The separatist politics in Kashmir is, in fact, the conflict between the two uncompromising struggles of the two ways of life and two diverse attitudes which have made Kashmir a battlefield. While Jawahar Lal Nehru believed in unity among diverse people, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, repudiating Nehru’s views, held that Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies and social customs. They neither can interdine, nor can intermarry, hence they belong to two different, conflicting ideas and conceptions.¹ The problem of separatist politics in Kashmir began as Pakistan started laying claim over the Muslim majority state of Jammu and Kashmir. However religio-ideological factors behind Pakistan’s claim over Kashmir can be traced back to freedom struggle of India. At the time of Indian Independence Act, Indian National Congress believed that diverse languages, religious and ethnic groups can co-exist in a secular state of India. However, such view of Indian National Congress was not acceptable

to Mohammad Ali Jinnah’s Muslim League as Jinnah was believer of Two Nation’s Theory.

Infact, both India as well as Pakistan claimed Kashmir on ideological grounds. Congress justified its claim on the secular basis. For Congress Kashmir could prosper and flourish only in secular India. Hence, accepting Kashmir as a part of Pakistan meant that Indian securalism is merely fragile, while Mohammad Ali Jinnah asserted that being a Muslim majority state, Kashmir should be included in Pakistan. Thus, both countries made Kashmir ideological battlefield and struggle with other over it. Pakistan’s support to separatism in Kashmir has its roots in pre-partition era when Pakistan adopted the policy of diffusion and encouragement to those who supported Kashmir’s merger with Pakistan on religious grounds. These leaders were opposed to the ideas projected by Indian National Congress as well as National Conference. Before the independence of India, the religious nationalism in Kashmir was represented by Muslim Conference formed in 1932 by Sheikh Abdullah. Though in 1939, Muslim Conference was converted into National Conference, yet some of its leaders including

---
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Chowdhary Ghulam Abbas, a Jammu Muslim leader, revived it and demanded Kashmir’s accession with Pakistan.

Thus, Muslims Conference shared the same Islamic ideology as represented by Muslim League. Muslim Conference also asked for help from Muslim League in its demand for accession of Kashmir to Pakistan. While taking advantage of reformation of Muslim Conference, Mohammad Ali Jinnah made an emotional speech in Kashmir in 1944 in which he declared: “Muslims have one platform, one Kalima, one God. I would request the Muslims to come under the banner of Muslim Conference and fight for their rights”.

Subsequently, when India was partitioned into two dominions and princely states were allowed to join either of the two dominions, Muslim Conference under the influence of Muslim League in its Resolution of July 19, 1947 resolved:

*The convention of Muslim Conference has arrived at the conclusion that keeping in view the geographical conditions, eighty percent Muslim majority out of total population, the passage of important rivers of the Punjab through the state, the language, the proximity of the borders of the state with Pakistan, are all facts which make it necessary that Jammu and Kashmir state should accede to Pakistan.*

---

3 Ibid, pp55-56
The state of Jammu and Kashmir, however acceded to the India which was not tolerated by the separatist elements as well as their masters in Pakistan. Pakistan in its attempt to annex Kashmir, adopted three pronged policy towards Kashmir. First, Pakistan repeatedly tried to foment and encourage the separatist feelings among the Muslims of Kashmir. Second, Pakistan tried to internationalise Kashmir isolating India diplomatically in the international community. Finally, with the purpose of procuring diplomatic and military support for the annexation of Kashmir from India, Pakistan started developing close ties with United States of America and China.\(^5\) Pakistan openly started providing support to the separatist forces in the valley.

**Table 4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Linkage with Pakistan</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No link with Pakistan</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Donot know</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Questionnaire

\(^5\) Ibid, p.712.
Such support has been of two types. First, it offered tangible support consisting of material support, communication and intelligence networks. It provided every possible direct aid and assistance so as to sustain separatism in Kashmir. Second, it started providing indirect assistance to the separatists by means of politico-diplomatic support including diplomatic pressure, campaign for the separatists and support in international governmental organizations. The reasons for providing support to separatists has been either effective or instrumental. Effective motives are on the basis of justice, humanitarian, ethnic and ideological affinity with the separatists. Pakistan always intervenes in the affairs of the Indian state on behalf of the separatists as she feels that its co-nationals in the other state are ill-treated, oppressed or being deprived of the right of self-determination. In the same manner, Kashmiri separatists are getting support for a sizeable number of their religio-ideological beliefs.

