[1]The Mound of the Dead: Origins, Memory and Monument

Ms. Soni Kar

> All history writing, we are frequently reminded, is premised on the present. Pasts become meaningful and usable only when they are activated by the contemporary desires of individuals and communities, and, most powerfully, by the will of nations. – Tapati Guha Thakurta[1]

Bearing this in mind, read this:

> I am the dancer
> Of Mohenjo-daro.
> For five thousand years,
> I have tread
> This slippery path:
> Khun Khun
> Khun Khun...[2]

Here is something similar:

> We have been Sindhis for 5,000 years, Muslims for 500 years, and Pakistanis for only 40 years. Sindh does not fit into an Islamic Pakistan. – G M Syed [3]

I begin with a quote from Tapati Guha Thakurta because it seems closest to the programme of the New Historicist study. It rephrases one of the arguments in Greenblatt's essay 'Resonance and Wonder' that resonance is an attempt

> to reflect upon the historical circumstances of their original production and consumption and to analyze the relationship between these circumstances and our own....a dense network of evolving and often contradictory social practices.
>
> to situate the work in relation to other representational practices operative in the culture at a given moment in both its history and our own
>
> to disclose the history of their appropriation [4]

My attempt is to see how these insights of reading a text in history and in our own times and examining its representational practices can be made productive in the context of claiming the monument and artefacts of Mohenjo-daro as the authentic Hindu and Sindhi Hindu site. As I have planned it, the New Historicist mode of study has made me ask the right kind of questions: What does it mean to resonate with the remains from the past? What does one do with such 'cultural artefacts'? Why and when does one claim them? What does it say about our present and, not necessarily, our past(s)? This paper would try to use these insightful questions from the New Historicist mode of study and see what kind of possible answers they tease out from [2]our 'great' past. This is an attempt to investigate the power relations surrounding some interesting claims on the Indus Valley Civilization. This is a small experiment in working with one of New Historicism's agendas:

> We need to develop terms to describe the ways in which material – here official documents, private papers, newspaper clippings and so forth – is transferred from one discursive sphere to another and becomes aesthetic property. [5]

This paper is a gesture to connect these insights with another phenomenon – a phenomenon that has recently emerged as a response to the presence of the images of the artefacts and the monument of Mohenjo-daro. What follows is an account of these responses 'circulating' in popular culture – largely on websites and in magazines.

It is interesting to note the features of the mediated access to these artefacts and how the representations of these artefacts differ from the times of their origin and our times. How are these objects appropriated and why? I choose to discuss these artefacts because I want to study the ways in which a section of a community resonates with them and thereby seeks to appropriate them. What are the prevalent conditions that lead to such acts of resonating and claiming?

One finds these images on several websites related to the Sindhi community. If they are not found on the home-page, they are found on a special page that claims to be a summary of the history of Sindhi community, its roots and its culture. When one encounters them for the first time there, one wonders, "Have I seen them somewhere?" As one navigates further on these websites, one realizes that these websites are trying to claim them as the history of the community. What follows is a brief summary of such accounts.

The most important claim is that Sindhis are children of one of the most ancient civilizations of the world. Of course, the reference is to the Indus Valley Civilization. India, according to these accounts, was originally called "Sindhustan". One account says:

> "The longest of three great subcontinental rivers is the Indus, *now in Pakistan, then Sindh*." (my italics). [6]

What is striking about these accounts is this statement – that there was Sindh in those days, now there is Pakistan. Also interesting is the jump not only around national boundaries but also a claim on what *was* then, and what *is* now. It is further said:[3]

> ...the people of the Indus are the products of unnumbered historical permutations and combinations, the fusion and clashes of fifty-five centuries of civilization. [7]

The terms 'Sindhi' and 'the people of the Indus' are made to seamlessly switch and flow into each other. A further support comes from the reference to the Mahabharata:

> The Aryans in Sindh virtually the Indus Valley are mentioned in history of having played role in the battle of Hastinapur when King Jaidrath took his army to support the Kurus. [8]

Then comes a note of drastic change:

> The Sindhis ruled Sindh till they were defeated and conquered by the Arabs in the seventh century. *And from that time onwards, they played the role of refugees* (my italics). [9]

