

INTOLERANCE AND BIGOTRY ARE NOT INHERENTLY RELIGIOUS TEACHINGS BUT RATHER HUMAN TEMPERAMENTS: THE DEPICTION OF MANOHARMALLGONKAR IN *A BEND IN THE GANGS*

Mohammed Yassin Mohd Aba Sha'ar, Mugahed Abdulqader Alawi Alheshami

Research Scholar AMU

ABSTRACT

*The partition of India in 1947 gave the birth for two countries India and Pakistan, huge numbers of people from the two countries were displaced and too many others were killed according to their religious background. Besides, the hatred was engendered and intolerance was fueled among the Indian Muslims and Hindus, supporters and detractors of British colonialism. In fact, intolerance refers to the inability and unwillingness to accept and respect the ethnic and personal differences of other people. Meanwhile, bigotry refers to the stubborn devotions of to one's own belief, creed, opinion and prejudices. Basically; this paper celebrates and introduces ManoharMallgonkar as one of the memorable Indian novelists whose works have still appreciation by many readers. Thereby, this paper defines what is intolerance and bigotry and how both concepts were depicted conspicuously by Mallgonkar in *A Bend in the Gangs*. In addition, many Indian writers ostensibly discussed the incidents and attempted to promote the idea of social and religious co-existence in order to establish a multi-cultural, multiethnic country like India but the unique and artistic depictions of Malgonkat made *A Bend in the Gange* one of the best Indian novels. Accordingly, this paper substantiates Malgonkat's idea that intolerance and bigotry are not religious teachings but rather human temperaments. Besides, this paper discusses the partition and its subsequent intolerance how they were retold by Mallgonkar. Further, it traces how the partition fueled an ideological conflict which impacted the behavior of people and resulted in horrible violence. Moreover, this paper exposes how the Indian writers have been endeavoring to promote peace, co-existence and the hope of flourishing multiethnic and multicultural nation in their writings.*

Key Words: *bigotry, intolerance, co-existence, religious teachings, human temperaments*

INTRODUCTION

Basically, religions always call for co-existence between the people affiliated to different religions and living in one identified place. Diversity in religions at one society is a great enrichment to its culture. This leads to the religious pluralism which “refers to the co-existence of – and peaceful relations between – different religions, not in a competitive way, but rather in co-operation, the showing of respect to beliefs held in common” (6). Intolerance and bigotry

have nothing to do with some religious extremists who claim that their religious extremism is only an application to their religious teachings. However, what are the reasons of the religious ignitions? They are rather human temperaments than religious teachings. Agitating some of the stereotypes or inciting one group against another are considered as the ultimate reasons of intolerance and bigotry.

In India, the British rule incited one religion against the other to get rid of the all. The British didn't want any Indian national solidarity against them because they realized that the Indians were trying to unify themselves to move in one way and get their independence. Indian struggle against the British colonials became more tensive and organized against the British rule "Debi hated the British, as they nil hated the British; that was what brought them together, Hindus and Muslims and Sikhs, men of differing regions united in the cause of freedom as blood-brothers; the freedom fighters" (Monohar,14). In an attempt to disturb the freedom movements, the British colonizers released the stereotypes against this movement and considered it as terrorist movements by using the stereotypes in order to convince the public opinion.

ManoharMallgonkar, in A Bend in the Gangs, depicted how the British were able to present the freedom fighters as terrorists who should be denied by the all people. The freedom fighters united themselves despite of the religious differences whether they were Hindu, Muslim or Sikh. They ate from one shared dish to prove their allegiance to the motherland. In addition, the British, in a cunning way, knew how to make them apart through reminding them of their religious differences; some religion followers get trapped into the serpentine ideas emanated by the colonizers. Religious intolerance harms not only the other people of different beliefs but it terribly causes too much suffering to the people of the same religion and this was the most suitable way to the British to fulfill their agenda.