The instrumental motives behind external support to the separatists are rooted in the real politik. It is apparent that Pakistan is providing all types of support to the separatists in order to promote its own interests. The objective behind support provided to the separatists is to prolong the conflict and drain Indian state’s economic, financial, material, personnel and military resources.
thereby weakening it from within. The separatists have also approached major powers for getting some support for their movement as a third party manager in the conflict. Similarly, international non-governmental organizations such as Amnesty International and Red Cross have also been approached by separatists to provide support, relief etc on humanitarian grounds.

It is imperative to mention that Pakistan’s claim over Kashmir and support to separatists has its impact not only on Kashmir politics, but also on the Indo-Pak relations. In fact, both India as well as Pakistan have refused to

**Table 4.2.**
**Whether separatist politics affects Jammu and Kashmir politics?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Affects State Politics</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Donot affects State Politics</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Questionnaire
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6 Rajat Ganguly n.2.p.63.
give up their respective claims over Kashmir. Since the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to Indian union failed to settle the view points of the separatists as well as Pakistan, they advance two mutually interdependent arguments for continuance of this type of feelings. First is that accession of Jammu and Kashmir to Indian was subject to the will of the people of Kashmir after the normalcy, is restored. Second, it assumed international character when the case was referred to the United Nations by Indian government. Since then various internal as well as external developments took place that augmented the separatist feelings among the Kashmiris.\(^7\) Needless to mention that it was India who referred Kashmir issue to United Nations. India at that time was having opinion that United Nations will support its claim over Kashmir. But contrary to this, United Nations showed its reluctance to come down heavily against Pakistan.\(^8\)

Thus referring Kashmir into United Nations, to some extent, meant India’s loss and Pakistan gain. It gave an opportunity to Pakistan to internationalise the issue and weaken India’s claim on Kashmir in two ways.

\(^7\) *Epilogue*, July 2009, pp. 25-26

\(^8\) The four permanent members of UN including USA, UK, France and China were supporting Pakistan’s claim over Kashmir except Soviet Union which remained neutral because of her policy of containment of communism. For more details see, C. Dasgupta, *War And Diplomacy in Kashmir 1947-48*, Sage, New Delhi, 2002, p-118
First, by referring Kashmir into United Nations it not only provided an opportunity to intervene in the domestic affairs of both the countries, but also provided an ample opportunity to Pakistan to present its case in the United Nations against India. Second, since India took the case to the United Nations under chapter VI of the UN Charter, it provides for the peaceful settlement of the dispute through negotiation, mediation and reconciliation rather than enforcement action as provided under chapter VII.  

Infact, Kashmir assumed international character the day India referred it to the United Nations Security Council. When India referred Kashmir issue to the United Nations, Pakistan denied the allegation of using her territory as a base by raiders to invade Jammu and Kashmir and openly and blatantly denied any support provided to the separatists. Thereupon United Nations called upon both India and Pakistan to take positive steps for improving the situation. United Nations passed resolution on April 17, 1948 recommending setting up of five member commission to start mediation at the disposal of both India and Pakistan. Thereupon the third resolution was passed on August 13, 1948. This resolution mentions that high commands of both India

---

9 Rajat Ganguly, n.2, p.65.  
11 Pyralal Kaul, *Kashmir-War or Peace*, Offset, New Delhi, 2003, p. 172
and Pakistan will issue separately a cease fire order in Jammu and Kashmir.\textsuperscript{12} The resolution of August 13, 1948 also deals with the Truce Agreement in which both countries agreed that future status of Jammu and Kashmir shall be determined in accordance with the wishes of people of Jammu and Kashmir.\textsuperscript{13} When this resolution was accepted by both the countries, cease-fire was ordered.

Similarly, on April 21, 1948 United Nations Security Council constituted United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan consisting of three UN representatives, one from India, one from Pakistan and the third was bilaterally chosen by both India and Pakistan. Later on at the instance of British and United States of America, membership of United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan was increased to five members. For providing solution to separatist politics of Kashmir, US administration under President Truman, in collaboration with Britian recommended to Security Council for the appointment of a mediator. Thus, by December 17, 1949, A.G.L. Mc Naughton, the then Canadian diplomat was appointed mediator on India and Pakistan. Mc Naughton in his proposals called for demilitarization of the Kashmir. However, Indian leadership objected the