Also interesting is this attempt at history writing:

> After Raja Dahir in 7th Century, The Great Sindhi Hindu – Seth Naoomal Hotchand Bhojwani (1804-1878)
>
> 'He was the richest Sindhi Hindu who had established 500 business centres all around the world. So much so that he had attracted the attention of even Queen Victoria of England. Sindhi Muslim rulers of Sind could not tolerate his name and fame and to take revenge on him, kidnapped his old father Seth Hotchand, and tried to convert him to Islam. But they could not do so due to the influence and money power of Seth Naoomal. They were even warned by the Hindu rulers of Kutch and Rajasthan. By that time, the Britishers had finished the rule of Muslims in the whole of India. Seth Neomal knew the whole history of Sind and the atrocities of the Muslim rulers against Sindhi Hindus. He drew the attention of the Britishers to these atrocities and requested them to liberate Sindhi Hindus. With his help, the Britishers entered Sind, defeated Muslims, and liberated we Sindhi

> Hindus. Seth Naoomal, after that, wrote in Sindhi, all his bitter experiences. Now, Naoomal has been named as the 'traitor of Sind' in Pakistan and also by our Sindhi Hindu writers such as the late Gobind Malhi, Uttam and Kirat Babani and their shallow followers. For the first time Lal Pushp has raised his finger by questioning: Was Seth Naoomal a traitor or Are Sindhi Muslims and Malhi-Uttam-Kirat traitors?' [10]

In order to substantiate the claims of close association with Hinduism, this villainizing of the Islamic past becomes necessary to the discourse of such 'summaries' of 'history'. As expected it moves towards the right/right-wing direction:

> 'Though they are refugees driven away from their home, they are again with their own Aryans who had spread out in parts of the country. The *brother Aryans* kept the banner of Sindh alive by including their identity in the National Song and recognizing as a positive community whose future lies in recovering the land of [4]their birth and supporting the country as they did in the battle of Hastinapur.' (my italics) [11]

What one witnesses is a systematic way of proving the authenticity of the brotherhood with the Aryans. It begins with establishing the roots of the Sindhi language as Sanskritic or pre-Sanskritic:

> 'The history of Sindhi is older than that of Sanskrit and its related civilization or culture are derived from the civilization or culture of Sindh and from the Sindhi language. *Sanskrit is born of Sindhi* – if not directly, at least indirectly.' (my italics) [12]

And Scandivian scholars are quoted:

> 'The language (that of Mohenjo-Daro) is an early form of Dravidian, called by us 'Proto-Dravidian'. It appears to be very close to the South-Dravidian, especially Tamil, and decidedly younger than the parent language of all Dravidian tongues.' [13]

So here we find an attempt at tracing origins to Sanskrit or even to say that Sindhi is older than Sanskrit. Of course, this fails to acknowledge that even if this claim is true, the Sindhi we speak today is drastically different from the language that would have existed then. In this light, the Islamic influence on the language is considered a corruption. The current practice of writing in the Arabic script is considered wrong. One also finds references to Ram Jethmalani and Lal Krishna Advani in the list of great Sindhis. One website has Jethmalani's speech. This is a look at what he has to say. Some excerpts:

> 'In about 300 and odd years before Christ, the Great Alexander landed on the bank of the Sindhu River and there he met our ancestors. Our ancestors are known to history as the Gymnosophists.
>
> Remember also that God is an all-loving Universal God.... We Sindhis live on that philosophy. We are not great ones for religion....there is no higher religion than that of the Sindhi [5]Hindu based as it is on the highest ideals of Sanatan Dharma which constitutes the very root of Hinduism.' [14]

Thus there is this constant attempt to connect the history of the community with that of the 'Aryan brothers'. Equally interesting is the reference to Bhagwan S Gidwani's novel *The Return of the Aryans* about the possibility that the Aryans did not invade India; they only came back here after their adventures abroad. Now this novel has been used to substantiate the claims about the origin of the Sindhi community and its relationship with Hinduism:

