

Chapter-3

An Intersemiotic Translation of Bapsi Sidhwa's *Ice-Candy-Man* by Deepa Mehta: An Ecofeminist Reading

Literature has been a powerful tool in the hands of a writer to bring changes and awareness in societal structures, and Bapsi Sidhwa is a name in the arena of literature who has been constantly bringing the social issues in limelight through her fictional works. One of her most significant work, *Ice-Candy-Man*, attempts to contribute to the development of such change by reconsidering the issues related to the equal rights of women and their space in a society. Though *Ice-Candy-Man* has mostly looked upon as a noteworthy partition novel by most of the critics, the other issues such as exploitation of women's body, role of nature has either gone ignored or considered only as secondary. In the novel, Bapsi Sidhwa wishes a world which is free from any kind of dominance and social hierarchy, and a society which is based on the principle of justice and equality. She represents a series of female characters in the novel, who have survived the chaotic time of 1947, which is registered as a period of worst religious riots in the history. *Ice-Candy-Man*, portrays a realistic account of women's plight and exploitation during communal riots.

Ice-Candy-Man is a novel which portrays the pre-partition and post-partition India and Pakistan through the curious and observant eyes of Lenny - a eight year old Parsi girl. She is suffering with deformity in her leg, and taken care by her Ayah-Shanta, who is one of the most influential persons in her life. The story revolves around Ayah and her life events. It is a story of her world, her many harmless affairs

with men belonging to her social strata but from various religious groups. Her natural sensuality fascinates Lenny and magnetically draws men to her: ‘their leaden eyes attracted to the magnet’ (Sidhwa 27). The game of courtship that is played out between Ayah and the different men who compete for her favour is observed by Lenny, and teaches her about men and women, relationships and sexuality. Ayah has drawn to her a motley group of admirers: Masseur, Ice-candy-man, a zoo attendant, a cook and so on. She is symbolically represented as Mother Earth in the novel, who is humble and protective to each friend of hers regardless of their religion, caste or class.

Sidhwa’s *Cracking India* is a highly personal account of the plight of women during partition as seen through the eyes of an eight-year-old girl living in Lahore during that crucial time. Lenny, the protagonist, belonged to the minority sect of Parsis who had remained neutral and non-aligned, while the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs single-mindedly massacred each other. Lenny’s has an entirely unique perspective. It came from within an impartial community, but was also the point of view of a child, who learnt about love, war, destruction and betrayal within a span of a few months.

Sidhwa herself being a Parsi and lived the experiences of partition during her childhood and therefore, represents realistic and convincing characters and events. It is no wonder that characters like Lenny and Ayah might have existed in Lahore in 1947, to see their land being destroyed by the forces of communal hatred. Earlier the novel was published under the title ‘*Cracking India*’ – to symbolically signify the cracks which had occurred not just on India as a geographical entity, but to emphasize on the fragmentation which had occurred in psyches, cultures and among people. The story of the novel is considered as a semi-biography of the author, for Sidhwa also had a limp in her leg like Lenny and suffered from polio in her childhood – identifiable with the narrator of the novel.

The novel is also adapted into a film by Deepa Mehta called *1947 Earth*. A great cinematic experience, the film however does not do justice to the novel's narrative, because it foregrounds the love story between Ayah, Ice-Candy-Man and masseur, leaving out the portrayal of many important issues Sidhwa dwells upon in the book. In any intersemiotic translation, especially when it is from a novel to a film or vice-versa, lots of changes occurred during adaptation due to the targeted audience/reader or the purpose of translation. When a novel is adapted into a film like *Ice-Candy Man*, many instances from the book are dropped due to their less importance and impact on the screen, even otherwise it is not possible to adapt each and every minute details of the novel in two hours film. My research is an attempt to explore the eco-feminist themes in the novel, how women and nature are the most passive character in the sense of violence and war but still how they become the most vulnerable beings to exploit and dominate. Apart from this the present research would also attempt to explore the intersemiotic translation aspects available in the novel and the film, and the kind of changes source text has to go through while adapted in target text.

