

REVISITING PARTITION OF PAKISTAN: A NEW HISTORICIST STUDY OF THE TRAUMA OF 1971 IN COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

¹Mufeeza Rauf, ²Rameeza Rauf, ³Umaira Rauf, ⁴Sumiara Rauf

¹M.phil English Literature

²Govt. Graduate College Marghzar Colony, Lahore

³M.phil Scholar

⁴M.phil English Literature

Abstract

This article tries to analyze the cataclysmic event, 'the Fall of Dacca, from new historicist point of view. The worst political conditions, failure of negotiations among Bhutto, Mujib and Yahya derailed the country into civil strife. Communal riots between Bengalis and non-Bengalis increased, resulted in mass killings and rapes. Bengali rebellion on the name of the Liberation War, gained momentum, that finally with Indian assistance dismembered the country into halves, i.e. Pakistan and Bangladesh. New Historicist analysis of the texts shows that a literary text is a cultural artifact and is mirror of the time that produced it. The concerned texts embodied the time of their creation. History of separation of East Pakistan is ambiguous. In New Historicist point of view historical accounts are not real rather reality is constructed, and this reality is constructed by writers' mode of representation. These histories are fabricated histories and there is always a doctrine behind every historical account. Being a tool in the hands of historians, historical accounts are used to propagate their ideologies and present the desired image of their respective countries before the world. They have distorted the reality of what was actually happened. The reality is hidden. No one exactly knows what had happened and who was responsible for the breakup of Pakistan. This study uses Louis Montrose concept of 'textuality of history' for the analysis of Blood and Tear and other dominant narratives of that time.

Key words: Fall of Dacca, New Historicism, textuality of history

Introduction

The present study shed light on the presentations of the catastrophic event of fall of Dacca in the dominant narrative of Bangladesh and how counter narrative emerged and written in Pakistan. The comparison of the literary and non literary texts with the Lenz of Loius Montrose concept of "textuality of history" critique the history that suggests history is not history rather 'only representation of history'. As Barry (2002) says that New Historicism is not 'to represent the past as it was but to present past new reality by reinventing it'. History is not a matter of facts rather written from the point of views of those who wrote them (Ardian, p.19). History that was previously regarded a set of objective events in chronological array is deconstructed as it becomes "a tapestry suggests the twin working of human consciousness with the crucial role of memory and amnesia in waving its design" (Aftab, Shaheen & Aslam, 2021). A contradictory literature emerged as a result of this secession of 1971. The narrative that was accepted in one place was rejected in other country. Bangladeshi writers were creating a "narrative of victimhood" (Waheed & Asif 2022) by putting all blames of atrocities on army, while west wing writers were adopting the policy of 'silence' to prevent "retributive reprisal against the Bengali populace in West Pakistan" (Aziz, 1974, p.6). This is an intellectual debate because the history that reached us up till now is a kind of constructed history (Saika, 2011). The same tragedy has been scribbled in different ways. The Bangladeshi and the Indian literature filled with the fabricated myths that three million people had been killed and three thousand women were raped by the Army (Chowdhury, 1996).

Viewing new historicist idea that history is subjective and come out as result of a writers own ideological beliefs and socio political upbringing, fluidity of narrative is digged out.

Socio political condition in 1971

The Muslims of the sub-continent demanded a separate land as it seemed to them that their social, political, cultural and religious rights would not be secured in undivided India. To preserve their Muslim integrity, and socio-economic rights they called for a separate land based on Islamic principles. The British Imperialists partitioned the Sub-continent and as a result two countries appeared on the map of the world, i.e. Pakistan and India. The newly established Pakistan comprised of two wings separated by 1600km with an Indian territory between them. Geographically both wings were not united. East Pakistan with large Hindu population as minority and due to being Indian neighborhood had great Hindu influence. The stumbling nation was on the way to erect itself on the columns of progress, but India, years long enemy, never let the opportunity to split Pakistan apart. From the very beginning after the Partition in 1947, India began to deteriorate the situations in East Pakistan and started making contact with the Bengali high officials. After the creation of Bangladesh, Sheikh Mujib admitted that “he (Mujib) and other Bengali leaders had contacts with Indian diplomatic and intelligence circles” (Bhutto, 1971, p.5). Except religion there was nothing common between the two wings. A number of causes from the beginning ingrained in the establishment of the newly ‘overpopulated’, (Chaudhry, 1988, p. 12) Eastern Wing of Pakistan. They were: 1. “Geographical and socio- cultural differences”(Mahmood, 1989, p.2), 2. “The rise of language issue and the economic centralism” (Zaheer, 1990, p.20) 3. The military bureaucracy. 4. Degeneration of feudal land. 5. “The loose hold of Muslims of Muslim League” (Khan, 2006, p.9). The growing weakness giving ground to professional, educated elite classes to politics resulted in the secession of the East Pakistan.

The ‘unending’ (Zaheer, 1990, pp.21-22) hatred started from 1948 when Urdu was implanted as “national language of Pakistan” (p.16), though the language of country’s largest population was Bengali. In 1952, on a procession, started for making Bengali as national language, police opened fire and killed “three students and a number of other people” (Iqbal, p.57). Later in the Constitution of 1956, Bengali was “accepted as state –language” (Salik, pp. 216-17) along with Urdu, but it was late to eradicate the “rising spirit of Bengali nationalism” (Iqbal, p.58).

The other reason that was supposed to become the cause of tear in the East and the West Pakistan was the poor political structure. Bhutto in his book *The Great Tragedy* (1971) bluntly put allegations on Ayub that he was responsible for developing gap between the East and the West halves of Pakistan. Ayub’s ‘One Unit’ formula “accentuated polarization between East and West wings and was chiefly responsible for two wings with each other as two rival states” (Bhutto, 1971, p.11) and blamed that it was Ayub’s regime “that militant Bengali nationalism began to show its face” (Bhutto, 1971, p.12). Wrong policies of Ayub i.e. abrogation of Pakistan constitution of 1956, shift of capital from Karachi to Islamabad, mishandling of Awami League militants were some other political failures that ignited the fire of separation in the hearts of the Bengalis. “History may well concluded that it was Yahya Khan’s misfortune to have completed what Ayub had launched finally Ayub compelled to say, “let East Pakistan go” (Kokab & Hassan, p.102) instead of federation, unicameral structure of government was imposed. This paper will use Louis Montrose concept of ‘textuality of history’ as theoretical lens to investigate *Aziz’s Blood and Tears and other selected texts* as historical accounts are not real rather constructed discourses and different representational modes work behind a dominant narrative

Review of literature

This study is based on historical and literary approaches from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and foreign writers. A number of books that deals with the traumatic event of the Fall of Dacca, 1971, have been written in Pakistan, Bangladesh, and India and in Western countries. Each writer of a particular country has written them from his own point of view. They have different perception about the same event as does Aziz in *Blood and Tears* (1974). Even within a same country, difference in narrative exists. The dominant narrative (Indian, Bangladeshi and Western) following pro-Bengali stance has its point of view quiet opposite to the Pakistani narrative, *Blood and Tears* (1974). There exist various points of departure between the two narratives that need elaboration.

