# Partition: Lives Divided

MixCache.com

---

## Table of Contents


- **Introduction**
- **Chapter 1** Lines Drawn, Lives Split: Deciding on Partition
- **Chapter 2** The Map Room: Boundary Commissions and the Radcliffe Award
- **Chapter 3** Cities on the Edge: Lahore, Amritsar, and Calcutta in Transition
- **Chapter 4** Caravans and Trains: The Great Migration of 1947–48
- **Chapter 5** Gendered Frontlines: Abduction, Honor, and Survival
- **Chapter 6** Village Testimonies: Punjab’s Countryside Speaks
- **Chapter 7** Bengal’s Slow Burn: From East Bengal to East Pakistan
- **Chapter 8** Departures from Sindh: Traders, Schools, and Silent Streets
- **Chapter 9** The Princely Predicaments: Hyderabad, Junagadh, and Kashmir
- **Chapter 10** Policing the Line: Militias, Armies, and the Shadow State
- **Chapter 11** Camps and Corridors: Relief, Rehabilitation, and Return
- **Chapter 12** Refugee Economies: Labor, Housing, and New Urban Worlds
- **Chapter 13** Faith and Repair: Religious Institutions and Reconciliation
- **Chapter 14** Languages and Scripts: Codifying Culture after Partition
- **Chapter 15** Borders that Breathe: Daily Crossings, Smuggling, and Trade
- **Chapter 16** Home Archives: Objects, Photos, Recipes, and Heirlooms
- **Chapter 17** The Archive Speaks: Petitions, Files, and Silences
- **Chapter 18** Listening Across Lines: Ethics and Methods of Oral History
- **Chapter 19** Screens of Separation: Cinema, Radio, and Popular Memory
- **Chapter 20** Schoolbooks and Silence: Teaching Partition to the Young
- **Chapter 21** Another Sundering: 1971 and the Making of Bangladesh
- **Chapter 22** Counting Communities: Demography, Elections, and the State
- **Chapter 23** Lines of Control: Security, Surveillance, and Everyday Life
- **Chapter 24** Diasporas and Distant Homes: Memory in Migration
- **Chapter 25** Afterlives of Partition: Justice, Reconciliation, and Repair


---

## Introduction

This book begins with a paradox. The Partition of 1947 is among the most documented events in South Asian history, yet its most essential truths remain scattered in family trunks, camp ledgers, fading letters, and the pauses that punctuate a survivor’s sentence. “Partition: Lives Divided” brings the map back to the people who had to live with it. Through archival research and oral histories gathered across India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, it reconstructs how decisions taken in committee rooms traveled into

courtyards, train compartments, and refugee camps—and how they continue to reverberate in the present.

The project is animated by a simple question that proves surprisingly hard to answer: what did Partition do to ordinary lives, and what have those lives done to Partition's memory? To approach this, I read across state files and personal keepsakes, electoral rolls and ration cards, boundary awards and birth certificates; I listened in kitchens, gurdwaras, mosques, mandirs, marketplaces, and on WhatsApp calls that bridged continents and decades. The testimonies in these pages are not side notes to political history. They are its method and measure, showing how demographic shifts were not mere statistics but the naming of new neighbors, the emptying of familiar streets, and the improvisation of livelihoods in cities that had to be built while grief was still fresh.

Placing personal stories alongside high politics risks flattening either into illustration for the other. I resist that temptation by moving between scales: from the boundary commissions that carved the line to the village hand that redrew it on a wall; from cabinet minutes to the relief-camp register; from national censuses to the cramped ledger of a shop reopened after flight. This braided approach illuminates continuities often missed by narratives that end in August 1947. Border regimes evolved, languages were ranked, and schoolbooks fixed meanings; yet, in countless households, the past remained unsettled—revisited in recipes carried across the line, photo albums missing a page, or the annual call to a childhood friend now a foreigner.

Oral history, central to this book, is both a practice and a responsibility. Interviews were conducted across languages and generations, with attention to consent, confidentiality, and the ethics of witnessing. Survivors often narrated not only what happened but what could be spoken about it in front of children, spouses, or strangers. Silences are therefore treated as sources: sometimes a wound, sometimes a strategy, sometimes an invitation to read an archive differently. Throughout, I juxtapose these testimonies with documents that corroborate, complicate, or contradict them—trusting that truth in the aftermath of rupture is less a single point than a constellation.

The geographical canvas extends from Punjab's divided fields to Bengal's waterways, from Sindh's emptied neighborhoods to Hyderabad's contested sovereignty, and forward to the second sundered moment of 1971 that birthed Bangladesh. Each region reveals distinct tempos of violence, migration, and settlement, yet common patterns emerge: the bureaucratization of belonging, the fragility of minority protections, and the tenacity with which people remake community under surveillance and scarcity. Attending to these patterns helps us see Partition not as an event that ended, but as a structure that endures in visa queues, fenced riverbanks, textbooks, and televised debates.

