



VIDHYAYANA

ISSN 2454-8596
www.MyVedant.com

An International Multidisciplinary Research E-Journal

PARTITION: AN INEVITABLE EVENT?

Dr. Manish Pandya,

(Co Author), Principal, Tolani Commerce College, Adipur

Avani Jitendra Ved,

Research Scholar, KSKVKU, Bhuj

VIDHYAYANA



Abstract

Till date we have studied a lot on partition and partition literature. We have studied many causes of partition. The historians study the root causes, the researchers too studied the history. But the reason why violence took place is different. If we do a detailed analysis of their personal and political lives of the people involved in the decision making of partition we will find that they divided the people based on religion, especially on the border area. But the communities were living together even in the interior parts of the country, then why partition on the borders? When the Indian subcontinent was being divided the Muslim League leader had agreed that Pakistan will be secular state and people will be allowed to preach any religion. If that was so than what was the need for a separate nation? This paper aims partially at studying the lives of political leaders, like Jinnah, Jawaharlal Nehru, Gandhi, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, and the rulers who ruled Bengal during the partition period. The main objective of this paper is to find the validness of the decision of Partition or was the criteria on which the partition was based or took place was incorrect?

Introduction

Indian subcontinent was divided into two nations when the Britishers were living the country. India gets its freedom on 15th August 1947 and Pakistan gets it on 14th August 1947. Partition brought about a man-made disaster Millions of people had to forcefully migrate to the other side. Because of the transfer of power law and order was at its worst. Poor people were the mostly affected victims. The weaker sections – the women were raped and murdered. Their body parts were mutilated. People had to leave their homes, fields, everything and had to run to save their lives. But if we do an analytical study of modern Indian History, we find that the leaders were personally more interested for the power and the country was less important .

Hindu Muslim Unity in the Subcontinent:

Hindus and Muslims have been living together in the country from a long period of time. They were unaware about the feeling of communalism. They lived like brethren. Even during the Mughal Emperor Akbar's reign , Hindu Muslim unity can be seen at heights. Though it will be wrong to say that there were no clashes between two communities, but still there was



peace and harmony in the country. Akbar encouraged the Sanskrit language scholars also. Translations of Atharveda in Persian language was also tried out but it couldn't be done. But Ramayana and Mahabharata were translated in Persian language.

The role of Congress members during the mid 1930s:

The congress party was set up with great expectation and responsibility. In the initial stage it worked out successfully. But after some years, the members began to misuse the power. The number of fake membership grew. Gandhiji himself began to feel that "we seem to be weakening from within" The members began to take personal advantages of their post. It was easy to join because it was an open party and any one could become its member. Bipin Chandra in his book, "India's struggle for Independence 1857" Jawaharlal Nehru had written to Gandhiji on 28th April that :

I feel strongly that the congress ministries are working inefficiently and not doing much that they could do. They are dating themselves far too much to the old order and trying to justify it. But all this, bad as it is might be tolerated. What is far worse is that we are losing the high position that we have build up, with so much labour in the heart of the people. We are sinking to the level of the ordinary politicians who have no principles to stand by and whose work is governed by a day to day oppurtinitism..... I think there are enough men of goodwill in the congress. But their minds are full of party conflicts and the desire to crush this individual or that party. The Quit India Movement and Khilafat Movement created a kind of alliance between the two communities but they didn't work and they began to oppose each others.

The British policy of Divide and Rule : Indian followed the caste system rigidly. The Britishers did not want the national feeling to rise in Indians. Partition was its result. Though the congress had thought of separate Muslim leaders in the year 1916.

When we look at the Britishers policies during the revolt of 1947, we find that they wanted the people of India to follow Christianity. Many missionaries were functioning throughout the country. Many people who belonged to the lower cast even got converted to Christianity. The Britishers also gave awards to the minorities, (those who were schedule cast.) They had declared Muslims, Sikhs and Christians as minors.

The minors had the opportunity to become the members of the legislative assembly. The sense of reorganization under the caste became a matter of pride, ultimately growing the



feeling of communalism in the people of the country. Belonging to a particular caste was ultimately destroying the feeling of nationalism in people. It was widening the walls between Hindus and Muslims. Each community wanted their own representation. Ultimately the people started fighting for freedom as Hindus, Muslims, Congress, and Muslim League. The people forgot that ultimately they had one identity that is of being and an Indian. If people would have begun to think under the bigger canvas, as Indians then the reality would have been something else and Partition would have not taken place. Except the congress other political figures also had been increasing in number.

The loss of trust among Hindus and Muslims :

Communal Riots: The Muslim League took the decision of observing 'Direct Action Day' on 16th of August 1946. Numerous killings took place in Calcutta where the Muslims killed the Hindus mercilessly. Murders and communal riots took place all over the country during the whole year almost. The congress leaders came to the decision that partition of the country was a better idea .During the period of interim government, communal riots took place on large scale. Jawaharlal Nehru had referred to this fact on June 3 1947

'There has been violence shameful, degrading and revolting violence in various parts of this country. This must end.'

Hukum Chand clearly states in his book ' History of Modern India' that

“ If they (the league) are forced to stay in India no progress and planning would be possible.

A similar view was of Sardar VallaabhBhai Patel that

“ If one limb is poisoned it must be removed quickly least the entire organism suffers irreparably.

In one of the newspapers that Jinnah had founded the following news by an editorial were published:

“ The British – Congress Axix is formed and the rape of the Muslim nation is to begin in a more ruthless and criminal manner than Hitler and Mussolini dared in Europe. If Muslims wanted to survive as a community they had to be prepared to fight. The moment the British handed the power to Nehru and a Congress dominated government that will be the signal for Muslims to do or die.



Conclusion:

The modern history of India has a lot to say but our objectives were to study why the country got divided or was partition inevitable? Basically from the reading one thing can be said that people were illiterate, they were molded by a few educated leaders who studied in foreign schools. The leaders learn good communication skills and impressed the poor people of our country. The newly growing leaders misused the immense power of the growing nation. The people were living silently bearing the exploitation of the Britishers. Learning to fight back, the foreign rulers they ended up fighting fiercely among each other for land, for religion, for community for their leaders filled with so many negative qualities. Though there were many good and genuine leaders too but they sacrificed their lives for getting the country free from the foreign rule. The leaders aroused the hatred feelings for the non-believers of their religion but personally the leaders were never religious themselves. Had the leading power of the country been strong to maintain law and order while the transfer of power, the partition would have not taken place.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1) Genesis of Two Nation Theory and Quaid –e- Azam Majid Abdul, Hamid Abdul
Pakistan Vision Volume 15 No. 1
- 2) India's struggle for Independence 1857- 1947 Chandra Bipin
- 3) Hazari Nishid Midnight's Furies: A deadly legacy to partition 2015
- 4) From Plassey to Partition, Bandhopadhyay Shekhar