



RESEARCH PAPER

Colonial Legacy and its Impact : Analyzing Historical Tactics, Institutional Structures, and Enduring Division In Pakistan and India

¹Dr. Muhammad Shahban Sahito* ²Majid Ali Noonari ³Iqra M. Iqbal

1. Assistant Professor In International Relation, Department of International Relation, University of Sindh, Jamshoro Sindh, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Area Study Center Forest & South Asia University Of Sindh, Jamshoro Sindh, Pakistan
3. BS, In International Relation, Department of International Relation, University Of Sindh, Jamshoro Sindh, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author** Shahban.sahito@usindh.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This research paper discusses Colonial Legacy and Its Impact. It further elaborates Strategies of Colonial Rule, exploring the divide-and-rule tactics employed by the colonial powers and their lasting impact on societal divisions. In addition, it explains the legacy of institutional structures, discussing how colonial governance shaped institutions and political classes, perpetuating societal disparities, post-independence, and continuing social divisions. The study briefly summarizes existing work on identity politics in terms of the us-other concept, as well as how colonial rule formed institutions and political classes, maintaining societal inequities, post-independence, and ongoing social divisions. Colonial ideology have also had a significant impact on the political landscapes of Pakistan and India. The results indicate that, it analyses the enduring effects of colonial ideologies on societal and political landscapes in Pakistan and India. It defines struggles for unity and progress. It defines struggles for unity and progress. In the end, it highlights the challenges faced in overcoming deep-rooted divisions and fostering a cohesive national identity. Apart from that, it highlights the complexities faced by societies in overcoming colonial legacies.

Keywords: Cold War, Colonial Legacy, Diplomacy, Western Democracy

Introduction

In 430 BCE, in a funeral oration for those who had fallen in the Peloponnesian War, the Athenian statesman Pericles described democratic Athens as "the school of Hellas." This city has several excellent traits when compared to other cities. He stated, "Its constitution, which benefits all people, not just a few, that is why it is called a democracy." Pericles went on, "If we look to the laws, they afford equal justice to all in their private differences; if we look to social standing, advancement in public life falls to reputation for capacity, class considerations not being allowed to interfere with merit; nor does poverty bar the way; if a man can serve the state, he is not hindered by the obscurity of his condition. The freedom we have in our democracy extends to our everyday lives(Tudor, 2013).

Aristotle

Aristotle defined democracy a century later, and his definition has proven to be quite useful in political system comparison research. The concept of a "constitution," which he defines as "an organization of offices, which all the citizens distribute among themselves, according to the power which different classes possess," serves as the foundation for his strategy. In light of the superiorities and distinctions among the various regions of the state, he concludes, "there must therefore be as many forms of government as there are modes of arranging the offices(Staniland, 2008).

Aristotle described three types of perfect constitutions, each of which describes a state in which the ruling class achieves the general good, and three equivalent types of perverted constitutions, each of which describes a state in which the ruling class pursues nefarious and self-serving objectives. The number of people each constitution permits to rule distinguishes the three types—ideal and distorted. Therefore, "rule by the few" represents aristocracy in its ideal form and oligarchy in its perverted form; "rule by the many" represents "polity" in its ideal form and democracy in its perverted form. "Rule by one" represents monarchy in its ideal form and tyranny in its perverted form (see tyrant). In his investigations into the diversity, stability, and makeup of real democratic administrations, Aristotle himself adopted a more positive stance towards democracy. Aristotle established a link between democracy and liberty that would be emphasized by all subsequent proponents of democracy when he noted that "the basis of a democratic state is liberty (Lee, 2017).