Why revisit this history now? Because its afterlives shape the politics of borders worldwide—how states count, sort, and secure; how communities remember and

Purchased from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

forget; how families transmit loss and hope. In South Asia, the line continues to determine who may cross to marry, mourn, trade, worship, or learn. Yet it also generates inventive forms of relation: clandestine crossings for festivals, exchange of contraband and stories, and digital intimacies that disregard checkpoints. Recognizing both coercion and creativity allows us to see agency where it is least expected, without excusing the violences that demanded it.

The chapters that follow trace this long arc—from the decision to divide, to the migrations it set in motion, to the institutions that managed, narrated, and normalized the new order. We move through camps and courts, classrooms and cinemas, kitchens and checkpoints. Along the way, we encounter people who never left home but found themselves foreigners overnight, and others who crossed the line repeatedly, refusing its finality. While the book engages policy and law, its measure of consequence is stubbornly human: the keeping of a key, the remapping of a market, the return to a grave, the question a grandchild dares—or does not dare—to ask.

Ultimately, “Partition: Lives Divided” argues that the border is not just a place on the map; it is a practice that enters memory, language, and everyday life. To study it is to study how societies build and unbuild themselves. If the past cannot be undone, its meanings remain negotiable. This book invites readers into that negotiation, listening for the lives that official narratives omit and the futures that survivors continue to imagine.

---

# CHAPTER ONE: Lines Drawn, Lives Split: Deciding on Partition

The decision to partition British India in 1947 was not a sudden, singular act, but the culmination of decades of evolving political thought, communal anxieties, and strategic calculations. It was a choice, made by men in suits, often far removed from the fields and villages that would bear the indelible marks of their deliberations. Yet, for all the meticulous notes and diplomatic communiqués, the story of Partition’s genesis is less a straight line and more a tangled skein, woven from competing aspirations and the relentless press of time.

At the heart of the matter lay the question of self-governance. As the jewel in the crown of the British Empire, India had long been a source of immense wealth and strategic power. However, by the early 20th century, the demand for independence had grown too loud to ignore. The Indian National Congress, predominantly Hindu, emerged as the leading voice for a united, independent India. Its vision was one of a secular, democratic nation where all communities could coexist.

Purchased from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

However, another powerful narrative was simultaneously taking shape. The Muslim League, led by the charismatic Muhammad Ali Jinnah, increasingly advocated for a separate homeland for India’s Muslims. The fear, eloquently articulated by Jinnah, was that in a Hindu-majority India, Muslims would forever remain a marginalized minority, their cultural and religious identity subsumed. This "two-nation theory" posited that Hindus and Muslims were distinct nations, incapable of coexisting peacefully within a single state.

The seeds of this division were sown much earlier than 1947. British policies, often deliberately, had fostered communal differences. The introduction of separate electorates for Muslims in 1909, for instance, created distinct political categories and encouraged politicians to appeal to religious rather than universal identities. This institutionalized division at the very heart of the political process, making a unified national front increasingly difficult.

The 1930s witnessed a deepening of this communal divide. The provincial elections of 1937, while a victory for the Congress in many regions, also highlighted the growing strength of the Muslim League in others. The Congress’s reluctance to form coalition governments with the League in some provinces further exacerbated Muslim fears of Hindu domination, solidifying Jinnah’s resolve for a separate state. These were years of intense political maneuvering, where trust was eroded, and suspicion took root.

World War II dramatically altered the political landscape. Britain, weakened by the war, recognized that its hold on India was tenuous at best. The promise of independence, long deferred, now seemed imminent. However, the exact shape of this independence remained fiercely contested. The British, keen to withdraw gracefully (or at least, expediently), found themselves caught between the irreconcilable demands of the Congress and the Muslim League.

Several missions were dispatched from London to break the deadlock, each attempting to broker a compromise. The Cripps Mission in 1942, for example, offered India dominion status after the war, with the tantalizing option for provinces to opt out of the new Indian union. While ultimately unsuccessful, it introduced the dangerous precedent of provincial autonomy and the possibility of secession, further fueling the idea of separate political entities.

The Cabinet Mission Plan of 1946 represented perhaps the last, best hope for a united India. It proposed a complex three-tier structure: a weak central government dealing only with defense, foreign affairs, and communications; groups of provinces with their own legislatures; and individual provinces retaining significant autonomy. The plan aimed to address Muslim concerns about majority rule while preserving a unified India. Initially, both the Congress and the Muslim League accepted the plan, albeit with their own interpretations and reservations.

Purchased from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

However, this fragile consensus soon unraveled. Jawaharlal Nehru, a prominent Congress leader and future Prime Minister of India, made statements that suggested the Congress might modify the plan once in power, leading Jinnah to withdraw the Muslim League's acceptance. This proved to be a critical turning point. The brief window of opportunity for a united India slammed shut, replaced by an increasingly bitter and confrontational political climate.

