



The Implications of British Colonial Territorial Division on Class Conflict in India and Pakistan

Citra Ayu Maharani

Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia; citra22003@mail.unpad.ac.id

David Rivendell Walalangi

International University Liaison Indonesia; Indonesia; david.walalangi@stud.iuli.ac.id

| Dikirim: 12-12-2025 | Diterima: 08-03-2026 | Dipublikasikan: 05-05-2026 |

Keywords

British colonialism; class struggle; conflict; India-Pakistan; Geopolitical marxism

ABSTRACT

This article examines how British colonial practices in India, including determining territorial boundaries, shaped power relations and class structures that were later reproduced into modern geopolitical conflict. The theoretical framework employed is Geopolitical Marxism, which emphasizes that relations of ownership and control over resources are the primary drivers of social and political change. This research adopts a qualitative method. The data are derived from secondary sources collected from various relevant materials. The collected data are then sorted and categorized according to the research focus. Subsequently, the data are analyzed using cross-source data triangulation to ensure the validity of findings and to strengthen the accuracy of interpretative results. The findings indicate that the hasty and arbitrary division of territory, such as the establishment of the Radcliffe Line, reinforced socio-economic inequalities and opened space for power struggles among postcolonial political elites. The prolonged conflicts in Punjab, Bengal, and Kashmir represent the reproduction of colonial ruling-class formations within modern state structures. The legacy of British colonialism is therefore not limited to territorial boundaries, but also includes enduring class domination that continues to generate cycles of conflict in India-Pakistan today.

Kata Kunci

India-Pakistan; konflik; kolonialisme Inggris; marxisme geopolitik; perjuangan kelas

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini membahas bagaimana praktik kolonial Inggris di India, termasuk dalam penentuan batas teritorial, membentuk relasi kekuasaan dan kelas yang kemudian direproduksi menjadi konflik geopolitik modern. Kerangka teori yang digunakan adalah Geopolitical Marxism yang menekankan bahwa relasi kepemilikan dan penguasaan sumber daya adalah penggerak utama perubahan sosial dan politik. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif. Data penelitian diperoleh melalui data sekunder yang dikumpulkan dari berbagai sumber relevan. Data yang telah terkumpul kemudian dipilah dan dikategorikan sesuai dengan fokus penelitian. Selanjutnya, data dianalisis menggunakan teknik triangulasi data antar sumber untuk memastikan validitas temuan dan memperkuat ketepatan interpretasi hasil penelitian. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pembagian wilayah yang tergesa-gesa dan arbitrer, seperti penetapan Radcliffe Line, memperkuat ketimpangan sosial-ekonomi dan membuka ruang bagi perebutan kekuasaan antar elit politik pascakolonial. Konflik berkepanjangan di Punjab, Bengal, dan Kashmir merupakan hasil reproduksi kelas penguasa kolonial ke dalam struktur negara modern. Warisan kolonial Inggris tidak hanya berupa batas teritorial, tetapi juga struktur dominasi kelas yang terus menciptakan siklus konflik di India-Pakistan hingga saat ini.

INTRODUCTION

Amidst escalating conflicts in various regions, the discourse of “peace is the time between wars” illustrates a pessimistic view of peace. Prolonged conflicts continue to occur even after the world has gone through various wars, from the two World Wars to the Cold War. Peace has been temporary and marked by protracted conflicts even though the world has gone through periods of major wars. The main causes of this situation include geopolitical interests, competition for resources, ideological differences, and a long history of hostility between groups or nations. Conflicts in various parts of the world cannot be separated from the significant role of major countries such as Britain and France in the dynamics of global conflict and peace (Silawati, 2021).

Some countries have historically played a role as colonizers and major players in the post-war world order with great economic and military power, with the capacity and influence to resolve international conflicts (Strangio, 2024). However, their role is ambivalent. On the one hand, these major countries can act as mediators in conflicts, facilitators of peace negotiations, and donors of humanitarian aid to countries in conflict. On the other hand, the involvement of these major countries might also be based around self-serving national interests, such as maintaining economic access to resources, strengthening strategic alliances, or maintaining political influence in certain regions. This sometimes prolongs conflicts and makes it difficult to achieve lasting peace because there are conflicting interests between local and international actors.

British involvement, particularly in post-World War II international conflicts, has been highly influential in shaping the geopolitics of several regions. As a former major colonial power, Britain left behind a political legacy that contributed to instability. One important example is the role of Britain in the dynamics of the Indian and Pakistani conflict through its colonial policies that triggered sudden territorial separation and impacted the ongoing conflict between the two countries (Silawati, 2021). Through its post-colonial policies, Britain contributed to a complex political situation that was prone to breaking out into prolonged conflict, which continues to this day in its former colonies.

British colonialism and imperialism began in the 16th century and continued until the 20th century, driven by a desire to dominate economic and political interests. At that time, Britain was one of the rapidly developing countries of Western Europe, so it targeted strategic areas rich in natural resources in various regions, such as Asia, Africa, and America, as colonies. British colonialism employed a distinctive strategy that combined military domination and cultural influence, as well as utilizing relationships with local elites to strengthen its power. Britain often sent scientists, administrators, and medical personnel to improve the quality of colonial society, but still implemented a system that benefited them as colonizers (Nada, 2022). Furthermore, during its reign, Britain implemented a divide and rule policy by exploiting social and religious differences in its colonies (Banerjee, 2023).

After the end of British colonialism, South Asia became one of the regions that underwent complex political and social transformations. The decolonization process carried out by the British was not a peaceful transfer of power, but rather a reproduction of the structures of conflict that were passed on to the new countries. In South Asia, particularly in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, the British left behind a system of government, law, and administration that still forms the foundation of these countries today (Ayunda & Aria, 2017). The partition of India and Pakistan in 1947 was a direct consequence of British colonial policy, which failed to anticipate the social impact of drawing national borders (Aryal & Pulami, 2024). Ultimately, post-colonialism became a critical period in history for many countries that had previously been under colonial rule. The vulnerability of developing countries, which often manifests in civil wars and repressive regimes, can be traced back to colonial practices that continue to shape geopolitical dynamics (Nongmeikapam, 2015).

Previous research on British colonialism and post-colonialism in India and Pakistan has been extensive, but limited to a focus on religion and identity. Ayunda & Aria (2017) found in their research that the Kashmir conflict, which has its roots in the religiously based political separation of the British legacy, reflects the failure of a fair decolonization process and has had multidimensional political, economic, and social impacts that continue to be felt even after 1970. Furthermore, previous studies have concluded that British colonial lines (McMahon, Radcliffe, Durand) not only divided territories but also shaped a fragile regional security architecture characterized by mutual suspicion (Aryal & Pulami, 2024). From an international law perspective, several studies concluded that the 2025 India-Pakistan conflict in Kashmir reflected historical tensions exacerbated by various multidimensional factors (Karo, 2025). Previous studies have also concluded that the prolonged conflict between India and Pakistan in the Kashmir region poses a major threat to stability and peace in South Asia, and even the world (Sihmanto et al., 2025).

Although there are many studies examining the partition of India and Pakistan and the conflicts it caused, literature that adopts a class-based approach to analyze the dynamics of this topic is currently sparse. Most studies focus on aspects of national identity and religion, but ignore the analysis of class structures and the economic-political processes that underpin this conflict. This study aims to fill this gap by integrating the theory of Geopolitical Marxism to provide a more comprehensive and critical understanding of British colonial policies and their role in creating the India-Pakistan tension that continues up to 2025. Through this analysis, this study seeks to contribute to the development of international relations studies by introducing Geopolitical Marxism as an analytical lens in understanding the India-Pakistan conflict.