Intolerance and bigotry that British implanted among the Indians continued after the Indian independence especially at the time of partition which resulted into two states, India and Pakistan. The birth of two states came as a result of a long time of regular religious agitation and incitation waged by the British inside the Indian society. There was a very long struggle with its two sides which are violent and non-violent struggle. Intolerance on the eve of independence was very horrible and out of control where a lot of people were the victims of killings and displacement "partition caused the 'greatest mass movement of humanity in history'" (Phillips, 1). Partition was extremely terrible because it based upon the religious affiliations which were already fueled with bigotry and hatred but we can't say that the religious teachings are the reason; rather religions were exploited to satisfy human demonic desires.

Some historians are of the opinion that the religious intolerance that happened between Hindus and Muslims at the time of partition goes back to the time of Mughal conquerors arrived to India in the sixteenth century; if it is so how can we account for the boundless cooperation and co-existence which are existed at the present? (Smith, 2). Divide and rule policy adopted by the

British was the ultimate reason in sowing the seeds of hatred and religious intolerance between the majority Hindus and minorities especially Muslims. They conducted a census in 1857 to include different geographical areas and created demographical consciousness among the religious communities. A great deal of knowledge regarding the religious growth and existence sparked a religious debate because the minorities were given specific seats based on their religious orientation. Even after the partition, the divide and rule policy continued in order to have an easy access to dominance; it is because Indians are no longer unified but they are religiously divided into sects as well as majority and minority. Conflict between the sects was directed against the religious backgrounds but it never based on the religious teachings. Religion was used to justify the conflicts over the self-interests.

INTOLERANCE AND BIGOTRY ARE NOT RELIGIOUS TEACHINGS

One can't claim that the teachings of religions are the reason for the violence, intolerance and hatred that spread nowadays in our modern time. Essentially, religions oppose any calls for intolerance and disrespect to the human beings. They always motivate the idea of appreciating the religious values and practices that are different from one society to another. Dogmatically, there might be strife between the followers of religions; however, this doesn't mean that there should be intolerance. Hatred and intolerance result from various political, economic, personal reasons "Religious beliefs, at least a great many of them, contain the conceptual resources for the flourishing of tolerance" (Clark, 1). Religion nourishes the values of acceptance and understanding between different people.

Devaluing other persons seems to be a natural inclination, so this tendency needs too much cultivation which will lead to tolerance. Generally, religions teach followers that tolerance is the blessing of God. Islam and Christianity say that God is very tolerant so his religions should teach and perform this virtue. They completely deny the claims of intolerant God because God endures the sins committed by the human beings without immediate penalty. Disbelieving in others' values and beliefs doesn't necessarily necessitate the rise of the feelings of hatred and intolerance. In the teachings of Islam, the principle of tolerance is always emphasized; Islam tells its followers to protect other religions that are available in a Muslim area. According to Islam, equality and justice should be applied to all the people without any discrimination, bias or prejudice "Islam provides equal protection to members of other faith. Islam inculcates the love of God's creatures in general" (Qaderi, 8). Similarly, in Christianity, all people are the members of God's family and they are bound to respect each other. Hatred and violence against anyone are strongly denied. Christianity enhances the idea of pluralism because of its associations to tolerance "Morrison, 152). Jesus taught his disciples not to fight those who didn't receive their message but they should take off the dust from their feet.

The long history of tolerance in Hinduism is a testimony that religions are in favor of peaceful co-existence with all the different religious faiths. Under the Hindu faith, too many

religious faiths have been living together in cooperation and harmony. It is for sure that the other religions have greatly elevated the idea of tolerance because the primary interests of religions are the human beings and humanity. Since a long time, religions called for tolerance and have helped in creating pluralistic societies in the present modern societies where the world has been reduced to a small village and tolerance has become an immense need for survival and prosperity. Any deviation from the teachings of religions is considered abnormal and in an opposition to humanity.

