area of studies as a deterritorialized discipline that not only must always cross borders" (2003: 16) between the so called 'North' and 'South'. The grotesque words of Spivak cannot be fulfilled with the help of one thesis, but this study is still a small contribution to de-territorialize the North South division on comparative literature and area studies.

Secondly, this thesis contributes to postcolonialism in relationship to International Relations Theory. Acharya and Buzan (2007) wrote a book and critical article with the name *Why is there no non-Western international relations theory?* The scholars search for answers on the absence of Non-Western IR theories. They argue that scholars in the West have gained a hegemonic status on ideas and concepts. The dominant status of Western concepts precludes the voices and theories written outside the West. Acharya & Buzan (2007) argue that Western dominance in IR theory is based on “ideational and perceptual forces which fuel, in varying mixtures, both Gramscian hegemonies, and ethnocentrism and the politics of exclusion” (Acharya and Buzan, 2007: 288). When focusing on India’s IR theories, Behera (in Acharya and Buzan, 2010) concludes that India has not been able to challenge Western IR theories. They still set out the rules of the game. The views of India remain on the margins of the discipline. Their ideas have been mostly de-legitimized as a source of knowledge for the IR discipline of political science. Hence, this thesis will focus on a discipline – postcolonialism – which is marginalized in the IRT academic discourse compared to the realist and liberal school, but from a critical perspective should deserve a whole lot more attention. This thesis will give the discipline its deserved attention.

Structure of the thesis

The next chapter sets out a theoretical framework concerning postcolonialism. Chapter three on methodology, will start by describing expectations that can be derived from the postcolonial literature. The chapter will give background information about the authors and is concluded with Jacque Derrida’s concept of deconstruction as a method to compare the discourse of the Hindu, Muslim and Western books. Chapter four starts by presenting the structure of analysis; how the books are compared within a discourse framework. Thereafter, the results of the discourse comparison will be discussed. The chapter is finished by relating the discourse of the Hindu, Muslim and Western books to the four fields of postcolonial theory. The answer to my research question is given in the concluding chapter, summarizing the outcomes, discussing the limitations of this study and highlighting the need for further research on this subject.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 An Introduction to Postcolonialism

Postcolonialism or postcolonial theory is a contested term in academia. Biswas (2016) claims that “the crucial point of departure for the body of scholarship loosely categorized as postcolonial theory is to foreground the history and politics of colonialism in making sense of our present social reality” (Biswas, 2016: 221). Colonialism can be described as the domination and exploitation of predominantly European power in non-western territories. The century of European colonialism climaxed from the beginning from 1815 to 1914. “When European direct colonial dominion expanded from about 35 percent of the earth’s surface to about 85% of it” (Said, 1978: 41). Said argues that at the end of the 19th century “scarcely a corner of life was untouched by the facts of empire” (Said, 1994: 6). European power enriched themselves, looted the resources from colonial lands, inflicted industrial damage and psychological trauma on colonial cultural minds and identities. The discipline of postcolonialism looks how the age of colonial rule still affects our contemporary world. Postcolonial scholars critically debate the impact of colonization on nation states and whether the former colonized still endure acts of neocolonialism now that states have been granted formal independence. The discipline has also been criticized for its lack of coherence. Philip Darby (1998) accuses postcolonialism as “free floating and open-ended in a way that enables a discounting or passing over of established disciplines of thought” (Darby, 1998: 217). Moreover, Young (1998) argues that “strictly speaking there is no such thing as postcolonial theory – rather there are shared political perceptions and agenda which employ an eclectic range of theories” (Young, 1998: 5). Young claims that you cannot see postcolonialism as a disciplinary field or theory, but that it involves a wide range political project which is to refashion the world from below, counter Western knowledge, imperialism, neocolonialism, emerging markets and so forth. Others (Grovoqui, Attridge, 2013, 2005) claim that postcolonialism aspires to “a multiplicity of perspectives, traditions and approaches to questions of identity, culture and power” (Grovoqui, 2013: 248). These perspectives are based on “a trinity of theorists central to the field’s success in the academic world” (Attridge, 2005: 48) which has caused an explosion of ‘the postcolonial field’ in North America of the 1990s. Homib Bhabha (1994), Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1988) and Edward Said (1978) are seen as the backbone of the discipline, whereas the latter is also referred to as the founder of the discipline by the publishing of his book *Orientalism* in 1978.

In the book *Orientalism* (Said, 1978) describes how an imagined duality between the civilized West and the alien, barbaric East developed from ancient Greece up till our modern day, secularized societies. Said (1978) cites from scholarly work, historic books, literature, movies and ancient plays to substantiate this duality which he refers to as: Orientalism (1978). His work lays bare the crucial relationship between power and language. The West created a mythical space and described the Orient as a place of overtly emotional, irrational, uncivilized, barbaric people which stood in sharp contrast to the civilized, rational, self-controlled, democratic and progressive West. These descriptions were presented in an unchallenged coherence both in- and outside academia around the 19th century and not only served as an instrument of cultural domination but also legitimized Western colonialism as a ‘mission civilisatrice’. Western colonizers such as the British, French and Dutch justified colonialism in the Orient as a civilizing mission. Said (1978) ends his book on how Orientalism still affects our societies today and assesses how the accumulation of generalized knowledge on the Orient can be countered. Said’s profound work will be more elaborately discussed in the following section of this theoretical framework.

The multiplicity of perspectives of postcolonial theory, incorporates views of poststructural scholars. The poststructural theories of Foucault and Derrida contribute to postcolonialism for analyzing the relationship between language and power. These scholars develop their theories from an epistemological concern that knowledge is not simply a mirror which represents the real, but is rather a potent force which shapes what is out there (Seth, 2013). The poststructural perspectives are hard to reconcile with the foundationalist approaches to history mapped out by Said in *Orientalism* (1978). Orientalism may give the discipline of postcolonialism an identical character but at the same time, does the discipline seek to show how porous boundaries, cultures and racial differences are between people. Postcolonial scholars claim that knowledge is always a reflection of a person’s interests. What scholars analyze is ultimately shaped by desires, interests and personal experiences of the author, which leads to subject knowledge structures, that in terms of power relations, benefit a field of study, state or entire continent (the West) over others.

There are postcolonial scholars who criticize the discipline of postcolonialism reconciling both a foundationalist- and a poststructuralist epistemology (Young, 1998, Parry, 2004). When studying the former part of the discipline, Frantz Fanon made considerable contributions to the discipline. Fanon is a Pan-African scholar and freedom fighter who wrote about the process of

decolonization and the dehumanizing effects of colonization on the colonized. His postcolonial books relate the discipline to the field of psycho-analysis. In his 1952 dissertation *Black Skin White Masks*, Fanon describes how colonization is accompanied with cultural racism, which obstructs the colonized to develop a sense of identity. Fanon wrote his second book called *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961) after his work as a freedom fighter for the *Front de Libération Nationale* (FLN) in Algeria. Here Fanon uses a Hegelian master slave dialectic to explain the process of decolonization and the political, social and cultural implications on the identities of the colonized. Parry (2004) argues that Fanon's thinking can be traced to theories of phenomenology, left-existentialism, penetrated by Marxism, who uses the Hegelian master slave dialectic to construct a similar relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. Fanon (1952, 1961) ultimately seeks to liberate the oppressed symbolically and violently.

Homi Bhabha (1994) describes Frantz Fanon as a premature poststructuralist. He criticizes Fanon for his Hegelian categorization of colonial identities and argues that there is neither 'the colonizer' or the fixed identity of 'the colonized'. Postcolonial scholar (Bhabha (1994) relates colonialism to the subject of culture and explains how his concept of hybridity is a foundational concept of postcolonial theory. Hybridity refers to the process of synthesizing cultural differences in a colonized state. He explains an intervening space where people experience an estranging form of relocation between the native and the colonialist culture. The fixed cultural identities, shifts, become inversed or are challenged within the process of hybridity (1994). Examples of these cultural shifts are the African Dandy or the Indian Babu. The urban bourgeoisie of the colonized state adapts by speech and costume towards the culture of their colonial oppressors in order 'to fit in'. Bhabha's theory on hybridity is criticized for his post-structural account on culture. Bhabha (1994) claims that symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity. He believes that a concept of 'pure culture' does not exist. However, he builds his reasoning on two fixed cultures and pure localities when explaining hybridity. This poses a paradox within the theory itself (Huddart, 2007). Hence, the possibility of developing a certain culture is still assumed within set boundaries.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1988), is, similar to Homi Bhabha (1994), critical of the binary opposition between the colonizer and the colonized. Spivak argues that she tries "to examine the heterogeneity of colonial power and disclose the complicity of the two poles of that opposition as it constitutes the disciplinary enclave of the critique of imperialism" (McRobbie, 1985: 9). Spivak is a postcolonial scholar who wrote her famous article *Can the Subaltern Speak*

(1988) to describe how the discipline of postcolonial studies ironically rehears and re-inscribes the process of political domination, economic exploitation and cultural supremacy. Most of the sources on postcolonial theory, discussions and critiques were written in French, which undermines the potential to refashion the world from below. Spivak claims that privileged postcolonial first-world male intellectuals should learn to take their loss in the discipline of postcolonialism. Postcolonial western study groups discuss how to give “voice” to the subaltern, but this endeavor paradoxically undermines their potential to speak. Spivak (1988) argues that epistemic violence is felt by any attempt from the outside to improve subalterns to speak for themselves. Since it is the West who gives them voice ‘allowing’ them to speak out of solidarity or tolerance. And secondly, these scholars represent the subaltern in that they are unable to speak for themselves. Hence, speaking or writing about the subaltern re-inscribes their subordinate position in society.

The discipline of postcolonialism is also related to the field of International Relations Theory (IRT). Postcolonial epistemological concern on knowledge as a representative act that forwards certain desires or interests, can also be applied to the field of IRT. Hence, values such as state sovereignty, self-determination and non-intervention are not neutral in the eyes of postcolonial scholars. These values can be described as ‘universal’, however, they will inevitably reinforce the dominance of some nations – read western – above others (Seth, 2013). Postcolonial scholars will encourage a more pluralist account of voices about International Relations theory (IRT), since their voices are not heard. But, they remain skeptical whether their voices are able to challenge the dominance of IR within the Western paradigm. The non-western voices appear in a western ruled discourse, which obstructs their potential to be heard. Acharya & Buzan (2007) argue in their article *Why is there no – Non-Western IR theory* that the Western theoretical formulations in International Relations have gained hegemonic status which precludes the inclusion of theories produced outside the West. Postcolonialism in relationship to IRT will take a critical perspective to the discipline of IRT and try to challenge its values, norms and terms claimed to be universal, but nevertheless serve the interests of great powers.

The connection between postcolonialism and IRT becomes visible when talking about issues like immigration, indigenous struggles and the political Islam. Said describes in *Orientalism* (1978) how the West portrayed Islam as a pseudo incarnation of Christianity. Islam belonged to the sphere of the profane whereas Jesus Christ was described as sacred in the West. This picture which Said portrayed of authors from ancient Greece onwards has transformed, but

emancipatory progress on the portrayal of religious Islam has halted or deteriorated in the twenty first century. After the terrorist attacks of 9/11, the image of Islam as a violent and evil religion has worsened. Postcolonial scholars discuss how views on Islam have transformed and whether Western societies are able to tolerate the religion. Hence, the so-called ‘founder’ of the postcolonial discipline remains a current subject when discussing the politics of Islam. Another current issue in postcolonial theory concerns immigration and the (in)justices of state policies for inclusion or exclusion when people suffer from the long lingering effects of neocolonial rule i.e. economic and resource exploitation which disproportionately benefits Western states over the former colonized nations (Young, 2012).

The unifying aspect of postcolonial theory might be explained by its goal. Postcolonial scholars seek to refashion the world from below, where differences in heterogeneous societies are respected and tolerated and knowledge is reconstructed to include subaltern voices. Ultimately, the ethos of egalitarianism, social justice and solidarity are objectives which the discipline of postcolonialism favors to achieve. This means that the othering of ‘the other’ should stop. The other is itself a product of racial theory which should be transformed. The first step of postcolonial theories is to lay bare the power structures in our contemporary world and from there beg the questions why still millions of people today live without all wealth that people in Western states take for granted. Unfortunately, the idealists side, and the emancipatory optimism of postcolonial theory is criticized as a utopian endeavor (Young, 2012).

There are four theoretical fields of postcolonialism of interest to answer my research question. The first relates to Eurocentrism (Chakrabarty, 2009). This term means that in historical discourses around the globe, Europe remains the primary focal point. The continent remains the centre of all histories. Secondly, is the field of literary criticism. Edward Said made contributions to this discipline with his book *Orientalism* (1978). He describes how Western perspectives on the East from ancient Greece onwards have shaped a demeaning picture of the East which he refers to as: ‘the Orient’. Conversely have there been anti-western sentiments described in its counterpart *Occidentalism* (Buruma & Margalit, 2004). Both perspectives will be studied to deduce expectations on Western and Eastern authors on India’s decolonization and the founding of Pakistan. Thirdly, the concept of violence will be addressed by analyzing the historical process of decolonization as described by Frantz Fanon in his book *Les Damnés*

*de la Terre*¹ (1961). Fanon addresses how the dialectic between colonizer and colonized changes during the period of decolonization and is accompanied with physical violence. Furthermore, the psychological effects of colonization on identity formation are explained by Fanon's dissertation *Peau Noire, Masques Blancs*² (1952). The theoretical framework is finished with reference to postcoloniality. Postcoloniality is related to the idea that colonialism does not stop after independence. The former colonized undergoes forms of neo-colonialism through austerity politics concerning trade and loans with its former colonizer.

2.2 Eurocentrism

The discourse of history is a European history. Postcolonial scholar Dipesh Chakrabarty (2009) argues that this is evident in historical books and in the academic discourse. He claims that "Europe remains the sovereign, theoretical subject of all histories including the ones we call Indian Chinese, Kenyan and so on" (Chakrabarty, 2009: 27). Historical discourses are written from a Western point of view. The West represents the historical discourse of third world states. They speak in name of these states by writing their histories. This brings the non-western states in a position of subalternity. Chakrabarty (2009) argues that two symptoms are responsible for this outcome. Firstly, historians in third world states feel that the history of Europe needs to be spread. They refer to European history in many historical books. Secondly, historians in Europe hardly refer to the histories in third world states. Western scholars write most about their own history without reciprocating the stories of non-European cultures. The two symptoms explain a matter of asymmetry. The west writes about itself and the non-west spreads their history. While both actors lack writing the histories of non-European states beyond its relationship to the West.

History and academia

Chakrabarty (2009) claims that the superiority of Western discourse is visible in academia too. Ancient Greek philosophers wrote 'universal theoretical insights'. They formulated insights that were applicable to people around the globe. While theories drawn by scholars outside Europe remained in the sphere of spirituality and religion. Their theories were only applicable to the region of origin. Scholars outside the West could have countered the universality of Western theories, but instead Chakrabarty (2009) claims that they were embraced. The theories

¹ Translated in English as *The Wretched of the Earth* (1965)

² Translated as *Black Skin White Masks* (2008)

were viewed as useful in states outside the West. But, the practice of adopting western science discourse by non-European states made it difficult for non-European scholars to enter the western dominated debates. This happens in the field of international relations theory (IRT) too. Acharya and Buzan (2007) argue that a great majority of western theories in IRT are produced in the West. The hegemonic status of Western international relations theory precludes the voices outside the West to enter the debate. The former claims superiority of IRT models by acting non-receptive to theoretical models produced by the latter. There are good reasons of the West to maintain their dominance on IRT discourse. It sustains their power position and influence in academia. From a postcolonial perspective, it is evident that Western scholars preclude theories written outside the West since this does not serve their self-interest.

Historicism as a transition narrative

Chakrabarty (2009) argues that Western historic discourse emphasizes themes of capitalism, modernization and development. Chakrabarty (2009) refers to it as 'the transition narrative'. Historical books on India are a prime example. The literature of Gandhi, who advocates a mythical kingdom that takes the peasant at heart is downplayed in historic discourse. Similarly, are views on the socialist revolution in India after British colonization underemphasized in historical books. While ideas around capitalism and liberalism dominate in the discourse in India. Sylvester (1999) claims that Western emphasis on modernization is based on an "un-self-reflexive faith in the winning virtues of the West" (Sylvester, 1999: 705). The modernization approach emphasizes development and economic growth which synonymously refers to Europe. Hence, this structure in historiography disregards the past experiences of the majority of humankind. Eurocentrism in historic discourse brings the people outside the West in a subaltern position.

2.3 Orientalism

The authors of historical books originate from diverse geographical areas around the world. Upon these geographical areas, men and women have constructed ideas about oneself and the other. We establish our identities through contact with others. Through communicative endeavours are people able to shape their self-identity in contrast to a significant other. But, this process of understanding oneself is accompanied with a human necessity of construction, essentialization, categorization and stereotypization. Edward Said, a Palestine-American literary scholar (1978) describes how an imagined duality between the civilized West and the

alien, barbaric East developed from ancient Greece up till our modern-day societies. Said (1978) substantiates this West – East duality by referring to scholarly work, historic books, literature, movies and ancient plays to theorize what he calls: Orientalism.

The word Orientalism has multiple meanings which are all interdependent according to Said (1978). He claims that generally Orientalism is “a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction between the Orient and (most of the time) the Occident” (Said, 1978: 2). This style of thought was taken as self-evident by economists, poets, novelists and philosophers. The people who wrote about the Orient are Orientalists. Their descriptions and imaginations were used as tools; as a political instrument to rule over the orient. “Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient (Said, 1978: 3). It was a discourse of the West, to make itself feel superior, contrasting itself by an imaginary weak other. However, describing the Orient as only imaginary is a false assumption claims Said (1978). Since the lies and myths told about the Orient are not easily to be countered by critical scholars or writers up till this day. It is a whole set of theories, which are written as truths and referred to as objective knowledge about the Orient. Orientalism, can therefore be interpreted within Gramsci’s theory on cultural hegemony. Gramsci argues that in society some cultural forms predominate over others. The influence of Oriental ideas has contributed to Western self-identity as being superior over cultures beyond the West. Non-Western people and cultures are portrayed as backward. Said (1978) explains that this predominance of Western superiority through Oriental writings could flourish because there was very little resistance of Orientals to counter the myths. The West could study the Orient, portray its characteristics in museums, describe its character anthropologically without any oriental criticism.

Said (1978) studies the writings of the great empires: The United Kingdom, France and American authors on their lies, myths and imagined knowledge. He describes how they have been reproduced and links their knowledge with the political. Said (1978) analyses the UK and France because they have been the greatest colonial powers in history. US authors are included because America has gained a hegemonic position in the world today. Said studies not only scholarly works but also travel books, journalistic text and religious and philological studies on Orientalist discourse. The works he studies describe an immense form of overlapping unity. The authors often refer to each other. They build upon each other’s ideas and myths and disclaim reforming their findings. Said (1978) questions how all these myths have accumulated and are taken for granted by scholars in universities up till this day.

The Origins of Orientalism

Orientalism originates back from ancient Greece where Europe was described as powerful and articulate, and Asia described as distant. Greece drew a line between the two continents. In classical Greece and Rome, historians and public figures like Caesar separated the minds of Western people and East, its nations and races. These men were first to impose their superiority upon people beyond the regions of their empire. Said (1978) argues that in the early middle ages, religion was the principal concept responsible for the dividing line between the dominant West and inferior East. In this period, Christianity was practiced in Europe. But beyond their borders, the religious hegemonic position of Islam grew enormously. Europe feared the rise of Islam in the Middle East and throughout Asia and replied with a form of awe, that is, by portraying Islam as a fraudulent version of Christianity. There were European thinkers who staged conferences for conversion of Muslims to Christians since “Islam was just a misguided version of Christianity” (Said, 1978: 61). Said (1978) explains how European authors have tried to tame the Orient by using the method of describing the unfamiliar as something that fraudulently tried to imitate Western originality. Hence, people in the Orient; Arabs, Indians, Chinese etc. all tried to imitate religious practices which originated in the West. The religious practice of Islam was seen as a pseudo incarnation of Christianity. Christianity and Jesus were described in these sources as sacred, while Islam and the practices of Muslims were profane. Muhammed was a false prophet that needed to be contained. These ideas have been described in ‘the highly important’ works of Barthélemy d’Herbelot as well as in plays of Dante such as *The Divine Comedy* and *Inferno*.

Modern Orientalism

After the middle ages, Said (1978) argues that there are four factors which contributed to the solidification of modern Oriental discourse in the 18th century. First factor was European expansion. Europe began exploring the rest of the world. Although the voyages kept the dominant position of Europe at heart. Second, is what Said calls historical confrontation. This means that oriental source material was being translated. The Qur’an was translated to English in 1734 by George Sale. This was all done in an attempt of the West to grasp its self-identity. But, when comparing the historical Oriental material, there was a tendency of the West to find coherence between Non-European cultures. For instance, philosophers explained internal coherence between cultures of China and Peru. This coherence among non-European cultures is the third factor that defined modern Orientalist discourse. And lastly is the element of classification. In the 18th century scholars dramatized features of certain cultures and made

generalizations about their character. They made philosophical moral classifications such as: ‘the Asiatics’, ‘the Europeans’ or ‘the wild men’. These elements have ultimately served to surpass the religious biblical framework of Orientalism in the middle ages. Structures from the past are inherited, modernized and secularized in modern Orientalist discourse. The dualism on the principle of Christian religion is surpassed by new essentializing and generalizing factors. Furthermore, unlike the representative writings of precolonial Orientalism, the modern Orientalist discourse “embodies a systematic discipline of accumulation” (Said, 1978: 123).

Said (1978) compares two scholars who have shaped the beginning of modern Orientalism in the 19th century: Silvestre de Sacy and Ernest Renan. The former is important because he linked his body of Oriental scholarly texts with public policy. Said (1978) explains that Sacy chose to focus on specific characters of Orientals. Since it was impossible to discuss the colossal amount of oriental literature. But, by selecting the specificities, he formulated general principles. A small amount of examples were used to explain ‘the Orient’ as a whole. Sacy can be seen as the originator - the father of Orientalism - while Renan was the man who solidified the discourse and fostered its continuance by establishing institutions. Renan was well known for his work on philology. This field analyses language in historical works. It includes both the study of linguistics as well as literary criticism. Comparing the works was not only a matter of description but also evaluation. European intellectuals had different interpretations on the oriental material. Some welcomed its spirituality, stability and primitivity. Others interpreted the Orient as “under-humanized, antidemocratic, backward, barbaric and so forth” (Said, 1978: 150). Said (1978) claims that these opposites have led to a restructuring process. A solidification of Oriental discourse that made the Orient considerably less eminent as some described it. In the end, the Orient was intellectually subordinated by the West. Orientalism became a whole system of thought about the orient. Texts were passed on anonymously. They were used uncritically, repeated and propagated. The relationship between knowledge and reality got lost. Interestingly, this body of thought upheld the idea of an Orient as something unchanging, fixed and static. Transformation and a sense of development in the Orient was impossible in the eyes of the West. The writers quoted each other without asking whether the subject matter should be changed. In this process, the difference between personal literary works and the scientific approach to the Orient got lost. The experiences of authors would be restructured for professional Oriental discourse. the professional scientific Orient was made acceptable for the West itself. Knowledge was reproduced in- and for the West without much resistance from Orientals.

The institutionalization of Oriental discourse by Sacy and Renan influenced the mindset of French and British pilgrims who explored the Orient in the second half of the 19th century. French pilgrims such as Chateaubriand and Lamartine observed the Orient while borrowing knowledge from its predecessors. Instead of rewriting their knowledge to the modern actuality in the Orient, they preferred to see what predecessors had described. The prejudices and representative descriptions of Nerval and Flaubert were without critical evaluations of the actual situation of the modern Orient taken as guiding perspectives. Deviations from these perspectives were systematically excluded. These pilgrimages can be seen as failed narratives of the modern Orient. Since they only sought to recognize what had already been written instead of studying the new reality of the Orient as it was presented to them. Hence, institutions and Orientalists – oriental scholars of the West – were able to get a hold of the Orient. Individuals exploring the Orient would live up to their descriptive ‘truths’. By the end of the 19th century, Said (1978) argues that “Orientalism fully formalized into a repeatedly produced copy of itself (1978: 197). Academically, the descriptions on the Orient were far from objectively true as it was presented as an unchallenging coherence. It was a whole system of representations, dominating perspectives and ideological biases that resulted in Orientalism.

Orientalism as political doctrine

Said (1978) argues that in the last two decades of the 19th century, the discourse of Orientalism ultimately became a political doctrine. At first, the Orient was described in geographical terms. The unchanging reality of the backward Orient was rooted in geography. But, at the outset of the 20th century, racial theories exacerbated the differences between East and West. The West no longer sought to understand the East. The oriental discourse became a political doctrine. The West believed that imperialism was justified to spread their enlightened values. The Orient had to be civilized from its backward position. It should be educated along the moral standards of the West. Instead of describing the East, gaining passive knowledge about it, Said (1978) argued that in this period, Orientalism became active knowledge. The discourse of Orientalism legitimized Western colonialism in the Orient. Hence, Orientalism transformed from a subtle philosophical subfield into a Western civilizing mission. The norms of Catholicism, open-minded thinking and plurality would be passed down to the Orient. This does not come near any idea of liberation according to Said (1978). The civilizations in the Orient would be oppressed by some form of mental prejudice of what is categorized as a moral standard and what not. The political doctrine was used by the West to serve its self-interest.

The whole idea of enlightening the Orient was reversed after the First World War. In this period, the West entered a phase of cultural crisis. The dominance of Western self-perception diminished in the interwar years. The alien and backward descriptions of the Orient were no longer assumed as scientific truisms. The cause for change can be attributed to the rise of Non-Orientalist philosophies in Europe which challenged the foundations of Orientalism. However, Said (1978) argues that this only limitedly changed Western Orientalized thinking. Since during these years, Islamic Orientalism gained ground. This field confirmed the dualism of Orientalism on the principle of Islam as something to be countered based on its evilness. Islamic oriental scholars such as Gibb and Massignon categorized the Orient as belonging to an ancient and static place in time. This was articulated against the modern society and thinking of the West. Said (1978) claims that in the first half of the twentieth century “Gibb and Massignon produced pages that recapitulate the history of Orientalist writing in the West ... to a monographic uniformity” (Said, 1978: 284). Hence, the dualism of East and West was somewhat challenged, but in the end the traditional dualism in Orientalist discourse would remain standing.

Contemporary Orientalism

The Oriental discourse which was found and developed in Europe took a flight in US after World War II. Since then, the French and British no longer occupied a hegemonic position in the world anymore. They had now given up most of their empire. Said (1978) explains that within the US, the Arab Muslim gained special attention in popular culture. He was portrayed in films and television as being dishonest, whose primary characteristics are his profession: being an oil supplier to the US and second: his steadfast hatred against Jews. Said (1978) argues that the Arab appears as “an oversexed degenerate, capable, it is true, of cleverly devious intrigues, but essentially sadistic, treacherous, low” (Said, 1978: 287). Furthermore, the field of Orientalism gained importance in US academia. New social science techniques were developed to study the Orient. What amazed Said is the avoidance of American social scientist attention to Oriental literature. The US did not refine and reconstruct the knowledge of the Orient written in Europe. And therefore, despite its advanced social science techniques, the Oriental discourse remained a very coherent discourse in US institutions built on European traditions. The cultural prestige of European scholars on the Orient was seen as too important to be challenged in the US. And consequently, the dogmatic views on Islam in academia continued.