Pakistani dominant literature about 1971

Mainstream Pakistani literature focuses on the political dilemma that the leadership had to face at that time and failure of negotiations that led towards military action and finally, to separation after war with India. It also highlights the Indian involvement in the form of military assistance i.e. training and armor. In Pakistan both positive and negative attitudes towards separation of 1971 exist. In the beginning, the policy of 'silence' (Saikia, 2011) was adopted in the West Pakistan during and after the cataclysmic event of Fall of Dacca, 1971. The basic reason to keep silence was to prevent further retaliation on the part of the West Pakistanis. It was said to keep things in secret is better otherwise there would be severe loss. Firstly, it would mean the negation of the Two Nation Theory (one Muslim is killing another). Secondly it would create the atmosphere of retaliation in West Pakistan, where thousands of Bengalis were living peacefully (Salik, 1997, p. 65). Due to this, all kinds of publications were banned in West Pakistan. With the passage of time, in 80's, a few people took initiative and began to raise their voices. Among them were the soldiers and journalists who witnessed the entire tragic event. The one of early published books was Siddiq Salik's *Mian Nay Dhaka Dobtay Dakha* (1977) later translated into English *Witness to Surrender* (1997). Later emerged, Altaf Ftima's *Chalta Musafir*, this is about the fall of Dacca and the issue of Biharis. Then came in quick succession, Tariq Mahood *Allah Megh De* (1986), Razia Faseeh, *Sadyon ki Zanjeer* (1988), Tariq Ismail Saagar's *Lahu ka Safaar* (1990) Musstansar Hussain Tarar's *Raakh*, M. Hameed Shahid's *Matti Adam Khati Hai* (2007). *Matti Adam Khati Hai* is a soldier's narrative, in which he highlights the Mukti Bahini's connection with EBR (East Bengal Regiment) and killings of pro-Pakistani Bengalis by the rebels (p.91). Pakistan's narrative focuses mainly on the political failure, military strategic policy, the need of operation and Army's involvement.

Historians took different issues and stance to figure out the causes of separation among East and west wing of united Pakistan, Salik (1997) in his book *Witness to Surrender* says that each participant on his part was responsible for the Fall of Dacca. Yahya wanted to retain his power and was doing everything in favour of Bhutto. Therefore, rumors were there that, during his meeting with Bhutto on 15th March at Larkana he made a plan with Bhutto. Replacement of General Tikka Khan (who was famous for his success in every battle field) in place of General Yaqoob was Yahya's planning that there was something in the air. Raja (2012) in his book *A Stranger in My Own Country*, says the same that Tikka Khan's appointment showed that Yahya had changed his policy and he had not a conciliatory attitude towards the East Pakistan. Raja (2012) says that because most of people in army were from such class who lent support to Bhutto, so it was important for Yahya to support Bhutto instead of Mujib who was unreliable. Therefore, Yahya put all blame of crisis on Mujib "and not even alluded to Bhutto" (Raja, p. 63). This was one notion.

Raja (2012) also affirms this notion in his book that each one of three was responsible for the dismembering of Pakistan. “Yahya...held the reins of power and wanted to hold on to them by hook or by crook” (p. 100) and “he [Mujib] did not need a coalition and was not at all inclined to share power with Bhutto” (Raja, p. 102). Salik (1997) says that Mujib who was involved in negotiation with Yahya and Bhutto for constitution settlement on one side was also involved in some illegal activities of dismembering Pakistan. Mujib asked Col. M.A.G Osmani to produce a private force for defense. This force consisted of former military officers, the Awami League militants and University students...students started to make bombs from the chemicals used in science laboratories...they made connections with EBR(East Bengal Regiment) and EPR(East Pakistan Rifles)...(Salik, p. 66). Qureshi (2002) in his book says the same that Yahya “individually ...appeared to be maneuvering for himself in the future set up” (Qureshi, p. 14). Salik (1997) points out that Indian involvement in the form of Mukti Bahini and “some armor comes from foreign country India”(P.66) are also evident. Qureshi (2002) also says that India took an active part first in creating gulf between Bengalis and non-Bengalis through its agents later, helped in the rebellion that happened on “25/26 March by Awami Leagues and their sympathizers in the Police and Defense forces with active Indian collaboration” (Qureshi, p. 33). Mujib was adamant on his Six Points Formula rather at the end he came up with a different draft that was acceptable not only to Yahya but to any Pakistani who wanted united Pakistan. That draft consisted of “two constitutional conventions and it was asked to make two separate constitutions one for each senate (East and West Pakistan). And then made these constitutions base for the confederation” (Salik, p.75).). But there is another group of writers in Pakistan who wrote against army. Hamid Mir (2013) in his article *Nasal to Naa Badli Geographia Badl Gia* says that army was involved in brutal killings. He says that General Niazi played the game of blood and gory in Dacca as his mind was “he would change the race of that illegitimate nation” and he did that in the East Pakistan. Mascarenhas (1971) also presents a very barbarous picture of Army who killed a numbers of civilians included not only the Hindus but also the Bengali Muslims “students, teachers, Awami League and left-wing political cadres”. He also mentions that the main targets of army were to sort out the impure (Hindus). The Bengalis with the Muslim names were the Hindus due to the influence of the Hindu culture on them. The general method of military shot was “after a short-arm inspection” either circumcised or not, killed them. Hassan Zaheer (1994) took a very different stance in his book *The Separation of East Pakistan: the Rise and Realization of Bengali Muslim Nationalism* (1994). He says that Mujib was resolute to make next constitution of the country based on Six Points as “none would be able to stop us framing a constitution on the basis of the six point programme” (Zaheer, p. 131). Some of the writers in Pakistan wrote with intention to bring the Bengalis’ allegation of exploitation on the part of the West Pakistanis to surface. They believed that in the beginning the separatist movement was very weak, but gradually grievances, either in the form of status of language, economic, political disparity added that made the situation worst and movement gained momentum in 1970, that culminated in the breaking of country. Afrasiab (2015) in his book, *Facts and Fiction* in answer to Tajammul Hussain’s quote neither Bengali Muslims nor Bengalis were welcomed/recruited in army, says that it was Jinnah who founded the East Pakistan Regiment. In 1955 when Ayub was GOC, he visited Dhaka University and urged students to join military but number of applicants from West Pakistan was greater than the number of applicants from EP. He says at the time of Partition 1947, there was no ICs officer from EP except Nurunnabi. So in order

to fill the gap, non-Bengali officers from the different provinces of WP were recruited. He is of the view that EP was given privileges in almost every field. He says that “EP was given preference over the West Pakistanis in the administrative services” (p. 63). Prior to 1947, there were industries in EP. Bengal, the world’s largest jute producer, did not have a single Jute mill in EP; all were in Calcutta (West Bengal, India). All industrial development took place during Pakistan period. As for as the seats in national assembly is concerned, Afrasiab (2015) says that in the first Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, EP was given 44 seats in total, while WP has $22+5+3+5=35$ in total. As for as power structure (1947-1958) of EP and WP is concerned, heads of the states from WP were 2 and same is the case with EP. Prime Minister from WP was 3 and from EP were 4. He further says that total number of members in Liaquat Ali Khan cabinet was 19: 13 from WP and 6 from EP and percentage of East Pakistanis was 31.2%. At the time of Khawaja Nazimuddin cabinet total were 15: 9 from WP and 6 from EP and the percentage of E Pakistanis was 40%. While at the time of M.Ali Bogra’s cabinet, total were 14: 9 from WP and 5 from EP. The percentage of E. Pakistanis was 35%.

