

## A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PARTITION IN BAPSI SIDHWA'S *ICE-CANDY MAN* AND KAMILA SHAMSIE'S *A GOD IN EVERY STONE*

**Waheed Ahmad Khan**

Assistant Professor/Head of Department (Linguistics)  
University of Haripur, Haripur Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.  
[khankaemail@gmail.com](mailto:khankaemail@gmail.com) , [waheed.ahmad@uoh.edu.pk](mailto:waheed.ahmad@uoh.edu.pk)

**Imran Ali**

Assistant Professor, Department of Linguistics, University of Haripur, Haripur Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, [imranali@uoh.edu.pk](mailto:imranali@uoh.edu.pk)

**Muhammad Farooq**

Lecturer, Department of Linguistics, University of Haripur, Haripur Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan  
[mfarooq@uoh.edu.pk](mailto:mfarooq@uoh.edu.pk)

### ABSTRACT

*The article discusses contradictory portrayal of partition of the United India in Bapsi Sidhwa's Ice-Candy Man and Kamila Shamsie's A God in Every Stone. The analysis of these novels exposes the contradictory line of depiction with reference to the issue of the partition. Sidhwa (2015) narrates story of the novel through a Parsee character, Lenny, in order to look at the partition through perspective of a minority community. Before the partition, characters of different religious backgrounds maintained affinity and homogeneity. However, during the faith-based partition, the bond of affinity weakened and the characters once close friends turned out to be enemies who did not hesitate killing each other. The British colonizers indoctrinated faith-based identities in the Indians and developed differences among them. The article implies Frantz Fanon's views about pitfalls of decolonization and views of Edward Said about colonial narratives. Contrary to this, Kamila Shamsie, though, highlights colonial ambition by including the theme of archaeology in the novel, however, she valorizes The British Empire by comparing it with the Ottoman Empire. She belittles the anti-colonial movements of Pashtun leaders, Bacha Khan and Haji Sahib of Turangzai. The anti-colonial struggle of the Khudai Khidmatgar is ridiculed for being non-violent. However, Haji Sahib of Turangzai is criticized for using violence against the British colonizers. The Pashtun cultural values are seen through the eyes of an Englishwoman, Viv. She devalues anti-colonial movements by considering social change more important than political change.*

**Key Words:** Partition, Identity, British Raj, Pashtun, Khudai Khidmatgar.

### INTRODUCTION

The period of British colonization of the United India is preceded by an ancient history of a rich civilization. However, the British colonized the region in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and continued the British Raj almost for one century. Pakistan was declared as an independent state on 14 August 1947. Partition of the Indian subcontinent is portrayed in Pakistani novels in English such as *The Crow Eaters*, *The Bride*, *Ice-Candy Man*, retitled as *Cracking India* of Bapsi Sidhwa, *The Weary Generations* of Abdullah Hussein and Kamila Shamsie's *A God in Every Stone*. This article focuses on portrayal of partition in the novels, *Ice-Candy Man* and *A God in Every Stone*.

The writers of the first generation such as Sara Suleri, Bapsi Sidhwa and Abdullah Hussein depicted partition of India and Pakistan with special focus on trauma experienced during the partition. They unveiled faith-based identities which promoted violence. However, writers of the second generation are mostly "concerned with critically locating Pakistan in the contemporary geo-political scenario" (Kanwal, 2015, p. 21).

The present article includes an analysis of contradictory portrayal of the partition in the two novels, *Ice-Candy Man* and *A God in Every Stone*. Sidhwa (2015) depicts the largescale violence and mayhem witnessed during and after the partition. For her, the British Raj is an embodiment of mischief which supported and promoted violence in the British India. However, Shamsie (2015) compares the

Ottoman Empire with the British Imperial Power in order to show difference between the two. In her novel, she also portrays two Pashtun leaders (Haji Sahib of Taurangzai and Ghaffar Khan) and status of women in Pashtun society during the era of the British India.