This approach highlights that postcolonial conflicts are not only related to issues of identity, nationalism, or territorial disputes, but are also rooted in economic-political structures and class relations originating from the colonial era(s). Furthermore, this research can also show policymakers that efforts to resolve the India-Pakistan conflict cannot be achieved solely through diplomatic negotiations or territorial dispute settlements, but requires an approach that addresses the structural roots of the conflict, including socio-economic inequalities and inter-class power relations that grew out of the colonial legacy. By understanding the deeper structure of the conflict, this article encourages the strengthening of an inclusive, socially-just conflict resolution framework that does not stop at short-term political compromises that are inherently fragile.

The urgency of this research stems from the fact that the India-Pakistan conflict continues to this day and has become one of the hotspots in the context of regional and global security. This reality shows that the British colonial legacy, through arbitrary territorial division, has given rise to unequal and endless power relations. This condition shows that there are structural problems that have not been fully addressed in the conflict resolution approaches that have been carried out, resulting in the failure to achieve the ideal condition that is expected, namely the creation of sustainable peace in South Asia. The gap between the actual condition (*das sein*) and the ideal condition (*das sollen*) is the starting point and main justification for this research.

Based on this framework, this article proposes a research question regarding how British colonialism, through its division of South Asia, created conditions that enabled the emergence and continuation of the India-Pakistan conflict. The main argument offered is that the India-Pakistan conflict is not merely a matter of rival identities or the geopolitical interests of modern nation-states, but is a continuation of the colonial structures of domination reproduced by the postcolonial ruling class in order to maintain access to power and resources. Thus, this conflict is a manifestation of long-rooted class relations and economic-political interests, not merely the result of religious antagonism or nationalism.

This study uses a qualitative method using secondary data, which will then be analyzed using triangulation techniques between sources to ensure data validity. This study aims to analyze how British

colonialism, through its territorial division policy, shaped the structure of class domination and economic-political relations, which were then reproduced into prolonged conflict between India and Pakistan, specifically identifying colonial policies that shaped the structure of postcolonial conflict. This article begins with an explanation of the theoretical framework of Geopolitical Marxism, followed by an explanation of the research methods and data sources, a discussion of British colonial practices in territorial division and the formation of colonial power relations, an analysis of the reproduction of structures of domination in the contemporary India-Pakistan conflict, and concludes with the theoretical and practical implications of the research findings.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Geopolitical Marxism

This analysis adopts a theoretical framework rooted in Geopolitical Marxism (GPM) (Von Pfaler & Teschke, 2024). This approach stems from the tradition of Political Marxism (PM) which states that historically specific social-property relations are the main drivers of social and institutional change (Aston & Philpin, 1995). Geopolitical Marxism expands this core insight by intrinsically linking PM's internal focus on class struggle with the external realm of international relations and foreign policy (Salgado, 2017, pp. 53–72). This approach argues that geopolitics is not a separate sphere that merely reflects domestic relations, but is an integral component of those relations (Lacher, 2003). This framework dissolves rigid internal and external divisions and treats the 'social' and the 'geopolitical' as inseparable moments of analysis.

The core of this framework is a commitment to radical historicism, which prioritizes agency within situations, contested resolutions, and open historical processes rather than structural determinism, which asserts that social, political, or economic structures in a society have a powerful influence on individual behavior, political decisions, and social dynamics within it (Salgado, 2017, pp. 57–58). Class itself is reconceptualized not as a fixed structural location, such as capital owners, but as an ever-emerging process. Following E.P. Thompson and Ellen Meiksins Wood, class is understood as social relations that are continuously formed and reformed through shared praxis, collective experiences, struggles and strategies over the distribution of resources, social reproduction, and, most importantly, spatial control (Wood, 1995). Therefore, foreign policy is a key arena where this class praxis takes place. This means that, according to this theory, there are no predetermined classes based on their 'position'; instead, classes and their dynamics are unique to each historical situation, and therefore need to be discovered or placed in context by researchers on a case-by-case basis. This contrasts with traditional Marxist theories, in which class analysis tends to focus exclusively on vertical class conflict between the working class and the capitalist class; or in World Systems Theory (Wallerstein, 2004): between the Imperial Core, Periphery, and Semi-Periphery.

An important analytical link between class struggle and the outcomes of foreign policy is the concept of strategies of spatialization. Developed by Hannes Lacher (2003, 2007), strategies of spatialization are concrete and historically contingent methods used by class factions mediated through institutions to produce and control space in order to secure their own reproduction. These strategies translate material needs for resources, markets, labor, and so on into concrete practices aimed at controlling territory and shaping the regulatory environment (Salgado, 2017, pp. 63–67). Foreign policy, alliance formation, and trade agreements are thus understood as geopolitics, that is, specific contested practices in which these spatially oriented class strategies are implemented and institutionalized.

Analytically, this framework reorients the analysis of foreign policy as a process of socially constituted spatial contestation (Salgado, 2017; Von Pfaler & Teschke, 2024). This framework examines the dialectical negotiation between three interrelated dimensions, namely the material constraints of social-property relations, the institutional mediation of competing class factions, and the improvisational agency of actors. This first requires mapping the dominant class formations and their

inherent spatial imperatives, as well as the constraints imposed by the struggles of subordinate classes. Second, it involves analyzing the specific institutional mechanisms, both formal and informal, through which class factions filter their interests and exert influence over the state's foreign policy apparatus. Third, it reconstructs the formulation of specific geopolitics by tracing the contestation between competing spatial strategies within the state. Finally, this framework examines inter-state interactions as encounters between domestically formed spatial strategies driven by this agency. Consequently, what is conventionally referred to as national interests are revealed as institutionalized and temporary manifestations of dominant and contested class-based spatial projects.

Academic studies of the India-Pakistan conflict often treat the British colonial era as merely a passive backdrop to modern security dilemmas, rather than seeing it as an active arena where this rivalry began. The mainstream Realist and Deterrence frameworks typically view the 1947 partition as the zero point of structural anarchy, arguing that Britain's chaotic withdrawal created a security vacuum that forced the new states to pursue nuclear modernization and integrated ring balancing for their survival (Akram & Fitriyah, 2024; M. Hussain & Ali Naqvi, 2025; Sridharan, 2005). Even approaches that attempt to trace the history of this conflict tend to focus only on the institutional or ideational legacy of the British Raj. For example, Constructivists argue that the Two-Nation Theory reinforced a Hobbesian culture of mutual existential threat, while recent analyses by Sato (2025) and Zaidi and Khan (2025) focus on deterrent coloniality and convoluted legal narratives, arguing that the conflict persists because postcolonial states have internalized British mechanisms of policing and territorial control (Sato, 2025; Wojczewski, 2014; Zaidi & Khan, 2025). While these perspectives correctly identify forms of colonial power such as borders, law, and identity, they suffer from an analytical blindness to the material social forces that necessitate them. They view colonial partition as a diplomatic failure or identity crisis, thereby obscuring the class dynamics that were actively maintained and ultimately institutionalized by the British empire.