proposal of the demilitarization on the ground that these were not relating to
the disbanding of the Azad Kashmir forces. Subsequently, on, March 14,
1950 Chester Nimitz was appointed the plebiscite administrator. He gave
proposal of regional plebiscite. However, this proposal was rejected by
India. In a speech in September 1949, Jawahar Lal Nehru said that Kashmir
is a part of India and no power on earth could take it away. Consequently,
A.G.L. McNaugton, the then President of Security Council made some
proposals for the resolution of the dispute, wherein he proposed that there
should be an agreed programme of progressive reduction of armed forces on
either side of the cease-fire line by withdrawal, disbandment and
disarmament in such stages as not to cause any problem for the people on
either side of the cease-fire line. It further proposed that programme of
demilitarization should include the withdrawal of regular forces of
Pakistan. As far as India was concerned, it could maintain limited number
of security forces on the Indian side of cease-fire for the maintenance of law
and order. Pakistan accepted the proposals put forth by A.G.L. McNaugton.
Besides Pakistan other delegates from Security Council i.e., from Britian,

China, France and US supported these proposals. However, these proposals were out rightly rejected by India declaring that Kashmir’s defence is India’s responsibility. India argued that Pakistani forces must leave the state and Azad Kashmir troops must be disbanded before a plebiscite could be held. In 1950 Owen Dixon, then Australian jurist was appointed as mediator.\(^{16}\) He proposed two alternatives. First to hold plebiscite by areas and allocate each area and allocate each section according to the results of the vote therein. Second, to demarcate the areas that were certain to accede immediately to either country. Thereafter, plebiscite should be held only in areas whose accession was in doubt. But such proposal was not acceptable to India. Owen Dixon in his report suggested method of allocation of valley. The remaining area of the state was suggested to be divided between India and Pakistan on the basis of geographical location and sentiments of their inhabitants. However, he rejected the idea of holding overall plebiscite because of the heterogeneous character of the state. He pointed out that Kashmir was not a single economic geographical or demographical entity and any attempt to allocate the whole of it to either country would create serious problems of refugee movements and dislocations.\(^{17}\) Owen Dixon

\(^{16}\) Ibid.

while commenting on the prospects of resolution told the Security Council, “I have formed the opinion that if there is any chance of settling the dispute over Kashmir by agreement between India and Pakistan, it now lies in partition and in some means of allocating the valley rather than overall plebiscite.”\textsuperscript{18} However, the proposal propounded by Owen Dixon received objections by both Pakistan and India. While rejecting Dixon Plan, Pakistan said, “Sir Owen Dixon’s poisoned pen has pricked as it were mere bubble, the belief that in the larger world. Pakistan is in the company of well-wisher, not to speak of friends.”\textsuperscript{19} The report of Owen Dixon was discussed at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference held in London in January 1951. In this Conference, it was suggested that as a concession to India either the Kashmir valley or the whole state might be declared as an independent sovereign state under the condominium of India and Pakistan, the two countries would jointly control the foreign relations, defence and communications as well. However, the mediation by Owen Dixon as well as commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference failed to provide a just and honourable solution to the Kashmiri separatism.


\textsuperscript{19} Jyoti Bhushan Das Gupta n. 17, p.158.
During 1950, S. Harrison, an expert on South Asian Affairs commented, “As a first step towards a solution of the Kashmir dispute, India would have to split the state, integrating most part of Jammu and Ladakh with Indian Union while giving special status to a new state in which the valley would be united with the sizeable Muslim pockets in Jammu and Ladakh. India could then offer to give the new state far-reaching autonomy as part of a Trieste-type solution under which Pakistan would grant some degree of autonomy to its sector of Kashmir…, Islamabad would terminate its support for insurgents in the valley. The present Kashmir cease fire line would become an international border with Kashmiris free to travel back and forth without Indian and Pakistan visas”\textsuperscript{20} However, United States of America signed Mutual Defence Agreement with Pakistan in 1954 and promised to provide Pakistan with substantial military equipment as well as training for Pakistani Armed Forces that changed the situation.

Infact US-Pak nexus was never as close as it was during 1950s. During 1954-55, Pakistan not only became militarily ally of United States, but also became the member of Bagdad Pact and South East Asian Treaty Organization, as member of anti-communist military alliances.\textsuperscript{21} The main

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} Rajat Ganguly, n.2, p.65.
motive of US behind providing military support to Pakistan was two fold. First, to get information about nuclear and missile capabilities of Soviet-Union. Second, to get military base in case Soviet Union attacks any gulf country.\textsuperscript{22} India succeeded in convincing the international community against the consequences of the pact.\textsuperscript{23} The US military aid to Pakistan was deeply resented by India which it viewed as an unfriendly part. Thereupon, Jawaharlal Nehru told Mohammad Ali Bogra, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan that “whatever the motives behind the arms aid to Pakistan may be, the mere fact that such large rearmament and military expansion takes place in Pakistan must necessarily have repercussions in India. The whole psychological atmosphere between the two countries will change for the worse and very question that is pending between us will be affected by it. We do not propose to enter into an armament race with Pakistan or any other country since our ways of approach to internationalize problems are different from those of the nations of Europe and America. But it is obvious that such expansion of war resources with the help of USA can be looked