However, what are the reasons of bigotry and intolerance that are attributed to religious teachings? We see too many extremist groups in the guise of religion who practice heinously and claim that they apply the teachings of religion. We should know that the human desires which are related to self-interests are the main reasons of incompatibility between the human beings. Religions are supposedly to be revealed by God and their ultimate goal is to unify all the human beings under the supreme super power even the paths to this power are different from one religion to another (Hassan, 3,4). Most of the wars that took place in the past were in the name of religion not because the religious teachings but because they used religions to justify their destructive human desires. No religion directly calls for killing the innocent people but the war leaders find religion as the best mean to agitate feelings to achieve their selfish desires.

Hassan stated that most of the wars that took place in the name of religion were economic, political and social in their real nature than religious. Hatred and intolerance might be passed from one generation to another but we can't hold the religious teachings the responsibility. The culture of hate is evil and the religious teachings have nothing to do with hatred but they always glorify the principle of tolerance as a divine cause. The fundamentalist groups are found in every religion and they claim that their fundamentalism is a pure service to God. Such groups can be described as narrow-minded in their thoughts because of their misinterpretations of the religious teachings or they may have exaggerations in their views; so this may result in feelings of hatred and intolerance. Most of the fundamentalists interpret the religious teachings in selfish biased ways.

All religions present a salvation plan to their followers. This means that those religions essentially love all people, so "knowing this breeds religious tolerance, ignorance of this fact will breed religious intolerance". They wish peace, unity and life of harmony to all their adherents. The idea of God is most agreed and sacred fact and once there is a removal to the idea of God from religion then the religion is reduced to nothing. Since religion is related to God, freedom of religious choice is optional. Before dividing people according to their religions or beliefs, humanity always comes first. No doubt, caring for the human needs will reduce tension between the different religious followers especially in plural societies. Religious tolerance frequently promotes and supports the human rights that are considered the fundamental factors of religious co-existence which remains away from the demonic desires of the human beings.

Bigotry and intolerance should be abhorred because the principle of tolerance is based on the equality in beliefs, values and truth claims (Carson, 12). There is no specific superiority to one religious faith more than the other. Accepting one religious faith to another doesn't mean that the first one is in complete agreement with the other but it means that the first one recognizes the right of existence to the other; tolerance of one religion to another includes the social tolerance especially in the multicultural society. The belief in the rightness of one religion doesn't mean the social superiority because this may result in more hatred and intolerance.

THE ROLE OF BRITISH COLONIALISTS IN TRIGGERING THE RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

At the outset, the term religious intolerance refers to the violent acts by the practitioners or/and followers of one religious faith against the individuals and/or the places of worship of another religious groups. India is a multicultural and multi-religious country but all of which are living in a harmonious and co-existent social fabric. Thereby, when we talk about the religious intolerance in India it will involve the most dominant religious groups Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians. The British colonialism dominated the Indian subcontinent for more than 300 years. They had created little good things, caused many painful things and much more horrible things during the period of their colonialism from 1600 to 1947. This paper will focus briefly on the religious intolerance between the Indians religious groups which had been triggered and constantly supported by the British colonialists as it made the people occupied with their own conflicts rather than with the major concern of the whole nation that was decolonizing the British settlers. Such riots, intolerance and religious clashes cost India and the Indians many valuable things starting from the demise of thousands of people and concluding with the partition of their homeland.

After the First War of Independence in 1857 the British colonialist realized the threat and danger of the unity among Indians and decided to utilize the 'divide-and-rule-policy' that will make the people busy with their own internal conflicts (John, 195). They exploited the diverse nature of the Indian nation and the cultural, religious social and linguistic differences between the Indian communities in order to prevent any similar revolts in the future. Thereafter, they focused on certain religious or cultural differences and started supporting some groups against the others which consequentially led to the occurrence of many horrible incidents. Besides, these occurrences led to the cultivation of hatred and antagonism among the Indian communal harmony (Death, 2013).