Geopolitical Marxism (GPM) offers a powerful alternative by placing the origins of conflict directly within the crisis of social-property relations engineered by British colonialism. Rather than viewing partition solely as a religious schism or security dilemma, GPM applies radical historicism to expose it as a calculated spatial fix designed to preserve a particular class hierarchy maintained by the Raj. Therefore, this conflict was not triggered by abstract anarchy, but by concrete vertical class struggles, as exemplified by the 1947 Poonch agrarian tax rebellion, which forced the ruling elites to divert internal resistance into an external "national" war (Hayat & Ahmed, 2021). Thus, GPM reinterprets the India-Pakistan rivalry not as a legacy of unfinished nation-building, but as a successful and enduring strategy of colonial class preservation, in which borders function as permanent valves for managing social contradictions inherited from the British empire.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The focus of this study is to answer the question of how the division of territories by the British has led to many conflicts in the modern era. The research method used in this study is a qualitative method conducted through the search for information or data in accordance with the research question. In the book *Research Method in International Relations*, Lamont (2015) explains that qualitative research is an approach that aims to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomena being studied, so as to be able to present a complete picture of the information and dynamics at play in international politics. Data collection in this study was carried out through comprehensive document analysis using secondary data obtained via the internet. Secondary data was obtained from various online sources, journal articles were obtained through the Google Scholar and JSTOR databases, while online media sources were obtained through trusted news channels such as Al-Jazeera, The Diplomat, CNN, and BBC. Data validity was ensured through data triangulation by comparing and confirming data from various sources, including official documents and academic publications, in order to obtain a complete and comprehensive understanding of the research topic (Lamont, 2015). Next, in the data analysis process, researchers first determine the scope of the study by reviewing information relevant to the phenomenon being studied. Sources that are not directly related to the theme of conflict inheritance due to colonial division are eliminated, so that only data relevant to the research topic is analyzed further. This process ensures that the data used is representative and academically accountable. After that, the collected data is grouped into specific categories through a deductive approach to facilitate the information processing. The final stage is carried out by systematically interpreting the data in order to draw objective and comprehensive research conclusions (Lamont, 2015).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The India-Pakistan Partition and Its Underlying Class Foundations

The end of World War II led to a wave of decolonization in various regions, including British colonies. The British decision to grant independence was significantly driven by the region's declining profitability (Fakhriansyah, 2025). In the mid-20th century, India was plagued by conflicts between Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs, which made the political and social situation increasingly unstable. This situation made it difficult for Britain to maintain order, especially since Britain itself was experiencing a post-war economic crisis with large debts and a drastic decline in its budget. In this situation, the British Labour Party government decided that granting independence to India was the best course of action. The decolonization policy was then promoted through The Mountbatten Plan.

The Mountbatten Plan refers to the final proposal to end British colonial rule in India by dividing the subcontinent into two independent countries. Lord Mountbatten, the last viceroy in India, immediately began work on the partition of India after taking office. While Britain drained India's wealth and profited from its natural resources, it divided 60% of the country into provinces and recognized a series of hundreds of "princely states" as autonomous entities supervised by existing local rulers (Blakemore, 2025). After receiving approval from the British government, Lord Mountbatten returned to India on May 30, 1947, and held a meeting with Indian political leaders on June 2, 1947, to discuss the plan. On June 3, 1947, a white paper was published outlining the details of the division of territory, whereby the provinces of Bengal and Punjab were to be divided between India and Pakistan based on Muslim and non-Muslim majorities (Jamil, 2018). This plan was announced on All India radio and followed by the formation of boundary commissions for Punjab and Bengal.

In this plan, the partition of India was entrusted to the Radcliffe Boundary Commission, led by Sir Cyril Radcliffe, a lawyer from London who had never visited South Asia before being assigned to this task. Radcliffe was appointed to divide the borders despite his limited knowledge of the complex social, religious, and cultural structures in the region (Kaur, 2025). With only 35 days to complete the task, the commission had to decide where the Radcliffe Line, or new border, would be drawn (Y. Khan, 2017,

pp. 105–124). In carrying out this division, the Radcliffe Boundary Commission had to divide the provinces mostly along religious lines using outdated and misleading census reports. The population census itself was one of the first tools conceived by the colonial state in 1872, with British colonial officials conducting systematic censuses and explicitly recording the religion and caste of each person (CNN, 2025). The British relied heavily on these censuses, and officials themselves often admitted to being unfamiliar with local customs and saw the census as a tool for easier population management.

Before partition, Hindus made up nearly 70% of the population of British India, while Muslims accounted for only about a quarter. Although most Muslim-majority communities were located in the north, religious groups were scattered throughout the country. As agreed, the division of territory was based on religious majority, with Muslim-majority areas allocated to Pakistan and non-Muslim-majority areas (mainly Hindu and Sikh) allocated to India (Jamil, 2018). However, there were still divisions that did not reflect reality, with some Muslim-majority areas ending up in Indian territory and vice versa. In addition, there were several controversial anomalies, such as the Muslim-majority district of Gurdaspur being given to India to provide strategic access to Kashmir and the district of Ferozepore, which was initially allocated to Pakistan but was later transferred to India due to political pressure (Jamil, 2018). Under this plan, princely states, such as Jammu and Kashmir, were given the choice to remain independent or join India or Pakistan (Singh, 2021).

The Radcliffe Line, completed in August 1947, left both India and Pakistan dissatisfied. The characteristics of this line stemmed from the urgency of a hasty and arbitrary partition process. The final changes in the determination of territories were largely influenced by political pressure from Congress and Lord Mountbatten, who tended to favor India. This hasty partition policy triggered mass migration, sectarian violence, and widespread social impacts that continue to this day. Although Sir Cyril Radcliffe left India shortly after submitting his maps, those who live along the partition line continue to bear the impact to this day. The hastily drawn Radcliffe Line is significant because it marks the border between the newly independent countries of India and Pakistan. Dividing the country based on religion proved difficult, especially in the provinces of Punjab and Bengal, which had roughly equal Hindu and Muslim populations. The discontinuous formation of Pakistan forced millions of Hindus and Muslims to relocate. This shows that the complex demographics in Punjab and Bengal contributed to the mass displacement and violence related to the India-Pakistan partition (Blakemore, 2025). The division of borders carried out by the British in the India-Pakistan region largely failed to account for the complex social realities of the local communities. The process took place without local consultation, creating ambiguous and arbitrary border lines that ultimately gave rise to conflict.

The case of India and Pakistan shows how ambiguity and arbitrariness in territorial division became the starting point for a prolonged conflict that has been passed down across generations between communities that previously lived side by side. Historically, the British left their mark on South Asia through turbulent borders and a legacy of complex conflicts within the region (Aryal & Pulami, 2024). This division is a direct result of the colonial strategy of “divide and rule,” which exploited cultural and religious tensions to facilitate separation (Nongmeikapam, 2015). The partition of India in 1947 divided people and territories based on religion and belief through a census, further strengthening the polarization of interfaith relations. This also disrupted the syncretic culture in the region. Most importantly, the partition has since been transformed into a politicized memory project with the aim of maintaining and strengthening power (Ranjan & Sulehria, 2022).

From this perspective, the British colonial strategy of “divide and rule” was not merely a tactic of socio-cultural fragmentation, but part of socio-property relations as a strategy to maintain the economic and political dominance of the colonial ruling class by exploiting religious identity tensions as a means of control. The division of territory was not always a foregone conclusion; the decision to partition was a long and conflict-prone process that could actually have been avoided. In 1942, the majority of Indians

supported Indian independence, and views of the British deteriorated due to their participation in World War II and public perceptions of discrimination against India. This was so severe that the viceroy at the time offered independence in exchange for Indian support in the war (Dalrymple, 2025, pp. 114–115). Because the Indian National Congress rejected this offer (they demanded immediate independence), they were sidelined during the war, allowing their pro-war opponents, the Muslim League and its leader, M. A. Jinnah, to rise in popularity unchallenged (Dalrymple, 2025, pp. 115–116).