\textsuperscript{22} Vergheese Koithara, \textit{Crafting Peace in Kashmir Through Realist Lens}, Sage, New Delhi, 2004, p. 126
\textsuperscript{23} Rajat Ganguly, n. 2, p. 66
upon as an unfriendly act in India and that is fraught with danger.”

Subsequently, on February 24, 1955 third Agreement on mutual cooperation was signed in Baghdad which greatly worried India because US military aid to Pakistan was viewed by India as a ploy to solve Kashmir separatist issue force.

However, Dwight Eisenhower, the then President of USA assured Prime Minister Nehru that such military aid would not be used against India. But by and large as a result of this alliance, USA promised Pakistan two benefits related to Kashmir, first, to bring about military assistance from the US which was badly needed by Pakistan to control over the territory of Jammu and Kashmir and second was to hold plebiscite in Kashmir. As a result of this, Washington succeeded in getting the ally and as a lynchpin of the West’s anti-communist policy in South Asia. Thus, India’s non-aligned status and Pakistan’s alignment with West resulted into politicization of Kashmiri separatism. India believed that major powers like USA and UK

26 Hemen Roy, How Moscow Sees Kashmir, Konark, Bombay, 1985, p. 33
adopted pro-Pakistan stand over Kashmir in the Security Council by dint of which Jawahar Lal Nehru rejected the Security Council’s resolution of holding plebiscite in Kashmir\textsuperscript{29}.

The United States of America regarded the problem as a serious dispute between the two countries with which it has friendly relations, but not as an issue involving vital US interests. Kashmir also appeared to be the type of regional dispute that UN should be able to resolve as India’s original suggestion for a plebiscite provided a basis for settlement.\textsuperscript{30} During initial years of UN deliberations on Kashmir, Soviet Union provided support to the plan of independent Kashmir put forth by Sheikh Abdullah. With the purpose of augmenting communist takeover of Kashmir, the Soviet, welcomed the land reforms as well as Sheikh Abdullah’s proposal of people’s government. The complements to the National Conference by Soviet Union for representing the will of the self-determination depicted the Soviet preference for an independent Kashmir. Infact Soviet Union during Stalin’s period embarked on a drive to build up Soviet power by the domination of strategic territory and wanted to translate into practice the Soviet system in Kashmir. But by the end of 1952, large scale changes were

\textsuperscript{29} Summit Ganguly, n.14, p.25.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., p.26.
brought at the international level and Soviet Union began to re-examine her policy vis-à-vis India. Consequently Soviet Union, which remained neutral on Kashmir till 1954 started vetoing every resolution in the Security Council on Kashmir that was opposed by India. This resulted into growing Indo-Soviet friendship\textsuperscript{31}. Subsequently, Pakistan which was confident of support from Muslim countries lost diplomatic support from such countries primarily because of India’s pro-Arab and pro-Muslim stand. This helped India to prevent support to Pakistan’s position on Kashmiri separatism, among Arab countries. Infact, most Middle East countries insisted on the resolution of Kashmir issue bilaterally between India and Pakistan.

Subsequently, when India got substantial help from Soviet Union, Pakistan under the leadership of Ayub Khan developed close ties with China. Consequently, after the Indo-China war, China came in open support for Pakistan.\textsuperscript{32} Contrary to this, Soviet Union decided to extend full support to India while fully supporting India’s policy in Kashmir, Nikita Khrushchev, the then Premier of Soviet Union during his visit to Kashmir declared, that Kashmir question has been settled by the people of Kashmir and that Soviet

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{31} C. Raja Mohan, \textit{Crossing the Rubicon The Shaping of India’s New Foreign Policy}, Viking, New Delhi 2003, p-121
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{32} Rajat Ganguly, n.2, pp. 65-68
\end{flushleft}
Union’s position with regard to Kashmir was precise and clear that Kashmir is one of the states of the republic of India.  

However, Pakistan strongly resented the Soviet stand over Kashmir and asserted that Soviet Union’s declaration was intended to encourage and involve the subcontinent in a sort of cold war.  

