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Unfinished Business of Partitionabstractkashmir has been a contentious issue between Pakistan and india. when Pakistan come into existence, 80% of the population of Kashmir were Muslims. They desired to annex Kashmir with Pakistan but Dogra Rajah, Hari Singh, was against Pakistan and Muslims. He made a coalition with India cleverly and permitted Indian forces to enter into Kashmir he provided an opportunity to India to take control. The Kashmiri Muslims started jihad and got ? areas of the valley freed from the Indian forces. INTRODUCTION TO KASHMIR: kashmir has been considered to as the most dangerous place on earth. the perspective of two nuclear power facing off across such as comparatively small space of frightening indeed. that the three major war has been fought between those protagonists over the heightens the fear that now exists given their advanced technology.

The left population of Kashmir divided and uncertain about their future due to the influence of political and regional implication.  The Kashmir issue dates back to 1947. The partition of the Indian subcontinent held by British, along with religious purpose that happened for the creation of Pakistan and India. The people had been fighting for freedom from British rule, and with their struggle about to bear fruit, they were not willing to let the princes fill the vacuum, who were given an option of deciding which country to join, or of remaining independent.

The restive population of these state proved decisive, resulting in violent protests and massacre.” Maharaja Hari Singh, prince of Kashmir during that time, wished to remain independent, upon given the choice to either join India or Pakistan. Although he was Hindu by religion but was ruling the state with a Muslim majority. The possibility of remaining independent was shredded in late 1947, when Pakistan, using Muslim tribesmen, started activism in Srinagar, capital of Kashmir, to force the prince to join Pakistan through his people. Liaquat Ali Khan, first Prime minister of Pakistan, rejected any involvement and insisted that actions by the tribesmen were a response to the atrocities being committed against Kashmiri Muslims, who aided these tribesmen for obtaining liberation. Hari Singh, afraid of another civil uprising and destabilization of his regime, appealed to the Indian government for military assistance and signed the “ Instrument of Accession”, surrendering Kashmir to India on October 26, 1947. This triggered the first war between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, lasted for over a year between 1947-1948. On August 13, 1948, the United Nations Organization intervened and passed a resolution insisting both countries to remove its troop, after which “ free and fair” plebiscite was to be held, letting the Kashmiri people to determine their future.

Both Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan were afraid of losing out in the plebiscite, due to lack of influence of Muslim League in Kashmir and the strong presence of Indian troops in the territory, thus consistently rejecting the proposed plebiscite. “ If the India Government is allowed to act…unfettered as it pleases by virtue of having already occupied Kashmir and landed their troops there, then, this El Dorado of plebiscite will prove a mirage,” stated in an official Pakistan statement. After Kashmir accession to India, New Delhi, capital of India, was successful in portraying to the rest of the world that Pakistan-supported militant activity was an act of belligerence. This remains the base of India’s case against Pakistan till today.

Soon after that, New Delhi sentenced 11 years to Sheikh Abdullah, then the successor prime minister of Jammu and Kashmir, upon declaring that his government was not bound by the accession treaty signed by the Prince Maharaja, under what became the infamous “ Kashmir conspiracy case”. Despite all this, bilateral talks were arranged to resolve this territorial dispute. These talks achieved nothing and both parties unable to formulate any peaceful solution without jeopardizing their claimed sovereignty. they clearly depicted that Kashmir had turned into a territorial dispute, risking the lives of Kashmiri “ self”. Zaib-Un-Nisa, documenting the history on Kashmir dispute, wrote, “ The Kashmiri ‘ self’ – which Pakistan ostensibly wanted to guard under the banner of Islam and which India wanted to protect under its constitution – was actually considered wholly fluid and expendable, something that could be cut up by the two states wantonly.

Tension rose between Pakistan and India, resulting in a second war again in 1965. Although the International community was convinced that Pakistan has initiated the conflict, but it was exacerbated by India and was internationally recognized that resolution of the Kashmir issue was the only way forward to avoid any confrontation in this continent. On September 16, 1965, the British high commissioner policy is recognized by the historical or political background of Kashmir issue. pakistan won’t resolved the issue of the partition of the Kashmir.

as many agreements is held but no positive attitude toward the partition of Kashmir. Many of them believed that this dispute was getting resolved after the agreement, as both parties were serious about the future to avoid any hurdle or confrontation. Yet again, after Pakistani Air Force planes attack Indian, India declared war on December 3, 1971, marched into Dhaka. This ended with Pakistan surrendering and creation of Bangladesh, earlier known as East Pakistan. “ The cataclysmic events of 1971 were obviously incredibly significant.