The article involves qualitative research that is viewed as an organic development dictated by ongoing research and not by a predetermined focus or hypothesis. It is based on textual analysis which “depends on a grasp of how meaning works” (Belsey, as cited in Griffin, 2005, p. 167). The views of Frantz Fanon and Edward Said have been contextualized since their views about problems after decolonization and colonial discourses respectively are related to present research. The ensuing sections analyze *Ice-Candy Man* and *A God in Every Stone*.

### **Traumatic Consequences of Partition**

Sidhwa in *Ice-Candy Man* narrates story through a Parsee girl of seven years. The story covers pre-partition scenario and is followed by trauma of the partition. Therefore, the novel portrays violence, killing, rape and plundering of Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and carnage of people on both sides of the new border during partition (Hai, 2000, p. 387). The story is worth mention for the reason that it includes characters of various ethnicities such as Hindu, Muslim, Parsee and Sikh. Lenny (Parsee) is the character-narrator (Homodiegetic narrator) of the story.

The narrative technique of the character-narrator is of significance in the novel. The story is narrated and focalized through a child, Lenny, a Parsee girl. She narrates the traumatic experiences of her maid, Ayah, who is Hindu. The novel thus “provides a non-dominant Parsee perspective on the Indo-Pak Partition that differs from Sidhwa’s Indian or Pakistani counterparts writing from Hindu, Sikh or Muslim perspectives” (Kanwal, 2015, p. 22). It, however, represents status of the other minority communities in Pakistan.

The novel portrays cordial relationship of characters of different religious backgrounds such as Muslims, Sikhs, Parsees and Hindus before the partition. They are united against the British rulers and wanted emancipation from the colonizers. Sidhwa (2015) portrays harmony among Sikhs, Muslims and Hindus who want freedom from the British Raj (p. 63). The movements of resistance against the British Raj give more momentum to their affinity; they do not want their co-existence to be affected by religious differences which later on during and after the partition made the characters more violent. A Sikh priest (granthi) named Jagjeet Singh expresses his firm conviction in brotherhood, “Our villages come from the same racial stock. Muslim or Sikh, we are basically Jats. We are brothers. How can we fight each other?” (p. 57). The characters live with a bond of love and attachment. In response to Sher Singh, *Ice-Candy Man* says that their religious differences would never weaken their bond of love and brotherhood (p. 124). However, this sense of affinity evaporates when the politicians raise slogans of dividing people of the United India due to their faith-based identity. National culture and identity gain ground during the movements of liberation, “National culture in the under-developed countries, therefore, must lie at the very heart of the liberation struggle these countries are waging” (Fanon, 2004, p. 168). Muslims and Hindus do not remain brothers; the United India is engulfed in flames of hostility and hatred. The Hindu-Muslim unity had gained momentum especially during *Khilafat Movement* and pushed All India Muslim League into a peripheral position (Jalal, 2014, p. 20). However, faith-based identities leads to rifts between the same people having different religious backgrounds.

This unity is shattered by the political strategy of the British colonizers who divide the Indians. Sidhwa (2015) also refers to the same issue through the character of a gardener working in the Government House and says that the British rulers had divided the Indians through various tricks and conspiracies (p. 93). The unity of the Indians is shattered by creating differences among them on the basis of their religious differences. Lenny feels the horrible situation during the partition, “Now I know surely. One man’s religion is another man’s poison” (p. 118). The novel portrays violence and trauma which most of the characters such as Ayah and Lenny, experienced due to faith-based identities sensitized by nationalist discourses (Hai, 2000, p. 388). Moreover, during and after the traumatic event of partition, children suffered psychologically and women were marginalized doubly. Sidhwa (2015) portrays violence which turned love into enmity and hostility. The roots of hatred penetrate so deeply into the Indians that religious differences were sufficient for killing them, “Within the same nation, religion divides the people and sets the spiritual communities, fostered and encouraged by colonialism and its apparatus, at odds with each other” (Fanon, 2004, p. 107).