In fact, Britain's need for Indian support in World War II in 1940 and Jinnah's support for it (contrary to the Congress's conditions for Indian independence) were what first opened official discussions about the possibility of Pakistani independence (Dalrymple, 2025, pp. 82–83). However, there were material, not just ideological, reasons behind the partition that ultimately made division inevitable, both from the British and Indian perspectives. From the British perspective, they faced enormous economic difficulties as a result of World War II, forcing them to sign the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of 1946. This agreement was very detrimental to Britain, causing the Sterling crisis and ending preferential trade with British colonies (Solomon, 2019). This financial crisis, coupled with Britain's large war debt to India, meant that maintaining India as a colony would be more expensive than its remaining benefits (De Paiva Abreu, 2017). Britain's decision to partition the territory was heavily influenced by the fact that India had been ravaged by communal violence between Muslims and Hindus, convincing Britain that the two communities could not coexist under one country (Dalrymple, 2025, pp. 189, 196).

The division of two regions based on religion was considered a solution for Muslims to resolve frequent religious conflicts. Meanwhile, the Indian National Congress (INC), with its secular ideology, sought to unite all regions of India and bring all religious groups together under one government (Kaul, 2024). The idea of establishing Pakistan elicited mixed responses from Muslim leaders, with some supporting it, while others rejected it on the grounds that Islam must continue to fight for justice in any form, including against unjust governments and fighting for the political rights of Muslims in general elections. The establishment of Pakistan was intended to ensure that certain regions were under Muslim majority control. Punjab became one of the important regions in this regard.

Punjab itself has played a strategic role since the Islamic conquest of the Hindustan region. However, even after India gained independence, the Punjab region was divided into two parts, Pakistani Punjab and Indian Punjab. Meanwhile, Kashmir, which was a princely state, formally had the right to determine its own fate after independence. The support of Indian Muslims for an independent Pakistan was based on material and class considerations, which can be directly linked to British policy. Class-based support for Pakistan from the Muslim community was a mosaic of various groups with different economic bases and interests. The first group was the traditional Muslim artisans, who were the majority in urban areas (concentrated in Bengal and Uttar Pradesh), where their traditional industries were defeated by imports of British-produced industrial goods, causing inequality between the Muslim and Hindu communities (Aleeza, 2025, pp. 1–3, 7).

The next group was Muslim business owners who were defeated by their Hindu competitors. This was due to the British's strict enforcement of Sharia inheritance laws, which caused Muslim entrepreneurs' capital to be divided among heirs, while Hindu entrepreneurs were able to accumulate their capital across generations and as family businesses (Kuran & Singh, 2011). Another important group is the Salariat, a professional class dependent on government employment (Alavi, 1988, pp. 76–77). They supported Pakistan's independence because they felt their opportunities for government jobs and political power were blocked by the dominant upper-caste Hindu Salariat group, and Pakistan was seen as an opportunity to create a new country where their jobs and elite positions would be guaranteed (Alavi, 1988, pp. 78–81, 1991). The role of the British in this regard was multifaceted. First, the change in the official administrative language from Persian, which was favored by the Mughal Empire, to English effectively reset the status of the educated Muslim Salariat. Second, the dissolution of Muslim

waqfs destroyed the Muslim education system, further worsening the Salariat's ability to improve their qualifications. Third, the Sepoy Rebellion of 1857 was viewed by the British as a Muslim conspiracy, causing them to distrust Muslims and prefer Hindus for government jobs (Momen et al., 2024).

Partition Violence in Punjab and Bengal: Class Politics and Colonial Legacy

In the context of the partition of India, other subcontinents experienced a more peaceful division, but Punjab and Bengal became the main centers of extreme violence. Other provinces, such as Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, certainly experienced communal unrest, but because they were not physically divided between India and Pakistan, the struggle for territory was not as intense as in Punjab and Bengal. Apart from religion, there were also several other factors that influenced this phenomenon. Both Punjab and Bengal were provinces with large territories and very diverse populations. Therefore, an arbitrary demographic division would create vulnerabilities that would trigger conflict.

Based on the pre-partition census (1941), Punjab's population was 34 million, consisting of 53% Muslims who dominated the western districts, 30% Hindus who dominated the eastern cities and some districts, and 15% Sikhs who were concentrated in central Punjab without an absolute majority in any large area. Meanwhile, Bengal had a population of around 60 million, consisting of 70% Muslims in the eastern districts and 70% Hindus in the western part, meaning that each side contained a very large minority of the "other" community (Jamil, 2018). The reality on the ground shows that prior to partition, approximately 5.7 million Muslims (30% of West Bengal) lived in the predominantly Hindu western zone, and 11.4 million Hindus (33% of East Bengal) lived in the predominantly Muslim eastern zone. Therefore, if the provinces were divided, millions of people would suddenly become religious minorities in the new countries of India or Pakistan.

This demographic mix caused widespread fear and insecurity among communities in both provinces after the partition plan was announced. In the weeks leading up to partition, these two communities, which had previously lived peacefully side by side, stopped identifying themselves as Bengalis or Punjabis. Instead, they began to see each other as Muslims, Hindus, or Sikhs. In addition, there were fears that they would soon be under the rule of an unfriendly majority or even be forced to flee or convert to another religion. In the case of the partition of Punjab and Bengal along the Radcliffe Line, the division of territory ignored religious and cultural demographics, causing deep feelings of loss and displacement, especially in areas such as Amritsar and Lahore, which were divided by the new border (Bessel & Haake, 2009).

The line hastily drawn by British lawyer Sir Cyril Radcliffe led to mass migration and communal violence, resulting in one of the largest human displacements in history (Aryal & Pulami, 2024). The process of regional separation triggered large-scale population displacement, affecting nearly 14 million people (Sato, 2024). This displacement led to widespread violence, loss of life, and destruction of property. The migration created a deep divide between the Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh communities, reinforcing religious identity boundaries in a country that had previously prided itself on its diversity and pluralism. For many people, partition was not only a geographical separation, but also a psychological and cultural rift that affected identities, both individually and collectively. In addition to leaving behind identity conflicts due to arbitrary territorial divisions, the policies left behind by the British also created chaos in provincial governance and administration.

The division of Punjab and Bengal had a political impact that served to perpetuate power. This can be observed in the period leading up to 1947, when politics in Punjab and Bengal became sharply polarized as a result of communitarianism triggered by British colonial policies such as separate electorates and the division of power based on religion. Political elites, such as the Muslim League, Congress, Hindu Mahasabha, and Sikh leaders, mobilized the masses in the name of religious communities, constructing exclusive narratives about their respective "nations." When political elites

such as the Muslim League, Congress, Hindu Mahasabha, and Sikh leaders mobilized the masses based on religious identity, they were actually using political tools, namely religion and nationalism, to maintain or expand their class power positions amid the decolonization process. This can be seen as a form of class politics wrapped in religious identity, where political elites sought to secure their dominance by diverting the consciousness of the masses from class contradictions towards a false solidarity based on religion.

