



ORCID of the Journal: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0723-9485>

DOI Number of the Paper: <https://zenodo.org/records/13934969>

Edition Link: [Journal of Academic Research for Humanities JARH, 4\(4\) Oct-Dec 2024](#)

Link of the Paper: <https://jar.bwo-researches.com/index.php/jarh/article/view/451>

HJRS Link: [Journal of Academic Research for Humanities JARH \(HEC-Recognized for 2023-2024\)](#)

HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS OF PAKISTAN-SOVIET UNION RELATIONS

Corresponding & Author 1:	DR. MUHAMMAD NAVEED AKHTAR , Assistant Professor, Department of History and Political Science, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Pakistan. Email: mnakhtar@gudgk.edu.pk
Author 2:	DR. MUHAMMAD ASLAM FAIZ , Lecturer of Pakistan Studies, Department of History and Political Science, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Pakistan. Email: mafaiz@gudgk.edu.pk
Author 3:	MUHAMMAD SADEEQ , PhD Scholar, Department of History and Political Science, Ghazi University, Dera Ghazi Khan, Pakistan. Email: socsadeeq@gmail.com

Paper Information

Citation of the paper:

(Jarh) Akhtar. M. N., Faiz. M, A., & Sadeeq. M., (2024). Historical Antecedents of Pakistan-Soviet Union Relations. In *Journal of Academic Research for Humanities*, 4(4),1–10.

Subject Areas for JARH:

- 1 Humanities
- 2 History and Political Science

Timeline of the Paper at JARH:

Received on: 30-04-2024.
Reviews Completed on: 25-05-2024.
Accepted on: 13-10-2024.
Online on: 15-10-2024.

License:



[Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License](#)

Recognized for BWO-R:



Published by BWO Researches INTL.:



DOI Image of the paper:

DOI [10.5281/zenodo.13934969](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13934969)

QR Code for the Paper:



Abstract

Pakistan was established in 1947 during the Cold War, when the US-led West and the USSR-led Communist bloc were at odds. Pakistan first sought non-alignment but promptly joined the Western bloc, which led to a protracted period of hostility with the Soviet Union that lasted until the USSR's collapse in 1992. This research paper, however, instead of discussing the dynamics of Pak-Soviet relations during or in the context of the Cold War era, recounts the historical antecedents causing rift between both states. It, thus, explains the expansionist foreign policy of Tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union towards South Asia and the pertinent aspirations and ambitions of its statesmen and intellectuals, which later had always been perceived by Pakistan as a threat to its existence and sovereignty. Further, it elaborates Soviet attitude towards the All-India Muslim League and its leadership campaigning for a separate homeland, i.e. Pakistan, for South Asian Muslims. The methodology deployed in the discourse to evaluate historical facts is descriptive-cum-analytical. The study relies on qualitative and archival data including primary sources, books, and research articles carrying the perspective from both sides of Pakistan and the Soviet Union. Developing an understanding and reflecting upon the dynamics and impact of imperialism and the behavior of great powers, this undertaking endorses and contextualizes the Post-colonial Theory. It presents the argument that during the pre-colonial and colonial eras, the acts of Tsarist Russia and then the Soviet Union bred mistrust, forcing Pakistan to maintain its distance.

Keywords: Soviet, Expansionism, British, Pakistan, Dynamics

Introduction

The international order changed following World War II when the USSR pursued a global Communist revolution, the UK withdrew from its colonies, and the USA emerged as a capitalist powerhouse. Due to Great Britain's withdrawal, the Muslim separatist movement in India succeeded in gaining independence, resulting in the 1947 formation of Pakistan. The newly born Pakistan attempted to opt for a non-aligned posture towards the Cold War, but soon joined the USA by signing CENTO and SEATO defense pacts, considering its economic and security concerns, while the USSR sided with India. From the end of the Soviet Union in 1992, Pakistan-Soviet ties remained primarily antagonistic, reaching their zenith during the Afghan War. The present research, rather than going into the dynamics of the Cold War era, discusses historical developments which played a decisive role in evolving the perceptions of both states, i.e. Soviet Union and Pakistan, towards one another and became the determinants of their foreign policies. It helps understand the historical background of distrusted relations between both states by discussing the social, cultural, religious, and ethnic relations between the USSR and the Indian subcontinent that evolved during the medieval period and colonial era. The subject matter which it further brings under limelight includes the political anarchy in international politics, interests of major powers in the subcontinent, political conditions of British India, and the response of the local people of the subcontinent, especially Muslims towards British imperialism and the connections of Indian revolutionaries with the Soviet Union and their inclinations towards socialism. Lastly, it gives an evaluation of the Soviet attitude towards the Pakistan movement led by the All-Indian Muslim League and its leadership, a political party during the British Raj in India accredited to be the founder of Pakistan.

