Remember, Recover: Trauma and Transgenerational Negotiations with the Indian Partition in *This Side, That Side* and the *1947 Partition Archive*

Ritika Singh

Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

> The traumatized, we might say, carry an impossible history within them, or they become themselves the symptom of a history that they cannot entirely possess. (Caruth, *Trauma* 5)

The impossibility of completely understanding a traumatic event makes the victim vulnerable to being possessed by it. The lived experience infuses the present with the past because it has not been fully experienced at the time of occurrence. This quality stems from the dialectic nature of trauma: grappling to come to terms with what had happened, the event has to be re-storied by the victim who becomes a living vessel of that history. The need to narrate trauma comes as a step towards the acceptance of the reality of that traumatic event, if not towards a possible healing of wounds. Since it can only be understood belatedly, the voicing of wounds is an incomplete task. The need to tell and retell is to keep the memory alive, to let the next generation know of the experience, and for the victims to connect through their testimonies of witnessing, sharing that burden.

In 1947, the political partition of the Indian subcontinent truncated and divided the country into two parts – Hindu-majority India and Muslim-majority Pakistan. In the span of a few months around a million people died, ten million mass migrated across the border, thousands died from

DOI: 10.13137/2283-6438/11875

contagious disease and malnutrition; and about 75,000 women were raped and abducted. Widespread riots and bloodshed marked both sides of the border. The continuing impact of this violence on the people of India has been studied in works such as *Borders & Boundaries* by Ritu Menon, Kamla Bhasin and, *The Other Side of Silence* by Urvashi Butalia. Both these seminal texts uncover female voices around the Partition by recording witness accounts of women in an attempt to negate amnesia around their suffering. In *The Footprints of Partition: Narrative of Four Generations of Pakistanis and Indians* (2015), Anam Zakaria examines the transgenerational handing down of painful memories of the Partition by Pakistanis and Indians and in *Partition Dialogues: Memories of a Lost Home*, Alok Bhalla interviews six novelists from India and Pakistan to invoke their personal experiences of the years around 1947. Artistic representations of trauma of the Indian Partition range from short stories to cinema – each proving how we "are implicated in each other's trauma" (Caruth, *Unclaimed* 24). Khushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan* is a historical novel set against the backdrop of the violence around the event while Bapsi Sidhwa's *Cracking India* looks at the Partition from the perspective of the Parsi diaspora settled in India. These are just some of the works that highlight the bitter legacy of the Indian Partition.

The website *1947 Partition Archive* attempts to capture how stories of the Indian Partition continue in 2015. Video interviews of those who lived through the experience not only tell the tales of individual trauma but also work at preserving its memory for those who did not experience it first-hand. The second work in consideration is an anthology of graphic narratives curated by Vishwajyoti Ghosh – *This Side, That Side – Restorying Partition* – that looks at second-generation accounts of the trauma of the Partition. It brings together storytellers, artists, illustrators from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh – ordinary people, who "may not have witnessed Partition, but who continue till date, to negotiate its legacy" ("Blurb"). If the *Archive* deals with memories, the latter is an attempt to remember those memories. The former is based on first-generation accounts and the latter explores the transgenerational impact of trauma. Together both in a way represent the present Indian state – where two or three generations are trying to deal with the memories of the Indian Partition of 1947.

Attempts to understand the Indian Partition continue till date not only because it continues to echo, but also because of the very nature of trauma itself. In the case of events that wound – physically, but more importantly

psychologically – trauma lies not in the shock of the occurrence of the event but in its reception:

> The pathology cannot be defined either by the event itself – which may or may not be catastrophic, and may not traumatize everyone equally – nor can it be defined in terms of a *distortion* of the event, achieving its haunting power as a result of distorting personal significances attached to it. The pathology consists, rather, solely in the *structure of experience* or reception: the event is not assimilated or experienced fully at the time, but only belatedly, in its repeated *possession* of the one who experiences it. To be traumatized is precisely to be possessed by an image or event. (Caruth, *Unclaimed* 4-5; emphasis in original)