1. The Birth and beginning of Hinduism took place in Sind, along the Sindhu river, prior to 8000 BC.
2. It was a man from Sind who first uttered the auspicious 'OM' mantra and devised the salutation of NAMASTE.
3. The 'SWASTIKA' seal and symbol originated in Sind to spread the message of 'Daya, Dana and Dharma'.
4. It was Sindhis from Sind who discovered the routes to Ganga, Dravidian Bangla and other regions in 5000 BC; and civilizations of all these regions, then, came under the spiritual guidance of Sind.
5. It was a Sindhi – he was known as Sindhu Putra – who 7000 years ago was acknowledged as Mahapati in the Ganga region to indicate his spiritual supremacy over Gangapati (ruler of Ganga region). Sindhu Putra was also recognized as the Periyar (supreme authority) in Dravidian regions.
6. The ancient name of Bharat Varsha was given to India to honour the memory of Bharat who was the 19th Karkarta (supreme chief) of the Hindu clan in Sind in 5000 BC.
7. Sindh had a profound influence on the Rigveda, doctrines of Karma, Moksha, Ahimsa and Dharma and also on pre-ancient roots and the lofty ideal of Sanatana Dharma.
8. All this should be treated as alternative history.
9. It should be noted that Bharat Varsha of 5000 BC formed with Sind's guidance,was far more extensive than the present-day territory of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh.

> 10. [*The Return of the Aryans*] is presented in the form of a novel, in the interest of wide readership, which a pure historical text is unable to achieve. [15]
>
> Much of the memory of Sind's ancient culture remained alive till 8th century AD when Arabs, under Mohammed Bin Qasim, conquered Sind. Raja Dahir Sen, the last Hindu Sindhi King died on the battlefield. For centuries thereafter, our culture remained suppressed, our books were burnt, our temples were destroyed, our idols were smashed, and even to speak or write about our culture earned the penalty of torture, death, or forced conversion. As it is, the majority of the population of Sind was forcibly converted to Islam. Many, through those dark centuries, lost much of the knowledge of our roots and ancient culture, for it was forbidden even to whisper about it. [16]

It is clearly stated that statements like the above are being brought to the community's knowledge because ignorance 'would rob the younger generations of the community of self-esteem and the respect due to them from other communities.'

That was a brief account of what is being said in terms of identity of the community and its attempts at writing about the past.

So when I look at the monument of Mohenjo-dro, I experience wonder. One is impressed with the scale of its existence, the beauty in the ruins that promise to survive, the riddles and mysteries of its origin. When one moves on to resonance, one attempts to imagine what the people of the city were like, what they wore, what language they spoke and how they lived. However, one also experiences a disruption in this movement when one hears, "This is your ancestral land. The people who belonged here were your ancestors." This is not an attempt to generalize and define who is a Sindhi and who is not. This is not a claim to pin down the identity of the community. This is only to register discomfort with the ways in which a cultural continuity is being established across different stages in the history of Sindh. The glorious civilization, then the birth of Hinduism, then the Dark Ages of the Islamic rule, then the respite in the form of the British rule and finally, the Partition which uprooted the community, but also reunited it with its "Aryan brothers".

My contention is that such a cultural continuity is too simplistic. It does not account for the phenomenon that the Sindhi way of life, its culture, its language as existing during the Partition, is the immediate past the community has left behind or is carrying with itself now. This is not a directive to mourn the loss but an attempt to state the logical and the obvious. To take a huge leap from the post-Partition scenario back to the Mohenjo-daro civilization and claim origins from that point in history is to deliberately ignore the intervening phases because those phases are not in alignment with the present. Equally interesting is the absence

of any reference to Buddhism especially in the light of the excavation of a stupa at Mirpurkhas in Sindh.

Rita Kothari has done an interesting study on this:

> They tend to believe that Sufism was a fringe phenomenon and mild version of Islam created to entice Hindus to Islam (Relwani, adhwani, personal interviews). At a broader level, it leads to the view that only Hindus are the rightful inheritors of India and that the Muslim was here on sufferance. This historical falsification and a rejection of what has been Sindh's tolerant syncretic tradition has far more serious implications... [17] [7]

[8]Before we dismiss the claims on the Indus Valley Civilization as non-serious, as mere nothings floating around in popular culture, let us look at these gestures in some of post-Partition Sindhi poetry as well. Some of these poems aptly demonstrate the construction of identity at large, and the ways in which it is influenced by otherization. We now look at some selected voices in Sindhi writing (available in translation) to explore how different Sindhi writers reflect upon the past of the community as a whole – as a gesture of trying to get integrated into their 'now' nation. The intention here is also to further contextualize the claims on Mohenjo-daro in the recurring patterns in the articulation of their feelings about Sindh.

