

Pakistan – India Political Relationship as Portrayed in Amitav Ghosh’s “The Shadow Lines”

William Kertha Adi Tama¹, Atikah Ruslianti²
Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia^{1,2}

Abstract: *India and Pakistan have been known as two big countries in South Asia that have a very long history of rivalries since the British colonization ended their reign in the Indian subcontinent in 1947. In the cold war era for example, India and Pakistan recorded four military engagements and countless espionage activities between them. This rivalry has been caused by many factors, and one of those deciding factors lies in the collective identity and national identity that the two countries possessed. This study aims to analyze how the novel “The Shadow Lines” written by Amitav Ghosh, portray the contribution of collective identity and national identity to establish the political relationship and rivalry between India and Pakistan from the perspective of political, socio-cultural, and economic using the concept of nationalism by Frantz Fanon and Imagined Community theory by Ben Anderson. This study found that the political relationship and rivalry between India and Pakistan is indeed affected by collective identity and national identity within the domains of political, historical, economic, and socio-cultural condition both in pre-independence to 1947 onward.*

Keywords: *India, Pakistan, Political Relationship, Rivalry, Collective Identity, National Identity, Novel*

Introduction

The rivalry between two or more states is one of the most common phenomena in the history of mankind as hundreds of countries, states, and even Empire and Kingdoms in the past and present are having this kind of phenomenon. The reasons for the rivalry between countries in history is very varied as some were limited contests for trade as it can be seen in the United States and People’s Republic of China, while some others were epic battles to death between the world’s big guns. Some of the fiercest rivals of yesteryears eventually became staunch allies today which took a few hundred years and a whole lot of wars to work things out (Muir, 2022).

The most common example of rivalries between countries are acknowledged until today such as England and France who were at war for seven hundred years long before they became a strong ally after both of them disputed in many conflicts such as Hundred Year War, Seven Years War, and Napoleonic Wars. Other examples can be found in the rivalries between The Habsburg and The Ottoman Empire, Denmark and Sweden, The Venetian and The Genoese, and Mughal Empire with Safavid Empire.

¹ Correspondent Author E-Mail: williammuller677@gmail.com – atikahruslianti@unj.ac.id

On the more recent period, there are even more rivalries between the countries in the world where for example, the world have witnessed the clash of the giants between United States and Soviet Union during the cold war, and even it is ended in 1991, the war on ideology and political domination still happened between these countries where Russia is replacing the collapsed Soviet Union as one of the big guns in the world today. In this case, it is very important first to know the essentiality in the rivalry between countries.

A rivalry is the state of two people or groups which engage in a lasting competitive relationship is the “ against each other “ spirit between two competing sides. In more conceptual terms, a rivalry can be understood as a perceptual categorizing process in which actors identify which states are sufficiently threatening competitors where in order for that rivalry to persist, rather than resulting in perpetual dominance by one side, it must be “ a competitive relationship among equals “. John. A. Vasquez, a political scientist, argued about the quality of power which is a necessary component for a true rivalry to exist, but others have disputed that element.

In this case, it can be argued that Rivalries between nations can induce the people to compete over naval armaments, foreign aid, cultural influence, and athletic events. The rivalry in each case is occurring with the context of the competitors having labeled one or more of their adversaries as worthy of particular concern and attention.

India and Pakistan’s rivalry is the example of the most common countries rivalry in history. Although the rivalry between these two states is not as old as the other country, it is very significant in creating the political atmosphere in South Asia along with Bangladesh. History has recorded the competition between India and Pakistan since both of them were released from the British’s colonization in 1947.

There are many factors that lead to the rivalries between these countries which led to the four wars between them in the second half 20th century. As mentioned before, the rivalry between the countries can be seen in many forms and India and Pakistan’s rivalry can be traced back to hundreds years back in history where the collective identity is the source of the conflict between them even until today.

Firstly, India and Pakistan were founded on very different bases. According to Gowher Rivzy in *South Asian Insecurity and the Great Powers*, he stated that the rivalry between India and Pakistan, to a large extent, is embedded in the structure of the relationship between two states.

While no conflict is ever inevitable, the handling of the problems by the leaders of both countries, many people viewed India-Pakistan relation as a “ zero sum game “, where the gain of one is seen as the loss of the other, which is also ensured that the rivalry persists just like Vasquez stated, and it has become deeply ingrained in the politics of India and Pakistan. The rivalry is too deep-rooted either to disappear easily or to be capable of a rational solution, at least now.