The novel is adapted into film *Earth 1947* by the Toronto-based, Indo-Canadian director Deepa Mehta. It was released world-wide in late 1999 as part of her projected trilogy called *Fire, Earth and Water*. According to Mehta herself –

These three different films are about elements on one level that nurture and destroy us. They are very tangible elements. Fire is about the politics of sexuality, Earth is about the politics of nationalism and Water is about the politics of religion. (Deepa Mehta interviewed by Maya Churi in Indiewire)

Like most adaptations, it is needless to say that there are several differences between the novel and the film. Focusing particularly on one theme in the film, Mehta omitted several parts of the story, especially the humour, the humdrum activities of ordinary people in Lahore, and several subplots from the novel.

She shifted through the book, amalgamated the characters and combined different elements to make it cinematically viable. For example, Lenny's polio, which forms a significant early narrative thread, is sidelined as are the changing relationship between Lenny's parents, the murder of a British official, the child marriage of the much-abused daughter of one of Lenny's family servants also missing from the film. Some characters like Slavesister as well as the young cousin who attempts incestuous relationships with Lenny which are well focused in the book but in the film they are mostly gone ignored. Not necessarily, each and every difference which occurred during intersemiotic translation has to have a reason, but some major changes needed to be discussed and stated out reasons for such differences.

The integration of several audio-visual art forms like - singing, dancing, and music is also a trait of the Bollywood style – which is witnessed, especially in the scene where Ayah rides with Masseur on his bicycle. Here the extended use of a song to replace dialogue (the lyrics to the songs in *Earth* were written by Javed Akhtar, one of India's most prominent lyricists/poets) gave the sequence a particularly romantic feel. The music provided by A.R. Rahaman was also fascinating. So Mehta's film can be called a crossover production, catering at the same time to the global and the local.

At the same time, *Earth* is not a traditional Bollywood movie either. Though it gracefully established the beauty of peace and crudely depicted the tragic loss of it during the partition, and concluded with the idea that the most painful kind of betrayal is that which occurs within the family, *Earth* also utilized several aspects of

Bollywood cinema. For example, Ice-Candy Man is played by Aamir Khan, one of Bollywood's biggest young stars. The director highlights the passionate love between the Masseur and Shanta a Muslim and a Hindu who want to go to Amritsar and marry. Though Mehta does not show too many intimate scenes, the love triangle and the revenge motif staples of mainstream commercial productions also make their presence felt in the film. Though there are several historical elements like communal violence, the British snobbery, the flight across the border for the millions who were rendered homeless by the events of 1947, *Earth* is best viewed not as a historical drama, nor a political fable. It steers clear of being a movie about the events of the Partition only; rather, by concentrating on its effects upon a small group of friends and how it affects their friendships and relationships, it shows the soul of partition.

This pertains primarily to the fact that the novel is a verbal medium whereas the film is visual. Geoffrey Wagner in his book, *The Novel and the Cinema* (1975) divides film adaptation into three modes:

The transposition, in which a novel is directly given on the screen with a minimum of apparent interference; the commentary, where an original story is taken and either purposely or inadvertently altered in some respect; the analogy, which must represent a considerable departure for the sake of making another work of art. (28)

In this case, Deepa seems to be following the second path where she decided to drop many incidents from the book to make it visually better. Sidhwa mainly focuses on the issue of partition in her novel, but Mehta adapts the novel keeping the targeted audiences in her mind and thus the subtitle of the film reads: An Epic Romance Set Against the Blood Stained Canvas of Partition. In the novel where Sidhwa's major concern is about the plight of women during partition, Deepa seems to focus more on

the love story to attract wider number of audiences. The story of partition in the film is woven under the love affairs of Ayah, where the focus shifts from the main story to the secondary concern. Speaking about the problems of adaptation, another critic Joy Gould Boyum states:

I've already suggested that a film might be considered faithful to its source to the extent that its implicit reading remained within the confines of that work's interpretative possibilities, to the extent that it neither violated nor diminished them. (5)

Sidhwa was always present when the film was being shot; she saw when her title was changed, but, even if at the moment, she did not think it matched the book, she knew Mehta was making her trilogy on the natural elements (*Fire, Earth, Water*). What might have really difficult to accept for Sidhwa would to see entire sections of the book being deleted: once again, though, Sidhwa understood that cinema is a different media: for instance, it could not contain all the novel's incidents and characters. The most evident and different of the changes relates to the 'end': the novel *Cracking India* follows the aftermaths of the Partition; *Earth* finishes soon after the event, when Ayah is kidnapped.