Interestingly, the Sindhi diasporic situation engages with the projection of history in terms of its impact upon the self, by addressing the various junctures in history that have been very instrumental in defining the self, largely in the sense of the collective self or communitarian issues. We would see how some of Sindhi Partition poetry resonates with the notion of the individual/collective self as that of a minority unit and a refugee, and therefore, fractured. The attempt here is to scrutinize the question of the past and present on the lines of time – the concept of identity as it manifests itself in 'evolution' – how certain milestones in what is now considered to be history define, erase and redefine the perception of the self. As pointed out earlier, these milestones have been assumed seamlessly – from the Indus Valley to the Partition. It is to a large extent consistent with the model of traces or layers of identity, rather than Stuart Hall's idea of multiple identities, since the attempt as it reveals itself in poetry in the tropes of nostalgia and memory overpowers any exploration of multiple selves. Such an articulation of/about the self problematizes representation as presented in narrative structures. The genre of poetry (poetics, at large) is crucial to this agenda.

Terence Cave brings out the tripartite relationship between genre, identity and representation very strongly when she suggests:

> The narrative structures displayed by poetics are not a mere form inhabited by moral and other themes, any more than personal identity is a particular body inhabited by a consciousness. They are rather a model of the processes by which we seek to comprehend that which borders on the incomprehensible. Fictional narratives present the awkward couplings of experience non-analytically, holistically, and – once again – in all their cultural and historical particularity. Poetics tries delicately to probe those couplings without reductively separating them. [18]

The suggestion of the incomprehensible through narratives is a brilliant venture into the comprehension of history too when it charts out the personal element in history:

> ...the notion of a poetics [is] bound up, in several senses, with history; a poetics which is itself an identifying structure. What it identifies in a given fictional narrative is primarily a mode of experience in its relative distance from our own; but that identification can in its turn provide a co-ordinate which may help us to locate where our own values lie, how they are constructed and how they may warp and fall apart or just prove inadequate. Poetics is in this sense inseparable from the many-sided question of identity, and shares with law, philosophy, [9]anthropology, and history the responsibility of attempting to understand that question.
>
> The strength of poetics does not lie in its generalizing power, in its capacity to produce an invariant model transcending all particulars. It lies rather in its ability to identify the distinctive individual properties of fictional narratives, and consequently their infinitely varied embodiment of poetical human experience. [19]

Let us examine the implications of Cave's suggestion. It reflects upon a praxis of literature, and thereby of politics, in terms of the general and the individual. What we explore now needs to be seen in the context of this possibility of understanding identity and identity-poetics as an experience that cannot be analytically presented in numerical form – the self's as against the community's. It would be very unproductive to look at certain kinds of assertion of identities as "true" or "real". The attempt here is to identify such an absolute identification of the self in Sindhi poetry but it is in no way intended to debunk all of Sindhi writing and all the possibilities of (contesting) Sindhi writing as predominantly absolutist.

The speaker in Prem Prakash's "Bhagati" proclaims: "Inheritor of the Indus Valley I am" [20] and points out a strong gesture towards identification of the self, which contrasts with the identity of being an Indian in India because of internal displacement. This suggestion of internal displacement highly problematizes the concept of nation and belongingness. The strong attempt to identify themselves as the primordial Indians because the roots of Sindhi

identity (it is claimed) lie in the locations of Harappa and Mohen-jo-daro - which brilliantly position Sindhis as original Indians - also estranges them in the nation-state of India because they have not been residing originally in the land that is now the nation-state of India. Sindhi identity is therefore problematic because it comes from outside the boundaries and yet maintains and claims psychological and historical continuity with that phase in history. What problematizes the situation further is that India as a nation-state too claims the Indus Valley Civilization to gesture towards her origin and yet, distances Sindhis as migrants or refugees. The idea of space becomes a powerful site of contest between history and location, if understood that there is no escape from intersections across time and space. In his essay "Sindhi Literature of the New Century", Prakash argues on the same lines:

> Sindhi civilization as well as the life-stream connected with it since centuries together is a continuous journey. It is also a known fact that the Sindhis are the inheritors of the civilization of Sindhu Valley. Excavations of Mohen-jo-daro and Harappa establish that Sindhu civilization was at its sublimity about seven to nine thousand years ago. [21]

[10]This Sindhiness, according to Prakash, is strongly Indian and therefore, Sindhis are Indians:

> It would not be right to understand Sindhi civilization (and Sindhi life also) by its own specific characteristics by segregating it from Indian civilization, because earlier, Sind and Sindhis were part of the Indian sub-continent, and after the Partition of 1947, Sindhis would have had their own province; even otherwise when Sindhis are without their own State, they are Indians. Indian civilization itself is a combination of all civilizations together. Therefore, it is not possible to understand 'Indian civilization' in isolation from 'Sindhu civilization'. The base of Indian civilization is accepted to be Sindhu civilization. Aryans too found their abode first on the backs of the Sindhu river. There itself the world's most ancient scripture 'Rig Ved' was written. The names 'Hind' and 'Hindu' originate from Sind and Sindhu. [22]

Such a strong claim towards essential ownership and belongingness leaves no scope for rethinking identity and other explorations in ideas of belongingness. Perspectives (on Sindhi identity) like this consistently interrogate the idea of representing identity in terms of an a priori Pakistan and thus, the articulation of affect towards it. Further, there is also a claim towards some sort of cultural purity:

> Sindhi character or the character of the people of the Sindhu Valley can be described thus: They are a very cultured lot, full of human values, fond of nature and surroundings, sober, polite with dignified behaviour, having full faith in their unique rites and rituals. . . .Sindhu civilization was impressed

> by Buddhism, Islamic culture, Sufism and then by other Indian cultures and the Sindhis kept on changing themselves. Sind was the first province of the then Indian sub-continent which was always to be the first victim of attacks by outsiders. Sindhis had no other option but to absorb the political, cultural and religious forces of Aryan, Arabian, Islamic and then the British invaders. For this reason, the genetic identity of Sindhi society went on decreasing collectively. [23]

Such a definition of Sindhi identity takes an essentialist stand on the formation of Sindhi identity. Prakash contradicts his very own stand of identifying Sindh with India when he later calls India "the unknown land":

> Sindhi community was mercilessly and cruelly hurt and uprooted by the Partition of the Indian sub-continent in 1947, whereby their own motherland Sind was snatched away, as a consequence of which they faced inhuman cruelties of migration, bloodshed, slaughter and separation of dear ones etc. There is no account whatsoever of such atrocities anywhere till today. Such a flourishing community was displaced from its own native soil and thrown to an unknown land, in a totally new environment and amidst unknown people. Their present had become past for them. From then onwards till this moment, Sindhi life is passing through a very dangerous and unsafe phase. [24]

This oscillation between Sindhiness and Indianness shapes the question of Sindhi identity in terms of a binary opposition that has to occupy only one of the either positions. The problem arises again when Prakash says: "When Sindhis were in Sind, it was a different story of having faced attacks, atrocities and influence of other communities, but, it was a totally different experience to live in exile after Partition with no one to take care of them" since he does not indicate his basis of perceiving continuity in various episodes of attack by several invaders and how *somebody* took care of the community in Sindh. Prakash acknowledges that Sindhis have been used to movement because of "maritime commerce" but does not draw upon that experience as a historical precedent of movement during Partition. This assumption of being transcendental as opposed to the people belonging to specific places in India where Sindhis chose (or were forced) to migrate is questionable. Prakash addresses the 'other' of the Sindhi community, that is the whole of India(ns), as the "local people" for whose benefit Sindhis constructed buildings. Such pointers towards the categorization of the others becomes invisible, as we shall see later, when it comes to being seen as refugees by the 'majoritarian' Indians. What is of immediate relevance here is that Sindhi identity, according to Prakash, is characterized by internationalism and everywhereness, but it quickly 'degenerates' into 'rootlessness' and 'landlessness'.