Although the issue of Kashmir remained unresolved in the Security Council, United States and United Kingdom tried to engage both India as well as Pakistan into talks over Kashmir issue. In addition to this in 1962, an Anglo-American mission headed by Duncan Sandys, the then British Defence Minister and Averall Harrim, former Governor of New York came to South-Asia to persuade both governments to involve themselves into talks. This team included James Grant, the then US Deputy Assistant Secretary of states for North-East and South Asia, Roger Hilsman, the then Director of US states Departments Bureau of Defence for International Affairs, Paul Adams, the then Commander of US strike Command and Karl Keysen, then member of US National Security Council Staff. The Anglo-American team visited both India and Pakistan. However, USA was tilted towards Pakistan so as to

33 Hemen Roy, n.26, pp. 32-33.
34 Ravi Nanda, Kashmir And Indo-Pak Relations, Lancers, New Delhi, 2001, pp. 68-71
35 Summit Ganguly, n.18, p. 32
secure her military bases\textsuperscript{36}. Similarly, in USA there was deep distrust of India because of India’s growing closeness to Soviet Union. In the meantime in 1963, Pakistan announced its border agreement with China mentioning Sinkiang under the control of Pakistan and under which Jammu and Kashmir state’s territory comprising about two thousand square miles were handed over to China.\textsuperscript{37} While reacting the Sino-Pak border agreement, India made it clear that Pakistan has no right to enter into any such agreement with China as the concerned territory legally belongs to India.\textsuperscript{38}

Apart from putting pressure on both India and Pakistan to resolve their differences bilaterally, US herself proposed a scheme of territorial division of Kashmir in January 1963. In this partition scheme, Kashmir was proposed to be with India keeping in view the India’s only supply route to Ladakh which runs out of Kashmir valley. But Nehru refused to entertain it. Even Pakistan gave a plan for the partition of Jammu and Kashmir by offering boundary that would follow the peaks of Pir Panjal range in northern Jammu and include the districts of Reasi, Mirpur, Kotli and Poonch in Pak\textsuperscript{39}. As far

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid. p.33.
\textsuperscript{37} Jamna Dass Akhter, \textit{Pak Espionage in India}, Oriental, New Delhi, 1971, p. 116
\textsuperscript{38} Ravi Nanda,\textsuperscript{n. 34}, p.70
\textsuperscript{39} Muhtaqur Rehman, n. 15, pp. 101-102.
as Kashmir valley was concerned, Ayub Khan proposed its internationalization, but Jawahar Lal Nehru turned down the proposal.

Since Pakistan from the early days of its creation has given considerable importance to the idea of forcible seizure of Kashmir, it drew up ‘Operation Gibralter’ to seize Kashmir by force. It was a two phased plan where in first phase called for crossing of Pakistani troops across cease-fire line for fomenting separatism in Kashmir. In the second phase, Pakistan was hoping to take advantage of turmoil in the state to invade and seize the state and therefore appealing the international community to hold plebiscite for determining the future status of Kashmir.\(^{40}\) Pakistani politico-military leadership was having the opinion that Indian forces were not prepared to defend against an attack. Second, there was a belief among the Pakistani elite that there would be widespread popular support for Pakistan among the people of Kashmir. Infact, Pakistan was trying to exploit the violent anti-national activities that erupted in Kashmir in the wake of Holy-Relic episode in December 1963 which is believed to be the hair of Prophet Mohammad.\(^{41}\) But Indian intelligence operatives managed to find it which mollified the

\(^{40}\) Rajat Ganguly, n. 2, pp. 66-67

\(^{41}\) Moe-e-Muquddas is believed to be the hair of Prophet Mohammad and has been kept in the Holy Shrine of Hazratbal located in the heart of city. For more details see J.B. Das Gupta n.17, pp. 308-309.
people of Kashmir. While commenting on getting full support from Kashmir in the Pakistan’s plan in 1965, Asghar Khan, the then Air Marshal said, “It was assumed that widespread support existed within occupied Kashmir to make such guerrilla campaign a success. It was considered unlikely that, as a consequence of this action, India would be inclined to attempt a military offensive against Azad-Kashmir territory lastly, the possibility of India crossing the international frontier was ruled out.” Similarly, Ayub Khan, the then President and Zulfikhar Ali Bhutto the then Foreign Minister were confident of Chinese assistance in case of war with India. But Chinese did nothing to assist the Pakistanis. Thus, Pakistan’s plan of encouraging separatism in Kashmir proved contrary to its expectations and Kashmiri population remained non-cooperative to the Pakistan in 1965.