The researchers in Pakistan follow different stance towards this traumatic event. In their article Aftab et al., (2021) conclude after comparative analysis of selective fictional works *End of Innocence* by Moni Mohsin, *Noor* by Sorayya Khan and *Of Martyrs* and *Marigold* by Aquila Ismail that “authors subjective voices politicize the process of historiography”. They affirms that there is no absolute historical account and 1971 war fictions are the only historical narratives that challenge the fixed categories of victim vs villain found in the conventional narratives from both Pakistan and Bangladesh. Waheed and Asif (2022) opine that the literature either literary and non literary written over the course of 1971 from both side “presents heterogeneous representations” they believe that a kind of nationalism created out in 1971, who fought for Bangladesh were called heroes in Bengal and rebels in Pakistan and vice versa. They also figure out how nationalist ideologies emerged and shape people’s emotions and identities. Another article by view the role of memory in shaping identity, a shift from history to psychology. This article also focuses on how the personal memory about a traumatic war is pen down into the larger collective memory of a nation.

1971 War: Myths and Realities (2022), researcher questions the exact toll of casualties as myth was created to justify each side of the war. Bangladesh put allegations of mass killing, rapes and torture on the part of Pakistan army while Pakistan call it out “exaggeration and denunciation” (Masood et al., 2022). They opine that all exaggeration pertaining to massacre, and rapes were “unrealistic”. Follow the new historicist lens the researcher draw comparison between literary and non-literary texts from both sides and concludes that these histories “present dissimilar and opposing national narrative about the whole event of 1971” (Danish & Ahmed, 2023). They uphold that things are manipulated and interpreted in certain ways to achieve desire interest within a single nation.

In his doctoral thesis Ahsan (2025) by comparative analysis of literary and non literary narratives, points out the issues that were put aside or forgotten completely in official documents for state purpose. This negligence of state towards these issues cause trauma of rejection. He used trauma theory as analytical tool to investigate the sideline issues kept in official documents. And Ahmad believes that literary sites are the only way where trauma reconcile.

Bangladeshi narrative on 1971

The Bengali literature deals with the exploitations on the part of the WP. It portrays the W. Pakistanis politicians were cleverer who only have interest in their power securing politics, who were not willing to hand over power to any Bengali. Bengali narrative began to appear soon after their so-called Independence. Almost all the Bengali Literature either fiction or non-fiction deal with the atrocities, killings and rapes by Army. Army is presented as brute, butcher, rapists and put more emphasis on the exploitation by West Wing as a way to justify their cause for liberation. But it did not mention the political situation which triggered Army intervention.

In Bangladesh, narrative is divided in to two groups. There were some Bengalis who were pro-Pakistani and wrote in opposite to the narrative that was dominant in Bangladesh and the rest of the world. In his book, *Behind the Myth of 3 Millions*, Chowdhury (1996) (a native of East Pakistan) presents a pro-Pakistani views about the atrocities committed by Bengalis and Indians in guise of Mukhti Bahini. He says that Sheikh Mujib's claim that 3 million had been killed and three thousand women were raped by Army is just a myth because they did not provide any proof of it. Maj. Gen. D.K Plait and Lt. Gen. Jagjit Singh Aurara who have hands in the creation of Bangladesh gave the figure of 1 million and Aurora pointed out that Mujib's figure was absolutely impossible because Pakistan army was simultaneously in war within a country and on boarder. Chowdhury gives examples of different wars who in spite of using lethal weapons, like USA waged war Vietnam, lasted for 12 years Afghan Mujahideen confronted Soviet occupation for 14 years, Anglo Civil War lasted for 16 years, Tamil separatist fighting for 13 years in Sri Lanka but casualties never exceeded 1 million. In figurative way, Chowdhury provides the logic that Nazi Germany killed six million Jews by herding them in "concentration camps and systematically gas them to death on a mass scale" (Chowdhury, 1996, p.18). But on the other hand 60,000 Pakistani soldiers were involved and to kill 3 million each soldier has to kill 50 persons and rape 5 women nonstop per day. This all seems ridiculous because even serial killers known in history have not succeeded in killing people at such a high rate. He further says that Mujib and his party made an inquiry committee to find the exact numbers of casualties and promised Tk 2,000 per victim family but at the end Mujib has to keep silence over the outcome of the fact finding as if it has never been attempted. The reasons behind it were that the result was less than the claimed figure and what happened to this inquiry committee is a secret up till now. Drummond (1972) reported that "about 2,000 complaints from citizens about deaths at the hands of Pakistani Army have been received" (p.29). Chowdhury also points the allegations about the rape of student girls by Army, he gives the reference of provost of Rukaya hall who told that girls left hostel when rumors of Army intervention spread. He also made a point that Mujib and his followers could not face the hard facts so they started spreading hatred against Islam and Pakistan through writers. So a number of books and articles were written by the atheists and the Hindus against Pakistan and Islam and they put they put false allegations on The Pakistan Army. Chowdhury highlights the brutalities of Awami League militants against non-Bengalis, Bihari's, and pro-Pakistani Bengali. They were killed for no reason but for supporting Pakistan. He quotes examples of a number of renowned people who were not only killed but their bodies were badly mutilated to make them sign of their brutality. He says the killing of 3 million is just a fabricated myth and is used to transfer this 'injured psychology' (p.72) to new generation. Chowdhury says that Bangladesh exaggerated the figure of killing on the behalf of India as, Robert Fick a 19th century German orientalist, point out Indian's habit of exaggeration. In making up numbers the Indians have always been very liberal

with zero, he provides statistical data that in 1993 Bangladesh International Institute of Strategic Studies showed that 800,000 people sacrificed their lives, and 11,000 soldiers on both sides were killed. A total of 50,000 lives were lost.

Another pro-Pakistani Bengali, M.T. Hussain (2006), is a teacher in East Pakistan Polytechnic Institute (now Dhaka Polytechnic Institute). He in his book, *Patriot-Traitor Question: Bangladesh Syndrome*, writes in a different way. He opines that Mujib was a true Patriot who for his “selfish ends” (p.6) turned into traitor. Then he drew a comparison between Mir Jaffer” the most despised one” (p.11) and Mujib “a puppet of Delhi in place of Company as Mir Jafar was” (p.12). Hussain (2006) says that Mujib had connections with RAW and he worked closely with RAW “for the secession of East Pakistan” (p.19) and made his country afterwards “subservient to India” (p. 8). Hussain also mentions Mujib and his son’s private forces, i.e. Rakhi Bahini that he used to suppress “alleged opponents” (p. 22). He also says that once Suhrawardy called him ‘illiterate graduate, if he comes to power, he will first destroy his country then himself’ (p.24). Same happened with him. He proved less efficient, he was only efficient in oration to mesmerize crowd not to run a country. Corruption, lawlessness, poverty prevailed in his reign. His own party became rich in overnight and killed those who were against him by his special force.

The granddaughter of the founder-secretary of the Awami Muslim League that later became the Bangladesh Awami League and daughter of a stern Awami League supporter, Tahmima Anam is a Bengali nationalist with strong political background. In her novel *A Golden Age* through a female narrator, Rehana Haque, Anam (2007) has portrayed the entire happening of the traumatic incident from March to December 1971 in East Pakistan. Like all other liberation war literature that has been written by pro Bengal writers, Anam (2007) has depicted the spoiled image of Pakistan Army. The common notion was that Pak Army committed genocide, as Bengali thought that “[t]his isn’t war. It is genocide” (p.79). At various places in the novel she mentioned the cruelties on the part of Pakistan Army, “They looted homes and burned roofs. They raped. They murdered. They lined up the men and shot them into ponds. They practiced old and new forms of torture...pioneers of cruelty...” (p.1129). She has presented the soldiers as lusty mongers, “a hunger in his eyes...he wanted something more...more savage...” (p.260), “...he looked at Maya-up, down- and licked” (p.259) his lips and they raped countless women. Her portrayal of army is, “waving their guns in the air” (p.252), as if it’s just a show of force” (p.252).