Since 1947, the most common conflicts and disputes that happened in India and Pakistan’s rivalry is about territorial disputes over the Kashmir region where this reason alone, resulted in two big wars between them in 1947 and 1965 and even the conflict in Kashmir is still going on today. In this sense, it is obvious that both countries feel that Kashmir has been part of either one of them for a long time using their own version of history and collective identity.

The issue of the political relationship and rivalry between India and Pakistan have been an interesting topic to discuss especially in the field of political and international relation as Hussain (2019) described about the existing literature regarding the relationship between India and Pakistan which can be found in the works made by Arthur Michael, Undala Alam, Majed Akhter, and many others. But, to capture another perspective toward the issue, the literature world has its part too on depicting the political relationship and rivalry between India and Pakistan as it is also realized in non-fiction historical literary works. One of those literary works is the novel titled “ *The Shadow Lines* “ written by Amitav Ghosh, one of the most prominent post-colonial writers which also became the corpus for this paper.

Therefore, This study aims to find out how the political relationship between India and Pakistan is established using the perspective of collective identity and national identity. To achieve that goal, the writer decides to use Frantz Fanon’s concept of nationalism and Ben Anderson’s concept of Imagined community by using the scope of socio-cultural, politics, and economics.

Literature Review

Collective Identity and National Identity

The term collective identity, according to Snow and Brown (2015) can be understood as the interaction between two or more actors which minimally requires that they be situated or placed as social objects which in order to do so, is to announce or impute identities. Hence, Snow and Brown, explained that the interaction among the individuals and groups as a social object in the community is very contingent on the reciprocal attribution and avowal of identities which they elaborated about the existence of the process which holds for both individuals and collectivities, and it probably has always been a characteristic feature of human interaction.

In this matter, there are what are called Social identities and Personal identities. Social Identities are the identities which attributed or imputed to others in an attempt to situate them in social space, typically in established social roles or in more broader and more inclusive social categories, while Personal identity on the other hand are the attribute and meaning attributed to oneself by the actor as they are formed in self-designations and self-attributions which regarded as personally distinctive.

These two concepts of identities are connected to what is called collective identity but yet, still typically overlapping and interacting constructs. Snow and Brown elaborated that collective identity has what is called as the shared sense of ‘ one-ness ‘ or ‘we-ness ‘ which is anchored in real or imagined shared attributes and experiences among those who comprise those collectivity and also in relation or contrast to one or more imagined set of ‘ others ‘.

This also shows the distinction between collective identities, personal identities, and social identities, because collective identities have three unique features which are : that collective identities may or may not be embedded in existing social identities, since they are often emergent and evolving rather than firmly rooted in prior social categories. This is often correlating to the case with the collective identities that emerge in the course of dynamic social protest events, The second one, the collective identity shared a sense of togetherness among the individuals in the community is animating and mobilizing cognitively,

emotionally, and sometimes even morally the emergence and operation of collective identities means that other social identities have subsided in relevance and salience for the time being.

Jalal (1996) stated that, one of the main aims of the collective identity which he discovered was to rectify the bias of elitists by restoring to the subordinate or using Gramsci's term of 'Subaltern' social groups for their subjectivity in the making of their own history

In times of shifts in decision-making processes, of the formation of new groups of solidarity across the state borders, increasing migratory movements, and other aspects, the solidarity binding the demos together is under huge pressure. Conflict and outside pressure tend to intensify collective identities, and individuals tend to take on their collective identity as their "imperative status" which overshadows other identities that existed.

Frantz Fanon's Nationalism Concept

In one of his famous book, *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon elaborated about national consciousness which he argued, instead of being embracing crystallization of the most innermost hopes of the whole people and also instead of being the immediate and most obvious result of the mobilization of the people, will be in any case, only an empty shell, a crude and fragile tapestry of what it might have been which Fanon argued could lead to the retrogression process that is so harmful and prejudicial to national effort and national unity which became one of the most difficult thing in the newly formed state.

Ben Anderson's Imagined Community

Ben Anderson in his book titled '*Imagined Communities : Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*' stated a definition of a nation as 'an imagined political community that is imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. In his opinion, a nation also acts as a fabrication that serves the bond between people that did not actually exist prior to its own recognition. Anderson also believes that the nation is imagined because members of the nation don't know most of their compatriots but still have a communal image which in other world, Anderson argues that nation is built based on the recognition of commonality, not itself

these nations and imagined communities are sovereign because the concept was born when Enlightenment destroyed thoughts of divinely-ordained legitimacy and hierarchy and also, these nations are defined as a community because the nation is conceived as a deep fraternity between people and the nation is based on this fraternity, not the shared characteristics that may have created this fraternity in the first place.