Because of these minute differences, what was becoming clear in Deepa Mehta and Bapsi Sidhwa's collaboration was that literature and cinema are different; they cannot but rule the experience of reading the novel and of watching the film. For instance, the first part on the screen creates a positive and peaceful atmosphere among the characters in a way that is different from how Sidhwa narrates it in her book. In the second section, everything changes; the tragedy begins; the film changes its register; it becomes darker; it changes its colours. Thus it is important to analyse to some of the

major differences between *Cracking India* and *Earth*, and to understand the reasons behind such gaps. As Mehta rightly adds in an interview that:

She was lucky that Bapsi understood her position that a book and a film are different mediums. She also reiterated the fact that her film is a direct statement against nationalism and separatism, not just in India, but everywhere. There is no nostalgia for British Raj in this film. (qtd. in Filmbuff 5)

The role of author's involvement while adapting his/her book in intersemiotic translation becomes very crucial to understand the storyline and write the screenplays. But this involvement varies from person to person; it has ranged from total rejection to full support. There are writers like Ernest Hemingway who sold the maximum number of stories to Hollywood producers and yet clearly stated that the only way is to give the book to the director and forget about it. In this case the writer is not bothered to care as to what the director does to the story. On the other hand we also have writers like Bernard Shaw who was spellbound with the infinite possibilities that the cinema could afford and who also stayed in the sets to watch how his plays were adapted.

In the case of Bapsi Sidhwa, we find the writer herself appearing in person in the last scene of the film from which it can be assumed that she has full support of Deepa's production. She shared with an interviewer how that in Hollywood, they don't allow the author near the sets. But here, Deepa wanted her participation throughout the making of the film. In part, this was because there was so much Parsi culture in it. Though she has a role in the movie there was not much involvement during adaptation. She agreed that the film stood on its own strength, Sidhwa only wished that Deepa had retained the original title because it would have helped the book.

Again, Sidhwa has also been very forthcoming about the changes made to her story and she candidly explained to her interviewer:

The movie stands on its own. But it has the voice of the child and it has the spirit of the book – it has objectivity and it has the story. A movie is only a two-hour affair. A book is spread over a wide expanse of time. Deepa had to get rid of many incidents and characters. I hated the fact that every time I saw the script it was shorter. Then when the film was made, scenes were thrown out until something that seemed very bare to me was left. I realize now that the film works so excellently because of the cuts. (qtd. in Filmbuff 8)

Though many scenes from the book were dropped and edited, it is very important to understand the function of two different mediums and their purpose in doing so. The adaptation might not be able to do justice to each and every event narrated in the book, what is important is whether the movie fulfils the overall purpose for the novel. It is convincing in the case of *Earth*, where it is important to understand that the screen exerts its own dramatic demands and that the film had to end the way it did otherwise the impact would have been weakened. When a novel is adapted in audio-visual translation, one should be aware that a movie has a totally different audience, and a different way of seeing things. But the film widens the audience for the original story. The purpose for writing the story is to reach an audience, so through the film, that goal was further achieved. Fidelity of a translated/adapted work has been a long debate, in such a case only the writer of the source text can confirm whether the translated text has done justice to the purpose of the translation or not. As Bapsi Sidhwa talks about the adaptation in an interview:

I love *Earth*, the film adaptation of my book *Ice-Candy-Man*. Novels are notoriously difficult to adapt to the screen, and this was perhaps the most difficult of my novels to make into a film. The task would have daunted a lesser filmmaker, or one less courageous. Deepa had to jettison many

characters and subplots to give shape to her cinematic vision of my book and fit it into a two and a half hour movie. But the film stands firmly on its own, as a work of art, apart from the book. It has its own intrinsic integrity and logic. (qtd. in filmbuff 15)

Another major difference that came while adapting the novel into film is use of different cinematographic devices by Mehta. Mehta is an exceptional director who takes help of various symbolic elements to represent the mood of characters or of the scene; in case of *Earth* she takes help of ‘colour’ to represent the theme of the film. Colour is an important element in Mehta’s films, giving her the possibility to communicate feelings and atmospheres that can be ‘felt’ by the spectator. It is a powerful possibility and Mehta benefits from it as much as she can, paying attention to the use of colours. Generally, her films have a dominant colour and for this film it was the colour terracotta that came to her mind when she was writing the script. Conversely, she did not want the colour blue or red to represent the massacre of partition.

It is exactly like that: the film covers a range of colours from green to yellow, from red to brown; and only in one scene, reappears the bright blue of Ayah’s sari. Daring a risky comparison, we could say that this dialectics works also for Sidhwa and Mehta: being a director, Mehta has her own singular ways of expressing sensibility. In her films, photography plays a key role - light is at the core of photography, and one has to know how to use it. Colours change with light, creating various atmospheres and conveying different emotions. These visual elements combine with music – which is always original in Mehta’s films. But it is not possible for a writer to include such cinematic elements in writing, because both are two separate mediums with their own specialities. Thus the fidelity of a translated work or adaptation is not judged by the

changes occurred during the process; rather, it is checked whether the message and the purpose of the source text is translated honestly or not, and it won't be wrong to say - *Earth* stays faithful to *Cracking India*.

Another difference between *Cracking India* and *Earth* is the use of 'language'. Despite the fact that Sidhwa is Pakistani, the novel is written in English, with a few words in Hindi or Urdu. Bapsi Sidhwa's novel is written in English, and although she wrote the screenplay in English as well, Mehta decided to make the film in Hindi titled *Earth*.

The official language of India is Hindi; English is common among the upper class and educated Indians. Sidhwa does not draw differences in class, religion, or occupation - every character speaks in English. Of course, this is because of narrative reasons: it would be extremely difficult to read a book with characters often switching language. This limit does not exist in cinema, where a dialogue can be easily understood by adding subtitles despite the fact that the dialogue is delivered in whatever language. Most of the characters in *Earth* are working class people and the thought of them speaking English in 1947 was felt as absurd, though some relevant scenes remain in English.

The original language adds realism to the social and cultural picture of the film and the scenes become more fascinating with the use of original dialect or expression, but if the same is used in writing it makes a book complex to read and comprehend.

English is the *lingua franca* allowing Indians to communicate among the different dialects spoken in India; though it is not the language spoken by everybody. The size of the country and the variety of languages and dialects spoken make it difficult to define India's national language. In this context, English plays an important role - it has lost its negative connotation of being the language of the British oppressor,

and it has also developed a unifying function in a fractionated country. If Sidwa was more or less bound to make a choice, Deepa Mehta decided not to do so. The characters in her film speak different languages: sentences in Urdu, Punjabi, Gujarati and rarely in English are pronounced in the film. Most of the time the dialogues switch from one language to another, sometimes mixing Hindi to English: this is a narrative strategy that gives the idea of the ‘multilingualism’ and ‘multiculturalism’ of the country.