Islam (1974) in his book, *A Tale of Millions* is also of the same view that the Pak Army unleashed worst pogrom against his own people, they looted “a wide variety of other expensive items were looted from shops owned by the Bengalis” (p.172), killed where they go “a trail of death and destruction was left behind” (p. 171), kidnapped “young people were taken away to unknown places” (170-71), and raped “selected women were picked up and taken to the harems in army camps” (p.173). Not only this, they committed such inhumane activities whose example is not found in history. They extract blood from young people and used it for his soldiers. At one place he says that “the women were naked...one had a breast partially cut and the child was biting at it for milk” (p.177). Islam in his book says that Army was making preparations for ‘genocide’ (p.5) as he mentions “they will butcher us all” (p.5). The writer of ‘Politics and the press during 1971’ pointed out the atrocities by the Pakistan Army against the innocent Bengalis. This bloody incident forced 10 million to leave their homes, and caused massive destruction. The military was involved in ‘genocide’. He says that they killed 3 million and according to the World Bank Team, “East

Pakistani town Kusthia looked like a world war II German town having undergone strategic bombing attacksarmy terrorizes the population..” (n.d).

Anam (2007) talks about all the elements that are historically discussed as part of causes that led towards separation as, “West Pakistan is bleeding us out. We earn most of the foreign exchange, we grow the rice, we make jute, and yet we get nothing- no schools, no hospitals, no army. We can’t even speak our own bloody language!” (p.29). Islam (1974) follows the same, he not only highlights the East Pakistani grievances by their West counterpart but also tells how they were suppressed and keep Bengalis aside. He says that the history of the East Pakistan is full of betrayal, treachery, “mistrust and fatal mistakes” (p. 28). Whenever Bengalis rose for their legitimate rights, they were suppressed by force. They were exploited first by their British colonizers then by West Pakistani (Punjabis). In 1948, Urdu was made the official language, they demanded Bengali for EP, result was killings of Bengalis in 1952 in a protest for Bengali language, Ghulam Muhammad, a Punjabi, dismissed Bengali Prime minister Khawaja Nazim just because constitutional proposals were thought to be aimed at curbing Punjabi domination” (p.12). Iskandar Mirza introduced ‘One Unit’ formula which meant “permanent domination of the affairs of Pakistan by the Punjabis” (p, 13). Ayub gave a new system, Basic Democracy’ in which all the powers “vested in the president” (p.15). He also tells in his book that EP has not navy, and air force and at the time of 1965 war, EP was left alone therefore Mujib demanded separate army to secure its border.

Islam (1974) in his book *A Tale of Millions* is of the view that Yahya has the same intentions as his predecessors “to look after the interest of WP” (p. 19). Bhutto and Yahya knew that Mujib would not compromise on his Six Points. They involved in dialogue just to have time for “army to build up its striking force in EP” (p. 23). Army installment started from January. If Yahya wanted political settlement, why Army was installed there?

As Anam (2007) is writing on the part of Bengalis and favored Hindus, therefore she suggested that the Hindus and the Bengali nationalists were the victims of army’s brutalities because “it’s not safe for Hindus in the city” (p.72) and Army was “targeting Hindus” (p.72). Islam also follows the same that one of the main targets of military crackdown was “the Hindu populated areas in the old city” (p.74). By the end of the novel, Anam (2007) views war as if it causes deaths, but it gives salvation and freedom in return. She adorned liberty “How I love you, my golden Bengal...and today I will clutch my flag, hold my breath...” (p.274)

Western attitude about Fall of Dacca

On foreign level different views about the secession / separation of EP from WP is found. Number of writers emerged whose theme of writing was East-West Pakistan separation. Sisson and Rose (1990) in their book, *War and Secession: Pakistan, India and the Creation of Bangladesh* dig out the controversies, conspiracies and the circumstances that lead towards army action that resulted into the dismemberment of Pakistan with Indian intervention on 16 December 1971. They are of the view that seed of secession was sown long before in the time of A.K Fazal Haq in 1952, who in his Calcutta meeting made “emotional statements” (p. 13) concerning the inviolability of Bengali unity that was later conceived as “evidence of his secessionist inclination” (p. 13) Bahsahni also propagated the notion that if inequalities were not removed,” EP would be forced to separate from the Western Wing” (p.30). The political parties and army have the opinion that Mujib had started “a campaign of hatred against West Pakistan” (p.31) and this was the reason that army had started preparations for “military solution” (p.155) in the mid Feb, 1971. ICJ (1972) also points out that military leader had decided “Bengalis be frustrated by force of arms from achieving

autonomy...” (ICJ, P. 14) and military preparation and installment in EP started in the month of February.

Sisson and Rose (1990) highlight the intentions of three main characters, i.e. Mujib, Bhutto and Yahya. Yahya the martial law administrator was fully committed to hand over power to majority winning party and “the creation of new constitutional order and ... withdrawal of the military from power” (p. 25). Till the end Yahya was serious “to seek a negotiated settlement” (P.112). Yahya’s seriousness and leniency could be seen, he brought two parties on one table, even though both have stern demands “no compromise on principles” (p.56) and Bhutto notion that no constitution be made without PPP. Instead of Leagues lawlessness, army remained in cantonment. Yahya also said he has no issue on Six Points but asked for the consent of West winging parties as it was matter of whole country. But according to the report made by ICJ (1972), Bhutto and Yahya both have reservations about Six points. They write about Bhutto that he was mad about power, was not ready to sit on opposition benches, and wanted share in new government. They also point out that Bhutto was a clever politician who convinced Mujib that “military regime would never transfer power to a Bengali government” (p.71), use Indian hijacking and Mujib’s stance on this incident to take “effective measure” (p.76) and urged Pakistanis that Mujib had Indian inclination and lastly it was Bhutto who aroused Yahya that consensus on constitution must be done first because if constitution passed in NA, President have no right of veto. Therefore, delay in NA session is demanded in order to come on terms. It was that postponement that Awami league regards “conspiracy against the Awami League and the people of Bengal on the part of vested economic and bureaucratic interests in the West” (p.92) and launched province-wide *haartal*. ICJ (1972) also says that Awami League thought this postponement meant like “betrayal and as a proof of the determination of the army and of the WP authorities to deny them the fruit of their electoral victory” (ICJ, 15). Blood also says that Mujib called the postponement of NA session as “the long standing conspiracy to maintain Bangla Desh’s colonial status to continue” (p.157)

Menen (1972) in his article, ‘The Rapes of Bangladesh: The Rapes’ opines that soldiers were involved in sexual activities. To quench the thirst of their lust they raped a girl several times. Young girls even 10-13 years old had no exception of this brutal act. He mentions that “what do soldiers talk about in barracks? Women and Sex “what do they look for when they go out of barracks on liberty? Women and Sex”. He further says that sixty rehabilitation centers built for raped women. Similarly, Linton (2010) in her article, ‘Completing the Circle: Accountability for the crimes of the 1971 Bangladesh War of Liberation’, says that “sexual violence is used as a weapon of war” and army raped 200,000-400,000 women which lead to 25000 pregnancies. Andrio (2016) in his article ‘India’s Role in the Emergence of Bangladesh as an Independent State’, points out the brutal acts of army. It killed 3 million people, “raped over 300,000 women, destroyed homes and forced more than ten million people to leave their homes and took shelter in Indian territory” (p. 37). Bass (2013) also says that a kind of ethnic cleansing started and purpose was to purify Pakistan from anti- sate, anti-Pakistan, anti- Islam elements” (p.104). Blood (2002) in his book is also of the view that Hindus were the main targets of Army and they burned their temples.