Thereafter, the world noticed in the early 20th century the rise of nationalism in many colonized countries as a means for encouraging the nations to revolt against the European settlers. India was not dissimilar; they formed 'the Indian National Congress' in 1885 as the first body of nationalist opinion and the representative in in some respects. In the other Side the

Indian Muslims felt that they should have a political party to gather all the Muslims in one party that consequentially was formed and named as 'All-India Muslim League' in 1906. The Muslim Indians were encouraged to have their own separate political and cultural identity separate from the Hindus. As a consequence the Muslim League arose as an organization that aims to enhance the different religious, cultural, political, social, economic, and interests for the Muslims (.). Accordingly, Mohammad Ali Jinnah was a Politian and lawyer who served as the leader of the 'All-India Muslim League since 1913 to 1947. He is considered as the founder of Pakistan. He began calling for the rights of having independent state for Muslims away from the largely Hindu majority. Before the massacre of partition the Indian nation and the entire world witnessed an appalling manslaughter in Bengal in the city of Calcutta and historically known as the 'Direct Action Day or the Great Calcutta Killings' in August 1946. The Indian Independence movement in 1946 was insistent urging the British Prime Minister Clement Attlee to send three Cabinet Mission members to argue the final plan for the transfer of power from the British Raj to the Indian leadership. In the 1940s the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League were the biggest and the representatives of the political parties. They discussed with the envoys and the plan was to hand over the rule of the country to the Dominion of India and its government. But few weeks after the British envoys proposed alternative plan that suggest that suggests "India should be divided into Hindu-majority India and a Muslim-majority Pakistan" (Bourke-white, 1949; Panigrahi, 2004). The Indian National Congress rejected alternative proposal and the All-India Muslim League under the leadership of Jinnah decided to protest and iniate general strike for the rejecting their demand to have separate homeland. On August 16 the general strike started with violent riots and mobs that consequentially resulted the demise of more than 4000 (Tsugitaka, 112). The conflict and slaughtering here was not enticed by national or governmental incentives but rather by religious and ethnic bigotry.

In fact, the massacres that followed the partition of India were triggered by communal incentives rather than national or political motives. Meanwhile, the British settlers played a vital role as they were the official rulers of the region and were having the power and means to cease the unforgettable and horrific genocides. However, in they decided and hasted the partition of the large colony into two countries Hindu and Muslim states which presently known as India and Pakistan. But this decision left millions of Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs on the wrong side of the newly-formed border. As a result the massacres of Sikhs and Hindus by Muslims in West Punjab and of Muslims by Sikhs and Hindus in East Punjab, the communal violence resulted in the murder of around 20,000–25,000 Muslims in Delhi by Hindus (D'Costa, 53: 2011; Sikand, 2004; Butalia, 2000). Besides, this instability forced almost 12 to 14 million to leave their homes and walk hundreds of miles to their newly religious affiliated homes. During this great exodus intolerance escalated and violence broke out between the various religious factions, leading to the demise of around 1 to 1.5 million. At that time many Muslims were killed by Sikh and Hindu mobs, while many Sikhs and Hindus faced the same fate at the hands of Muslim mobs in

Pakistan .This horrific genocide is rated as the seventh most horrific massacre in the 29th century (Jeff Danelek, 2012).

A part from the partition and the intolerance between Muslims and Hindus, there is also an antagonism between Hindus and Sikhs. Jeffery M. Shaw and Timothy J. Derry find that the animosity and conflict dates back to the British colonial period due to communal, religious and political differences (371). They further add that, the religious conflict which the British Raj failed to solve ended up in the separation of Muslim States that Pakistan from the Hindu majority declaring the partition in 1946. Meantime the Sikh leader Bhatti suggested the creation of the a sepate Sikh nation ‘Khalistan’, but later on they supported the Congress part and realized to be with the United India is better than seeking separate states (371).