Equally noteworthy is what did not happen. India, for instance, did not try to take over the Pakistani-controlled part of Kashmir. The reason was American pressure on the Indian government to refrain from taking the war into Kashmir.”, said bt zaib. In 1972 Indira Gandhi, the Indian prime minister, and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Pakistani prime minister, signed the Simla Agreement, reviving the promises made in Tashkent. The final agreement thus read: “ In Jammu and Kashmir, the line of control resulting from the ceasefire of December 17, 1971, shall be respected by both sides without prejudice to the recognized position of either side. Neither side shall seek to alter it unilaterally, irrespective of mutual differences and legal interpretations.

Both sides further undertake to refrain from the threat or the use of force in violation of this Line.” Since then, India echoed that Pakistan train and arm infiltrators in Kashmir to create insurgency in all international forum. Pakistan denied these claims and they are giving only moral support. The possibility of a full-scale war again already diminished, as both countries attained nuclear capabilities, coupled with struggling economies and the realization of what international sanctions could do to them, may have prevailed in both countries. India developed a stronger grip on Kashmir since then through stationing more than half a million soldiers, making Kashmir the most densely militarized area in the world. In all this, most of us forget to take into account the misery and pain of Kashmiri people, which hardly being discussed or even understood, neither by the those who considered themselves the true representative of these people nor the International community who described themselves the biggest advocate of human rights. The Kashmir issue in the security council: when the Indian forces failed to take back the areas occupied by the Kashmiri freedom fighters, India took this issue to the security council and adopted this stand that Kashmiri had already been integrated with India.

It further blamed that Pakistan had attacked Kashmir, which meant Pakistan had attacked India. pakistan challenged the accession of Kashmir to India, and apprised the security council about the actual position. It stressed that the Hindu Raja did not have the right to decide the future of Kashmir, rather Kashmiris should have this right. The security council directed for a ceasefire in Kashmir through a resolution. The security council directed for a ceasefire in Kashmir through a resolution. The ceasefire came into effect on 1st January 1949. Decision on Kashmir’s future: The security council accepted Pakistan’s stand and decided that Kashmir’s future could be according to the will of the people of the state.

A plebiscite would be carried out under the supervision of the united nations. This resolution of the security Council was accepted by both Pakistan and India. The war ended for stopping the violations of the ceasefire, United Nations appointed its representative to monitor the ceasefire line. India’s delaying tactics: when these initial problems were settled, it was expected that the united nations would make arrangements for a plebiscite under its supervision in Kashmir. The united nations made efforts for this settlement but India was not sincere from the beginning. It created a hindrance for a free plebiscite in Kashmir. India expected that the Kashmiri people would surely vote in favour of Pakistan.

It adopted different delaying tactics and deployed a large number of forces there. While declaring Kashmir as an integral part of India, it flatly refused to have a plebiscite. The Kashmir issue is still unresolved. Pak-India relations: The main dispute between Pakistan and India is the Kashmir issue, and without its solution, the relations cannot be improved.

Better ties can be established between both countries in all the fields if it is resolved. pakistan has always shown a positive attitude but India is not serious about resolving this issue. some betterment of relationship appeared in pakistan and India in 1990.

Mutual trade and travelling facilities were increased. No effort can be fruitful without the solution be of Kashmir issue amicably. pakistan is firm in its stand that the Kashmir issue should be settled according to the resolution s of the united nations and the wishes of the helpless Kashmiris. conclusion: As indicated by the above account of the various aimed at resolving the Kashmir dispute, there are no ideas on how to resolve the Kashmir dispute. pakistan dialogue process centred on Kashmir and no outcome of this process submit an eternal peace dividend unless it enjoys the support and backing of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. In the 17th Century, The Mughal emperor Jahangir shared his experience on his visit to Kashmir ” Gar Firdaus bar-rue zamin ast, hami asto, hamin asto, hamin ast.

If there is a heaven on earth, it’s here, it’s here, it’s here.” He could not possibly have imagined at that time that in future, this heaven would end up being blood-soaked barren land, telling the tales of the struggle and pain of Kashmiri people. a new chapter has begun in the history of Jammu and Kashmir with the beginning of the peace process in the post kargilera.

major changes have taken place in the approach adopted by India, Pakistan and separatist forces towards the Kashmir issue. However, restoration of democracy in the state can be ensured only by involving all sections of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.  References: 1. http://www. telegraph. co. uk/news/1399992/A-brief-history-of-the-Kashmir-conflict.
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