Communal violence in India occurred as a result of Jinnah's "Direct Action Day," in which Muslims across India planned to protest in support of Pakistani independence. However, tensions escalated, leading to clashes and killings between Hindu and Muslim communities (Dalrymple, 2025, pp. 172–179). In Bengal, radicalization peaked through Direct Action Day, which triggered the Calcutta massacre and a chain of riots in Bihar and Noakhali (Das, 1993). In Punjab, the collapse of the interfaith coalition in March 1947 paved the way for extreme violence such as the Rawalpindi Massacre, when Hindu-Sikh villages were destroyed and the Sikh elite began devising the Sikh Plan to cleanse Muslims from the eastern region (Copland, 2002). Thus, society was completely mobilized into religious power blocs that were mutually suspicious and ready to act aggressively.

Another determining factor was the collapse of the colonial administration, particularly in Punjab, which created a security vacuum. The administration and police force were divided along religious lines, and guard forces such as the Punjab Boundary Force were drawn into the violence rather than calming it down (Singh Sidhu, 2021). Britain, at that time in a period of transition towards independence, held back and failed to control the riots in Punjab and Bengal, even prioritizing the protection of European citizens. In contrast, Bengal still maintained a functioning government structure, supported by Gandhi's moral intervention in Calcutta, which was able to prevent an outbreak of violence on Independence Day. Therefore, although both regions experienced communal conflict, only Punjab fell into uncontrolled violence, like a civil war between communities, while Bengal experienced violence on a more limited and delayed scale (Kamran, 2007).

The partition of India was a major catastrophe for the subcontinent, but the worst suffering was concentrated in Punjab and Bengal due to the unique dynamics of these provinces. In both regions, structural factors converged: highly interrelated demographic patterns were torn apart by the logic of religious separation, and decades of communal political rhetoric had fractured social bonds. Furthermore, colonial authorities abdicated responsibility as law and order collapsed. Local leaders and princely states also exploited the vacuum to settle old conflicts and seize territory using private militias. The hasty drawing of the Radcliffe Line brought chaos and insecurity to an already highly unstable situation. Punjab and Bengal became the epicenter of what has been called the "mutual genocide of the Partition", a region marked by intimate and widespread communal violence between neighbors.

Seven decades have passed, but the events in Punjab and Bengal in 1947 continue to significantly impact the historiography and collective memory of the subcontinent. These events serve as a stark reminder of how quickly inter-community relations can collapse when political ambition, administrative failure, and fear converge. Partition is not only historically significant; it also provides a valuable warning about how similar dynamics can be prevented in the future when diverse regions face political division. By highlighting the political and structural explanations, it becomes clear that this violence was not a spontaneous explosion of primordial hatred, but rather the result of class conflict mediated by colonial institutional structures and the motivations of an elite class that exploited religious divisions to maintain power. The new ruling class in the postcolonial state inherited and perpetuated spatial control mechanisms that reinforced socioeconomic inequality and impeded national integration.

Historical Roots, Dynamics, and Reproduction of Power in Kashmir

The conflict between India and Pakistan continues with overlapping territorial claims over the disputed region of Kashmir. Kashmir is located in the heart of Asia with an area of 222,236 km², making it geographically very strategic, supported also by its borders with other large countries. The population of Kashmir is approximately 85% Muslim out of a total population of eight million, while its leader is Hindu (Khaeruddin, 2024). Both India and Pakistan claim Kashmir as part of their territory (Malik, 2023). This conflict began when Kashmir had to determine its own territory, whether it would stand as an independent country, join India, or join Pakistan. The leader of Kashmir, Singh, thought of not joining either country and wanted to create a new country. However, Singh declared joining India without the consent of the population on October 27, 1947.

The decision, which was made without the consideration of the majority of the population, was unacceptable to the people of Kashmir, ultimately leading to a prolonged dispute over the region. The conflict was further exacerbated by India's domestic policy towards Kashmir, which often showed a tendency to use violence to make decisions (Ayunda & Aria, 2017). Essentially, the Kashmir conflict is not limited to a territorial dispute between India and Pakistan, but also involves social and political dimensions, including issues of ethnic and religious identity. The two countries subsequently went to war in 1947-1948, 1965, 1971 and 1999, making Kashmir the focus of an international crisis. The first war began when Pakistan claimed Kashmir as its territory and then attempted to annex the region with the support of Pashtun militias (A. Khan, 2020). This first war ended in 1949 with both countries agreeing on a resolution regarding the Kashmir Cease Fire Line, which later developed into the Line of Control in August 1972. The second war occurred in August 1965, during which Pakistani forces attempted to enter Kashmir and incite an uprising, but it ended in a ceasefire and India was able to seize a small area of Pakistani territory, albeit briefly. The third war began when Bangladesh demanded independence from Pakistan. Finally, the fourth war occurred in 1999 and was called the Kargil War. International pressure on Pakistan forced it to retreat, and the war ended with India seizing Kargil and Pakistan facing diplomatic isolation.

The conflict in this region has become a battleground for global geopolitical interests, with major powers influencing the political dynamics of South Asia (Akram & Fitriyah, 2024). The occurrence of conflicts, which have been ongoing, has impacted the economies of both countries, causing instability, trauma to the people of Kashmir, and an increase in population in both India and Pakistan due to immigration from Kashmir (Sahoo, 2025). The prolonged uncertainty and tension have weakened the social and cultural order of Kashmir, which was once known as a region with ethnic and religious diversity that lived in harmony.

India's domestic politics in recent years has been dominated by far-right Hindu nationalist groups. In Kashmir, which is under Indian administration, the influence of these nationalist groups culminated in a controversial policy to revoke the region's autonomous status. This policy was implemented through the repeal of Article 370 of the Indian Constitution, a clause that previously granted special autonomous status to the state of Jammu & Kashmir (Press Information Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs, 2019). Meanwhile, Pakistan, with its foundation of Islamic nationalism, has been linked to Islamic fundamentalist groups operating as proxies in Kashmir. The living conditions of the local population in Kashmir are also bleak, with civilians on both sides facing human rights violations. For example, in Indian-administered Kashmir, communication lockdowns such as internet blackouts were imposed for seventeen months after the revocation of Article 370, while the legal status of non-Kashmiri settlers was upgraded in an effort to encourage more non-Muslim immigration to Kashmir. (Kuszewska, 2022, pp. 201–202). In Pakistan-administered Kashmir, pro-independence actors reported threats from the Pakistani government and the general population of Kashmir is required to take an oath of allegiance

before applying for government jobs or competing in general elections (Kuszevska, 2022, pp. 207–208).

Fundamentally conflicting interests in the region over the years have resulted in cycles of border clashes as well as military attacks between the two countries. Recently, conflict resurfaced in 2025, when a terrorist attack inside Indian Jammu & Kashmir killed 26 people (Roy, 2025). India accused Pakistan of aiding this attack as well as terrorism in general in Kashmir and launched several missile strikes into Pakistani territory, while Pakistan retaliated with its own attacks, hitting several targets in India (Al Jazeera Staff, 2025; Roy-Chaudhury, 2025). Pakistan claimed the Indian attacks killed forty civilians, while India claimed 21 of its civilians were killed (Alex Kleiderman, 2025; Rahn, 2025).

Much of this contemporary instability is deeply rooted in the British-led partition of the Indian subcontinent. First, the British, through the East India Company, legitimized the oppressive rule of the Dogra Sikh dynasty and its allied Hindu elites over the Muslim-majority population in Kashmir. This was done through the 'sale' of Jammu and Kashmir to Raja Gulab Singh on March 16, 1846 (called the Treaty of Amritsar), after he and the Hindu elites in the state called pandits helped the British against other Sikh kingdoms (Bhat, 2025, pp. 141–142). In securing Dogra power in Jammu and Kashmir as a vassal state, the British helped quell popular uprisings against Amritsar and Dogra rule (Hassnain, 1974, pp. 18–23). Once secured with British assistance, Dogra rule over Kashmir was highly segregated based on religion, with Hindus and Sikhs largely occupying privileged or elite positions in society.