Research Objectives

1. To investigate the factors that migrated the political, cultural, and ethnic ties between the Muslim communities of Central Asia and South Asia during pre-colonial and colonial periods.
2. To assess the expansionist policies of Tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union, which endangered the sovereignty of newly formed nations like Pakistan.
3. To analyze the Soviet approach towards the nationalist movement of the Indian Muslim-led All-India Muslim League and its struggle to achieve a nation-state, Pakistan.

Research Questions

1. Why did the Muslim populations in Central Asia and South Asia lose their historical links, and to what extent was this the fault of the imperialist powers such as Tsarist Russia/Soviet Union and Great Britain?
2. What were the historical trajectories of the foreign policy of Tsarist Russia and later the Soviet Union for which it was recognized to be an expansionist state and the smaller states like Pakistan became reluctant to extend friendly ties with the Soviet Union?
3. What was the Soviet attitude towards the Pakistan movement led by All-India Muslims that caused Pakistan to side with the Soviet Union in the context of the Cold War?

Research Methodology

The study employs a qualitative methodology and archival data to evaluate the expansionism of Russian ruling elites and intellectuals, as well as their attitude toward the Indian Muslim struggle for Pakistan, a separate country in South Asia. To find reoccurring themes and patterns in Russian elite and intellectual attitudes on territorial expansion and their opinions on the Indian Muslim separatist movement, the archive material will be gathered and examined. A comparative analysis is made to understand the distinctive features of Soviet policy towards the Muslim separatist movement in India, the British colonialist attitude in the region, and the

endeavors of Indians of independence, particularly that of the Indian Muslims.

Theoretical Framework

To understand and frame historical facts and events and to interpret the mindset and statements of the political and intellectual leadership, this research deploys two theoretical frameworks, the first is 'structural realism' and the second, 'Post-colonial Theory.' [E. H. Carr \(1892-1982\)](#), American Professor of International Politics [Kenneth Waltz \(1924-2013\)](#), American academician Robert Keohane (b. 1941), American political scientist John Mearsheimer (b. 1947). Despite showing disagreements on myriad components of theory, structural realists emphasize the contours of power politics in International Relations. They view international structure as having inherent anarchy for an unequal status of the states. Not ideology but security, survival, and sovereignty, they contend, are the goals the states give priority while maintaining relations with each other. The great powers make use of their military might, warfare technology, economic resources, and stronghold on media means to influence and manipulate the behaviors of the states, so that they could assert their hegemonic stature and serve their strategic interests ([Waltz, Theory of International Politics, 1978](#)). The smaller players in the international system contrarily defend their sovereignty and ensure their security and survival by allying with great powers, insurgency acts, and guerilla warfare techniques ([Michael E. Brown, 1995](#)) ([Waltz, Realism and International Politics, 2008](#)). The theory of Post-colonialism and Subaltern Studies framework, however, emphasizes issues including the attitude and core values of imperialist and great powers, the ways they subjugate other underdeveloped and remote countries and nations, politico-cultural legacies of the colonialist powers as well as the consequent depressive repercussions that the nations and society under their political control had to bear by ([Persram, 2007](#)).

Literature Review

Historical, Political, and Cultural Ties between South Asia and Central Asia

Observing it historically, this becomes evident that the inhabitants of the North-Western region of the Indian Subcontinent have had strong traditional, ethnic, and cultural ties with that of Central Asia. Some of the Muslim dynasties that ruled India during the medieval ages, such as [Mamluk \(r. 1206-1290\)](#), [Khilji \(r. 1290-1320\)](#), [Tughlaq \(r. 1320-1413\)](#), & [Mughal \(r. 1526-1857\)](#) were originated from the area which later became Soviet territories and currently recognized as Central Asian States (CARS). The two regions mainly having Muslim populations shared deeper mutual contacts, but those went to be disengaged after losing their political independence. Britain occupied India in 1857 and Russia gradually conquered and annexed the Central Asian States between 1839 and 1895 ([Keller, 2020, pp. 81-100](#)) ([Popatia, 1988, p. 1](#)). It was a struggle for power accumulation through exploiting sources of other nations and the impulsive urge of the great powers to acquire and play a hegemonic role that made all ties between the said regions impotent. The notion of cooperation appeared to be false. Their acts are mere to satisfy the instinct, i.e. getting dominant over the rest, acquiring, and playing a hegemonic role, and ordering the international system to serve their politic-economic-political-economic interest. This consequently initiates a process of cultural modifications and the ideologies, culture, norms, ethics, and moralities of one nation went through the process of transition, despite the reluctance and resistance of some segments of society.