Bass (2013) also highlights the pogrom on the part of army “found heavy traces of blood....the victims were Hindus” and the common notion that he observed there was “wherever the army is, you won’t find Bengalis”. He says the same that the Hindus were the victims of army’s atrocities as “large scale looting, pillaging and murder ...against Hindus and Bengalis” (p. 79). Bass (2013)

is also of the view that army unleashed the gory acts. On the night of 25 December, the city of Dacca echoed with the firing of guns, “burned huts and houses...killed a lot of people” (p.72). And according to him, ‘storehouse’ of the Bengali nationalists’ weapons was ‘scorched’ (p. 75). Blood (2002) in his book mention the presence of mass graves and execution of the EPR’s Bengali members.

One thing that Bass (2013) has mentioned in detail is the role of US, India and USSR in the civil strife of the East and the West Pakistan. US adopted the policy of Silence that it was Pakistan’s internal matter, stood behind Pakistan’s orgy of Bengalis’ bloodbath, and provided “F-86 Sabres..., C-130 heavy tanks...M-24 Chaffee light tanks, US jeeps. This all help was to make friendship with China and for the hatred with India. Bass (2013) tells in detail the role of India in the emergence of Bangladesh. Soon after the military crackdown, Bengalis started to move the West Bengal, India. India who was backing “total struggle for independence” (p, 121), colored the Army’s atrocities against the innocent Bengalis in India as well as in Western media in order to seek international support for war with Pakistan. As a benevolent neighbor India come forward, provided arms and ammunition, trained guerilla in war fare, helped through BSF. Bass (2013) mentions that Mrs.Gandhi was eager to start war in the beginning in April but the Indian army officers asked for the right time, that was winter. He also mentions the involvement of the RAW in this traumatic event. Bass (2013) at end says that Indian’s involvement in the EP on the voice of Mujib was not a humanitarian act. He also says that India was involved in this brutal act and Indian soil was used for training of guerillas.

Like Bass, Blood (2002) in his book, *The Cruel Birth of Bangladesh*, is of the view that “Yahya came across as very sincere” (p. 37) and committed to give maximum provincial autonomy but wanted “strong central government” (p.37). But Bhutto, as other writers (Sisson and Rose) have mentioned, was a clever and ‘unscrupulous politician’ (p.44). Blood (2002) says that Mujib thought Yahya as “partially sincere” (p.69) who in spite of imposing martial law, held fair election and committed to hand over power to elected party. He says that Mujib’s party was adamant to make constitution based on six points and “deny the PPP any part in the constitution making” (p.141); therefore, Bhutto refused to sit in NA. Yahya was in between the two. If he convened NA, then Bhutto who warned to launch a movement “from Khyber to Karachi” and if not started NA session, Mujib reaction would range from non-violent movement to declaration of independence. Therefore, by taking the middle way, Yahya postponed NA session “to give more time to political leaders to arrive at a reasonable understanding on issue of constitution making” (p. 154).

Indian stance on war of liberation 1971

Indians follow the same stance as Bengalis and depicted Bhutto and Yahya power lusty mongers and it was their lusty ambition to gain power that leads country towards dismemberment. It also points out the exploitations of the Bengalis in the hands of the W. Pakistani Punjabis. India also presents the reasons of its involvement in the EP crisis and that is for humanitarian cause.

Lt. Gen. Jacob (1997) in his book, *Surrender at Dacca: Birth of a Nation*, is of the view that socially, politically and economically exploited Bengalis developed nationalism long before and Mujib’s victory in elections 1970 was “ the strength of Bengali nationalism and the deep resentment against the social and economic dominance of the East by the West” (pp.31-32)

Jacob (1997) opines that both Yahya and Bhutto have cunning nature. Bhutto rejected Mujib’s Six Points and presented a formula to have a share of power with Mujib. Yahya who was negotiating with Mujib on one hand was installing Army in the EP on the other hand. On the night of 25

March, the Army well equipped with Russian PT 76 tanks, Chaffee tanks had to launch military crackdown as the only solution of problem. Ghosh (1983) in her book is also of the same view that Bhutto was not willing to hand over power to Bengalis as he said “Awami League by its brute majority would impose on Pakistan a constitution of its own making” (p.34). Ghosh (1983) is also of the view that Bhutto was a clever politician who used ‘patriotism’ as a tool to sentimentalize common people. He used Lahore hijacking case to arise people’s anti-Indian emotion to sabotage the negotiations.

In his book, Jacob (1997), he clearly discusses the grounds on which India intervened in the internal matters of EP. ‘On public outcry’ (p.35) to immediately intervene, forced India to pass resolution to transfer power to elected party. The number of refugees began to increase in India. India could not wage war with Pakistan because according to him, (a). Not prepared (b). Fear of China’s attack on India. Therefore, they delayed it till winter. Another important thing was to gain international opinion about war. He mentions that on 29 July resolution was passed ‘to help the Mukti Bahini’ (p. 42). During that period BSF helped Mukti Bahini. To train 100,000 freedom fighters, base camps were established. November was the right time when they started their activities there. They finally plunged into war on 3 Dec 1971, when “our air fields in the West were bombed by the Pakistan Air Force” (p.101). The Economic times in an article says that because of Pakistan’s attack on Indian airfields, India started war (Remembering the 1971 war, 2017). The article also mentions that Indians intervention was just for humanitarian cause because army’s genocide reached to an influx that people started to move in India. Ghosh (1983) has taken same stance about Indian involvement that “India did not engineer the developments leading to the military crack-down, rather it was after the bloodbath ...an element of deliberate planning entered into the Indian policy” (Ghosh, p. 256). But Saikia says that India took opportunity in the name of refugee’s influx and entered in to the territory of the EP.

Ghosh (1983) in her book, *The Role of India in the Emergence of Bangladesh* taking a pro-Pakistani stance and says that Pakistan’s fear of India is not without any reason because India has never accepted Pakistan by heart and it always desired “Akhand Hindustan” (Ghosh, p. 9). She says that movement for autonomy took concrete form after language movement and congress supported that movement. This movement “discarded the two-nation theory of Jinnah...found its ideology in Bengali nationalism” (Ghosh, P. 14). She says that the WP considered the Bengali language and culture as Hindu culture and un-Islamic. She says that the EP become “less anti-Indian” (p.20) and the WP thought that “Indian agents had established full control over the political developments of the region” (p.20) and Mujib’s Six Points were considered a conspiracy to establish “a greater sovereign Bengal under Hindu domination” (p.20). She mentions that the EP has anti American sentiment as Pakistan was making military with USA; it was for the WP only. She mentions army and navy has less number of Bengalis. Indian tension with Pakistan began to increase due to Pak-USA alliance. Ghosh (1983) presents a very interesting point made by Yahya. If India had refugee’s problem, why it did not ask for it? This matter could be solved with dialogues. There was no need of war for it.