THE DEPICTIONS OF VIOLENCE AND INTOLERANCE IN MANHOR’S A BEND IN THE GANGES

In fact, many studies discussed the partition and how the communal bigotry rather than the entire religious beliefs was the perpetrators of victimization and intolerance during and after partition. Ayesha Jalal in his book *The Pity of Partition: Manto's Life, Times, and Work Across the India-Pakistan Divide* states that, “my analysis of partition violence demonstrates that banded individuals rather than entire communities were perpetrators” (11). Accordingly, this paper argues that neither the religious faiths nor the communal cultures promote violence, bigotry and intolerance. The wicked nature of some human beings in all the religious faiths and communities instead is the cause of the atrocities and genocides that the world witnessed throughout the entire history. Besides, it sheds light on the role of British colonialists in agitating the conflict between the communities which resulted in mass killing, chaos and ceaseless violence.

ManoharMalgonkar is one of the leading Indian novelists in English. He is widely known as a Maratha historian (Badhwar, 67). *A Bend in the Ganges* (1964) is selected as one of the best three novels in the 1960s, one of the best acknowledged texts in the whole canon of Indian fiction (Prasanthi M, 87). The novel begins with the civil disobedience movement in the early 1930s and continues to the partition riot in Punjab in August 1947. It portrays serial events starting by the civil disobedience movement of the early 1930s passing to the Swadeshi movement then the activities of the freedom fighters, the outbreak of the Second World War, the British retreat from Rangoon, the Bombay dock explosion, and ultimately the division of India in 1947. *A Bend in the Ganges* is divided into three parts, “The Lull”, “The Storm”, and “The Aftermath”. The name of the first chapter “the lull” indicated to the peace and harmony which was before the time of partition in which all the Muslims and Hindus lived without religious conflict for centuries. Naming the second chapter as “the storm” refers to new events and changes that woke up the religious intolerance between the largest religious Indian groups. Suddenly, the Indians became aware of their religious and ethnic origin. “The storm” here is also

symbolic to the role of the British colonizers in agitating the religious violence under the pretext of the religious differences between Muslims, Hindus and Sikh and they rumored the impossibility of religious co-existence between all the Indians. The 'Aftermath' refers to the separation of Pakistan and the deportation and killing of millions of people.

Ghandi's speech at the beginning of the novel is directed to all the Indians and this means that all of them are unified and they adopt the non-violence policy to win victory. He addressed the whole Indians and urged them to get rid of the British colonization non-violently. All Indians were unified against the British whether they were Hindu, Muslim or Sikh "Debi hated the British, as they all hated the British that what brought them together Hindus, Muslims or Sikhs, men of differing religions united in the cause of freedom as blood-brothers: freedom fighters" (Mallgonkar,62).

The Indian sub-continent witnessed in the wake of independence horrible bloodsheds and communal riots that shocked the foundations of the entire nation. The novel shows how the individual violence moved into communal bloodsheds which erroneously described by many as religious killings. In fact, all the religious beliefs do propagate the social co-existence and harmony and discourage the intolerance and slaughtering by the name of religion. It seems to be religious war as the conflict raged between the Muslim and Hindu communities but it cannot be labeled as some writers referred to as religious killing or war. Because it was not agitated by religious reasons and thereby did not have any religious goals. Accordingly, the last lines of the epigraph which was taken from Gandhi speech, Malgonkar wants to indicate that it was communal riots rather than religious violence, "when the fury bursts, not a man, woman, or child is safe and every man's hand is raised against his neighbor" (A Bend in the Ganges). Moreover, religious faiths are stainless and pure by nature and the fault lies only in the human beings who misinterpreted them or justify their ill-wills and bad acts by some religious teachings.