Methodology

This study uses a descriptive analytical method to analyze the dialogues and narrations from the novel "The Shadow Lines" which was written by Amitav Ghosh. Besides that, this study is also using a qualitative method. The descriptive qualitative interpretative method is a method that uses data in the form of words and pictures. The qualitative and descriptive analytical method are applied in this research because the objective of this study is to find out how the novel is portraying the issue of political relationship and rivalry between India and Pakistan from the perspective of collective identity and national identity, particularly traced back from 1947 through the setting, narrations, and dialogues from the novel that highlighted

the issues the writer choose in this study. The data that are used as mentioned before come from the narrations and dialogues from the novel.

The selected data will be analyzed using the concept and theory of nationalism conducted by Frantz Fanon to finds out the correlation between the collective identity and things that followed it such as political, economy, and socio cultural in India and Pakistan in shaping the political relationship between those states while correlating it with the theory of Imagined community by Ben Anderson.

This study attempts to find out how the post-colonial literature captured and portrayed the political relationship and rivalry between the countries which in this study, the writer focuses on India and Pakistan. There are several steps that were done to collect data in this research:

1. Search about nations Political relationship and rivalry
2. Search about collective identity and national identity
3. Determine the corpus (the novel) that indicates the topic of political relationship and rivalry between the nations
4. Identify the narrations, settings, and dialogues that shows the collective identity of India and Pakistan that related to political relationship and the rivalry between them.
5. Identify the narrations, settings, and dialogues that show the national identity of India and Pakistan that are related to political relationships and the rivalry between them.

The technique for data analysis in this study comes in several steps as explained below:

1. Classify the narrations and dialogues from the novel that represents the collective identity of India and Pakistan
2. Classify the narrations and dialogues from the novel that represents the national identity of India and Pakistan
3. Analyze those collective identity and national identity that are found in India and Pakistan as portrayed in the novel using the approach of Frantz Fanon's nationalism and Ben Anderson Imagined community theory while relating those components' contribution in shaping the political relationship and rivalry between India and Pakistan.
4. Interpret the data analysis.
5. Draw a conclusion.

Findings & Discussion

India's Political and Socio-Cultural Condition

It has been known for many years that India is one of the largest multi-ethnic countries in the world where it has become a home for billions of people coming from different backgrounds. The creation of cultural diversity in India has not happened in short times, but rather in a very long time in history since the first civilization in India existed. In this discussion part, the researcher wants to finds out how are the condition of India's political, economy, and socio-cultural condition through history with focusing more on the historicism of India in 20th century, particularly on the events on national independence movement, 1947 partition, to the rest of second half of 20th century as portrayed by the novel.

First of all, the portrayal of the novel “The Shadow Lines “ about India’s condition in terms of economic, political, and socio-cultural condition is very clear as Amitav Ghosh points out some important things to analyze regarding the issue. First of all, in terms of politics, Indian people have already had their own nationalist party back in 1885 with the name “All Indian National Congress which founded by many important people in India from many backgrounds, which particularly came from Islam, Hindu, Buddhist, and Sikh’s practitioners. At that time, the whole Indian subcontinent was dominated under The British Rule for almost three hundred years now. It is not easy to overcome the differences between so many cultural backgrounds in India in attempting the independence and freedom from the British, but, since the late 19th century, many philosopher, poets, politician of India have gathered what is called as “ the original culture “ of India in many various form such as clothing, folktales, and others as the base foundation of Indian nationalism and also act as their own identity, despite there were also tension between religious practitioners in India who wants the better for their groups which in this case, can be considered as the imagined community.

Besides the original culture, the politician who sits on the congress also coined the term “ Jai Hind ” or can be translated as ‘ long live India “ as the slogan for political meetings. The term Jai Hind was firstly coined and introduced by Indian nationalist, Abid Hasan in 1907 which the use of this slogan became massive from time to time alongside what is called as “ Hindustan Zindabad “ or “ India Zindabad “. Amitav Ghosh has portrayed this in this line:

“For the first, and almost certainly the last, time the celebratory slogan ‘Central Intelligence zindabad!’ rang out on the street of an Indian city. “ (P.164)

In this case, it can be argued that this kind of slogan serves as one of their collective identities that can unite all people of India even until today. These slogans were also used by many Indian leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi, Indira Gandhi, and Jawaharlal Nehru. But, on the other hand, the use of India zindabad or Hindustan zindabad can be considered controversial particularly since the partition of India happened in 1947.