After internalization of faith-based identities among the Indians, the British colonizers attempt to indoctrinate the Indians for their inability to rule over the United India. Mr. Rogers, Inspector General of Police, shares the same view with Mr. Singh. Mr. Singh responds to Mr. Rogers, “You recruit all our Sikh soldiers into your World War Number Two and we win the war for you! Why fore then you think we cannot do Home Rule?” (Sidhwa, 2015, p. 63). The Indians are recruited forcefully to fight wars of the British Masters. Sidhwa (2015) exposes the same exploitation of the Indians in her novel. Inspector General of Police, Mr. Rogers, warns Mr. Singh about the dangers which await them, “If we quit India today, old chap, you will bloody fall at each other’s throats” (Sidhwa, 2015, p. 63). Fanon (2004) also comments on the colonial claims of being savior:

The final aim of colonization was to convince the indigenous population it would save them from darkness. The result was to hammer into the heads of indigenous population that if the colonist were to leave, they would regress into barbarism, degradation, and bestiality. (p. 149).

The colonizers tried to convince the colonized that without their presence the colonized would not be able to live peacefully. Edward Said (1994) also unveils the same point about claims of the colonizers, “You are what you are because of us; when we left, you reverted to your deplorable state” (p. 35).

Sidhwa (2015) unfolds bitter reality of trauma of the partition which creates crevices in harmonious relationship of the characters belonging to various religions. Ayah (Hindu) is friendly with all members of her group including Parsee, Hindu, Muslim and Sikh; their harmony is not shattered by their religious differences (p. 98). However, she becomes victim of the partition due to her religious identity. She is Hindu and meets a tragic end. Her tragedy also refers to the fate of minority in both the countries:

Lenny’s consciousness of the horror and pity hovering over the city of Lahore is also informed by the story of what happens to her beloved Ayah, who becomes a representative for millions of displaced Hindus and Muslims during one of the harshest political phases in the history of the subcontinent. (Kanwal, 2015, p. 22)

Lenny realizes the dire consequences of religious identities that have made people violent. He also feels the ambiguous status of the Parsi community during the partition of a united India, which was to be divided on the basis of religious identity, i.e. Hindu and Muslim, “According to the novel, the Parsis or Zoroastrians were politically neutral in a conflict in which Hindus were the central actors. , Muslims and Sikhs” (Daiya, 2008, p. 68). The Parsees could not decide whether to side with the Hindus or the Muslims: “There must be not one but two or even three new nations! And Parsees can find themselves defending the wrong side if they don't look before they leap!” (Sidhwa, 2015, p. 38). Their confusion was not because of just Muslims or Hindus, they were reluctant even about their closeness with the Sikhs. Parsees were evicted by the Arabs from Persia, “When we were kicked out of Persia by the Arabs thirteen hundred years ago....We got into boats and sailed to India!” (p. 38). This time they had a choice of joining either the Muslims or the Hindus. The partition did not give space to Parsee community. Paromita Deb (2011) also highlights ambiguous status of Parsee group (minority) during the partition which marginalized them (p. 218). The partition of the subcontinent on faith-based identities has proved fatal for minority groups which are marginalized due to their religious identities.

Sidhwa (2015) also reveals the pitfalls of national consciousness because the differences and rivalries emerged after the partition. Frantz Fanon (2004) also unveils the fragile nature of nationalism. He argues that decolonization is followed by emergence of ethnic differences. The rivalries and religious differences soon prevailed in the subcontinent which was to be divided into two states i.e. Pakistan for Muslims and India for Hindus. The partition caused killing of many innocent people who were connected very closely irrespective of their religions and ethnicities. In Pakistan, differences emerged due to political and ethnic marginalization and resulted in the separation of East Pakistan (Bangladesh) in 1971. The war of 1971 is depicted in Intizar Husain’s *Basti*, Sara Suleri’s memoir *Meatless Days* and Kamila Shamsie’s *Kartography*. However, the ensuing section analyzes issue of the partition as portrayed in the novel, *A God in Every Stone*, in order to show difference between writers of the first and second generation.