Literature Review

Colonial Legacy and Its Impact

Western colonial yoke on the world has impacted various parts of the world. In some parts, the ethnic and cultural impacts and in somewhere religious and economic impacts helped the Europeans to keep control of colonial dominance. The most important factor that helped the Europeans to shape a new colonialism after the Second World War was democracy which Europeans had set up the system of politics during colonial laws. The Western powers prepared the plan for the new world order, even before the First World War Western especially European empires had understood this direct colonial rule would be costly and ineffective so they gradually initiated the plan of a neo-colonial system of politics (Miller, 2019). For it, they had already developed and introduced the political parties and political and social classes within the colonial society as they embarked on the Western neo-order of the world. When Western started to crumble, most importantly after 1890 when Bismarck twisted the balance of power in Europe the world moved to a new system and political earth quack. Since the Western dominant power of colonialism had understood that this colonial world could not continue longer, they developed a new order plan in the early nineteenth century (Schonberger, 1989). In the twentieth century, the British Empire and Western powers had rejected the totalitarian and authoritarian system of the governments. So they were clear that in the coming future western colonial power and empires had to face the authoritarian types system and because Germany was so against the Western powers Western cunningly developed the ideology of democracy against nationalist ideology and communist ideology which was supposed to be most threatening to western dominance of the world (Magalhães, 2014). At the end of the twentieth century, nationalism and communism felt a grave threat and danger from Western dominance so they developed the ideology of democracy and a democratic system of politics in the future to deter the ideology of nationalism and communism because these ideologies were ideologies of the authoritarian system of the government total control of the society (Kotzian, 2011). The newly independent countries that arose in the 1950s and 1960s played a significant role in shifting the UN's power dynamics. The United Nations had 35 member states in 1946, but when the newly independent countries of the "third world" joined, the number of members grew to 127 by 1970. Several traits characterized these new member states: they were non-white, their economies were in development, and they were dealing with issues brought on by their colonial past. These issues occasionally caused them to clash with other European nations and made them wary of political ideologies, economic institutions, and governmental frameworks influenced by Europe (Klingemann, 1999).

Nationalism and Communism Ideologies

The Western empire had enough experience of bitter nationalism and communism. Nationalism was a powerful ideology in Europe against colonialism since the eighteenth

century and later communist ideology became the other threat to Western dominance of the world (Fawn, 2003). The nationalist ideology once unified the two countries in the eighteenth century one was unification of the Germany and Italy in 1970-71. Later this powerful anti-colonial nationalism ideology started to resist the Ottoman Empire in Eastern Europe popularly known Eastern Question or Eastern Europe Crisis (Beissinger, 2009). The second important ideology emerged as a communist ideology in the late eighteenth century. This communist ideology was grave dangerous for Western colonialism and class contradiction ideology was not an ideology to put an end to colonialism but a threat to the existence of the capitalism of the Western power empire that was developed after exploiting the working classes (Fawn, 2003).

Industrial Revolution

In the nineteenth century and twentieth-century western society was facing social and economic differences after the Industrial Revolution. The Industrial Revolution had divided society in class contradiction and the communist ideology had created a political disaster in class relations (Xu, David, & Kim, 2018). The Communist ideology and its followers were spreading all over Europe and the political parties' movements started in Germany, Italy, England and America. In 1917, during the First World War Russia communist Party of Russia made a successful attempt of the Communist Revolution and Russia already had having expansionist policy toward Europe and east Europe. After the Russian Revolution, European powers were so scared that the Russian Revolution would not end but it would spread and sympathizers were already powerful all over Europe and eastern countries (Berg & Hudson, 1992). So they had a plan to stop it, otherwise, it would destroy the European and Western century-old system of politics. Soon after the First World War the western powerful countries ended and created the alliance known as the Allied Powers to destroy the communists and nationalists in Germany and Italy (Lucas, 2002). It was the failure of the central powers that German nationalist Hitler, Italy, Japan and Russia could form a successful alliance. In the early of the war period Germany and Russia had signed the agreement of the non-aggression but Hitler underestimated it and started a two-front war against Russia. It was lethal for Germany and the central powers provided a chance for Russia should join the alliance Allied powers and central powers were defeated in the Second World War (Philbeck & Davis, 2018). This way western democracy ideology remained successful most in the twentieth century.

Western Democracy Ideology and Global Dynamics

The Western democratic ideology helped the Western industrial powers to contain all other ideologies-communist and nationalism. After the Second World War, The communist block and communist ideology was the important ideology that challenged the Western democracy ideology but it was also defeated in 1990 (McCoy, Rahman, & Somer, 2018). Communist Russia which was known as the Soviet Union a block of thirteen states. It could not be sustained because of the Communist soviet policies after World War (Whitehead, 2015). The Soviets had several failed policies and economic plans to contain the Western capitalist block. The capitalist block under America remained powerful during the Cold War period. It finally continued the Soviet Union and destroyed communist Russia in 1991 (Connell, 2020). These countries also became ardent supporters of continued decolonization, so the UN Assembly frequently outpaced the Security Council on problems of self-governance and decolonization. The new nations pushed the UN to accept resolutions calling for colonial states' independence and to establish a special committee on colonialism, demonstrating that, while some nations fought for independence, the colonial era was coming to an end in the eyes of the global community (Adamson, 2005). The Identity of the country is divided and ethnic and social differences are deep in the society. If we look India that India is nothing much has changed there is communalism is deep-rooted and the political elite class are dominant factor the institutions are involved to help the political elite rule India on the policy of the British divide and rule. The process of decolonization

coincided with the nascent Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as the early formation of the new United Nations (Muzaffar & Khan, 2016; Mokyr & Strotz, 1998).