The use of English as *lingua franca* suggests the presence of the century long British rule, the influence on the politics of the subcontinent and the inheritance it has left. British rule on India is a discussion that is not addressed by the film, while it is clear in the novel, even though neither artist delves deeply into the subject. A scene in the house of Lenny’s parents is the occasion to show how this controversial debate can degenerate into a fight. Lenny’s parents invite their friends for dinner: Mr. and Mrs. Singh, both Sikh, and Mr. Rogers, an English policeman, with his wife. They are spending an enjoyable night chatting away, when Mr. Singh and Mr. Rogers start arguing; the reason relates to the time when India will be independent, allowing the most crucial points of the debate on British rule to be thrown on to the table. The British imperialistic and racist belief is that the Indians will never be able to self rule - it is what Mr. Rogers says, strongly opposed by Mr. Singh. They then start discussing what will happen when the British quit India. Mr. Rogers’ conjecture is wrong, when he says that the situation is politically confused (the political situation will become clear soon after Partition, with the Congress Party and the Muslim League respectively placed in India and Pakistan); still, he is also right in foreseeing the explosion of violence that will follow.

The discussion turns into a fight, as soon as the calm returns to the table, the hosts make a list of the good effects of the British domination in the subcontinent - in the book, conversely, the narration goes on to describe the continuation of a pleasant and relaxed dinner. The point of discussion is presented, though the mainstream idea that the British colonialism had, in the end, its advantages: the British built roads, they gave India the regular Post service; they taught the Indians English.

Though it can be argued that a cinematic adaptation of any work of fiction at least helps the less perceptive reader/viewer to understand and appreciate that particular work of art or oeuvre of the novelist better, it would be appropriate to conclude the eternal debate of adaptation by quoting from Joy Gould Boyum:

In assessing an adaptation, we are never really comparing book with film, but an interpretation with an interpretation – the novel that we ourselves have recreated in our imaginations, out of which we have constructed our own individualized movie’, and the novel on which the filmmaker has worked a parallel transformation. For just as we are readers, so implicitly is the filmmaker, offering us, through his work, his perceptions, his visions, his particular insight into his source. An adaptation is always, whatever else it may be, an interpretation. (61-62)

When Richard Phillips asked Mehta about some background to *Earth*, why she made the film and why there have been so few films made by western filmmakers about the partition of India, Mehta’s reply was:

The partition of India was like a Holocaust for us and I grew up hearing many stories about this terrible event. Naturally I was attracted to the subject. . . I think it is bound up with a number of attitudes that prevail in the western countries about India. . . There is firstly the spiritual India – a place where you

can go and find nirvana. Secondly, there is the conception that India is entirely poverty-stricken, with a permanent kind of begging bowl attitude. There is India of the Maharajas, princes and queens, and the India that comes from nostalgia for the Raj. And there is always the prevailing pressure that people should feel superior to some other place: look how bad India is with all the beggars, aren't we lucky to be better off. It is uncomfortable and difficult for some filmmakers to produce works that destroy these perceptions. India brings specifically fixed images in many western minds, and the minute you start de-exoticising that, you have to deal with Indians as real people, and there is pressure not to do that. (qtd. in Filmbuff 7)

Thus it defines the ecocritical dichotomies of culture/nature, India being a developing country and having its roots in nature, is looked upon as barbaric and near to 'nature' and less cultured. This is a given identity to it which remains fixed.

Nature plays an important role in *Ice-Candy-Man*; it is an integral part of the story which revolves from beginning till end. Even Deepa has carefully used the elements of nature to represent different moods and themes in the film *Earth*. The representation of nature is shown symbolically in both novel and film, Deepa elegantly uses nature through different cinematographic tools such as songs, shades of trees and colours etc., and represents it through her narrative strategies.

The novel/movie is set during the partition time, thus it becomes crucial to understand postcolonial ecocriticism to understand how women and nature were oppressed and exploited during postcolonial India. A postcolonial ecofeminist perspective would involve the coming together of postcolonial ecocriticism and ecofeminism into one analytical focus, where it would be necessary to recognize that the exploitation of nature and the oppression of women are intimately bound up with

notions of class, caste, race, colonialism and neo-colonialism. The related fields of postcolonial ecocriticism and ecofeminism have been dominated by a typically Euro-American point of view till date, and both fields do not address the issue of postcolonial ecofeminism adequately, where both fields need to recognize “the “double-bind” of being female and being colonized.” (Campbell 1)