Said (1978) argues that multiple dogmas of Orientalism persist in contemporary studies of Islam. Firstly, the generalizing descriptions of difference between the West and the Orient. The

former is described as superior, developed, rational and humane. While the latter is seen as inferior, underdeveloped and alien. Secondly, is the idea that the Orient is incapable of defining itself. It needs Western representation. The West is capable of writing scientifically objective about the Orient. Third, is the idea that the Orient is a place beyond the West that needs to be controlled. In the eyes of the West it is a place to be feared. And as Said (1978) claims, these dogmas persist without much resistance from Arabic or Islamic scholars from the Orient. The reasons for this persistence can be found in power politics. The ruling ideas, paradigms and ideology of the West on Orientalism are unsuccessfully contested because the West claims cultural superiority. Consequently, Oriental students prefer to study in educational institutions in the West. Firstly, because there are no universities who challenge the dominance of Oxford, Harvard, Princeton and so forth. However, when Oriental students study the Orient in Western institutes, they will reproduce and repeat the dogmas that the West has ascribed to this geographical area. This is problematic, since after their return to the Oriental mother country, they feel superior compared to natives based on their knowledge of the Orient and consequently reproduce the myths and lies learned in these institutes. Hence, Said (1978) argues that the system is responsible for Western culture maintaining its dominance in the world: “the modern Orient, in short, participates in its own Orientalizing” (Said, 1978: 325). This process would present a very pessimistic future of Orientalism. Nevertheless, Said (1978) ends his book positively. He is convinced that many contemporary scholars can counter the racial and imperialist stereotypes of the past. These scholars can help to free the Orientalists from their generalizing ideologies on the Orient. Taking this perspective, Said (1978) does not plea for similar generalizing descriptions of Occidentalism. Ultimately, the incorrect descriptions of the Orient cannot be countered by Occidental stereotypical accusations of Orientals. It needs to be overcome within the Oriental discourse itself.

2.4 Occidentalism

The West has portrayed an essentialized picture full of myths and stereotypes around the East. But, similarly has the East made stereotypes about the West. Buruma & Margalit (2004) argue that the West can be described as a “machine civilization, coldly rationalist, mechanical and without soul” (Buruma & Margalit, 2004: 32). The devotion of Westerners to materialism is seen as a prime cause for secularization and idolatry. It makes the West a “mass of soulless, decadent, money grubbing, rootless, faithless, unfeeling parasites (Buruma & Margalit, 2004: 10).

Buruma & Margalit (2004) compare western societies with the Oriental mindset and claim that the West is only focused on trade and commerce for the sole purpose of acquiring more comfort and physical pleasure in life. Enemies of the West argue that physical comfort should be sacrificed when 'higher goals' in life can be obtained. Goals that emphasize purity and heroic salvation to defend the sovereignty of the state. These goals are often related to spiritual and religious convictions. These convictions have become absent in the secular Western mindset. While in the Orient, people can aspire to higher ideals in life and are willing to sacrifice their lives in pursuit of higher ideals.

The authors of *Occidentalism* (Buruma & Margalit, 2004) turn the bigotry of Orientalism upside down. However, contradictory to *Orientalism* (Said, 1978) the stereotyping and generalizations of Western thought have not been shaped, at first, by oriental thinkers. The critique on Western ways of thinking have been advanced around the period of the French revolution by German philosophers, poets and writers. Hence, the roots of Occidentalism can be traced in the West itself. During the time of German Enlightenment, Thomas Abbt, a German philosopher and mathematician wrote a famous essay called: *Dying for the fatherland* (in Buruma & Margalit, 2004: 50). In this essay, Abbt advanced the idea of sacrificing yourself in name of culture and national spirit. Abbt wrote his essay as a critical response to the French who upheld a universal model for civilization after the French revolution. His ideas on heroic idealism was a critique against the French ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. Romantic philosopher and poet Johan Herder followed in Abbt's occidental ideology. He argued in line with Abbt that "German *Kultur* stood for martial discipline, self-sacrifice and heroism" (Buruma & Margalit, 2004: 52). Thomas Abbt, would not be described as an enemy of the West at that time. However, his Occidental rhetoric did contribute to German culture and national spirit. His ideas in *dying for the fatherland* contributed to an idea of a nation that was culturally distinct from other nations in the West. Later, in WW I, social scientist Werner Sombart wrote an article called *Merchant and Heroes*. In this article, Sombart claims that war was an existential battle between different world views and not between nations. Sombart argued against the ideals of British merchants and the Republican ideals of the French promulgated in 1789. Sombart said that the ideals of "liberty, equality and fraternity are true merchant ideals ... and the merchant, is interested only in what life can offer him in terms of material goods and physical comfort" (Sombart in Buruma & Margalit, 2004: 53). Sombart describes the devotion to these ideals with the term *Komfortimus*. This means that Western civilizations only seek to cultivate physical wellbeing instead of dying for higher goals. The people in search for *Komfortimus* shy away from violent

conflict. They deny the tragic side of life. The British merchants and French universalistic notions of civilization are described as superficial. Since they are only dedicated to “the satisfaction of individual desires, which undermines the very basis of a higher moral sense of the world and the belief in ideals” (Buruma & Margalit, 2004: 55).

The aversion towards the satisfaction of individual desires has spread in the orient as well. Around the start of the 20th century, a new ideological movement spread in India led by M.S. Golwalkar. He set up a voluntarist organization called: the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (R.S.S.). Golwalkar argued against individual autonomy. He claimed that every Hindu would have to submerge him or herself in a Hindu nation. This means that all individual desires should be abandoned. He wrote about the ideology: “Each cell feels its identity with the entire body and is ever ready to sacrifice itself for the sake of the health and growth of the body” (in Buruma & Margalit, 2004: 65). The principles of Golwalkar concur to the ideas of German nationalists in the age of romanticism. Both Golwalkar and the German philosophers reason against the liberal bourgeois mentality of the West.

Orientalism versus Occidentalism

The concepts of Orientalism and Occidentalism constitute stereotypical views on ‘the other’ which are taken for granted regardless of their empirical accuracy. The oriental discourse of the West representing identities in the Orient and portraying them as weak, uncivilized and barbaric serves as an instrument of colonialism. Orientalism as a political doctrine justifies the hegemonic practices of European states. Occidentalism on the other hand, can be adopted by authors outside the West on the subject of colonialism. Non – Western authors are likely to use Occidental discourse to describe how natives suffer from colonial rule with stereotypical terms as the cold, rational, mechanical and soulless West.

2.5 Violence

This thesis analyzes the discourse of historical books on India’s partition of 1947. It was a period where India gained its independence after 300 years of British rule. According to postcolonial scholar Frantz Fanon, decolonization is accompanied with physical violence. I will describe how violence occurs during the transfer of power by referring to his 1961 book *the Wretched of the Earth*. Fanon based his ideas on the independence struggle in African states. The freedom struggle in Algeria where Fanon worked for the *Front de Libération Nationale*

(FLN). Secondly, I will focus on the psycho-analytic effects of colonization on the subjects of the colonized. Fanon argued in his dissertation *Black Skin White Masks* (1952) that colonization damages the identity and the cultures of the colonized during- and after decolonization. He ends his dissertation on how the colonized black man can gain recognition through emancipatory acts of (symbolic) violence.

2.5.1 Decolonization

Fanon (1961) argues that decolonization is always a violent phenomenon. He claims that the first encounter between the settler and the native was violent. The settler gained his superior position in society and his property through an encounter of bayonets and cannon fire. But during the process of national liberation, the native starts to question the colonial situation. He is about to free him or herself. The social structure is about to tear down through a change of consciousness. The colonized starts to think that “the last shall be the first and the first last” (Fanon, 1961: 28). The mindset is changed and a murderous struggle against its opposing force will follow. The question remains how the process of a change in consciousness is initiated and how it erupts in absolute violence against the colonizers. In order to understand this process, Fanon first looks how the colonial system functions before decolonization. Second, he focuses on the transfer of power between the colonialist bourgeoisie, native intellectuals and national political parties. Third, he describes how the colonial structure will tear down to an independent state by a violent struggle of the mass of the people and fourth, how violence liberated the colonized man but unfortunately not their fight against oppression in a capitalist world.

The Colonial World

Fanon (1961) describes the colonial world as a Manichean world. Manichean stems from the word Mani, an apostle who lived in Mesopotamia and taught the universal religion of dualism in 240 A.C. Two sides that are directly opposed of each other. This dualism – Manichaeism – can be seen in the colonial world. Fanon (1961) explains that it is a world divided in two compartments. It exists of two towns that are opposed to each other. The strong town belongs to the settlers. They have streets covered in asphalt, with garbage cans that swallow people’s leavings, with people who are well-fed, and who’s feet are covered with shoes. Conversely, the native town is a place of ill-famed and hungry people. It is a town where people live on top of each other. There is lack of space in this town. People are born here and die here. It does not matter to anyone when and how. It is a place filled with niggers and dirty Arabs (Fanon, 1961).

The people of this town look envious at the settler's town. They want to be in their place. But they can't be in their place. Since the settler describes the native as an animal. The settler refers to the native in zoological terms. He is described as a person insensible to ethics. In fact, he is described as absolute evil. Fanon (1961) argues, that during these moments, the native begins to sharpen his weapon for a violent struggle. Since decolonization will eventually mean that one zone will be abolished. One zone needs to be buried deep in the depths of the earth (Fanon, 1961). There will be a moment, that the native laughs at western values, a moment where the native start to insult the settler and vomits when he hears their civilized values (Fanon, 1961).

But before the native finds out that his skin is just as valuable as the skin of the settler, dialogues have already begun between the bourgeoisie of the colonialist country and colonized intellectuals. The dialogue concerns cultural values and essential qualities of the West which need to be carried on. After this dialogue, the colonized intellectuals respond in two ways. There will be intellectuals who primarily believe that these qualities remain eternal and need to be carried on. However, when they come in touch with the people, they believe these values to be worthless. The colonized intellectual discovers that individualism is a false theory of the West. He will choose to sacrifice these values and remain faithful to the interest of the masses. But, there are also colonized intellectuals who associate themselves with the colonial bourgeoisie. This occurs when the masses have not sufficiently shaken the colonial system yet. This brings the colonial intellectual in a difficult position. He behaves as an opportunist. Since on the one hand, he adopted the thoughts of the colonialist bourgeoisie but also seeks to remain faithful to his people. Although the colonized intellectual is amazed by the good faith of his people, he cannot destruct the essential values of the West. Since this would bring his position in jeopardy. He might risk eliminating himself. At this moment, the colonized intellectual forgets that the colonial world will remain intact. The real struggle, the defeat of the colonial world, will be preserved.

The colonized world is a compartmentalized world where violence between the colonizer and the colonized is prevented by policemen and soldiers. These men behave as moral teachers and speak in name of the colonizers. They are the go-betweens of the settlers and the natives, claims Fanon (1961). The men carry guns to uphold peace, but also bring ideas of violence in the mind of the natives who wish to take the place of the settler. However, the latter can fend itself off from the colonized masses. Hence, the aggressiveness of men can only find an outlet against its own people. Niggers start to beat each other up (Fanon, 1961). It becomes a tribal warfare. A

bloodthirsty explosion among natives. This sets free their muscular tension, but can be viewed as an act of avoidance. Instead, they should have turned armed resistance against the colonizers. Moreover, the fraternal bloodbaths confirm the settler's assumption that natives are animals. That they cannot be called reasonable human beings. They are hysterical people who do not possess the essential qualities of the West (Fanon, 1961).

Physical violence

The struggle for liberation will change the practices of the natives. A shift of violence can be observed because new forces arrive to engender violence: national political parties. The parties are only violent in their words but Fanon (1961) claims that there is a gap between what they say and what they think. Since these parties have good reasons not to radically overthrow the system. The national parties are only concerned about power. They want more and more power. The leaders of these parties assimilate themselves in the colonial world. They serve their self-interest, not the interest of the people at large. The mass of the people - the peasantry - see how these individuals only increase their success. How they disregard the interests of the masses and conclude that only violence pays. Fanon (1961) argues: "Colonialism is not a thinking machine, nor a body endowed with reasoning faculties. It is violence in its natural state, and it will only yield when confronted with greater violence (Fanon, 1961: 48).

The colonialist bourgeoisie has remained inactive till now and comes up with a new idea: non-violence. This idea is formulated by the colonialist bourgeoisie to settle the colonial problem around a table, before acts of violence have taken place. However, the masses have already started to set fire to buildings. During this moment, the nationalist political parties and the intellectual elite rush to the colonialist and request them to find a solution. A compromise between the colonizers and the colonized needs to be found. Fanon (1961) argues that this is an important phenomenon of decolonization. Since the nationalist bourgeoisie; the intellectual elite and national parties are afraid that they will be swept away in mass violence. They explain that they have confidence in the settler and urge them to act fast since the masses continue to destroy everything on their path such as bridges and farms (Fanon, 1961). Negotiations are initiated between all actors to find a compromise. This is attractive for the colonized intellectuals and nationalist parties as well because they are uncertain about the consequences that mass violence might bring. Compromise is seen as a tool to defend their self-interests. The nationalist parties will appeal the masses to calm down. They request them not to use physical force and sometimes in private they condemn the hateful acts of the masses. Hence, the

nationalist parties appeal to the liberal intentions of colonialism to consolidate their power. Another path of revolutionary violence could be sparked by individual action of the colonized. This could be a person who in single combat kills four or five policemen. A person who makes a statement by setting himself on fire. Someone who commits suicide to overcome colonial rule. According to Fanon (1961) these men become heroes. Since they bring an end to the colonial regime in power. The violent struggle of the people to break down colonial structures can thus be sparked in two ways. Either by revolutionary action of individual natives or as response to the opportunist behavior of nationalist parties and intellectual elites (Fanon, 1961).

Disruptive violence of the masses perseveres and the settlers become anxious. They initiate more meetings and discuss how violence can be countered. The settler concludes that it can only be solved by greater violence. They favor more bayonets and cannonade fire. However, this time the counter measures of the settler only reinforces aggressiveness of the natives. The soldiers and arms of the occupying power are under attack by the masses. They have formed a great chain. The native groups have bonded together. They react in one direction against the settler and are likeminded in their armed struggle. Fanon (1961) argues that “the mobilization of the masses, when it arises out of the war of liberation, introduces into each man’s consciousness the ideas of a common cause, of a national destiny and of a collective history” (Fanon, 1961: 73). Henceforth, he argues that liberating violence will destruct tribalism and regionalism. The compartmentalized world is broken. The masses have joined hands and begin an armed struggle against the colonizer. Mass violence of the natives makes the colonial world deteriorate in favor of the natives. They eventually force the colonial government to release person X or Y. Momentum for change has come. The colonial government complies and releases the native. Not much later, the people are liberated and can dance in the streets. They have broken their chains and know that this could only happen through force. It could only be achieved through acts of physical violence.

2.5.2 Colonialism and Psychoanalysis

The process of decolonization influences the identities and mindset of the colonized. The mindset of the natives changes during- and after colonization. Fanon (1952) questions in his dissertation *Black Skin White Masks* (1952) whether the master-slave dialectic of superiority and inferiority has been overcome after colonial rule. He argues that cultural racism obstructs the black man from gaining an equal position in society. Firstly, because the white colonizer

does not treat the black man as a fellow man and secondly, because the colonized black man, in his quest for recognition, behaves in the image of 'the dominant' white race. Fanon (1952) argues that this only confirms the superiority of white people and the inferiority of black people. To understand Fanon's ideas on identity formation, I will first describe Fanon's experiences of cultural racism. Secondly, I will describe Fanon's critique on the institutionalized racist discourse in academia as well as in movies and children (books). And finally, I will explain Fanon's quest for black recognition. How the inferior black man should demand human behavior from the former colonizer through acts of symbolic violence.

Cultural racism in language

Fanon argues in *Black Skin White Masks* (1952) that colonization is accompanied with cultural racism which makes it impossible for the colonized to develop a sense of identity. Fanon (1952) refers to cultural racism in his book by describing what he experienced in the practice of language on his island of birth: Martinique. Most people in Martinique spoke Creole. This was a dialect of French language where consonants like the 'r' were swallowed. It was prohibited in middle class families on Martinique to speak Creole. The reasons were related to the positions of high educated men and women in this colonized state. French education in 'the motherland' had contributed to this change of culture. What struck Fanon was a form of cultural transformation that black man revealed when they returned from France to the island. The person behaved as if he forgot the Creole language all together. As if he had never spoken Creole in his life. Fanon (1952) questioned why black people acted in the image of white people. Since the acceptance of French language in the colonized state of Martinique confirmed the dominant position of the French and obstructed the possibility of the islanders to develop their own culture. Furthermore, the black man did not speak his mother tongue on the island of Martinique but would not develop a sense of own identity by speaking French either. Although his behaviour was esteemed in Martinique, it was not recognized by the native French. The black man was treated differently in white European society. The native French used '*le petit nègre*' to downplay black people. The racist language was used to devalue them. Since the reasons for speaking '*le petit nègre*' was based on skin colour and not on capabilities, education nor profession. Moreover, French natives were amazed when black people responded in perfect French. They could not believe that a man with black appearance could speak French fluently. Their behaviour was remarkable because such acts would not be presented in a conversation between two white people in society. Hence, changing or subverting oneself to the culture of the colonized was never to be recognized and esteemed similarly as the people born and raised

in France. The educated man from Martinique who behaved in the image of the white was esteemed by the colonized, but not in the motherland itself. France was an utterly racist society claimed Fanon (1952). He concludes that people in Martinique learned about the good of whiteness and the evil and impurity of blackness. The constructed ideas made black people decide to accept and behave in the image of white people. The inferiority of black identity was internalized but imitating the behaviour of the superior white was not met with similar forms of recognition.

Cultural racism in relationships

Feelings of superiority and inferiority can also be seen in relationships. How people judged each other in the search for love. Fanon (1952) observed that women of colour were not aiming to find a black partner. They searched for a white partner because they represented wealth, intelligence and virtue. The behaviour of black women confirms internalized racism. Fanon (1952) gives examples of women and men with differential colour. A secretary of a waterways company in Martinique called Nini was half white and offended when a black accountant of the same company proposed to marry her. Since her honour of being a white woman would now be damaged. Contrarily, when a white man with a good governmental job approached black Senegalese woman Dedee. She felt like a dream came true because now she could finally enter the white world. Likewise, Fanon (1952) addresses the longing of a black man for a white woman in French society. Jack Veneuze, a black man from the Antilles was eager to find a European woman to reach equal standing with white French people. However, in his quest to fall in love, he kept some distance. He underestimated his potential to give love and was afraid to be abandoned. These ideas are also influenced by white perception of black men. The former group viewed blacks as evil and impure. Fanon (1952) argues that black men were associated by white women as potential rapists. European women suffered from negrophobia. For them, the negro became a feared object biologically. Women were frightened of what their bodies were capable of. They had the potential of impregnating their pure white bodies. They could use their 'sword' and penetrate them. Moreover, white men feared blacks because they thought them to be much better under the sheets. Black men were viewed as males with larger penises which confirmed the assumption that blacks were much better to pleasure their women.

Institutionalized racist discourse

Fanon (1952) argues that racist discourses have contributed to the inferior relationship between black and white people. Fanon refers to (children)books such as Tarzan, Mickey Mouse and

other weekly magazines as sources who have contributed to the superior-inferior divide between white and black people. There is a dialectic opposition between the good white Gaul's who presented the hero and the evil genii who were represented by blacks. The one-sided portrayal of good and bad is not just undesirable for the self-perception of blacks but also for the perception of white people. Fanon (1952) critically argues that magazines should be produced for black children where this one-sided view is countered. Since the idea that black people are to be associated with impurity, sin and evil can be overcome if the characters within these books are changed to a morally acceptable position.

Fanon (1952) claims that a racist discourse can be seen in academia as well. He pays attention to the work of a French psycho-analyst Octave Mannoni. In his work, *Psychologie de la Colonization*, Mannoni claims that black people suffer from a dependency complex. Mannoni studied French rule in Madagascar between 1930 and 1940 and argued that natives were longing for white rule before French arrived on the island. He argues that the black Malagasy felt a need in their heart to be ruled. They craved for dependency. This false assumption is used by Mannoni as evidence that black people suffer from an inferiority complex. Fanon (1952) is critical of Mannoni's claims. He argues that Malagasy did not feel inferior, but were made to feel inferior by supremacist behaviour of the colonizers. First, the French colonizers came to land and killed over 80000 natives. Consequently, the natives became dependent of their rule and began to suffer psychologically from unequal treatment. The French colonizer claimed that Malagasy were only capable of work on the fields. They shouted at them, saying they were walking piles of manure and should adapt to the civilized behaviour of the white French. These subordinating acts made the natives develop an inferiority complex. The black man internalized feelings of inferiority through inhuman acts. The colonizers stripped them from their dignity.

The negro's quest for recognition

The negro has become a scapegoat according to Frantz Fanon (1952). He should fight against the image of being dirty, bad and evil contrary to the dominant white as the colour of progress, civilization, solidarity and pureness. In other words, he needs to fight for recognition. This fight is not an individualist endeavour. In critical response to Alfred Adler, Fanon (1952) argues that the black individual cannot compensate for his oppressed position in society. Since every attempt of the black man to demand a similar position in a white society confirms the superior-inferior dialectic between the two. Adler was a psychiatrist from Vienna who was famous for his work on individual psychology. This concept stood for the idea that every person who

suffered from an inferiority complex will search for possibilities to be revalued from a backward position. This is what Adler calls a strive for compensation i.e. a quest for overcompensation. Fanon (1952) criticizes the concept of individual psychology in a colonial state. Since during colonialism, the negro does not associate his inferiority in relationship with someone who has a similar identity, but with a white colonizer. It is impossible for the colonized to compensate in terms of education or profession when this is not recognized in the colonized system. In this state, the individual psychology concept becomes a social issue. Since society as a whole has become responsible for feelings of inferiority which cannot be compensated. Fanon (1952) argues that within this system, not the black individual but his environment is to blame for his experience of inferiority. Second, Fanon (1952) discusses the position of the negro related to the Hegelian dialectic. Hegel argues that recognition is ultimately a reciprocal act between master and slave. This means that both have a desire to be recognized. There is a battle between both sides to gain recognition. However, claims Fanon (1952), in a colonized system, the master enables himself to recognize the slave without any battle. There is not a two-way process of movement between master and slave. And hence, without this battle, it will become impossible for the slave to develop independent self-consciousness. The black man is acted upon. He or she can only react. The white master maintains his power position by keeping the slave in a reactive mode of being. He allows the slave to eat at his dinner table and tells him to be a sweet human being. However, Fanon (1952) claims that these acts of the master prevent the possibility of the slave to tear down the power relations.

Emancipatory violence

Fanon (1952) concludes that the black man desires to be equally recognized by white people. This desire is expressed by blacks who behave in the image of white people. Black people are trying to be like white men. They behave with white masks. Fanon (1952) argues that this behavior confirms feelings of inferiority. It paradoxically undermines respect for black culture as well as the potential to develop one's own identity. Furthermore, is it also a tool that makes the subordination of blacks by white people possible. Instead, Fanon (1952) argues that black people should not desire but demand human behavior of white people. The black man needs to recapture his identity by making his own choices and not renounce when his respect is scrutinized. Lack of respect can be attributed to the weight that blacks need to carry from ancestral acts. But Fanon says: "I am not the slave of the slavery that dehumanized my ancestors" (1952: 230). He argues that a form of desalination to the past is crucial for equal power relations between white and black people. It means that both white and black people

should turn their back to the inhumane acts of their ancestors. However, if white supremacy is taken as self-evident in reference of ancestral rule, then, argues Fanon (1952), the self can be recaptured through conflict, or through the risk that conflict implies. The black man must demand human behavior when white people challenge the humanity and freedom of blacks. He should stand up, claim respect and spread the risk of conflict when his freedom, his dignity, is endangered. Since the risk of conflict, will make a transformation of the black man possible to a position of equal recognition. The black man will transform his subjective being that is accompanied with a lack of self-worth, into a supreme good, a good that has universal valid truth (Fanon, 1952).

2.6 Postcoloniality

Violence during colonialism is described by Fanon (1961) as a cleansing force. “It frees the native from his inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction. It makes him fearless and restores his self-respect” (Fanon, 1961: 74). However, Fanon (1961) is aware of the difficult task that lies ahead after national liberation. The behavior of political leaders in the young independent states and their former colonizers - the European nations - re-inscribe a division of superiority and inferiority (Fanon, 1961). The former reasons along the lines of “catching up with other nations”. Hence, leaders of the independent state want to prove that they can reach similar achievements compared to European states. Fanon (1961) argues that this behavior is incorrect. A similar form of reasoning addressed by Fanon in *Black Skin White Masks* (1951) is substantiated here in *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961) concerning decolonization and the international context. Fanon (1961) claims that countries of the Third World should demand European nations to rehabilitate the former colonized. They should curse their past behavior and demand restitution in money and wealth.

Fanon (1961) describes how capital of European nations takes a flight after decolonization. This capital is used to subvert the young state: “The apotheosis of independence is transformed into the curse of independence, and the colonial power through its immense resources of coercion condemns the young nation to regression” (Fanon, 1961: 77). The leaders in ‘liberated’ nations respond in two ways. Either they reject the coercive measures of European nations and impose an austerity regime on their people who desperately try to develop the state from hunger and misery. However, in most cases, political leaders accept coercive conditions of the former colonizer. And consequently, the young state becomes economically dependent. The European

powers lend money to the liberated states to serve their self-interest. They want to ensure that products are manufactured to keep factories in the mother country running. The injection of small budgets in these nations will uphold colonial trade channels which disproportionately benefits European states over the former colonized. Moreover, European companies do not wish to take any risk investing in the young nations. They favor political stability and a calm social climate and therefore pressure governments signing military and economic pacts to protect their self-interest. Fanon (1961) claims that most of the time, governments cannot fulfill these requests which causes capital to stock in Europe. This proves to be catastrophic for the young nations in the long run.

Fanon (1961) claims that the consequences of colonialism after national liberation should not be accepted by the leaders of the young states. He claims that European opulence is a scandal. Since all its progress “has been built with the sweat and the dead bodies of Negroes, Arabs, Indians and the Yellow races” (Fanon, 1961: 76). Fanon argues that the former colonized should demand for restitution similarly as European states requested in the aftermath of Nazism. European nations claimed for a restitution of wealth for stolen goods and products from their states. Moreover, Fanon (1961) claims that this should also be accompanied with a change of attitude of European nations. He argues that: “European people must first decide to wake up and shake themselves, use their brain and stop playing the stupid game of the sleeping beauty” (Fanon, 1961: 84).

3. Method

The postcolonial literature shows that historic discourse is subject to a diverse set of interpretations which are reflected by the interests of authors. Based on the postcolonial literature, I will formulate expectations on a divide between Western and non - Western historiography. Second, background information about the authors and their historic books on the decolonization of India will be addressed. The latter involves a focus on the sources which the authors used to write the books and how their work has been reviewed. Third, I will address how certain elements in historic discourse are privileged at the expense of others by describing the concept of deconstruction of Jacque Derrida and explain how his concept supports a comparison of historic discourses on the decolonization of India from three perspectives.