The traumatic event continues to haunt those affected by it and urges them to go back to the source to make meaning of the present. This to-and-fro between the past and the present happens because of unresolved grief, incomplete narratives, and the absence of closure that cannot be achieved because of the inability to fully understand the traumatic event in the first place. Going back to history by engaging in a narration of traumatic memories is an endeavour to try to comprehend the source of these. Cathy Caruth argues, "that the history of a trauma, in its inherent belatedness, can only take place through the listening of another" (*Trauma* 12). This listening is what the *Archive* promotes by giving people access to oral histories and converting survivors to citizen historiographers. The telling and the listening are possible belatedly when the wounds have scars but will not fester if scratched. This works with the latency that trauma comes with. Oral histories that are a part of the *Archive* are by people who witnessed the Partition when they were children and are now recalling their experiences after a substantial passage of time. The attempt is to move from surviving the event to, years later, explaining how it was experienced.

In her essay, "An Archive with a Difference: Partition Letters", Urvashi Butalia highlights why there has been a long silence around the experiences of those who lived through the Indian Partition and why there is a return to it after a gap:

> Until recently, we have known little about what the experience of Partition meant for those who lived through it, how they put their lives back together again, how they coped with the loss, the trauma, the grief. This silence is about what I call the 'underside' of the history of Partition, that is, its human dimensions, its many hidden histories, is not a silence of simple historiographical neglect. Rather, it is,

> to my mind, a trauma of such deep dimensions, that it has needed nearly half a century for Indians to acquire some distance, and begin the process of coming to terms with it. (209)

Acquiring distance from the traumatic event allows the witness or the victim to build a narrative of the event. The organization of this coherent narrative of trauma takes time and can happen after having survived its immediate impact. The narration of trauma is done when "the story can be told, the person can look back at what happened; he has given it a place in his life history, his autobiography, and thereby in the whole of his personality" (van der Kolk, van der Hart 176). The victim lives in two worlds – one of everyday reality and one of trauma: a successful narration of the traumatic past must integrate the two.

"I Too Have Seen Lahore!" by Salman Rashid and Mohit Suneja in *This Side, That Side*, captures the process of going back to the past after gaining distance. It recounts the experience of a couple from Lahore, Pakistan, who come to Jalandhar, India, hoping to find some details about their pre-Partition past. As the two search for information about their ancestral house in Pakistan, an excited man named Darshan Singh comes up to them and exclaims – "I too have seen Lahore! I once went to the zoo there with my father and brothers" (209). When the couple learn that their house had been pulled down long back, they return to Darshan Singh to hear his story of the Partition. He recounts his travel from Pasrur to Dera Nanak on a train that "was crammed with people, with little room for anyone else to get in" (212) – a journey that made his eight year old self a spectator of the "tragic harvest of partition" (217). His story becomes a narrative of witnessing and of carrying the burden of memories for years:

> Sixty-two years and four months had passed before I met Darshan Singh. But the harrowing journey in August 1947 did not leave his mind. Surely, he would have preserved those memories by telling his stories to his children, but deep inside, Darshan Singh's connection with Klasswala is a tenuous one and exists only in his mind. I realised how he must want to speak to a Pakistani to ask of the land that he was forced to abandon as a child. Now he could even tell me of the Lahore he knew; now we could bond. (218)

Both the *Archive* and the anthology take the history of a collective to the particular histories of individuals that form this very collective. If