The 1965 Indo-Pak war witnessed mixed response from external countries. While USA was of the apprehension that continued Indo-Pak war would bring Pakistan closer to China which would be detrimental to its interest in South Asia. UK was also disturbed by the war between two common wealth countries.  

42 Summit Ganguly, n.14, pp. 41-42.  
43 Mustaqr Rehman, n. 15, p.115
The close ties between Pakistan and China witnessed bitter experience for Pakistan in the Indo-Pak war of 1965. During the war Pakistan was expecting full support of Western powers but was shocked when arms embargo was imposed on both India and Pakistan by them. While strongly supporting Pakistan, China made it clear that it would neither stop supporting the movement of self-determination of Kashmiri people, nor would it cease supporting Pakistan in its struggle against Indian aggression. It further warned India of meeting grave consequences if it did not stop entry in the Sikkim sector where Sino-Indian boundary line exists. However, politico-diplomatic support that Pakistan got from China did not help Pakistan to win over Kashmir from India. The Soviet Union was disturbed by the growing influence of China in the subcontinent, so Alexei Kosygin, the then Prime Minister of Soviet Union sent a message to Lal Bhadur Shastri, that Soviets would not be frank if they did not say that military conflict in Kashmir also arouses the anxiety of the Soviet Union because it has flared-up in a region immediately adjacent to the frontiers of the Soviet Union. Consequently, cease fire initiatives came from United States, Britian and U. Thant, the then Secretary General of United Nations on September 1, 1965 made an appeal to the governments of both India and Pakistan with
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44 Rajat Ganguly, n. 2, p. 67
respect to cease fire and withdrawal of forces to their respective position. But both countries rejected the proposal of cease fire. Subsequently, U. Thant visited Rawalpindi on September 9, 1965 and Delhi on September 12, 1965 and directed them to observe cease-fire, but it was again refused by India and Pakistan. On September 20, 1965 Security Council proposed invoking of Article 40 in case both parties refuse to agree on cease-fire.\footnote{Article 40 of the United Nations Charter authorizes Security Council to order the two parties to stop fighting and to use force if they do not comply.} Thus, on September 23, 1965, both India and Pakistan agreed on cease-fire\footnote{Mushtaqur Rehman, n.15, pp. 112-113} which later culminated into Tashkent Agreement\footnote{For details of Tashkant Agreement See Appendix (xii).}. In the Tashkent Declaration signed between Ayub Khan and Lal Bahadur Shastri, both agreed that conditions should be created for the establishment of good neighbouring relations between India and Pakistan and to that end all disputes between the two countries be settled through peaceful means in accordance with principles of United Nations Charter.\footnote{Mushtaq-ur-Rehman n.15, pp-115-116}

But after the announcement of cease fire in Kashmir, the separatists, inspired by Pakistani intelligence agency once again started agitations...
against India and demanded plebiscite.\textsuperscript{49} They were having an opinion that Pakistan will definitely capture Jammu and Kashmir through force and as such they automatically will become part of Pakistan or create an independent state. But when the Tashkent Agreement was signed, their hopes were dashed to the ground. Therefore they again started agitations against India and falling back on United Nations Resolutions. The hopes raised by Tashkent soon perished after Prime Minister Shastri died.\textsuperscript{50} On returning to Pakistan, Ayub Khan explained Tashkent Declaration to his people, We also impressed on the Indian Prime Minister that peace could not be lasting unless the Kashmir dispute was amicably settled. Pakistan was not prepared to accept Jammu and Kashmir as a part of India. The Indian leaders, on the other hand emphatically accepted that Kashmir was not negotiable and that India’s stand on Kashmir remained unchanged. Ayub Khan further explained the agreement and provided a, ‘no force declaration’ in accordance with the Charter of United Nations, instead of India’s No-War Declaration The Indian Prime Minister wanted us to sign a no war pact, but we made it clear to him that we would never be a signatory to such a pact

\textsuperscript{49} Ravi Nanda, n. 34, p. 78
\textsuperscript{50} K.R. Gupta, \textit{India-Pak Relations with Special Reference to Kashmir}, Atlantic, New Delhi, 2000, p. 105
unless the Kashmir dispute was settled honourably and equitably.\(^{51}\) Thus, it failed to secure good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan and keep sentiments of hatred and separatism unresolved. The bitterness in their relations further developed after the creation of Bangladesh when India helped East-Pakistan (now Bangladesh) in their independence. Thereafter, another war broke out between India and Pakistan in 1971.\(^{52}\) In the 1971 war, USA mounted pressure on India in support of Pakistan. China was also supporter of Pakistan. Various Muslim countries also provided material support to Pakistan. In the fourteen days war, Pakistan captured Chammb area of Jammu and Kashmir. India too launched counter attack and captured 91000 Pakistanis as prisoners of war in the East Pakistan.\(^{53}\)

