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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores different aspects of the sub-conflict of Kashmir that has become the one of the most dangerous issue not only in South Asia but also in the world. It is so important that it be studied a full conflict in itself. Therefore, the significance of the movement understood. The study explores the development of the sub-conflict of Kashmir over the broader inter-state conflict between India and Pakistan. It seeks to map the role of Pakistan and Indian leadership in the conflict.
CHAPTER ONE

1.1. INTRODUCTION

The Kashmir conflict started in 1947 by the independence of India and Pakistan. India and Pakistan got freedom from British Colonialism in 1947. The problem was about 650 princely states controlled by different individuals. Kashmir was one of the largest princely state. At the time of partition in 1947 a Hindu Raja Hari Singh was ruling over Kashmir but most of his subjects were Muslims. At that time British asked all the 650 princely state to decide about their future, whether they can choose India or Pakistan or may also remain independent.

Geographically Kashmir shares border with Pakistan, India and china. It shares the border Pakistan in West, India in East and South and China in North. Pakistan, India and china are ruling over different parts of Kashmir Valley. India is administering over Jammu, The Kashmir Valley, and Ladakh. Pakistan is administering the territories of Azad Kashmir and Gilgit, Baltistan. China is administering over Aksai Chin and the Trans-KaraKoram Tract.

Kashmir conflict had raised by Indian and Pakistani leaders. From 1947 to till now India and Pakistan have been fought four wars over Kashmir Conflict. India also fought a war against China over Kashmir territory in 1962. The Kashmir Conflict is still there unsolved and Indian military forces in different campaigns for freedom are murdering hundreds of innocent men, women and children.
1.2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDIES

Conflict over Kashmir is the nucleus of all problems between India and Pakistan. It is increasing the tensions between the relation of India and Pakistan since their independence from the British rule in 1947. The reality of this sub-conflict started when the British India was partitioned in 1947, Muslim majority areas were to be given to Pakistan while Hindu majority areas were to be given to India (Cheema, 2015: 46). At the time of Partition there were 650 Princely states. These princely states had the option of choosing whether to choose India or Pakistan, or they could also remain independent.

Although many princes wanted to be "independent" but this means to support monarchies and there will be no chance to adopt or implement democratic system. So these princely had to decide to choose to be a part of India or Pakistan. Most of these princely states decided to choose one between India and Pakistan based on religion. Muslim states preferred to join Pakistan and Hindu majority states decided to be a part of India.

The state of Jammu and Kashmir was one of the 650 princely states of the British India.

Because of its location, Kashmir could choose one from India and Pakistan. Maharaja Hari Singh, the ruler of Kashmir, was Hindu while most of the people of Kashmir were Muslim. At that time Maharaja Hari Singh was unable to decide between India and Pakistan that is why he decided to remain neutral.

In 1948, Burke, (1975), says the then-ruler of the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, Maharaja Hari Singh, who was holding out for independence, acceded to India on condition that the state retain self-reliant in all matters except defense, currency and foreign affairs. This decision was not acceptable by Muslim Majority of Kashmir, so the Muslim population of Kashmir revolted.
Indian leaders view that in October 1947 a force of Pushtun tribesmen invaded Kashmir (Burke, 1975). The tribesmen had come to help Kashmiri Muslims who were concerned that the Maharajah of Kashmir was going to hand over Kashmir to India. With the help of tribesmen Kashmiri people announced the war for their liberation against Maharaja Hari Singh and advanced towards Srinagar Capital of Kashmir.

Hari Singh fled to Delhi and directly appealed to the Indian government for military help to protect his territory. Lord Mountbatten, the last British viceroy and at the rise of the situation in Kashmir the Governor-General of India, accepted Hari Singh's supplication with the condition that the Kashmiri people would be offered a referendum to decide about which country they actually want to join. Indian Prime Minister Nehru, however, himself a Kashmiri Hindu also wanted Kashmir as a part of India, so they can proof India as a secular state, flew troops to the state (Johnson, 2005).

According to Cheema, (2015), after the deployment of Indian forces in Jammu and Kashmir on 26th August 1947 the Indian government adopted double standard policy. Indian government, on one hand, expressed the intention for resolving the dispute by the choice of Kashmiri people but on the other hand, practically the Indian leaders, especially Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, took steps to incorporate the state in the Indian Union. Unlike other inter-state conflicts, Kashmir conflict not started for strategic stuff neither for geopolitical importance.

The key cause of this dispute may be sought in the diverse conceptions about religion of Indian and Pakistani leaders. India is representing itself as a secular state, therefore, wanted to include Kashmir, because most of the population of this state are Muslims, so it can easily demonstrate itself as a secular state. India argued that if a Muslim-majority area might flourish in the limits of a Hindu dominated state; India would have been
committed to secularism without any doubt (Burke, 2015). For Pakistan, it was equally very much important to integrate Kashmir into its dominion, as the homeland of the Muslims of South Asia. The leaders of Pakistan claim that their Country and Muslim Nation of Pakistan in incomplete without having Kashmir as a part of Pakistan (Ganguly, 2006).

In 1948 the ruler of the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, Maharaja Hari Singh, who was holding out for independence, acceded to India on condition that the state retain self-reliant in all matters except defense, currency and foreign affairs (Kumar, 2014). The invasion of Pakistani raiders and an uprising of villagers in the western part of the state provoked the accession. The war between India and Pakistan ended with U.N. intervention; since 1948 the U.N. Military Observer Group on India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) has monitored the cease-fire line (Cheema, 2015). The northern and western areas of the state Azad Kashmir, GilgitBaltistan are under Pakistan's control; the Kashmir valley, Jammu, and Ladakh are under India's control.

U.N suggested to held a fair referendum to determine the final opinion of Kashmiri people, but Indian leaders have been rejected this suggestion and claims that because Kashmiris have voted in national elections in India, there is no need for a referendum (Kumar, 2014). Pakistan maintains that a referendum to be held. Several militant groups and people in Kashmir have also called for a referendum but argue that an independent Kashmir should be an option. India and Pakistan have been fought four wars for Kashmir but the issue is still there.
1.2.1. INTERNAL FACTORS IN KASHMIR CONFLICT

Stereotyping

The first witnessed internal factors in the Kashmir conflict is stereotyping which, according to Burke, (2015), gives a perception placing India and Pakistan at extreme ends with little or no chance of coming into a consensus whatsoever. What in actual sense is happening as explained by Burke, (2015), is Hindu fundamentalists advancing their agenda using the rebellion as an excuse to carry out biased measures, for example, using the AmarnathYatra to promote religious tourism, while in reality it was a way to acquire land and promote nationalism argues Burke, (2015).

Demonization of Muslim and Pakistanis

Demonization of Muslim and Pakistanis by various political parties like Shiv Sena is also a major challenge that continues to create dispute and disharmony between the two states Lamb, (2002). There are strict visa regulations making travelling from these states very difficult locking out dialogue across conflict lines and as a result continuous contact between India, Pakistan and Kashmir people.

Non-inclusive negotiation and mediation process

The Indo-Pak talks that strive to come up with a consensus in regards to Kashmir conflict is very limited in terms of representations because it excludes the Kashmiris from the negotiating table despite being at the centre of the whole conflict and are regarded as playing a critical in the conflict. This will not create a peaceful process that is legitimate for it does not address the critical question of problem of the hostile security forces among the Kashmir civilians who continuous engage in serious violations of human rights as indicated by Lamb, (2002).
The Kashmiris lack a clear leadership pattern that can compel India or Pakistan government to a negotiating table hence the difficulty in granting them an opportunity for representation. Witnessed are negotiations taking place between government officials and with a Kashmir with no legitimate government representation in place to represent their views and issues the difficulty is evident. Kashmir is manned with legal and administrative systems that are incompetent making justice unattainable as indicated by Lamb, (2002), as well as lack of government transparency culminating to suspicion among the Kashmir people.

**Continuous abuses by non-state actors**

In Kashmir there are non-state actors better known as rebels who continuously engage in human rights abuses on civilians and such abuses go unchecked or confronted making it difficult for peace to prevail. Burke, (2015), claims the Indian security forces who are suppose to be answerable in regards to such abuses often corporate with these rebels and make it difficult for peace and sanity to prevail in Kashmir as a result of the continuous human rights abuses committed.

**1.2.2. EXTERNAL FACTORS IN KASHMIR CONFLICT**

**Central cause for Islamists**

The conflict in Kashmir takes a different turn away from the issues of India, Pakistan and Kashmir and it has become a central cause for Islamists. Ganguly, (2007), argues the conflict to have ignited the Islamic fundamentalists in almost every part of the world who are now working to promote the spread of Islamism quotes Ganguly, (2007). This is seen where almost all the militants and rebels in Kashmir have become Islamist from various nations not necessarily Indians and Pakistanis.
This has promoted the conflict further and made it more prone to violence as these rebels have brought with them the tenets of jihad warlike ideologies and values as explained by Ganguly, (2007). These are non-state actors in the conflict and therefore holding them accountable for their actions is very difficult making the conflict more complicated.

In Pakistan it is vulnerable to radical militant groups as stated by Ganguly, (2007), and therefore it is very difficult for the government to control such groups as some of them are members of Pakistan and work closely with the Pakistani government concludes Ganguly, (2007). Therefore curbing militant activities and actions by the Pakistan government in Kashmir is a question left unanswered by many as the writing is on the walls.

**Chinese influence**

External influence in any conflict can be either positive or negative. In the case of the Chinese influence in the Kashmir conflict, it is clear that China is using the Indo-Pak rivalry to its advantage. This is because the Chinese government seen to be close to the Pakistan government where they provided them with military wherewithal states Habibullah, (2004), as a strategic and economic advancement to exert pressure on their India counterparts.

China and India are competitors in the Asia continent both economically and politically and therefore, the Kashmir conflict is a opportunity to further their own economic and strategic goals that will outdo Indian even if it means backing Pakistan as much as that support may be seen negatively by the international community and actors in the conflict.

**USA influence**

The USA influence in the Kashmir conflict has not be so intense compared to the Chinese influence. The USA is fairly non-committal as it is more concerned about nuclear
nonproliferation, it wants to control the Taliban influence and its priority is to foster peace between India and Pakistan notes Habibullah, (2004). The Indian nations is a critical trade and economic partner to the USA while the Pakistan are an important military ally to it therefore it has desisted from taking central role in the Kashmir conflict mediation process.

The international actors in the Kashmir conflict are presented with a dilemma on how to actively and dominantly involving themselves in the mediation process of the conflict. The unavailability of clear and active mediation process spearheaded by the international community and actors has left several loopholes in the conflict where no enough pressure is evident especially towards India towards creating a lasting solution that is tantamount towards the aspirations of the Kashmir people that is peaceful and democratic.

Despite the possession of nuclear weapons by India and Pakistan, there is a realization that the nuclear weapons have only deterrent value and war is not the solution to any problem in the region. Only cooperation can help in fostering peace and cooperation in the region. The intervention of the outside powers has only exacerbated the conflict, solved through trust and confidence in each other.

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
India and Pakistan both have stake in Kashmir. Both countries have been fighting since 1947 on who legitimately should occupy Kashmir. According to Malik, (2008), from 1947 both countries have gone through the war four times because of Kashmir, but could not find a solution that is acceptable for both countries.

In 1948 Kashmir, conflict presented in United Nations Security Council, and UN Security Council suggested to held referendum as a solution. Since 1948, referendum could not be held just because of the Indian government interruptions making it impossible for that
process to take place. Leaders of both countries want to resolve this conflict according to their own conditions a case that cannot achieve any solution in the international relations criteria. There must be consensus and agreements, which require soberness and compromise to take center stage for peace to prevail.

A critical problem in the Kashmir conflict is the views of India about Kashmir that continuously makes it difficult for mediation and lasting peace to prevail. According to Malik, (2008), India’s argument is Kashmir became an integral part of India the moment Hari Singh signed the Instrument of Accession. India further argues its case that legally the Maharaja of Kashmir was the only competent authority to sign the Instrument of Accession concludes Malik, (2008). it is the duty and right of heads of states to sign international treaties and therefore India’s argument is legitimate, but there are other underlying factors that must be observed and amicably regardless of India stand to create peace in Kashmir.