a traumatic event like the Partition leads to a divide, then the stories of its traumatic impact lead to a coming together where "[…] history, like trauma, is never simply one's own, that history is precisely the way we are implicated in each other's traumas" (*Unclaimed Experience* 24). Stories by Indians and Pakistanis share common space on the *Archive* and in the anthology. This signals a coming together of survivors through the telling of trauma of a shared past. This coming together does not idealistically negate differences, but transgresses them by highlighting the likeness of these traumatic tales. The similarity remains despite the changing narrative of history at the borders. The *Archive* has an interactive online map of stories, with pegs on places where the survivors are now located ("Story Map"). The vast number of these pegs literally hides the Indo-Pakistan border. The etching of the border has caused scars that are the same on either side. The anthology too brings together artists from across dividing lines — Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi artists and storytellers collaborated to produce *This Side, That Side*. If national identities are based on the formation of an 'Other', then the self and the 'Other' are mirrored in similarity of wounds. The anthology ends with a section titled "Making Faces" where the reader can flip through the trifurcated divisions of pages and swap the forehead, the eyes or the lips to make many South Asian faces – a Muslim, a Hindu, a man, or a woman. "Making Faces" is an invitation to the Indian/Pakistani/ Bangladeshi reader to acknowledge the thread of commonality between people who survived the Indian Partition.

The Indo-Pakistan border divided the people of the Indian subcontinent, but they share the trauma of witnessing it being drawn. This adds to the complexity of the relationship between people of India and Pakistan. The illustrated poem *Border* by Bangladeshi poet Kaiser Haq plays with this complexity:

> […] and the border:
> perfect knife that slices through the earth without the earth's knowing, severs and joins at the same instant, runs inconspicuously through modest households, creating wry humour – whole families eat under one flag, shit under another, humming a different national tune. (46-48)

At the larger level of the collective, social psychologist, Arthur G. Neal clarifies why national traumatic events require a repetitive engagement by each generation:

> The narratives of these traumatic events can never be told once and for all. As historical circumstances change, the stories must be told and retold by each succeeding generation. The retelling of stories is in part based upon the excavation of new data about them with the passing of time. But, more important, stories take on new meanings for subsequent generations as they rework their social heritage and confront new set of challenges. (9)

One of these new set of challenges is for the second generation to deal with the past without having direct memories of their own yet continuing to feel its impact. The memory is triggered in everyday situations: a conversation with a grandparent, the news, the continuing Indo-Pakistan disputes. Without experiencing it first-hand, the second generation tries to make sense of a narrative that precedes their birth. Negotiating the event and dealing with its continuity is a part of the larger motive to understand one's social heritage. This is where recalling memories and passing them on through storytelling plays a role. The genesis of the *Archive* lies in such an attempt by Guneeta Singh Bhalla, who grew up listening to terrifying stories of the Partition and the loss of those of stories with the death of her grandmother led to a project that is "committed to preserving this chapter of our collective history" ("About Us"). Crucial here are two terms: 'preserving' and 'collective' – both that signal that there is a danger of erasure of memories of the event and the life during those times. This erasure or loss is not a threat for the individual whose story is at stake, but for the collective. One generation carries these stories and the second wants to return to these to get a better understanding of the event that continues to haunt. The threat looms both at the level of the individual and the collective. "The Red Ledger" by Ankur Ahuja in *This Side, That Side* stresses the importance of preserving tales of the past:

> A lot of these stories died with my grandfather, and the rest wandered around in those red ledgers filled with grandiose black squiggles in Urdu, that none of us ever learnt to read. After he died, all his red ledgers were sold to the kabadi. All that remains of him is a certificate from the Ministry of Relief and Rehabilitation that confirmed his status – a refugee. (175)

The *Archive* does this by capturing these stories before more such narratives are lost in the ashes of history. The orality of such a telling of traumatic histories allows for gaps and silences during narration; it gives

the subject freedom to narrate his story in his own words and allows others to connect with the survivor directly. While the latter is important in the direct connection that it offers, the former is important because the silences between the lines convey the difficulty in recalling memories and the continuing emotional impact of the traumatic event. The teller wavers between the burden of knowing that the event is past and not knowing how to deal with it. Hence, trauma narratives engage in a double telling – telling the story of an event that is known yet remains unknown, and oscillating between a crisis for life and a crisis for death.