Besides the nationalist party, the movement of India independence also happened underground, where there were some radical movement in that time as Amitav Ghosh stated in these lines in the novel :

“Tridib, who had been listening intently, told me a little about the terrorist movement amongst nationalists in Bengal in the first few decades of this century: about secret terrorist societies like Anushilan and Jugantar and all their offshoots, their clandestine networks “ (P.28)

Now, another thing that can’t be separated from the Indian nationalist independence movement and also became the foundation of Indian political life is Gandhi’s philosophy of how India’s government philosophy should be which he described in his four philosophies. First, Gandhi wants India to be not considered as a nation, but as a big community. He argued that a proper nation should consist of people who have the sense of being part of a community which is realized in what is called as “ the fusion of the people “ which was coined by Ernest

Renan. The fusion of the people can be interpreted as Gandhi's effort in uniting cultural diversity of India under one flag which in reality his idea was not welcomed by every nationalists in that time. It's also implying that India will be a secular nation after independence.

Second, Gandhi wants to accommodate the relationship between religion and language as the concept of the nation where he encouraged the Lingua Franca of India as the substitution of English language. But the problem is, Indian people speak many languages in their daily lives and to deal with that, Gandhi argued that every people in India should learn each other languages where for example, a North Indian people should study at least one South Indian language and vice versa, a Hindu should study Urdu, Arabic, and Persian language, a Muslim should try and learn Sanskrit, so on and so forth. This also shows that language has become one of the most important components in creating the collective identity and later the national identity by imposing the national language of India. Gandhi even tried to harmonize the Hindi and Urdu language as two of the most spoken languages in the Indian subcontinent with the new name "Hindustani" which he did not find success but at least, some parts in India today used Hindustani as their language.

Third, Gandhi thought that the All Indian National Congress is very essential in accommodating the nationalist movement of India because this political party has been successful in gathering the people from all parts of India as mentioned before, the congress itself was founded by many people who came from various backgrounds in India. To make the public aware of the importance of All Indian National Congress by making the analogy of Naoroji, Gokhale and Taiyebji which came from a various background consist of a Parsi, a Hindu and a Muslim, respectively. By highlighting this trio, Gandhi indirectly substantiated his claim of the accommodative character of Indian civilization as well and evaluated the merits and demerits of its extremist and moderate factions like in the novel, Ghosh portrays the Bengali nationalist and radical movement who contributed to Indian national movement.

And finally, Gandhi is criticizing the politician, lawyers, and many educated people in India in that time who is only thinking about their own interest, exploiting, deceiving and oppressing the people at large in the name of the nation and the reality is, this phenomenon is something which already happened and still going on in present times in many post-colonial states including India.

At this point, it can be argued that many nationalist thinker in that time wants to harmonize the cultural diversity in India under one flag, one collective identity, and one national identity by the act of fusioning those elements of Indian culture which became the face of Indian today as one of the largest multi-ethnic country in the world. But still, in the midst of national movement in India against the British, there are some people who is not satisfied with the plan of unified India which in this case, comes from the Muslim community who feared that they can found themselves becoming the minority in the newly founded Indian nation as in that time, the Hindus are dominating the country which makes the partition of 1947 is inevitable and ruining the dream of unified India. Amitav Ghosh shows his concern of how collective identity of certain community in India in that time can creating something so massive like state borders in these lines :

“ Ah, said Tridib. That’s the trick, you see. It happens everywhere, wherever you wish it. It was an old story, the best story in Europe, Snipe said, told when Europe was better place, a place without borders and countries – it was a German story in what we call Germany, Nordic in the north, French in France, Welsh in Wales, Cornish in Cornwall: it was the story of a hero called Tristan, a very sad story, about a man without a country, who fell in love with a woman-across-the-seas “ (P.136).

In these lines, Tridib, one of the main characters in the novel, merely sees a nation's border as “ a trick “ that happened everywhere in the world. In this passage, it is implied that Amitav Ghosh wants to express his thought of how collective identity that consists of culture, political thoughts, and historicism can separate people who once lived together and even by creating the violence and war between the states. It is also symbolizing the political dream of Indian leaders in that time that shattered by the war of collective identity which in this case became one of the finest example of creating their own version of imagined community as Anderson said in his book where people tend to feel the we-ness among them even that they are not knowing each other and it usually united by certain things and this phenomenon became the problem in creating the harmonization in Indian politics even until today which shows the absurdity of partition in the eyes of many Indian people including Ghosh himself.