### **Partition and Valorization of Colonial Discourses**

*A God in Every Stone* encompasses themes such as archaeology, conflict between empires (The Ottoman Empire and The British Empire), love, colonialism and anti-colonial movements. It highlights ancient history of the Persian emperor Darius and his most trusted man Scylax who travelled to India.

This ancient history has been revealed through the recurring theme of archaeology. The political uprising in the then-Indian city of Peshawar in the 1930s is depicted in detail. The conflict between empires such as The Ottoman Empire and The British Empire and the decline of the Ottoman Empire followed by the Khilafat movement also have weighty importance in the novel. The whole plot is knitted together with the help of the English archaeologist Vivian Rose Spencer.

Shamsie (2015) differentiates her novel from partition-novels of the first-generation writers in many ways. She includes some of the characters such as Vivian Rose Spencer (English), Tahsin Bay (Turkish) and Najeeb Gul (Pathan from Peshawar) in order to reveal archaeological discoveries. A young English Archaeologist, Vivian Rose Spencer, travels to Turkey with her father's friend, Tahsin Bey, for archaeological excavations. There she develops amorous feelings for Tahsin Bey but it seems to be absurd to express her love to him because he was her father's friend. Viv's visit is cut short due to the First World War.

The character of Viv is of paramount importance. In many ways, she represents the colonial project by giving some useful information to a man from the War Office. He appreciates her information about the Ottoman Empire, "But you see, what you have said, it is of enormous interest...It could certainly guide significant decisions in the propaganda department" (p. 41). For him her role was equally significant like that of a soldier on the battlefield. Shamsie (2015) depicts the role of Viv in the colonial mission through words of the man from the War Office; he compares her with a courageous son who is not afraid of any danger in a battleground (p. 43). Reference to the Ottoman Empire in the time of the war is important in the novel. Its significance was heightened in the form of *Khilafat Movement* which brought Hindus and Muslims together.

This movement gave momentum to the pro-Khilafat Muslims such Shaukat Ali and Mohammad Ali. The Europe had already sensed danger from the expansion of the Ottoman Empire, "Until the end of the seventeenth century the "Ottoman peril" lurked alongside Europe to represent for the whole of Christian Civilization a constant danger" (Said, 1995, p. 59). The Hindu-Muslim unity posed a serious threat to the British Empire. Shamsie has depicted fear of the British in the novel. When Viv makes a contrast between The Ottoman Empire and the British Empire, curiosity of the man from the War Office increases. Viv is of the view that Sultan of the Ottoman Empire is not admired and loved by his people; she further says that the people do not offer their loyalty to the Sultan so it is difficult for them to win a war in such a situation (Shamsie, 2015, p. 40). Viv's information about the Ottoman Empire represents prejudice of not only Viv but also of the British Empire. The man responds to her information very excitedly, "What you have said, it is of enormous interest" (p. 41). Viv has loyalty with her own empire and her views reflect the same allegiance to her people. Her optimistic thinking about her own empire is based on the colonial discourses as she says that the values of morality and honesty are helpful in situation of war because they develop a bond between the ruler and the ruled and natives with the English people (p. 40). She thinks that the bond of the British rulers and the native Indians is of mutual trust and love. She, however, ignores the real friction between the two. The Indian Independence movement such as in 1857 is the obvious instance. Her antagonism towards the Ottoman Empire also testifies her allegiance to her own empire when she considers the Ottoman Empire as an empire of savagery since according to her barbarity has destabilized the Ottoman Empire (p. 40).