This thesis must therefore analyse the accession of Kashmir to India in terms of its legality and legitimacy and India’s claim that the state is inseparable from the country. Further, it must address the bilateral discussions under the terms of the Simla agreement in 1972 to understand what it meant in regards to the accession claims by India.

Another problem the thesis will be analysing is the importance of Kashmir to both India and Pakistan. Malik, (2008), argues Kashmir as viewed by India is a test for on its secular ideology while for Pakistan its view on Kashmir is that it encompasses the nation’s Islamic identity. This makes it more complicated because Kashmir is not only becoming a territorial dispute but also an ideological and tradition dispute between the two nations India and Pakistan over Kashmir.
India maintains a military policy approach in the issue of Kashmir, a process that has not been successful in creating a lasting solution and peace. The outcome of this military process has been fighting and more killings in the region. Therefore, the paper will look at more peaceful and credible solutions to the Kashmir conflict that will critically provide a lasting peace for the larger south Asia region.

The present study attempts to find out the role of Indian and Pakistan leaders in the conflict. It also attempt to find out the perspectives in Kashmir as viewed by Indian and Pakistan leaders to rule over Kashmir, addresses the influence of international community and actors involved in the conflict, providing the strategies and recommendations to address the conflict and ultimately create a peaceful outcome agreeable by both parties involved.

1.4. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

a) To trace the history of the Kashmir Conflict

b) To discuss the social and economic benefits of Indian and Pakistani leaders in Kashmir

c) To examine the role of India and Pakistan leadership in the Kashmir conflict

d) To examine the influence of international community and actors in the Kashmir conflict

e) To provide the strategies and recommendations to address the conflict

1.5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

a) What is the history of the Kashmir conflict?
b) What are the social and economic benefits of Indian and Pakistani leaders in Kashmir?

c) What kind of role the Indian and Pakistani leaders are playing in Kashmir conflict?

d) What is the influence of international community and actors in the Kashmir conflict

e) What are the strategies and recommendations to address the conflict?

1.6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

More than 24,000 lives have gone wasted during the sub-conflict of Kashmir (Johnson, 2005). Both India and Pakistan have expended a great deal of money, many lives and much effort. Both countries have fought difficult campaigns, often against the odds, in 1947-8, 1965, 1971 and 1999 observe (Johnson, 2005). So far, no country could achieve a lasting strategic advantage from any of the disastrous fight.

1.7. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research uses a qualitative research approach. It utilizes secondary data from different sources such as academic articles, books, and Internet resources. The method of research combined case study analysis and a theoretical frame of analysis. Information gathered from friends and classmates contributed immensely to this research.

1.8. CHAPTER OUTLINE

This research is organized into five chapters.

Chapter One - This chapter introduces the study, research questions, objectives, problem statement, back ground information about the topic and about specific areas which can be benefitted from this studies.
**Chapter Two** - It looks at the history of the Kashmir conflict. It gives a general overview of the factors that led to the hostilities between Pakistan and India over Kashmir. Using a historical and philosophical approach, this chapter surveys the factors that contributed to the Kashmir conflict. This chapter provides a good understanding of the history, forms, and actors involved in the conflict. It will also examine different perspectives of Indian and Pakistani leaders in Kashmir.

**Chapter Three** - Chapter three provides the detailed methodological frame work which has been used to conduct this research.

**Chapter Four** – This chapter provides details about the objectives of this research by looking at the role of Indian and Pakistani leaders in Kashmir conflict. It also explores resolution attempts made by the involved parties and external actors like the UN and the UK government. The chapter examines the role each actor has played in fueling the conflict or resolving it. It explores the negative and positive impacts of external actors in the Kashmir conflict. It offers a complete assessment of the advantages as viewed by Indian and Pakistani leaders of making the Kashmir area be part of India, Pakistan or leaving it to become an independent state.

**Chapter Five** - It synthesizes the information gathered in the previous three chapters. It sums up the findings and makes recommendations going forward.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

More than 24,000 lives have gone worthless amid the sub-conflict of Kashmir (Johnson, 2005). Both India and Pakistan have consumed a lot of cash, numerous lives and much effort. Both nations have battled troublesome campaigns, regularly against the chances, in 1947-8, 1965, 1971 and 1999. So far no nation could accomplish an enduring vital preferred standpoint from any of the grievous battle. In late March 2003, psychological oppressors thought to be individuals from Pakistan-upheld Islamic gatherings murdered 24 Hindu villagers in Kashmir. This episode evoked recollections of the suicide assault by Muslim psychological oppressors on the Indian Parliament in New Delhi in December 2001. Occasions like these raise the potential risk of war amongst India and Pakistan. South Asia is thought by numerous spectators to be the most perilous place on the planet, with both adversaries outfitted with atomic weapons. Kashmir has been in dispute amongst India and Pakistan since the season of the segment in 1947. It is a site where both nations always go head to head. In January and June of 2002, India was ready to assault Pakistan as a result of psychological militant military activity against Indian focuses in Kashmir. (Subbiah, 2004)

Besides, the rise of the religious right in both nations makes a political domain that borderlines on the prophetically catastrophic. Islamic groups in Pakistan's fringe territories with Afghanistan won in the last parliamentary decisions. Also, components of Pakistani military insight keep on supporting fear based oppressor action in Kashmir. Experts trust that President Musharraf has restricted capacity to check this activity. In the
meantime, as the race season approaches in 2004, the decision party in India, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), resorts progressively to the idea of Hindutva, a conviction that India is not a mainstream, pluralist state, but rather the sacrosanct place of Hindu command. Any understudy of religion and legislative issues realizes that when either party in an ethnic or partisan clash conjures God or divine beings on its side, the potential for real death toll in war essentially takes off (Šumit, 1999).

In the wake of facilitating a two-day workshop prior keep going November on the separate parts of Track 1, official tact, and Track 2, informal discretion, in the Israeli-Palestinian clash, the Carter Center's Conflict Resolution Program picked the Kashmir issue for its next subject. Mirroring its dedication to inside and out political, mental, and authentic examination as an essential to building any conceivable procedure on Track 1/Track 2 approaches, the Center assembled local conceived Indian, Pakistani, and Kashmiri specialists on the contention with senior resigned negotiators from the subcontinent and the United States and strife determination experts to build up a way to deal with peacemaking in Kashmir. This report is the product of this preparatory exertion.

Three states, India, Pakistan, and China, control parts of Kashmir, which in spite of a substantial Muslim majority share is host to imperative Hindu and Buddhist minorities and seven noteworthy dialect families. One of the numerous incongruities in the contention is that while the Vale of Kashmir is the brutal focus of the contention that could accelerate atomic war, it adds up to only .25 percent of the region, populace, and GNP of South Asia. However Kashmir has incapacitated the area throughout the previous 12 years and more than quite a few years created contending national accounts in India and Pakistan on the privilege of ownership that have left the locale in a limbo of desolation (Behera, 2007).
The issue of whether Muslims or Hindus or common legislators ought to lead has distracted Kashmir from at any rate the mid 1930s when a particularly Kashmiri personality started to develop. Nevertheless, with the way to deal with parcel in 1947, Kashmir got to be entangled in the calamities of the subcontinent in general. As Kashmiri national yearnings got to be subsumed under the more noteworthy India/Pakistani clash, the grievances of the area started to take shape. A plebiscite called for by the United Nations to recognize Kashmiri wishes about their political status was never held. With another informed era coming to age in the 1980s, requests for Kashmiri self-assurance expanded however were confronted with incredible concealment by the Indian armed force and police (Noorani, 1992).

Endeavors of free disapproved of Kashmiris to utilize races for a well known command were finished when the race of 1987 was fixed against them. The subsequent descending winding, exacerbated seriously by the appearance in the locale of jihadi veterans of the Afghan war, has added to the political brutality that has endured until today. While Indian security authorities appear to be persuaded that the Pakistani armed force is controlling the jihadi components assaulting Kashmir, different eyewitnesses see the jihadis, blooded veterans of the war against the Soviet Union, as a risk to the armed force on the off chance that it tries to stifle them. Some consider these Muslim contenders/psychological oppressors to be a Frankensteïn beast (Korbel, 1953).

While it might be justifiable that a few pioneers of India call Pakistan a fear based oppressor state, such dialect may very expand the quantity of Pakistanis and different Muslims who volunteer for psychological oppressor activity. The condition of Pakistan is a great deal more feeble and helpless than India with its created lawful framework and working popular government. For sure, Pakistan needs India's assistance as it endeavors
to smother the radicalization in its nation. In the event that Pakistan flops as a state, India would endure a noteworthy crumbling in its own particular security (Behera, 2007).

Thought of Track 1 and Track 2 activities requires significant alert given the delicacy of the India-Pakistani relationship. There is solid accord that the United States has a basic Track 1 intervening part to play, and it ought to play it on a proceeding with premise. This security circumstance is excessively genuine for long winded intercessions. But instead than formal two-sided discourses between the two nations, encouraged back-channel correspondence might be less demanding to oversee and more gainful at first. Once more, the American exertion must be managed, mirroring an interest in time and vitality similar with the level of risk to the area. There ought to likewise be not kidding and nonstop endeavors to construct peace bodies electorate in both nations and in Kashmir. What's more, an extraordinary exertion ought to be made to discover regarded religious pioneers who can advance the possibility of serene settlement of contentions.

Track 2 endeavors to date have principally comprised of gatherings normally composed by non natives that unite previous Indian and Pakistani government authorities, resigned military officers, and scholastics. Now and again, the procedure produces intriguing papers and the periodic book, yet next to no effect on government arrangements in Islamabad and New Delhi.

What may hold guarantee are endeavors to associate Indian and Pakistani business pioneers. They have the characteristic motivator of expanding the low existing level of exchange products and enterprises. Vitality exchange is one territory of extensive guarantee. India could devour as much vitality as it could get from all of its neighbors. Vitality connections make reliance connections, nearly by definition. In addition, India and Pakistan's involvement with the Indus Water Treaty is one of the uncommon positive
cases of judiciousness and inventiveness in the generally beset two-sided relationship (Behera, 2007).

2.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE KASHMIR SUB-CONFLICT AND ITS RESOLUTION

The Kashmir conflict is a regional clash fundamentally amongst India and Pakistan, having begun soon after the parcel of India in 1947. China has now and again assumed a minor part. India and Pakistan have battled three wars over Kashmir, including the Indo-Pakistani Wars of 1947 and 1965, and additionally the Kargil War 1999, the territory also saw heavy fighting in the third war in 1971 (Bose, 2014). In the last few decades, Kashmir has become a paradise lost in conflict. His people trapped in a bitter dispute between India and Pakistan. The disputed area is comprised of over 100,000 square kilometers, utilized mainly for agriculture and tourism. The conflict worsened India-Pakistan relations bringing the countries to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe.

The two nations have likewise been included in a few clashes over control of the Siachen Glacier. India asserts the whole condition of Jammu and Kashmir, and, starting 2010, directs roughly 43% of the area. It controls Jammu, the Kashmir Valley, Ladakh, and the Siachen Glacier. India's cases are challenged by Pakistan, which oversees roughly 37% of Kashmir, to be specific Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan. China at present manages Demchok region, the Shaksgam Valley, and the Aksai Chin district. China's claim over these domains has been questioned by India since China took Aksai Chin amid the Sino-Indian War of 1962.

The foundation of these conflicts between the Kashmiri insurgents and the Indian government is fixing to a disagreement about neighborhood independence. Just
advancement was constrained in Kashmir until the late 1970s, and by 1988, a number of the equitable changes presented by the Indian Government had been turned around. Peaceful channels for communicating discontent were from that point restricted and brought about a sensational increment in support for extremists pushing fierce withdrawal from India. In 1987, a questioned state race made an impetus for the insurrection when it brought about a portion of the state's authoritative gathering individuals framing equipped guerilla bunches. In July 1988 a progression of exhibits, strikes and assaults on the Indian Government started the Kashmir Insurgency (Dasgupta, 2005).

