

deny their citizens the essential freedoms of speech, assembly and action, as they are essential instruments for actualizing political objectives of the Islamic state. An inclusion of the works and opinions of jurisconsult of Abū Ḥanīfah, Abū Yūsuf, Shāfiʿī and Ibn Khaldūn's caliber might have strengthened Enayet's argument.

Enayat concludes that there exists an intellectual vacuum which needs to be filled in. The contemporary Muslim intellectuals need to rise to this challenge. The works of Modern Muslim political thinkers provide a foundation. The many political problems call for searching minds to explore these dimensions of Muslim political life. Systematic study of politics must subject the past intellectual legacy to critical reassessment based on the practices of Rightly-Guided Caliphs and the teachings of Qur'ān and the Prophet Muḥammad. The new approach to the study of politics should discard currents of thoughts that stigmatize and romanticize the political history and consider it as part of present realities. However, Enayat does not attempt to provide a methodology or an approach that can be used as a theoretical frame of reference for reassessing traditional Muslim intellectual political legacy. He, however, identifies the political problems that need systematic investigation to show that Islam is progressive and in essence a religion of freedom, justice and prosperity for mankind.

Enayat's work is commendable for Muslim revivalists and political activists alike irrespective of doctrinal belief. It provides adequate direction for the wide spectrum of activities that needs to be undertaken for the purpose of the reconstruction of Islamic political thought. A revised edition of Enayat's *Modern Islamic Political Thought* was long over due.

---

***Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India***  
by Gyan Pandey. London: Cambridge University Press, 2001, 232 pp.  
ISBN 0521002508.

Reviewer: Beerendra Pandey, Asst. Professor, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Gyan Pandey's *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism and History in India*, like Riu Menon's *Borders and Boundaries* (1998) and

Urvashi Butalia's *The Other Side of Silence* (1998), revises the history of modern India by placing at the center the otherwise silenced subaltern subjectivity. Whereas the rewriting by Menon and Butalia involves both the state and society in geopoliticising of women who were the chief recipients of the partition violence, Pandey's revisionist history interrogates the historiography of partition itself. It "ask[s] how the different ways in which 1947 is remembered and written about are implicated in the making of the event and the heritage called Partition" (p.66). Pandey believes that historiography remains ideology-coloured because for him every history writing "is implicated in a political project, whether consciously or unconsciously" (p.10). He argues that the ideological function of partition historiography has been to justify the partition violence "as being illegitimate" (p.3), "to deny its force" (p.4), and to present it as being removed from the general run of the Subcontinental "tradition and history: how [it] is, to that extent, not our history at all" (p.3). Pandey's dismissive attitude towards the modern Indian historical discourse animates his study, which deals with the "genocidal violence [of 1947], and with what the renditions of that violence tell us about" (p.204) the "procedures of nationhood, history and forms of sociality"(p.1). Pandey resumes his dismissal of modern Indian historiography in chapter three, wherein he contends that modern Indian historiography treats partition as an accident—an "aberration, the handiwork of 'outsiders' and 'criminals'" (p.64)—in the triumphant march of an emerging nation-state along its secular, democratic and tolerant path.

In chapter two, Pandey treats 1947 as three different moments of rupture, which he calls, "The Three Partitions of 1947." For him, the first moment of rupture (partition) is 1940 when the Muslim League demanded a Muslim-dominated Pakistan in response to a Hindu-dominated Hindustan. The second moment of rupture, which started in March 1947 in the form of the outbreak of communal riots, led to the partition of families and communities in the Muslim-majority provinces of Bengal and Punjab, the third partition, which Pandey finds the bloodiest, entailed the violent uprooting and the accosting violence while migrating: the singularly violent character of 1947 stands out in this phase because the arson, plunder, violation and murder were unparalleled both in scale and method. Chapter four, which considers the sources upon which the historic representations of 1947 are based, asserts the record of partition "hovers between" (p.68) the marks of testimony and rumour. After subjecting Begum Anees

Qidwai's memoir, *Azadi Ki Chhao Mein* (In the Shadow of Freedom) and the much-vaunted oral histories of partition by Ritu Menon and Urvashi Butalia to critical scrutiny, Pandey concludes that the general discourse on partition is still confined within the realm of rumour. In particular, he undermines the oral histories of partition by calling them "a gigantic rumor, albeit a rumor commonly presented as 'testimony' (or 'history')" (p.91). Pandey similarly writes off both the Muslim League account and the British version (Francis Toker's *While memory Serves*) of the *Garhmukhteshwar* pogrom as bearing the stamp of rumour in the chapter, "Folding the Local into the National: Garhmukhteshwar, November 1946."

Gyan Pandey's real brilliance as a subalternist historian comes to the fore in the next two chapters. Presenting the post-partition Indian Muslims as the subaltern, the chapter entitled "Disciplining the Difference" argues that the Muslims, who form a blurred boundary around the national core (Hindus and Sikhs), are looked upon as "naturally theirs [Pakistan's], as in the circumstances of Partition they were commonly declared to be" (p.164). This shadowy space means a problematizing of Muslim Indianness that requires a persistent demonstration of loyalty to the nation. The preceding chapter on "Delhi in 1947-48," though an analysis of the discourse of violence in post-partition Muslim writings, especially those by Shahid Ahmed Dehlavi and Ebadat Bareilvi, focuses on the moment of the marginalization of the Muslims in their cultural citadel of Delhi at the so-called hallowed time of liberation—a marginalization that rendered them refugees in their own place of habitation. The collapse of Muslim Delhi, in Gyan Pandey's view, represents not only the "the calamity of the Delhi Muslims alone... [but also] the calamity of India's Muslims" (p.136) as the moment of the independence of India also turned out to be a sudden moment of the congealing of new identities and construction of new communities at an accelerated pace.

Pandey further clarifies the connection between the discourse of violence and the discourse of the process of solidifying new communities in the concluding chapter, wherein he argues that the most telling feature of the discourse of the partition violence is the narrativization of violence by the witnesses, who have lived through it, as "employ[ing] a variety of techniques to elide the violence or consign it—often against their own testimony—to happenings somewhere else ('out there')" (p.178). As Gyan Pandey insightfully concludes, "It is the denial of any violence 'in our midst,' the attribution of harmony

*within* and the consignment of the violence *outside*,” (p.188) which secures the life of the community or nation. Pandey goes on to contend that the construction of community as found in the narratives of the survivors and the witnesses of the partition violence patterns after disciplinary history that proceeds on the assumptions of fixed subjects such as the community and nation. The central contention, which is cogently argued and successfully sustained, alerts a student of partition studies to the blindspot in feminist commentary-contained oral narratives of partition, even though the history-from-below approach in these feminist historical writings prevents a full-scale configuration along the line of disciplinary history. The blindspot can be avoided only when a historian focuses, as Gyan Pandey does, on the question of how we as individuals and communities (or nations) live with violence, and on thinking what constitutes violence in our discourses and how therefore violence and community (or nationhood) constitute each other.

In spite of being major apologist for the exploration of the language of violence and the first one among the subalternists to underscore the need to negotiate with the problems of language in representing the trauma of the partition victims in his classic essay, “The Prose of Otherness” (1994), the question of trauma remains largely unaddressed in Gyan Pandey’s historiographic reformulations. A comprehensive treatment of the problems of language in the representation of the partition violence still remains a productive site of Gyan Pandey. All things considered, this excellent book, with its combative attitude to disciplinary history, its foregrounding of the specificity of violence in the partition of India, and its implicit critique of the valorization of the recent subaltern survivors’ personal narratives by the feminist authors, will have seminal influence in the fields of both Partition Studies and Subaltern Studies.