Ideological and religious aspects

There is a long, glorious, and tragic history of Islam in Russia, marked by seven centuries of severe conflict with Muscovy and later Russia and the USSR. This inheritance could never be annihilated by the Communist Revolution of 1917 ([Tuna, 2015, pp. 79-102, 171-194](#)). The origins of this issue can be traced back to the

time of the Golden Horde, the capture of Kazan in 1237, as well as the Holy War of Imam Shamil (b. 1797-d. 1871) in 1834 (Griffin, 2015) (Tuna, 2015, pp. 79-102) (Hunt, 2012), the Basmachi rebellion (1916-1926) and Alexander Benningen and Marie Broxup argued "a religious culture fourteen centuries old which is as deeply rooted in the popular lore of Islam, penetrating all aspects of everyday private and public life, could not and has not been destroyed in fifty years of massive propaganda" (Broxup, 1983, pp. 17, 20, 41, 54). In either case, the ponderable question is to what extent do their private and public life remain as normal now as before the Communist Revolution and the adoption of policies by the Soviet Union? How much did they cooperate with Islamic Revolutionaries (struggling for the Pan-Islamic movement or those Muslims who are engaged in the struggle for their freedom) rather than those revolutionaries who claimed to have brought the World Communist Revolution? Some scholars like Alexander Benningen and Marie Broxup observe Russia historically centered on Europe and thus interacted mainly with the West. Even though the migrations and invasions centered upon the Asian heartland were undergone in the ancient and medieval ages. The Mongols of the 13th century and the establishment of the reign of the Golden Horde made an indelible impression on Russia since there emerged extensive colonies of Central Asian origin in Russia (Broxup, 1983). It was in the aftermath of the conquest of Timur at the end of the 14th century that the Golden Horde kingdom split up into several Khanates, which implies the territory was governed by a medieval Turkish khan or Chinese or Mongolian Emperors. Nonetheless, during the 16th Century, these Khanates were eventually invaded and conquered by the Russians. (Halperin, 1987, pp. 33-42). The cultural transformation is a natural and irresistible phenomenon, and it can be observed that the culture of Muslim communities of Central Asia

is quite different from the culture of South Asian Muslims and the same is the fact with Muslim communities of the Middle East (Bhatta, 1996, pp. 94-95). Both temporally and specially, it changes because of the interaction of people and with the need for modern challenges.

Initiation of Russian Expansionism towards the South

Russia started giving expression to be an imperialist power in the 16th century by encroaching towards the East and from the 18th century to Southwards, particularly during the reign of Russian Emperor Peter the Great (b. 1672-d. 1725). Under the rule of Peter, the Great, Russia emerged to be a great European nation. He declared Russia an empire in 1721 and adopted the title of Emperor of All Russia, Great Father of the Fatherland, and "the Great." He proved a Great Conqueror by acquiring territory in Estonia, Latvia, and Finland, and through several invasions on Turkey in the south. He secured access to the Black Sea. In 1709, in the middle of an intolerable Russian winter, he beat the Swedish army by deliberately routing their forces to the city of Poltava. Briefly, thereafter, St. Petersburg was deemed as a "window to Europe" (Famous Political Figures: Peter the Great, 2021). Similarly, Mahbood Ahmed Popatia holds that Russian advancement southward, and Russians began to settle in Kazakhstan. By the late 1860s, Russia had reached the Amu Darya which constituted the northern border of Afghanistan (Popatia, 1988, pp. 1-2).