In contrast to other Indian writers, Bose (2014), in her article, ‘Anatomy of violence: analysis of civil war in East Pakistan in 1971’ talks about the violence committed by the Awami League insurgents against the non-Bengalis. She highlights White Paper’s estimation about the death toll that “worst loss of life” occurred during this tragic event. She is of the view that the political situation deteriorated, therefore Army had to intervene to disarm “disloyal Bengali personnel in

police and army”. In her article she rejected the western narrative written against Pakistan to spoil the image of the Pak-Army. She figures out the atrocities by insurgents “slaughter of a very large number of Bihari-men, women and children...on March 27-28” and also mentions that after killings, dead bodies were dumped into river. She also gives the clue of Indian trained guerillas who after training in India returned with the aim to disrupt situation.

Saikia (2011) in her book *Women, War and the Making of Bangladesh*, logically put forward that all blame of separation of the EP can't be put on Pakistan. We are in the hands of 'received histories' which make people blind and they commit violence in the name of this so-called nationalism. Previously Muslims of sub-continent propagated the notion of religious nationalism and got separation in 1947, later people of the EP developed Bengali nationalism based on linguistic difference, because Bengali were living as colonized under the authority of the Urdu speaking Punjabis. Like Bose, Saikia (2011) says that unlimited atrocities were committed against the non-Bengalis by the Bengalis because they believed them to be the WP compatriots and to kill those means to take revenge from the WP for their grievances.

Saikia (2011) writes from feminist stance and says that women, land and nation are one unity that is used and torture more during war. She says that it was women who suffer a lot in a man dominated society. It was women on whom power was shown. And it was the body of women that become place of torture. She is of the view that both Pakistani and Indian Armies committed sexual violence against women. Rapes were associated with army.

Theoretical framework

New Historicism is a critical approach that believes that all works of art literary or non-literary are studied and interpreted within the context of author's historical time period in which text was written and place literature within the broader historical context. Not only the author's life and historical background of the text affect it, but critic also deeply influenced it. Critic responds to the text according to his own cultural, socio-political and psychological beliefs and color the text according to this believe system. New Historicism is a 'critical practice not a doctrine' (Schmitz, p.159) based on not only the historicity of texts but also the textuality of history' (Louis Montrose). New Historicism pioneered by Greenblatt, based on the principle of critical methodology of interpreting texts that 'all texts, whether they are literary or non-literary are cultural artifacts' (Kacmaz, p.53) and cannot be interpreted in isolation.

Greenblatt was the one who coined the term, 'New Historicism' and used it for the first time in his *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (1980). But Louis Montrose gave the more explicit definition of New Historicism. He gave the core concept of New Historicism 'historicity of the text' and the textuality of history'. He diminishes the boundaries between literary text and history. Historicity of texts means the "social embedment of all modes of writing" and the textuality of history means "have no accesses to a full and authentic past, a lived and material existence" (Montrose, 1989, p.20). In other terms textuality of history is actually constructedness of history, reality is constructed through author's skill of power of representation. This representation conjoins national, linguistic and religious boundaries. He also believes that historical textual traces are mere subjects from which other histories are constructed.

Greenblatt is of the view that cultural/ social energy circulates through literature. He wrote a number of books and articles on New Historicism. In his *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (1980), he suggests that "fashioning of identity...is primarily a product of social institutions" (Dogan, p.85). Identity is a constructed, less autonomous and artificial entity. He is of the view that 'fashion' was

a term that was widely used during 16th century and it had multiple meanings. The term means representation of one's nature or intention in speech or actions. When we talk about representation, literature comes into our mind where characters are fashioned (fashion other's identities). Identity is culturally fashioned, there is no free choice, as "human subject itself...unfree, ideological product of relations of power in a particular society", (RSF, p.256) whenever have free choice then still it is "among possibilities whose range was strictly delineated by the social and ideological system in force (RSF, p.256). He also poses that art is not autonomous rather "written word is self-consciously embedded in specific communities, life situations, structures of power" (RSF, p.7). Nothing is pure, total, and autonomous. Everything is fashioned and constructed, like, language, literature, identity, actions and even self.

Discussion`

New Historicism posits that a historian lives in a society, everything that exist around him affect him (Tyson,). He has his own prejudices, biases and historical accounts are written from the "point of view of those who wrote them" (Ardian, p.19). The writing produced as an outcome of this is 'subjective' not 'objective'. It means that history is a constructed discourse, comes as a result of writer's intention. It is not a record of facts that was previously thought about it. Montrose's 'textuality of history' implies the notion of constructedness of history and Greenblatt says that "to construct is an imaginative act" (p. 27). It means that history like literature is an imaginative process "things made, composed, fashioned" (Greenblatt & Gallagher, p. 28). New Historicism has close affinity with Deconstruction notion of aporia i.e not center, not fixdity. There is not total reality. Reality is constructed. New Historicists believe that reality is constructed through author's skill of "power of the concept of representation" (p.32) and representation conjoins national, linguistic and religious boundaries

The history of separation of East Pakistan is very conflicting. Years have passed but reality of what happened and who was responsible for this heinous crime is still hidden. A very opposite narrative about this trauma exists. India, who was the great alliance of this separation and western media who turned against Pakistan just because of army's effort to banish them from this cauldron of hell to safe heavens Pakistan, composed stories to defame West Pakistan and Army. As Churchill says 'history is written by Victors', very contradictory narrative about this gruesome event of 1971 is present all over the world. Greenblatts (2000) is of the view that nationalism "generated most of histories (p.37) filled with the sentiments of jingoism/ nationalism, Bengalis put forward such histories that made them right in their cause of liberation. They added those things that were of their use and missed those who could spoil their image. As history writing become matter of selection, and omission. And it is on the choice of writer who wrote it. As far as India is concerned, who won the war, how can it be possible, anything that can spoil Indian image prevailed in their narrative? They presented themselves as 'benevolent neighbor and whatever they have done, done for humanitarian cause while an image of butcher is portrayed for Pak Army who killed millions and raped thousands. As a result, very confusing and controversial history come into being.

General Tikka Khan in his interview to the Newsweek on 10 April, 1972 said" to this day the world still believes we started everything. This is a complete distortion of history...Mujib wanted a showdown. During the struggle that followed, the Bengalis exaggerated their causalities by a thousand percent or more. Mujib says there were 200,000 rapes. A Roman Catholic Organization which the press has chosen not to quote, come up with a figure of 4,000. We have been the victim

of a propaganda machine" (Ahmad, p. 83). The narrative that is written in Pakistan is based on the notion that Mujib was adamant on his six points, Yaha and Bhutto tried to convince Mujib, but he had a support of Indian Army and Intelligence Called for rebellion, made his *de facto* government in East Pakistan and with the help of Indian amours and Indian trained Mukti Bahini, killed innocent non-Bengalis (pro-Pakistanis), raped and finally in December through open combat with India, got separated. The Pakistani historian hold the stance that militants started killings, loot and rapes on such a large scale in the month of March that military intervention became mandatory. They praised Tikka Khan as "extirpated the treacherous elements" (n.d). On the other hand, the Bengali, Indian and Western stance is very much different. They hold the belief that Bhutto put pressure on Yahya to postpone NA session, because he himself wanted a share of power with Mujib. Therefore, he did not accept his Six Points. Yahya had the same intention to stay on power. India and Bengalis proppogated the notion that dialogue among Bhutto, Yahya, and Mujib was just to consume time for military preparation (Islam, 1974), because if Yahya had real intention of transferring power to Mujib, army was not being installed in Dacca in the beginning of January. A very ambiguous narrative exists. No one knows what is right and who was responsible for that tragic act.