Albeit a great many individuals have passed on because of the turmoil in Jammu and Kashmir, the contention has turned out to be less destructive as of late. Dissent developments made to voice Kashmir's question and grievances with the Indian government, particularly the Indian Military, have been dynamic in Jammu and Kashmir since 1989. Decisions held in 2008 were by and large viewed as reasonable by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and had a high voter turnout disregarding calls by separatist activists for a blacklist. The decision brought about the production of the ace India Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, which then shaped a legislature in the state. As per Voice of America, numerous examiners have deciphered the high voter turnout in this decision as a sign that the general population of Kashmir embraced Indian administer in the state. Be that as it may, in 2010 turmoil ejected after asserted fake experience of nearby youth by security drive. A large number of adolescents pelted security strengths with rocks, smoldered government workplaces and assaulted railroad stations and authority vehicles in consistently strengthening savagery (Jha, 2003).

The Indian government faulted separatists and Lashkar-e-Taiba, a Pakistan-based aggressor bunch for feeding the 2010 dissents. In any case, races held in 2014 saw most noteworthy voter's turnout in 26 years of history in Jammu and Kashmir.
However, investigators clarify that the high voter turnout in Kashmir is not a support of Indian run by the Kashmiri populace, rather the vast majority vote in favor of every day issues, for example, sustenance and power. A feeling survey directed by the Chatham House universal issues think tank found that in the Kashmir valley - the primarily Muslim zone in Indian Kashmir at the focal point of the uprising - bolster for autonomy shifts between 74% to 95% in its different locale. Bolster for staying with India was however greatly high in prevalently Hindu Jammu and Buddhist Ladakh. As per Amnesty International, as of June 2015, no individual from the Indian military conveyed in Jammu and Kashmir has been striven for human rights infringement in a regular citizen court, despite the fact that there have been military court military's held. In October 2015 Jammu and Kashmir High Court said that article 370 is changeless and Jammu and Kashmir did not converge with India the way other regal states consolidated yet held extraordinary status and constrained power under Indian constitution (Behera, 2007).

The sub conflict over Jammu and Kashmir is the core of all issues amongst India and Pakistan. It has agitated the relations between the two nations since their freedom from the British manage in 1947. The beginning of this sub-strife lies in the truth that when the British India divided in 1947, Muslim lion's share territories were to be given to Pakistan while Hindu greater part zones were to be given to India. The condition of Jammu and Kashmir was one of 562 princely states. It had Muslim dominant part and it controlled over by a Hindu maharaja who closed a stop concurrence with Pakistan and began outrages against the Muslim populace of the state. In response the populace revolted (Dasgupta, 2005).

Indian leaders see that in October 1947 a compel of PashtunAfridi tribesmen attacked Kashmir. The tribesmen had come to help their Kashmiri brethren who were concerned that the Maharajah of Kashmir was going to hand over Kashmir to India. Kahmiri powers
with the assistance of the tribesmen declared a war of freedom against maharaja and progressed on the capital, Srinagar. Hari Singh fled to Delhi and specifically spoke to the Indian government for military help. Mountbatten, the last British emissary and at the ascent of the circumstance in Kashmir the Governor-General of India, acknowledged Hari Singh's supplication with the condition that the Kashmiri individuals would be offered a choice to choose their future. Indian Prime Minister Nehru, be that as it may, himself a Kashmiri Hindu, flew troops to the state (Johnson, 2005).

Amid the last months of 1947, while abnormal state Indo-Pakistani talks neglected to determine the emergency in Kashmir, Indian troops prevailing with regards to crushing the spirit of the tribal hostile and securing their own hold over Srinagar. In the meantime the Gilgit district on 3 November 1947, under the administration of the administrator of the Gilgit Scouts, Major W. Cocoa, diverted from all remnant of Dogra control and pronounced for Pakistan on the next day. As of now, with the onset of the winter of 1947-48 the military circumstance in Jammu and Kashmir was quick drawing nearer a stalemate, the State being adequately cut in two by a versatile yet impervious fight front. Over the span of 1948 battling in Kashmir went ahead between the Indian Army and the strengths of the Government of Azad Kashmir, which formally announced its freedom from Maharaja's administration on 24th October 1947 just before the Indian airdrop in Srinagar (Lamb, 2002).

This prompted to a brief equipped clash amongst Pakistan and India in 1948. It was India, which alluded the debate to the UNSC. On first January 1948 the Indian agent to the UNSC, P. P. Pillai, transmitted to the President of the UNSC the case from India. It was in the type of a grievance against Pakistan and it asked for the UNSC to prevent Pakistan from intruding in Kashmir. The contention of India depended on the legitimacy of Maharaja's relationship to India (Lamb, 1992).
Joined Nation's Commission on India and Pakistan UNCIP was framed to enquire the issue of Kashmir and help the clashing gatherings with the goal that they may achieve a settlement. The consequence of the contemplations of the Commission was two resolutions of the UNSC, which were passed on thirteenth August 1948 and fifth January 1949. The initially called upon both administrations of both clashing gatherings to "reaffirm their desire that the future status of Jammu and Kashmir might be resolved as per the will of the general population". The second determination determined that both governments had acknowledged rule that the topic of increase of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan would be chosen through the vote based strategy for a free and unbiased plebiscite (Behera, 2007).

After the deployment of Indian powers in Jammu and Kashmir on 26th August 1947 the Indian government received a strategy with twofold principles. The Indian government, on one hand, communicated the goal for determining the question in the light of the desires of the general population of the state however despite what might be expected, for all intents and purposes the Indian pioneers, particularly Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, found a way to consolidate the state in the Indian Union. One of the main endeavors of the determination of the Kashmir issue by worldwide peace merchants occurred amid October 1948. Head administrator of Pakistan, Liaquat Ali Khan disclosed that he held two mystery converses with the British Prime Minister Clement Attlee, British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin and Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. The discussions did not convey an answer for the issue extremely neater (Dawn, 1984-Oct 25). Instead of an acceleration of the war in the most recent days of 1948, there were transactions prompting to a truce which produced results on first January 1949 and on 27 July 1949. Indian and Pakistani military delegates consented to at Karachi an arrangement
characterizing a truce line in Kashmir which, until the 1965 was to check the point of confinement of the two states as claimed by Lamb, (1992).

Clearly both parties agreed that India and Pakistan each might direct a piece of Kashmir until a plebiscite could be held. Pakistan had controlled the Gilgit Agency, Baltistan, and the western edge of the valley of Kashmir, with a populace of around 3 million, while India had held whatever is left of Kashmir, Ladakh and Jammu, managing nine million (Johnson, 2004). The reason for this speedy, unforeseen and transitory settlement of the Kashmir strife was that around then the Commanders of the Armies of both states were still British, General Gracey for Pakistan and General Bucher for India. They stayed in close touch amid the basic days and their nearness diminished the potential outcomes of long clash. Besides the Prime Ministers of the both nations, Jawaharlal Nehru of India and Liaquat Ali Khan of Pakistan, did not have any desire to smash their recently discovered states in the very begin (Lamb, 1992).

2.3. HISTORICAL NATURE OF KASHMIR CONFLICT

State of Jammu and Kashmir

Kashmir's history before 1947 can be categorized into four major periods- Hindu and Buddhist rule; Muslim rule; Sikh rule and Dogra rule (Rahman, 2006). During the Sikhs rule, everything was in order until 1845 when the first Anglo-Sikh war broke. Two treaties were concluded between Sikhs and British. The first treaty promised the British an indemnity of 10 million rupees for Kashmir state, including the hill country between the Beas and Indus Rivers, and was signed in Lahore on 9 March 1846. The second treaty which was signed in Amritsar on 15 March 1846 surrendered all mountainous country and its dependencies situated east of the Indus and west of Ravi River to the British (Dixit, 2012).
Sikhs could not pay the indemnity and therefore Gulab Singh gave the British a discount sum of 7.5 million rupees in return for the possession of Jammu, Kashmir, Ladakh and Baltistan. The Hindu monarchy established in Kashmir in 1846. Kashmir was reasonably flexible during the reign of Maharaja Gulab Singh and the Muslim subjects equally treated with their Hindu compatriots. However, all Maharaja’s successors were ruthless, biased and authoritative. Following the period of Maharaja Gulab Singh, Kashmir Brahmins and the Dogras controlled most of the agricultural land, and the Muslim population who were working on these lands were subject to the Kashmir Brahmins and the Dogras (Ganguly, 2007).

However, the Muslims who represented 53 per cent of the population in the Southern Jammu and 93 per cent in the Northern Kashmir Province were a community without wealth or influence. The flame of opposition was increased by some events in 1931. The Hindus demolished a mosque in Jammu. Muslims prevented from offering their prayers. Hatred of the Maharaja intensified by all these events, which resulted into launching of independent movement by the Muslims against the Maharaja, under the leadership of Kashmiri Muslim, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah.

**Partition of Indian Subcontinent**

The Jammu-Kashmir area is a land full of wealth and therefore forms one of the greatest subjects of dispute between the Dominion of Pakistan and Union of India. According to Das, (2006), 526 Indian states were left to decide on becoming part of one of the greater nations; the Dominion of Pakistan or the Union of India, upon the partition of India in 1947 (Das, 2006). Kashmir was subject to the rule of a Hindu Maharaja despite having predominantly Muslim population leading to religious dispute, which made it substantially more difficult for the Dominion of Pakistan to appeal to Kashmir.
When India and Pakistan emerged as separate independent states on 15 and 14 August 1947 respectively, the expectation of the Muslim leaders, that Muslim majority provinces and princely states, especially the state of Jammu and Kashmir would automatically join Pakistan was not completely fulfilled (Das, 2006). This resulted into a long-lasting antagonism, suspicion, hostility, wars, military built-up and nuclear arm races between India and Pakistan the following years.

**Accession of Kashmir to India**

Accession of Kashmir was the most painful act which brought the most troublesome consequences in Indo-Pakistan relations. The ruler of Jammu and Kashmir was a Hindu, therefore, the basic principle that the ruler should decide while taking into account his people was confused since majority of the subjects were Muslims. Also Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, Muslim leader, was in favor of accession to India (Dawson, 2004). The leader of Kashmir, Maharaja Hari Singh himself covertly harbored visions of independence and ignored Mountbatten’s explicit injunction.

Maharaja Hari Singh was not responsive to the National Conference despite receiving dual approaches to join their states both from India and Pakistan as he was inclined to declare Kashmir an independent state with himself thereafter as the monarch. Jammu and Kashmir conference wanted Kashmir to become part of Pakistan but the National Party led by Sheikh Abdullah opposed the idea of Kashmir becoming part of Pakistan.

**2.4 TIMELINE OF THE CONFLICT FROM 1947 - 2016**

The following is a course of events of the occasions that went before the most recent clash between the two nations. Since independence from the British rule in 1947 as indicated by Guha, & Mahatma, (2014), by the Pakistan and India nations they have engaged in a total of four. According to Guha, & Mahatma, (2014), the first was that took
place soon after independence is known as the First Kashmir War caused by the interest to secure Kashmir by either parties (India or Pakistan).

Wirsing, (1994), argues The Maharaja of Kashmir, Hari Singh intention was to remain independent hence the delay in the issue of either joining India or Pakistan and this was followed by the invasion of a concentrated force of Pro-Pakistan Tribes from (NWFP) and regular Pakistani soldiers (Wirsing, 1994). On witnessing the invasion The Maharaja of Kashmir was obliged to accede Kashmir to India which quickly rushed in and thus started the war in Kashmir concluding with the Pakistan forces.

According to Guha, & Mahatma, (2014), the Pakistanis questioned the accession by the Indian government and that this was not appropriate their argument was that since the majority of the Kashmir people were Muslims, Pakistan deserved the princely state and not India. The claim for Kashmir by Pakistan can also be traced from the time of the partition and that one princely state Jonagadh ruled by Muslim Raja Muhammad MahtabKhanji and his subjects were Hindus argues Guha, & Mahatma, (2014). Through plebiscite, India managed to take over control of Jonagadh this made Pakistani to demand a fair plebiscite in Kashmir as granted to India in some princely states as explained by Guha, & Mahatma, (2014). India in his part refused to accept this proposal and this is where the root cause of the war in Kashmir between India and Pakistan began to rise.