Russian intellectuals' expansionist aspirations

A factor that alarmed South Asian countries like Pakistan was the fact that Russian intellectuals in the 19th century, fascinated by the Orient, pleaded through their scholarship for Russia's expansion eastward. Alexei S. Khomyakov (1804-1860), a Russian theologian, philosopher, and poet, studied Sanskrit and not only considered Slavs as outstanding representatives of the Aryo-Iranian race but

even valued Islam higher than Catholicism. Konstantin Leontev (1831-1891) who was a staunch advocate of tsarist monarchy studied Tibetan and Hindu traditions and espoused Russian expansion towards India, Tibet, and China. Another Russian revolutionary, Kilolai Y. Danilevsky (1822-1885) saw the vision of a future Russian-dominated pan-Slav union extending from the Adriatic to the Pacific, with Constantinople as its natural base. Arguing that the major Eurasian races (like Aryan, Semite, and Turanian) and religions (such as Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) originated in Asia, he saw deeper differences and divisions between the currently dominant Romano-German civilization of Western Europe and the Greco-Slav civilization whose inevitable conflict would result in Russia succeeding Byzantium and Ottoman Turkey as the historical heir to Constantinople. Even the renowned Russian novelist Dostoevsky (1822-1881) pointed toward Central Asia as the future New Russia, following the Russian conquests in Turkistan in 1881 (Bhatty, 1996, p. 95).

Strategic railroads plan A Soviet strategy for penetration into the Indo-Persian region

Soviet policy to penetrate the Indo-Persian region and reach the Indian Ocean must be understood in the context of the strategic railroads planned and built in Central Asia and adjoining areas of West and South Asia. In the second half of the 19th century, as Russia built railways linking its European system to its Asian territories, notably the Trans Caspian Railway (1880-88), the British perceived a threat to the North-West Frontier in India and proceeded feverishly to extend their Indian railroad network towards the region. Russia's Central Asian railway system to railheads at the Afghan border at Kushka and Termez increased the threat. (Bhatty, 1996, p. 98). Hence, Czarist Russia made all their efforts to materialize their intentions to establish the Great Russian Empire. South Asia became the center of the imperialist rivalry between Britain and Russia long before the period of the Great Game in the

latter part of the 19th century. Russia and Britain first clashed over India during the Napoleonic Wars (1800-1815), when Napoleon (r. 1805-1814) proposed a Franco-Russian military campaign, with France and Russia each providing 35,000 soldiers, to invade India across Persia via Herat and Kandahar. Emperor Paul I (r. 1796-1801) of Russia ordered an advance towards India by Don Cossacks under the command of General Orlov in January 1801. Britain successfully counteracted by sending a military mission under Mount Stuart Elephantine (1779-1859) from India into Afghanistan and Persia successfully halting the major threat (Elphinstone, 1966). General Andrei Snesev (1865-1937) was a representative of the more aggressive school of thought that stood for Russia's historic mission to reach the warm waters of the Indian Ocean. A military geographer and Orientalist, General Snesev defined Central Asia as consisting of Turkistan, Khiva, Bukhara, northern India, Kashgaria, the Pamir Tiber, Afghanistan, Baluchistan, and eastern Persia. As Moscow turned its attention eastwards towards colonial Asia, and specifically towards British India, Leon Trotsky, the leader in charge of international revolutionary propaganda, recalled Snesev in 1919 from his military post on the Polish frontier and made him director of the General Staff Academy in Moscow Trotsky urged the future Soviet generals and diplomats "if you want to destroy capitalist tyranny over the world beat the British in India." He resurrected an old saying, "He who rules Herat commands Kabul, and he who rules Kabul commands India." His print blueprint for a military invasion of India via Afghanistan and Pamirs and subsequent Soviet plans were seen as a serious threat to India's security by the General Staff in New Delhi till 1941 (Bhatty, 1996, p. 96).

First World War

During the First World War, India supported the British against its enemies and provided help to them, both in cash and in kind. Indian