The Simla Agreement reached after the end of 1971 war, however did nothing for resolving the issues of separatism in Jammu and Kashmir rather than only mentioning that conflicting issue that disturb Indo-Pak relations would be resolved by peaceful means bilaterally. When Zulfikhar Ali Bhutto returned to Lahore after signing Simla Agreement on July 3, 1972, he declared, “On the vital question of Kashmir, we have made no

\(^{51}\) Mushtaqur Rehman, n. 15, p. 16

\(^{52}\) Ibid, pp. 128-129.

\(^{53}\) For details of Shimla Agreement see Appendix (xiii).
compromises, We told the Indians categorically that the people of Kashmir must exercise their right of self-determination. This was a question which can be decided only by the people of Kashmir. Neither India nor Pakistan had any say in this matter.54 While India believed that Kashmir issue is final after Simla Accord. Both countries once again failed to make it a final agreement due to fear of uneasiness in their respective countries.55

While India’s policy towards Kashmir from 1972 onwards was to resolve Kashmir issue bilaterally and to strive for permanent settlement of issues by converting the line of control into an international border between India and Pakistan. However, on the part of Pakistan, the post-Simla agreement era has witnessed the consistent denial and violation of the spirit of agreement.56 In 1976, Pakistan while raising the Kashmir issue at the United Nations General Assembly called for the solution of Jammu and Kashmir as per the wishes of people, as recognized by the United Nations Security Council Resolutions. In order to further internationalise the separatist issue, Pakistan again raised the Kashmir at sixth non-alignment movement (NAM) summit held at Havana on September 6, 1979. Initially,

55 The Tribune, June 22, 1982
56 From Surprise to Reckoning, Kargil Review Committee Report, Sage, New Delhi, 2000, pp 57-59
Pakistan used Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) for spreading separatist feelings among Kashmiris. But gradually several other pro-Pakistani separatist organizations as Hizbul Mujahideen (HM), Allah Tigers, Al-Umar, Harkat-ul-Ansar etc were used by Pakistan which were firm and determined to secure Kashmir for Pakistan. Pakistan also raised Kashmir issue at United Nations Human Rights Commission. Besides United Nations, Pakistan also raised Kashmir issue at the organization of Islamic countries (OIC) and at the Foreign Minister’s Conference in 1983 to internationalise it.\textsuperscript{57} The organization of Islamic countries and other international forum was used by Pakistan to condemn India on the issue of treatment of Muslims throughout India particularly in Jammu and Kashmir.\textsuperscript{58}

In addition to this, the end of Soviet occupation of Afghanistan immediately helped Pakistan to provide substantial military support to the separatists of Kashmir. During Afghan war, United States trained and equipped Afghan separatists for fighting guerilla warfare against the Soviet Union. Pakistani Inter Service Intelligence (ISI) developed close links with the Afghan separatists as they were asked to monitor separatists activities.\textsuperscript{57}\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid, p. 74
But, after the end of Afghanistan and disintegration of Soviet Union, Inter Service Intelligence of Pakistan started covert and overt support to the Kashmiri separatists.

Moreover, a large quantity of highly sophisticated weapons including stringer anti-aircraft missiles and automatic rifles which the United States gifted to Pakistan as a frontline state to be used by Afghan separatists, have been diverted to separatists by Pakistan which made them carry out jihad against India as reported and reproduced on several occasions. The Afghan guerrillas who were left aimlessly after Soviet-Union withdrew from Afganistan were made to infiltrate into Kashmir to carry forward the separatist movement of Kashmir. It is reported that between 1991-1993 large number of Afghan separatists having close ties with Gulbaddin Hekmatyr’s separatist party and Hezb-e-Islam Party, infiltrated into Kashmir to join separatist movement. In the initial years of separatist politics, the pro-Pakistani as well as pro-independent separatists were receiving covert military support. In 1993 another pro-Pakistani separatist organization of All Party Hurriyat Conference emerged, with the result, that Pakistan stopped aiding and funding pro-independent separatists groups like JKLF. As for as Pakistan’s support to the separatists is concerned, it has produced