Material and Methods

This research study was conducted through secondary data. Such as books, various articles, magazines, newspapers, websites, and research articles published by various scholars and researchers. In addition, this research was conducted with a descriptive research design.

Result and Discussion

Colonial Strategies: Divide and Rule

Western democracy that known as the idea of the Greek and Greek ancestral ideology. The Western Empire was discovered in the twentieth century. Even the Western countries did not practice and implement it before the Second World War. The Western countries during the colonial powers were semi-authoritarian systems of government but they introduced them after the end of World War for the entire world and new states were created according to the system of democracy. The colonial society politics was most affected due to the Western democracy later in process of the ending colonization. The post-colonial states which were once under the Western empire developed political divisions and democracy remained fatal for the colonial society's politics and social coherence. India is one of the most explained the experience. After the British Empire, two states were created and South Asia politics came under the policy of the neo-colonialism of the West. Seven decades have passed but the politics of the difference and social divisiveness under the Western so-called democracy ideology did not let South Asian society end the difference. The institutions which were developed during the British Empire did not let Indian people be united and elevate poverty and social inequality. The region is most divided by inter and intra-conflict of the society and states.

Pakistan a country which was created according to the divided rule democracy had not helped Pakistan develop economically and politically. The institutions are deeply rooted in the same pattern as the British Empire. In seventy years long state and its political elite ruled this country according to the same political tactics of the British. Decolonization was frequently influenced by superpower competition, which had a significant impact on the evolution of that competition. It also had a considerable impact on the overall structure of international relations.

During the decades of imperialism, Europe's industrialising nations saw the African and Asian continents as repositories of raw materials, labour, and territory for future settlement. In most cases, however, major development and European settlement in these colonies occurred infrequently. However, the colonies were exploited, sometimes ruthlessly, for natural and labour resources, as well as military conscripts. Furthermore, colonial power established arbitrary natural boundaries where none had previously existed, dividing ethnic and linguistic groupings as well as natural features, providing the groundwork for the formation of several states with no geographic, linguistic, ethnic, or political connection. While the United States generally backed the concept of national self-determination, it was also closely tied to its European allies, who had imperial claims on their former colonies. The Cold War only complicated the US position, as US support for decolonization was counterbalanced by American concerns about communist expansion and Soviet strategic objectives in Europe. Several NATO partners claimed that their colonial lands gave them economic and military power that would otherwise be lost to the alliance. Almost all of the European allies of the United States thought that, once they recovered from World War II, their colonies would offer the raw materials and secure markets for completed commodities

that would bind the colonies to Europe. Whether this was true or not, no European government interested in postwar stability would have welcomed the prospect of the colonies slipping away and maybe entering the economic realm of the United States or another power. The United States government pushed the European imperial powers to negotiate an early exit from their foreign colonies, even if it did not impose its will on them. The Philippines received its independence from the US in 1946.

Impact of Democracy on Post-Colonial States

The narrative then shifts back to the South Asian context, examining how the colonial legacy of Western democracy profoundly affected post-colonial states. The political landscape, particularly in Pakistan, is characterized by the perpetuation of divisive tactics by the political elite, reminiscent of British strategies during colonial rule. The text suggests that institutions established during the colonial period continue to wield influence, hindering efforts towards social and political cohesion.

Global Struggle against Authoritarianism

The text further broadens its perspective to examine the global struggle against authoritarianism, framing it as a universal narrative. The rejection of totalitarian and authoritarian systems by Western powers in the 20th century is discussed, presenting democracy as an ideological counterforce. The collapse of the Soviet Union is portrayed as a significant triumph for Western democracy, marking the end of the communist bloc.