The "Direct Action Day" called by the Muslim League on August 16, 1946, in Calcutta, unleashed an unprecedented wave of communal violence. The city descended into anarchy, with thousands killed in sectarian clashes. This horrific event served as a stark and bloody demonstration of the deepening chasm between the communities and underscored the urgency of finding a solution. It also provided a grim preview of the carnage that would accompany Partition.

As the prospect of a united India faded, the British government appointed Lord Louis Mountbatten as the last Viceroy of India in February 1947, with a clear mandate to oversee the transfer of power by June 1948. Mountbatten, known for his decisive and often impatient style, quickly realized that the divisions were too entrenched. The dream of a unified India, he concluded, was no longer viable.

Mountbatten's initial plan, known as the "Dickie Bird Plan," proposed a transfer of power to individual provinces, allowing them to decide whether to join India, Pakistan, or remain independent. This plan was met with strong opposition from Nehru, who feared it would lead to the balkanization of India. Mountbatten then, in consultation with his advisors, particularly V.P. Menon, swiftly pivoted to a plan for outright partition.

The final plan for Partition, often referred to as the 3rd June Plan or the Mountbatten Plan, proposed the division of British India into two independent dominions: India and Pakistan. The provinces of Punjab and Bengal, with their mixed populations, were to be similarly divided. Princely states were given the option to accede to either India or Pakistan, or theoretically, to remain independent, although the practicalities of this option were severely limited.

The announcement of the plan on June 3, 1947, set in motion a frantic race against time. The date for the transfer of power was dramatically advanced from June 1948 to August 15, 1947, giving barely ten weeks for the monumental task of dividing an entire subcontinent. This accelerated timeline, a consequence of Mountbatten's desire for a swift exit and the escalating communal violence, would have profound and tragic consequences.

The decision for Partition was not unanimous, even among the key players. Mahatma Gandhi, the spiritual leader of the independence movement, vehemently opposed the

Purchased from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

division, advocating for a united India until the very end. He believed that Partition was a surrender to communalism and a betrayal of India’s pluralistic ethos. However, by this stage, Gandhi’s influence on the political decisions of the Congress leadership had waned.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, another towering figure in the Congress, initially harbored reservations but eventually came to accept Partition as a painful but necessary evil to prevent further bloodshed. He famously remarked that while he disliked the vivisection, it was preferable to an indefinite period of civil strife and political instability. His pragmatism, born of a deep understanding of the ground realities, played a significant role in the Congress's ultimate acceptance.

Jawaharlal Nehru, while expressing regret, also acceded to Partition. His vision of a modern, secular India was increasingly threatened by the communal polarization, and the prospect of a perpetual civil war loomed large. For him, a truncated but independent India was preferable to a larger entity consumed by internal conflict. His focus quickly shifted to the monumental task of nation-building within the new borders.

For Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Partition was the culmination of his life’s work, the realization of the two-nation theory and the establishment of a separate homeland for Muslims. He famously declared, "We have got a truncated, mutilated and moth-eaten Pakistan, but we have got it, thank God." His unwavering commitment to the idea of Pakistan, despite the geographical challenges and the human cost, defined his legacy.

The British government, for its part, presented Partition as a democratic solution, reflecting the wishes of the two major communities. However, critics argue that they bore a significant share of the responsibility for creating the conditions that made Partition almost inevitable. Their "divide and rule" policies, their hasty withdrawal, and their failure to effectively mediate between the warring factions all contributed to the tragedy that unfolded.

The decision to partition India was made with a chilling detachment from the human realities it would unleash. For the politicians and administrators in Delhi and London, it was a matter of lines on a map, of constitutional arrangements and power transfers. For the millions who lived in the border regions, however, it meant the uprooting of lives, the sundering of communities, and the violent redefinition of identity.

The discussions leading up to Partition were largely confined to elite circles. The voices of ordinary people – farmers, shopkeepers, teachers, and laborers – were largely absent from the negotiating tables. Their destinies were being shaped by decisions made far away, in marbled halls, by men speaking a language of statecraft and geopolitics that bore little resemblance to the rhythms of daily life in villages and towns.

Purchased from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

Yet, even as the political leaders grappled with the enormity of the decision, communities on the ground were already feeling the tremors. Reports of localized violence, fueled by inflammatory rhetoric and growing suspicion, became increasingly common. The air was thick with apprehension, a sense of foreboding that something momentous and terrible was about to happen.

The very act of deciding on Partition, then, was not merely a political maneuver; it was the initiation of a profound human drama. It set the stage for one of the largest and most traumatic migrations in human history, an event that would redefine the subcontinent and leave an indelible mark on the collective memory of millions. The lines drawn on paper were about to be etched in blood and tears across the land, dividing not just territories, but lives, families, and futures. The consequences of these decisions would reverberate for generations, shaping the destinies of three new nations and the millions who called them home.

---

---

*This is a sample preview. Purchase the book to read the full content.*

Visit MixCache.com to purchase the complete book.