The formed state of Jammu and Kashmir was a highly complex entity with three main regions, namely Jammu, Kashmir, and Ladakh (S. B. Hussain, 2020). Under Dogra rule, this princely state consisted of three parts: the Jhelum Valley, the Indus Valley, and Jammu. The Jhelum Valley included Srinagar, Baramulla, and Muzaffarabad. Then, the Tibetan Block covering Ladakh, Gilgit, and the Frontier Illaqa formed the Indus Valley. Meanwhile, the Jammu Province consisted of Jammu, Udhampur, Kathua, and Raisi. These three regions had clear differences in geographical, cultural, linguistic, and dominant religious aspects. Jammu was dominated by Hindu and Sikh populations and controlled by the Dogra Rajput group, while the Kashmir Valley was a Muslim-majority region, with over ninety percent of the population being Islamic according to the 1941 Census. As for sparsely populated Ladakh, it consisted almost entirely of Tibetan Buddhists. Based on the 1941 Census, 77.11% of the J&K population was Muslim, 20.12% Hindu, 1.64% Sikh, and 1% Buddhist.

British support for the Dogra Government was not solely driven by colonial administrative considerations, but also by shared class interests between the colonial elite and the local feudal elite. The British in the colonial era occupied the position of the imperialist bourgeois class as owners of global industrial and financial capital who controlled international trade, resources, and world production lines. Meanwhile, the Dogra rulers came from the ambitious and wealthy Jammu aristocracy, with Gulab Singh as a Sikh vassal who seized Ladakh and Baltistan before "purchasing" Kashmir from the British post-First Sikh War. The Dogra group was a class of Hindu Rajput landowners from Jammu who ruled the state (as intermediaries on behalf of the British) prior to accession to India. Meanwhile, Muslims, representing about 78 percent of the total population, were mostly tenant farmers, laborers, and the artisan class who generally experienced exploitation. The princely state of J&K had a unique characteristic because its rulers and elites were of the Hindu religion, while the majority of the people were of the Islamic religion.

The Dogra administration represented the local ruling class that enjoyed wealth accumulation from the exploitation of the Muslim community's agrarian labor. On the other hand, the British as an imperialistic colonial power had an interest in maintaining the stability of a class structure that benefited them. Protection of the Dogra administration can be understood as a form of alliance between the colonial ruling class and the local feudal ruling class. The British maintained the Dogra not merely because Kashmir was a "rich" region, but because the Dogra regime guaranteed the sustainability of an economic order that allowed for the extraction of production surpluses without significant resistance.

In other words, the colonial dominant class protected the local dominant class to keep the system of exploitation running. This situation subsequently bequeathed class inequality and social tensions that contributed to the prolonged conflict in Kashmir in the post-colonial era.

Exploitation in Kashmir was not only socially formed but also economic as the Muslim majority became farmers under Hindu landowners, facing exploitation, forced labor, and starvation (Bhat, 2025, p. 143; S. Hussain, 2021, p. 28). Furthermore, there was also discrimination against Muslim workers in urban areas, such as the Muslim-majority shawl weavers who faced exploitation by state monopolies, where their already low wages were stolen by corrupt Pandit officials (Andrabi & Bhat, 2017). In other words, there was an overlap between social class (oppressed or elite) and religion (Muslim and Hindu), where discrimination occurred based on religion, but was actually based on a foundation of inequality in economic and class terms. British colonialism placed Britain as the imperialist bourgeois class, while the people of what is now India and Pakistan were positioned as exploited colonial proletariat spaces. However, this exploitation was mediated by an alliance between the colonial ruling class and the local feudal and bourgeois elites, which then bequeathed the structure of class inequality in the post-colonial era.

The British not only enabled the brutal Dogra rule through the initial "sale" of Jammu and Kashmir but also provided legitimacy and empowerment to the Dogra dynasty. This empowerment then created oppressive conditions that are ultimately reflected in the policies implemented on both sides of Kashmir today, whether under Pakistani or Indian administration. Specifically, the British viewed Kashmir and its compliance as a key point for their geostrategic interests in the region, especially in facing the Russian and Chinese empires. Therefore, the Dogra family was given much support, ranging from political violations to direct arms supplies (Hassnain, 1974, pp. 45–48, 63–66). Only after massive popular movements against the Dogra threatened the dynasty did some reforms materialize through the Glancy Commission Report on March 22, 1932, which included religious freedom, improved education for the Muslim community, and land rights reforms (Bhat, 2025, pp. 147–151; S. Hussain, 2021, p. 41). However, the Glancy Commission Report was opposed by Pandit elites, driven by a desire to preserve privileges rather than by religious differences, and largely, the Glancy Commission Report was not fully realized by Kashmiri elites, and so it resulted in no real impact or changes (Huttenback, 2004, p. 145).

It can be concluded that the British, with their protection of the Dogra government, prolonged and strengthened the conflict between the oppressed class, which was majority Muslim, and the elite class, which was majority Hindu in Kashmir. This would ultimately lead to the separation of Kashmir between India and Pakistan and the ensuing conflict. This conflict began with the Poonch Rebellion, where tens of thousands of Muslim World War II veterans rebelled against a burdensome double and discriminatory tax system (Mushtaq, 2021, pp. 34–38). This event caused a series of consecutive consequences. First, the formation of a Muslim-led government in 'Azad Jammu & Kashmir' which would later join Pakistan. Second, retaliation by Dogra forces through a massacre of Muslims in Jammu. Third, Pashtun tribal forces entered to support the rebellion, which then led to the annexation of the remaining Jammu and Kashmir territory to India under the Dogra government with the help of the Indian army. Finally, this series of events triggered a direct military conflict between India and Pakistan over the Jammu & Kashmir region (Mushtaq, 2021, pp. 50–60).

CONCLUSION

Policies and territorial divisions in the colonial and post-colonial periods carried out by the British have had long-term impacts. The unilateral division of territory by the British colonial power created not only territorial disputes but also class inequality and elite dominance that perpetuated cycles of conflict and instability. The unique contribution of this research lies in the effort to integrate an analysis of the British colonial legacy and the India–Pakistan conflict through a Geopolitical Marxism approach, which is still relatively rarely used in the study of international relations in the context of the India-Pakistan conflict. This research expands the literature that has so far been more dominated by identity and security analyses, by placing class structures and economic interests as primary variables in understanding post-colonial conflict. In the context of this territorial division, Geopolitical Marxism theory offers an important perspective by highlighting the relationship between political power, class structures, and economic interests as the main factors shaping post-colonial conflict. Conflict is not solely triggered by ethnic or religious sentiments, but is also an expression of class struggle regarding the seizure of resources and state control. This shows that the colonial legacy is not only in the form of geographic boundaries but also in the form of unequal socio-economic structures that trigger prolonged conflict. This legacy makes India-Pakistan the region with the most volatile security complex in the world, where national identity, class, borders, and geopolitics are intertwined in a cycle of conflict.