By following the ceasefire Pakistan decided to end the war as they realized they would not make any progress in any sector as claimed by Wirsing, (1994). As a result India managed to control two thirds of Kashmir which was relatively wealthy and crowded and fertile regions of Kashmir Valley, leaving only a third to Pakistan control.

It also prompted to the begin of the primary war over the area, which was just ended Jan. 1, 1949, when a United Nations-facilitated truce made a line of division that gave India
control of 65 percent of the region and the rest of Pakistan. Expected to just be an impermanent game plan until a choice was held, the division stays set up right up ’til today (Dasgupta, 2005).

1957 – India announced Kashmir an essential part of the Indian Union.

Despite the ceasefire, other border disputes between the two nations existed even though not as predominant as the Kashmir issue. Wirsing, (1994), says border issues and conflicts existed over the Rann of Kutch, seasonal salt marsh located in the Thar Desert in Kutch district of Gujrat, India and Sindh province of Pakistan. The conflict stated as explained by Wirsing, (1994), on April 9th 1965 leading to a mega battle of 1965. For example, Indian forces started meaningless firing when Pakistani forces finished the mission of road leading to the Indian border. Indian forces further constructed check posts in that area that did not go well with the Pakistan who engaged them in limited attack as explained by Bose, (2007). To clear the area and further pushed back Indian forced to their borderline.

The success in Rann of Kutch region made Pakistan confident under the leadership of leadership of General Ayub Khan says Bose, (2007). They argued Indian Army were not that strong and would fall under a quick and fierce military attack in the disputed territory of Kashmir for they had suffered a loss to China in 1962 (Bose, 2007).

According to Bose, (2007), 1st September 1965, Pakistan government launched a counter-offensive, called Operation Grand Salam, whose main objective and goal was to Capture the Vital town of Akhnoor in Jammu. This was to cut communications and supply routes to Indian troops a process that would make them vulnerable and weak. This attack made little gain as the Pakistan through Operation Grand Salam did not succeed and were
unable to capture Akhnoor, they only took control over Kargil. This made India furious and on 6th September 1965, Bose, (2007), says India crossed the international border, a statement that marked the official beginning of the war Koithara, (2004).

The war between India and Pakistan headed to a deadlock with both countries holding the other’s territory. According to Koithara, (2004), the war ended because Pakistan leaders realized it was tilting in India’s favour while the international pressure also played a part in making the India leaders to accept a ceasefire. As much as Kashmir because the center of the war against the two nations, it is found that both the country’s wanted to gain and occupy the fertile land of Sialkot and Lahore. With the later famous producer of rice concludes Koithara, (2004).

Navnita (2007), claims in 1999 conflict between India and Pakistan that occurred near the town of Kargil in Kashmir was a military clash between two nuclear powers argues (Navnita, 2007). India occupied Siachin peak in 1984, which is the world highest battlefield. During winter periods, Pakistan forces would withdraw from Siachin peak and come back during summer periods. The Indian forces and leadership took advantage of this situation and occupied Siachin during winter nights a situation that made Pakistan leaders and forces furious.

All this time the Pakistan leadership and forces were unhappy about the situation and waited for an opportunity to recapture the region again. A plan was hacked in1999 according to Navnita (2007), the chief of Pakistan army ParvezMusharaf orchestrated a plan in regards to Kargil operation a plan that was kept a secret that even the Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif was not aware of it. He managed to send 200-trained commandos to Kargil peak as indicated by Navnita (2007). This process was successful and in March the same year the Pakistan forces were able to gain control of the Kargil peak as there were no Indian forces at that time. The Pakistan armies were able to capture more than
140 peaks a process that did not go down well with the Indian leaders and forces. It did not go down well with the Indian leaders as they retaliated and due to pressure from international community, Pakistan withdrew from Kargil.

2008 – Armed shooters opened fire on regular people over the Indian city of Mumbai Nov. 26. More than 160 individuals were murdered. In spite of the fact that Pakistan prevented association or information from securing the assault, India severed peace talks.

2010 – Protests by Muslims in Indian-controlled Kashmir prompted to a crackdown by Indian powers, leaving 120 individuals, for the most part adolescents, dead.

2016 – A quieting of relations in Kashmir was broken after a July executing of a 22-year-old separatist activist named BurhanMuzaffarWani by Indian security strengths.

The history of the conflict between India and Pakistan traced from these instances, which have created a lot of tension and mistrust between the two nations. It has tremendously affected the relations between India and Pakistan to the extent of engaging in blame games on who caused the wars and why. These wars have contributed to military and economical loss and therefore it is important to encourage peace and promote ceasefire regardless of who thinks or believes is right or wrong.

2.5 PHILOSOPHICAL NATURE OF KASHMIR CONFLICT

2.5.1. Hindu-Muslim Antagonism

According to Dixit, (2002), Indo-Pakistan hostility is perceived to have rooted in the long period of Muslim rule over India. When General Muhammad Bin Qasim, sent by the Umayyad dynasty conquered the Indian Delta region in Sindh, the very first piece of Hindu-Muslim antagonism was witnessed. This led to the establishment of Indo-Muslim state, which resulted to the suffering of over ten thousand Buddhists and Hindus, (Raja,
2010). An Islamic outpost, where Arabs set up trade linkages with the Middle East developed in Sindh.

Mahmud of Ghazni, who was the leader of the Turkic tribe by the end of the tenth century, occupying Punjab as the Eastern Province, launched seventeen aggressive operations into Northern India. In the thirteenth century, Shams-ud-Din Iltutmish established a Turkic kingdom that extended its influence to Bengal and Deccan. There is a strong perception that the assertiveness of Muslims and Hindu resentment dating from the time of Aurangzeb who ruled from 1658-1707, aggravated the existing Hindu-Muslim antagonism.

2.5.2. Geographical Location

Kashmir is located at the junction of Pakistan, India, Afghanistan and China between the Himalayas and PirPanjal mountain range. It is regarded as the valley between the Himalayas and the PirPanjal mountain range. Geographically, the regions subjected to dispute are north of the Union of India and the Dominion of Pakistan, and the south west of the Republic of China. Over 100,000 square kilometers of land comprises the disputed areas. This land is mainly utilized for tourism and agriculture.

Kashmir region is a home to a myriad of historically valued Hindu and Muslim shrines, where annual pilgrimages are made. Due to its geographic borders and abundant resources, Kashmir and Jammu has acquired significant political, religious, economic and military potential. This has ultimately led to the power struggle for the Kashmir area.

2.5.3. An Indigenous Freedom Struggle

According to Indian Government, the mass Kashmir resistance movement in its areas of control is described as a terrorist activity waged by infiltrators in an attempt to nullify the indigenous nature of the freedom struggle in Jammu and Kashmir. India therefore has
blamed Pakistan for fanning the movement. However, the fact is that the struggle for self-determination has been going on since 1947. The movement began as a political struggle but was faced with setbacks. Also the Indian policy of backtracking on promises made transformed the movement into an armed struggle. According to Bose (2007), Kashmir rose into rebellion because they saw no hope of redress within the Indian state’s institutional framework to the gross, consistent and systematic pattern of abuse of their rights. This led to brutal and disproportional violent response to which their protests were sought to be suppressed.

2.5.5. Indo-Pak Water Dispute

The struggle on the usage and ownership of the water from the Indus River is another factor that has been a facilitator to the Kashmir issue. The water from this river has been used for irrigation purposes. Dispute started between various water users when there is substantial increase in demand for water. However, these disputes, which were domestic, became international after the creation of Pakistan. There was a disagreement on how to share and manage what was a cohesive and unitary network of irrigation. Since the partition was such that the source rivers of the Indus basin was in India, Pakistan felt threatened over the main source of water for its cultivable land.

2.6. ACTORS INVOLVED IN THE CONFLICT

2.6.1. India

According to Musarat, (2015), The Union of India got involved in Kashmir conflict when Jammu and Kashmir agreed to the Union. The first interest in the region resulted from the formation of two major states in the sub-continent, Pakistan and India. The accession was done in exchange for military aid against the Pakistan forces, which led to official signing
of Kashmir into being a territory of India. In the first Indo-Pakistan war, India played a
defensive role cites Schofield, (2010).

India came to the point of a standstill with Pakistan after the drafting and adoption
procedures of the UN Security Council Resolutions 39 and 47 (Schofield, 2010). Pakistan
was unwilling to let up control it maintained over the regions, leading to a point of
standstill between India and Pakistan, Pakistan also accused India of not honoring the
Standstill Agreement between Pakistan and India.

India also accuses Pakistan of sabotaging its efforts for peace in the Kashmir region. India
has accused Pakistan of causing civil unrest and direct attacks from locals. India
leadership says that Pakistan militia attempted to defame the image of Indian rule in the
Kashmir people’s eye. India, currently, has multitude units of stationed military troops in
Kashmir and is trying to provide better living standards to people of Kashmir and also
immersing them into the Indian lifestyle a process that is not take positively by Pakistan
(Musarat, 2015).

Kashmir was a significant area for India because of numerous reasons and one of them is
that according to Navnita (2007), it was considered an ancestral homeland of Nehru, the
first Indian Prime Minister and one of the founding fathers of India (Schofield, 2010). As
a result of this development the Indian government and leadership used his influence to
ensure India’s commitment to retaining Kashmir Navnita (2007).

India economic benefit and advancement formed the basis for and towards the fight to
retain Kashmir. For security and economic needs of India argues Schofield, (2010), says
Kashmir was a strategic significance and therefore it made it necessary for India to battle
and fight hard towards retaining its dominance and control in Kashmir.
Economically, as indicated by Musarat, (2015), Kashmir’s rich in the production of timber with the headwaters of three major rivers of Indus Basin. Kashmir is considered very helpful to India despite the fact that in 1947 as explained by Musarat, (2015), the economic links of Kashmir with the areas, which later became the parts of Pakistan, were far greater than with the areas, which became the part of India after partition Navnita (2007).

2.6.2. Pakistan

Pakistan was one of the chiefly involved parties in the Kashmir dispute. The Dominion of Pakistan is one of the three states bordering the Jammu-Kashmir region. The vast Muslim majority residing in Kashmir acted as the main supporting cause for Pakistan. Pakistan were therefore able to claim that the rule and accommodation provided by the Pakistan government was the best for Kashmir’s inhabitants. Pakistan supported the two-nation theory and argued that Kashmir should be part of Pakistan due to negligence of India’s part.

Navnita, (2007), cites that the original importance of Kashmir for Pakistan lies in the two-nation theory upon which all India Muslim League based its demand for a separate Muslim homeland. In the theory claims that the Hindus and Muslims are two separate nations who cannot live, together because of their differences in ideology in both regards to religious and governance. This formed the basis through which the Pakistan felt it necessary to fight over Kashmir as the Muslims of the subcontinent cannot lead their lives in full accordance with their beliefs under Hindu domination (Wirsing, 1994). Dominance of Indian control over Kashmir was problematic and became a center of conflict, as it was the sole Muslim majority region that was not given to Pakistan concludes Wirsing, (1994).
Pakistan was involved in the first Indo-Pakistan War. Pakistan’s Government and Army are also working closely with local tribesmen, residents, and Kashmir to dismantle Indian influence in the region (Wirsing, 1994). They believe that it is Indian who did not honor the Standstill Agreement and states that Indian troops and officials have been mal-treating the Kashmir people. Pakistan has been unwilling to resort to any method of resolution except for plebiscite. This followed its alliance with CENTO (Wirsing, 1994).

2.6.3. China

China got involved in the dispute in the Aksai Chin region disputed with Kashmir and Jammu. Also, Tibet, which was a semi-independent state of China, had a role in the deteriorating relations between China and India. Tension rose over the border between the newly established People’s Republic of China and India after the Indo-Sino War (Guha & Mahatma, 2014).

No formal treaty was signed over the regions despite the ceasefire between the nations. China also experienced diplomatic issues with the USSR, USA and other nations it suspected of expansionist movement. This resulted with the succession of Communist Party leader Mao Zedong concludes (Guha & Mahatma, 2014).