At the time of initiating the communal movement – FreedomFighters - its members may have difficulty but they preferred the idea of India to any other selfish idea. Religions stand no longer as the barrier to co-exist and achieve goals "Their meetings always ...of all the religions of India. Hinduism, Sikhism, Islam. The Hindus and Sikhs venerated the cow; she was the go-mata, the universal mother; the Muslims abhorred the pig as an unclean, unholy animal. After eating a dish made of Pork and beef no Hindu, Muslim or Sikh could practice his religion" (Mallgonkar , 57). Hafiz's fear and incitation were the main motives to agitate the religious hatred but Shafi tries his best to belittle the fears of Hafiz. We can claim here that Hafiz represents the mentality of intolerance though his fears are based on discriminative, political reasons than on religious teachings. Hafiz emphasizes that Muslims should take steps just to protect themselves from any future discrimination or attack "We have to organize ourselves— Muslims against the rest of India, if we are to survive. Organize, not so much to win freedom, but to protect ourselves from being swamped by the Hindus" (Mallgonkar, 73).

Generally, the political havoc is the most dominant on the current events in this novel. The communal solidarity and tolerance between the different religious Indian groups have deteriorated and a new era of hatred and mutual suspicions have already started. The culture of intolerance and retaliation has taken place against each other especially Muslims and Hindus. Both of them realize that the enmity between them is not based on a religious teaching but the British have exploited religion to create division between them “the British have succeeded in what they set out to do. Set the Hindus and Muslims at each other's throats. What a lovely sight!” (Mallgonkar, 244). The colonizers have succeeded in instilling the idea that Muslims and Hindus are the traditional enemies and each one of them should be always on alert. A cruel, horrible and religious civil war happened between the Hindus and Muslims and it was fueled by political self-interests. It is unreasonable to accuse Islam and Hinduism as the reasons of massacres and displacements that occurred during the time of partition.

Malgonkar raises questions of surprise that after a long time of brotherhood and co-existence which extend for centuries, such cruelties take place in our country: “After living as brothers over so many generations how had they suddenly been infected by such virulent hatred for each other? Who had won, Gandhi or the British? (Mallgonkar, 301). When Shafi with his companion attack Tekchand in order to snatch Sundari in revenge to his mistress, Mumtaz, who is taken by Debi, Tekchand begs them not to harm his wife and daughter. Tekchand gives his pleas to them in the name of everything sacred to them and even in the name of prophet Mohammed who is sacred to all Muslims. Mentioning the prophet Mohammed in this awful context is a very clear proof that the prophet Mohammed represents Islam and he never agreed to any violence against the human beings “I implore you, in the name of all that is sacred to you, your prophet Mohammad himself, not to touch them, your sisters” (Mallgonkar, 320).

Basically, Malgonkar characterization in *A Bend in the Ganges* shows that there are evil people in both communities but neither Islam nor Hinduism are violent religions. In other words, Debi Dayal and ShafiUsman are not representatives of real Hinduism and Islam but rather violent men with wicked nature who do exist in every religion and community. Initially, both Debi and Shafi were represented as members of Hanuman Club. They are called ‘freedom fighters’. Both were not content with Ghandian non-violent movement. They “advocate a new religion of brotherhood as they believe that religious differences among the Indians contribute to their slavery” (Prasanthi M, 90). They both agree that violence is the only way to derive away the British rule from India and anyone who represents that rule is their enemy. Both Shafi and Debi were hurt deeply by the British rule. Shafi’s father was killed in JallianwalaBagh massacre and Debi mother was molested by British soldier in front of his eyes. As a consequence Shafi believes that “non-violence is a naked insult to the land of Shivaji and Akbar and Ranjeet.” (Malgonkar, 80). Besides, their secret word was ‘Jai ram, Jai Rahim Which enhances the equal respect for both religions. Shafi;s disguise later on in the form of Sikh indicates that even Sikhism is a religious belief that boosts for co-existence and peace. Undeniably, both were

represented as terrorist but their sole aim was to overthrow the British rule from India. In addition they “were all willing, almost eager, to die for their motherland” (Malgonkar, 77).