3.1 Expectations

The postcolonial literature makes it plausible to assume that discourse on the decolonization of India from Hindu, Muslim and Western perspective will be subject to a battlefield of rival interpretations. Three tensions can be expected when historical discourses of Western and Non-western authors are compared:

(1) Western Dominance versus Subaltern agency

Books written from the perspective of the former colonizer will emphasize the civilizing impact of the colonial regime and focus on beneficial effects such as modernization and development. The authors of Western books are likely to use 'the transition narrative' Chakrabarty (2009). They centralize the ideology of capitalism, liberalism and modernization in such a way that the West remains the sovereign theoretical subject in historic discourse outside its continent. The non - Western authors on the other hand, will stress the negative consequences of subordination. They are likely to critically evaluate the behavior of the colonizer and give voice to local books and articles which are inaccessible to Western authors. A second tension that can be expected concerns:

(2) Orientalism versus Occidentalism

It can be expected that both Western and non - Western authors will base their analysis on stereotypes, albeit different ones. Western authors are likely to use Oriental discourse in their books. They are likely to describe people in the Orient as: backward, violent, irrational

traditional, exotic and barbaric (Said, 1978), whereas non - Western authors are likely to portray people from the West using Occidental discourse: rational, mechanical, cold, individualist, progressive but soulless (Buruma & Margalit, 2004). It is assumed that authors outside the West are likely to describe colonialism as a Western instrument to fulfill their merchant ideals. These authors are likely to explain that colonialism was necessary for the West to obtain material goods and physical comfort (Buruma & Margalit, 2004). A third tension that can be expected from the postcolonial literature concerns a divide between:

(3) Barbaric versus Emancipatory violence

Authors of Western historiography can be expected to defend violence of colonizers as a necessary evil to rule the colonized state. Moreover, they could describe it as a rational reaction to the uncivilized behavior of the natives. The oriental discourse as described by Said (1978) is likely to be rehearsed by Western authors and legitimizes violent interventions by colonial officers to restore peace in the colonized state. While non – Western authors can be expected to emphasize the instrumental value of violence as a means of liberation. These authors will describe the use of violence similar to Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961). Decolonization is accompanied with violence because the natives no longer accept colonial oppression. Masses are mobilized to tear down the colonial system by acts of emancipatory violence because authoritarian rule of the colonizer cannot be overcome peacefully.

3.2 Background Information on the Authors and the Books

Dominique Lapierre & Larry Collins: Freedom at Midnight

The authors Dominique Lapierre and Larry Collins (1975) have cooperated in writing historical novels multiple times. Lapierre is a French author born on 30th of July in Châtelailon-Plage, France (Pen Publishing, 2017). He studied economics at Lafayette college in Easton, Pennsylvania. After his studies, he was obliged to serve in the French military. During his first year of service, he met the US graduate Larry Collins. The two authors began publishing historical books from the moment they met. *Freedom at Midnight* was published in 1975. The book describes the history of partition from New Year's Day 1947 till the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi on the 30th of January 1948. The authors describe in the epilogue of the book how the history of partition was studied. The authors held many interviews with former British colonial rulers such as: Louis Mountbatten, Krishna Menon, Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord

Trevelyan, Sir George Abell, Sir Olaf Caroe and Sir Conrad Corfield. The authors have used predominantly British sources such as: *Britain in India*, *The Fall of the British Empire*, *British Social Life in India*, *Pax Britannica* and *The Handbook of British India, 1984*. Lapierre and Collins (1975) have also examined Indian sources. They held interviews with former Prime Minister Indira Gandhi on the life of her father: Congress leader Nehru. The image of Muslim party leader Jinnah is based on interviews with his daughter: Dina Wadia. The authors have focused a great deal of attention in their book on the life of Gandhi and his role during India's decolonization. Many written sources about his life such as: *Gandhi: A study in Revolution*; *Gandhi, An Autobiography*, *the Life of Mahatma Gandhi* and *Jinnah and Gandhi* have been studied for this book. These sources are complemented with interviews of Indians who were closely related to Gandhi. The authors are less precise on the sources used that describe the outbreak of violence in the aftermath of British withdrawal from India. Lapierre and Collins (1975) claim that they have selected stories from over 400 refugees. The last five chapters of *Freedom at Midnight* are focused on the Indians responsible for the assassination of Gandhi. The background, membership of the R.S.S. and the final assassination in Gandhi's Birla home were based on interviews with the men who carried it out.

Book review

The book has been reviewed by Leonard Gordon in 1976 who claims that the centerpiece of *Freedom at Midnight* concerns the viewpoint of Mountbatten on India's decolonization and the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi. Gordon claims that "we get the God's eye view of events, presented uncritically" (1976: 702) by Lord Mountbatten. "A great deal of the narrative circles around him" (Gordon, 1976: 702). He regrets that the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi covers a great deal of the book. In fact, 100 pages of this 500 page historical book is focused on this subject. Gordon (1976) criticizes the authors for combining descriptions of colonialism in the 19th century with British rule in 1947 as if Indian society remained unchanged. Furthermore, Gordon (1976) argues that the authors stress that Muhammed Ali Jinnah -the leader of the Muslim League - is one-sidedly to blame for the partition of India. If he was not so stubborn to insist on an independent state, India could have remained united after British withdrawal. Nevertheless, the interviews and private papers with former viceroy Mountbatten as well as the interviews with Gandhi's assassins Gopal Godse, Vishnu Karkare and Madan Lal Pahwa give new insights on this period in India's history. Gordon (1976) claims that the book made contributions which are vividly described by the authors. This makes *Freedom at Midnight* accessible to a wide public (Gordon, 1976).

Massarrat Abid: Britain, India and Pakistan, Partition and After 1947 - 1951

The author of this book was born and raised in Pakistan. She graduated with a M.A. in history at the University of the Punjab in Lahore in 1976 and is currently Professor of Pakistan studies and director of the Pakistan study centre at the same university. Abid published 45 research articles on Pakistan international relations, including historic books as the one under analysis for this thesis (Abid, 2013). Muslim author Massarrat Abid (2013) describes in the introduction of her book that she used British sources, such as: Cabinet memoranda of the UK high commissioners in India, letters and reports from the Commonwealth Relations Office (CRO) and other dominions who provided information. However, the author claims that she “also tried to use all the published sources from Pakistan” (Abid, 2013: xii) in her study of British, India and Pakistan relations referring to decolonization and partition.

Book Review

Reviews about the historic book of Massarrat Abid (2013) are not found in Google Scholar, WorldCat or other academic search engines. You would expect that a book about India’s decolonization consisting of 485 pages would be reviewed by scholars. The lack of interest of Western scholars to read and review this work confirms Gramsci’s theory of cultural hegemony in Western academia.

Sucheta Mahajan: Independence and Partition, The Erosion of Colonial Power

The author of this book is Sucheta Mahajan. She graduated at the Jawaharlal Nehru university in 1979 and is professor since 2007 on modern and contemporary history of India. She has written many articles about India’s independence movements, decolonization, constitution building, India’s economy, child-labour and so forth. Mahajan (2000) wrote four books including two about India’s struggle for independence as well as the book under analysis for this thesis. She explains in the preface of her book that she used numerous primary sources from archives in India as well as abroad such as; institutional papers, newspapers, pamphlet literature and contemporary work. Mahajan (2000) acquired first-hand information from the leaders of the Indian National Army (INA) and the Royal Indian Navy (RIN) on their revolts against the colonizers. Moreover, she read about worker struggles, peasant movements and literature of the British officials and information from the Congress and Muslim League leaders. The Hindu author claims in the introduction of her book to give a historical approach that endeavours: “to steer clear of colonial stereotypes, nationalist romanticization, sectarian

radicalism and a rigid dogmatic approach. We have also discouraged the flavour of the month approach which tries to ape whatever is currently fashionable” (Mahajan, 2000: 9).

Book Review

Chakrabarty (2001) reviewed Sucheta Mahajan’s book. He argues that her research pays predominant attention to the erosion of colonial power. Chakrabarty (2001) argues that she attempted to find crucial factors that have influenced the British to withdraw from India which is sometimes exaggerated with phrases like: “the British administration stood totally eclipsed in some areas during the 1942 Quit India movement” (Chakrabarty, 2001: 340). He concludes that the book is very useful to understand how nationalism came about in the years preceding the transfer of power.

3.3 Deconstructive Discourse Analysis

This thesis compares books on the decolonization of India from a, Hindu, Muslim and Western perspective. A comparison of the three books allows me to deconstruct the dominant assumptions on this tumultuous period in India’s history. The method under concern can be categorized as poststructuralist deconstructive discourse analysis. In order to understand this method, I will first address poststructural schools of thought on the relationship between power and language. Second, I will explain Derrida’s discourse analysis concerning his definitions of deconstruction. Third, the idea behind the concept of deconstruction is explained as well as critique from other scholars. Fourth, Derrida’s concept of deconstruction is related to the three books on India’s decolonization.

Language and power

This study will address two schools on the relationship between power and language. Firstly, the Foucault, Marxist and Frankfurt school. This group of scholars argue that there are political, economic or ideological structures of domination. Foucault (2002) argues that meaning and power are inextricably linked in discourse. The power - knowledge relationship are both co-articulated in discourses. Neo-marxist approaches have ideological foundations. Gramsci argues that language serves as an instrument to dominate over others. It is an instrument of power to create an ideological hegemony. They focus on how historical processes help to consolidate a dominant culture. The second school of poststructuralists focus on the role of language in social life. An influential scholar in this field is Jacques Derrida. Derrida looks at the dominant structures in texts, books, literature and so forth. He is well known for his concept

of deconstruction. Derrida explains two definitions of deconstruction. His first definition is of interest for this thesis since the second is more political theory oriented³.

Deconstruction

Deconstruction is “an analytical project which aims at demonstrating that all dominant systems of thought emerge through discourse and, therefore, are contingent and fragile constructions rather than absolute truths” (Chouliaraki, 2008: 88). Derrida examines hierarchies between written and spoken language when he analyzes discourse. He explains the differences between these discourses in his book *Of Grammatology* (1967). In this book, Derrida (1967) criticizes Ferdinand de Saussure. The latter argued that western linguists have paid too much attention to written language and should instead focus on speech. Derrida turns this reasoning around. He argues that speech always gained priority over writing. Several factors have contributed to the dominance of speech over the written. Firstly, people are able to speak before they write. Even today, there are still ethnic- and indigenous groups where people communicate through speech acts without writing. Furthermore, Derrida argues that you cannot find people around the world who start writing before they speak. The process of writing always follows after abilities to verbalize words in speech with a significant other (Ellis, 1990). And lastly, the dominance of speech over written language is also based on presence. This means that between the speaker and the listener, there is no temporal nor spatial distance (Florentsen, 1996). Barbara Johnson (1983: VIII) argues that immediacy in spoken language “seems to guarantee the notion that in the spoken word we know what we mean, mean what we say, say what we mean, and know what we have said”. However, Derrida (1967) argues that the hierarchy of speech over the written, ultimately leads to a detriment of written knowledge. It remains a derivative of the spoken. Speech is privileged for its spontaneity while writing is reduced to the realm of repeatability. Derrida (1967) concludes that the written is reduced to an imitation of the spoken word. It is subverted under the prevalence of the spoken. This is what Derrida calls: immanence. This immanence of the written word; undermining its importance by making it operative within

³ Derrida explains in *The Force of Law* (1992) that deconstruction can be approached in a genealogical and formalistic style. The former definition addresses histories of a certain theme such as the history of writing or the history of justice. While the latter; the formalistic style or otherwise called, the structural style, examines aporias; these are a-historical paradoxes. when focusing on the history of justice for example, Derrida argues that urgency always obstructs the possibility of making a just decision since you are not acquainted with all sources and perspectives. Derrida describes this as ‘an act of madness’.

another term is problematic and calls for deconstruction. Derrida (1967) refers to it as the first phase of deconstruction. The second phase is the action approach. This means that priority of the spoken over the written is reversed by re-inscribing the written to a new idealized origin. The commonsense viewpoint of speech above the written is now reversed. The temporality of Derrida's first definition of deconstruction becomes clear from his project.

Jacques Derrida uses the idea of temporality as a fundamental critique to the structural approaches of metaphysics. This idea is addressed in his second book: *Positions* (1981). Here, Derrida elaborates on philosophy and the concept of language (Lawlor, 2014). He questions philosophy as the solemn dispenser of reason. Derrida (1981) argues that many philosophers such as Plato have been able to impose their ideas by suppressing the disruptive effects of language (Norris, 1991). In *Positions* (1981) Derrida criticizes Plato for his structural approach of metaphysics. Plato claims that existence can be structured in oppositions. Between these oppositions, a certain hierarchy unfolds. This means that some term becomes more valuable compared to others. The more valuable explanations will bring us to a better understanding of reality. Derrida argues that the assumptions of this approach are wrong. The hierarchy in oppositions does not spark naturally. When you take oppositions between for example: soul and body, good and evil or essence and appearance, one term is often reduced under to a dominant other. For instance; soul is reduced as a variation of the body. This critique is based on the process of immanence as Derrida explained in *Of Grammatology* (1967). One opposite is reduced within another term. Derrida claims that the reduction was based on a decision. Ambivalence is responsible for the hierarchies in oppositions. Derrida (1981) argues that the ambivalence can be solved by a process of re-inscription. This means that the inferior term of the hierarchical oppositions must be re-inscribed as the origin of the opposition. The inferior term becomes dominant while the former dominant term is subverted. This concept accords to the subject of the spoken and written in Derrida's book *Of Grammatology* (1967). Derrida (1981) concludes that dominancy and inferiority of terms are based on temporal experiences of reality. His critique on Plato is directed at the self-evidence of his beliefs, concepts and structures. Derrida (1981) aims "to demonstrate the limited validity of concepts and beliefs, even their falsity, aiming, in other words, to dispel the illusions they have generated. In general, deconstructive critique targets the illusion of presence, that is, the idea that being is simply present and available before our eyes (Lawlor, 2012: 122).

Derrida's deconstructive endeavor and criticism

The concept of deconstruction is described as a two-step method. First to lay bare oppositions and hierarchies and second, to re-inscribe a term in such a way as to reverse the reduction of the subordinated term as the origin of the opposition. However, Jacques Derrida would not claim that deconstruction is a method. He argues that: "Deconstruction is neither a theory nor a philosophy. It is neither a school nor a method. It is not even a discourse nor an act, nor a practice. It is what happens, what is happening today in what they call society, politics, diplomacy, economics and so on and so forth" (Derrida, 1990: 85). Derrida's goal of deconstruction is a quest for egalitarianism. He seeks to prevent the dominance of one pole of an opposition by enabling another.

Derrida undermines logocentric assumptions and can therefore be categorized as a postcolonial scholar. Young (2016) argues that Derrida's concepts have been used by minorities and subaltern study groups. His ideas have contributed to a separation of rational methods from truths. Nevertheless, his concept of deconstruction has also been criticized. Florentsen (1996) claims that reality obstructs the process of re-inscription. A term can only theoretically be re-inscribed, privileged or subverted to another term. Secondly, critics argue that 'true interpretation' of a text will remain impossible. As de Man (1983) argues: "the possibility of reading can never be taken for granted. It is an act that can never be observed, nor in any way prescribed or verified" (de Man, 1983: 107). This view is confirmed by Barbara Johnson who claims that deconstruction in the absence of foundations: "seem to dig up something that is really nothing, a difference, a gap, an interval, a trace" (Johnson, 1983: X). However, this criticism is related to the interpretation of discourse by Derrida's concept of deconstruction. My aim with Derrida's concept of deconstruction is narrow in this sense. It is focused on the first phase of Derrida's first definition on deconstruction described in *of Grammatology* (1967). I want to present how in certain texts some discourse dominates at the expense of subaltern explanations. The aim is to deconstruct the history of India's decolonization by comparing discourse from three perspectives and see how certain elements are limitedly addressed i.e. are subverted by privileging discourse of the authors interest. This is not done to demonstrate that limited validity of certain beliefs or concepts, but from a postcolonial perspective. This means that I seek to find out whether beliefs are shaped by the interest and desires of the Hindu, Muslim and Western authors. How these authors describe some events extensively, while limit description on flaws or sensible regrets or elicit them all together.

4. A Hindu, Muslim and Western Perspective on the Decolonization of India

The three books on the decolonization of India will be compared within a discourse framework. First, I will describe the structure of this framework and justify why this structure of comparison has been chosen. Second, the discourse of the Hindu, Muslim and Western books will be compared on similarities, differences, elaborations, elicitations and interpretations. Third, the discourse of the three books will be related to the postcolonial literature by examining the tensions of (1) Western Dominance and Subaltern explanations (2) Orientalism and Occidentalism and (3) Barbaric and Emancipatory violence.

4.1 Structure of Analysis

The discourses of the Western, Muslim and Hindu books on India's decolonization will be compared in a discourse framework of three periods. Before choosing these periods, one needs to analyze what part of India's decolonization is covered in the books. The following table shows in a simplified manor, what the discourse of the Western, Muslim and Hindu book entails on the whole period of decolonization – before 1946 till 1951:




Period	Year	Discourse		
		Western book	Muslim book	Hindu book
1	Prior 1946			
	1946			
2	1947			
3	1948			
	1949			
	1950			
	1951			

Table 1

The thickness of the squares present the amount of discourse described by the authors in a certain year. Hence, the Western book of Lapierre & Collins (1975) limitedly addresses the run up to partition and elaborates extensively on 1947, the year prior India's independence and early 1948 when Mahatma Gandhi was assassinated. The Muslim book of Massarrat Abid (2013) equally pays attention to issues in years prior to independence, the year itself and the aftermath of national liberation till 1951. The Hindu book of Sucheta Mahajan (2000) pays almost all attention to the years prior to India's independence when British power was eroding on the

subcontinent. She hardly addresses the consequences of British withdrawal in 1947 and the dreadful consequences of partition.

The periods for deconstructive discourse comparison are chosen to cover the discourses of the three books evenly. Hence, the discourse needs to be balanced over three periods. The first column of table 1 presents how the discourse of the three books are matched with three periods. They are demarcated as follows:

Period	Subject
1	Background information till the appointment of viceroy Mountbatten, 20/2/1947
2	Appointment Mountbatten till Independence Day of India 15/8/1947
3	Discourse of the books after India's Independence Day

Table 2

Period 1 concerns background information till the appointment of viceroy Mountbatten on the 20th of February 1947. I have deliberately chosen to finish the first period of this discourse framework with the appointment of Mountbatten as the last viceroy of India. From a postcolonial perspective, this might confirm the image that his role in the transfer of power was eminent. By choosing Mountbatten as a determinant for ending the first period in the process of India's partition, I risk making him more important in the decolonization of India than the Hindu and Muslim authors would attribute to him. However, I have chosen to end the first period with the appointment of Mountbatten to obtain an equal spread of discourse in the three periods. Hence, the justification of this event lies primarily on the discourse Western, Muslim and Hindu authors address in their books, not on the momentous event of Louis Mountbatten's appointment. Nevertheless, I realize that by choosing this date, my Western bias and the reification of Western knowledge and power is confirmed.

Period 2 of this discourse framework starts from the day that Mountbatten is appointed as viceroy of India till the withdrawal of the British on the 15th of August 1947. The latter date is the formal Independence Day of India. On this day, India celebrates its national liberation from British rule. As can be viewed in table 1, the discourse of the Hindu book outpaces the Western book and the Muslim book in quantity within the second period. However, all authors pay considerable attention to the transfer of power in 1947. But, as will be discussed in the results chapter, the authors elaborate or highlight some events, issues, developments or transformations, while others are silenced or elicited before the transfer of power.

Period 3 sets out the discourse of the three books after independence. Hence, this period entails the discourse of the books after 15th of August 1947. The consequences of decolonization and the withdrawal of the British from the Indian subcontinent will be discussed in the third period. The Muslim author (2013) devotes much of her discourse on the consequences of partition. She writes about the consequences till 4 years after British decolonization with analysis of the Kashmir dispute, British – Pakistan financial agreements, and Pakistan – Afghan relations. The Western book (1975) devotes many chapters on one event after India’s independence; the plan to- and final assassination of Mahatma Gandhi. This event took place within a timeframe of six months after August 15, 1947. The Hindu author (2000) hardly addresses the aftermath of India’s independence. Almost all discourse of the book covers the years prior independence with special attention to national movements i.e. the erosion of British colonial power on the Indian subcontinent.

4.2 Period 1 - Discourse Comparison of Western, Muslim and Hindu books

The discourses of the three books vary considerably in the first period: background information till the appointment of viceroy Mountbatten⁴. The authors of the Western book explain how the Indian subcontinent was conquered by the British. How the East India Company (EIC) set sail to the Orient, entered the coast of Bombay, invaded the land of the Moghuls and took charge of the Indian subcontinent. The Hindu (200) and Muslim (2013) authors do not describe the invasion and colonization of India elaborately. Instead, they focus on the relations with the British on the subcontinent after it was colonized. However, there are great differences between the two authors as well. The Muslim author analyzes the relations between the British and Muslims in India. Abid (2013) explains how relations declined during the Mutiny of 1857, but also how relations improved during World War II when Muslims were willing to help the British in their war effort against Japan. The Hindu author, Mahajan (2000) on the other hand, analyzes the relations of the British in India just after WW II when Indians began to question the legitimacy of British rule on the subcontinent. Colonial rule eroded through national movements. The Hindu author (2013) explains how the Indian National Army (INA) trials and Royal Indian Navy (RIN) revolts initiated a change of mindset towards British officials which could not be reversed. When comparing the discourses of the three authors in this first period,

⁴ A summary of the Hindu, Muslim and Western discourse in the first period can be found in Appendix 1.

it becomes clear that the assumptions of postcolonial theory are confirmed. Hence, there are no logically consistent explanations or universal truths in historic discourse. Descriptions on this historic period are shaped by authors interests. Hence, the Western authors focus on British imperialism and how the British successfully ruled the land of India for 300 years. The Muslim author (2013) explains the relations between Muslims and the British during colonization and how the Muslims were suppressed and mistreated by the imperial British, whereas the Hindu author (2000) analyzes the erosion of British authority through the lens of Indian national movements i.e. how Indians began to riot against British officials prior to the transfer of power.

There is hardly any overlap between events in the Hindu, Muslim and Western discourses, but even when they do, there are differences concerning interpretation. For instance, the authors of the Western book (1975) refer to the Mutiny of 1857 as an event that caused a change for British rule in India. It would be transferred from the 'Honourable East India Company' to Queen Victoria. Hence, India was now in hands of the Crown. The Muslim author (2013) on the other hand, describes the consequences of the Mutiny in 1857 for Muslims in India. She explains how the British colonizers blamed Muslims for the Mutiny and were punished by abandoning them from any work in the administrative field. A similar difference can be found on the authors approach to the last viceroy of India: Louis Mountbatten. The authors of the Western book; Lapierre & Collins (1975), open their book with a background portrait of Louis Mountbatten. His heroic acts during World War II and his successful negotiations as Supreme Allied commander of Southeast (SEAC) are extensively described. The subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 & Mahajan, 2000) rather focus on the question why Louis Mountbatten was chosen to become viceroy of India, that is, because an impasse was reached between Indian party leaders and British Cabinet Ministers in 1946. All parties involved could not agree on the constitution, the interim government and the shape of the Indian state after independence. The Muslim author (2013) focusses on British internal struggles between Cabinet Ministers and former viceroy Archibald Wavell. They could not agree on the configuration of the interim government. The Western authors (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) have chosen not to pay any attention to these events at all.

The authors also differ in the first period on the role of Mahatma Gandhi The Western authors (1975) devote much discourse on the background of Gandhi. Where the man was born, his life as a student in London and as a lawyer in South-Africa. Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe his 'turning points' in life which made him formulate 'revolutionary' principles such as non-

violence and civil disobedience. These principles were successfully practiced in India to undermine British authority on the subcontinent. The background information on the life of Gandhi is not discussed by the Muslim (2013) and Hindu (2000) authors. The Muslim author (Abid, 2013) does not even mention his name in the first period. She does not view him as an imminent figure for the transfer of power in 1947. The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) discusses the role of Gandhi, but she characterizes the man as a politician instead of a saint. The latter stereotypization relates to the Western authors portrayal of Mahatma Gandhi. The Hindu author (2000) also criticizes the success of Gandhi's pilgrimages for peace between Hindus and Muslims and Sikhs. The Western authors give a one-sided image of Mahatma Gandhi emphasizing his benevolent character. A man who was able to solve issues between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs when they threatened to become insurmountable.

A last difference can be viewed in the first period between the discourses of the Western, Muslim and Hindu books when focusing on the role of the Maharajas. The authors of the Western book (1975) describe the lives of the Maharajas in full detail. Lapierre & Collins (1975) explain how they decorated their palaces, devoted their spare time hunting tigers and fulfilled their sexual desires from a harem of women. The subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 & Mahajan, 2000) do not make any descriptions about the lives of the Maharajas. The Hindu author pays attention to the role of the Maharajas but only in relationship to the transfer of power i.e. how they would no longer rule over their sovereign lands, but became part of either India or Pakistan. The Muslim author (2000) relates to the Maharajas in her chapter on the Kashmir dispute. She explains how controversy in the region heightened due to the quest of Maharaja Hari Singh to remain independent after decolonization. However, this concerns the third period of this deconstructive discourse framework and will therefore be discussed in the third part of this chapter.

4.3 Period 1 - Discourse in Relationship to Postcolonial theory

Western dominance versus Subaltern agency concerning political negotiations

A first difference can be observed in the three books on India's decolonization concerning political negotiations. The authors of the Western book only mention the Cabinet Mission Plan (CMP) initiated by Clement Attlee in 1946 once in the whole book. Lapierre and Collins (1975) do not describe how an impasse was reached between all parties before the arrival of viceroy

Mountbatten in India. It seems as if the authors (1975) do not wish to pay attention to British negotiations which failed during their rule in India. They only focus on the ‘successful’ negotiations - although you can debate whether partition of India can be seen as a success at all – for a transfer of power between the British and the Indian political parties. The Muslim (2013) and the Hindu (2000) authors on the other hand elaborate on the Cabinet Mission plan (CMP) of 1946. They describe the process on how a constitution would be built, the shape of an interim government and how Indians would replace the British government in the executive council. Abid (2013) and Mahajan (2000) both analyze the internal issues between British Cabinet Ministers and viceroy Wavell in 1946. The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) argues that the latter held good relations with Muhammed Ali Jinnah; the leader of the Muslim League. Viceroy Wavell claimed that the Muslim League should be invited to enter the interim government based on their world War II effort. And, in contradiction with the Cabinet Ministers, he claimed that the leaders of the Indian National Congress – referred to as Congress - should not interpret the rules of the plan to their own liking. The Cabinet Ministers encountered internal struggles with viceroy Wavell about his approach. Since the Ministers wished to keep Congress aboard at any cost. The internal struggles of the British are not described in the Western book of Lapierre & Collins (1975). This confirms the Eurocentric dominant view that in historic discourse, the West portrays itself as benevolent, rational, civilized who privilege their success and undermine discourse on their misgivings during colonial rule. The Western authors glorify the role of Viceroy Mountbatten and thereby undermine attention to British internal struggles of predecessor Wavell, whereas the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 & Mahajan, 2000) critically assess British misgivings for a possible transfer of power in 1946 and thereby undermine the benevolence of viceroy Mountbatten. This deviation confirms the postcolonial assumption that historic discourse remains subjective and induced by the interests of the authors.