"Water Stories", by Bangalore-based writer Arundhati Ghosh and comics creator Appupen in *This Side, That Side*, deals with the passing down of stories by a father to his daughter – "In all her father's stories about the land he came from, there was water" (130). The father goes back to memories of his childhood – playing in the river, feeding fish while coming back from school, watching his mother and aunts worship the waters of the river Padma. The memories take on a darker tone as he recalls his mother drowning herself in the same river. The river becomes a vengeful figure, devouring those who tried to leave the land and migrate to the other side after the Partition. He makes sense of his loss as 'a curse of the river Padma' as he narrates his past to his daughter. She then, symbolizes the second generation inheriting these stories:

My mother did not die of any illness, you know.
What?
"The Padma swallowed her. It ate her up. My beautiful mother. She went into the river one afternoon and never came back. I think the Padma knew we were leaving for another land. She stole my mother."
[…]
He kept going back to the past and returning to the present, mixing up her mother with his mother. She [the daughter] did not sleep that night. His rants were beginning to affect her. She touched the barrenness inside her. Was it the river who made her barren, like many other women? She knew nothing would ever grow there. It would not support life bearing the curse of their banished ancestors? Was it still angry at those who left? She felt an intense, painful longing deep inside her. A longing for something she was not destined to have.
Many years later, after her father's death, she went looking for the river in the other land. And slowly, as she became the river. They saw the large yellow moon rise in her dark, dark eyes. (132-135)

The passing down of unanswered questions and gnawing grief leaves the second generation with their own burden of indirect witnessing. They remain haunted by the traumatic stories of the first generation and attempt to revisit the past to try to answer the questions that they have imbibed during the 'listening of another'. This, mingled with their own personal interactions with continuing impact of the Partition, leads them to narrate their stories and negotiations for the next generation. The echoes continue for years, across generations.

The engagement of the second generation with these stories was the basis of *This Side, That Side* that in its blurb conveys that "[m]any of the stories in *This Side, That Side*, grew out of conversations – in several cases, across borders – between graphic artists and storytellers". The fuel behind this negotiation is a curiosity – of the attempt to understand not what happened, but how it touched the everyday and altered it for those who experienced it. The curiosity also lies in an attempt to understand what stories are told on the other side: "From the tin trunk of memories, *This Side, That Side* hopes to open the cabinets of curiosities that exist on all sides, with markers that must be recapped after use. This is not a closure, but one of many beginnings" (12).

One of many beginnings that the anthology marks is for the second generation to begin expressing their negotiations with first-generation stories of the Indian Partition. The choice of using a genre like comic strips and graphic narratives to do so is not to negate the seriousness of the event, nor to ridicule the experiences of the first generation, but to present the changing way in which the Indian Partition is being examined. It opens with an illustrated narrative of the process of India's division into three:

> […] It was a merely technical problem. Should the baby [India] be parted horizontally or vertically? Hmm. Hmm. Hmmmm. But the King was not just cool, he was wise too. We told you that at the beginning, didn't we? He was really, very utterly wise. ("Why not both horizontally and vertically, fellows?"). And that is how, as we know from our old-old stories, the newborn baby was divided into three parts, and everyone (except the baby) lived unhappily ever after. (27-29)

Employing a language of wit and humour to understand the Partition is to refresh the telling of these 'old-old stories'. The traumatic event has to be re-visited through the memories of the first-generation and it continues to be re-presented by the latter generations that look at newer mediums of

representation. The repetition done (through literature and films) by the subsequent generations comes with newer ways of analysing the traumatic event. In *Beyond Individual and Collective Trauma*, psychoanalyst Clara Mucci asserts there is a difference in the representation of first-generation and second-generation traumas. While the former deals with the reality of the experience, it translates into fantasmatic terms for the latter:

> A very interesting and clinical point regarding the transmission of trauma from one generation to the next could be rephrased as follows: while the first generation suffered the real "trauma", for the second generation the impact of the trauma was translated into fantasmatic terms that can still have a pathological effect. Since symbolization was impossible in the first generation, this burdensome task must be acted out by the second generation in other forms of illness. (178)