But in every shattered dream, there is a new dream incoming where Amitav Ghosh implied about the plan of Indian Reunification in this lines:

“They had drawn their borders, believing in that pattern, in the enchantment of lines, hoping perhaps that once they had etched their borders upon the map (Ghosh, P.169 – 170).

This passage shows the irony of how Tridib was killed in the riot of 1964 in Dhaka because of the war of collective identity domination in Bangladesh in that time but also implying the reunification plan of India which was voiced by many people in India for a long time. This reunification plan will be like how the Silla Dynasty of Korea can unifying all of the Korean peninsula in 7th century or how many Kingdoms and Dynasty in India can unified Indian subcontinent under one flag and it is became the motivation of some nationalist in India even until today which is in doubt cannot be happened in the future due to how strong is collective identity impeded in the people in three states which is very difficult to harmonize the differences imagined community that becoming each nations national foundation for many years which this case also became the reason of the political war in Southeast Asia.

This also strengthened by how Ghosh portray the methods of Indian nationalist to overcome those differences :

“ War is their religion. That’s what it takes to make a country. Once that happens people forget they were born this or that, Muslim or Hindu, Bengali or Punjabi: they become a family born of the same pool of blood. That is what you have to achieve for India, don’t you see? “ (Ghosh, p.58)

These passages implied the importance of collective identity for Indian people in achieving independence and also became the political base in the Indian constitution. Now since this passage mentioned Muslim, Hindu, or Bengali, it is also implied about the politic of

secularism in India which means the separation of religion from state. It has four main principles. First, India has no official religion which confirmed Ghosh's lines about " people forget they were born this or that, Muslim or Hindu , ... " where it describe about Indian unity so that's why, Indian official is rejecting the idea of " Two nation theory " as from this, they argued that the partition is only the division of the map of the country and not in the hearts of the people. This also brings the Anti-Pakistan sentiment that becomes the political play for some factions in India until today.

Even, on side of the novel, Amitav Ghosh has included about how the Indians give their all to support the Indian Army during the 1965 Indo-Pakistani war as described below :

" I gave it away, she screamed. I gave it to the fund for the war. I had to, don't you see? For your sake; for your freedom. We have to kill them before they kill us; we have to wipe them out " (Ghosh, p.172).

The setting of this passage happened one year after Tridib died in 1964 communal riots which explained how Tha'mma, the grandmother of the narrator, had given her jewelry in order to support the Indian Army when they faced Pakistan in their another major stand-off. By the way she describes " we have to kill them before they kill us " gives an implementation of how the sentiment toward Pakistan works. Tha'amma herself is a devoted Hindu practitioner who also didn't support the partition on the novel's plot and also a former Bengali residence who have to witness dramatic social changes in her ancestral home in Dhaka (occupied by Pakistan in that time) which make this is a perfect representation on how collective identity and imagined community can change the perspective of Pakistani in the eyes of Indian people and government.

Pakistan Political and Socio-Cultural Condition

Pakistan is the second largest country in South Asian region who gained their independence just months after Indian independence from the partition process which Ghosh explained in this lines of novel :

" And then, in 1947, came Partition, and Dhaka became the capital of East Pakistan. There was no question of going back after that " (Ghosh, P.92)

These lines are simple as it seems to only describe the partition that happened in 1947 that separates India and Pakistan into two nations, but the history behind the partition is much more complex. It all started in the Muslim community concern in India back then about how the power is transferred in the future India state after the independence. Even though most Muslims at that time were joining the All Indian National Congress, they were still concerned about the possibility of being marginalized by the majority of Hindu people who dominated the Indian population at that time . Fanon describes that phenomenon as comprador or new elite class which in India's case, the Muslims fears about when the power is transferred from the British to Indian people, they expect that there is unbalance share of power between all religious practitioners in India even though that most of Indian nationalist were encouraging the secularism in Indian government.

To counter this, Muslims community leaders like Mohammad Ali Jinnah and Sir Muhammad Iqbal were coined the term two nation theory where they proposed that there must be two separate nations to accommodate both Hindustan and Pakistani people means that Hindustan people get their own state and so the Muslim get their own state. Besides that, the motivation of Muslim community leaders in India that time is not merely centered in the fear of being marginalized but also because they thought that they have their own cultural identity that became their collective identity that separates them from any other ethnicities in India and also the glory of Muslim in the past in conquering Indian subcontinent as stated by Burki (2010). Those things are Muslims identity and Urdu Language.