There are also some differences between the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 and Mahajan, 2000) on the interpretation of the impasse between Indian party leaders and the Cabinet Ministers in 1946. The Muslim author (Abid, 2013) argues that the Muslim League accepted the rules set out by the Cabinet ministers on the 16th of May 1946. The leaders of Congress however would interpret the rules to their own liking. Congress party leader Jawaharlal Nehru wished to regroup the Hindu provinces himself and would not accept the possibility to change groups after a period of ten years. Abid (2013) claims that within this context, the leader of the Muslim League; Muhammed Ali Jinnah decided to withdraw from the Cabinet Mission Plan (CMP). Mahajan (2000) does not deny that Congress interpreted the rules to their self-interest, but she

blames the British for this behavior. Since the British were ambiguous about the grouping process of provinces. In an attempt of the British Cabinet Ministers to please both Indian parties, Congress behaved accordingly. Hence, not only do we see a divide between the Western book and subaltern books (Abid, 2013 & Mahajan, 2000) whether to devote discourse on the Cabinet Mission Plan (CMP) or not, we also discern different interpretations between the Hindu and Muslim authors on the question why negotiations between the British and the Indian political parties failed. From a postcolonial perspective, the Muslim author (Abid, 2013) has an interest to defend the acts of Muslim League leader Jinnah. Likewise, has the Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) an interest to blame the British for their ambiguous policies. The different interpretations confirm the assumptions of postcolonial theory i.e. that the analysis of the writer is imbued with subjective knowledge. The authors see what they wish to see and interpret it to their self-interest. What the authors analyze is shaped by desire.

Western dominance versus Subaltern agency concerning British decolonization

The authors of the Western book written by Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe British withdrawal from India as a rational decision. The authors claim that the financial debt of World War II was high for the United Kingdom. Consequently, British Prime Minister Clement Attlee decided to dismantle the overseas colonies just after the war. The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) gives a different explanation for British withdrawal from the Indian subcontinent. She argues that the British only had short period of time to decide on its future or else it would be forced to quit. She elaborates on national movements on the Indian subcontinent. In November 1945 and February 1946 movements in Calcutta challenged the British authorities. These violent struggles undermined British power and liberated the minds of the Indian people (Mahajan, 2000). In the words of Frantz Fanon, “the colonized subject [the Indians] discovered that his life, his breathing and his heartbeats are the same as the colonist” (1961: 10). The Hegelian dialectic between the colonizer and the colonized would be turned around. The Indians no longer accepted British colonial suppression and would force them to withdraw in a short period of time. Hence, a divide between Western (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) and the Hindu (Mahajan, 2000) authors can be discerned on the interpretation of British decolonization from India. The Western authors argue that the withdrawal from India was a rational decision. A clear plan would follow suit to make the transfer of power with Indian party leaders possible. While the Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) describes that the British were forced to quit India if they would not grant independence to the Indians soon. The descriptions of both authors confirm the postcolonial assumption that the Western authors (1975) have an interest to positively portray

British withdrawal from India. Similarly has the Hindu author (2000) an interest to undermine the rationality of this decision and privilege the erosion of British power in the subcontinent as reason for the British to initiate decolonization. It is in her interest to critically assess British colonialism in India against national movements which force them to quit from the subcontinent. Mahajan (2000) desires to portray British colonial concerns; as men and women who urgently wish to uphold a civilized legacy, and rush a decision for a transfer of power to serve their self-interest.

Western Orientalism versus Occidentalism on the lives of the Maharajas

The authors of the Western book (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) describe the lives of the British and the lives of the Maharajas in India. The authors portray the lives of the British in India as civilized and luxurious where all pleasures in life could be fulfilled. The India of the British was:

“the India of gentlemen officers in plumed shakos riding at the head of their turbaned sepoy...; of sumptuous imperial balls in the Himalayan capital of Simla; cricket matches on the manicured lawns of Calcutta’s Bengal Club; polo games on the sunburnt plains of Rajasthan; tiger hunts in Assam; young men sitting down to dinner in black ties in a tent in the middle of the jungle, solemnly proposing their toast in port to the King Emperor while jackals howled in the darkness around them... those men were, generally the products of families of impeccable breeding but less certain wealth... fit to rule an empire” (Collins & Lapierre, 1975: 13)

Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe the Western colonizers as superior, rational and civilized similarly as Said does in his book *Orientalism* (1978). The British lived a comfortable life, full of materialist wealth and physical pleasure in the colonized state of India. The authors contrast the rule of these ‘gentlemen’ with the lives of the Maharajas. These men made a compromise with the British to remain sovereign rulers of their lands in India. Lapierre and Collins (1975) devote a whole chapter in the book *Freedom at Midnight* (1975) on their peculiar behavior which is described as uncivilized, alien, barbaric and exotic. The authors portray in detail how the exorbitantly wealthy Maharajas spent their fortune. Hence, how the rulers decorated their palaces with chandeliers, bought loads of jewelry and surrounded themselves with a harem of women. The authors also describe how they Maharajas organized tiger hunts for fun. While these hunts have also been organized by British colonizers. However, this ‘uncivilized’ form of behavior is not addressed in detail by the authors. Leonard Gordon (1976) reviewed the book on these descriptions questioning the content: “we learn about the vast wealth of the Nizam of Hyderabad and the sexual perversions of the Maharaja of Patalia. What do these details have to

do with the achievement of Indian independence?” (Gordon, 1975: 702). The subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 and Mahajan, 2000) do not devote any discourse on the personal lives of the Maharajas in India. The authors limitedly refer to the Maharajas and when they do, it involves their lives as politicians not their private lives. Hence, when the authors refer to the Maharaja of Kashmir; Hari Singh, they focus on his political goal: to become an independent state after the transfer of power. The Western authors (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) also describe this goal, but combine this with oriental character descriptions. They claim that Maharaja Hari Singh: “was a weak, vacillating, indecisive man who divided his time between opulent feasts in his winter capital in Jammu and the beautiful, flower-choked lagoons of his summer capital, Srinagar, the Venice of the Orient” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 145). I will come back to the dispute of Kashmir and the role of Maharaja Hari Singh in Period three of this chapter.

Western Orientalism versus Occidentalism concerning Mahatma Gandhi

Lapierre & Collins (1975) devote much discourse on Mahatma Gandhi. The authors focus both on his character as well as his political role during the transfer of power. Lapierre and Collins (1975) describe where he grew up, his ambitions and how his life in England and South-Africa shaped his mind. The authors describe Gandhi as a spiritual man, a prophet. An exotic man who was able to change the political direction of India by his principles of non-violence and civil disobedience. Lapierre & Collins (1975) make use of cheesy oriental sentences to describe this behavior: “Gandhi destined to become India’s greatest spiritual leader of modern times” (1975: 40), “Gandhi, the future prophet of poverty (1975: 42) or sentences like: “No man was more tolerant, more genuinely free of any taint of religious prejudice than Gandhi (1975: 27). These sentences confirm Said’s (1975) argument of Western orientalist discourse. The character of Gandhi is romanticized by the authors. He is a man who conforms to spiritual believes which cannot be grasped by Western enlightened people. The Western authors obstruct the possibility for Gandhi to portray himself. Instead, he is interpreted and represented by the West. This stands in sharp contrast to the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 & Mahajan 2000) where these character descriptions are absent. The Muslim author (Abid, 2013) does not even mention the role of Gandhi in this first period. His name is not mentioned. She does not attribute him an important role in the run up to India’s decolonization. The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) analyzes the role of Gandhi, but she does not ‘represent him’. She does not describe what he thinks and why he behaves in a certain way. The Western interpretations of Gandhi’s character are absent in her book. She pays attention to Gandhi, but merely as a political negotiator before- and during the transfer of power in 1947.

Western Orientalism versus Occidentalism on the British transfer of Power

The authors of the Hindu and Muslim books (Abid, 2013 and Mahajan, 2000) describe how the Cabinet Ministers and viceroy Wavell struggle on a plan for the transfer of power. The Cabinet Ministers proposed a three-tier constitutional framework that would safeguard the unity of India. However, they could not agree on the structure of the plan and the amount of parties invited to negotiate for a transfer of power. Instead of changing the plan in a direction which would satisfy all, viceroy Wavell concluded that an impasse was reached. A compromise between the Cabinet Ministers and viceroy Wavell was no longer possible. The conclusions described by the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 and Mahajan, 2000) confirm to theories of Occidentalism (Buruma & Margalit, 2004). Hence, the West approached the decolonization and transfer of power in India very mechanical. The cold and rational West sought to find a rational solution on the future independent state of India, but their mechanical approach did not yield to any compromise and caused an impasse. The authors of the Western book (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) do not devote any discourse on these negotiations. They claim that the transfer of power was a win-win outcome for all parties involved. The subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 and Mahajan, 2000) do not express similar conclusions. The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) argues that British rigid approach towards the transfer of power provoked communal tensions between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs in India. They decided to categorize some provinces as Hindu and others as Muslim. Mahajan (2000) concludes that British political strategy of divide and rule caused the detrimental effects of communal violence. The Hindu author (2000) blames the British for this outcome with Occidental stereotypizations.

Barbaric versus Emancipatory violence

The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) and the Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) describe symbolic emancipatory acts of violence in the first period of this discourse framework. Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe how Gandhi wished to be socially accepted as a law student in London. He decided to become an English gentleman. Gandhi dressed like them and behaved like them; enhancing his speech by elocution lessons and playing Western instruments such as the violin. This behavior of Gandhi accords with Fanon's view expressed in *Black Skin White Masks* (1951). Gandhi's attitude confirmed the superiority of the white man and his subordinate position as a brown immigrant. This might have increased the gap between the dominant Western race and the inferiority of the Indians. However, Lapierre & Collins (1975) do not describe British non-acceptance of Gandhi explicitly. Instead, they argue that Gandhi desperately tried to become an Englishman but failed in his endeavor. His tongue refused to

speak with Western accent. Moreover, the authors (1975) claim that he was far too shy to make contact any contact and gained the British recognition which he longed for. The authors of the Western book (1975) are more explicit describing symbolic acts of violence when Gandhi returns to India. Back in his mother country, Gandhi began to challenge British authoritarian rule. The authors mention how Gandhi gathered masses of peasants for his pilgrimage to sea called: The Salt March. It was a symbolic act of Gandhi to counter British salt monopoly. This was a financial system which disproportionately benefited the British government at the expense of the colonized Indians. Similarly has Gandhi promoted the boycott of British institutions such as courts and schools because they upheld unjust practices which undermined the position of the Indians.

The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2013) devotes much discourse in the first period on symbolic acts of violence. She explains how popular consciousness in India changed in August 1945. After World War II, Indians started to celebrate the death anniversaries of national patriots and independence activists. Students began to protest against suppression and claimed civil liberties. They burned the British flag and hoisted the national flag of India. Mahajan (2013) also focusses on societal response on the Indian National Army (INA) trials as symbolic acts of violence. Indians throughout the subcontinent supported the release of Indian army officers. The British government would bring them to trial since they were seen as guilty of torture and murder in WW II. However, widespread popular support throughout the state protested for the release of the INA prisoners. The British government in India could not turn down these demands. Mahajan (2013) explains that the protests and the burning of colonial flags changed the mindset of the people. These acts correspond with Fanon's final chapter in *Black Skin White Masks* (1952) on how the negro can gain recognition again. The Indians started to demand human behavior of the colonizer through these symbolic acts of violence. They started to liberate themselves from British oppressive colonial rule.

Barbaric versus Emancipatory violence

The subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 and Mahajan, 2000) analyze decolonial violence in the first period of this discourse framework. This contrasts with the Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) who do not devote any discourse on decolonial violence in their book. The concept of decolonial violence is described in Fanon's book *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961). Fanon describes how violence erupts between the natives and the settler during decolonization. The former overcomes the oppressive colonial system by absolute violence against the

colonizer. The colonized masses experience a change of consciousness and a murderous struggle against the oppressor will follow. Mahajan (2000) explains that there were instances where student demonstrations on the INA trials triggered physical violence against police authorities. She explains how students challenged the authorities by throwing bricks and stones. These acts similarly occurred in the Royal Indian Navy (RIN) Revolts of 1946. Mahajan (2000) refers to other scholars on the impact of the revolts: “The RIN revolt shook the mighty British empire to its foundation” (Banerjee in Mahajan 2000: 25). Interestingly, the violent confrontations between Indians and British authorities in Calcutta on November 1945 and February 1946 are only described in the Hindu book of Mahajan (2000). Furthermore, she is the only author who analyzes the violence against the British authorities of the Royal Indian Navy (RIN) in February 1946. The author claims that: “the RIN revolt was seen as an event which marked the end of British rule almost as finally as Independence Day, 1947” (Mahajan, 2000: 97). When comparing the discourses of these books, it is remarkable that the Hindu author claims that these were crucial events during India’s history and British decolonization since the authors of the Western book (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) and the author of the Muslim book (Abid, 2013) do not refer to these events at all. The Muslim book only pays attention to decolonial violence in this first period by describing the Mutiny of 1857. She argues that the British consolidated their rule in India by defeating the last Mughal emperor. Abid (2013) describes the consequences of the mutiny on the Muslim position in the colonized state. The Western authors does not refer to the Mutiny in terms of decolonial violence. They claim that the most important result of the Mutiny was that India would no longer be ruled by the British East India Company (EIC) but by the British crown. Moreover, Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe the consolidation of British rule after the Mutiny as beneficial for India. They argue that the British united the Indians by its legal, administrative and educational institutions: “It gave India the magnificent gift which was to become the common bond of its diverse peoples and the conduit of their revolutionary aspirations, the English language” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 12). Hence, the authors argue that the imposition of British institutions and the English language is beneficial for the Indians. The conclusion of the Western authors confirms symbolic acts violence. The authors claim British language and institutions as superior. They can be legitimately enforced in India for their own benefit.

4.4 Period 2 - Discourse Comparison of Western, Muslim and Hindu books

The discourses in the second period of the discourse framework - appointment of Mountbatten as viceroy till Independence Day of India in 1947 - presents great diversity⁵. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) devote lots of discourse on how viceroy Mountbatten experienced the last phase of British rule in India. First, by elaborating on Mountbatten's head to head conversations to foster a possible transfer of power. These conversations are not- or are very limitedly addressed in the Hindu (Mahajan, 2000) and Muslim (Abid, 2013) books. Furthermore, there are differences on how the authors approach the Simla negotiations of 1947, which by all authors is described as an event that changed the course of history. The Western authors pay lots of attention on the place Simla itself: the reasons of the viceroy to move to this summer capital, where it was situated and how British governors spend their holidays up there. The authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) describe the negotiations in Simla, but limit their discourse on the impact of the negotiations for the transfer of power. They also elicit the consequences of the negotiations in Simla 1947 on the relations between viceroy Mountbatten, Congress leader Nehru and Muslim League leader Jinnah. The subaltern authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) pay much more attention on the implications of the behind-the door negotiations between viceroy Mountbatten and Nehru in Simla. The authors critically evaluate the role of the British who did not take responsibility for the communal disturbances in India during that period of time. Furthermore, they accuse the British on the outcome of the Simla negotiations. The authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) claim that they were only occupied serving their self-interest when Congress leader Nehru agreed to join the Commonwealth (CW) as a separate dominion in exchange for an early date to transfer power. Secondly, the authors critically evaluate the role of Congress and party leader Nehru for his secret arrangements with viceroy Mountbatten. Abid (2013) describes that Nehru would not speak about his deal with Mountbatten publicly and Mahajan (2000) concludes that in the end, the Simla negotiations of mid 1947 was a Congress directive carried out by viceroy Mountbatten. This assumption is confirmed in the Western book of Lapierre and Collins (1975) when they describe the round table conference on June 3, 1947. They claim that Mountbatten forced Jinnah to comply with his plan for the partition of India. Furthermore, the authors of the Western book (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) never refer to the final agreement on the transition of power as: 'the 3rd June plan'. The authors refer to it as a conference organized around this day. The Hindu and Muslim authors on the other hand, name the title of a chapter or paragraph as: 'the 3rd June plan' and

⁵ A summary of the Hindu, Muslim and Western discourse in the second period can be found in Appendix 2

refer multiple times to the last negotiations between the British and Indian party leaders as such. Hence, the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013 and Mahajan, 2000) thereby make these negotiations between the British and Indians much more important compared to the Western authors.

The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) focus on the role of Sir. Radcliffe in this second period of this discourse framework. The authors describe his background as a lawyer in the United Kingdom and the daunting task waiting upon his shoulder to partition two enormous regions in Northern India. The Muslim and Hindu authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) do not dive into the background of Radcliffe nor do they describe how he would draw the borders in Punjab and Bengal. Instead, they critically examine British decolonization in 1947 and claim that it was impossible to draw a line in such a short period of time by a man who never visited India himself. Abid (2013) claims that the early date for a transfer of power would cause countless difficulties for the Muslim League. Mahajan (2000) confirms her assumption when she claims that the massacres in the Punjab region were prevented if the decision to withdraw from the subcontinent was not taken in a short period of time. The outbreak of violence was avoided when the boundary was not drawn within a period of four or five weeks.

The authors of the historic books on the decolonization of India also differ in their descriptions about communal violence before August 15, 1947. The Western book of Lapierre & Collins (1975) does not explain why Sikhs started to riot in the Punjab region. The authors describe the reasons superficially. They argue that the transfer of power was hastened to prevent an outbreak of civil war. The Muslim author (Abid, 2013) analyzes the reasons for communal violence and the Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) focusses on the mass outbreak of violence in relationship to British rule i.e. how they failed to take responsibility for a disastrous outcome in Punjab. Furthermore, the authors differ in the second period on their descriptions of violence. Mahajan (2000) limits discourse on the subject and only mentions the fact that communal violence between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs occurred in Punjab just before Britain's withdrawal on August 15, 1947. She does not give any detailed descriptions on the acts committed in the region. The Muslim author (Abid, 2013) describes crimes, assaults and riots practiced by Sikhs in the Punjab region and criticizes the attitude of viceroy Mountbatten who refused to arrest their leaders. She blames viceroy Mountbatten for not having taken any preventive measures to counter violence in the region before the transfer of power. Furthermore, Abid (2013) describes how violence in the region took place. However, in contradiction with the Western book, Abid (2013) argues that Muslims fell victim by the violent assaults of Sikhs. She (2013) explains that

Muslims were massacred in the region, how their villages were set on fire and how Muslim women were raped if they did not convert to either Hinduism or Sikhism. While Lapierre & Collins (1975) portray the Muslims as the villains of the region. The Western authors also describe attacks of Sikhs, but a majority of violent anecdotes in their book point at the sins of Muslims when violence broke out in the Punjab. Lastly, the Western authors (1975) describe 'the celebration' of India's formal Independence Day in full detail. The authors construe how Mountbatten experienced this day in capital city New Delhi. They claim that the man was thanked by the Indians who sang: 'long live Mountbatten' on the streets after he raised the flag of India on Independence Day. The authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) claim that both Hindus and Muslims won by British transfer of power. These claims are not shared in the Muslim (Abid, 2013) and Hindu (Mahajan, 2000) books. The authors critically evaluate the transfer of power in 1947 and conclude that British decolonization was set in motion too fast i.e. that the British sought to withdraw from India without taking responsibility for partition, serving their strategic self-interest either united or divided, and did not grant all parties involved in the process a fair chance to decide on the future of India.

4.5 Period 2 - Discourse in Relationship to Postcolonial theory

Western dominance versus Subaltern agency on negotiations in Simla 1947

The Hindu, Muslim and Western authors all describe the negotiations between viceroy Mountbatten and Nehru in the summer capital of Simla mid-1947. The authors similarly explain how Mountbatten and Nehru changed the plans for the transfer of power. Hence, that a clause in the plan to let provinces themselves decide whether to join India, Pakistan or become fully independent was changed in favor of only two choices. The provinces could either join India or Pakistan. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) describe how Mountbatten intuitively chose not to invite Jinnah for these negotiations. This assumption differs with the authors of the Hindu and Muslim books (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000). They criticize the behavior of viceroy Mountbatten who decided to make a deal behind the back of Muslim League leader Jinnah. While Mountbatten knew that he was equally important in the process for the transfer of power. Instead, he made a deal with Congress leader Nehru and asked him to keep their plan secret. Lapierre & Collins (1975) do not critically evaluate the behavior of the British concerning the Simla deal. The authors describe the perspective of viceroy Mountbatten who intuitively believed that it was better to show his revised plan only to Nehru.

From a postcolonial perspective, the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) criticize the behind the back negotiations similarly as Fanon in his book *the Wretched of the Earth* (1961). Fanon describes how the dichotomy between the settler and the native tears down during decolonization through a violent struggle of the masses. He claims that before the violent uprising of the masses, colonized intellectuals have started a dialogue with the urban bourgeoisie about cultural values and essential qualities of the West. This process can be seen before the transfer of power in India as well. The Simla negotiations resonate with Fanon's ideas. Viceroy Mountbatten represented the colonial intellectual and Congress leader Nehru belonged to the urban bourgeoisie. Mountbatten persuaded Nehru either to strengthen ties as member of the Commonwealth (CW) or as a separate dominion in the CW. The eternal values of the West would be strengthened in this union of states led by the British. However, Nehru also sought to remain faithful to the interest of the people in India and thereby asked in exchange for 'an early date' to transfer power. His request served the interests of the masses on the subcontinent. Fanon (1961) explains this as the opportunist behavior of the urban bourgeoisie. Nehru sought to sustain his power and limited the risk of eliminating himself. Fanon criticized this process because the colonial system perseveres by it. The urban bourgeoisie behaves in the image of the colonizers and thereby the masses of the people - the rural peasantry - are still suppressed.

Western Orientalism versus Occidentalism on the role of Sir. Cyril Radcliffe

The Western authors (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) focus on the role of the Sir Cyril Radcliffe in the second period of this discourse framework. They describe his successful background as a Lawyer in the United Kingdom and the daunting task upon his shoulders to partition the regions of Punjab and Bengal in India. The authors devote discourse on his conversations with viceroy Mountbatten, his flight over the region where thousands of Indians fled in anticipation of his decisions, Sir Radcliffe's reflections on how the lines were drawn in the region as well as descriptions of his bungalow at the edge of capital city New Delhi. The Western authors claim that Radcliffe: "had come to Delhi convinced he would at least have the time and facilities to carry it [the boundary lines] out in a deliberate, judicious manner" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 186). However, since Mountbatten made a deal with Congress leader Nehru on an early date for the transfer of power, Radcliffe had to comply with the decision of viceroy Mountbatten. The descriptions in the Western book of Lapierre and Collins (1975) concurs to Orientalism as described by Said (1978). Mountbatten insisted that partition would take place within a period

of five weeks. There was no possibility to deviate from this rational decision. The Western authors portrayal of the British rigid approach concerning the transfer of power confirms Oriental stereotypizations as explained by Said (1978). Consequently, such a grave task could not be performed in such limited amount of time. The Western authors (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) describe Radcliffe's thoughts. He knew that errors would easily creep in when the date for the transfer of power was not deferred. The idea of 'unfeeling parasites' in the West who only serve their self-interest i.e. to make India member of the Commonwealth in exchange for an early date for transfer of power also confirms to generalizations made by Said in Orientalism (1978). The subaltern authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) critically evaluate British behavior in India and argue that prioritizing their self-interest evoked disastrous effects on the people in India.

Barbaric versus Emancipatory violence

All three authors of the historical books on India's decolonization describe the Punjab massacre within the second period of this discourse framework. The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) only mentions that these events took place, whereas the Muslim author (Abid, 2013) describes how violence broke out in the region. Abid (2013) includes anecdotes of violent attacks, massacres, rapes and so forth in the region. She does however include examples where Muslims are viewed as the victims of communal trouble. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) include lots of anecdotes and instances of violence around 1947 in the region of Punjab but do not explain why Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs began to rebel. Abid (2013) explains that the demands of Sikhs were insufficiently taken seriously during the transfer of power in 1947. This made leaders of the largest Sikh party decide to rebel against Hindus and Muslims. They forced them to flee to the region where they belonged (Abid, 2013). The outbreak of violence as described by Abid (2013) confirms descriptions made by Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961). Fanon argues that the colonized world is a Manichean world. There are two compartments in a colonized state which are direct opposites of each other. There are places destined for settlers and places destined for natives. Contact between these two compartments is obstructed by the colonial army or police force. The native suffers from the functioning of the colonial system since he cannot direct his aggression towards the oppressor. The only possibility to release his muscular tension is by tribal warfare. A fraternal bloodbath among his fellow natives will ensue (Fanon, 1961). The Punjab massacre confirms the image described by Fanon (1961). The Sikh leaders in the Punjab region could not counter the decisions made by the colonialist elite. A plan for national independence was imposed by the colonizers in New

Delhi. Viceroy Mountbatten and his close advisors together with Nehru, Jinnah and Singh concurred to 'plan Balkan'. This plan favored an independent Pakistan and partition of the Punjab and Bengal regions. The Sikh leaders in the Punjab region had no voice to counter this decision. Unwilling to accept the plan but unable to change the outcome of the negotiations, they decided to take justice into their own hands and initiated violent attacks against Hindus and Muslims. The difference between the discourse in the historic books is that the Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) describe the outbreak of violence with oriental characteristics. Violence of the Indians is described with barbaric connotations:

"An enraged horde of Sikhs was ravaging a Muslim neighborhood...They slaughtered its male inhabitants without mercy or exception. The women were stripped, repeatedly raped, then paraded shaking and terrified through the city to the Golden Temple where most had their throats cut" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 270)

The authors of the Western book (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) enumerate many violent attacks in their book. These attacks are however described as occurrences which happened independent from the decisions made by the colonialist intellectuals and national parties at that time. The subaltern authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) make the relationship between decision-making and violent uprising in the Punjab evident. Abid (2013) describes how Sikhs sought to defend the interests of their region, whereas Mahajan (2000) holds the British responsible for the Punjab tragedy since they advanced an early transfer of power with Indian Congress leader Nehru. The tragedy in Punjab was prevented if the viceroy and the leaders of the national parties had agreed to defer partition of the Punjab for one year (Mahajan, 2000). The subaltern explanations for the outbreak of communal violence in Punjab are not found in the Western book. The subaltern authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) describe the outbreak of violence as emancipatory violence i.e. the first phase of emancipatory violence when violent attacks take place among natives, whereas the Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) describe the outbreak of violence independent of the decision-making process. They stereotype the attacks as exotic, uncivilized, alien, immoral and barbaric similar as Said (1978 about people living in 'the Orient'.

4.6 Period 3 - Discourse Comparison of Western, Muslim and Hindu books

The Hindu, Muslim and Western authors differ substantially in the third period – discourse of after India’s Independence Day⁶. Firstly, there is a great difference on the total sum of discourse described by the authors after August 15, 1947. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) focus on to the outbreak of violence in the Punjab region and how people on these lands ‘had gone mad’. They describe many instances of violence between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs in full detail. Furthermore, the authors explain how viceroy Mountbatten secretly retook control over the subcontinent because Indian leaders - Nehru and Patel -pledged him for help to set up an emergency committee. The whole subject of this committee is not addressed in the Muslim (Abid, 2013) and Hindu (Mahajan, 2000) books. Furthermore, the Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) pay much attention on Mahatma Gandhi in the third period. How he disapproved a decision of the Indian government to halt financial payments to Pakistan and therefore commenced a fast. The issue concerning financial payments between India and Pakistan is also discussed by Abid (2013) and Mahajan (2000). However, they describe that the fast took place as a political goal and do not elaborate how saint Gandhi weakened and almost died in his fasting process.