Her friendship with Tahsin Bey and later on her desire of marrying him also reflects her support for the oppressed Armenians. This relationship again has political implications for the British Empire and Viv exploits it in the name of her friendship. Tahsin Bey is included in the plot in order to expose despotism of the Ottoman Empire which Shamsie does willfully for two reasons. She compares it with the British Empire in order to show the British as benign and civilized. However, apart from the ancient rivalry with Islam and the Ottoman Empire, The European hostility towards the Ottomans mounts up during the First World War. Remmick, a political agent, informs Viv, "The Haji has given us trouble before but this time round it is because the damned Turks have riled up the tribes in the name of the Caliphate...they really are such damned Turks" (p. 106).

Through the character of Tahsin Bey, Shamsie very tactfully depicts victimization of the Armenians. Shamsie exposes brutality of the Ottomans not only through Viv but also with the help of Tahsin Bey in order to establish its authenticity. Shamsie in the portrayal of the Ottomans as decayed seems to be inspired with the Orientalists such as Samuel Chew (*The Crescent and the Rose*). The movements of independence gain momentum especially during wars due to support of the allies, "In

the period between the wars, ... the relations between East and West assumed a currency that was both widespread and anxious. The signs of Oriental claims for political independence were everywhere; certainly in the dismembered Ottoman Empire they were encouraged by the allies" (Said, 1978, p. 248). This is a war strategy in order to weaken the opponent side. Tahsin Bey has dual identity i.e. Turkish and Armenian. This identity "makes him indispensable in the historical holy war between the British and Ottoman Empires" (Kanwal, 2015, p. 151). Mehmet informs Viv that Germans had captured an information from London and his uncle was suspected to be a valuable informer since he was considered a supporter of the Armenians; he further says that Viv was highlighted as the main source (Shamsie, 2015, p. 211). The British archaeologist, Wilhelm, receives this information after "the Germans relayed the information to the Ottomans" (p. 211). Two days after receiving telegram from Wilhelm, he "was shot dead" (p. 212). This news has a killing effect on Viv because she thinks that, "He was dead because of her" (p. 212). Thus with the help of Viv and Tahsin Bey, the political bond of The British Empire and the Armenians is established.

Viv embodies the Civilizing Mission and White Man's Burden, "Almost all colonial schemes begin with an assumption of native backwardness and general inadequacy to be independent, "equal," and fit" (Said, 1994, p. 80). Remmick acknowledges his role and that of Viv in the colonial service, "we are here to civilize...some of us in large ways, and some of us in small" (Shamsie, 2015, p. 184). She exemplifies her role of White Man's Burden when she imparts information about the Ottoman Empire to the man from the War Office. In the city of Peshawar, she justifies her role of civilizing mission in her interaction with Najeeb Gul. She travels to the city of Peshawar of the British India because she receives a letter from Tahsin Bey who informs her about his plan of travelling to the ancient city of Caspatyrus (the ancient name for Peshawar) in order to "see the Sacred Casket of Kanishka" (p. 46). The letter rekindles the spark of her archeological ambition which is in fact a colonial drive. In the train, when Qayyum asks her, "Why do the English dig for old, broken things?" (p. 90). She responds to the question by saying that "We like to find history" (p. 90). However, Qayyum feels the hidden motive of the English who wanted to ensure expansion of the British Empire and Archaeological pursuits exploited for the same colonial project (p. 90). Shamsie has unveiled the colonial ambition especially through the recurring theme of archaeology in the novel. Viv takes interest in the archaeological excavations in Turkey or India in order to facilitate the colonial expansion. Therefore, she decides to join the archaeological site at Shahji-ki-Dheri which was on the border of Peshawar.

In the train she meets Qayyum Gul and in the Street of Storytellers Najeeb Gul interacts with her. She takes interest in Najeeb because in him she finds seeds of the British colonial discourses (p. 117) because he takes interest in her archaeological pursuit. His frequent meetings with Viv are not approved by his brother Qayyum Gul who warns him to be away from Viv and other English women (p. 169). Due to the war, she moves back to London. It is only after receiving a letter from Mehmet in London that she travels again to Peshawar. Najeeb gets appointed as an Indian Assistant in Peshawar Museum during absence of Viv in Peshawar.