soldiers defended British Imperialism even in the remote corner of the Empire. British government showed many incentives to the Indian people in return for the services of the Indian soldier soldiers (Shah, 2005, p. 317). Moreover, they also promised Indian Muslims to protect the Turkish Khilafat institution with which Indian Muslims had great political and religious sympathetic affiliations (Qureshi, 1999, p. 439). Afterwards, to reward them they introduced new oppressive laws like the Rowlett Act. Indians showed large-scale agitation and resentment against the British government. When the law-and-order situation worsened in India, people started to migrate towards Afghanistan, Germany, and the Soviet Union (Shah, 2005, p. 319). Several Indian revolutionaries had been working for the German Emperor during the First World War. Now they transferred their allegiance to Lenin to conduct propaganda from Tashkent, at the gate of India, among them were Moulvi Barkatullah (b. 1854-d. 1927), Maulana Obeidullah Sindhi (b. 1872-d. 1944), Varendranath Chattopadhyay (b. 1888-b. 1937) and Raja Mahendra Pratap (b. 1886-d. 1979). By the early twentieth century, national movements began to take shape in several countries under colonial or despotic rule including India and Russia. Many of those who settled in Europe had the advantage of exchanging views with the Russian revolutionary exiles. Shyamji Krishnavarma (b. 1857-b. 1930), Madame Bikaiji Rustom Cama (b. 1861-d. 1936), Sardarsinhji Ravaji Rana (b. 1870-d. 1957) and Virendranath Chotopadhvaya, who stayed in Paris came into contact with Russian Social Democrats and learned about their political ideas (Malik, 1994, pp. 9-10). During World War I, there was a huge enthusiasm for activities to liberate India from British oppression and imperialism. Often, these activities were foreign-based, especially assisted by the Germans and Turks. One group of Indian emigrants was that of Raja Mahendra Partap, Maulvi Barkatulla, Maulana Obeidullah

Sindhi, and others who had set up what was known as the Provisional Government of Free India at Kabul (Shah, 2005, p. 317).

Khilafat Movement and Soviet Revolution

The October Revolution (1917) in Russia coincided with an equally powerful political and emotional upheaval among the Muslims, caused by the Khilafat movement in India. Allied with Germany, the Ottoman Sultan-Caliph Abdul Hamid II (b. 1872-d. 1918) had urged the Muslims to sabotage the war effort and thus save the Caliphate (Popatia, 1988, p. 3). To the Indian Muslims, the caliphate had a deep emotional significance, throughout the Sultanate and Mughal period. Responding to the call of the Turkish Caliph, the Indian Muslims organized the Caliphate Conference in December 1919 (Malik, 1994, p. 12). The Khilafat Conference, in July 1920, insisted that Muslims migrate out of India. The British Government had failed to respect Turkey's territorial rights. Many people migrated in the direction of Afghanistan. Many of the students also discontinued their studies and without keeping their future in view marched towards Afghanistan (Qureshi, 1999, pp. 96-97). During the same time, Afghanistan signed a treaty with British India. According to Syed Wiqar Ali Shah, a professor of history at Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad, 'by signing this treaty with British Afghanistan it became a country similar to rest to the Islamic countries in the World' (Shah, 2005, p. 316). So, under such conditions, the Indian migrated people were not happy living in Afghanistan anymore, and they decided to leave Afghanistan for the Soviet Union, which they considered the "Land of Revolution." Soviets extended facilities to these Indian *Muhajreens*. A group of 180 students drifted into Soviet Central Asia. They had different socio-political and educational orientations interacting with the Soviet socialists. Among this group of Marxist-Leninist converts, there were several well-known Indian communist leaders, including Firoze-ud-Din Mansur, Fazl-i-lahi Qurban, Mir Abdul Majid,

Mian Akbar Shah, Abdullah Safdar, Fida Ali Zahid and Gauhar Rehman. In 1920, they united at Tashkent, with Hindus to create the CPI. One more group of Muslim communist leaders acquired their knowledge of Marxism-Leninism from Britain during the late 1920s. Prominent among them were Dr. Kunwar Muhammad Ashraf (1903-1962) and Sajjad Zaheer (1899-1973), both of them first joined and worked for CPI, and after the partition of the Indian Subcontinent in 1947, they played a significant role in organizing the Communist Party of Pakistan (CPP) (Gupta, 1973) (Malik, 1994, p. 12).

Soviet Union and the Formation of CPI in India

The pattern of the relationship between a superpower and a regional state had always been 'asymmetrical.' Such disparity among states and anarchy in the international system led states to put 'instruments of their diplomacy and self-projection' in exercise. (Malik, 1994, p. 7). Lenin, in 1919, established the Communist International (also known as Comintern), which subordinated all foreign communist parties to Moscow, Communists were called upon to make propaganda within their own countries' armed forces, when necessary by secret and illegal means, make special efforts to win peasant support, achieve emancipation of oppressed nationalities and colonial peoples, and develop among their workers fraternal feelings towards the workers of colonies and oppressed nationalities subject to their nation, and to function legally and to maintain parallel with their legal organization a clandestine organization capable for the decisive movement of fulfilling its duty towards the revolution (Malik, 1994, p. 8). Communist parties thus emerged in foreign lands as the ideological allies of the Soviet Union and often did not hesitate to function against the perceived national interests of their states. These parties were an instrument in Soviet hands to their ideology, through which they could legitimize their imperialist and hegemonic role. The Communist Party of India

came into existence in Soviet Central Asia in response to the anti-imperial policy of the Comintern. How Soviet leaders were attracted towards India through Lenin's view. He wrote as early as 1921, "British stands at the head of these countries and there the revolution is developing all the more rapidly... even though they are still backward, will play an important role in the coming phase of the world revolution" (Lenin, n.d., pp. 13-14).