2.6.4. United Nations

United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan

This established from the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 39 (1948). It served as the first international meditative measure for this dispute. Since both parties initially objected the mission and mandate of the body, it thus amended and enacted with United Nations Security Council Resolution 47 (1948). Its main goal was to assist the conflicted nations in reaching an accord over the disputed state (Guha & Mahatma, 2014).
In determining the future state of Jammu and Kashmir, the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan decided that it will be arrived at in accordance with the will of the people and thus upon the acceptance of the Truce Agreement. Therefore, both the Governments agreed to enter into consultations with the Commission to determine fair and equitable conditions in order to assure such free expression. The commission branched out to further create the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan

**United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan**

This commission was formed to serve the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan in finding preventative and mitigating measures in the region. The full mandate of the commission is investigating, reporting, and dispute resolution, and especially through the use of an observer. The first mission with unarmed military observers supervising the mission area of Kashmir and Jammu was conducted in January 1949 (Musarat, 2015).

**2.6.6. United States of America**

Owing to its dialogue with India on the Sino-Indian border issue, United States became a third party in the Kashmir Conflict. In order to create a positive opinion on India in the United States, the Indian government focused on bettering its relations with the states. India also requested for various aid from the United States in order to gain an upper hand in the border dispute with China. However, the United States government responded negatively to Indian government’s pleas when they requested for a number of troops and armaments to help support India’s offensive against China (Musarat, 2015).
2.6.7. British Empire

India and Pakistan were directorates of the United Kingdom before their partition. Most of their resources and functions were being directed by the East India Company. United Kingdom therefore continued to play a vital role in the region after the partition. The United Kingdom offered consultancy on the issue of unification, alliance, partition and independence of the states in the sub-continent. British officials were directly involved in trying to find a solution for Kashmir conflict (Musarat, 2015). United Kingdom currently maintains a relatively distanced approach to the conflict, following the discharge of East India Company in the area.

2.6.8. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Soviet Union was first contacted by India to request for military assistance against China. In an attempt to further strengthen Russo-Indian relations, Nehru spoke with Nikita Khrushchev, while also requesting for military support for the army in order to secure victory against China. Mao Zedong however criticized Khrushchev’s behavior, saying that Khrushchev was only willing to stand in the way of communism and defy communist principles for his own financial gain (Navnita, 2007). Thus, the Soviet Union refused to offer any military support to fight in the area. The Soviet Union currently maintains a state of neutrality on the issue between India and Pakistan (Navnita, 2007).

2.7. TALKS AND DIALOGUE OF PAKISTAN AND INDIA LEADERSHIP TOWARDS RESOLVING KASHMIR CONFLICT

India and Pakistan has had renewed political engagement to date with an agreement set up to maintain dialogue as a weapon towards peace provision and eradicate the tension that has been witnessed by both countries for the longest time possible.
According to Burke, (2005), the India Prime Minister Narendra Modi, through his foreign policy advocacy since 1989, can be able to break the cycle of dialogue – disruption that has continuously disrupted the peaceful efforts between the two nations. Modi’s foreign policy is to promote peace by giving dialogue between India and Pakistan a chance to create a lasting solution to the conflict and issues surrounding the conflict between the two nations.

It witnessed that the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi since 1947 that the war and tension between India and Pakistan is seeing some light and peace process that can take lasting solutions through a formal and structured engagement (Burke, 2005). Prime Minister Modi has had successful attempts for example in 2014, as indicated by Burke, (2005), where he engaged the Pakistan Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in 2014 following his election. This engagement has been successful with the announcement of more peace process through dialogue named comprehensive bilateral dialogue that covered ten specific areas of conflict resolution including terrorism, trade, Kashmir and humanitarian issues etc (Burke, 2005).

The leadership of prime Minister Modi of India different from his predecessor as explained by Bose, (2007), Modi sought to strip bureaucratic strictness and extreme protocol from India’s engagement with Pakistan. He has no selfish interests in the conflict compared to his predecessors but determined to control and manage the nature and direction of India’s Pakistan policy towards peace and dialogue (Bose, 2007).

Modi predecessor Manmohan Singh, never engaged Pakistan leadership on matters or core issues that generated the conflict for this made it difficult to resolve the conflict as many scholars believe he had selfish interest and motive. Prime Minister Modi on his tenure has been very articulate and has continuously taken personal responsibility for difficult decisions, which focus as indicated by Bose, (2007), on matters problem solving,
monitoring and evaluating the implementations of commitments and resolutions set
towards creating a lasting solution between India and Pakistan.

In contrast to the previous regime in India, Modi has been able to make several visits to Pakistan in an effort to bring the gap between the two nations and develop peace and dialogue. His eighth visit according to Bose, (2007), was in Lahore. One of the most talked about visits by an Indian prime minister since the partition of the subcontinent in 1947 states Bose, (2007). Manmohan Singh, in his decade long serving tenure as India’s prime minister never visited Pakistan even once, this clearly shows lack of interest towards creating conflict through dialogue with Pakistan.

2.7.1. Six rounds of Indo-Pakistani talks in 1962-1963

Bose, (2007), argues that during the six rounds of Indo-Pakistani talks in 1962-1963, the two nations under pressure from the international community discussed possible Kashmir settlement that would end the Kashmir dispute that is seen as long overdue. The talks almost came to a settlement in regards to exchanging territories of strategic importance to either country (Bose, 2007).

According to Bose, (2007), a joint U.S.-U.K. proposal intended at make the two sides settle and create progress towards conflict resolution proposed that neither India nor Pakistan would give up entirely its claim to the Kashmir Valley but for each side to retain a ‘substantial position’ in Kashmir through the drafted settlement concludes (Bose, 2007).

This research was very effective in promoting peace, permitting political freedom and creative a form of a self-rule in Kashmir by permitting free movement of people from India and Pakistan was meant by representatives from both countries. This created an image that both countries had stake and selfish interest in Kashmir making the peace process and talks unsuccessful.
2.7.2. Obstacles to compromise

The challenges of implementing the proposals that would alter the status quo on Kashmir are real as admitted by both Prime Minister Singh and President Musharraf. In India for example, the political opposition according to Schofield, (2010), accused the Singh government of backing away from its long-held position that Kashmir is an integral part of India, this further complicating the intrinsic peace and dialogue process being undertaken.

The largest Islamic party in Pakistan the Jamaat-i-Islami and his leadership, according to Schofield, (2010), argued that there is no way for the government of Pakistan to argue, and had not right to bargain and compromise on Kashmir issue. There argument was that these undertakings ignored the opinion of the Kashmiri people who wanted freedom away from the Indian rule.

In Pakistan, the hard-line taken by the Pakistan army and its leadership is greatly influencing the peace process as the level of support from the military commandos is wanting argues Burke, (2005). This critical factor continued in many instances to derail and undermine the peace talks especially through their leaders Musharraf.

Interestingly it is difficult to understand how president Musharraf will be able to engage in meaningful talks towards peace process especially in regards to Kashmir issues for he is the one who was in charge, served as the Chief of Army Staff in 1999, and spearheaded the Kargil military operation. This operation critically destabilized diplomatic talks between former Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and former Indian Prime Minister Atul Bihari Vajpayee cites Burke, (2005).
2.8. INDIA AND PAKISTAN MEDIA AND THEIR ROLE IN KASHMIR CONFLICT

The media in any country has a huge responsibility in the society today for it is the vehicle through which people get information on development, democracy, dialogue, conflict resolution etc. Therefore when the media plays a negative role in its mandate chances are that the result of that outcome will not be positive in nature.

Today’s society is market according to Guha, & Mahatma, (2014), with high number of conflict to which the media has a role to report play. In the case of the India and Pakistan conflict the media is seen to have played a critical role both negative and positive in nature.

Guha, & Mahatma, (2014), argues in regards to the Kashmir conflict, the media plays a role as a perpetrator of a conflict or as an agent for peace depending on how it plays its agenda setting role. The conflict in Kashmir a look at the media in both India and Pakistan during the Kashmir conflict there was a use of provocative reporting that only tended to create more tension even amidst peace negotiations and talks that were underway (Guha, & Mahatma, 2014).

2.8.1. A contentious role

Both India and Pakistan media are playing as indicated by Guha, & Mahatma, (2014), a very negative and dangerous role which is divisive and controversial as they are seen to be warmongering for their respective governments’ claims Schofield, (2010).

For example, the Indian media is playing a finger-pointing mode while the Pakistani media is playing a denial mode in their reporting during the conflict. This does not add any value to the people and the governments of both nations towards peace building and negotiations.
Most media house in both India and Kashmir are used to propagate the stands of their respective governments eliminating the critical role of media as a peace reporter and negotiator and in trying to create and foster peace between the two nations by professionally reporting on the consequences of the conflict in regards to fuelling it.

2.8.2. No fact-checking

India media and its coverage of Kashmir conflict is marred by controversy as indicates Schofield, (2010). Senior respondents from one of the India media had to resign citing fabrications in his stories and reports on Kashmir and that the media house had forced the journalist to report in favour of Indian government in regards to Kashmir. This clearly showed the bipartisan approach the media had taken in not only contributing but promoting the Kashmir conflict.

2.9. SOLUTIONS TO THE KASHMIR CONFLICT

Tensions are still high in the Kashmir region, this exposes the future of Kashmir to a great risks. Countless wars and deaths which spanned from the partition period have been witnessed severally. Several attempts, including international interventions, binding resolutions passed by the security council, bilateral talks, unilateral actions demilitarization have, been made, but the best result has only yielded stalemate. There are specific routes that can be followed in order to end the tensions between the nations. These include;

2.9.1. Retraction of military forces

Retracting the military forces stationed along the borders of Kashmir and Aksai would greatly help in ending the active and potential direct combat between the nations and eventually results to a peacefully co-existence.
2.9.2. Bilateral talks

Bilateral talks between the nations will also result in a final solution to the conflict. This can be achieved through face to face meetings among high ranking leaders of both the parties. Mediation with the United Nations representatives could be moderators within these meetings.

2.9.3. Consideration of the previously rejected plebiscite

This achieved having majority citizens of the region voting on the side they wish to accede to based on religious, political, social and economic views.

2.9.4. Independence of Jammu and Kashmir

The independence of Jammu and Kashmir would result in the retraction of the claims of both India and Pakistan on the whole region. This will lead to lifting of all military personnel, political and economic claims. Independence will also make the state to be internationally recognized and also locally represented.

2.10 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.10.1. Constructivism theory

Constructivism which highlights the importance of ideas, identity, constitutive rules and norms, culture, history, inter-subjective meanings and the social nature of state interaction offers great value to understanding and analyzing India-Pakistan relations (Koithara, 2004).

Koithara, (2004), poses many questions including: How else can Pakistan’s quest for survival and security through an almost obsessive concern with checking the power of its much larger Indian neighbor be explained but for the historical and institutionalized fears of ‘Hindu domination’ and the two-nation theory that is central to Pakistan’s self-
conception and legitimizes the very existence of the Pakistani state? Similarly, what else but the importance of it to India’s often-fragile secular identity can explain New Delhi’s relentless efforts to keep the Muslim-majority Kashmir well within its grasp?

The purported anarchic structure of the international system and India and Pakistan’s place within it cannot sufficiently explain the conflict; neither can rationalist explanations which assume interests are exogenously determined and treats states as ‘like-units’ argues Koithara, (2004).

According to Guha, & Mahatma, (2014), constructivists believe that international relations are socially constructed, and therefore determined by constantly evolving beliefs, ideas, and norms of state actors. They disagree with realism’s insistence that material forces or innate nature alone drive international relations (Guha& Mahatma, 2014).

Constructivism may not be the central approach to explain Pakistan-India relations, but it certainly has the capability to explain and establish close ties, especially at social level. In spite of political and military clashes, people-to-people relations can be improved through the building of mutual beliefs, ideas, and norms. This will not only be good for people-to-people relations, but will also pave the way for a stable South Asian region (Ali, 2011).