The phenomenon of the India-Pakistan conflict also demonstrates how post-colonial states still face the challenge of building inclusive and stable national systems. Tensions rooted in territorial division are also influenced by political and economic battles between the new ruling classes born in the former colonial territories. Thus, this research expands the horizon of conflict theory reading, which has so far been more dominated by geopolitical and ethno-religious analyses, by showing that the British colonial legacy not only created problematic territorial boundaries but also perpetuated power formations and unequal resource distribution that continue to be reproduced by post-colonial political elites. The implications of British colonial policies on modern international relations indicate that various conflicts and alliances occurring today are rooted in the legacy of colonial rule. Colonial and post-colonial legacies continue to shape most deeply rooted conflicts in various regions. Colonialism did not end; it merely changed form into neo-colonialism, and the British played a role as architects of modern geopolitical conflicts. Decades later, the India-Pakistan partition remains a case study on the consequences of hasty decisions and ignoring the reality on the ground. The echoes of this division are still felt today as the Radcliffe Line continues to shape the contours of India-Pakistan relations.

Conflict resolution efforts in the India–Pakistan region through political diplomacy and border negotiations alone are not sufficient, and instead a structural reform agenda to reduce socio-economic inequality and elite dominance (which are the roots of the prolonged conflict) is required. Thus, it is suggested that research discussing colonial legacy conflicts needs to pay attention to class and political economy dimensions. Furthermore, this research still has limitations, particularly in data collection, as the researcher only used secondary data and document analysis, and thus has not explored the perspectives of local actors directly through interviews or field observations. Additionally, the scope of the research is still focused on the India–Pakistan case, so generalizations regarding post-colonial conflicts in other regions remain limited.

REFERENCES

- Akram, A. S., & Fitriyah, A. (2024). Kashmir As A Center Of Global Conflict: Historical, Political, And Diplomatic Perspectives. *Politeia : Journal Of Public Administration And Political Science And International Relations*, 2(2), 96–115. <https://doi.org/10.61978/Politeia.V2i2.461>
- Al Jazeera Staff. (2025, May 7). *Operation Sindoor: What's The Significance Of India's Pakistan Targets?* Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/5/7/operation-sindoor-whats-the-significance-of-indias-pakistan-targets>
- Alavi, H. (1988). Pakistan And Islam: Ethnicity And Ideology. In F. Halliday & H. Alavi (Eds.), *State And Ideology In The Middle East And Pakistan*. Macmillan Education.
- Alavi, H. (1991). Nationhood And The Nationalities In Pakistan. In H. Donnan & P. Werbner (Eds.), *Economy And Culture In Pakistan* (Pp. 163–187). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-11401-6_8
- Aleeza. (2025). THE ROLE OF THE BRITISH RAJ IN SHAPING MODERN PAKISTAN: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE. *Journal Of Applied Linguistics And TESOL (JALT)*, 8(3), 2015–2025. <https://doi.org/10.63878/Jalt1209>
- Alex Kleiderman. (2025, May 11). *India-Pakistan Ceasefire Appears To Hold After Accusations Of Violations*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cvg9d913v20o>
- Andrabi, D. S. D. A., & Bhat, Dr. Mohd. Y. (2017). Economic Exploitation Of Working Class Under Dogras 1846-1952. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 22(05), 60–64. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2205076064>
- Aryal, S. K., & Pulami, M. J. (2024). The Role Of The McMahon, Radcliffe And Durand Lines In Shaping Regional Security Complexes In South Asia: An Assessment. *The International Spectator*, 59(4), 61–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03932729.2024.2402468>
- Aston, T. H., & Philpin, C. H. E. (Eds.). (1995). *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure And Economic Development In Pre-Industrial Europe* (Repr). Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Ayunda, M. K., & Aria, R. D. (2017). Konflik India Dan Pakistan Mengenai Wilayah Kashmir Beserta Dampaknya (1947-1970). *Risalah*, 4(6). <https://journal.student.uny.ac.id/risalah/article/view/9991>
- Banerjee, S. (2023, January 10). *Legacy Of Colonial Divide-And-Rule Strategies | D+C - Development + Cooperation*. <https://www.dandc.eu/en/article/divisive-politics-pitting-hindus-against-muslims-india-and-pakistan>
- Bessel, R., & Haake, C. B. (2009). *Removing Peoples: Forced Removal In The Modern World*. Oxford University Press.
- Bhat, S. A. (2025). Feudal Kashmir, The Princely State And Beginnings Of Reform Efforts. In W. Menski & M. Yousuf (Eds.), *Kashmir After 2019: Abrogation Of Article 370 And Completing The Partition*. ROUTLEDGE. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003588849>
- Blakemore, E. (2025, October 9). *Why The Partition Of India And Pakistan Still Casts A Long Shadow Over The Region*. History. <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/partition-of-india-and-pakistan-history-legacy>
- CNN. (2025). *India Mau Kembalikan Kasta Di Sensus Penduduk Usai Dihapus Sejak 1931*. Internasional. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/internasional/20250402202555-113-1215405/india-mau-kembalikan-kasta-di-sensus-penduduk-usai-dihapus-sejak-1931>
- Copland, I. (2002). The Master And The Maharajas: The Sikh Princes And The East Punjab Massacres Of 1947. *Modern Asian Studies*, 36(3), 657–704. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X02003050>
- Dalrymple, S. (2025). *Shattered Lands: Five Partitions And The Making Of Modern Asia*. William Collins.
- Das, S. (1993). *Communal Riots In Bengal 1905—1947*. Oxford Univ. Press.
- De Paiva Abreu, M. (2017). Britain As A Debtor: Indian Sterling Balances, 1940–53. *The Economic History Review*, 70(2), 586–604. <https://doi.org/10.1111/Ehr.12372>