Nuanced Perspective on Western Democracy

While recognizing the successes of Western democracy, the text introduces a nuanced perspective, questioning the timing of its widespread implementation by Western countries. It highlights that Western powers operated semi-authoritarian systems during the colonial period, raising questions about the true nature of Western democracy and its role in shaping post-colonial societies.

Woodrow Wilson's views on world order, as articulated in his "Fourteen Points" address in January 1917, were based on the conviction that the Great War—as World War 1 was then known—would be "the war to end all wars" by reorganizing the international system in accordance with liberal principles. Wilson's main suggestion was to establish a League of Nations, which would ostensibly ensure each state's independence and territorial integrity. Among his other suggestions were bolstering international law, basing territorial claims on the right to self-determination, and advocating for free commerce, democracy, and disarmament. The Cold War was not a golden period for democracy. Though both sides in this worldwide conflict claimed to advocate for true freedom and equality, their mobilisation efforts frequently resulted in suppression, discrimination, and bloodshed. This was true not only for communist regimes, which conducted merciless crackdowns and purges, but also for those in the American-led anticommunist coalition.

Following World War II, the United States engaged in a "Cold War" with the Soviet Union, its allies, and other communist countries. This period was marked by violence, as well as worldwide political, ideological, and economic rivalry. To counter the influence and spread of communism around the world, the US backed democracy through diplomacy. The United States and its allies viewed communism as a danger to free trade, free elections, and personal liberty. This threat was heightened by the increasing number of nuclear weapons.

Berlin Airlift: Europe's First Cold War

Berlin Airlift: Europe's First Cold War



Source: Encarta Encyclopedia

Source: Encarta Encyclopedia

Germany and its capital city of Berlin were split in two following World War II. West Germany and West Berlin were under occupation by the western Allies, which included the US. Berlin and East Germany were under Soviet occupation. Initially partners, the US and the USSR soon came to differ over the task of reconstructing the infrastructure, politics, and economy of a Europe devastated by war.

In June 1948, the Soviet Union invaded West Berlin in an attempt to take control of the entire city. The West refused to accept the encirclement, and the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, ordered the Berlin Airlift. The Berlin Airlift was a massive airlift of food and supplies to the people of West Berlin.

Using aid as a diplomatic tool

The United States maintained West Berlin fed for nearly a year by utilizing aid as a diplomatic instrument rather than a military strike. Not willing to risk a military conflict, the Soviet Union backed down and opened the highways to the West in May 1949. Berlin's location on the border with Soviet-controlled Poland made it vulnerable to communist influence. Citizens of West Berlin were besieged and unable to travel freely to East Berlin or across East Germany to Western democratic nations. Thirteen years later, Berlin once again became the epicenter of Cold War tensions when, in an unexpected move, the Soviets practically erected the Berlin Wall overnight, cutting the city in half.

Diplomacy throughout the Civil Rights Movement

During the Cold War, US diplomacy was concerned with preventing the expansion of communism and reducing its impact where it already existed. American politicians felt that increasing democracy would increase individual liberty for everyone. However, the democratic United States faced a challenge. It could not say that democracy is the finest form of government while millions of its citizens face racial discrimination and segregation.

Despite the limited budget, Biden's administration prioritises supporting democracy and seeks "a significant increase in resources to advance human rights and democratic values." For fiscal year 2021, Congress committed \$2.4 billion in foreign aid for human rights and democracy efforts around the world. These include international funding for the National Endowment for Democracy (\$300 million), the State Department's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labour (\$190.5 million), USAID's Bureau of Development, Democracy, and Innovation (\$100.3 million), and State Department initiatives focused on

the Middle East, such as the Middle East Partnership Initiative (\$50 million) and Iran human rights (\$55 million). Bilateral aid programmes also support help for human rights and democracy. The accounts, initiatives, and area(s) that the administration intends to allocate the additional cash will be clearly indicative of its objectives for human rights and global democracy throughout the entire budget request.

Douglas E. Schoen's book "The End of Democracy: Russia and China on the Rise, America in Retreat" was published in 2021 and provides a comprehensive analysis of global power dynamics, with a particular emphasis on the rise of Russia and China and what Schoen sees as the United States' simultaneous decline on the global stage. Schoen contends in his book that Russia and China's authoritarian regimes are effectively using their political and economic models to project power and influence on a global scale. He claims that these countries are not only expanding their own spheres of influence, but also actively seeking to undermine the democratic and liberal principles that have been primarily espoused by the United States and its allies. Schoen critically evaluates the United States' internal and exterior policies, arguing that America's retreat from global leadership responsibilities, inconsistent foreign policies, and domestic political polarisation are all contributing to the country's declining worldwide stature. He worries that this retreat threatens not only the United States but also the entire democratic system.