In the 1930s and the early Malgonkar finds that: “all the Indians hated the British; that was what brought them together; Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs, men of differing religions united in the cause of freedom as blood-brothers: the Freedom Fighters” (73). But the British realized the danger of the unity among the communities for their existence and interests in the Indian Sub-continent. Thereby, “they have learnt to take the fullest advantage of these differences, playing the Hindus against the Muslims and the Sikhs against the both” (Prasanthi M, 92). Hence differences started to be exaggerated and echoed in the suspicious and menacing manner. Thereby, distrust and antagonism between Muslims and Hindus began even among those who were having the same aspirations and aims. Malgonkar enquires about the repressed hatred between each other which was provoked by the British rule, “How long would it be before the flames of communal hatred caught up with them?” (86). The years that preceded the partition their hatred and antagonism were repressed from each other as Hafiz Khan was telling Shafi “I am not a Leaguer only because the League does not believe in our methods. But there is no denying that Jinah is a great man. He has pointed out the way. We must now turn our back on the Hindus, otherwise we shall become their slaves! (Malgonkar 94). Hafiz attempts to convince Shafi about the futility of the non-violent movement as he further says “Gandhi’s non-violence, violence persists. Violence such as no one has ever seen. That is what awaits this country: the violence bottled up in those who pay lip service to non-violence. The Hindus are preparing for it—to kill us, to swamp us” (98).

In his book, *The Functional World of Manohar Malgonkar* A. Padmanabhan sums up the entire situations saying that “the Hanuman Club becomes a microcosm of the macrocosm that was Indian society, with the Hindus and the Muslims united at first to fight against the British, and, at last when they were about to leave, fighting against each other”(110). Like Gandhi, Malgonkar knows the bitterness between the two communities and the chaos that will follow the withdrawal of the British that “Hindus and Muslims would be at each other’s the throat just as they had always been before the British came and established peace.” (253). Suspicion and sense of betrayal split the unity among the Indian communities and enraged the coming storm as Malgonkar depicts one of the instances that shows the deterioration of their unity against the British Raj “It is rather funny, really; all seven were Hindus; not a single Muhammadan in the lot; which makes us think that there was some kind of a rift among them... (137). Clearly, Prasanthi M asserts “Shafi’s betrayal of the Hindu members of the Hanuman Club creates a gulf between the two communities resulting in a violent communal strife” (105).

Essentially, the British were anticipating chaos, civil war, man slaughter, abduction and rape of thousands of women. Before their withdrawal the British have succeeded in what they set out to do, “they set the Hindus and Muslims at each other’s throats. What a lovely sight!”

(Malgonkar, 297). The British diabolically succeeded in what can be called internal conflict and communal slaughtering saying “What had been aimed against the British, has turned against itself. And the ugliest thing it has bred is distrust. No Hindu can trust a Muslim any more, and no Muslim trusts a Hindu (Malgonkar, 298). Thereafter, Basu believes that “believes that violence has to be met with violence otherwise Hindus will perish, He wants the Hindus to rise against the Muslims (Prasanthi M, 112). Similarly Hafiz assures that they have to organize themselves to confront the Hindus saying “Muslims has to set themselves against the rest of India, if we are to survive. Organize, not so much to win freedom, but to protect ourselves from being swamped by the Hindus” (Mallgonkar, 73). As a consequence the communal riots have erupted in Bengal, Delhi, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab and in many other places, resulting in the demise of thousands, displacement of millions, rape and abductions of hundreds. Mallgonkar finds that “Tens of millions of people had to flee, leaving everything behind; Muslims from India, Hindus and Sikhs from the land that was soon to become Pakistan: two great rivers of humanity flowing in opposite directions along the pitifully inadequate roads and railways, jamming, clashing, colliding head-on, leaving their dead and dying littering the landscape (341). Besides, “Every citizen was caught up in the holocaust. No one could remain aloof; no one could be trusted to be impartial” (341).