In the case of a return to the past by the second generation, the event does not have to be experienced in reality but can be revisited via memories and stories of others. The return is exemplified not just in literature, but also through recent commercial Bollywood movies. *Bhaag Milka Bhaag* (2013) and *Bajrangi Bhaijaan* (2015) – two of the biggest blockbusters of Indian cinema in the last few years, dealt with the memories of the Partition in different ways. *Bhaag Milka Bhaag*, a biopic on an Indian Olympian athlete – Milkha Singh, fluctuates between the past and the present as his childhood memories of witnessing his parent's slaughter during the days of the Partition are triggered by flashbacks and dreams. The title of the movie literally translates to 'run Milkha run' – the dying words of his father as he urged a young Milkha to run away from the violence of the riots that gripped his village in 1947. While running the last leg of the race, Milkha Singh's past is triggered when his coach tries to motivate him by shouting "run Milkha run" — words that remind him of his traumatic past. Vivid memories of the violence return, his performance suffers, and he drops down to winning the forth position in the Olympic race. In a different take on the legacy of the Partition, the movie *Bajrangi Bhaijaan* is the story of a Hindu man who takes upon himself the task of returning a six-year-old Muslim girl back to her parents in Pakistan after she is mistakenly left behind in India. The film gives a strong message of the importance of cross-border peace between India and Pakistan and the need to bridge the mental divide created by the drawing of the Indo-Pak border. The tensions between the two countries are reminiscent of the continuing impact of the

Partition. The variation in mediums and modes of going back highlights the fact that the process of coming to terms with the Indian Partition is an ongoing, and perhaps never-ending, phenomenon for the collective.

If the memory of the Indian Partition is traumatic, then why do the first and second-generation survivors return to it? What function do mediums like the *Archive* or *This Side, That Side* that trigger these memories, fulfil? Coming to terms with the Partition, as Butalia argued, has just begun ("Archive with a Difference" 209). Its traumatic legacy will continue to be expressed through eyewitness accounts and creative media like films and fiction. The human side of the Partition of India will continue to be recovered and expressed through these channels. In order to heal wounds left by the Partition, stories of its continuing effect on the lives of many need to be heard at the individual and social level. In *Trauma and Recovery*, Judith Herman presents a model for recovering from trauma wherein the second stage of remembrance and mourning is based on the importance of narrating memories of loss followed by a grieving process:

> In the second stage of recovery, the survivor tells the story of the trauma. She tells it completely, in depth and in detail. This work of reconstruction actually transforms the traumatic memory, so that it can be integrated into the survivor's life story. (175)

The *Archive* becomes a platform that encourages this reconstruction of memory. The telling of experiences is an affirmation of the commencement of the second stage of healing and a step towards integrity of the self. Joseph Breuer's treatment of Anna O. by using the cathartic method of the 'talking cure' lay the ground for Freud and Breuer to conclude that "hysterics suffer mainly from reminiscences" (244). The passing on of trauma from one generation to the other, where the latter imbibes an affluence to it can perhaps be extended to a broader national level in case of the Indian Partition where the latter generations have to discuss the impact of these reminiscences upon them. Oral histories therefore initiate a transgenerational healing process where the ones who lived through it indulge in a cathartic talking and the others participate in a cathartic listening and understanding. It requires an empathetic undertaking on the part of the listener that becomes a bridge between the primary witness and the secondary witnesses. However, this empathy is more than reaching out to others and understanding their trauma. In *Empathy in the Treatment*

of Trauma and PTSD, Wilson and Thomas assert that "empathic ability, including empathic attunement, is a *requirement* for post-traumatic or traumatology psychotherapy" (emphasis in original 10). They define empathic attunement as the "capacity to resonate efficiently and accurately to another's state of being" (10). Used in psychotherapy to help patients recover from traumatic experiences, empathic attunement allows one person (the therapist) to resonate with the experience of another (the client/patient) in order to help them overcome trauma. The synchronization of the two encourages a successful narration of painful memories and is a step toward possible recovery. Empathic attunement can be extended to the act of reading, watching or listening to real/fictional accounts of collective trauma where the traumatic past is shared between those whose story is being told and those listening to it. For example, listening to survivor stories of 1947 on the *Archive* can help other survivors of the Partition to come to terms with their traumatic experience. Their stories will find further resonance with others who lived through the event. The cycle continues across generations: first-generation survivors narrate their trauma; second-generation inherit these stories and add their negotiations with the past to their narration; so on and so forth. In this, the healing takes a psychosocial dimension where it entails social participation and becomes more than the story of one. In the case of the *Archive*, it hints at the readiness to start this process and that coming to terms with the Indian Partition has truly just begun. The anthology, on the other hand, illustrates how these stories resurface from memories for children of survivors.