The book mixes in-depth geopolitical analysis with a call to action, pushing US politicians to take a more coherent and strategic approach to international affairs, notably in resisting Russia and China's manoeuvres. Schoen pushes for a stronger assertion of democratic values as well as more muscular assistance for allies to guarantee that democratic administration does not slip away in the face of dictatorial advancements. Critically, the book has been praised as a thought-provoking examination, while some critics have remarked that Schoen's interpretations may tend towards a more conservative viewpoint, notably his condemnation of recent US foreign policy choices. However, it has received appreciation for its clarity and urgency in tackling the difficulties that democracies face today. "The End of Democracy" makes an important contribution to the conversation regarding the future of global politics, especially for those interested in the strategic competitions that define the early twenty-first century. It appeals to readers interested in international relations, political science, and contemporary history, providing both helpful and worrisome insights on the potential decline of democratic influence around the world.

Conclusion

To sum up, post-World War II, the global political landscape witnessed the rise of Western democracy as a response to the perceived threats of nationalism and communism. The success of Western democracy in containing these ideologies, particularly in the aftermath of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, is acknowledged. The text questions the nature of Western democracy, noting its roots in ancient Greek principles and its delayed widespread implementation by Western countries until after World War II. The imposition of democracy during decolonization is presented as a strategic move by Western powers to shape the post-colonial world order.

Reference

- Adamson, F. B. (2005). Global liberalism versus political Islam: Competing ideological frameworks in international politics. *International Studies Review*, 7(4), 547-569.
- Beissinger, M. R. (2009). Nationalism and the collapse of Soviet communism. *Contemporary European History*, 18(3), 331-347.
- Berg, M., & Hudson, P. (1992). Rehabilitating the industrial revolution 1. *The Economic History Review*, 45(1), 24-50.
- Connell, R. (2020). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*: Routledge.
- Fawn, R. (2003). Ideology and national identity in post-communist foreign policies. *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 19(3), 1-41.
- Klingemann, H.-D. (1999). Mapping political support in the 1990s: A global analysis. *Critical citizens: Global support for democratic government*, 31-56.
- Kotzian, P. (2011). Public support for liberal democracy. *International Political Science Review*, 32(1), 23-41.
- Lee, A. (2017). Redistributive colonialism: The long term legacy of international conflict in India. *Politics & Society*, 45(2), 173-224.
- Lucas, R. E. (2002). The industrial revolution: Past and future. *Lectures on economic growth*, 109, 188.
- Magalhães, P. C. (2014). Government effectiveness and support for democracy. *European Journal of Political Research*, 53(1), 77-97.
- McCoy, J., Rahman, T., & Somer, M. (2018). Polarization and the global crisis of democracy: Common patterns, dynamics, and pernicious consequences for democratic polities. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(1), 16-42.
- Miller, J. M. (2019). *Cold War Democracy: The United States and Japan, 1945-1963*: Harvard University Press.
- Mokyr, J., & Strotz, R. H. (1998). The second industrial revolution, 1870-1914. *Storia dell'economia Mondiale*, 21945(1), 219-245.
- Muzaffar, M. & Khan, I (2016). China-Russia Relations after the Cold War, *Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 1 (II), 151-169
- Philbeck, T., & Davis, N. (2018). The fourth industrial revolution. *Journal of International Affairs*, 72(1), 17-22.
- Schonberger, H. B. (1989). *Aftermath of war: Americans and the remaking of Japan, 1945-1952*: Kent State University Press.
- Staniland, P. (2008). Explaining civil-military relations in complex political environments: India and Pakistan in comparative perspective. *Security Studies*, 17(2), 322-362.
- Tudor, M. (2013). *The promise of power: The origins of democracy in India and autocracy in Pakistan*: Cambridge University Press.

Whitehead, L. (2015). International democracy promotion as a political ideology: Upsurge and retreat. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 20(1), 10-26.

Xu, M., David, J. M., & Kim, S. H. (2018). The fourth industrial revolution: Opportunities and challenges. *International journal of financial research*, 9(2), 90-95.