Qayyum Gul and Najeeb Gul are important to mention because both show transformation in their association with the British Empire. Qayyum Gul fights for the British Empire and loses one of his eyes at Ypres. He is inspired with the King-Emperor and respects his status as a king by bowing his head (p. 67). However, his appreciation turns into hostility when he is not allowed to meet his friend, Kalam Khan, in Kitchener Hospital. He is shocked over isolation of the Indian soldiers who were accommodated separately from the English people in the hospital (p. 77). In Peshawar, his mind changes and thus Qayyum Gul unwraps his covering of the Lance-Naik and decides to support Ghaffar Khan though he knows the consequences of changing loyalty with the English Empire (p. 148). He is inspired with the ideas of Ghaffar Khan. When he meets Kalam Khan's father, he learns about the inspirational qualities of Ghaffar Khan from his friend's father who admires the Pashtun leader, Ghaffar Khan (p. 179). Recommending Ghaffar Khan as a true Pashtun leader undermines the political struggle of Haji Sahib of Turangzai.

Shamsie (2015) depicts the two Pashtun leaders and their different ways of political struggle against the yoke of the British colonials. However, the actual reason of their separation is not depicted in the novel. Haji Sahib has been depicted as a leader having belief only in jihad. On the contrary, his first option was reformation of madrassah education. Shahid Siddiqui (2017) comments on his religious zeal that consequent upon his completion of religious education he returned to village and the turning point was his visit to Deoband. His interest was in reforming the society in order to strengthen resistance

to the Raj which promoted inferior status of Indian cultural values, "England is to rule the world because it is the best; power is to be used; its imperial competitors are unworthy; its colonies are to increase, prosper, remain tied to it" (Said, 1994, p. 104). His movement of Madrassah reformation gained popularity which earned him hostility of the British Colonials.

Haji Sahib was not against the Western education. He hired services of Taj Muhammad who got Western education. As the reformation of Madrassah became popular among the local people, the British colonials took it as a threat to their colonial set up and forced Haji Sahib to take refuge into tribal areas. The aim of the British colonials was to restrict him to the mountains of tribal areas in order to put an end to his Madrassah education (Shamsie, 2015, p. 180). Shamsie depicts him as a man who believed only in fighting; nothing has been said about his undying love for education. He is mainly known for his educational commitment, "Haji Sahib's fearless struggle against the British Raj encouraged the freedom fighters to set up educational institutions in the area" (Haji Taurangzai Remembered). However, Shamsie (2015) depicts Haji Sahib as a man of war and thus challenges his political struggle.

Shamsie (2015) belittles political struggle of Haji Sahib through the words of Ghaffar Khan. Ghaffar Khan's movement of Khudai Khidmatgar is demeaned through Qayyum, Najeeb, Viv and Zarina. Qayyum loses all his pride in his unwavering loyalty with the British Raj which he served as a Lance-Naik with the 40<sup>th</sup> Pathan. He is disappointed due to the war and the way the Indian soldiers were treated in the hospital. Thereafter, he joined the political movement of Ghaffar Khan.