Urdu is the main language spoken in Pakistan today and some parts of India. It has as long a history as Hindi. Amitav Ghosh describes how Urdu language became the power of Pakistan's political life as seen in these lines :

“ The only relationship my vocabulary permitted between those separate realities was war or friendship. There was no room in it for this other thing. And things which did not fit my vocabulary were merely pushed over the edge into the chasm of that silence. “ (Ghosh, P.159)

In this passage, Ghosh explained about “permitted vocabulary “ that refers to the Urdu only policy which refers to the policy of the Pakistani government to spread Arabization and Islamization in all of Pakistani territory including East Pakistan (Now Bangladesh) even if it is by force. Urdu is the only official language that is permitted to be used all across the nation which makes this policy unpopular among the Bengali people who live in the East, especially when they already used Bengali language for hundred years. The motivation to this policy can be traced back in 1867 when there was an incident called as Hindi-Urdu Controversy when The British Government prepared to accept the demand of Hindu communities of the United Provinces and Bihar to change the Perso-Arabic script of the official language to Devanagari and also to adopt Hindi as the second official language in British Raj which makes the Muslim community felt angered by the decision.

It is also show that Muslims community in India that time were highly valued the Urdu Language as symbol of Muslim community and therefore, also the incident in 1867 argued can lead to the more hostile disputes between the Hindus and Muslims which is became one big reason Two nation theory is proposed. This means that the indeed the Muslim identity and Urdu language are the components that create Pakistan's national identity today which in this case, Mitra and Ray (2019) argued that the importance of religious conflict today can hardly be overstated and the effect of it can also be seen until today.

The partition between India and Pakistan, besides creating the communal riots, wars, and political turmoil was also became the source of Anti-Indian sentiment in Pakistan which according to Christophe Jaffrelot and Jean-Luc-Racine, Pakistan nationalism is basically primarily anti-Indian even though the fact that for over a thousand of years Pakistan was part of British India and also Indian community in general. Anti-Indian sentiment itself was also already existed back in the formation of Pakistan state. Pakistan has faced some difficult challenges right after the partition when Pakistan secular leaders in that time decided to use Islam as a rallying cry against perceived threats from predominantly Hindu India. Because

they felt so unsure about the Pakistani future, so they have to create those sentiment which existed until today and also became the fuel of Indian- Pakistani war over the years.

The Cross Path of India – Pakistan’s Political Relationship and Rivalry

After analyzing some parts of the novel where the researcher took narrations and dialogues that represents the foundation of both collective identity and national identity of India and Pakistan, it can be argued that both countries are having sentiments toward each other for many decades before and after the partition which started from the differences of collective identity of people in Indian subcontinent particularly in the use of language and the religious practices which in this case, Muslims and Hindus are two domain that fight each other in Indian subcontinent for many years in history. It can be seen by how India and Pakistan are both have a very different political approach where on one side, Indian people didn’t truly accept the partition and hoping that all countries in Indian subcontinent could be reunited under one flag (the tricolor flag of India) while on the same time, grows a sentiment toward the Pakistani.

The Pakistani on the other hand is approaching the policy of Islamization, Arabization, and Urdu only Policy in their country which is also fueled by the sentiment toward the Indian and the Hindus, particularly on the event in 1867 mentioned before. It can be argued that, both India and Pakistan have their own motive to gain the domination toward each other. The disputes between India and Pakistan only became worse in the Cold War, especially in the 1950’s to 1970’s where they were fighting three major wars on that timeline where most of the wars were caused by the border dispute between India and Pakistan, particularly on Kashmir region.

Kashmir has been a primary subject of interest of India and Pakistan over the years. Kashmir has a great stand in the contribution to both India and Pakistan economy. For example, the data from India Brand Equity Foundation has found out that Jammu and Kashmir’s NSDP, increased at a CAGR in Rupee of 8,61 percent from 2015 – 2016 to 2020 – 2021 has reached 1.49 trillion Rupee (US\$ 20.49 billion) with a vast natural resource base for cultivating major fruits. This means that for India, Kashmir is essential for their agricultural business which involves food processing industry and agro based industry. Meanwhile, for Pakistan, the region of Kashmir that they owned has given them around 3.2 billion dollars in GDP per September 2013, although it is not as much as other Provinces like Punjab and Sindh, but still Kashmir is a very important region for Pakistan.