2.10.2. Neo-Realism theory

Neo-realism or structural realism is a theory of international relations outlined by Kenneth Waltz as the first author of this theory in his 1979 book ‘Theory of International Politics’ claims Ali, (2011). Realists in general argue that power is the most important factor in international relations. This can clearly explain the Kashmir conflict without trying to look at various reasons and causes that fuel the conflict as seen with constructivism theory.
The conflict between India and Pakistan is about nothing put scramble for power especially on who will be able to control Kashmir. Forget about other factors that are being addressed and underlined by constructivism theorists. The power to control Kashmir is the basis of the conflict and whoever gets it will be able to control all the other resources available within its perimeters Navnita, (2007).

**HYPOTHESIS**

Leaders of India and Pakistan are fighting for their, social, economic benefits and also for their ideology, India as a Secular state and Pakistan as a Muslim state further causing a defilement to Kashmiri’s rights.

**2.11. CONCLUSION**

India and Pakistan are in a stand-off state regarding Kashmir. Kashmir has therefore remained a bone of contention between the two nations; India and Pakistan, where each party has its own stand on the Kashmir region. A situation where India views Kashmir as one of its integral parts, where there is no space for dispute has arose. On the other hand, for Pakistan, Kashmir represents a problem of partition and therefore is yet to be solved. For the people of Jammu and Kashmir, there exist a territorial dispute between Indian and Pakistan which cannot be resolved without of the main parties in this dispute.

Due to its high economic potential and critical geographical location, Kashmir has remained to be of great significance for both states. Kashmir serves as a junction between many nations, and also the region has been a home of agricultural and tourism opportunities in the region. Kashmir also has high energy production potential and this has left both India and Pakistan to remain fighting over its possession.

The long lasting nature of Kashmir conflict therefore has been as a result of many things, the main one being the demographic present within the population. Kashmir has been
primarily home to Muslim population, which is comprised of many Indian and Pakistan natives who belong to various cultural and ethnic divisions. Kashmir is therefore in a wildly uncertain state that is open to changing in the shortest period of time.

Kashmir can be regarded as an obstacle, without any permanent solution tried and implemented. Kashmir conflict remains to bar development and peace in the region, Kashmir has remained to be the burning topic of debate and quarrel between India and Pakistan. The constant threats and rivalry between India and Pakistan over Kashmir has extended to be of threat to other nations in the region. The bordering nations have term the conflict as being of threat to them and may also affect them. The Kashmir issue has also attracted third parties to intervene and this has been a ground for more political turmoil and possible conflict worldwide.

The tension and continuous conflict between India and Pakistan is often seen as Kashmir but there are other reasons that have also made it difficult for the two nations to agree which the leadership of both countries try to hide under and use the Kashmir issue.

Navnita, (2007), argues that the actual reason for the Indo-Pak conflict is the ‘selfish nature of nations’ which is a representation of realism theory. Both states prefer their own benefits either ideological or economical. Both India and Pakistan are agricultural economies and require river water to champion this role, India has all the head works of rivers Sindh, Ravi, Chinab and Jehlum as indicated by (Navnita, 2007). Pakistan fear and threatened to switch off the supply on behalf of India a process that is still present today.

The water issue is a very contentious one in the Indo-Pak conflict and various attempts to resolve it such as the Indus Water Treaty have been made in 1960 (Koithara, 2004). Violations of this treaty as indicated by Koithara, (2004), where in 2008 President of Pakistan Asif Ali Zardari also pointed to the ramification of the violation of the Indus
Water Treaty condemning the Indian process of building dams on rivers flowing towards Pakistan can been seen as some of the growing concerns says Koithara, (2004).
CHAPTER THREE

3.0. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter describes the research methods and designs used in the collection of data to identify the research topic and analyze it appropriately. It will strive to analyze the role of Pakistani and India leadership in Kashmir conflict from its initial stages to date.

3.2. Research design

The research design refers to the overall strategy that you choose to integrate the different components of the study in a coherent and logical way, thereby, ensuring you will effectively address the research problem.

The study uses qualitative research where scholars gather a deep understanding of human character and the reasons that guide their behavior. The researchers investigate the "how" and "why" of decision-making. Apart from this, the research examines the idea, policies and strategies used in explaining and understanding the research topic. The source of information secondary online sources and this chapter discusses the information in the methodology.

This study is critical in identify certain issues that surround the conflict in Kashmir conflict especially issues in regards to the role of the leadership of both Pakistan and India. Identifying the role of the leadership in both countries is essential in understanding why the conflict in Kashmir erupted and further how it can be controlled or eventually
stopped. Another goal in this research study is to understand the different perspectives of Indian and Pakistani leaders in Kashmir. From the study it is clear that both countries do not want Kashmir to claim its independence a factor that will be analyzed especially looking at the interest of both India and Pakistan in Kashmir that leads them not wanting Kashmir to be subjected to a referendum that will eventually determine its independence.

I want to conduct this study because personally I belong to Kashmir i.e. am a native of Kashmir and due to the conflict I was forced together with our families to seek peaceful refuge in other countries. I want to research and understand the conflict in Kashmir in details so that it be used in creating a peaceful Kashmir for all the natives’ people to live in peace and stability.

3.3. Description of the study site

The Kashmir conflict is an inclusion of all the problems that have occurred and continue to arise between India and Pakistan. The tension between India and Pakistan has gradually increased since attaining independence from the British in 1947 according to Ganguly, (2007). The conflict arose because of the partitioning of the 650 princely states claims Ganguly, (2007), of the area whereby the Muslim majority areas given to the Pakistan and the Hindu majority areas given to India.

Interestingly the princely states had an option to either join India or Pakistan or remain independent. Due to the various interests of both Pakistan and India in regards to Kashmir in specific created a serious conflict between the two states on how to go about who to acquire the Kashmir area.

Kashmir is the study site and the various challenges that come about Kashmir especially as a result of the options of being independent to the fight to join either Pakistan or India
is the centre of attraction that continue to create conflict and instability. These factors are to be addressed in thin research accordingly.

3.4. Study population and sample selection process

Kombo and Tromp (2006), cites that population in methodology and research study is a whole group of people or characters who have at least one common attribute from which to acquire data. The target population as defined by Kombo and Tromp (2006), is the total number of fundamentals of a detailed population pertinent to the research project. Kashmir region to which the research is categorical about have various elements and persons. The study population will therefore include the Kashmir people, the Pakistan and India leaders and other external or international actors who are in one way or the other contributes to the conflict in Kashmir.

3.5. Data collection methods and procedures

Kombo and Tromp, (2006), explain that data collection refers to gathering information with a view to prove or get an answer of various issues and circumstances regarding some incidences and events. Collection of data is through various methods including, filling of questionnaires, engaging in interviews, through observations, through applying experiments, understating and manipulating models and theories to get the answers etc. Difference disciples in academic research writing use different methods of data collection. In regards to this research topic, I will use various models available in different academic journals and books to understand the role of Pakistan and India leadership in Kashmir conflict.
3.6. Data analysis methods

In research methodology, the processed information is used in answer the research question. These data are critical in answering the research questions reflecting on the research problems and objectives of the research. In this research, I will use qualitative approaches for data analysis.

The presentation of this data will be through analysis of theories and strategies analyzed according and presented in a way that address the research questions and answers the critical objectives of this study that pertains to the role of India and Pakistan leadership in the Kashmir conflict.

3.7. Limitations of the study

The limitation of this study is argued in various aspects. For example, lack of application of a quantitative method of research that applies questionnaires as a form of collecting data is critical in gaining first hand information from the sample population. Lack of the ability to travel to Kashmir to source this information is a serious limitation to the study. This eliminated obtaining first hand information from the victims of the Kashmir conflict which are the Kashmir people themselves and also lack of questioning the leaders of both Pakistan and India is also another limitations that is witnessed by the researcher.

As much as there are various videos of journalists and media houses who have interviewed some of these leaders on issues dealing with Kashmir, the perception and the influence of both leaders and their interest is one serious objective and question avoided by many. This is what I would like to bring forth so as to create a picture of the true cause of the Kashmir conflict.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The Pakistan and Indian National Security Advisors are preparing for a strategic dialogue although tensions within the Kashmir Valley and across the Line of Control (LOC) are mounting. The role of Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee in finding peace between the two countries discussed in many forums as indicated by Dabla, (2011). The chief of Research & Analysis Wing (R&AW) of India Amarjit Singh Dulat praised Prime Minister Vajpayee for his efforts to end the Kashmir conflict with Pakistan's President Parvez Musharraf states Dabla, (2011).

Dulat positively refers to the Prime Minister's Lahore visit and discusses in detail the Agra Summit of 2001. From the tour, we can see the happenings at the Summit discussion putting in mind the key leaders: the Pakistan leaders President Musharraf and Abdul Sattar, and the Indian leaders Advani, Jaswant Singh and Vajpayee. Dulat criticizes the Indian leaders' un-statesmanlike conduct and clumsiness, and the mistakes Pakistan leaders' make. During the summit, Abdul Sattar notes the sticking point as arising on 15th July 2001 when the Indian and Pakistan Foreign Ministers exchanges note on the problems they face with each other's declaration draft. Evidently, while President Musharraf lays stress on Kashmir, the Indians are busy tackling the terror (Wolpert, 2010).

Nanda & Batra (2011) discuss that the Studies on the Kashmir conflict differ. According to Achin Vanaik, who is an author, Vajpayee's visit to Lahore in February 1999 was just a
diplomatic trip due to the Indo-Pak nuclear explosions in May 1998. Moreover, the Lahore visit by Vajpayee did not stop the Kargil conflict in 1999. On the other hand, AG Noorani notes that Lal Krishna Advani, who is the Indian Deputy Prime Minister, misplaces interventions during the negotiations between the two leaders of the state and during the two foreign ministers talks.

According to Noorani, the action of Advani causes the collapse of the proposal in the Agra Declaration of 16th July 2001. Later on, Vajpayee admits in Parliament that his face-to-face meeting with Musharraf was longer than his expectations making Advani find out what is happening. The talks of the Indian Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh with the Pakistan's Foreign Minister had similar destructions due to phone calls from Advani. Noorani argues that the Indian Prime Minister should call upon the Pakistani President for a day long talk, visit Ajmer Sharif then continue his discussions with the Indian leaders to solve the conflict (Nanda & Batra, 2011).

Nanda & Batra (2011), assert that another role of Indian and Pakistan leaders play in the Kashmir conflict is the predominant and sometimes negative role of the IB, the R&AW, and the Indian intelligence agencies. The role of the Indian institutions, which are same as Pakistani agencies, makes Kashmir the most militarized region in Indian. The IB is central to Indian /government control over Kashmir. Both the R&AW and the IB with Dulat as the head then, are top-secret and works without a charter of duties or a legal framework. In 1981, the Parliament did not accept the reform recommendations of the LP Singh Committee. The reason for not accepting was that it is not logical for a top intelligence officer to supervise the peaceful conduct of the State Assembly elections instead of the State Electoral Commission. Another thing that raises questions was Dulat's free access to the IB funds to buy up militants and politicians to involve them in the electoral processes. Regarding the issue, Dulat justifies his move by stating that it
happens all over the world. His argument shows that there is no democracy in the electoral commission, which triggers the two nation's disputes. The idea that money plays a significant role in Kashmir's political scene damages the political reputation if India (Gupta, 2006).

4.2. Current tension in Kashmir and its impacts on both countries relations

Cohen (2016), cites that the current tension reached its utmost peak on September 18\textsuperscript{th} 2016 when four anti-India militants engaged in armed conflict and attacked an army base killing 19 soldiers inside the India controlled portion of Kashmir (Cohen, 2016). According to India, they blame Pakistan for the attack, which denied participation.

India on its part responded nine days later as indicated by Cohen (2016), this was through commandos to hit militant outposts a short distance within the Pakistani controlled section of Kashmir (Cohen 2016). As much as these countries often trade firearms especially across the border this was the first time India accepted and took responsibility of the strike confirming the tension created as a result.

Even though the tensions are high, it is unlikely to escalate because both India and Pakistan gain nothing through continuous attack on each other with analysts stating that both countries will only especially economic loss if they attack each other.

India is steadily growing to a major economic giant and the Prime Minister of India Modi is focusing on development and avoiding war and conflict with Pakistan. The elections will only focus on how the ruling party has created and increased economic development of India and therefore that is the most important agenda of India and not defense.
4.3. USA and China support and economic interests in Kashmir conflict

The USA and China are super powers enjoying UN veto status says Dabla, (2011), therefore India and Pakistan being third world countries and facing conflicts in regards to Kashmir both countries seek support of the two super powers in justifying their positions over Kashmir argues Dabla, (2011).