Najeeb, brother of Qayyum, also shows antagonism towards the British Raj after knowing about bloodshed in the Street of Storytellers. He is significant for materializing the Civilizing Mission of the British Colonials; Viv thus inspires him with the charm of archaeology. She takes Najeeb away from the maulvis so that he is inspired with knowledge of colonial mission (Shamsie, 2015, p. 279). He is appreciated by Viv who calls him with the nickname of Herodotus of Peshawar. The colonial discourses which characterize the civilizing mission are focalized through Najeeb Gul, "the idea of a "civilizing mission" is focalized through the figure of Najeeb" (Kanwal, p. 153). His brother, Qayyum, tells him that his museums support the colonial project in the name of civilizing mission (Shamsie, 2015, p. 232). However, the grip of Viv loosens when he visits the railway station Peshawar in order to receive Viv who wants to visit Shah Ji Ki Dheri. Najeeb rushes towards the Street of Storytellers when he comes to know about killing of his people. He moves into a house wherein he finds a young girl, Diwa. She gives him red dress because he was in the official dress and thus it was easy for him to join the crowd in the red dress (p. 349). For him protest of the unarmed *Khudai Khidmatgar* is ridiculous (p. 346). It was only after joining the group of his native men that his mind changes, "*Inqilab Zindabad!*...It feels slightly ridiculous until the men around him join him in the cry" (p. 350). Zarina finds him wounded, "She sees herself unwinding, Najeeb Gul's bloodied bandage and waving it like a flag, joining in the cry of *Inqilab Zindabad* (Long live revolution)" (p. 365). Najeeb thus fights against the British Raj even though he is fascinated by Viv's untiring pursuit of archaeological excavations especially in Peshawar. The anti-British protest of *Khudai Khidmatgar* is ridiculed by even Zarina. When Qayyum asks why Diwa, sister of Zarina's husband, went down, she responds sarcastically that the unarmed protest against the British forced her to join the crowd because the protest failed in giving protection to the women (p. 269).

Shamsie's depiction of anti-colonial protests show contradiction. Zarina questions the anti-colonial protest of the *Khudai Khidmatgar* on the pretext of being unarmed. The *Khudai Khidmatgar* movement followed the non-violent movement of the Congress. However, Haji Taurangzai is criticized for the use of Jihad (the holy war) against the Raj.

Viv also undermines the anti-colonial movements in the name of women's marginalization in Pashtun society. She focalizes the cultural practice of using burqa. As already discussed, she provides very significant information to the man from the War Office and delivered services which makes her father very happy. Being English, she expresses her resentment on behalf of the women of Peshawar for using the burqa which she thought was a vile heavy cloth. Viv thinks so because she wants the British subjects to follow the colonial cultural practices. It is in fact the aim of colonization, "it is the subjection of the universe or a vast part of it to that people's language, customs, ideas, and laws" (Said, 1995, p. 219). Viv being an English woman does not realize logic and background of the social practice of burqa in Muslim societies in general and Pashtun society in particular, "Viv, being an Englishwoman, without an understanding of the meaning of social practices from the inside, cannot help but conflate

Pashtun *purdah* culture, of which the majority of Muslim women are proud, with patriarchal conservatism” (Kanwal, p. 155). What Viv considers to be vile and disgusting may not necessarily be the same to people of different cultures such as Peshawaris. Burqa fulfills the cultural requirement of *purdah* which Muslim women generally and Pashtun women specifically observe. *Purdah* varies in urban and rural areas; In urban areas, women use veil, shawl or a scarf while in rural areas a burqa is normally the most common means of observing *purdah*. In the wake of colonial discourses, Viv denies Indians the right of political emancipation since according to her it is the social change which is more important than the political change. But the question is that what should be the source of inspiration for the social change?

The most important feature which differentiates Shamsie’s novel from the partition novels of the first-generation novelists is that most of the first-generation novelists depict horrors of faith-based partition i.e. disintegration of the United India in terms of religious identities which created eternal rivalry between Hindus and Muslims. However, she unearths conflict of the empires i.e. The British Empire and the Ottoman Empire, the atrocities of the empires with a comparatively better position of the British. Her focus instead of the trauma driven by religious identities during the partition is on the importance of social change which she ascribes to the people and culture of Viv. This is the reason that British Peshawar is visualized through the eyes of Viv.