Historically, Kashmir was part of the British States in India and when the independence of India and Pakistan occurred in 1947, the Maharaja of Kashmir was considering creating their own nation, but soon changed his mind after the series of incidents when he decided that Kashmir will become Indian territory. This angered the Pakistani and created the First Indo – Pakistani war in 1948 where it resulted in India controlling Kashmir valley, Jammu, and Ladakh while Pakistan was given Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan territory).

Both India and Pakistan have tried to gain full control of the territory because of its strategic location. The conflict of Kashmir was only getting worse during 1950 to 1960 where in 1965 after having several disputes on the border, India and Pakistan decided to go to war. India in that time sent off 700.000 troops with multiple aircraft and tanks while Pakistan was

outnumbered as they could only send about 260.000 troops along with aircrafts and tanks that surprisingly matched Indian's number of artillery. Internationally the war was viewed in the context of the greater Cold War where before the war, the US and UK have been allied with Pakistan while India has aligned themselves with the Soviet Union. The war also can be seen as the continuation of the communal conflicts that happened between 1963 – 1964, particularly on the Hazratbal Shrine incident.

Speaking of Kashmir position in the war, there is some irony where Amitav Ghosh reveal in one part of the novel about the practice of syncretism between religions practitioners and also people from many background in there where it is very contrast to India and Pakistan's situation when it came about ethnicities and harmonizing cultures.

“ But in the whole of the valley there was not one single recorded incident of animosity between Kashmiri Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs. There is a note of surprise – so thin is our belief in the power of syncretic civilisations ” (Ghosh, P.164)

This passage, besides telling us about how the Kashmiri reacted to the communal riots in 1964, it also tells us about the syncretism that has been practiced for many years in the region. Unsurprisingly, this is not to say that the communal peace and equality have incessantly grow very well in the region, rather, coexistence between various communities in Kashmir has generally remained synchronized in harmony despite of the existence of various cultures and religions implanted by different dynasties, empires, and kingdoms over many centuries. Even when India and Pakistan were afflicted with the Partition on religious lines, the Kashmiris were proudly maintaining their communal harmony and interfaith diversity. But, Kashmir on the other hand didn't have much power to repel the India – Pakistan rivalry that soon changed how things work in Kashmir and the dispute over the region still happened until today as stated by Aurangzeb et al (2020). Not only that, Yaseen et al (2016), stated that India and Pakistan also still not able to resolve other border issues between them such as Siachen, Tulbul, and Sir Creek although there were some meetings and negotiations between the two countries. In this case, Yaseen et al also elaborated about how India has some kind of hegemonic design and actually never maintains good relations with their neighboring countries in South Asia which is portrayed very much by the symbolization of the characters in *The Shadow Lines* like Tha'ama who doesn't like the idea of partition and maintaining hatred toward other countries in South Asia, particularly to Pakistan.

Besides that, India and Pakistan have a very different approach in the way they run their country as Wojzewski (2014) stated that India is a federal, secular, parliamentary democracy where its unique ethnic, religious, lingual, and socio-economic heterogeneity has been posing a major challenge since the state founding while Pakistan on the other hand has a hybrid system of government that combine between patrimonialism, semi-authoritarianism, and semi-democracy which creates an uneasy sense of autocracy and aspiring democracy where Wojzewski explained that the military uses populism and democracy to legitimate its rule.

From this point, the questions regarding the political relationship between India and Pakistan that has been mentioned earlier has become clear. How do they do so ? What or which objectives do they choose ? or The mix of tools they assemble to achieve those goals,

which are depicted as the question of strategy. In terms of how they do so is very vary depending on the situation whether they both will use military intervention, espionage, political intervention, and many other methods which the example of these can be seen in how India and Pakistan have been engaged in military disputes over the years with intelligence warfare playing alongside it.

Military supremacy also became a thing that powered up both India and Pakistan in gaining domination toward each other where it also proved Thompson's argument about how military dominance can be a satisfied threshold in countries' rivalries. Sudirman (2018) noted that India for example has spent their vast resources and their GDP to supply their military expenditure where Pakistan is also doing the same thing like India did although the military dispute between India and Pakistan is not as dramatic as it seen back in 20th century, but some little military incidents are still happened between those countries. Khan (2015) stated that India and Pakistan are already traversing on divergent strategic trajectories which means that the problem of India and Pakistan is not only in religious or borders terms but is eventually expanding to a more larger scale, but still, Khan is arguing that in South Asia, both countries had inherited a huge divergent baggage of history which already mentioned before consist of political, cultural, religious, and social ethos since the partition happened in 1947 which is why, although India and Pakistan are actually sharing the similarity to each other, there's still a huge gap of border that separate these two nation into rivals which once again, Amitav Ghosh by his persona of " the narrator " in " The Shadow Lines " implying that border is absurdity.