The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) devote one chapter on the Kashmir dispute in the aftermath of decolonization. However, their descriptions deviate with the descriptions of Muslim author Abid (2013). The former focuses on the invasion of Pathan tribes, the response of its ruler - Maharaja Hari Singh - and military aid of the Indian government, whereas the latter critically evaluates the behavior of the Indian government concerning the Kashmir dispute. Abid (2013) claims that they had no right to support their temporary accession in the Indian state based on a majority Muslim population. Furthermore, can you read subtle differences on the reasons for the invasion of the Pathan tribes in the region. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) argue that Pakistan requested tribes to invade the Kashmir region because it rightfully belonged to them, whereas Abid (2013) argues that the Pathan tribes invaded Kashmir as a response to the internal trouble in the region itself. Members of the Hindu RSS and Sikhs started to kill Muslims. Pathan tribes would aid the Muslims to counter the riots. Moreover, the authors of the Western and Muslim books differ on how the dispute evolved after India’s independence. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) limit discourse on the consequences of the Kashmir dispute. They argue that the region remained an area of dispute

⁶ A summary of the Hindu, Muslim and Western discourse in the third period can be found in Appendix 3.

for over 25 years. This contrasts with the extensive amounts of discourse which Muslim author Abid (2013) assigns to it. She describes how the dispute evolved by discussing plebiscites in the region, negotiations in the United Nations (UN) and a possibility to solve the issue within the Commonwealth (CW). The Hindu author Mahajan, (2000) does not pay any attention on the Kashmir dispute in her book.

The authors of historic books on India's decolonization differ in the third period of this discourse framework on the subject of Mahatma Gandhi. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) elaborate extensively on his assassination. They devote 5 of 21 chapters in their book on this event. The authors describe the nationalist organization Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), the background of their members, how they develop a plan for the assassination of Gandhi and how they kill Gandhi on August 30, 1947 during his prayer meeting in New Delhi.

The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) also describes the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi but her discourse is concise about the event. Mahajan (2000) refers to the assassination in relationship to the subject of communalism i.e. how it influenced the relations between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs in India. The Muslim author (Abid, 2013) does not describe the assassination of Gandhi at all. As a matter of fact, Abid (2013) ends her book on disturbed relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan from 1947 onwards and concludes her book on the assassination of Pakistan's Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan in 1951. She is also the only author who analyzes financial relations between Pakistan and Britain after decolonization. Abid (2013) argues that the British imperial preference system did not foster mutually beneficial trade agreements between the two nations. It unequally fostered British economy at the expense of Pakistan.

4.7 Period 3 - Discourse in Relationship to Postcolonial theory

Western dominance versus Subaltern agency concerning 'the Emergency Committee'

The discourse of the Hindu, Muslim and Western books show substantial differences in the third period of this discourse framework. The Western authors (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) focus on a so-called: 'emergency committee'. This committee was desperately requested by the new national leaders since they had no idea how to cope with the disastrous outbreak of violence after partition. The Hindu and Muslim authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) do not devote any

discourse on this committee. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) argue that Louis Mountbatten successfully put an end to all the violent attacks in the northern regions of India when he took charge of the nation again. The discourse in the Western book confirms to Eurocentrism as described by Chakrabarty (2009). Lapierre & Collins (1975) privilege Western discourse in the book. This contributes to the centering of Europe as the theoretical subject of all histories (Chakrabarty, 2009). Moreover, the secrecy of the emergency committee inhibits the possibility of verification; whether Mountbatten actually ruled India again after formal independence. The fact that this committee is not mentioned in the Muslim (Abid, 2013) and Hindu (Mahajan, 2000) books, reinforces suspicion on this subject. From a postcolonial perspective, the discourse on 'the emergency committee' confirms their epistemological concern that authors shape knowledge on the history of India's decolonization to their self-interest. The subjective knowledge structures are visible by the Western authors' focus on 'the emergency committee'. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) positively portray the British as a responsible great power. They do not abandon the weak and ignorant Indians when they feel incapable to rule their independent state.

Western dominance versus Subaltern agency concerning British legacy in India

A second division between Western dominance and subaltern experiences can be read on the subject of British legacy in India. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) emphasize the goodwill and homage paid to viceroy Mountbatten for independence. The decolonization of India is positively portrayed by them. Lapierre and Collins (1975) claim that the legacy of the British in India was secured and positive relations with India guaranteed for the future. This view is not shared by Muslim author Abid (2013). She (2013) describes how an agreement on trade within the 'imperial preference system' benefitted the British at the expense of Pakistan. Although the British claimed that they would agree to a mutually beneficial outcome for both nations. Abid (2013) criticizes Britain for exacerbating the weak position of Pakistan after independence. The wealthy British could easily conduct trade agreements with other states, while Pakistan - as an economically weak state - had to accept the proposal of the imperial preference system as a dependent new state which sought to survive. The discourse of the Muslim author (Abid, 2013) confirms Fanon's view that decolonization does not stop after formal independence. Frantz Fanon (1961) argued that the former colonizer has the power to make the independent nation an economically dependent state. The oppressive practices of the colonizer continue after formal independence. It only shifts from colonization within a state to neocolonial structures between states. Abid (2013) criticizes that Pakistan leaders lacked

knowledge to counter this outcome. Fanon (1961) would argue that the Pakistan government could not have denied the British proposal. The suppressed position of the young state will be used by European nations. It will make the state suffer from capitalist exploitation and monopolies since the colonized state has no other choice. The new state has to comply with neocolonialist structures such as the imperial preference system as described by Abid (2013). The Muslim author (Abid, 2013) is the only author who addresses neocolonialist structures after India's decolonization in 1947. The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) does not describe it and the Western authors (Lapierre and Collins (1975) only emphasize gratitude of the Indians for British decision to grant them freedom.

Western Orientalism versus Occidentalism on Mahatma Gandhi

The divide between Orientalism and Occidentalism is confirmed on the subject of Mahatma Gandhi in the third period of this discourse framework. The authors of the Western book (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) describe how Gandhi reiterated his principles of civil disobedience and non-violence. He commenced a fast for the withholding of 350 million rupees of the Indian government which belonged to Pakistan. The subaltern authors (Abid (2013, Mahajan 2000) also address Gandhi's fast but rather concise. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) describe the fast in full detail. They explain how Gandhi's body deteriorated. How his low blood pressure would evoke unrepairable damage to his vital organs and how the life of the 107-pound Mahatma hung on a thread. But the fast was practiced for higher moral ideals. The Indian government immediately had to pay the rupees which belonged to Pakistan. The remaining sum was transferred to Pakistan mid-January 1948 (Lapierre and Collins, 1975). Moreover, the Western authors argue that Gandhi continued his fast to foster peace on the whole Indian subcontinent. They describe that Gandhi "grasping for breath with each word...said: I would cease to have any interest in life if peace were not established all around us over the whole of India, the whole of Pakistan. That is the meaning of the sacrifice" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 390). The Hindu and Muslim authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) do not describe that Gandhi continued his fast after the payment of the remaining sum to Pakistan.

The image of Gandhi as a saint is re-iterated by the Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) multiple times. They confirm the spiritual, religious, exotic character of Gandhi in their concluding chapter of *Freedom at Midnight* (1975) when multiple Western leaders around the world are quoted on Gandhi's death. Lapierre and Collins (1975) argue that the man should be rewarded equal recognition as Jesus Christ and Buddha since the whole world mourns about

his death. The Muslim (Abid, 2013) and Hindu (Mahajan, 2000) authors do not describe Gandhi's death with such grotesque words. You would expect that authors who originate from India or Pakistan would devote much more discourse on the divine characteristics of Gandhi after his death if he was really that important as the Western authors claim he was.

However, the Muslim and Hindu authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) hardly refer to the assassination. The difference between Western discourse and subaltern interpretations of Mahatma Gandhi, confirms the use of Oriental discourse (Said, 1978) in the former book.

The Western authors represents Gandhi as a saint figure. While these stereotypizations are not shared by the people living in 'the Orient'.

Western Orientalism versus Occidentalism on the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi

The authors of the Western book (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) describe the nationalist Hindu organization R.S.S. in India. Members of the organization argued that Gandhi's ideal of communal peace between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs was a threat to the nation. Gandhi was an evil villain who undermined the R.S.S. ideological beliefs of building a Hindu state. Gandhi had to be killed to purify the state. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) describe in detail how members of the R.S.S. kill Gandhi after two attempts. The men were not afraid to give up their lives for their 'higher ideals'. The criminal assassination was condemned by the Indian government with life sentences and death penalties. Hence, the historic discourse in the Western book is described with use of Oriental discourse (Said, 1978). Lapierre and Collins (1975) describe that people in the Orient are willing to sacrifice their lives for 'higher ideals'. Heroic salvation is described in the West as an obligation of loyalty to the nation.

Barbaric versus Emancipatory violence

The authors of the Hindu, Muslim and Western books differ in their interpretations of violence concerning the Kashmir dispute. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) explain the cause for the outbreak of violence. This was related to ruler of the region Maharaja Hari Singh. He did not wish to join Pakistan nor India. The Pakistan government replied to Singh by sending Pathan tribes to Kashmir. They would force him to give up his quest for an independent state (Lapierre and Collins, 1975). The authors of the Western book (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) claim that the Pathan tribes were "the most troublesome and feared population of the subcontinent" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 348). However, they were incompetent to reach Maharaja Singh in the capital of Kashmir. Since the Pathan tribes "were giving vent to their ancient appetites for rape and pillage. They violated the nuns, massacred the patients in their

little clinic, looted the convent chapel down to its last brass door-knob” (Lapierre and Collins, 1975: 357). The barbaric interpretations of violence of the Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) are not shared by the Muslim author (Abid, 2013). Conversely to the Western discourse, Abid (2013) claims that the Pathan tribes came to aid Muslims who were massacred in the region by extreme nationalist Hindus and Sikhs. The difference between Western discourse and Muslim interpretation of the Pathan tribes confirms the use of Oriental discourse (Said, 1978) in the book of Lapierre & Collins (1975). They portray the Pathans as exotic, uncivilized and barbaric people, whereas Muslim author Abid (2013) positively portrays them as heroes who aid their fellow Muslims in the region. However, her descriptions of violence cannot be characterized as emancipatory violence as explained by Fanon (1961). He argues that emancipatory violence erupts by the masses prior to the transfer of power. The Kashmir dispute happened after decolonization and is no longer directed at the colonizer. It is directed at an outcome which involved a decision of the colonizer. This does not support Fanon’s view of emancipatory violence. The discourse of the Muslim author (Abid, 2013) on the Kashmir dispute resonates with the idea that the colonial past shapes social interactions and can provoke violence after decolonization. However, this assumption goes beyond the scope of this thesis and requires further research.

5. Conclusion

This thesis has deconstructed the historic books on India's decolonization from three perspectives. The authors of the Western, Muslim and Hindu books have all contributed describing the period in India's history from their point of view. However, the process of deconstruction has shown that writing history remains a construct. The authors decide on which part of history they seek to elaborate and which parts of history can rather be limited or even elicited. Although the subject of study – the decolonization of India - was alike to all three authors, the discourses have shown great differences. As described in the introduction, the three authors confirm the assumptions of postcolonial theory i.e. that there are no logical consistent explanations when describing history. The process of describing history is imbued with desires, interests and power relations that result from the tensions in thesis. The first tension concerning Eurocentrism versus subaltern experiences in historic discourses has shown that authors of the Western book (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) emphasize European dominance in historic discourse. They have given much weight in their book on British imperial history in India and the heroic background of Louis Mountbatten. They also emphasize his importance in the transfer of power which is either not described or not given crucial importance by the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000). The Muslim (Abid, 2013) and Hindu (Mahajan, 2000) authors devote discourse on the role of the British, but show that the imperial history was not as benevolent as Lapierre & Collins (1975) described it. The authors claim that the British encountered internal struggles in the transfer of power and argue that they were forced to end colonial rule in India because their power eroded quickly after World War II. The great amount of discourse on national movements, upsurges and revolts described by Hindu author Mahajan (2000) presents that a rational decision of the British to withdraw from the Indian subcontinent happened parallel with a possibility of Indians to force the colonizers out.

The divide between the Western, Hindu and Muslim authors on Oriental and Occidental stereotypes in in historic discourses confirms postcolonial assumptions as well. The authors of the Western book (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) devote much discourse on the lives of the Maharajas which were characterized as alien, warm and exotic and uncivilized. These characterizations confirm Said's (1978) Orientalism. The West seeks to represent the Maharajas and speak in name of it. Furthermore, the authors emphasize the enlightened West when describing their bourgeois lives playing cricket on manicured lawns, sipping their whiskies and

enjoying black tie parties. The oriental descriptions continue in the Western book (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) on the so-called 'emergency committee' where professional administrator Louis Mountbatten is pledged to take back control of India in the aftermath of partition. The enlightened Western man knows how to rule a state in spite of the weak and uncivilized Indians. The title of the first chapter of Lapierre & Collin's historic book is exemplary on the use of orientalist discourse: 'A Race Destined to Govern and Subdue' (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 3). The oriental descriptions continue on the topic of Mahatma Gandhi. The Western authors (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) portray him as a saint figure who was always searching for compromise and peace between all inhabitants of India. While the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan 2000) describe him as a politician who had a role in the transfer of power on a par with Indian Congress leaders Nehru and Patel. Furthermore, the grotesque words of world leaders after Gandhi's death are not described in the subaltern books (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000). In fact, the Muslim author (Abid, 2013) ends her book with the assassination of Pakistan's first Prime Minister (PM): Liaquat Ali Khan. Lastly, the Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) confirm the use of Orientalism (Said, 1978) in their descriptions of the RSS members. The members of this extreme nationalist Hindu organization were willing to sacrifice their lives for higher ideals. The RSS members believed that Gandhi undermined the principles of a Hindu state and therefore had to be sacrificed. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) devote much discourse on the final assassination of Gandhi which confirms the barbaric acts of Oriental people who favor spirituality over reason.

The third tension considering barbaric versus emancipatory violence in historic discourse confirms the assumptions of postcolonial theory as well. The Western and subaltern authors are on par in their descriptions of symbolic emancipatory violence in the first period of the discourse framework. The Western authors (Lapierre and Collins, 1975) describe how Gandhi challenged British authoritarian rule in India by his non-violent Salt March. The Hindu author (Mahajan, 2000) devotes discourse on the symbolic acts of violence describing national movements, upsurges and riots against British colonialism preceding national independence. However, a divide between barbaric and emancipatory act of violence in historic discourses of the Western, Muslim and Hindu authors becomes clear in the second period. Lapierre and Collins (1975) describe in detail how communal violence between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs took flight in the Punjab region independent of the decisions made by the British colonizers and the Indian party leaders in New Delhi or Simla. The descriptions confirm Western Oriental interpretations of barbaric violence. Hence, communal violence sparked in the Punjab because

Indians were weak individuals, incapable to solve issues peacefully. While the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan 2000) describe how the outbreak of violence in the Punjab district was related to colonialism i.e. that the outbreak could have been countered when viceroy Mountbatten had decided to arrest those responsible for the outbreak of violence. The third period of the discourse framework also lays bare a divide on oriental and occidental descriptions of violence when considering the Kashmir dispute. The Western authors (Lapierre & Collins, 1975) portray the Pathan tribes as the most troublesome of the subcontinent with an intrinsic need to riot, loot and rape. While Muslim author (Abid, 2013) claims that these groups came to aid fellow Muslims who fell victim to violence in the Kashmir region. Violence was caused by unjust decisions of Maharaja Hari Singh. He did not wish his majority Muslim province to join India nor Pakistan. This decision ensued the Pakistan government to intervene in Kashmir with the help of Pathan tribes.

This thesis deconstructed a divide between Western- and Oriental authors on historic discourse concerning the decolonization of India. However, the discourse of the Muslim (2013) and Hindu (Mahajan, 2000) authors also show considerable differences. Mahajan (2000) devotes a major part of her book on the years prior independence, whereas Abid (2013) spends much of her discourse on the consequences of decolonization. Furthermore, the subaltern authors (Abid, 2013, Mahajan, 2000) show differences on certain events. Abid (2013) and Mahajan (2000) interpret the failed outcome of the Cabinet Mission Plan in 1946 differently as explained in the first period of the discourse framework. The different interpretations confirm postcolonial assumption that historic discourse is shaped by subjective knowledge of the authors.

The results of this thesis raise questions for further research. The decolonization of India in this thesis has been studied from a Western⁷, Hindu and Muslim perspective. However, one ethnic group which also had a role in the transfer of power and the outbreak of violence in Punjab were the Sikhs. Their perspective on the decolonization of India has not been included in this study. The Sikh perspective on this historic period has been described by Anita Inder Singh (1987) in the book: *The origins of the Partition of India 1936-1947*. Her book can be of great

⁷ The discourse of the Western book written by Lapierre & Collins (1975) depends greatly on interviews with Louis Mountbatten. It would be interesting to see whether the events concerning the transfer of power are experienced similarly or deviant reading books about the Indian and Pakistan party leaders. The former perspective can be read in Mobashar Jawed Akbar called *Nehru: The Making of India* (2004). He gives a political and personal biography of Jawaharlal Nehru paying lots of attention on the pre-1947, the years before Independence. The latter view can be read in the book of Ayesha Jalal: *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan* (1994)

value on the subject of colonial violence in the Punjab and the tension concerning the interpretation of violence as either barbaric or emancipatory. Considering that the three authors all blame Sikhs for horrendous atrocities in this region. They have all been singlehandedly blamed for initiating riots and attacks against their fellow countrymen. It would be interesting to see how a Sikh author would write about these historic events, would confine discourse on the subject or refrain devoting discourse on it at all. Furthermore, continuation of violence in Kashmir after decolonization cannot be explained with the historical descriptions of Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961). This continuation might confirm variations of ‘colonialism’ and ‘postcolonialism’ (Bortoluci & Jansen, 2013). The concepts tend to be less rigid as explained by many postcolonial scholars. Eimer claims that “historical structures of domination might be perpetuated by internal colonialism” (Eimer, 2017: 7). Hence, the continuation of suppressive acts by Maharaja Singh after national liberation could be viewed as a form of internal colonialism which explains why violent attacks of the masses in the region endures. The variations of colonialism can be of great interest for further research on the subject of the Kashmir dispute, but also as a concept which explains various ‘colonial’ practices in our societies today.

The results of this study can be of added value for the discipline of International Relations Theory (IRT). The models and concepts of the West have gained hegemonic status over the years based on experiences, memories and written sources of the past. These sources shape our understanding of the present. However, this thesis has shown that interpretations of the past differ significantly. Hence, the models and concepts which we believe to be self-evident in IRT can be easily questioned and criticized from a postcolonial perspective. Nevertheless, the results from this study, incorporating the views of Hindu and Muslim books need to be viewed with reference to my own background. As a man born and raised in the Netherlands, the outcomes of this study will be shaped by a Western centric bias. I do not pretend to truly understand the decolonization of India and founding of Pakistan based on the sources studied. As a Western student at Radboud University, not having visited India myself, nor being able to examine primary sources in Hindi or Urdu, the moderate goal of this thesis was to gain insight in historic discourse concerning India’s decolonization from three perspectives. Nevertheless, I hope to have made contributions understanding India’s decolonial history, to counter orientalist accumulation of generalized knowledge, and in the footsteps of the postcolonial political agenda refashion the world from below and foster egalitarianism in a predominant Western centered academic world.

Reference list

- Abid, M. (2017). Curriculum Vitae Prof. Dr. Massarrat Abid. Retrieved on October 5, 2017 <http://pu.edu.pk/images/cv/1400222742113.pdf>.
- Abid, M. (2013). *Britain, India and Pakistan: Partition and After, 1947-51*. Lahore: Punjab University Press.
- Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (Eds.). (2009). *Non-Western international relations theory: perspectives on and beyond Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (2007). Why is there no non-Western international relations theory? An introduction. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 7(3), 287-312.
- Acharya, A. (2000). Ethnocentrism and Emancipatory IR Theory. In Arnold, S. & Beier, J.M. (Eds.) (*Dis*)*Placing Security: Critical Evaluations of the Boundaries of Security* (1-18). Centre for International and Security Studies: York University: United Kingdom.
- Akbar, M.J. (2004). *Nehru: The Making of India*. New Delhi: Roli Books.
- Attridge, D. (2005). Deconstruction today. *Études anglaises*, 58(1), 42-52.
- Banerjee, S. (1981). *The RIN Strike* (2nd ed.) New Delhi: People's Publishing House.
- Barnett, C. (1999). Deconstructing context: exposing Derrida. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 24(3), 277-293.
- Behera, N. C. (2009). Re-imagining IR in India. In Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (Eds.), *Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and Beyond Asia*. (pp. 92-117). London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Biswas, S. (2016). Postcolonialism. In Dunne T., Kurki, M. & Smith, S. (Eds.) *International Relations Theory* (219 -235) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bortoluci, J.H., & Jansen, R.S. (2013). Toward a postcolonial sociology: the view from Latin America. *Postcolonial Sociology* 24(1), 199-229
- Botella-Ordinas, E. (2017). *Colonialism and Postcolonialism*. Retrieved on June 14, 2017 <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199730414/obo-9780199730414-0174.xml>.
- Bristow, R. C. (1974). *Memories of the British Raj: A soldier in India*. London: Johnson.
- Buruma, I. & Margalit, A. (2004). *Occidentalism : The west in the eyes of its enemies*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Butalia, U. (2000). *The other side of silence : Voices from the partition of India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Chakrabarty, D. (2009). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chakrabarty, B. (2001). Book Reviews: Sucheta Mahajan, *Independence and Partition: The Erosion of Colonial Power in India*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, 2000, pp. 425. *The Indian Economic & Social History Review*, 38(3), 340-342.
- Chakrabarty, D. (1998) Provincializing Europe: Postcolonialism and historical difference, lecture given at Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University, 10 August 1998.
- Darby, P. (1998). *The Fiction of Imperialism: Reading Between International Relations and Postcolonialism*, London: Cassell.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2008). Discourse analysis. In Bennet, T. & Frow, J. (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of cultural analysis* (674-698). London: SAGE Publications.
- Collins, L., & Lapierre, D. (1975). *Freedom at Midnight*. Great Britain: William Collins Sons and Co.
- Collins, L., & Lapierre, D. (1972). *O Jerusalem*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Collins, L., & Lapierre, D. (1965). *Is Paris Burning*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Creighton, M.R. (2003). Imaging the Other in Japanese Advertising Campaigns. In Carrier, G. *Occidentalism, images of the West*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1992). Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority'. In Cornell, D., Rosenfield, M. & Carlson, D.G. (Eds.) *Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice*. (3-68) London: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (1990). "Some Statements and Truisms about Neologisms, Newisms, Postisms, Parasitisms, and other small Seismisms". In Carroll, D. (1990) *The States of Theory* (63-94). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1967). *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eimer, T.R. (2017). *What if the subaltern speaks? Traditional knowledge policies in Brazil and India*. Manuscript submitted for publication, Department of Political Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands
- Ellis, J. M. (1990). *Against Deconstruction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fanon, F. (1961). *The Wretched of the Earth* (1965). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Fanon, F. (1952). *Black Skin White Masks* (2008). New York: Grove Press.
- Florentsen, P. C. (1996). Deconstruction, philosophy, and literature: Readings of Jacques Derrida. *Orbis litterarum*, 51(2), 67-98.

- Foucault, M. (2002). *The order of things : An archaeology of the human sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Furumizo, E. (2005). "East Meets West and West Meets East: A Comparison of Occidentalism and Orientalism" *Review of Communication* 5,(2-3), 128-137.
- Gordon, L. A. (1976). Book Reviews: Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre, *Freedom at Midnight*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975. 572 pp. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 35(4), 702-703.
- Grovogui, S.N. (2013). Postcolonialism. In Dunne T., Kurki, M. & Smith, S. (Eds.) *International Relations Theory* (247 - 265) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gupta, P. S. (1945). Imperial Strategy and the Transfer of Power, 1939–51. In Gupta, A.K. (Ed.) *Myth and Reality: The Struggle for Freedom in India, 1945-47* (1-53). Delhi: Manohar Publishers.
- Huddart, D. (2007). Hybridity and cultural rights: Inventing global citizenship. *Reconstructing hybridity: Post-colonial studies in transition*, 21-41.
- India Today (1982). Book Review Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre, *Mountbatten and the Partition of India*. Retrieved August 4, 2017. <http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/mountbatten-and-the-partition-of-india-by-larry-collins-&-dominlque-lapierre/1/391753.html>.
- Jalal, A. (1994). *The sole spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the demand for Pakistan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, B. (1984). Rigorous Unreliability. *Critical Inquiry*, 11(2), 278-285.
- Johnson, B. (1983). *Dissemination*. Illinois: University of Chicago.
- Lawlor, L. (2012). Deconstruction. In Direk, Z. & Lawlor, L. (Eds.) *A Companion to Derrida*. (122-131) United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mahajan, S. (2017). Curriculum Vitae Prof. Dr. Sucheta Mahajan. Retrieved on October 5, 2017 <https://www.jnu.ac.in/Faculty/smahajan/cv.pdf>
- Mahajan, S. (2000). *Independence and Partition: The Erosion of Colonial Power in India* New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- McRobbie, A. (1985). 'Strategies of Vigilance: An Interview with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak', *Block* 10, 9.
- Mohanty, C. T. (1984). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Boundary* 2, 333-358.
- Moore, R. J. (1988). *Endgames of Empire: Studies of Britain's Indian Problem*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- New York Times (1975). Book Review Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre *Freedom at Midnight*. Retrieved on August 4, 2017. <http://www.nytimes.com/1975/10/26/archives/freedom-at-midnight.html>.
- Norris, C. (1991). Jacques Derrida: Language Against Itself. In Norris, C. (Ed.) *Deconstruction* (18-42). London: Routledge.
- NRC (2017). *Ouderwets epos over laatste dagen van Brits India*. Retrieved on November, 26th from <https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2017/07/11/ouderwets-epos-over-laatste-dagen-van-brits-india-11732861-a1566304>.
- Oostindie, G. J. (2008). Historical memory and national canons. In (Ed.) *Dutch colonialism, migration and cultural heritage* (63-96). Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Parry, B. (2004). Problems in current theories of colonial discourse. In Parry, B. (2004). *Postcolonial studies: A materialist critique* (13 - 37) London: Routledge.
- Penn Publishing (2017) Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre. Retrieved on October 4, 2017. <http://penn.co.il/en/author/collinslapierre/>.
- Rosen, G. (2004). Is Terrorists' Hatred of the West, The West's Own Bastard Child? Book Review Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit: *The West in the Eyes of Its Enemies*. Retrieved on May 6, 2017 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/03/27/books/books-of-the-times-is-terrorists-hatred-of-the-west-the-west-s-own-bastard-child.html>.
- Ruskin, J. (1860). The Roots of Honour. In Ruskin, J. (Ed.), *Unto This Last*, (155-228) New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Said, E. (1994). Overlapping Territories, Intertwined Histories. In E. Said (Ed.) *Culture & imperialism* (pp. 1-15). London: Vintage.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism* (2003). London: Penguin Classics.
- Seth, S. (2013). *Postcolonial Theory and International Relations : a critical introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Singh, A. I. (1987). *The Origins of the Partition of India, 1936-1947*. Michigan: Oxford University Press.
- Singh, K. (1956). *Train to Pakistan*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Spivak, G. C. (2003). *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In Nelson, C. & Grossberg, L. (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. (271-313). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Sylvester, C. (1999) Development studies and postcolonial studies: disparate tales of the 'Third World', *Third World Quarterly*, 20(4), 703-721

Volkskrant (2017). *De Indiase onafhankelijkheidsstrijd is zo goed als onzichtbaar, maar het blijft een mooi kostuumdrama*. Retrieved on November 26, 2017 from <https://www.volkskrant.nl/recensies/de-indiase-onafhankelijkheidsstrijd-is-zo-goed-als-onzichtbaar-maar-het-blijft-een-mooi-kostuumdrama~a4505955/>.