CONCLUSION

The horror of the partition was a result of certain mutual distrust and misunderstanding. Muslims and Hindus fought each other not on the basis of the teachings of their religions but on the basis of unbearable external pressures whether they were social, political, historical or racial. In addition, Malgonkar refers to the atrocity took place on the eve of independence and at the time of partition as something innate in the human nature. Initially, revenge desire can never be a religious trend but it can be a devilish symptom of the human nature. Hindu and Muslims used to live in peace for centuries but suddenly they discover their religious differences that are associated with hatred rather than peace.

This article states the fact that all religious beliefs are pure by nature and all unanimously call for co-existence, peace and love. But there are religious figures and/or some communities who unluckily misinterpret the religious commands and teachings. In case of the violence that erupted before and after the independence of India was communal rather than religious as many assume. In the three days of independence many man and women were killed and displaced. Thereby, Malgonkar wanted to say that non-violence does not always work but in the other side violence never does. This article in addition explores the role of the British in triggering the communal conflict which followed by a horrific genocides. But the question that can be asked at the end of this article is that who won Ghandi or the Britishers?

WORK CITED

- Badhwar, Sonika. "A comparative study of historicity and indianness in postcolonial novels." (2011).
- Bourke-White, Margaret. *Halfway to Freedom: A Report on the New India*. Simon and Schuster, New York 1949.
- Butalia, Urvashi, *The Other Side of Silence: Voices From the Partition of India*. Duke University Press, 2000
- Carson, Donald A. *The intolerance of tolerance*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2012.
- Clark, Kelly James. "Religious diversity and religious tolerance." *Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company* (1997): 16.
- Danelek , Jeff. *Top 10 Most Horrific Genocides In History*. TopTens, November 14, 2012. Retrieved in September 05, 2017. <http://www.toptenz.net/top-10-most-horrific-genocides-in-history.php>
- D'Costa, Bina. *Nationbuilding, Gender and War Crimes in South Asia*.Routledge, 2011.
- Death toll in the partition". *Users.erols.com*. Retrieved 5th September 2017. <http://necrometrics.com/20c300k.htm>
- Gaderi, Mohammed Ahmad. "Peace and tolerance in Islam." *Islamic and cultural rsearchcentre of north America, non-profit, non-political organization* (2004, California): 20.
- Hassan, M. Shihar. "Religious Intolerance - The Crumbling of Civilizations." (2012): 9.
- Jalal, Ayesha. *The Pity of Partition: Manto's Life, Times, and Work Across the India-Pakistan Divide*. Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Mallgonkar, Manohar. *A Bend in the Gangs* . London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd, 90 Great Russell Street,London, 1964.
- Marriott, John. *The other empire: Metropolis, India and progress in the colonial imagination*, Manchester University Press, 2013.
- Morrison, Angus. "Christian Freedom, Tolerance And The Claims Of Truth." *Associaled Press ByTerian Churches, Edinburgh* (n.d.): 29.
- Padmanabhan, A.*The Functional World of ManoharMalgonkar*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, 2002. Print.

Panigrahi, D.N. *India's Partition: The Story of Imperialism in Retreat*. Routledge, 2004, pp.294.

Phillips, Sean. "Why Was British India Partitioned in 1947? Considering the Role of Muhammad Ali Jinnah." Nuffield College, University of Oxford. London, 2017.

Prasanthi, M. "Depiction of partition and emergency: a study of select post-Independence Indian novels in English." (2012).

Shaw, Jeffrey M., and Timothy J. Demy, eds. *War and Religion: An Encyclopedia of Faith and Conflict* [3 volumes]. ABC-CLIO, 2017.

Sikand, Yoginder. *Muslims in India Since 1947: Islamic Perspectives on Inter-Faith Relations*. Routledge, 2004

Smith, Katie. "Assess the primary causes of religious conflict in India." *E-International Relation Students* (Dec, 2007): 2.

Tsugitaka, Sato. *Muslim Societies: Historical and Comparative Aspects*. Routledge, 2000.