Postcolonial ecocriticism focuses on the intersection of postcolonial and environmental issues. The postcolonial eco-critic thinkers have asserted that postcolonialism is inherently anthropocentric and ecological concerns are secondary. In discourses of purity concerning environment, literature and criticism, women as the colonized, for example, have been “repeatedly naturalized as objects of heritage to be owned, preserved, or patronized rather than as subjects of their own land and legacies.” (Rob 2)

In *Ice-Candy-Man*, the character of Ayah is considered as ‘object’, her life is equated with the park where she meets with her admirers. At earlier phase of the story park and Ayah are described as harmonious beings who represent happiness and goodness. But as time progresses, park and Ayah become merely objects which can be winning over by force. When Ayah refuses to accept of their love expect masseur one’s, they not only hate her but also destroy her in the end. She is not taken as an individual who has the rights to choose her life partner. The character Ice-Candy-Man is a destroyer who betrays Ayah in the end and hands her over to the fire of communal riots.

The image of park is symbolically significant; it is a place for everyone irrespective of religion, caste or class, but the fate of the park is pre-decided with the established statue of Queen Victoria, which represents the British rule over India: Queen Victoria cast in gunmetal, is majestic, massive, overpowering, ugly. Her statue

imposes the English Raj in the park (Sidhwa 18). The same harmonious park turns into violent place for communal riots. Even the relationships of Ayah with her admirers changes, now they don't share their personal experiences and laugh, rather it becomes a place for aggressive discussions on the religions aspects, which ultimately turns into communal tension between Hindu, Muslims and Sikhs where they butcher each other.

It is amazing to see the role of nature and women in such riots and partitions, the partition occurred due to political fundamentalists who were led dominated by the male sections of the society. Women were either put aside or projected mute over the issue of partition, as in the case of Ayah who never talks about it and doesn't like the discussion about religious division. Ironically, women became the most vulnerable victims of the inhuman acts despite their aversion to riots. Women were abducted, murdered, raped; their breasts were cut and filled in sacks. Ice-Candy-Man became so violent and animal like because his sisters were killed and their breasts were butchered. In a patriarchal society women became the subject of honour of man who could be destroyed and polluted if man wills to. In the same way the park which is a symbol of peace and harmony turns into a place of hatred, violence, killings etc.

It is important then to bring together postcolonial and environmental issues so that continuing imperialist modes and colonialist attitudes of social and environmental dominance can be challenged. If we were to look at some of the postcolonial countries such as those in Africa and South Asia, particularly India, we realize that these nations have a history of environmental activism and movements even before ecocriticism emerged as an academic discipline in the Western world. This is indicative of the fact that environmental consciousness in the postcolonial world in terms of activism precedes the formation of ecocriticism as a discipline.

In the park and many other places which were initially represented as symbols of love and friendship were destroyed and their beauty was polluted. The image of the huge tree behind Sethi's house is repeatedly shown in the film to represent growing love between Ayah, Ice-Candy-Man and masseur. The wild place where masseur and Ayah meet is marked with wilderness and their love is represented by the peacock sound and chirping of sparrows. The sacredness and purity of all these natural places were polluted by the communal violence which was already ignited by the colonial emperors in India.

Deepa significantly shows the impact of nature on characters in the film through using various cinematographic tool such as singing and dancing. One song is completely dedicated to the spring session and its celebrations; the title of the songs is 'Rut aagai ree. . . rut chaa gai ree. . .' In this song Ice-Candy-Man and Ayah are seen celebrating the session and the song is about the happiness that the session brings in. It's a session of love and harmony.

Apart from this, the character of Ayah is symbolically represented as Mother Earth. Before the analysis of Ayah as mother earth it is important to focus some attention on the concept of mother earth and its relation with ecology and woman. In the history and traditions, images of women representing Mother Earth and Mother Nature, appear repeatedly in various cultures. Mother Earth is a term generally used to refer to the female form of divinity associated with motherhood, creation or is perceived as the bountiful embodiment of earth itself. In Indian context the Rig Veda calls the female power 'Mahimata', a term which literally means Mother Earth. In Indian epic texts the Mother Earth has been viewed as a living, female being.