Young, R. J. (2012). Postcolonial remains. *New Literary History*, 43(1), 19-42.

Young, R.J.C. (1998) Ideologies of the postcolonial. *Interventions* 1:1, 4-8.

Appendix 1 - Background Information till the Appointment of Viceroy Mountbatten

Discourse Western book

Lapierre and Collins (1975) focusses on five subjects in the first period: (1) British – Indian relations (2) The background of Louis Mountbatten, the last viceroy of India (3) the life story of Mahatma Gandhi (4) The rule of the Maharajas in India and (5) Indian – Muslim relations.

British – Indian relations

The book on the national liberation of India opens on British soil. Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe the circumstances of London after World War II. Although the British won the war, unemployment in the United Kingdom (UK) was high. More than two million British were unemployed. The costs of their victory was high. And it was in these circumstances, that the modest Clement Attlee, of the British labor party came to power. He was the successor of conservative party leader Winston Churchill. He was the man who would start to dismantle the empire of the British on which it set foot on August 1600. Lapierre & Collins (1975) explain how the British began their imperial history. Queen Elizabeth I assigned a charter of the East India Trading Company to start trading beyond Cape of Good Hope, South Africa. The first charter, named *Hector*, arrived in India on the 24th of August 1600. The British signed contracts with the Moghul rulers and opened trading ports North of Bombay. It was an economic success; silk, cotton, sugar and spices were exchanged between the nations. The authors argue that soon, trade deals entered the terrain of local politics. They claim that “the irreversible process which would lead England to conquer India almost by inadvertence” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 11). The merchants became politicians and began building an empire. They succeeded the Moghul rulers of India. Trade flourished until the Mutiny of 1857. This changed the course of authority on the Indian subcontinent. Queen Victoria would take over power and replace the East India Company (EIC). Its existence would be terminated. In practice, 2000 members of the Indian Civil Service (ICS) and British officers of the Indian Army would rule India. These men belonged to the most talented aristocracy of Britain. Educated in Eton, Harrow and Charterhouse, the wealthy elite was destined to rule the Indian empire. Furthermore, the authors describe the lives of the British in India after 1857. How they played cricket and polo in colonial clubs, hunted tigers in the Northern plains and held imperial balls where every guest had his own servant. Parties were held in the big cities of India such as: Delhi, Lahore, Calcutta and Bombay.

Background of Louis Mountbatten, the last viceroy of India

Lapierre and Collins (1975) pay attention to the background of Louis Mountbatten. They describe his privileged family background and his career. He was an ambitious naval officer and took charge of Her Majesty's Ship (HMS) *Kelly* on 25th August 1939 and fought against a German submarine in the British channel. When the stern of the ship was heavily damaged by a torpedo, Mountbatten refused to leave the ship and decided to spend a night alone on the wreck. A second heroic act of Mountbatten is described by Lapierre and Collins on May 1941. When the HMS *Kelly* was hit again, and commander Mountbatten fought his way up to the surface into a small life raft. The heroic acts and immortality of Mountbatten can have later been made into a film by friend Noel Coward and called: *In Which We Serve*. Five months later, Winston Churchill decided to appoint Mountbatten as Supreme Allied Commander of Southeast Asia. From that moment, Mountbatten, 43 years old, would rule over 128 million people in South-East Asia. During these years, Mountbatten dealt with general Aung San in Burma, Chinese communists in Malaya, Sukarno in Indonesia and unruly trade unionists in Singapore. The authors describe Mountbatten as an intelligent man with proven historic leadership and great negotiating capabilities. he was self-confident and could bring people together. This made him an excellent candidate to become the last viceroy of India. Clement Attlee, decided to call him, invite him at Downing Street 10. Attlee was about to make him the last viceroy of India. He would become the man that would give up the Indian empire. For such an ungrateful job, Mountbatten would discourage Attlee by making many requests, including non-interference of London to carry out his task. Attlee would agree to his demands. The empowerment of Mountbatten would turn against the interests of Attlee. The latter did not wish to keep India in the British Commonwealth (CW). But as the authors describe; "Mountbatten would insist that Attlee include in his terms of reference a specific injunction to maintain an independent India, united or divided, inside the Commonwealth if at all possible" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 33). This request was proposed to Attlee, after Mountbatten had conversations with monarch George VI. The latter agreed with Mountbatten that the United Kingdom could maintain its great power position in international relations if it maintained ties with former colonies, that is, to bring the independent state of India inside the Commonwealth (CW).

The life story of Mahatma Gandhi

The authors pay considerable attention to the people living in India. In the run up to the transfer of power, Collins and Lapierre (1975) describe background information on Gandhi's life. The authors summarize the background of Mahatma Gandhi. He was born in the Hindu caste of the

Vaishyas, which is known as the caste for shopkeepers and tradesman. He had political ambitions and decided to study in London to once become the Prime Minister (PM) of his princely state Porbandar. But Gandhi was a very shy man in the United Kingdom. He was just 19 years old, very thin and still wore his Bombay clothing in the streets of London. His appearance and shy behavior made him a lonely man who was too shy to connect with strangers. To overcome these feelings of agony, Gandhi decided to behave as English gentlemen. He bought a whole new wardrobe such as an evening suit, some leather boots, white gloves, a walking stick and a hat. The authors describe how he even bought a violin, took dancing lessons and hired an elocution teacher. But his plans to gain social acceptance did not work out and he gave up his effort to become an English gentleman. Lapierre & Collins describe how these experiences have shaped Gandhi's mind. Back in India, Gandhi could not find a job, but his family had a relative in South Africa who could use Gandhi now he had become a lawyer. South-Africa became Gandhi's training ground for India's national liberation from British rule. Lapierre and Collins (1975) describe how Gandhi experienced two turning points in South Africa. First, was a book Gandhi read when he boarded on a train from Johannesburg to Durban. It was called *Unto this last* written by John Ruskin (1860) who wrote; "a laborer with a spade served society as truly as a lawyer with a brief, and the life of labor, of the tiller of the soil, is the life worth living" (Ruskin in Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 43). Gandhi had become a wealthy man in South-Africa. But Ruskin's text served as a wake-up call to follow the principles of the Hinduist poem: *Bhagavad Gita* which says that true spiritual awakening will be found when you distance yourself from material possessions. The authors claim that "Gandhi's life took on the pattern that would rule it until his death: a renunciation of material possessions and a striving to satisfy human needs in the simplest manner, coupled with a communal existence in which all labor was equally valuable and all goods were shared" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 43).

The second turning point was Gandhi's experience of cultural racism in an overnight train from Durban to Pretoria. Gandhi, who had booked a first-class ticket was urged by a white man to move to the Baggage car. Gandhi refused, and was thrown off from the train in the next station by a policeman. The cultural racist behavior left a deep scar on him. This behavior made Gandhi develop two doctrines which made him 'world famous': (1) non-violence and (2) civil disobedience. On the former doctrine Gandhi said: "You don't change a man's convictions by chopping off his head or infuse his heart with a new spirit by putting a bullet through it. Violence only brutalizes the violent and embitters its victims" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 44). The second doctrine on civil disobedience was based on an essay of Henry Thoreau called *On civil*

disobedience which Gandhi read in South-African jail. He argued that it is a right of individuals to disobey unjust laws of a tyrannical government. These ideas were brought into practice by Gandhi back in India. He set out his strategy for Indians to boycott British jobs, British courts and British schools. And, he challenged British financial rule by organizing a march with the rural peasantry towards the sea. The British maintained a monopoly on the production and distribution of salt in India. The Indians would pay a small tax each time they bought salt. The Salt March of Mahatma Gandhi became a symbol against British imperialism. Gandhi's symbolic act challenged British rule. The man proved by arrival that salt could be won without British interference. The colonial rulers intervened and imprisoned Gandhi as well as thousands of his followers. The Salt March was one instance of symbolic violence. During World War II in 1944, Gandhi also sought to steer the economic exploitative structure of society by a product that exemplified the ant-thesis of capitalism: a primitive wooden spinning wheel. The wheel would stand for a peaceful revolution; to liberalize the state from British rule. This ideal was exacerbated during the war. When the Japanese army came close to the borders of India from the East, Winston Churchill urged Indians to defend the territory from invasion. But Gandhi refused cooperation. He would only counter Japanese aggression non-violently. Gandhi's non-cooperation would lead to another imprisonment.

The rule of the Maharajas in India

Collins & Lapierre (1975) address the rule of the Maharaja on the Indian subcontinent during British colonial rule. When the British consolidated power over the subcontinent, there were many princes who ruled over a small piece of land on India's territory. The British allowed these Maharajas, Nawabs and Rajas to maintain sovereign rule over the land during the occupation. Less than two years after World War II, there were still 565 Maharajas in power. Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe the extravagantly wealthy lives of the Maharajas. They describe how the Sikh Maharaja of Kapurthala wore the largest topaz in the world. The authors argue describe that "its apricot brilliance set off by a field of 3000 diamonds and pearls" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 133). The Maharaja of Baroda made luxurious travels on his elephant. The howdah – the carriage on top of the animal –, the harness of the prince, chains alongside the ears of the elephant, was all covered in gold. The Maharaja in Gwalior decided to hang a chandelier, bigger than the one in Buckingham palace, in his palace. In order to ensure that the ceiling would hold the heavy weight of the chandelier, the Maharaja decided to hoist an elephant of similar weight on the top floor to find out whether the roof would hold. The same man also had an obsession with electric trains. He could arrange food from the kitchen to dinner

table by trains who made their way from the royal kitchen through the wall into the dining hall of the Maharaja where the meals were served to his guests. Furthermore, the Maharaja of Patalia had an obsession for sex. It surpassed his passions for hunting and polo. He recruited the ladies himself. The Maharaja had whole team of beauty-makers, hairdressers, jewelers and perfumers to remodel the ladies to his own taste. Lapierre and Collins (1975) describe that he once had around 350 ladies around his pool. The authors claim the behavior of the Maharaja shows that he was actually dying of boredom in his palace. The authors (1975) argue that not all of the Maharajas behaved outrageously. “The India of the Maharajas often noted for substantial achievements as well. Where the rulers were enlightened men, often Western-educated, the state’s subjects enjoyed benefits and privileges unknown in those areas administered directly by the British” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 142). Hence in the state of the Maharaja of Baroda, Indians could study for free, and he abandoned polygamy. The authors conclude that the Maharaja in India remained a fundamental pillar to sustain British rule in India.

Indian – Muslim relations

Lapierre and Collins (1975) describe that Gandhi’s wish for national independence would not come easy in the colonial state of India. It was a state with 300 million Hindus and 100 million Muslims. The agony between the two religious groups was fierce. The differences were “subtly exacerbated through the years by British own policy of Divide and Rule” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 7). The authors describe “Moslem leaders now demanded that Britain rip apart the unity she had so painstakingly erected and to give them an Islamic state of their own” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 7). “the cost of denying them their state, they warned, would be the bloodiest civil war in Asian history” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 8). The threats were soon turned into deeds. On the 16th of August, the party representing Muslims in parliament - the Muslim League - proclaimed ‘Direct Action Day’. Civil violence in the streets of Calcutta broke out. Muslims busted into the Hindu slums and smashed everything on their path. For 24 hours Calcutta became a place of savages, and it would spark violence to the surrounding district of Noakhali sooner than later. In his quest to prevent violence sparking to other sides of the sub-continent, Mahatma Gandhi decided to take on a pilgrimage through the jungles of Noakhali. In the villages, Gandhi would prevent violence from erupting by bringing together a Muslim and Hindu leader in one home. Both made the pledge that whenever communal violence would erupt initiated by either a Muslim or Hindu, the responsible leader would undertake a fast. Gandhi would walk bare-footed from village to village to stir communal violence between Hindu’s and Muslims around (Lapierre & Collins, 1975).

Discourse Muslim book

Massarrat Abid (2013) focusses on three subjects in the first period: (a) the British – Muslim Relations (b) the possibility for a transfer of power in 1946 called the Cabinet Mission Plan (CMP) and (c) the internal upheaval between British Cabinet Ministers and viceroy Wavell which led to an impasse in the transition process.

British – Muslim Relations 1857 – 1946

The Muslim author (2013) introduces how the British colonized India and consolidated their power. However, this is mentioned very briefly. Her main subject of analysis are the historic relations between the British and the Muslims in India. Firstly, she addresses the mutiny of 1857. The mutiny was a widespread rebellion in India against British rule. The Author (2013) claims that the British held Muslims accountable for the rebellion. And consequently, all Muslims, or those who were suspects of supporting the Mutiny, were all hanged by the colonizers. Moreover, due to the Mutiny, Muslims lost their positions in government services. Prior to the revolt, Muslims were allowed to speak Urdu in the administrative field. But after the Mutiny of 1857, this concession was withdrawn by the British. The relations between the British colonizers and Muslims deteriorated during these years. However, by the end of the 19th century, relations between Muslims and the British recovered. Muslims were loyal towards the British. The former learned the English language which restored the Anglo-Muslim friendship.

The outbreak of World War I proved another blow in the Anglo – Muslim relations. The reasons for decline can be attributed to British policy according to Abid (2013). The British decided to fight against Turkey and asked the Muslims in India to help them out. However, the Muslims in India did not wish to fight against fellow Muslims in Turkey. It conversely led to a Khilafat movement in India. This movement promoted a similar movement for the protection of Muslims in Turkey. Abid (2013) claims that the Anglo-Muslim relations recovered during WW II. The Congress party of Jawaharlal Nehru would cooperate in conditionally, that is, if India could be granted a declaration for independence and quit India for their War effort. The British refused the proposal. The national party for Muslims in India - The Muslim League - on the other hand, was willing to aid the British in WW II. The British rewarded their help and accommodate their claims by expanding the executive council in India. This was called the August offer. The offer “assured... the Muslims that no constitutional advancements would be made in India without their agreement” (Abid, 2013: 7). The Muslim author (2013) argues that this offer was

succeeded by the Cripps offer. The latter offer upheld the possibility for “the establishment of two or more independent unions in India, i.e. the possibility of a separate Muslim state (Abid, 2013: 7). The Cripps offer adhered to Muslim League party leader, Muhammed Ali Jinnah. During a gathering of the party in Lahore in March 1940, Jinnah held a speech in favor of a constitutional settlement which included partition for Indian Muslims.

The Cabinet Mission Plan

Abid (2013) jumps to the period of July 1945. In this historic period labor party leader Clement Attlee came to power. Attlee would be determined to realize self-government in India. However, the two major political parties, Congress and the Muslim League, were not likely to find an agreement on the contours of an independent state. Abid (2013) claims that Congress pledged for a united India with “a single constituent assembly to draw up constitution for an all-India Federal Government and Legislature dealing with foreign affairs, defense, communications, fundamental rights, currency as well as other subjects allied to them (Abid, 2013: 13). The Muslim league on the other hand favored partition. In order to reach a constitutional settlement between the two parties, British parliament decided to send a Mission to India which consisted of three Cabinet ministers. The goal of the Ministers was to reach an agreement which would serve the interest of Congress and the Muslim League on the subject of constitution building as well as an interim government. The ministers would bridge the gap of interest by a three-tier constitutional plan which would allow India to remain united. The plan was forwarded on May 16, 1946 and would first of all consist of a union which included ministries of foreign affairs, defense and communications. Secondly, it would consist of three groups of provinces, with Hindu majority, Muslim majority, and remainder provinces; Bengal and Assam. The ministers agreed that re-grouping would be possible but only after the first general elections. Abid (2013) explains that: “On June 6, 1946, the Muslim League’s Council decided to accept the Cabinet Mission Plan” (Abid, 2013: 15). The Congress Working Committee however rejected the plan. Nehru refused to accept the fixed Hindu provinces from the start and claimed that “Congress was free to change or modify the Cabinet Mission Plan in the Constituent Assembly as it thought best” (Abid, 2013: 16). Congress would accept the plan by adhering to their own interpretation. The Muslim author (2013) concludes that within this context, the Muslim League decided to withdraw from the Cabinet Mission Plan (CMP) and enforce their plan for an independent Pakistan.

British internal struggles, viceroy Wavell versus British Cabinet Ministers

The Muslim author (2013) devotes discourse on the internal struggle between the Cabinet Ministers of the British Parliament and the viceroy of the Indian subcontinent; Archibald Wavell. Both groups did not agree on the inclusion of the Muslim league for an interim government. The Cabinet Ministers concluded that the decision of the Muslim League to withdraw from its three-tier constitutional plan had ruled them out of court for an interim government. Viceroy Wavell on the other hand, favored the inclusion of the Muslim League for an interim government. Abid (2013) argues that the Cabinet Ministers accepted the ambiguous interpretation of Congress of their constitutional plan because they wished to keep Congress on board of the negotiations. However, viceroy Wavell supported Muslim League's inclusion because "the compulsory grouping was the whole crux of the Cabinet Plan" (Abid, 2013: 21). He stood by Muslim League leader Jinnah who claimed that he would re-enter negotiations for an interim government when "congress accepted the literal interpretation of the Cabinet Mission Plan" (Abid, 2013: 22). The deadlock between the two major parties could only be broken in a new conference arranged in London on December 2, 1946. The British decided after the conference that Congress should reconsider their perspective on the Cabinet Mission Plan (CMP). The party was insulted and felt betrayed by the British for this decision. The party replied by enforcing Muslims to retreat from the interim government since not all of them 'accepted its scheme'. Hence, the negotiations reached an impasse again. In the end, King George VI decided to withdraw viceroy Wavell and appoint viscount Mountbatten for a fresh start between all parties involved. Abid (2013) describes that Mountbatten was known for his "qualities of persuasive speech, imagination and proven capacity to work with people of all races (Abid, 2013: 24).

Discourse Hindu book

Hindu author Sucheta Mahajan (2013) pays most of her discourse in the first period on the erosion of British power in India. She explains the rise of (A) national movements in India and (B) Upsurges and revolts against British authority. In this first period Mahajan (2000) also addresses the role of (C) Mahatma Gandhi and the transfer of power.

National movements in India

Sucheta Mahajan (2000) focusses in her book about India's decolonization on the erosion of British colonial rule. She describes the national movements before the appointment of viceroy Mountbatten. Congress was constrained as a platform of political activity because it could

challenge British rule. Gandhi, however, bypassed the ban by underground movements. Thereby, large amounts of people gathered to celebrate Independence Day and National week celebrations. During these celebrations, Congress hoisted their flag and demanded the British to release Congress leaders. Gandhi referred to the underground movements as 'constructive work, but the goal was to counter British rule and liberate the Indians from colonization. Mahajan (2000) explains that the constructive program had two effects; firstly, it led to increased politicization. The constructive programs sparked political activity of other parties, such as the Communist Party of India (CPI), all the parties and organizations similarly pledged for the release of Congress leaders.

Mahajan (2000) explains the political strategy of Congress after World War II. The most effective strategy that could counter British rule was (a) non-violent mass movement of Indians and (b) constitutional reform. Jawaharlal Nehru predicted that Britain would leave the subcontinent within 5 years. But before the labor government of Clement Attlee announced his determination of reforming the British empire, the popular mood had already changed in India. Although the Simla conference of 1945 failed, there was enormous enthusiasm and support for Congress leader Jawaharlal Nehru. The change increased the power position of Congress and his quest for the transfer of power. Furthermore, the birth and death dates of national leaders in India were once again celebrated. The 25th anniversary of reformist and independence activist Bal Gangadhar Tilak was celebrated on August 1, 1945. The number of meetings and processions increased considerably. The masses spoke out on: Civil liberties day, Students Demand day, the Charkha Demonstration Day and the National Unity Day. The gatherings changed the mindset of the people and thereby influenced the outcome of provincial elections. Mahajan (2000) argues that "Congress made a clean sweep of the general seats in the provincial elections" (Mahajan, 2000: 79). The Hindu author (2000) claims that the reasons for winning the elections can also be attributed to the subjects of Congress electoral campaign. The party focused on the violent response of the British against Indians who defended the sovereignty of their nation in 1942. And secondly, the Indian National Army (INA) trials. These were trials organized against the members of Subhas Chandra Bose's Indian National Army (INA). The British government would trial some of the army officials who were guilty of brutal acts such as torture and murder in WW II. Mahajan (2000) describes how Nehru used British behavior as an electoral instrument. Jawaharlal Nehru emphasized British judicious treatment towards the INA prisoners and organized the INA Relief and Enquiry committee. The INA trails gained tremendous attention in the press. The trials spread far on the Indian subcontinent, and

surpassed international news on the 25th of August 1945. It spread from political parties such as Congress and the Muslim league, to municipal communities and the Indian army. The widespread support for banning the trials confirms British erosion of power. The voice of Indians could no longer be denied by the British government.

Upsurges and revolts against British authority

The Hindu author (2000) describes how instances of violence sparked from the electoral campaign and mass movements. Sucheta Mahajan (2000) describes two upsurges which evolved from the INA trials. Firstly, from 21st till the 23rd of November 1945 there were demonstrations in Calcutta about the INA trials and a student demonstration in the same city in February 1946. Mahajan (2000) explains the authority of the British was challenged during both demonstrations. The student protest for instance, started off peacefully, but when the police force prevented them from shouting slogans such as ‘Jai Hind’ (victory to India) and ‘Marshal Bose Zindabad (long live Marshal Bose; Indian officer and patriot) police dispersed the crowds in the protest. They reacted by throwing stones and bricks. The police responded by firing guns. Two Indians died and 52 people were injured after the demonstration. A second instance which caused violence was the Royal Indian Navy (RIN) revolt. Again, the demonstrations evolved peacefully at first. Naval officers started protesting the distasteful food on board of Indian ships, racial discrimination and abuse. The officers hoisted the Congress flag, broke shop windows, threatened English policemen and shouted slogans which undermined British authority. The colonial rulers replied by encircling the ships. Indian officials started to fire guns although they were outnumbered by the British. Six men died in the revolts and there were many injured. Mahajan (2000) argues that the upsurges showed severe anti-British sentiments. It would bring the city of Calcutta to a temporary standstill. And the RIN revolt was particularly important. She claims that: “The RIN revolt remains a legend to this day. When it took place, it had a dramatic impact on popular consciousness. A revolt in the armed forces, even if soon suppressed, had a great liberating effect on the minds of people” (Mahajan, 2000: 97).

The Indian’s challenged British rule in upsurges and riots, but severely heightened around February 1946 when government institutions were burnt down as well as post offices and police stations (Mahajan, 2000). Indians also ambushed railway stations, trams, banks and universities. The whole transport system of Bombay had come to a halt. Moreover, cars of government officials were stopped and demolished with bricks. Mahajan (2000) evaluates these instances of violence and comes to the conclusion that Congress played a major role in the

activities. She claims that “Congress was not only in the forefront of the widespread activity, its leaders and the rank and file, [they] in fact, inspired the three major outbreaks” (Mahajan, 2000: 101). The speeches of Congress leaders have greatly impacted the national struggles against colonialism. Mahajan (2000) claims that Congress members did not officially support the struggles but praised the courageous behavior of the Indians. The struggle and pressure of the people paid off. The author explains that British power eroded in India when they cancelled the INA trials. The ‘guilty’ Indian army officials would no longer be punished for their acts in World War II.

Mahatma Gandhi and the transfer of power

The Hindu author (2000) devotes discourse on the role of Mahatma Gandhi during the transfer of power. The man had discussions with India’s national party leaders on the future of India. Gandhi had multiple conversations with Muhammed Ali Jinnah in 1944. Gandhi made clear that he wished to maintain unity of the Indian subcontinent and overcome communal issues between Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs. He wished to hold plebiscites in the Northern regions of India with a Muslim majority to overcome the tragedy of partition. Gandhi as politician believed that his plan would change the Muslim demand for Pakistan. Furthermore, Mahajan (2000) refers to Gandhi and his role as peace-keeper in the district of Noakhali, after Jinnah called off ‘Direct Action Day’ in Calcutta. On the 16th of August 1946, violence in the Indian city Calcutta spread when Muslims began to riot against Hindus. There were over 5000 casualties. Communal riots in the surrounding eastern district Noakhali heightened as a consequence. Mahajan (2013) explains that Congress leaders lacked power to change these violent uprisings and that Mahatma Gandhi could turn the riots around by preaching his principles of non-violence. He would reach out to Hindus and Muslims, organize prayer meetings and visit households. However, Mahajan (2013) describes that Gandhi only achieved partial success in his endeavor. Gandhi was not much liked by Muslims at that time. He made ambiguous decisions which confirmed a Hindu bias. Gandhi had decided to counter the violence in the Hindu majority district of Bihar in October 1946 but refused to undertake a similar fast to preserve peace in the Muslim majority district Bengal. The one-sided decisions of Gandhi for peace and unity in India were far from lauded by Muslims in Noakhali district. They did not regard Gandhi as their ally. But even close associates of Gandhi were critical of his peace pilgrimage. Hindu-Muslim unity could be achieved in the Constituent Assembly, not in an insignificant district of India. Nehru said: “Mr. Gandhi was going around with ointment trying to heal one sore spot after another on the body of India, instead of diagnosing the cause of this

eruption of sores and participating in the treatment of the body as a whole” (Mahajan, 2000: 241). Gandhi also admitted that “probably my presence would have made no difference to the situation” (Mahajan, 2000: 241).

Appendix 2 - Appointment Mountbatten till Independence Day of India

Discourse Western book

Lapierre & Collis (1975) focus in this period on the negotiations between representatives of the British government and the Indian political parties on the transfer of power and the outbreak of violence in the Punjab region. The role of viceroy Mountbatten gets substantial attention in the second period. The covering subjects are (A) Mountbatten and his conversations with Indian party leaders (B) Simla, May 1947 (C) The 3rd June Plan (D) Sir Cyril Radcliffe and (E) Punjab Massacres.

Mountbatten and his conversations with Indian party leaders

Lapierre & Collins (1975) first describe the transfer of power between viceroy Wavell and his successor: Louis Mountbatten. Wavell argues that a daunting task was waiting for Mountbatten. Negotiations between the British government and the Indian parties had reached a total impasse. Viceroy Wavell blamed the parties for it: “I have tried everything I know to solve this problem and I can see no light. There is just no way of dealing with it” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 70). However, Mountbatten’s plan for the transfer of power was accompanied with a change of character towards the Indian culture and traditions. Mountbatten ordered that the kitchen of the viceroy’s house should now serve Indian dishes. He visited a garden party of Jawaharlal Nehru, shook hands and chatted with the Indian people. Lapierre and Collins (1975) refer to an article of the *New York Times* (NYT) saying that “No Viceroy in history has so completely won the confidence, respect and liking of the Indian people” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 80). But during the first month, viceroy Mountbatten also discovered that communal tensions heightened. Mountbatten informed the government of Clement Attlee saying that: “unless I act quickly, I will find the beginnings of a civil war on my hand” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 82).