Follow a neutral stance, this study discusses certain points of contradiction (representation of army, political condition, and rapes) that exist in dominant writings (i.e. nationalist Bengali, Indian and foreign literature) and compare it with Pakistani text, *Blood and Tears* (1974) by Aziz.

1. Image of Army (Killings)

As a true Bengali nationalist, Islam had hatred against Pakistan because of the indifferences that WP continued against them. Islam was a freedom fighter and fought along with Bengali Army against its rival colonizers i.e. West Pakistanis. He portrayed Army as butcher who were making preparations for "a genocide" (Islam, 1974, p.5). He says that Pakistan history is stained with the bloody clots of Army. Anyone who came to power, tried to secure the interests of their Punjabis. Iskander Mirza, Ayub and Yahya did the same. As he was freedom fighter and has severe enmity with WP, he depicted the acts of Army as of beasts who committed inhume activities against their brethren Pakistanis. On the night of 25 March, 1971, "Army killed about thousand Bengali soldiers indiscriminately. Killed anyone within the range of their weapons" (Islam, 1974, p. 66). At another place he says that killing and raping were done on a competitive basis" (Islam, 1974, p. 172). To spoil the picture of army more, he put severe allegations on Pak Army that it was specially trained by foreign experts who trained them on the line of 'American green berets' whose acts of bestiality horrified the whole world" (p.24). As "literature... is an ideology" (Eagleton, p. 28) and history is like literature, it has the connotation of ideology. History is a tool through which historians/ writers propagate their certain ideologies. And as Greenblatt says that history and literature are alike "things made, composed, fashioned", (Greenblatt, p.28). In the same way writers fashioned or fabricate certain things just to propagate certain ideology. Here the dominant narrative ambition was to spoil the image of Pakistan Army through writing in order to gain world support for their cause of Liberation. At one place Islam went beyond his senses and says that victims were brutally slaughtered by the Army "eyes were taken out and skull broken to take out brains. Men did not slaughter even their animals in that cruel manner" (Islam, 1974, p.244).

Jacob (1997) in his book follow the same view and pouring out his internal psyche (inborn hatred with Muslims) as New Historicism posits that author's psyche is nurtured by the dominant ideological forces of powerful structure of the time. Hindu-Muslim antagonism had become an

internalized psyche of every inhabitant of sub-continent and it is this psyche that unconsciously comes on the surface. Jacob says that Army equipped with Chaffee tanks, Russian PT 76 tanks, 25 Sabre jet fighters unleashed atrocities on a large scale that forced 9 million people to leave EP and took refuge in India. Mascarenhas (1971) is also of the same view that army started a reign of terror against Bengalis and most particularly against Hindus, as their enemies. Army had started an ethnic cleansing with the aim to clean EP from 'impure' (Hindus). He presented army as butchers. Villages become deserted on seeing army.

On the other hand, a very different picture has been portrayed by Pakistani nationalist, Aziz. He is of the view that the Awami League militants started a reign of terror, killed, raped non-Bengalis, especially men. They established sex cells and slaughter houses, where they did such inhumane activities whose example is not found in history. Orders were given to militants "to drain out blood from their non-Bengali victims in the slaughter-house before slaying them" (Aziz, p. 51). At another place he says that "all the victims of this bloodlust were non-Bengali" (Aziz, p. 56). Worst brutalities were witnessed on the part of the Awami League militants, "EPR supervised the hordes of thugs and hoodlums who worked as executioners and vampires in these human abattoirs for the liquidation of the non-Bengalis" (Aziz, p.99). In contrast to dominant narratives, Aziz presented Pak Army as "the federal troops were kind to us" (Aziz, p. 130)

The comparison of both types of narrative, i.e. pro Bengali and pro Pakistani, shows that a complete contrast about the same incidence exists. If one portraying Army as evil to spoil its image before the world to gain sympathy, other who belonged to it depicting it as savior and put allegations of brutality on militants.

2. Political Condition

Islam (1974) in his book, *A Tale of Millions* is of the view that both Yahya and Bhutto were cunning and had lust for power. They knew that Mujib would not do compromise on his Six Points, as it was public property; they continued dialogues with no satisfactory conclusions. He says that on one hand Yahya kept Bengalis engaged in dialogues, but on the other hand, began to install army in Dacca, in the beginning of January. The dialogues were just to consume time needed for "Army to build up its striking force in EP" (Islam, 1974, p.23). When military preparations were done, they launched military crackdown to usurp power from Bengalis. Islam (1974) also mention the exploitation of Bengalis by WP and says that whenever Bengalis rose for their rights, they were called "enemies of Pakistan, agents of India" (Islam, 1974, p.16) and their demands were suppressed by the use of the force, i.e. the language issue, the Agrata Conspiracy to defame Mujib, Six Points were rejected and show off power in the form military action). Jacob in his book, *Surrender at Dacca: Birth of a Nation*, is of the same view that Bhutto and Yahya both had clever nature.

Bhutto wanted a share of power with Mujib and therefore he rejected Mujib's Six Points' formula. And Yahya who was negotiating on one side, was installing troops in East Pakistan secretly. Mascarenhas in his article, 'Genocide' mentions that Punjabis who ruled there since partition were not willing to hand over power to a Bengali. And "the army backed them up" in their cause. It unleashed atrocities against Bengalis as a 'final solution' for the East Pakistan crisis.

Aziz holds a very different position. Aziz highlights the evil intentions of Mujib. Mujib on one hand was involved in Constitutional dialogues, with Yahya, but violating and breaking the law on the other hand? "From 16-23 March... Awami League continued to operate its parallel administration and trained cadres in the use of automatic weapons at a number of training centers

in Dacca...” (p.18). Supply of food and killing of army personnel started, situation of the province deteriorated to an extent that one of the foreign newspaper wrote that” Sheikh Mujib took the province to the edge of secession” (p.17). Mujib himself was a cunning politician who instead of showing leniency in constitution making progress, flare up the emotions of Bengalis by his fiery speeches” accused West Pakistan of looting the wealth of EP” (p.229). Mujib’s own demand to make East and West two sovereign states with weak center also meant that” Sheikh Mujib’s virtually independent Bangladesh could have shaped it any time he wished to do so” (p.20). Aziz also mention a clue of continuous help from across the border. Aziz says that “rebels were using a transmitter in the Indian diplomatic mission in Dacca for round-the-clock...who were giving support to the rebels” (p.20)

The comparative analysis of the two sides shows another sign of contradiction. Indian and Bengalis literature put allegations of political failure on Bhutto and Yahya as both were power lust men. They put more emphasis on Yahya and Bhutto’s position but did not mention Mujib’s secret activities, (seeking help from India and making the situation of the country worse, in order to pull it into civil strife). Aziz posits his point of view in sharp contrast to opposite narrative.