Against this background, what follows is an understanding of Sindhi identity claiming Sindh as its just location and thereby finding itself to be minoritarian and refugee in India. The problem begins with the onset of Partition:

> Once this was heaven;
> now every heart bleeds in this hell.
> Is it my land, or the land of my enemies?

and indicates a deep loss:

> even I have been buried alive
> homeless in history's graveyard.

The other(s) also works towards a sense of solidarity towards one's own community:[11]

> Life and limb is Sindhu, for she alone is Mother.
> Only our people can be our own, alien are the others. [26]

The arrival in India is largely an extension of this loss of belongingness. The status of a refugee, if it is a 'status' at all, figures in such vulnerable situations and also when the self notices itself to be unwanted. The metaphor of mother was also present in the discussion of space. These lines indicate how the process of understanding the new land is similar to the understanding of the world to an infant. And, this is how the episode of deterritorialization would affect Sindhi identity for generations to come:

> Our youngsters
> When they ask
> Of our sons and daughters
> Who were our elders
> How were they
> Our children
> After thinking a while
> Will answer with heavy hearts
> We don't know from which country our elders came
> Where dropped their tongue
> What they wrote you can't read
> Their songs you can't sing
> Seems neither were they your elders
> Nor are you their young ones. [27] [12]

The use of family is remarkable again to generate a sense of attachment/estrangement.

After this quick run-through, it becomes easier to critique the notion of identity as it appears in the fragments quoted above. Fred Dallmayr says: "...identity [is] the work of an ever renewed creative praxis, a praxis mediating between convention and invention and between past sedimentations and imagined possible futures" (in Baral and Kar, 14). This helps us address the absences in Sindhi writing in a much better way to scrutinize the simplistic positions upheld by writers like Prakash. Dallmayr's position could be seen as an extension of Cave's as he points out more explicitly the connection between both identity and narratives as texts – each a praxis on its own discursive level. His position is also similar to that of Stuart Hall in that he (Hall) addresses the relation of the fluid nature of identity and identity as a process and a becoming. It is precisely such a complex understanding of identity as always in motion that seems to be absent in Sindhi writing. And also, to reiterate, it in no way undermines the freedom of expression of Sindhi writing at all, or else the model of 'minor' literature that is used to understand Sindhi writing would prove to be contradictory if the latter is dismissed as a waste and repetitive. Though stands similar to that of Prakash cannot be denied, they cannot, in any way, be seen as representative of the entire community and therefore, need to be discussed categorically.

The essentializing of Sindhi culture does not allow for exploration of that very "creative praxis" in terms of exploring other ways of connecting with society and the other individuals and communities. By submitting to essentializing, such an articulation about the self does not consider other possibilities of being (and becoming, of course) and gives way to chauvinism. Rita Kothari seems to investigate this problem when she analyzes the influence of Hindutva on the political affiliations of Sindhis and their religious practices; an instance of which arises in Sindhis' participation in the Godhra carnage (2002) and the 1969 riots in Gujarat:

> While the Sindhis of Gujarat show no desire to accept the Muslims, they in turn remain rejected and marginalized by the mainstream Hindu Gujaratis who think of the Sindhis as 'dirty', 'shrewd' and 'Muslim-like' people. Was the Sindhi hatred for the Muslims a result of this marginalization? ....Were the Sindhis of Gujarat retaliating for their sufferings during Partition and settling old scores, so to speak? Or had living in Gujarat created communal tendencies in them that had hitherto not existed? Was their newly acquired Hindu identity a result of their efforts to shed their sense of stigma? [13](Kothari, xvii)

Any encounter with the mainstream community (like the Gujarati Hindus) is seen as predominantly pressurizing and universalistic. To quote Dallmayr again:

> In [such a] confrontation, the idea of "universalism" often serves as a camouflage for particular hegemonic ambitions – ambitions which tend to be resisted on the part of nonhegemonic societies or cultures through a retreat into nostalgic (and essentialized) forms of parochialism, communalism, or ethnocentrism. One exit route from this (potentially violent) clash of identities – route favored by some postmodern thinkers – is the strategy of constructivism, a strategy which negates or "deconstructs' all existing identities in favor of contingent fabrication (in Baral and Kar, 27). [14]