There is an effort to share the knowledge of witnessing the Partition as it affected those who have remained silenced until now. However, on another level, going back is an attempt to understand the pre-Partition state of things in India. Summoning nostalgia before the drawing of borders, the 'past' is beckoned to understand not just the event, but also the everyday before the event. The creation of the other side leads to a curiosity about 'those times' when there was no such distinction. Therefore, oral histories that recount life before the Partition are a channel to get information about the time that can never return. The *Archive* encourages an interviewee to share details of their pre-Partition life as it "allows the listener to build a context for Partition and to better understand how Partition affected you, your family and your community and ways of life" ("The Questions"). The witness and the listener partake in a knowledge sharing of life before the Partition. This knowledge is precious because the border can never

be erased and the return to pre-Partition India can only ever 'take place' through testimonies of first-generation witnesses. In addition, the need to go back further than the traumatic event is to pick up the threads of the subject's lost pieces of their narrative memory and weave them again.

For the second generation, there is a working through trauma because of an "empathic unsettlement". Dominic LaCapra, in *Writing History, Writing Trauma,* defines it as a virtual experience where one puts oneself in the position of another without discounting the difference between yourself and the other (78). Therefore, as argued earlier, listening to the wounds of others can evoke empathy, but is should not lead of an erasure of differences – of experiences and identities. The line between sympathy and empathy is marked with the distinction at the level of identification with the victims:

> [... T]he notion of empathic unsettlement can help point the way to a fruitful middle ground between a conventional engaging narrative which allows readers to understand the represented other, and disrupting techniques which make clear that understanding the other can never be complete. Moreover, the distinction between sympathy and empathy is crucial when it comes to determining an ethical response to the suffering literary other. Sympathy can be equated to 'feeling sorry for you', while empathy corresponds to 'feeling your sorrow' (Eagleton, *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic*, 2003, 156). (Koopman 309).

Empathy creates an emotional connection between the one who is narrating trauma and the one listening to its 'story', if the latter shares the same traumatic past. For survivors of the Partition, listening to oral testimonies on the *Archive* can stimulate them to begin the narrating process of their own stories. This connect that empathy creates does not dilute the individuality of experience. The stories of survival of the Indian Partition are similar, but not the same across the border or across generations. Each generation negotiates with the trauma of the event in their own way, and this further differs from one person to another. Both sides of the Indo-Pak divide continue to feel the impact of the Partition, can share stories of its impact upon their lives, but something new will continue to be unearthed about the way in which it continues to haunt.

The trauma of the Partition has to be dealt with still and will perhaps, continue to find articulation via different mediums – cinema, graphic narratives, oral histories, literature. Memories are yet to be unearthed and

some stories remain untold. The *Archive* plans to record 10,000 stories by 2017 by embarking on a global level search for silent tales of witnessing and surviving the Indian Partition. As people on both sides of the Indo-Pak border continue to negotiate with the event and its memories, the telling and healing will continue. Artistic and literary expressions will keep making a return to the past of the Indian Partition as it continues to affect the present of many Indians and Pakistanis. Remembering the traumatic past is to recover it from a possible erasure and to help survivors recover from it.

The crucial question is whether such a transgenerational telling can make possible a move towards forgiveness. And when fraught with international political ramifications, can survivor stories, especially ones that narrate the bloody loss of a people, not become triggers for pointing fingers and furthering friction between 'this side and that side' of the border? Forgetting the event and its impact is negated in the very act of publically sharing the traumatic experience. The *Archive* and the anthology are media that go one-step further than a one-to-one sharing of experiences between people. However, are these the first step toward 'forgiving' and bandaging wounds?