Mountbatten goes to work and starts with one on one conversations with the Indian leaders. First up was Jawaharlal Nehru. The two men agreed in their discussion on two things; first, a quick decision on the transfer of power would be essential to avoid casualties, and, both agreed that the unity of the subcontinent should be maintained. Dividing the subcontinent in two states would be a tragedy. The second man who was invited for a conversation with Mountbatten, was Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhi’s approach was clear. He would not agree to any form of division for India. Gandhi stated: “So long as I am alive, I will never agree to the partition of India”

(Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 93). During the meeting with Mountbatten, Gandhi begged the viceroy not to divide India. In despair about the consideration of a possible partition, Gandhi sought for an alternative. He said that Muslim leader Jinnah could be asked to rule over the whole continent. Partition could be avoided when Jinnah was allowed to form a government. After the conversation with Mountbatten, Gandhi was convinced to have turned the tide around. The withdrawal of the British from India would not be accompanied with partition. The next leader up for a conversation with Mountbatten was Vallabh Bhai Patel. Patel ruled the administrative apparatus of the Congress party. He earned his high rank in Congress for his services to Gandhi. Patel had organized a campaign based on Gandhi's principle of civil disobedience in around 137 villages in district Bardoli, outside Bombay. The experiment succeeded, and Patel became the Congress brother of Jawaharlal Nehru. Both leaders disagreed with Gandhi's radical approach to give Jinnah power over the whole continent in order to remain united. They would not allow the British to hand-over all power to their adversary. The fourth leader who entered Mountbatten's office was Muhammed Ali Jinnah. The authors explain Mountbatten's view on Jinnah. "Mountbatten had found Muhammed Ali Jinnah in a most frigid, haughty and disdainful frame of mind" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 100). He was a psychopathic case. Mountbatten later recalled that: "I did not realize how utterly impossible my task in India was going to be until I met Muhammed Ali Jinnah for the first time" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 100). The viceroy came to a similar conclusion as former viceroy Wavell: "He [Mountbatten] tried every trick I could play, used every appeal I could imagine, to shake Jinnah's resolve to have partition. Nothing would. There was no argument that could move him from his consuming determination to realize the impossible dream of Pakistan" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 103). Jinnah pushed his dream for an independent Muslims state through. Secondly, Jinnah requested that the great provinces of Punjab and Bengal would be included in his Islamic state. Mountbatten refused. He claimed that a partition of Punjab and Bengal would be part of the deal if an independent state of Pakistan was erected. The authors describe how Mountbatten would turn his stance in favor of Jinnah and would give him what he wanted. He first proposed his plan at a governance conference where the governors, known as the pillars of British India, came together. Mountbatten proposed his plan called Plan Balkan. His plan would entail that every province could choose to join either India or Pakistan and, if a majority of Hindus and Muslims agreed, they could become independent. But, more importantly, Lapierre And Collins (1975) describe how their legacy would remain untouched: "He wanted the world to know the British had made every effort possible to keep India united. If Britain failed it was of the utmost importance that the world knows it was, 'Indian opinion rather than a British

decision that had made partition the choice” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 114). The governors did not oppose the plan but did not show enthusiasm either.

Simla, May 1947

Mountbatten delivered his plan to the British parliament. The impasse with the Indians was over. Britain would keep up an honorable exit. But Mountbatten was concerned about a clause which he included in ‘plan Balkan’. The clause about a possibility of independence if both Hindus and Muslims would find agreement. This had inspired the Bengal Congress leaders. It would mean that under this plan, India would be divided into three instead of two independent states. Jinnah was not likely to oppose this idea, but he had not discussed it with the leaders of Congress; Nehru and Patel. Around May 1947, Mountbatten would replace Delhi for Simla. The authors (1975) describe the village at the foothill of the Himalayas as a miniature Sussex Hamlet. A precious place of the viceroy when the remorseless heat in Delhi had become unbearable. Mountbatten decided to invite Nehru to the viceroy’s summer residence. Mountbatten’s staff opposed the idea of inviting him. Since the viceroy would discuss his concerns with Nehru and not with Jinnah. His staff warned him: “To show the plan to Nehru without exposing it to Jinnah would be a complete breach of faith with the Moslem leader” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 125). But Mountbatten would push through and invite his friend and political colleague, Nehru. When Nehru heard about Mountbatten’s plan and the clause for independence, “he was horrified by what he read” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 126), “the impression his plan, left... was one of fragmentation and conflict and disorder” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 126). Mountbatten had not expected this reaction of Nehru. He knew that Nehru’s Congress party would never be willing to accept this plan. And moreover, this plan had already been sent to the British Cabinet in London. Within this context, Mountbatten decided to revise his plan with only two options. India’s dilemma for independence would be solved by two options: India or Pakistan. The possibility of an independent state of Bengal was abandoned. Lastly, the leaders also agreed on ties between Britain and India after independence. Nehru would accept dominion status when the process for a transfer of power was accelerated. An early transfer of power, 15 august 2017 would be granted in exchange for India’s dominion status. Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe these arrangements very subtle in their book. Referring to it in a different chapter and only in one sentence: “It was Congress’s promise to accept dominion status if it was offered immediately” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 149). It relates to the independence and not to dominion status when reading about the negotiations in the book of Abid (2013) and Mahajan (2000).

The 3rd June Plan

The one on one conversations were replaced in June 1947 by a table conference of parties who were all involved in British transfer of power: Mountbatten and some of his key advisors, The Muslim League, represented by Nehru and Patel, the Muslim League represented by Jinnah and Baldev Singh, who spoke in behalf of the 6 million Sikhs in Punjab. At the start of the conference, Mountbatten once again asked Jinnah whether he would accept the Cabinet Mission Plan (CMP) administered by viceroy Wavell. Jinnah was not. Hence, Mountbatten discussed his plan and finally come to a settlement on the transfer of power. By midnight, Mountbatten wished to receive support for his plan. Congress and the Sikhs had agreed to the plans, But Jinnah had not agreed yet. The authors emphasize his denial: “Jinnah simply could not bring himself to utter the word he’d made a career of refusing to pronounce – yes” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 158). The leader of the Muslim League first wished to discuss the plan with the League council. He wanted to pursue, the legal constituted way which upset Mountbatten: “Mr. Jinnah, said Mountbatten, I’m going to tell you something. I don’t intend to let you wreck your own plan. I can’t allow you to throw away the solution you have worked so hard to get. I propose to accept on your behalf” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 159). The authors describe how Mountbatten forced Jinnah to nod at the meeting on the 3rd of June quoting Mountbatten in a conversation with Jinnah about the plan: “if you don’t nod your head.... You can go to hell” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 160). The plan was accepted as envisaged by viceroy Mountbatten. The independent state of Pakistan, would be realized. The viceroy argued that on August 15, 1947, the transfer of power is finalized.

Sir Cyril Radcliffe

Sir Cyril Radcliffe was a great lawyer in England. He never visited India in his life, but was chosen by Mountbatten as the man who would partition Punjab and Bengal. The leaders of Congress and the Muslim League would never find agreement about the contours of partition and therefore Radcliffe was appointed as head of the boundary commission. A man who did not even know where Punjab and Bengal were geographically located and inhabited around 88 million people, would be divided by Radcliffe. Within a period of three months, Radcliffe would have to divide the two provinces. In such a short period of time, the provinces could not be analyzed in detail. Instead of a scalpel, he would divide the regions with an axe (Lapierre & Collins, 1975). Radcliffe decided to draw out the lines on a map in his bungalow situated at the edge of Delhi. He found Bengal a simpler task than Punjab. He only stumbled upon the city of Calcutta. Since all the jute produced on the fields in Bengal were exported from the harbor of

Calcutta. In the end, Radcliffe decided in favor of the Hindu's. the city had a majority population of Hindu's which overruled the economic reasons. Punjab proved to be immensely more difficult. A boundary had to be drawn between villages and cities of Sikhs, Hindus and Muslims who were dispersed all over the region. the spiritual center of Sikhism, the golden temple in the city of Amritsar, was also found in this region. Radcliffe concluded that no matter where the line was drawn in Punjab, slaughter and bloodshed would be guaranteed. When Radcliffe finished his maps on the partition and Bengal he revealed it to viceroy Mountbatten. The viceroy concluded that he would like to leave the Indian empire by a legacy of British goodwill. Hence, he wished that every Indian in the Punjab and Bengal region could celebrate Independence Day on the 15th of August and therefore concluded that the boundaries of the partitioned regions would be published after this date. Mountbatten claimed: "let the Indians have the joy of their Independence Day, he reasoned, they can face the misery of the situation after" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 228).

Punjab massacres

Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe how 5 days after the arrival of viceroy Mountbatten, violence between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs took off. In early March violence erupted in the city of Lahore. A place in northern India where Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs had always been tolerant towards each other. But in early March, violence had erupted. A Sikh leader had cried: "*Pakistan Murdabad*" – Death to Pakistan (188). The outcry was replied by Muslim riots. Communal hatred was severely increasing, and police authorities encountered trouble to restore order in the city. In April, Mountbatten decided to visit a village 25 miles from the city Rawalpindi in the heart of Punjab. The village had been destroyed by Muslim hordes. They came into the village with buckets of gasoline, and set the whole village in fire. Families cried for help, but those Hindus and Sikhs who tried to escape were tied together, flooded with gasoline and burned alive. Other Hindu women were forced to convert to Islam or raped. The violence spread over the region and to the city of Lahore. Sir. Radcliffe described that the center was heated and covered in dust. There were riots in the streets. Lahore was burning. British police authorities could hardly restore order. The authors (1975) describe how you could be killed like lightning. There was an evil balance between Muslim and non-Muslim killings in the streets of Lahore. Old Punjabi traditions, sleeping under the stars during a hot night was given up. It was too dangerous. Your throat could be easily slit by Muslims or Sikhs at night. The central post office in Lahore was flooded by mails signed by Muslims. They showed pictures of Hindus and Sikhs being raped and murdered. Threats were written down saying "this

is what has been happening to our Sikh and Hindu brothers and sisters at the hands of the Moslems when they take over” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 214). In case partition was agreed in Delhi between Muslims, Hindus and the Sikhs, there were extremist Sikhs who arranged a council to set out a different strategy. They would not allow Hindus and Sikhs to overrun their lands and called for bloodshed to safeguard their region of origin: Punjab (195). Communal violence increased considerably. Sikhs took off to Muslim village by railroad and commended savageries against Muslims, mutilating and killing them (214). Order in Punjab began to collapse. There were only a handful of British officers responsible to preserve order. They used a new strategy compared to their previous 15 years of service. The men would use their tommy gun first and ask questions later. A day before India’s independence violence climaxed in the streets of Lahore. Water in the streets had been cut. When women and children would come out of their homes to reach for water in the summer heat, Muslims would butcher them. The amount of fires was getting out of control (245). Nehru argued that: “at the stroke of the midnight hour, while the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 251). Although he could only think about the city of Lahore which was burning down. The Hindus who wished to flee were massacred at the railway station. A British police officer at the station noticed how stacks of corpses were loaded on luggage carts. It was an appalling sight.

On Independence Day, 15 August 1947, the Indian flag was raised in the streets of New Delhi. Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe how over half a million Indians gathered in the capital city. During this day, Louis Mountbatten would hand over his power. Although the leader of Congress had asked him to become his first servant as Governor-General (G-G). The roles would be turned on this day. The authors write that: “Louis Mountbatten raised his right hand and solemnly swore to become the humble and faithful first servant of an independent India” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 266). The celebration of independence was accompanied with goodwill towards Mountbatten. On his way back to the Lutyens’ palace, Indians payed homage to the last viceroy. They shouted: “*Mountbatten Ki Jai!* Over and over again – *Long Live Mountbatten.* Lapierre & Collins conclude: “No Englishman in Indian history had been privileged to hear it shouted with the emotion and sincerity that went with it that afternoon in New Delhi” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 278). The viceroy described the celebration in Delhi as the freedom experienced after war. Mountbatten believed that this war had winners on both sides. But these feelings were not felt in the Punjab region. Sikhs in Punjab ravaged Muslim neighborhoods. They forced them to flee. The railway station in Amritsar had become a refugee center for Hindus who fled from Pakistan. Hindus were on the platforms waiting for missing

relatives and friends. But on this day, when a train entered the railway station, doors kept locked. The station master, Chani Singh opened one door and encountered carriages full of corpses. there was a message written on the last cart of the train: “this is an independence gift to Nehru and Patel” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 272). Terrible bloodshed and violence would arise in the wake of India’s national independence.

Discourse Muslim book

Muslim author Massarrat Abid (2013) main subjects in the second period are the negotiations between the British and leaders of the Indian national parties. Furthermore, the author pays attention to the outbreak of violence in the Punjab region and critically evaluates the role of the British in it. The covering subjects in this period are (A) the early conversations of Mountbatten with Indian party leaders (B) Negotiations in Simla, May 1947 (C) Critical reflection on the 3rd June Plan (D) The role of the Sikhs on the outbreak of violence (E) Muslims, the victims of the Punjab riots and (F) British responsibility for the Punjab Massacre.

The early conversations of Mountbatten with Indian party leaders

Abid (2013) discusses the negotiations between Mountbatten and the Indian leaders. She focuses on the conversations between him and Nehru and the conversation with Jinnah. In the former conversation, Congress leader Nehru argued that the provinces of Punjab and Bengal should be split. Abid (2013) argues that Congress demanded in favor of partition. They knew that if Jinnah agreed to partition, violence would erupt in the regions of Bengal and Punjab, and Muslims would no longer support the Muslim League. A discussion on the partition of these regions was also discussed with Jinnah. In his meetings with Mountbatten, Jinnah argued that the unity of Bengal and Punjab should not be destroyed since the regions had a common history and common ways of life. Due to a lack of mutual trust between Congress and the Muslim League, Mountbatten expressed the need for ‘a surgical operation on India’. He indicated in favor of a two state solution and agreed to Nehru’s request for the partition of Punjab and Bengal. Mountbatten described his strategy in plan Balkan where every province would have the choice to join India or Pakistan, or remain independent. Hence, each province could decide on its own future. Mountbatten proposed his plan at the governor’s conference.

Negotiations in Simla, May 1947

Abid (2013) claims that Mountbatten knew that an early transfer of power would create countless difficulties for the Muslim League. It was a decision taken in demand of Congress

without taking the position of the Muslim League into account. Abid (2013) argues that Britain gave more weight to their relations with Congress than Pakistan. The negotiations in Simla are described by Abid (2013) to support this claim. Mountbatten's plan would give every province the option to decide whether to join India, Pakistan or become independent. But an option for independence was non-negotiable for Nehru. Since he was committed to a partition of Punjab and Bengal. He also made clear that his Congress party would not accept the plan as it was proposed now. The viceroy could not enforce his plan considering the objections of Jawaharlal Nehru. Mountbatten decided to redraft the plan by omitting the options for independence. While Jinnah maintained that: power should be transferred to provinces as they exist. They can then group together or remain separate as they wish" (Abid, 2013: 39). The new plan would only consist of two options: provinces could decide either to join India or Pakistan. Besides this revision, Abid (2013) argues that "the acceptance of Dominion Status by Congress and Mountbatten's decision to transfer power earlier than June 1948 were perhaps the most important developments which had resulted from the Simla negotiations between the Viceroy and Nehru" (Abid, 2013: 44). Abid (2013) emphasizes that Jinnah was not aware of the trade-off between dominion status in exchange for an early transfer of power between Nehru and Mountbatten in Simla. Furthermore, Abid (2013) argues that Jinnah was not informed about this deal because they feared that he would publish a statement about these negotiations. Nehru told Mountbatten that he would not talk openly about the Simla negotiations in public.

Critical reflection on the 3rd June Plan

When Mountbatten arrived back in Delhi on May 30, Jinnah had little choice but to accept the Viceroy's proposal. The plan would be announced on a radiobroadcast on June 3. Abid (2013) claims that although all parties did not agree with the plan they had received, they would accept it. The plan under consideration was also accepted by the House of commons, the labor government of Attlee agreed as well as the house of lords.

Abid criticizes two events about in the run up- and the final agreement of the third June Plan. Firstly, Mountbatten's change of plans favoring Congress demands for an early transfer of power. While Mountbatten knew that the Muslim League could never organize nor built a state in such a limited amount of time. Secondly, the fact that "Jinnah was neither invited nor informed of these negotiations in Simla (Abid, 2013: 53). Within this context, Abid (2013) concludes that the plan for a transfer of power was an Anglo-Hindu pact. Abid criticizes that Mountbatten was aware that as the leader of the Muslim League, Jinnah should have been

invited at the negotiation table in Simla 1947. She (2013) argues that the decision of Mountbatten to keep the negotiations a secret, can hardly be justified. Abid (2013) claims that many demands of the Muslim League had not been fulfilled such as the Muslim league demands for: an independent Bengal, the transfer of power to the provinces to choose whether to join India, Pakistan or become independent and a proposal to hold plebiscites in Bengal and the Punjab for a decision on its future and so on and so forth. In the end, Jinnah accepted the plan, as a compromise. In the given circumstances, this was the only solution possible for all parties involved. And, “the consequences for any other alternative would have been disastrous to imagine” (Abid, 2013: 55)

The role of the Sikhs on the outbreak of violence

Abid (2013) describes how communal violence increased due to the division plan of Sir. Radcliffe. The Sikhs represented by Baldev Singh during the negotiations of the 3rd June plan, agreed to the partition of Punjab and Bengal. In response to a complete demand of the Punjab region by Muslims, Sikhs demanded for division of the region. However, Sikhs in the region concluded that the boundary commission did not take their demands seriously. They demanded that the district of Ambala, Jullundur, Lyallpur and the Montgomery districts should be awarded to them based on their economic contributions and prosperity of the region. The governor of the region, sir. Evan Jenkins informed viceroy Mountbatten that Sikhs would fight if their claims were not taken seriously. But head of the boundary commission, Sir. Cyril Radcliffe could not decide properly on the division of Punjab when taking into account his limited knowledge of India and the limited amount of time to fulfill his task. Consequently, Sikhs threat of violence was set into action. Abid (2013) claims that: “fires, stabbings and bomb explosions became an almost daily affair in the province” (Abid, 2013: 79). the leader of the largest political party for Sikhs called Tara Singh proclaimed collecting arms. Abid (2013) argues that in this stage of violent uprising in the region, it was necessary to arrest the leaders of the Sikh political party; Akai Dal. However, Mountbatten refused to take this step. According to Mountbatten, this would only severe the trouble in Punjab. Contrary to Mountbatten, Jinnah did not want to postpone the arrests of the Sikh leaders until the official boundaries of partition would be published.

Muslims, the victims of Punjab riots

Abid (2013) describes how riots broke out during the reign of viceroy Mountbatten. The district of Punjab, the N.W.F.P, Bihar, Delhi, Calcutta, Bombay and Uttar Pradesh (UP) were all

confronted with communal violence between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs. Abid (2013) describes instances of violence conducted by Sikhs. They burned down Muslim villages, killed them and forced them to flee westward, into the Pakistan regions. First, Sikhs would fire a warning shot, to get Muslims off their roof and then throw grenades over the walls of Muslim homes. When Muslims decided to stay inside, Sikhs would enter their homes and slaughter them. Army officers described the events as “a thousand times more horrible than anything they had seen during World War II” (Abid, 2013: 98). The author pays attention to how Muslims experienced the outbreak of violence in this region with many claims on how Muslims became the victims during the period of decolonization. Abid claims that in eastern Punjab Muslims were being killed “like cats and dogs” (2013: 99), Muslims being abducted and raped. The violent acts spread outside Punjab as well. Abid (2013) argues that in Delhi Muslims were being systematically hunted down and butchered” (2013: 98). Districts were set on fire and looted while the Muslim police had been disarmed by the Hindu administration of the city. The Muslim population in Delhi was reduced by half, around 15000 of them were killed and 150000 left the city. Abid (2013) criticizes the role of the Indian government in this period of time. She claims that they failed countermeasures to overcome the atrocities. She describes that personal of the Indian police services either allowed or actively assisted to murder when Muslims were killed. Moreover, the train guards working for the Indian government did not provide any help to Muslims who sought to leave Delhi. Many incidents happened on the railway station which could have been easily countered.

British responsible for the Punjab Massacre

Abid (2013) criticizes the role of the British related to the outbreak of violence in the Punjab region. She argues that viceroy Mountbatten, despite advice of govern Evan Jenkins who reported that Sikh leaders were preparing violent attacks against Muslim in the region, he decided not to arrest them. Moreover, Mountbatten also failed to take any preventive measures although he knew that uprisings and mass massacres were planned by Sikhs. He based his judgment on his closest advisors. Pakistani politicians such as Ghulam Muhammed and Feroz Khan Noon, member of Pakistan’s Constituent Assembly criticized Mountbatten for his actions. The latter also argued that if the government of Punjab had responded immediately to the violence that massacres could have been prevented. When Mountbatten later referred to the Punjab massacres in 1947 he said that the massacres only affected 3% of the total population in India. The government of Pakistan replied after its independence that this 3% was more than the total population of Australia. Abid (2013) explains that “communal trouble was enormously

aggravated by the speed with which everything was done” (Abid, 2013: 126). The Indian army did not have enough time to take proper measures before Independence Day on August 15. The author argues that Mountbatten must have recorded that his administration could no longer carry out the administration in India. Hence, the idea of an early transfer of power served British interests but aggravated communal violence in Punjab before India’s Independence Day.

Discourse Hindu book

Hindu author Sucheta Mahajan (2000) main subjects in the second period cover a critical evaluation of the negotiations between Mountbatten and the Indian party leaders. The author also pays attention to the partition massacres in this period. The covering subjects are (A) a critical reflection on the negotiations in Simla, May 1947 (B) British strategy enforcing the 3rd June plan and (C) the Punjab tragedy.

Critical reflection on the negotiations in Simla, May 1947

Mahajan (2000) also looks at the event of Shimla in May 1947. She cites scholars on the implications that the head-to-head conversation between the leader of Congress; Nehru and viceroy Mountbatten had, on the outcome of partitions. Ayesha Jalal (in Mahajan, 2000) argues that Congress played a crucial role in India’s decolonization and the outcome of independent state Pakistan. She argues: “Partition is not a British award, but a Congress directive carried out by Mountbatten” (Mahajan, 2000: 197). Similarly, R.J. Moore (in Mahajan, 2000) argues that a shift in the responsibility for partition is seen during the negotiations of Simla in 1947. Mahajan (2000) argues that Mountbatten personally liked Nehru. Inviting him to this summer residence in Simla embodies the good relations between the two. Conversely, Mountbatten disliked Jinnah. “Mountbatten did not share Wavell’s instinctive sympathy for Jinnah and the League” (Mahajan, 2000: 195). He could not believe that a man with such lack of knowledge or a sense of responsibility could hold this important position. The anti-Jinnah and pro-Nehru attitude of Mountbatten has contributed to outcomes of India’s decolonization favoring the interests of Congress.

Mahajan criticizes the deal dominion status for early transfer of power

Mahajan (2000) criticizes the date of the transfer of power reached in Simla Mid-1947. Mountbatten reached a deal on the early transfer of power; 15 August 1947 in exchange for dominion status. However, Mahajan (2000) claims that during a time when British rule on the subcontinent was already eroding, they escaped their responsibility of countering a violent

uprising before the official transfer of power on 15th of August 1947. The British were only preoccupied how they could withdraw from the colony securing their interests which included India's dominion status and early retreat from the subcontinent. Mahajan (2000) argues that the British "were immobilized by their total preoccupation with how best they would come out of the crisis" (Mahajan, 2000: 200). But this approach of the British had a downside. Indians good will towards the British was lost in the 'generous' declaration of the British to withdraw from the subcontinent. The Indians did not experience the British leaving the subcontinent as a lovely farewell. The erosion of power and the declaration for an early transfer of power eroded India's goodwill

British strategy enforcing the 3rd June Plan

Sucheta Mahajan (2000) analyzes the role of Mountbatten as last viceroy in India. Mahajan looks at the parties involved for the transfer of power when describing the 3rd June plan and argues that politics won from strategic interests. Similar to Lapierre & Collins (1975), Mahajan (2000) describes that Jinnah did not listen to alternatives of Mountbatten and insisted on the independent state of Pakistan. Mountbatten claimed in an interview with Jinnah: "I am very much afraid that partition may prove to be the only possible alternative" (Mahajan, 2000: 185). But the preference of a political solution over a strategic solution served the interests of the British. The 3rd June plan would transfer power to the states of India and Pakistan which included the partition of the regions Punjab and Bengal. Both nations would become two dominions in the British Commonwealth (CW). Mahajan (2000) describes that the British only had two concerns. Firstly, was to withdraw from the colony as painlessly and bloodlessly as possible. Secondly, they wished to maintain economic and strategic benefits from India and Pakistan, united or divided, after decolonization. Whether this would be a united India in the Commonwealth or two states who became two dominions in the Commonwealth (CW) still served British self-interest. Hence, Mahajan (2000) argues that the British were neutral towards a united or divided subcontinent. If unity would not work, they would continue for an agreement for partition. Since an agreement was better than no agreement at all. A neutral stance in the transfer of power was also chosen to prevent taking any responsibility on a two-state solution in the future. Mountbatten reiterated this position on the Governors' conference mid-1947. He assured absolute impartiality towards both the Muslim League and Congress. Mahajan (2000) criticizes this role of the British. She claims that this was the easiest alternative for the British. However, "A serious attempt at retaining unity would have involved identifying with the forces that wanted a unified India and countering those who opposed it" (Mahajan, 2000: 191). Hence,

Mahajan (2000) criticizes the mediating role of the British. They should have positively intervened and forced unity because it would have downplayed the communal issues in India.

The Punjab tragedy

Mahajan (2000) does not describe any of the Punjab massacres. She only mentions that violence occurred in this district of India. She focusses on the decision-making process instead of the riots themselves and criticizes the early transfer of power. Mahajan cites army official Bristow who claims that: “the Punjab tragedy would not have occurred had partition been deferred for a year or so” (Bristow, 1974 in Mahajan, 2000: 201). Other members of the Indian army endorsed similar views. Widespread violence could have been countered when a decision for the transfer of power, was not taken so quickly. Mahajan (2000) argues that the British decision to delay the publication of the boundary commission ruled by Sir. Radcliffe on how the boundaries of the Punjab and Bengal region were drawn, confirms the image that the British shied away from taking responsibility that would go along by this decision i.e. the violence that would break out due to the partition of these regions.