Muslim League and Soviet Union/ Partition of India

Earlier the Soviet attitude towards the partition of India especially towards the "Two Nations Theory" pursued by the Muslim League was of extreme adversity to the idea and the League's stand was severely criticized by the Soviet media and commentators. For instance, A. Dyakov, a leading Soviet commentator saw the League as the chief asset of the British in realizing their plan to retain their rule in India. In an article, Dyakov and B. Bushevich condemned the Muslim League for "disrupting the front of the struggle of the Indian people" for its independence (Naseem, 1989, p. 33). On the other hand, they regarded the "Indian National Congress as the sole representative of all the Indians" (Dyakov, 1978, p. 175). Soviet literature had not given much attention to Mohammad Ali Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan. They regarded Jinnah as pro-British and, therefore, to them a hostile politician. Dyakov distinguished three schools of thought: the first one was the pro-British school which viewed India as a conglomeration of races and religions that could only live in one state and for that they were thankful to the British rule. Second was the Indian National Congress which propagated India having one nation, and third was the Muslim League which saw India as composed of two nations, i.e. Muslims and Hindus. Dyakov believed that this last school was inspired by the British who later adopted it themselves (Dyakov A. , 1978, p. 179). However, once the Soviet Government got engaged in mortal combat with the Nazi

Germany, it needed all the support it could gather. (Naseem, 1989, p. 33). The Communist Party of India (CPI), like the Soviet leadership, changed its stance about the Muslim League. In September 1942, the Central Committee of the CPI took up a resolution explicitly advocating the demand of the Muslim League. Sajjad Zaheer admonished the Congress: Congressmen fail to see the anti-imperialist, liberationist role of the Muslim League, fail to see that the demand for Muslim self-determination of Pakistan is just, progressive and is the positive expression of the very freedom and democracy for which Congressmen have striven and undergone so much suffering all these years (Sajjad Zaheer, 1944, p. 1) (Malik, 1994, p. 12). P.C Joshi, the prominent CPI leader, supported the League's demand for a separate state. In 1943, he admitted, "the demand for Muslim self-determination or Pakistan is a just progressive and national demand" (Malik, 1994, p. 12).

U-Turn Policy of the Soviets after World War II

Once the war ended, the Soviets started reverting to their earlier position, but the noticeable fact was that they were rather careful and adopted an attitude of "wait and see" and their approach toward both Congress and the League was balanced. The Soviet leadership, however, favored the transformation of India into a loose federation rather than its division on communal and religious lines. It is interesting to note that this line contrasted with CPI's line, which supported the right of succession.] However, in pursuance of the "wait and see" policy, the Soviets held that the idea of Pakistan had a different meaning for the Muslim masses than for the reactionary League leadership. This view is evident in Soviet writings. The Mountbatten Plan of June 3, 1947, was denounced as a "British maneuver calculated to perpetuate imperialist control of the sub-continent" (Ram, 1983, p. 6). The dominant opinion in the Soviet Union was that the Indian leaders accepted the June 3 Plan under the

pressure of the wealthy classes who would use the partition plan to enhance their wealth and power and avert a real democratic revolution.