If every generation returns to painful memories and expresses it in its own unique way, then forgiveness also operates at the same transgenerational level. Forgiveness is often seen as a closure and an end in itself. Narrations of stories of a traumatic event continue for two main reasons: each generation goes through a process of understanding, narrating and trying to forgive and; even if forgiveness is reached, these operate as 'never-again' reminders. Therefore, forgiveness works within one generation and across generations. It has both a generational quality and a transgenerational one, as Derrida notes in an interview in the context of Shoah:

> So one may imagine that, while for a generation that witnessed or participated closely in this trauma forgiveness should be impossible, for the following generation, forgiveness remaining still impossible, modes of reconciliation, of re-appropriation, of mourning become somewhat easier. These generational differences, naturally, are marked in public discourse and in philosophical discourse. (Ben-Naftali 7)

These generational differences are also marked in literature and creative narratives. The attempts at forgiveness are cyclical – this wheel turns the cycle of transgenerational negotiations with trauma. The evasive

nature of forgiveness opens doors to first and second-generation creative accounts of their attempts to deal with it: therein lies the paradox at the heart of forgiveness – forgiving the unforgivable. Especially in the context of political traumas, each generation works with two contradictory threads – trying to make visible the blood spots on the slates of the mind and trying to find forgiveness. The stories will be narrated by different generations via different innovations in the way in which these are told and retold to public consciousness. The attempts at forgiveness act as a catalyst to transgenerational narrations of collective trauma.

The question that arises is what constitutes the nature of forgiveness? For Derrida, "[f]orgiveness must be a gracious gift, without exchange and without condition" (44). If it is conditional, then it is not forgiveness but a transaction that introduces a hierarchy of power between the wrongdoer and the forgiver. Similarly, Julia Kristeva uses the French word 'pardon' (*par* meaning 'through' and *don* 'gift') to conceptualize forgiveness as a non-judgemental gift and an act that interprets meaning of suffering (qtd. in Kelly, Keltner 67). Fiction, films, oral-testimonies on traumas of events like the Indian Partition help the collective move beyond identifying who is to blame for the violence to understanding the suffering of those who lived through it. In the specific context of the Indian Partition, it is the violence and the bloodshed that need to be forgiven rather than the people who perpetuated it; the unconditional gift is to be bestowed upon the traumatic time rather than upon particular individuals. For those who witnessed the death of their family and near ones, the witness also needs to forgive him-/herself for having survived the event. S/he needs to overcome this survivor's guilt in order to forgive oneself and move towards recovering from trauma of the past.

The idea of forgiveness is deeply rooted in the grieving and mourning process:

> At the most basic level, forgiveness is on a continuum with grief. The way I understand it now is that when you're offended or hurt or violated, the natural response is to grieve. All of those problems can be seen as a loss – whether we lose affection or a human being or a dream – and when we lose something, human beings have a natural reintegration process, which we call grief. Then forgiveness is the resolution of grief. But the challenges we have with grief are twofold: Some people never grieve, and some people grieve for too long. (Luskin n. p.)

In the context of the Indian Partition, the loss could be of land, identity, loved ones or of a sense of a secure national belonging. Transgenerational accounts of trauma operate with both the extremes of not grieving at all and grieving for too long: in the light of the former, these work as triggers that nudge the victims to recall their hurt as they partake in a shared remembering process and, in the case of the latter, initiate a collective working through trauma via the realization of the need to reach a resolution. The final act of forgiving does not entail a necessary forgetting but draws on human resilience for recovery. This resilience defines human strength and reveals the power of connectedness in the context of collective trauma, loss and mourning (Mucci 196). Forgiveness therefore is a reestablishment of a sense of community and a sense of connectedness within it, a process that helps the subject go beyond trauma to re-establish a hope in the future and in humanity (Mucci 202).