## CONCLUSION

The article has analyzed the two novels, *Ice-Candy Man* and *A God in Every Stone*, in order to reveal differences in terms of the issue of the partition as portrayed in the two novels. The analysis has shown that Sidhwa (2015) unveiled horrible and traumatic experiences of the partition. Before the partition, characters of various religious backgrounds lived with harmony. However, the same characters after ensuring their unwavering bond of love for their friends, turned against each other when they were sensitized about their religious identity. Sensitivity about faith-based identities, led to a huge massacre in the United India during the partition. The narrative technique of character-narrator in *Ice-Candy Man* is also very interesting since the story is narrated through perspective of Lenny who belonged to a non-dominant ethnic group. It reveals an important fact about the ambiguous status of minorities such as Parsees after the partition. The analysis of *A God in Every Stone* unearths a different line of portrayal. Shamsie (2015) uplifts status of the British colonizers by focusing more on atrocities of the Ottoman Empire. Though the novel portrays colonial exploitation, however, she considers social change more important than political change. Pashtun culture is shown as brutal to the readers through the eyes Viv, English character. The anti-colonial movements are devalued on the pretext of women’s marginalization without considering deep cultural differences.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A. Salahuddin. (1997). *Jinnah, Pakistan and Islamic Identity: The Search for Saladin*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ahmad, A. (1994). *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London and New York: VERSO.
- Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Cilano, C. N. (2013). *Contemporary Pakistani fiction in English: Idea, nation, state*. London & New York: Routledge
- Cocks, J. (2002). *Passion and paradox: Intellectuals confront the national question*. Princeton University Press: New Jersey.
- Daiya, K. (2008). *Violent belongings: Partition, gender, and national culture in postcolonial India*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Deb, P. (2011). “Religion, partition, identity and diaspora: A study of Bapsi Sidhwa’s *Ice-Candy Man*.” *South Asian Diaspora*, 3(2), 215-230.
- Fanon, Frantz. (2004). *The Wretched of the Earth* (1st Ed. Trans. By Richard Filcox). New York: Grove Press.
- Griffin, G. (2005). *Research methods for English studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- “Haji Taurangzai Remembered”, *The Daily Dawn*, April 16, 2015. Retrieved from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1176220>

*A Comparative Study of Partition in Bapsi Sidhwa's Ice-Candy Man and Kamila Shamsie's A God in Every Stone*

- Hanif, M. (2009). *A Case of Exploding Mangoes*. New York: Random House India.
- Hamid, M. (2015). *Discontent and its Civilizations*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Hai, A. (2000). "Border work, border trouble: Postcolonial feminism and the Ayah in Bapsi Sidhwa's *Cracking India*." *Modern Fiction Studies*, 46 (2), 379-426.
- Hussein, A. (1999). *The Weary Generations*. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications.
- Jalal, A. (2014). *The Struggle for Pakistan: A Muslim Homeland and Global Politics*. The United States of America: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Jalal, A. (2013). *The pity of partition: Manto's life, times, and work across the India-Pakistan divide*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Jalal, A. (1994). *The sole spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the demand for Pakistan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jalal, A. (2000). *Self and sovereignty: Individual and community in South Asian Islam Since 1850*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kanwal, A. (2015). *Rethinking Identities in Contemporary Pakistani Fiction*. The UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nandy, A. (2002). "Telling the Story of Communal Conflicts in South Asia: Interim Report on a Personal Search for Defining Myths." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(1), 1-19.
- Rahman, T. (2002). "Government Policies and the Politics of the Teaching of Urdu in Pakistan." Retrieved from [http://www.urdustudies.com/pdf/17/11\\_Rahman.pdf](http://www.urdustudies.com/pdf/17/11_Rahman.pdf)
- Said, E. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. India: Penguin Books.
- Seliger, H. B., & Shohamy, E. (1995). *Second language research methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Shamsie, K. (2015). *A god in every stone*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Sidhwa, B. (2015). *Ice-Candy Man*. Lahore: ILQA Publications.
- Sidhwa, B. (2016). *An American Brat*. Lahore: ILQA Publications.
- Siddiqui, S. "Taurangzai vs the Raj", *The Daily News*, 17 January, 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.thenews.com.pk/print/181083-Turangzai-vs-the-Raj>
- Suleri, S. (2014). *Meatless Days*. Lahore: ILQA Publications.
- Waterman, D. F. (2015). *Where worlds collide: Pakistani fiction in the new millennium*. Oxford University Press.