Mother Earth is adorned with hills, plains, mountains, forests, plants, herbs and treasures; and she takes care of every creature. Still, being self-centred, we human

beings are constantly destroying the nature, chopping trees constantly in the name of development. Ayah in the story is like Mother Earth, who takes care of each of her admirers, she is a protective cover for all of them. Though her friends belong to different religious groups, but Ayah unites them in one form of humanity. Just like nature from where we produce most of our resources to survive, at times we forget the limitation of nature and start destroying it. In the same way, Ayah who showers her admirers with love and care becomes the victim of their greed. She is sacrificed to satisfy the ego and greed of communal riots. Her clothes were torn apart in the same way we chop off the nature, and then dragged her away.

Indian environmental activist Vandana Shiva's work comes closest to cultural ecofeminism in the Indian context. Shiva asserts that: "[w]hile gender subordination and patriarchy are the oldest of oppressions, they have taken on new and more violent forms through the project of development" (6). She argues for the recovery of the feminine principle—'Prakriti'—to counter the destructive effects of the Western model of development, which she calls maldevelopment. She defines Prakritias "the feminine principle as the basis for development which conserves and is ecological. Feminism as ecology, and ecology as the revival of Prakriti—the source of all life (Shiva 6). Shiva characterises maldevelopment as

a paradigm that sees all Shiva convincingly argues and shows that the Western model of development, or maldevelopment, has been violent for many people, especially women and local environments, as the violence that arises from such a model "is rooted in the patriarchal assumptions of homogeneity, domination and centralisation that underlie dominant models of thought and development strategies." (Shiva 9)

Same is the case in *Ice-Candy-Man*, though the partition was done on the name of religion its roots lies in development and better opportunities. It was utterly a political game to divide one country in two parts. The loss was not only for human beings and of property; it was a greater loss for nature too. The whole violence occurred to divide land and to show personal rights on natural resources, and the migration was not only for human beings, rather numerous number of animals were also shifted from one place to another.

Such essentialism and stereotypes of women and nature give rise and credence to the nature/culture dualism. In dominant modes of patriarchal thought, women are linked closer to nature and men are identified as being closer to culture. Nature and women then are both seen as inferior to culture and men. The impact of such dualistic thinking, where hierarchies are set up between dominance and submission, is that “the inferiorised group. . . must internalise this inferiorisation in its identity and collude in this low valuation, honouring the values of the centre, which form the dominant social values” (Plumwood 11). Therefore, the categories of culture, men, and coloniser claim for themselves reason, rationality and universal humanity, and nature, female, and colonised inherit for themselves primitivism, emotionality and animality.

Work Cited

Andrew, Dudley. *Concepts in Film Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Print.

Boyum, G. Joy. *Double Exposure: Fiction into Film*. New York: University Books,

1985. Print.

Campbell, Andrea (Ed.). *New Directions in Ecofeminist Literary Criticism*.

Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008.

Dutta, Riwita. "Re-presenting the Partition of India From Bapsi Sidhwa to Deepa

Mehta." *Filmbuff*, vol. 2: 3-9. Print.

Mehta, Deepa, dir. *Earth*. Prod. Anne Masson and Deepa Mehta. Barry Farrell, 1998.

Film. 3 Dec 2013.

N., Rob. "Environmentalism and Postcolonialism." *Postcolonial Studies and Beyond*.

London: Duke University Press, 2005.

Plumwood, Val. *Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason*

(*Environmental Philosophies*). London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

---. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature (Opening Out: Feminism for Today)*.

London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Shiva, Vandana. *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability and Peace*. London: Zed

Books, 2006. Print.

Sidhwa, Bapsi. *Ice-Candy-Man*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 1988. Print.

Wagner, Geoffrey. *The Novel and the Cinema*. Cranbury: Associated University Press,

1975. Print.

Whelehan, Imelda and Cartmell, Deborah. *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen*

to Text. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.