Oral testimonies of first generation survivors on cyber-real platforms like the *Archive*, and/or expressions of latter generations' inherited trauma through literature like *This Side, That Side* perform these very tasks. The unforgiving memory of the Indian Partition and its impact on a people continue to echo via different platforms and the process of dealing with the paradox of forgiveness enables a moving beyond its trauma. Even though the tragic past cannot be forgiven, its memory can be channelized to reconnect with others through transgenerational narrations of having survived it. This restores the faith in human resilience and allows a psychosocial recovery from the trauma of the Indian Partition through such rememberings.

Opere citate, Œuvres citées, Zitierte Literatur, Works Cited

"About Us." The 1947 Partition Archive, n.d. Web. 08 Dec. 2014.

Bajrangi Bhaijaan. Dir. Kabir Khan. Perf. Salman Khan, Kareena Kapoor, Harshaali Malhotra. Eros International, 2015. Film.

Ben-Naftali, Michal. "An Interview With Professor Jacques Derrida." Trans. Moshe Ron. (1998): 1-29.*Yadvashem*. Shoah Resource Center, The International School for Holocaust Studies.

Bhaag Milka Bhaag. Dir. Rakeysh Omprakash Mehra. Perf. Farhan Akhtar, Sonam Kapoor, Meesha Shafi, Divya Dutta. Viacom 18 Motion Pictures, 2013.

Bhalla, Alok. *Partition Dialogues: Memories of a Lost Home*. New Delhi, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Breuer, Josef, and Sigmund Freud. *Studies on Hysteria*. New York: Basic, [1897] 2009.

Butalia, Urvashi. *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000.

———. "An Archive with a Difference: Partition Letters." *The Partitions of Memory: The Afterlife of the Division of India*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002: 208-41.

Caruth, Cathy. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

———. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Derrida, Jacques. "On Forgiveness." *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. London: Routledge, 2001: 25-60.

Figley, Charles R. "Foreword." *Empathy in the Treatment of Trauma and PTSD*. By John P. Wilson, Rhiannon Brwynn, Thomas. New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2004: 9-11.

Ghosh, Vishwajyoti. *This Side, That Side: Restorying Partition: Graphic Narratives from Pakistan, India, Bangladesh*. New Delhi: Yoda, 2013.

Herman, Judith Lewis. *Trauma and Recovery*. New York, NY: Basic, 1992.

Koopman, Emy. "Reading the Suffering of Others: The Ethical Possibilities of Empathic Unsettlement."*Journal of Literary Theory* 4.2 (2010): 235-51.

LaCapra, Dominick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Luskin, Fred. "What Is Forgiveness?" *Greatergood*. University of California, Berkeley, 19 Aug. 2010. Web.
Menon, Ritu, Bhasin, Kamla. *Borders & Boundaries: Women in India's Partition*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998.
Mucci, Clara. *Beyond Individual and Collective Trauma: Intergenerational Transmission, Psychoanalytic Treatment, and the Dynamics of Forgiveness*. London: Karnac, 2013.
Neal, Arthur G. "Preface." *National Trauma and Collective Memory: Major Events in the American Century*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1998: 9-11.
Oliver, Kelly, and S. K. Keltner. *Psychoanalysis, Aesthetics, and Politics in the Work of Kristeva*. Albany: State University of New York, 2009.
"The Questions." *The 1947 Partition Archive*, n.d. Web. 09 Dec. 2014.
Sengupta, Somini. "Potent Memories From a Divided India."*The New York Times*. 13 Aug. 2013. Web. Accessed 08 Jan. 2015.
Sidhwa, Bapsi. *Cracking India: A Novel*. Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions, 1991.
Singh, Khushwant. *Train to Pakistan*. New York: Grove, 1956.
"Story Map." *The 1947 Partition Archive*, n.d. Web. 4 Dec. 2014.
Van der Kolk, A. Bessel, van der Hart, Onno. "The Intrusive Past: The Flexibility of Memory and the Engraving of Trauma." *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Ed. Cathy Caruth. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1995: 158-183.
Zakaria, Anam. *The Footprints of Partition: Narratives of Four Generations of Pakistanis and Indians*. Noida: Harper Collins India, 2015.