3. Rapes

Jacob and Mascarenhas have not mentioned rapes by Pakistan Army. But Rafiqul Islam in book, *A Tale of Millions* presents Army as insane rapist, “women were naked- one had a breast partially cut” (p.192) and at one place says that “selected women were picked up and taken to the harems in army camps...” (p. 173)

Aziz presents a very sharp contrast and says that it was the Bengali militants who used sexual violence to terrorize its victims, i.e. non-Bengalis. There is no mentioning of rapes by Pak-Army in Aziz’s. Aziz narrates the story of a female victim: “our clothes were stripped and we were marched in nude to school building where our captors ravished us” (p.141)

Conclusion

This critique challenges the notion that history is not a chronological objective sequence of recorded facts, rather constructed discourse through which collective identities are re-imagined. The tragic event of Fall of Dacca, 1971 is very confusing, contradictory and controversial. A body of literature either fiction or non-fiction, historical and critical narratives have been written by Pakistan, Bangladesh India and by western writers but they achieve it by using selected words, personal choices and their own ideological upbringing and the political climate of that time. New Historicism believes that anecdotes, / historical texts are not real rather reality is fashioned through different representational modes. This reality is fabricated by ‘power of representation’. When a writer depicts something, his own intention, biases, psyche, and ideological forces that nurtured him, unconsciously poured out in his writing and the result is subjective history not objective. The comparative analysis of *Blood and Tears* and books from pro-Bengalis/nationalist or dominant narrative shows that history is made according to their own perceptive. The thing that is found in one side is completely opposite to what is found in other side. The dominant Indian, Bengali and foreign literature did not mention the evil intentions of Mujib who was involved secretly in secession, while they put more emphasis on the brutalities committed by Pakistan army. Their main purpose was to defame the Pak army just to gain world’s sympathy.

References

- Ahsan, Md Firoz Mahmud. "The trauma of rejection: contemporary literary encounters with the 1971 Bangladesh war." *HKU Theses Online (HKUTO)* (2025).
- Aftab, Asma, Aamer Shaheen, and Fareena Aslam. "Alter (Narrating) The Story of Nation: The Fluidity of 1971 War Narratives in Anglophone Pakistani Fiction." *Pakistan Social Sciences Review* 5.4 (2021): 791-803.
- Afrasiab. (2015). *1971: Facts and fiction: views and perceptions in Pakistan, India and Bangladesh*. Lahore, Pakistan: Makhdoom Printing Press (pvt.) Ltd
- Anam, Tahmima. (2007). *A golden age*. New York, USA: HarperCollins publisher
- Aziz, Qutubuddin. (1974). *Blood and tears* (1st Ed.). Victoria Chambers, Karachi: Publications Divisions of the United Press of Pakistan Ltd
- Bass, Gary. J. (2013). *The blood telegram: Nixon, Kissinger and a forgotten genocide*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf
- Bhutto, Zulfikar Ali. (1972). *The great tragedy*. Karachi, Pakistan: Pakistan People's Party
- Blood, Archer K. (2002). *The cruel birth of Bangladesh: memoirs of an American diplomat*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: The University Press Limited
- Bose, Sarmila. (2014). *Anatomy of violence: analysis of civil war in east Pakistan in 1971*. Retrieved from: <https://defence.pk/pdf/threads/anatomy-of-violence-analysis-of-civil-war-in-east-pakistan-in-1971.297110/>
- Bose, Sarmila. (2011). *Dead reckoning: memories of the 1971 Bangladesh war* (1st ed.). London, UK: Hurst & Co. Publisher
- Chowdhury, Abdul Mu'min. (1996). *Behind the myth of three million*. London, UK: Al-Hilal Publisher Ltd.
- Danish, Ehsanullah, and Munawar Iqbal Ahmed. "PLURALITY OF HISTORIES: NATIONAL DISCURSIVE NARRATIVES ABOUT 1971 WAR."
- Eagleton, Terry. (1996). *Literary theory* (2nd edh). UK: Blackwell Publisher
- Ghosh, Sucheta. (1983). *The role of India in the emergence of Bangladesh*. Calcutta, India: Minerva Associates (Publications) Pvt. Ltd
- Greenblatt, Stephen & Gallagher, Catherine. (2001). *Practicing new historicism* (paperback edition) The University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Islam, Rafiqul. (1974). *A tale of millions*. Dacca, Bangladesh: Adeyebros & co
- Ishtiyaque, Farah. "Suturing the memories of the liberation war of 1971: the narrative poetics of Sorayya Khan's Noor." *European Journal of English Studies* 19.3 (2015): 301-314.
- Jacob, J.F.R. (1997). *Surrender at Dacca: birth of a nation*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: The University Press Limited
- Jie, LIU, Yong-hui, MA & Xiao-juan, YAO. (2014). Power, subversion, and containment: a new historicist interpretation of the Virginian. *US-China Foreign Language*. 12 (7), pp. 614-619
- Kokab & Hassan. (2017). Success of Bengali separatist movement: an assessment of Ayub Khan's leadership. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 8 (2), pp. 93-103
- Mascarenhas, Anthony. (1971). *Genocide*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbgr1971.org/files/SundayTime/GenocideAnthonyMascarenhasDocx.pdf>

- Menen, Aubrey. (1972). The Rapes of Bangladesh: The Rapes'. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/document/137075930/The-Rapes-Of-Bangladesh-Aubrey-Menen-New-York-Times-Jul-23-1972>
- Mir, Hamid. (2013). *Nasal to Naa Badli Geographia Badl Gia*. Retrieved from <http://www.currentaffairspk.com/hamid-mir-column-facts-of-dhaka-fall-1971/>
- J.F.R. Jacob. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J._F._R._Jacob
- Remembering the 1971 war: When India won and Bangladesh got liberated
Retrieved from <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/remembering-the-1971-war-when-india-won-and-bangladesh-g-liberated/articleshow/62094109.cms>
- New historicism. (n.d.). In UBC wiki. Retrieved May 20, 2018, from http://wiki.ubc.ca/Course:ENGL211/New_Historicism
- New historicism. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.enotes.com/homework-help/what-difference-between-old-historicism-new-73643>
- New historicism. (n.d.). In Wikipedia. Retrieved May 22, 2018, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Historicism
- Qureshi, Hakeem Arshad. (2002). *The 1971 Indo-Pak war: a soldier's narrative*. Karachi, Pakistan: Oxford University Press
- Raja, Khadim Hussain. (2012) *A stranger in my own country East Pakistan 1969-7*. Pakistan: Oxford University Press
- Raj, P Prayer. (2015). Fashioning text and context: a study on new historicism. *An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal*, 2 (1), pp.212-216
- Raj, P Prayer. (2015). Text/texts: interrogating Julia Kristeva's concept of intertextuality. *An International Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal*, 3, pp.77-80
- Raman, B. (2007). *The kaoboy of raw: down memory lane*. India: Lancer Publishers LLC
- Saikia, Yasmin. (2011). *Women, war and the making of Bangladesh: Remembering 1971*. Korangi Industrial Area, Karachi: Oxford University Press Pakistan
- Salik, Siddiq. (1997). *Witness to surrender*. USA: Oxford University Press
- Schmitz, Thomas A. (2007). *Modern literary theory and ancient texts (An-Introduction)*. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishing
- Sisson. Richard, Rose, Leo E. (1990). *War and secession: Pakistan, India and the creation of Bangladesh*. University of California Press: USA
- The Events in East Pakistan, 1971: A legal study by the Secretariat of the ICJ (1972)
- Tyson, Lois. (2006). *Critical theory today* (2nd edh). New York, London: Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group)
- WAHEED, SADIA. "Delegitimizing Bangladeshi Narrative of Victimhood through Alternative Narrative of Bose in Dead Reckoning: Memories of the 1971 Bangladesh War."
- Zaheer, Hassan. (1994). *The separation of east Pakistan: the rise of and realization of Bengali Muslim nationalism*. Karachi: Oxford University Press