The economic importance of China – Pakistan relations seen in the Balochistan case, which is identified, as critical towards economic development and growth for China and according to Cohen (2016), is the championing of China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), a massive infrastructure connectivity project supported and funded by China to a tune of $46 billion in investments (Cohen, 2016). The China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), contains the construction of a system of pipeline, rail, and road links connecting Balochistan’s Arabian Sea port of Gwadar with western China concludes Cohen (2016).

The USA has increasingly engaged in militarizing India, the continuous military strategic boost from the USA has elevated India to a ‘major defense partner’ claims Dabla, (2011), to the extent that the USA have started co-developing weapons systems with India. Dabla, (2011), further identifies that with the support from the USA India is increasingly and actively strengthening their ties with Africa and east Asia.

The USA is as putting much pressure on India towards its rapacious agenda trying to change India into a frontline state all in the USA confrontation with China admits Cohen, (2016). For example, according to Cohen (2016), India signed an agreement with the US that provided the US with the ability and capacity to freely gives the US combat planes and warships right of entry for supply and repairs in the Indian military bases.
The United States, which was once a friend and supporter of Pakistan in regards to the fight against terrorism, has in the recent past grown nearer to India states Cohen (2016).

The Kashmir’s water resource is an important resource value in the region and it is this fact that has made both USA and China interested in the conflict and support it gives to either side i.e. USA supporting India while China supporting Pakistan.

According to Cohen (2016), India has started construction of hydroelectric plants on various rivers that are in the sections they control which has enable them to get valuable electricity and fast tracking its development agenda.

4.4. Different Perspectives of Indian and Pakistani Leaders in Kashmir

According to Saha (2006), the Pakistan leaders in Islamabad claim that Kashmir's majority-Muslim area is part of their country. Although the United Nations gave a suggestion after the countries first war that they should call for a referendum to allow Kashmir's citizens to choose the country they belong, the vote did not happen. The Pakistan leaders want the referendum to take place because they want to resolve the conflict. The Indian leader claims that Pakistan supports terrorists fighting their government control and asserts that a 1972 agreement after the Bangladesh war allows a solution to the Kashmir conflict through bilateral talks. From both countries leaders perspectives, it shows that neither of the nation wants Kashmir to gain its independence (Saha, 2006).

4.5. Resolution Attempts Made By the Involved Parties and External Actors

It is evident that the Kashmir conflict is a long-term issue, which is changing from a simple territorial dispute to a complex religious, political, and cultural issue with global implications. Due to this, any attempt to solve the regional conflict is inadequate.
Therefore, the parties settling the dispute must deal with it on its cultural, social and religious fronts if they have any hope of peace in Kashmir.

Wolpert (2010) argues that the first move to stop the conflict is ending violence in Kashmir. Both countries must participate in bringing peace. For example, Pakistan must stop supporting terrorists in Kashmir. Moreover, international pressure is necessary as it can end the terrorists' monetary assistance and training camps, which they use to access Pakistan. Furthermore, to achieve peace, the leaders must change the attitudes of Pakistan and Kashmir citizens that want Islam to rule Kashmir and destroy India rather than improving the living conditions of Kashmir residence. By doing this, it will put restrictions to the popularity of the rebel groups in Pakistan and result to the end of violence in Kashmir. The idea can only work if both countries leaders promote secularism and education in Pakistan and Kashmir. It is sad that these concepts are contrary to the reality on the ground in Pakistan (Wolpert, 2010).

Similarly, the Indian foreign policy must change. Indian leaders must try to find solutions for border disputes, and improve their relationship with China before attempting to resolve the Kashmir conflict. As long as China and Pakistan remain partners and India is their common enemy, the Kashmir conflict will never get a solution. The Indian government shows its involvement in the nation by considering the wants and needs of the Kashmiri community to make them feel comfortable as part of India. The idea will end the sense of neglect and alienation that looms over many residences of the valley.

India can achieve this by sending humanitarian assistance to Kashmir, putting an end to inefficiency, injustice, and corruption in the local government. Additionally, India involving in Kashmiri infrastructure will improve the living standards of the people and lead to less rebellion against their country. The Indian government checks the wanton abuse of Human rights by Indian security forces because the violations not only increase
the communal tension but also makes the citizens in the valley stop trusting the security forces protecting them. Moreover, the India opposes and prevents any informal polls regarding the desire of the Kashmir people to accede to Pakistan; this implies the illegal occupation of Kashmir by Indian forces. India is changing this policy and opening its mind towards a plebiscite in Kashmir that the United Nations suggests (In Schneider & In Honeyman, 2006).

Wolpert (2010) argues that another way of bringing peace in Kashmir is India should try to end discrimination against Muslims in their state. Recently, Indians in the western state of Gujarat were rioting against Muslims. The riots led to the death of many Muslims resulting in communal tension in the entire country, especially Kashmir. The action adds to the hatred between the citizens and encourages terrorism-related violence in Kashmir.

To solve this, Indian promotes secularism in the country, particularly in Kashmir. Both countries should take serious steps to bring peace in Kashmir. They can facilitate this by withdrawing security forces from Kashmir if the violence decreases. Furthermore, the governments must resettle the Hindu population displaced from the valley; this is important as it will give rise to religious tolerance and contribute to the growth of Kashmir's economy.

Furthermore, for peace to prevail, the countries must solve the regional conflict, this is important because it will provide a sense of identity to the residence of Kashmir. The people of the valley lack a sense of identity which increases their feeling of hatred and resentment against India. There are many proposals to achieve each of the steps the paper mentions although the countries must review them carefully and come up with an amicable solution (Wolpert, 2010).

First, Pakistan and India should give up the control of Kashmir let (five percent of the area in dispute) have a neutral guard similar to Switzerland, or into a quasi-independent
nation with UN control, this can act as a buffer state. Both Pakistan and India can provide fifty percent of their armed forces each to the new authority. Pakistan will lose some territory and so would Indian thus it will be more palatable. For India, it will be advantageous because the entire state will completely merge into India without a special status, and reduction of the security personnel budget to guard the valley. Moreover, reduction of border wrangles with Pakistan and improving its brand image in the world. On the other side, Pakistan leaders can claim the victory of getting some Indian territory, and this will make them continue with a healthy relationship with India. The United Nations are also on the front line in resolving the Kashmir issue although its efforts diminish due to the two nations not agreeing on the solutions they suggest. Even though it faces the problem, the UN always attempts to deal with the issue tirelessly (Schofield, 2010).

Schofield (2010) discusses that the talks between the external actors and the leaders from Indian and Pakistan led to the recent opening of roads across the LOC; this encourages peace and development in Kashmir. The roads not only help families meet but provide a boost to tourism and trade. The trans-LOC trade through the roads will further develop the whole region, as the routes are more accessible than other routes within the Valley. The roads will also improve agriculture, as farmers will get an opportunity to transport their products freely. Other than the economic merit to Kashmir, the move increases trust among the people thus reducing chances of future conflicts.

4.6. The Negative and Positive Impacts of External Actors in the Kashmir Conflict

Due to the involvement of the United Nations in the resolution of the Kashmir conflict, many challenges and opportunities are emerging. The gaining ground of the peaceful atmosphere gives rise to the growth of the Kashmir's economy because peace attempts and development go together. There is a shift in Indian policy of providing largesse to
Kashmir, which allows providing incentives to private sector to encourage its economic growth. The change in approach is advantageous in two ways. First, it helps reduce the chance of the conflict re-emerging, as unemployment and poverty are the prime factors people consider as propellers of violence. Second, it addresses the grievances of the citizens by making them take part in projects; thereby contribute to the conflict resolution (Schneider & Honeyman, 2006).

The revival of Kashmir's economy is an uphill task, and it faces many challenges ranging from tapping the new resources to renewing the degenerating industries; attracting investors to develop infrastructure. However, these opportunities, especially in the concerns of development, are enormous as Kashmir not only has rich flora and fauna, and natural beauty, but also it had a prosperous economy in the pre-independence era. It is partly due to its trade with its neighbors like West Asia, Central Asia, and China via the famous Silk route. The following part of the paper focuses the areas that are benefitting from the external actors in the Kashmir conflict (Gupta, 2006).

Kashmir citizens are good at weaving and knitting. Many of them engage in making embroidered clothes, silk carpets, shawls, rugs, etc. The valley is also known for silk weaving, papier-mâché work, woodcarving, and silverwork. Their other area of prominence is the stone carving using the tombstones. The stone carvers of Kashmir build mosques and house with different stones for each season. The external actors in Kashmir dispute provide market to their products and in the process boost their economy, if they manage it correctly (Schneider & Honeyman, 2006).

According to Gupta (2006), tourism is among the primary sources of income in Kashmir's population. The external actors trying to resolve the conflict tours destinations like Gulmarg and Sonmarg which are the best for winter games such as ice-skating. Gulmarg is the highest green golf course in the world, and it has the world's largest cable
car lift. The tourists also visit the Dal Lake in the Kashmir valley. Moreover, the visitors take part in adventure sports in J&K which include golf, trekking, water sports, fishing, winter sports, and mountaineering. Furthermore, the external actors in the Kashmir dispute help the valley's tourism attractions that remain dormant due to the conflict, For example, the region of Ladakh and Jammu, which has a high tourism potential. The actors develop the tourist spots in Jammu with modern facilities to attract more tourists from different parts of the globe (Gupta, 2006).

Kashmir is an industrially backward state because the government owns most of the industries. However, through external actors many small-scale industries can export cricket bats and other sports items, plastic products, foundry and chemicals, textile items, etc. to different parts of the world. Exporting these goods help in improving the Kashmir's economy.

Schneider & Honeyman (2006), assert that agriculture plays a significant role in improving Kashmir's economy as it supports about eighty percent of the valley's population. The staple food of the valley is rice, followed by corn in Indian. The region also grows oats, barley, and wheat. Kashmir has a temperate climate as compared to the subcontinent, which makes crops like broad beans, asparagus, cauliflower, cabbage, seakale, and beetroot grow well. The horticulture industry in Kashmir is the bulwark of its economy. More than seventy-five per cent of India's temperate fruits are grown in Kashmir. Although the agricultural sector is the backbone of Kashmir's economy, the industry lacks marketing strategy and also the violence-prone image of the state affects its productivity. The external actors help the people of Kashmir develop the marketing strategies as they attempt to reduce violence in the valley.

For Kashmir's economic reconstruction to become successful, the private sector needs to join in the mission. It will be substantial for the state to engage the private sector, both at
internal and external levels. The outer actors in the Kashmir conflict help the government identify the donors, financial institutions, and potential investors. Additionally, the players make the people of Kashmir identify potential investment areas, followed by a course of actions to achieve development (Schneider & Honeyman, 2006).

For the revival of Kashmir's economy infrastructure growth is a requirement. The dispute between India and Pakistan damaged the existing infrastructure in the mountainous and hilly regions that are the major parts of Kashmir. The external actors in the Kashmir conflict resolution help in the restoration of the infrastructure in the valley. The infrastructure they give immediate attention are the power supply, and connectivity in the region through road and rail transport and many other forms of connections (Schofield, 2010).

Dabla (2011), states that another positive thing the external actors in the Kashmir dispute work on is reducing unemployment. The actors together with the leaders in Kashmir are opening the intra-Kashmir routes, tapping new areas, reviving domestic industries, and many other things to not only boost the valley's economy but also create employment. Lack of infrastructure and jobs is the main reason for militancy in Kashmir. Eighty percent of activism will go if the government and private sectors create employments for youths, which the actors are trying to accomplish. According to studies, many Kashmir citizens believe that the perfect way to bring peace to the valley is through developing its economy, which will lead to the creation of jobs (Dabla, 2011).