Appendix 3 - Discourse of the Books after India's Independence Day

Discourse Western book

The authors of the Western book (1975) focus in the third period on the aftermath of India's independence. The focus of the authors in this period are on a secret request of the Indian leaders on Mountbatten to take back control in (A) The emergency committee, the continuation of violence in Punjab and (B) the Kashmir dispute, (C) Gandhi's fast for peace and the book is concluded with Hindu extreme nationalists (D) assassination of Mahatma Gandhi

The Emergency Committee

Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe how violence climaxed after India's independence. Leaders of the national parties claimed that people had gone mad. The riots in Punjab continued for weeks and sparked greater violence in the city of Calcutta and Delhi. The administration in Delhi was about to collapse. This dreadful scenario could lead to a breakdown of the subcontinent. Muslim policemen already fled the city, there were only 900 troops available. Within this context, Indian civil servant (ICS) V.P. Menon called Louis Mountbatten in Simla. The last viceroy of India regretted the enormous outbreak of violence but as a Governor-General (G-G) he had no authority to do anything about it. Menon requested Mountbatten to return to Delhi, to give advice to the new administration. After some deliberation, he flew back to the capital. Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe a meeting on the 6th of September between Mountbatten, Nehru and Patel. The British versus leaders of the administration of an independent India. The authors claim that during this conversation, Nehru pleaded for Mountbatten as an expert to take command of the administration. Nehru said: "You are a professional, high-level administrator. You've commanded millions of men. You have the experience and knowledge colonialism has denied us. You English can't just turn this country over to us after being here all our lives and simply walk away. We're in an emergency and we need help. Will you run the country?" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 315). The leaders concluded that an Emergency Committee was needed to counter the grave situation of India after independence. Mountbatten agreed that nobody would find out about this committee and that Indians would pledge to follow Mountbatten's commands. The authors describe it as follows: I [Mountbatten], will always go through the motions of consulting you, but whatever I say you're not to argue with me. We haven't got time. I'll say: I'm sure you'd wish me to do this, and you'll say: Yes, please do. That's all I want. I don't want you to say anything else. From this moment in September, India

was once again ruled by the British. Lapierre & Collins (1975) claim that through the efforts of the emergency committee, violence gradually declined. Reinforcements entered the city within 24 hours after Mountbatten took over command. The authors describe that the emergency committee was dissolved in January 1948 and government was in the hands of Nehru again.

The Kashmir Dispute

Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe the events happening in the district of Kashmir after India's independence. The Maharaja of Kashmir, Hari Singh, would stick to his plan to stay on his throne. He would only favor the option for an independent Kashmir and not join Pakistan nor India. Jinnah however, believed it to be self-evident that a region which consists of a majority Muslim population would become part of Pakistan. The Maharaja refused this offer. He even denied the Muslim leader access to the territory of Kashmir when he decided to take a vacation in the region, one month after partition. The Chief minister of the Frontier province in Pakistan agreed with Jinnah on a solution. The Pathan tribes man of the North-West frontier district would be persuaded to riot in Kashmir. Lapierre & Collins (1975) described the men as "the most troublesome and feared population of the subcontinent" (1975: 348). Pakistan would financially support the Pathans and force the Maharaja to give up his beloved Kashmir. Moreover, when the Pathans are handed the opportunity to loot bazaars in Kashmir, they are unlikely to riot in the Pakistan city Peshawar. Jinnah agreed to this option, on condition that neither the British officers nor the Pakistan army officers would find out about it. On the 22nd of October 1947, Pathan tribes rushed in the Kashmir region. the operation was led by Shaukat Hayat Khan. The man would bring thousands of Pathans to the capital of Kashmir called Srinagar. The British heard about the invasion of Kashmir but a response to the situation posed a moral dilemma. Mountbatten would not agree with an invasion of the British army. A military intervention would fall under the responsibility of the Indian army. Mountbatten did not want to risk any involvement of British troops. In the meantime, Maharaja Hari Singh pleaded help confronted by violent riots on his soil. The Indian government would provide aid but on condition that Kashmir would be temporary acceded as an official district of India. Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe that: "the Maharaja was ready to accept any terms they proposed in return for their aid" (1975: 355). He signed an act for accession to India. Four days later, on the 26th of October, 1947 Pathan raiders were about to capture the only airport of the region in Srinagar. However, Mountbatten arranged an airlift of troops to the airport just in time. Troops would need to defend the airport at all costs. More reinforcements would join the artillery by

land later. The authors describe that in the end the Pathans did not make it to Srinagar. They had paused at a small city called: Baramulla. Where they “were giving vent to their ancient appetites for rape and pillage. They violated the nuns, massacred the patients in their little clinic, looted the convent chapel down to its last brass door-knob (1975: 357). The reinforcements of Nehru’s army eventually set foot on the Kashmir region and forced the Pathans back to the valley of Kashmir. Jinnah replied by sending more troops to re-arm the demoralized Pathans. The authors conclude that partition would cause the start of a more than 25 year dispute over the Kashmir region. the parties were not able to find any compromise and turned towards the United Nations (UN). They divided the Kashmir region. the valley of Kashmir would fall under India’s rule and the territories surrounding Gilgit would belong to Pakistan. Unfortunately, the dispute over land in this region has not been solved till this day.

Gandhi’s fast for peace

Gandhi resided in his Birla house in New Delhi. he had initiated fasting against a decision made by the Indian government. During the negotiations for partition, India and Pakistan reached an agreement about financial and material assets. The Indian government would transfer a sum of 750 million rupees to Pakistan. An advance of 200 million had been payed but the government refused to transfer the additional 550 million rupees. Since the government was afraid that Jinnah would purchase artillery and kill Indians in the Kashmir region. Gandhi believed that the postponement of payments was immoral. The sum belonged to Pakistan. However, the refusal of Nehru to pay, made Gandhi decide to endorse his principal of non-violence one last time. He would take on a fast to make Nehru change his mind. “They could never deny to Gandhi dying in the agony of a fast” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 375). The strategy of Gandhi worked. Two days later, the Indian government confirmed that it would immediately re-start payments of the remaining 550 million rupees. But Gandhi would not give up his fasting yet. He would give his life unless peace would endure over the whole Indian subcontinent. Leaders of national parties and organizations should end the mass killings across India. It was during this fast half January 1947. In the end all parties signed a covenant for “peace, harmony and fraternity between the communities” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 396), even representatives of the extremist Hindu organizations, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and the Hindu Mahasabha.

The Assassination of Mahatma Gandhi

Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe the consequences of India's decolonization paying much attention to the Hindu nationalist organization, RSS, its members and how they plan and assassinate Gandhi. The authors (1975) start off by describing the men who played their part in the assassination. They give background information of Nathuram Godse, Narayan Apte, Gopal Godse and Digambar Badge. These men were all inspired to extreme Hindu nationalism. Gandhi was the villain who undermined the possibility of India to become a Hindu state. Nathuram Godse claimed that Gandhi did not favor unity, he would prolong division. In the aftermath of partition, Godse gave a speech in Poona saying that Gandhi's principles of non-violence made Hindus defenseless in the eyes of enemies. Hence, Gandhi defends Muslims at the expense of Hindus. Nathuram Godse and Narayan Apte were both inspired by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar. This brave man upheld the ideal of *Hindutva* – Hindu nationalism – as the official ideology of India after its independence. The goal of the *Hindutva* doctrine was to build a Hindu empire, where Hinduism obtains a supremacist position in society. Gandhi would obstruct the implementation of Hinduist principles and had to be removed from society. A first attempt to kill Gandhi was disrupted by the men who wished to execute him. During the fast in Gandhi's home, Madan Lal Pahwa shouted against Gandhi who addressed his vision now freedom had come to India. Pahwa was arrested for his crime by the police.

The vengeance of the Hindu extremists was postponed till January 20, 1948. On this day, the Hindu extremists would attempt to assassinate Gandhi again. Lapierre & Collins (1975) describe how the men bought a gun and tested it in New Delhi. Gandhi held a prayer meeting on 5 o'clock that day. Narayan Apte and Digambar Badge visited the garden of the Birla home prior to the meeting. Close to Gandhi's prayer platform stood a sandstone pavilion. It was an ideal place to hide. There was barely 10 feet between the platform and the window. The chance was very slim that they would not hit their target. Apte would throw a hand grenade from the window when the killer, Digambar Badge opened fire and kill Gandhi. The assassination would be initiated by a time bomb, which was hidden by Madan Lal Pahwa behind a brick wall near the Birla home. Gandhi was carried in a chair to the platform where he began to speech saying: "He who is an enemy of Muslims is an enemy of India" (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 408). Madan Lals' bomb exploded in the garden of the Birla home and panic broke out. But Gandhi was not shot by the Hindu extremists who hid in the pavilion. Badge rethought his act in the heat of the moment. He decided to flee. The men sought to escape from the Birla home into Delhi as fast as possible. The first attempt to assassinate Gandhi had failed.

Gandhi did not condemn the acts of violence carried out on him. He claimed: “we have no right to punish a person we think wicked” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 415). The men who failed to assassinate Gandhi came together, evaluated the attempt and concluded that one man would have to do it instead. Nathuram Godse agreed to take up this daunting task. He claimed that “he would kill Gandhi as soon as possible” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 422), since the police were like to arrest the men. Gandhi continued his prayers calling for unity, claiming that Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs were all leaves of the same tree. They should live in harmony with each other. In the meantime, Hindu extremists Godse and Apte bought a new pistol for the assassination. They tested it once again. This time, all bullets hit their target. The men also discussed how to bring the pistol to the garden of the Birla home. The men believed it to be heavily guarded after the failed attempt last time. They thought about buying an old-style camera with a hood. Godse could easily hit Gandhi from under the concealment. Apte, however, found it a bad idea. Secondly, they discussed to buy a Burqa. But when Godse tried to take out his gun underneath, he concluded that it hindered him too much. Finally, they believed a long greyish military suit would casually cover up the gun.

The men entered the Birla home garden on the 30th of January 1948. Gandhi was late that day. He had an urgent meeting in Delhi with the police since utility workers in the city would call for a strike the next day. Since he was late, Gandhi entered by lawn. Nathuram was waiting for his arrival. He grabbed the gun from his pocket, first concealed it and said “Namaste Gandhiji” (Lapierre & Collins, 1975: 440). he took out the gun and shot three times in Gandhi’s chest. Blood covered his cotton khadi and Gandhi’s lifeless body fell to the ground. Viceroy Mountbatten first reply to the devastating news concerned the background of the killer, whether he was a Muslim or not. He was afraid that a Muslim killer would cause the ghastliest massacre in the world ever. The viceroy made his final tribute to Gandhi saying that: “Mahatma Gandhi...will go down in history on a par with Buddha and Jesus Christ” (Lapierre & Collins, 1976: 442). The rest of the world mourned likewise. Prime Minister (PM) of France, Georges Bidault said: “All those who believe in the brotherhood of men will mourn Gandhi’s death (Lapierre & Collins, 1976: 445). President of the United States (US), Harry Truman declared: “the entire world mourns with Gandhi (Lapierre & Collins, 1976: 445). There were thousands of others who sent condolences to Gandhi as well. The authors (1975) conclude their book with Gandhi’s funeral. The Mahatma would be cremated according to Hindu customs, that is, within 24 hours after death. His body would be cremated at Raj Ghat in New Delhi. An immense crowd

gathered at the occasion. Dozens of women were weeping when the torch ignited Gandhi's pyre. According to the Hinduist rituals, Gandhi's ashes were brought to the most sacred place in Hinduism; the *Sangam* of Allahabad. This spot in India was sacred since here the river Mother Ganges joined India's Jumuna river. Gandhi's ashes were immersed at the meeting point of these rivers. The father of the nation would now blend with India's collective soul and "become one with the *Mahat*, the Supreme, the god of his celestial *Gita* (Lapierre & Collins, 1976: 451).

Discourse Muslim book

Muslim author Massarrat Abid (2013) main subjects in the third period cover the continuation of violence in a (A) Kashmir dispute, the foundation of Pakistan and its relations with the British in (B) British Financial 'Assistance to Pakistan (C) Pakistan – Afghan relations and the author concludes the book with (D) the assassination of Pakistan's Prime Minister (PM) Liaquat Ali Khan.

The Kashmir Dispute

Abid (2013) pays extensive attention to the Kashmir dispute which was caused by India's partition plan. The Muslim author describes the background of the partition plan, the cause and consequences of violence in the region and how the issue was not solved by aid of the British in the Commonwealth (CW) nor by the United Nations (UN).

Abid (2013) repeats the conditions of Mountbatten's 3rd June Plan saying that the first draft gave states the opportunity to join India, Pakistan or remain independent. According to these rules the Maharaja of Hyderabad, the Nizam of Junagadh and the Maharaja of Kashmir wished to either join Pakistan or remain independent. However, the former two states were no geographical neighbors of Pakistan. The Nizam of Junagadh was Muslim and ruled Hindu majority region. Viceroy Mountbatten therefore claimed it to be morally indefensible to accept Junagadh to join Pakistan. When Pakistan officially accepted this region's accession, Indian army troops intervened. A plebiscite was organized, and the Indian government announced that an overwhelming majority had voted in favor of joining Indian. Similar actions took place by the Indian government in the Hyderabad region where the Muslim Nizam wished to join Pakistan. Within this context, Abid (2013) criticizes the stance of the Indian government by accepting the request of a Hindu ruler to join India since the Kashmir region consisted of a majority Muslim population. The author (2013) describes in full detail how upheaval in the

region came about. Kashmir is a strategically important region, with its many borders in the North-West of India such as: China, Afghanistan and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). Trouble in the region broke out two weeks after India's independence. Internal trouble in Kashmir broke out when Maharaja Hari Singh ordered Muslims in the region to hand in their arms to the police. Abid (2013) argues that many Muslims were killed by state troops. Their homes were all burned. Members of the Hindu RSS and Sikhs got all involved in the killing of Muslims, rioting and burning of their villages. Pathan tribesman cursed the attacks and fled to Kashmir where they would aid Muslims and overcome the violent attacks. By that time, the Maharaja fled the region and asked the Indian army for military assistance. Nehru replied positively to the appeal as well as Mountbatten. The only requirement of the latter was that India would only be willing to send troops if Kashmir became part of India conditionally. This would make it legally justifiable to send troops. The Indian army spreads around the region. Jinnah complained about how the situation evolved. during this meeting in Lahore the idea for organizing a plebiscite was raised to decide on the future of Kashmir. Jinnah opposed the idea since Muslims in the region would not have the courage to vote in favor of Pakistan when great amounts of Indian troops occupied the land. Therefore, the idea was raised to ask observers of the United Nations to visit Kashmir and ensure a free and impartial plebiscite. Jinnah refused this idea and claimed that only the Governor-General's (G-G's), that is he himself and viceroy Mountbatten, could decide on the organizations of a plebiscite. But this, request was denied by the British government. In the end, the meeting between all parties failed.

A new solution for the Kashmir dispute was found in December 1947. The Indian government decided to solve the dispute in the United Nations (UN). The Indian government believed that they could win support by claiming that Pakistan had illegally allowed Pathan tribes to pass in Pakistan and intervene in Kashmir. Conversely, Pakistan claimed that they did not aid the Pathan tribes in the region. They also "accused India of being responsible for widespread genocide against the Muslim population" (Abid, 2013: 170). On January 20, the Security Council submitted a resolution which did not refer to withdrawing troops, either Indian army forces or Pathan tribesmen, in the region. It reached a deadlock. Soon after, the idea of holding a plebiscite with UN observers was raised again. Abid (2013) explains how the Security Council was requested many times to solve the Kashmir dispute. Hence, in March 1948 a new draft on the dispute was presented saying that Pakistan should withdraw the tribesmen, that India should reduce the number of troops in the region and an administrator should be designated to organize a fair plebiscite. The resolution was not supported by both India and Pakistan. For months, the

parties kept arguing and Pakistan had moved troops into Kashmir just as India had done to support the Maharaja. The Indian government now claimed that these forces should be withdrawn if a fair plebiscite is to be organized. A UN commission in August 1948 supported the proposal of India. Hence, they claimed that Pakistan should first withdraw its troops and tribesmen preceding the organization of a plebiscite. Pakistan critically replied that they would only support a cease fire if this would aid the process of a fair plebiscite, and this resolution did not.

In absence of any agreement, the British brought up the idea towards the partition of Kashmir. This meant that certain areas of the region would fall under the administration of Pakistan while others became part of India. The conclusion followed because no real progress had been made by all parties one year later. Pakistan did not favor the idea of partition in Kashmir, however the British government favored this alternative together with limited plebiscites in the region. However, India favored partition without the holding of any plebiscites. Again, the negotiations reached a deadlock. The British officials now sought to find a solution on the Kashmir dispute not inside the UN but by organizing a conference of Commonwealth (CW) states. The parties agreed that a force from Australia and New Zealand would be stationed in Kashmir after a cease fire and withdrawal of Indian and Pakistani troops. Nehru denied this proposal. He also refuted an alternative of a mixed force made up around Indian and Pakistani forces. Abid (2013) argues that Nehru's behavior prevented the CW to take any further steps to find a solution on Kashmir.

Massarrat Abid (2013) concludes on the dispute of Kashmir saying that India used a renounced strategy of delaying a solution in the region to consolidate their power. India claimed that it first sought to demilitarize the region before holding any plebiscite. But its government rejected all proposals for demilitarization and it can therefore be questioned whether India wished to hold any plebiscite at all. Secondly Abid (2013) condemns the British. Since they did not condemn India obstructing UN resolutions or Commonwealth (CW) solutions to postpone a solution for Kashmir. They also did not press the Indians adopt a reasonable stance. Since the British were afraid that India would otherwise threaten to leave the Commonwealth (CW). For this behavior Abid (2013) believes that their solid reason to criticize the British for the problems on the subcontinent.

British Financial 'Assistance' to Pakistan

Abid (2013) also describes the financial issues facing Pakistan after independence. The Muslim author explains that industries in Pakistan suffered due to partition. Around 75% of the world Jute supply was produced in East Bengal in 1947 but the mills were all located on India's soil. Similar practices could be seen in the sugar industry. Pakistan also needed to become industrially independent. The new state could achieve this with great sums of money. The partition plan signed by Muslim, Indian and British leaders presented a hand over of 550 million rupees by the Indian government to Pakistan. However, the Kashmir dispute halted the transfer of 350 million rupees. India was afraid that Pakistan would buy more arms to conquer Kashmir. In early October 1947 the financial advisor of Jinnah requested that the government of Pakistan asked the British for a loan to first defend the new state. however, Britain denied, due to 'political difficulties' it was not possible for them to finance Pakistan. the British would start negotiation on a British loan for Pakistan if India and Pakistan solved the payments related to the partition plan. Abid (2013) describes briefly how Gandhi pressured the Indian government to transfer the sum by undertaking a fast. Gandhi's pressure worked, and the last sum of money was assigned to Pakistan.

The transfer sum was insufficient for the Pakistan government to build an administration. It would now start talks with the British for a loan of 16-million-pound sterling. However, the United Kingdom was not eager to help Pakistan because it was engulfed in a 'trade war' with India. When the US started to devalue her currency in 1949, Britain and India followed suit, but Pakistan decided not to change the gold parity of its rupee. This decision made India decide not to consider any trade with Pakistan. trade between the states virtually stopped. Within this context, Pakistan asked Britain to grant them a loan. However, this posed a great dilemma for Britain. If they agreed to Pakistan's request, India would criticize them for supporting the government for in its quest for non-devaluation. Conversely would Pakistan criticize the British if they could not get a loan by condition of devaluing its currency. Hence, although Britain did not wish to take any sides in the issue, it ultimately would. In the end, Britain decided to give Pakistan 2-million-pound assistance. In January 1950, Britain asserted another 2 million pounds. The small amounts of assistance were chosen because the government did not wish to choose sides in the dispute which the two parties had to solve themselves. However, by June 1950, Britain had financed another 17.5 million pounds into Pakistan's economy. This was far less than the amount of 40 million pounds requested by the Pakistan government at that time. Although Britain wished to be neutral, it had now decided to support Pakistan. Nevertheless,

they claimed that Britain requested Pakistan to devalue their money. Pakistan wished to become member of the IMF in early 1950. They claimed that Pakistan should devalue its money equal to the currency of India as soon as possible. The institution would not endorse Pakistan's current rate. Abid (2013) concludes that the trade war between India and Pakistan and trade standstill, shifted Pakistan's imports to Britain. The trade between Pakistan and Britain increased considerably during this period.

However, trade between Pakistan and Britain followed a certain system; 'the colonial preference system'. This meant that certain goods between states would be traded by preferential rates of duty. India joined the system as well and benefitted from preferential treatment on the exchange of goods such as tea, leather and goatskins, vegetable oil, jute, hardwood and tobacco. After Pakistan's independence, new negotiations were initiated for a more suitable Pakistan-British agreement that included both tariff questions and exchange commodities. The negotiations took place in Karachi. The countries agreed that negotiations would have to lead to an "agreement on a mutually advantageous basis" (Abid, 2013: 346). However, Abid (2013) claims that the preference system was more advantageous for Britain than for Pakistan. Since the duty-free rights and preferences for goods in Britain for Pakistan hardly had any value for the latter. Moreover, the British threatened that the withdrawal of certain preference goods by Pakistan would turn out to Britain diminishing trade which threatened the long-term trade perspective of Pakistan. Finally, the parties agreed on preferential commodities. Pakistan would gain preferential treatment on trade of: tea, leather, carpets and sports goods. Conversely, would have preferential commodity trade with Pakistan on: iron and steel products, chemicals, paints and textiles (Abid, 2013). The new trade agreement was criticized in Pakistan claiming that the new imperial preference system was much more advantageous for Britain than Pakistan. Abid (2013) criticizes the outcomes of the new trade agreements and questions why this much hated system still has not been abolished. The agreements were part of British system to create sheltered markets which benefitted her domestic manufactures. Hence, the system did not help to create mutually beneficial trade agreements and was not beneficial for Pakistan. Abid (2013) questions why the system was not scrapped after independence: "It may be asked why the system, a colonial legacy of the days when the Indian subcontinent was not free, was retained" (Abid, 2013: 360). She reasons that lacking knowledge of the Pakistani government can declare why Pakistan failed to achieve outcomes that served the self-interest of the state.

Pakistan – Afghan relations

The Muslim author (2013) finishes her book on the consequences for the new state of Pakistan after decolonization and its relations with Afghanistan. Kashmir did not prove the only region of dispute after partition. Abid (2013) describes how a province in North-West Pakistan called the North-West Frontier Province (N.W.F.P) had been a 'separate unit' of the Punjab region. It was also referred to as the Tribal Areas. This region had a 2430 km border with Afghanistan. A British civil servant had drawn this line as the separation between the sovereign state Afghanistan and Punjab in the 19th century. the tribal areas were inhabited by Pathans. Afghanistan had always supported the Pathans to decide their own future. The government even supported the tribes to form an independent state when Mountbatten's 3rd June Plan was submitted. The afghan press propagated and campaigned for a so-called: Pathanistan. But India knew that the region could never support itself. It was too small and weak to form an independent state. the attitude of Afghanistan was not welcomed, to say the least, in Pakistan who argued that the case of Pathan tribes concerned a domestic affair. But the Afghan government did not cease the use of anti-Pakistan and pro-Pathan propaganda. Meanwhile, the United Kingdom did not wish to intervene in the case because good relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan was essential to counter any communist, Russian threat in the region. Nevertheless, the Afghan-Pakistan tensions heightened when Prime Minister (PM) Shah Mahmud claimed at a conference in Kabul on March 27, 1949 that "they would rescue their Afghan brethren in Pakistan through negotiations and if negotiations failed, then by other means" (Abid, 2013: 387). The threat of Afghanistan made Pakistan inform the British, claiming that as a member of the Commonwealth (CW) they were obligated to take responsibility in the matter. The British government made clear that Afghanistan would have no right to interfere in any affair East of the Durand line. The governments of both states, Afghanistan and Pakistan should further cooperation and solve the issue through direct negotiations. However, Afghanistan disputed that the Durand line was an official international border and continued their plead for an independent Pathanistan. The government of India de facto supported Afghanistan in their claim. Nehru also disputed international recognition of the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Abid (2013) argues that Pakistan wished to normalize relations with Afghanistan, but the latter would only complicate matters. An armed clash between both nations took place on the 17th of June 1950. And another clash followed in the frontier province near Parachinar. The relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan worsened. The Prime Minister (PM) of Pakistan, Liaquat Ali Khan wished to cease the dispute and fled to India. Since India was to blame for the circumstances as well. They had supported

the Afghans for an independent Pathanistan and stabbed them in the back by taking any side which damaged Pakistan's position if there was a chance. Liaquat Ali Khan had even proof that India supported Afghanistan financially and that they supplied troops to Afghanistan. Abid (2013) claims that this behavior can be seen as forcefully trying to reduce Pakistan's territory. Within a period of four years, from 1947 till 1951, at a date when Afghanistan underwent a transfer of power, both states maintained bad relations. Abid (2013) argues that the Afghan rulers prevented settlement of issues between the two sovereign states.

The Assassination of Pakistan's Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan

Abid (2013) concludes her book by describing the Afghan-Pakistan dispute after India's independence. She ends the book claiming that the Prime Minister (PM) of Pakistan; Liaquat Ali Khan was assassinated by an Afghan murderer called Saad Akbar. The nationality of the killer has infused suspicion that the Afghan government played a role in the assassination. However, this will always remain open for discussion.

Discourse Hindu book

Hindu author Sucheta Mahajan (2000) hardly addresses the aftermath of India's independence in her book. Hence, the discourse of the Hindu author in the third period is limited covering (A) the consequences of partition and (B) The consequences of Gandhi's death on communalism in India.

The consequences of Partition

The Hindu author hardly focusses on the consequences of partition. The aftermath of India's independence is limitedly discussed. The author (2000) claims that India's independence appealed to nationalist organizations such as the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and nationalist parties like the Hindu Mahasabha. These organizations and parties campaigned for a purification of the state. Muslims were framed as the cause of all trouble in India and should be removed from the independent state. Consequently, riots broke out in September 1947. Muslims were driven out into refugee camps or would undertake the journey to the destined state; Pakistan. Mahajan (2000) describes disruptive violence in the aftermath of partition. Sikh terrorists caused brutal killings and Hindus destructed villages of Muslims. Moreover, in Delhi, mosques were converted into temples. The flag of the nationalist party, the Hindu Mahasabha was raised on these sacred places. The RSS also organized activities to influences the masses and encouraged them to riot. The members of the RSS would participate in these riots as well.

Press and public platforms were used for slander of Muslims. Congress leader Nehru condemned the provocative speeches and actions of the Hindu Mahasabha members.

The consequences of Gandhi's death on communalism in India

Mahajan (2000) limitedly addresses the assassination of Gandhi after Independence of India. She refers to a speech of Nehru, who claims that there is a link between the Hindu and Muslim communal issues and the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi: "Communalism resulted not only in the division of the country, which inflicted a deep wound in the heart of the people which will take a long time to heal if it ever heals but also the assassination of the Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi" (Mahajan, 2000: 316). Communalism was exacerbated by the Hindu, nationalist/ fascist groups such as the RSS. Congress condemned the nature of this organization claiming it to be a fascist organization, mischievous. The organization looks like a private army and speeches are provocative aspiring to violence and publicly shouting: "death to Gandhi". The response of Congress, and leader Nehru was strong, when the assassination took place. Nehru claimed that the people of these organizations have blood on their hands. The Indian subcontinent has to be purged from these organizations. In early February, short after the assassination, around 25000 members or sympathizers of the Hindu Mahasabha were rounded up by the government. Mahajan (2000) claims that this was a positive change caused by Gandhi's death. The man who had always pledged for national unity contributed to weakening the communal tensions between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs after his death.