- Fakhriansyah. (2025). *Awal Mula India Vs Pakistan, Ternyata Ada Inggris & Palestina*. CNBC Indonesia. <https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/entrepreneur/20250507102752-25-631614/awal-mula-india-vs-pakistan-ternyata-ada-inggris-palestina>
- Hassnain, F. M. (1974). *British Policy Towards Kashmir, 1846-1921: Kashmir In Anglo-Russian Politics*. Sterling Publishers.
- Hayat, J., & Ahmed, R. Q. (2021). The Kashmir Conundrum: Past, Present, And Future. In S. Hussain (Ed.), *Society And Politics Of Jammu And Kashmir* (Pp. 33–51). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56481-0_2
- Hussain, M., & Ali Naqvi, S. I. (2025). Indo-Pakistan Rivalry And Integrated Ring Balancing: Prospects And Challenges To Regional Stability In South Asia. *Asian Journal Of Political Science*, 33(1), 74–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185377.2024.2386663>
- Hussain, S. (2021). *Kashmir In The Aftermath Of Partition* (1st Ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108780995>
- Hussain, S. B. (2020). *ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE PRINCELY STATE OF JAMMU & KASHMIR (1846-1947)*.
- Huttenback, R. A. (2004). *Kashmir And The British Raj: 1847 - 1947* (1. Publ). Oxford Univ. Press.
- Jamil, B. E. (2018). Radcliffe Award And The Dissection Of The Punjab 1947: Partition Retrospect. *REVIEW OF HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.15640/Rhps.V6n2a4>
- Kamran, T. (2007). *The Unfolding Crisis In Punjab, March-August 1947: Key Turning Points And British Responses*.
- Karo, E. Z. (2025). *Analisis Konflik India-Pakistan Di Kashmir Dari Perspektif Hukum Internasional: Analisis Atas Hak Penentuan Nasib Sendiri Dan Kedaulatan Teritorial*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15642885>
- Kaul, A. (2024). *Understanding The Kashmir Conflict: A Complex Multiplicity Perspective*.
- Kaur, J. (2025). *What Is The Name Of The India-Pakistan Border?* <https://www.msn.com/en-in/news/india/what-is-the-name-of-the-india-pakistan-border/ar-AA1OmZff>
- Khaeruddin, K. (2024). Sengketa Perbatasan Wilayah Kashmir Dalam Perspektif Hukum Internasional. *Lani: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Sejarah Dan Budaya*, 4(2), 117–123. <https://doi.org/10.30598/Lanivol4iss2page117-123>
- Khan, A. (2020). *The British Colonial Policies In The North West Frontier Of India: 1849-190*.
- Khan, Y. (2017). *The Great Partition: The Making Of India And Pakistan, New Edition* (New Edition). Yale University Press. <https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300233643>
- Kuran, T., & Singh, A. (2011). Economic Modernization In Late British India: Hindu-Muslim Differences. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1747193>
- Kuszevska, A. (2022). The India-Pakistan Conflict In Kashmir And Human Rights In The Context Of Post-2019 Political Dynamics. *Asian Affairs*, 53(1), 198–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2022.2041288>
- Lacher, H. (2003). Putting The State In Its Place: The Critique Of State-Centrism And Its Limits. *Review Of International Studies*, 29(4), 521–541. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210503005217>
- Lacher, H. (2007). *Beyond Globalization: Capitalism, Territoriality And The International Relations Of Modernity* (Transferred To Digit. Print). Routledge.
- Lamont, C. K. (2015). *Research Methods In International Relations*. Sage.
- Malik, A. U. R. (2023). *INDIA-PAKISTAN RELATION: TERRITORIAL DISPUTES, WARS, AGREEMENTS, AND Cbms*.
- Momen, A., Ebrahimi, M., & Yusoff, K. (2024). British Colonial Education In The Indian Subcontinent (1757-1858): Attitude Of Muslims. *Journal Of Islamic Thought And Civilization*, 14(1), 17–39. <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.141.02>
- Mushtaq, O. B. (2021). *Poonch Revolt 1947: Genesis Of An Unending Crisis*. Quaid-I-Azam University.
- Nada, N. (2022). *Masa Penjajahan Inggris Di Indonesia*. https://www.kompas.com/skola/read/2020/02/11/140000669/masa-penjajahan-inggris-di-indonesia?Lgn_Method=Google&Google_Btn=Gsi&Page=All
- Nongmeikapam, D. N. (2015). *Colonial Legacy: Historical Injustices And Current Geopolitical Conflicts*. 3(1).

- Press Information Bureau, Ministry Of Home Affairs. (2019, August 6). *Parliament Approves Resolution To Repeal Article 370; Paves Way To Truly Integrate J&K With Indian Union*. Press Information Bureau, Ministry Of Home Affairs. <https://www.pib.gov.in/newsite/printrelease.aspx?relid=192505>,
- Rahn, W. (2025, May 13). *Pakistan Says Over 50 Killed In Last Week's India Clashes – DW – 05/13/2025*. Dw.Com. <https://www.dw.com/en/pakistan-says-over-50-killed-in-last-weeks-india-clashes/a-72528430>
- Ranjan, A., & Sulehria, F. (2022). Special Issue On Partition – IR 21(3) – Guest Editor Introduction. *India Review*, 21(3), 277–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14736489.2022.2088013>
- Roy, R. (2025, April 30). *Indian Survivors Of Kashmir Attack Say Gunmen Asked If They Were Hindus And Opened Fire*. AP News. <https://apnews.com/article/kashmir-attack-india-pakistan-victims-a5492962cd86174262cb73b85c04c51a>
- Roy-Chaudhury, R. (2025, May 15). *India–Pakistan Drone And Missile Conflict: Differing And Disputed Narratives*. IISS. <https://www.iiss.org/online-analysis/online-analysis/2025/05/indiapakistan-drone-and-missile-conflict-differing-and-disputed-narratives/>
- Sahoo, H. (2025). *India-Pakistan Relations In 2025: Continuity, Challenges, And Prospects For Peace*. *International Journal Of Humanities And Education Research*.
- Salgado, P. L. D. (2017). *The Peculiarity Of Brazilian State-Formation In Geopolitical Context: The Challenge Of Eurocentrism In International Relations And Political Marxism* [Phd Thesis, University Of Sussex]. https://sussex.figshare.com/articles/thesis/The_Peculiarity_Of_Brazilian_State-Formation_In_Geopolitical_Context_The_Challenge_Of_Eurocentrism_In_International_Relations_And_Political_Marxism/23457866?file=41166101
- Sato, S. (2024). *Post-Partition Migration And Identity In South Asia: A Comparative Analysis Of India, Pakistan, And Bangladesh*. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.22541/au.172979368.86287308/v1>
- Sato, S. (2025). *Enduring Confrontation: A Critical Analysis Of India-Pakistan Conflicts Since 2000 In Historical, Military, And Diplomatic Contexts*. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.22541/au.172971565.50859064/v2>
- Sihmanto, A. A. D., Dhanara, A. D., & Rahkmi, W. B. (2025). *KONFLIK WILAYAH INDIA-PAKISTAN DI KASHMIR: DIMENSI SEJARAH, GEOPOLITIK, DAN IMPLIKASI HUKUM INTERNASIONAL*. 14(7).
- Silawati, D. A. (2021, January 5). *6 Krisis & Konflik Besar Dunia Yang Ternyata Warisan Inggris*. IDN Times. <https://www.idntimes.com/science/discovery/6-krisis-dan-konflik-besar-dunia-yang-ternyata-warisan-inggris-01-hg2sn-mzql96>
- Singh, P. (2021, June 3). *Mountbatten's Last Plan For Independence: All You Need To Know About The June 3, 1947 Plan*. Hindustan Times. <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/mountbattens-last-plan-for-independence-all-you-need-to-know-about-the-june-3-1947-plan-101622694800571.html>
- Singh Sidhu, J. (2021). *Punjab 1947: Bloodied And Partitioned By Competing Nationalisms*. The Wire. <https://thewire.in/communalism/punjab-1947-bloodied-and-partitioned-by-competing-nationalisms>
- Solomon, J. (2019). *Anglo-American Loan And Britain's Economic Struggles In Post-War Europe*. *Armstrong Undergraduate Journal Of History*, 9(2), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.20429/auj.2019.090206>
- Sridharan, E. (2005). *International Relations Theory And The India–Pakistan Conflict*. *India Review*, 4(2), 103–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14736480500225582>
- Strangio, S. (2024). *UK Officially Joins Trans-Pacific Trade Agreement*. <https://thediplomat.com/2024/12/uk-officially-joins-trans-pacific-trade-agreement/>
- Von Pfaler, L., & Teschke, B. (2024). *Quo Vadis, Historical International Relations? Geopolitical Marxism And The Promise Of Radical Historicism*. *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, 21(82), 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.33458/uidergisi.1474307>
- Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/J.Ctvl1smzx1>

- Wojczewski, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2347797014551269>
- Wood, E. M. (1995). *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism* (1st Ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511558344>
- Zaidi, S. M. S., & Khan, M. T. F. (2025). Analyzing The Convoluted Kashmir Dispute: A Retrospective Analysis. *NUST Journal Of International Peace & Stability*. <https://doi.org/10.37540/Njips.V8i2.203>

BIOGRAPHY

Citra Ayu Maharani is an International Relations student at Universitas Padjadjaran. She has an interest in studies about China, security, the Global South, as well as identity and culture.

David R. Walalangi is an International Relations student at International University Liaison Indonesia. His research interests are in Global South issues, international development, and the role of class dynamics in IR.