The gesture towards Hindutva and loss of syncretism are merely two instances of growing parochial attitudes of the community towards the self. Also interesting is the other avenue that Dallmayr suggests as a more productive approach towards hegemony and that is the postmodern turn, the recognition of "contingent fabrication" in the process of identity formation, which is absent because of essentialization of Sindhi identity. Further, Chanchala K. Naik elaborates that "the postmodern critiques of subjectivity" see "individual identity (as) a myth and an illusion ....conflict-ridden, often self-deluded fundamentally opaque to themselves, and let alone able to master" (in Baral and Kar, 68). On the contrary, Sindhi identity in the words of the poets discussed above, seems to be a concrete ground for expressing grief over the loss caused by the partition – an act of conscious choice, very legitimate in its concerns, but it does move beyond, and locates the self in the recognition as refugee, as somebody leading a "Number Two" life, as the inheritor of the Indus Valley. It is quite difficult to account for a representation of what Sindhis have left behind even in second or third generation poets but examples like that of Babani do exist to make space for other ways of identification.

Moreover, imagining the self in the community across generations involves a dialectic of its own. Naik discusses Hernadi in this context:

> Hernadi argues that memory and imagination – the directedness of belief and desire toward a postulated past or a hypothetical future – affect the individuals who do the remembering or imagining. Mutual awareness that two or more persons share certain memories often leads to reciprocally constitutive impact on the ongoing formation of each separate self. Therefore, the self is historical and is both constituted by and constitutive of a community.[15]

End notes

1 Guha-Thakurta, 2004
2 Makhija et al

3 Pal, 2008
4 Karp and Lavine, 1991
5 ibid
6 http: // www.jhulelal.com/history.html
7 ibid
8 ibid
9 ibid
10 ibid
11 See 9
12 http://www.sindhishaan.com/articles/whoissindhi.htm
13 ibid
14 http: //www.jhulelal.com/sindhi-articles/Sindhi-civilization-universality-of-all-religions.html
15 Summarized from http://www.jhulelal.com/sindhi-articles/roots-of-Sindhi-civilization-glory.html
16 http://www.jhulelal.com/sindhi-articles/roots-of-Sindhi-civilization-glory.html
17 Economic and Political Weekly July 8-15, 2006 3013
18 in Harris, 1995
19 ibid
20 Abhichandani, 1998
21 Ibid
22 ibid
23 ibid
26 Makhija et al
27 Ibid
13 Kothari 2007
14 Baral and Kar 2003
15 Ibid

Works cited

1. Abhichandani, Param (ed) *Indian Literature: Accent on Sindhi Literature* No. 187: Sept-Oct, 1998 Vol XLII No. 5
2. Cave, Terence "Fictional Identities" in *Identity* edited by Henry Harris New York: OUP, 1995
3. Dallmayr, Fred "Social Identity and Creative Praxis" in *Identities Local and Global* edited by Kailash C Baral and Prafulla C Kar Delhi: Pencraft International, 2003
4. Danta, Bijay "The Race for New mythologies: Travelling identities in Postnational Discourses" in *Identities Local and Global* edited by Kailash C Baral and Prafulla C Kar Delhi: Pencraft International, 2003

5. Greenblatt, Stephen "Resonance and Wonder" in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display* edited by Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press: 1991
6. Guha-Thakurta, Tapati *Monuments, Objects, Histories: Institutions of Art in Colonial and Post-Colonial India* Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004
7. Kothari, Rita "Sindhis: Hardening of Identities after Partition" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol 39, No. 35 (Aug 28 – Sep 3, 2004)
8. Kothari, Rita *The Burden of Refuge: The Sindhi Hindus of Gujarat* Chennai: Orient Longman:, 2007
9. Makhija, Anju, at. al (ed) *Freedom and Fissures: An Anthology of Sindhi Partition Poetry* New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1998
10. Naik, Chanchala K "Identity and Social Self" in *Identities Local and Global* edited by Kailash C Baral and Prafulla C Kar Delhi: Pencraft International, 2003
11. Pal, Pratapaditya *Sindh: Past Glory, Present Nostalgia* Mumbai: Marg Publications, 2008
12. Prakash, Prem "Sindhi Literature of the New Century" in *Indian Literature* No. 195 Jan-Feb 2000 Vol. XLIV No. 1