Conclusion

After analyzing the narrations and dialogues in the novel by using the methods mentioned above, the researcher has found some important points to be highlighted regarding how Amitav Ghosh, as a Bengali born, has perfectly portrayed his concern toward the Indian and Pakistan political relationship and rivalry as a " third party ". The third party merely means that Ghosh positioned himself as the spectator who witnessed, heard, and read about India and Pakistan's relationship over the years, especially in the post-colonial era by making himself as the narrator of the story.

On the larger scale, this novel is a satire means for how collective identity and national identity creation on India and Pakistan before and after the partition has showing the absurd side of the creation of the border between them which only create more misery, more complex, more difficulties, and more challenges for both states in maintaining a good relationship between them. the term rivalry in India and Pakistan is also means to highlight the dualism of national interest and national identity that they have which also at the same time, dominating the geopolitics in South Asian region until today where to realized that, both states are using any methods if necessary like military confrontation, espionage, and even communal riots just to gain the political domination on the area.

But since most of the scholars agreed about the new era of India and Pakistan relationship, there's still hope for both countries to put their differences aside and start a healthy bilateral relationship just like Ghosh wanted by " slowly pushing the state border to become none ".

References

- Ghosh, A. (1988). *The Shadow Lines*. Great Britain: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Muir, M. (2022). *11 Of History's Longest And Most Intense Rivalries*. R <https://www.ranker.com/list/states/always-fighting/michael-muir>
- Vasquez, J. A. (1999). *The Power of Power Politics: From Classical Realism to Neotraditionalism*. Cambridge Studies in Internal Relations. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511491733>
- Buzan, B. & Gowher, R (1986). *South Asian Insecurity and The Great Powers*. Basingstoke : Macmillan.
- Hussain, E. (2019). India-Pakistan: Challenges and Opportunities'. *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs*. 6(1), 82 – 95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2347797018823964>
- Snow, D. A., & Brown, C. C. (2015). Collective Identity. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Oxford : Elsevier, 174 – 180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10403-9>
- Jalal, A. (1996). Secularists, Subalterns, and The Stigma of Communalism: Partition Historiography Revisited. *Modern Asian Studies*. 30(3), 681 – 736.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of The Earth*. Grove Press : New York.
- Anderson, B. (1983). (Eds.). (1983). *Imagined Communities : Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso.
- B, C., Upreti. (2006). Nationalism in South Asia. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*. 67(3), 535 – 544.
- Mitra, A. & Ray, D. (2016). Hindu-Muslim Violence in India : A Postscript From 21st Century. 1 – 14. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-98848-1_14
- Burki, S., J. (2010). *Pakistan's Politics and Its Economy*. In: Routledge Handbook of South Asian Politics : India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal. pp. 83 – 97. Routledge : Taylor & Francis Group.
- IBEF Editorial Team. (August, 2022). *Jammu and Kashmir State Presentation*. R. <https://www.ibef.org/states/jammu-and-kashmir-presentation>
- Aurangzeb, M., Akhtar, S., Ali K., Hayat, N., & Amir, S. (2020). Kashmir Struggle for Freedom: Proposed Solution. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*. 5(1), 61 – 68. ISSN : 2545-420X
- Yaseen, Z., Jathol, I. & Muzaffar, M. (2016). Pakistan and India Relations: A Political Analysis of Conflicts and Regional Security in South Asia. *Global Political Review*. 1(1), 1 – 9. [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gpr.2016\(I-I\).01](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gpr.2016(I-I).01)
- Wojzewski, T. (2014). The Persistency of the India-Pakistan Conflict : Chances and Obstacles of the Bilateral Composite Dialogue. *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs*. 1(3), 319 – 345. doi.org/10.1177/2347797014551269
- Sudirman, A. (2018). The India-Pakistani Military and Nuclear Arms Race in Post-Cold War Period : The Regional Security Complex in South Asia. *Global dan Strategis*. 12(1), 167 – 181.
- Khan, Z. (2015). India- Pakistan: Emerging Trends in Strategic Dynamics. *The Korean Journal of International Studies*. 13(3), 577 – 607. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14731/kjis.2015.12.13.3.577>.

About the Author:

Chief Researcher
William Kertha Adi Tama <i>State University of Jakarta, Indonesia</i>
Researcher Member
Atikah Ruslianti <i>State University of Jakarta, Indonesia</i>