Although the external actors in the Kashmir conflict have many positive influences towards the region, they also have several negative influences. First, the UN favors India more than Pakistan, which leads to brewing the dispute further. Moreover, since India and China are not in real terms, the Chinese government uses the Kashmir conflict opportunity to damage India by backing up Pakistan indirectly. Furthermore, because the
suggestions of the international community about solving the conflict always fail, the external actors in the issue keeps quiet and watch. It is disadvantageous as India and Pakistan will never settle the dispute alone instead people will continue to suffer (Schneider and Honeyman, 2006).

Kashmir's present phase referred to as ‘sunrise’ period, can change the economy of the state, with the help of international donors and voluntary organizations. The India and Pakistan conflict affects the development of Kashmir, as it discourages private developers to invest and blocks the channels of development. However, the peace process in progress creates a space wherein Kashmir can co-manage development and conflict by neither jeopardizing neither investors nor the valley's citizens. However, the dispute is still on, India and Pakistan provides a peaceful space that encourages development.

Kashmir has blessings of beautiful flora and fauna and other natural resources, and a human resources repository. Many scholars analyze the conflict and its negative dimensions. However, the international community's opportunity to bring peace through development in Kashmir needs implementation instead of waiting for full resolution of the conflict. The dispute in the valley brings many losses for both Pakistan and India, but the people of Kashmir suffer the most. The leaders in the region must utilize the current opportunity to improve the living standards of the citizens in Kashmir. With economic development, there is a likelihood of steering the peace process and help both nations realize a resolution of the Kashmir dispute. The process comes in three ways: using development and its results as a deterrent against new violence; addressing the underdevelopment; and involving the Kashmir citizens in the development process.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary of findings

This thesis opted to analyze the role of India and Pakistan leadership in Kashmir conflict. In this regards we can summarize the findings in three distinct ways; one the leadership of both India and Pakistan have the ability and capacity to end the conflict in Kashmir with clear and effective approach but only if they put their interests aside which is a major obstacle to creating peace and stability in Kashmir. Secondly, the leadership of both India and Pakistan must now engage the Kashmir people and determine what the Kashmir people want and third parties notwithstanding. This is because the conflict directly affects the Kashmir people. Thirdly, the international community and parties involved in the conflict such as the USA and China needs to address their support towards ending the conflict and not using their influence to gain favors and champion their own interests in Kashmir, which only serves to create more obstacles towards resolving the conflict.

5.2. Discussion of findings

Hindu-Muslim rivalry

In the findings of this study, religion plays an important role in the conflict in Kashmir. Indians mostly practice and Hindu while Pakistanis are considered Muslims. There is a strong perception that the assertiveness of Muslims and Hindu resentment dating from the time of Aurangzeb motivated the existing Hindu-Muslim rivalry. This rivalry makes it difficult for consensus building towards resolving the Kashmir conflict.
Involvement of Militia in the conflict

India has accused Pakistan of causing civil unrest and direct attacks from locals. India leadership says that Pakistan militia attempted to defame the image of Indian rule in the Kashmir people’s eye but Pakistan is quick to argue that Indian who did not honor the Standstill Agreement and states that Indian troops and officials have been mal-treating the Kashmir people. Pakistan believe that the Kashmir people are their Muslim brothers and that they have to protect them at all costs and this only made it difficult to create consensus between the two states Schofield, (2010).

Economic benefits of Kashmir

India economic benefit and advancement formed the basis for and towards the fight to retain Kashmir. The Indus River is critical for irrigation and other economic benefits and therefore it both India and Pakistan engaged in confrontations on who should control the river.

Kashmir was a strategic significance for security and economic needs of India argues Schofield, (2010), says and therefore it made it necessary for India to battle and fight hard towards retaining its dominance and control in Kashmir.

External influence

The external influences to the Kashmir conflict creates a dilemma on how to effectively resolve the Indo-Pak conflict and advance their interests in a more neutral way. The Chinese for example are seen to support the Pakistan this is prompted by the Chinese rivalry with India, as they are both competitors in the Asian continent. These interests are a challenge to resolving the conflict in Kashmir.
5.3. Conclusion

India and Pakistan over the past years have continuously been engaged in taking critical steps meant to improve and promote their bilateral relations towards promoting peace and stability between the two nations in regards to the conflict and fight for Kashmir region. As much as the two foreign ministers of both nations met in mid February in 2016 according to Schofield, (2010), there has not been tangible outcome from these meetings, as they have not been effectively felt towards promoting peace and stability in regards to fight for Kashmir region.

The conflict between India and Pakistan is a serious concern for the international community because of several reasons. One both Pakistan and India come from South Asia and this is where two nuclear -armed neighbors are in active conflict along the indo-Pakistani border. This form of conflict is one that can generate to another world war because of the different players supporting different sides. This conflict currently continues because of the various parties supporting different sides and making it more difficult to come to a consensus to stop the conflict.

Pakistani is a critical player in fight against global terrorism and this is why the USA continuously support Pakistan that has also created a problem towards solving the Kashmir conflict. The USA because of its interest with Pakistan cannot boldly face Pakistan towards making hard choices and resolutions towards solving the Kashmir conflict. Dorabji, (2011), asserts that the United States wants to guarantee Pakistan’s active support in counterterrorism activities along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border and within Pakistan (Dorabji, 2011).

Use of militants is another factor that plays in the Indo-Pakistani conflict. India accuses Pakistan of using militants to pressurize concessions from India. Militants have become rampant towards attacking the Indians soldiers and armies. Many attacks witnessed along
the border side where the Indian army resides have raided by the militants with accusations channeled to the Pakistani for organizing and funding such raids. These accusations for some extent are true as and this is what has made the Indian more vulnerable and engage in consensus and talks with the Pakistan government in regards to Kashmir. These militants for example the Islamabad as explained by Schofield, (2010), fosters to shelter Pakistan’s welfare in Kashmir and Afghanistan. These so-called mujahideen says c intimidate the security of South Asia and beyond hence slowing down the rate at which India and the international community would address the issue of Kashmir (Zalman, 2011).

Zalman, (2011), asserts that the sustained disagreement between India and Islamabad has made it difficult for India to engage in an active and aggressive dialogue with the various groups in Kashmir. The sustained discord with Islamabad has mostly affected India’s economic growth and development. It has also made it difficult for India to improve its influence beyond South Asia. India understands that amicable resolving the Kashmir conflict it has with Pakistan will make it become an important global power house and this is why all attempts towards achieving that goal is critical and continues to be addressed regardless of the challenges it faces from every sides.

Pakistan has seriously endured its standoff with India in regards to the Kashmir conflict, other threats especially from Afghanistan border is a headache for Pakistan including its own internal security environment, which has tremendously deteriorated. Internally organized crimes are a menace in Pakistan that has affected its commercial and financial industry without appropriate and effective resolution at hand.

The international actors in the Indo-Pakistan conflict have gone through rapid negotiations and reconciliations mechanisms that have been exhaustive and complicating issues and factors even more. What the USA and the international actors have often
sensitive and pressed for a complete resolution of the conflict instead of just management. Pakistan seen as most welcoming in regards to the involvement and intervention of the USA and international actors to which India is opposed. India argues as described by Dorabji, (2011). that the conflict is strictly a bilateral matter that does not require outside involvement as enshrined in the 1972 Shimla Accord (Dorabji, 2011).

While many experts believe that tangible, measures and factors are at play towards resolving the Indo-Pakistan conflict. There is still doubt in regards to a lasting solution towards the Kashmir dispute because of the numerous hard lines taken by both parties and involvement of various factors, have specific interests in Kashmir and support different parties in the conflict. The most fundamental challenge is as indicated by Dorabji, (2011), is the intrinsic irregularity of ideal objectives with respect to the disposition of Kashmir where India wants to employ Pakistan to legitimize the territorial status quo by finding some means to make official the Line of Control (LOC) in Kashmir as the legal international border quotes Zalman, (2011).

Pakistan on the other hand wants India to find some means of changing, in a variety of ways, the status quo and openly discards the likelihood of transforming the LOC into the international border as a practical means of conflict resolution argues Zalman, (2011).

Resolution to the conflict carries with it internal constraints that do not go well with the new approach taken by both countries. For example, the political and security dynamics in Pakistan as illustrated by Zalman, (2011), is not appealing as it will not be adequately accommodate Pakistani demands especially its citizens and the army and present it as the core issues in regards to the dispute of the Indo-Pakistani conflict. The public in Pakistan as stressing for a just peace in resolving the Kashmir conflict and therefore issues addressing the involvement of the militants is also one that will be at play because it will
be difficult to accommodate them, for they have to be dismantled and destroyed as a result.

India on its part has its own domestic challenges and intrigues towards creating an environment that fosters peace and stability and resolving the conflict with Pakistan. Guha and Mahatma, (2014), assert India’s imperfect democracy towards reaching a consensus on contentious issues such as relations with Pakistan is more of a challenge in its different and dynamic polity (Guha and Mahatma, 2014). Further, since the Kargil calamity and the continuing attacks inside Indian-administered Kashmir, many Indians have grown exhausted of Pakistan’s tactics and therefore hard-liners in India argue that they should not reward Pakistan by being lenient when it ceases its activities that they should have avoided in the first place (Guha and Mahatma, 2014).

5.4. Recommendations

5.4.1. Inclusion of Kashmir people in the talks

The conflict in Kashmir as a matter of urgency needs to be more elaborate and more inclusive as it has to incorporate the Kashmiris in the negotiations and dispute resolution neglected for a very long time. Kashmiris civilians will make the process illegitimate because their exclusion is not appropriate for a more conclusive resolution. The hostility of the security forces among civilians currently observed and this makes it difficult to create an environment to promote peace and stability.

Schofield, (2010), argues that the Kashmiris lack a clear leadership channels in their dispossession and therefore there is no concentrated, political attempt that can balance against the Indian and Pakistani governments. As much as the Kashmiris as fed up with the continuous violence there are few legal and political options available for application but most of these options have neglected the middle level and grass root actors only promoted by government official and elites in Kashmir.
5.4.2. Stereotyping perceptions eliminated

Stereotyping and negative perceptions have made it difficult for Pakistan and India to find a lasting solution to the conflict as both ends have taken hard-line stands and positions eliminating a possible solution to the conflict because of these stereotyping and negative perceptions. The use of rebellion which making the gain ground in Kashmir by Hindu fundamentalists according to Lamb, (2002), for example holding prejudiced events, such as using that the AmarnathYatra to encourage religious tourism but in essence is a way of acquiring land and promoting nationalism concludes Lamb, (2002). On the other hand, some political parties and extremists oppose and talk ill of Muslims and the Pakistanis an example is Shiv Sena forming a rift between the public in both countries concludes Lamb, (2002).

Interactions of people from both countries and the Kashmiris made worse by the strict visa rules. This is a clear example of creating a rift and discouraging dialogue and interactions between the civilians who might create a harmonious avenue used to form alliances and other forces that can call for transformation and change in regards to the conflict resolution mechanisms and foster dialogue to end the conflict and dispute.

5.4.3. Constructively address grievances and problems

An important resolution to the conflict in Kashmir is that grievances and challenges not constructively addressed and this makes them grow bigger in nature creating desperation and bitterness. Further, legal and administrative systems lack ability to create harmonious and appropriate measures and features that can promote accountability and transparency therefore creating suspicion and frustrations to the civilians. The Indian security forces
with their actions in Kashmir given immunity by the government and this only makes them become unresponsive to their actions.

### 5.4.3. Neutralization of Militants

The role played by the militants in the Kashmir conflict cannot go unnoticed and addressed in regards to creating a lasting solution. Neutralizing the militants require time and resources for both countries to engage in and therefore this has only made it impossible to manage completely end the conflict but to only manage it to certain level of control.

For India, so long as the militants continue to create violence and attacks, it allows India to justify their heavy security presence in Kashmir. This, which works to their advantage as the government of India, will still have control over Kashmir that can come into question if for some reason we are to have a complete peace settlement reached and implemented.

### 5.5. Suggestion for further research

This research study has managed to address fundamental issues in regards to the role of India and Pakistan leadership in Kashmir conflict. Further research is therefore necessary to address the resolution mechanism implemented to display the depth and extent the conflict has been controlled and managed. External actors must now come in and play a central role in promoting peace and stability in Kashmir a factor that further research will effectively address.
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