Partition of India and Soviet Attitude

Some writers hold that the fundamental reason for their opposition and disagreement with the June 3 Plan and the later transfer of power was that the Soviet leadership thought of any division along religious or ethnic lines as 'non-Marxist.' Soviet analysts argued that owing to the fragility of the British Power, the resulting constraints, and pressure the imperialists were compelled to make certain concessions to the nationalist struggle movement in India but without adversely affecting the imperialist interests (Popatia, 1988, p. 62). Henceforth, according to Geoffrey Wheeler, "It suited the Soviet government to see partition as a result of an unholy agreement between the Moslems, capitalist Gujarati and Marwari Hindus in control of the Congress, and the British, with the object of averting a mass movement in the lower ranks of Congress" (Wheeler, January, 1958, p. 8). Describing the Soviet attitude towards the partition of India Ayaz Naseem took a few lines from the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, which elaborates the partition of India enabled British imperialism to weaken the economy of the country and inflaming differences between India and Pakistan that facilitated British domination in both domains in the same passage the encyclopedia described both the new dominions as "parts of the British empire, former British colonies, retaining to a different degree their dependence on Great Britain and members of the so-called British Commonwealth of Nations" (Naseem, 1989, p. 36). This was in stark contrast to the Soviet Union, which had established relations with India as early as April 1947. Soviet leaders and commentators expressed serious doubts about Pakistan's chances of surviving as an independent state. For example, commenting on the Cabinet Mission Plan (1946), B. Bushevich observed that the concessions offered in the Plan

“originated from no desire to preserve India, though in the changed form, in a colonial position and to keep it subordinate to the interest of British imperialism” (Dyakov D. a., 1978, p. 175). Among these first come the working masses, the labor class, and the peasantry, which participated quite actively in the national freedom movement, then comes the national Intelligentsia and important national bourgeoisie circles (Dyakov D. a., 1978, p. 175). Dyakov also analyzed the socio-religious character of the Muslim League slogan of “Divide India.” His attitude towards the two-nation theory, like other Soviet scholars, was of extreme adversity. He denounced the League as a sectarian party bent upon destroying the traditional and historical unity of the subcontinent. He saw the “Muslim League as the chief asset of the British in realizing their plan to rule India” (Dyakov D. a., 1978, pp. 75-76). He, however, observed that the Indian National Congress did not represent the Muslims of India, as the Hindu bourgeoisie controlling it was not accommodative of the socio-economic and religious requirements of the Muslims. (Wheeler, January, 1958, pp. 6-7). The Soviet analysts were also more critical of the June 3rd Plan of Mountbatten which envisaged the partition of India. The Soviet Union looked down upon the plan as a colonial device to “divide and rule” aiming at the “Balkanization” of India without transferring real powers to the Indians. E. Zhukov out of this skepticism observed that the adoption of the British Plan for the partition of India having the consent of Indian leaders, to satisfy the statute of the two dominions while preserving the majority of princes as an important stronghold of the British Empire, showed that the Indian bourgeoisie and the Indian landlord, did not try to attain true independence of India which was useless without progressive reforms and the active support of Indian people. (Jain, 1979, pp. 185-86). As regards the Muslim bourgeoisie and its ploy of ‘divide India’ based on the nation

theory, Yury V. Gankovsky and L. R. Gorden Polonskaya observed that the Muslim landlords, bent upon seizing the commanding political heights in areas with a Muslim majority, and big Muslim bourgeoisie, which was out to win a market of its own and to get rid of more powerful competitors, had used the idea of partition to their advantage. These were the interests of these classes, not the two-nation theory that was the *raison d’état* of the Pakistan movement (Polonskaya, 1964, pp. 6-7). The negative propaganda of the Soviet scholars and state-controlled media about the Pakistan movement and its leadership, hence, resulted in distrust and strained relationships after the creation of Pakistan.

Conclusion

Concluding the discussion, the distrust and hesitation behind developing amicable relations and strategic partnership between Pakistan and the Soviet Union has been owing to historical experience, westwards, and southwards imperialist ventures of Tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union, expansionist aspiration of Russian intellectuals and policymakers, negative attitude of Soviet Union towards Pakistan movement and its leadership. The Muslims of South Asia who struggled to make Pakistan shared cultural and ethnic connections during the medieval period with the Muslim population of Central Asian states—the region remained under frequent occupation of Tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union. The Muslim communities of the region had to face religious persecution under policies formulated based on communist ideology, this created anguish among the Indian Muslims for the USSR and sympathies for the Central Asian Muslim brothers. Soviet expansionist policy for the World Revolution or security purposes or the sake of national interests- for which Comintern was established, had been the policy of Tsarist Russia also. They got a new socialist orientation in the USSR, which they propagated with the synthesis of Islam in India. Many Muslim ideologues did not view its socio-

economic aspect as incompatible with Islam. Some of the Muslim migrant students studying in Central Asia learned and others who were living in London, at the time of chaotic situation due to the *Khilafat* and *Hijrat* Movements, learned about the Leninist-Marxist ideas returned to the country and established the Communist Party of India to escalate the movement of World Communist Revolution in Indian society. The progressive ideologue of every society always had a mild corner towards new ideas for the betterment of the present and future of society. Soviet leaders and CPI initially condemned the Muslim League and Jinnah considering them the tools to cultivate the seeds of British imperialism and to counter the Congress's anti-imperialist activities. But when the USSR was with the Grand Alliance against Germany, in the Second World War, it favored the Muslim League to win the support of Indian Muslim masses. For, unlike Congress, the Muslim League was willing the recruitment of Indian soldiers in the British Army to fight against the German forces.

References

- Ahmar, M. (1986). *Superpower Rivalry in the Indian Ocean since the Withdrawal of Great Britain*. Karachi: Area Study Centre for Europe.
- Alvin J. Cottrell, R. M. (Ed.). (1972). *The Indian Ocean: Its Political, Economic and Military Importance*. New York: Praeger.
- Bhatty, M. A. (1996). *Great Powers and South Asia: Post-Cold War Trends*. Islamabad: Institute of Regional Studies.
- Broxup, A. B. (1983). *The Islamic Threat to the Soviet State*. London: Routledge.
- Dyakov, A. (1978). *Contemporary India*, in Bolshevik, 1946, in Jain. In R. K. Jain, *Soviet South Asian Relations 1947-1978* (Vol. 1, p. Radiant Publishers). Delhi.
- Dyakov, D. a. (1978). *India and Second Imperialist War*. In R. K. Jain, *Soviet South Asian Relations 1947-1978* (Vol. 1). Delhi: Radiant Publishers.
- Elphinstone, M. (1966). *History of India: the Hindu and Mahometan Period*. Allahbad: Kittab Mahal.
- Famous Political Figures: Peter the Great. (2021, April 14). Retrieved 10 12, 2024, from <https://www.biography.com/political-figures/peter-the-great>
- Gandhi, L. (2020). *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical International*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Griffin, N. (2015). *Caucasus: Mountain, Men and Holy War*. St. Martin's Publishing Group.
- Gupta, M. F. (1973). *Life and Work of Dr. K. M. Ashraf*. New Delhi: Communist Party of India.
- Halperin, C. J. (1987). *Russian and Golden Horde: The Mongol Impact on Medieval Russian History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hunt, D. (2012). *Legends of Caucasus*. London: Saqi Books.
- Jain, R. K. (1979). *Soviet South Asian Relations 1947-1978*. Humanities Press.
- Jukes, G. (1972, May). *The Indian Ocean in Soviet Naval Policy*, (London: IISS, May 1972). Adelphi Paper No. 87.
- Keller, S. (2020). *Russia and Central Asia: Coexistence, Conquest, Convergence*. London: University of Toronto Press.
- Lenin, V. I. (n.d.). *Lenin's Prediction on the Revolutionary Storm in the East*. Peking: Foreign Language Press.
- Malik, H. (1994). *Soviet-Pakistan Relations and Post-Soviet Dynamics 1947-1992*. London: Macmillan.
- Marwat, F.-u.-R. K. (1985). *The Basmachi Movement in Soviet Central Asia: A Study in Political Development*. Karachi: Emjay Books International.
- Michael E. Brown, S. M.-J. (1995). *Perils of Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International Security*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Naseem, A. (1989). *Pak-Soviet Relations 1947-65*. Lahore: Progressive Publishers.
- Persram, N. (Ed.). (2007). *Postcolonialism and Political Theory*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Popatia, M. A. (1988). *Pakistan's Relations with Soviet Union, 1947-1979*. Karachi: Pakistan Studies Center, University of Karachi.
- Qureshi, M. N. (1999). *Pan-Islam in British Indian Politics: A Study of Khilafat Movement*. Netherlands: SEPSMEA.
- Ram, R. (1983). *Soviet Policy towards Pakistan*. New Delhi: S. Chand and Co.
- Sajjad Zaheer. (1944). *A Case for Congress-League Unity*. Bombay.
- Shah, S. W. (2005). *Mian Akbar Shah*. In M. T. Parvez Khan (Ed.), *Celebrities of NWFP* (Vol. I). Peshawar.
- Tuna, M. (2015). *Imperial Russia's Muslim: Islam, Empire and European Modernity*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Waltz, K. N. (1978). *Theory of International Politics*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Waltz, K. N. (2008). *Realism and International Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Wheeler, G. (January 1958). *Soviet Publications on India and Pakistan*. *Asian Review*, LIV, 197, 8.