59 Rajat Ganguly, n.2, pp. 82-83
both positive as well as negative results. First, as a result of Pakistan’s involvement in Kashmir separatist politics, Kashmir has been kept alive internationally. As a result of this separatists are getting support from large number of states.\footnote{Prayalal Kaul, n. 11, p. 248} Consequently, the foreign separatists belonging to different countries like Afghanistan, Algaria, Bahran, Bangladesh, Eypt, Iran and Labenon joined local separatist.\footnote{Rajat Ganguly, n. 2, pp. 74-78} Though on the one hand, Pakistan’s diplomatic and moral support succeeded to garner support from international community, yet on the other hand, it has strengthened Indian Union. In addition to this, financial and weaponry support to separatists has created donor-dependence relationship between separatists and Pakistan.\footnote{Anil Maheswari, \textit{Crescent Over Kashmir, The Politics of Mullaism}, Rupa, New Delhi, pp. 102-103}

Meanwhile, Pakistan started supporting separatist politics within Kashmir by adopting two-pronged policies. First, by providing overt, moral and diplomatic support to the separatists, thereby internationalizing it. Second, by providing arms, ammunition and training facilities to the separatists\footnote{Rajat Ganguly, n.2, pp. 84-88.}. However, when Pakistan’s policy of fomenting separatism in Kashmir by means of military force failed, she resorted to diplomatic efforts
to focus the attention of international community on Kashmir. In turn India responded to Pakistan’s policy by massive use of force. The massive force and powers enjoyed by security forces came under heavy fire from human rights activists inside and outside India. Pakistan’s policy of raising human rights issue was to seek the support of foreign countries on Kashmir. This strategy proved quite successful in the initial years when the organization of Islamic countries voted for imposing sanctions against India on the human rights violation in Kashmir. Subsequently, human rights violation issue was also raised in the British Parliament wherein Parliament supported for the right of self-determination for Kashmir. Similarly, Bill Clinton administration in USA also criticised India for human rights violation in Kashmir.

However, Pakistan’s policy of receiving diplomatic support from external countries received set back because of diplomatic campaign carried by India from time to time. Even Islamic countries like Afghanistan, Uzbekistan and Kazakastan who have voiced their concern over the human rights violation in Kashmir adopted the policy of neutrality on the Kashmir.

Subsequently, in order to globalize the separatist issue, Kashmir American Council (KAC) was formed by Ghulam Nabi Fai in the United
States and the World Jammu and Kashmir Freedom Movement of Ayub Jhakur in Britian.\(^{64}\) In the US, Pakistan and separatist lobbies of Kashmir such as Kashmir American Council, Human Rights Groups like Asia Watch and the Amnesty International succeeded in getting enlisted the violation of Human Rights by Indian state in Kashmir on the agenda of US administration.\(^{65}\)

Similarly, for the propagation of separatist feelings, a radio station of ‘Sada-e-Hurriyat-e-Kashmir’ was started across line of control (LOC). Since 1991, several programmes like ‘Jal Raha Hai Kashmir’, ‘Kashmir Dastan’, ‘Kashmir Banega Pakistan’ and ‘Mukadma-E-Kashmir’ are being relayed to incite dissatisfaction among the people of Kashmir.\(^{66}\) When separatists in Kashmir came under pressure from security forces, Pakistan increased involvement of foreign separatists for strengthening separatism in Kashmir. These separatists are from Pakistan, Pakistan Occupied Kashmir (POK), Afghanistan and Islamic countries.\(^{67}\) Consequently, Pakistan utilized Organization of Islamic countries (OIC) to condemn India on the issue of

\(^{64}\) Ashok Kapor, n. 25, p. 524  
\(^{65}\) Anil Maheswari, n. 62, pp. 21-23  
\(^{66}\) Kargil Review Committee Report, n.56, pp.57-59.  
\(^{67}\) Prayalal Kaul, n.11, pp. 241-242.
separatists in Kashmir which India sees as an interference in her internal affairs.

The Indian government maintains that without external support, separatist politics in Jammu and Kashmir could not have sustained\(^\text{68}\). Despite Pakistani government’s denial of supporting separatism in Kashmir, India firmly believes in the material and financial support given to separatists in Kashmir by Pakistan without which separatism would have been easily suppressed by Indian security forces.\(^\text{69}\) In addition to this, Pakistan is trying to get the support of western countries and organization of Islamic countries. Infact, Pakistan’s attempt to internationalize the Kashmir issue succeeded with the active support of Islamic countries in Cairo. Besides in the 1994 Foreign Ministers meeting of Islamic countries, the members of Hurriyat Conference were also invited which also strengthened separatist feelings\(^\text{70}\).

Pakistan, which considers Kashmir an unfinished agenda of partition, received boost from United States of America in 1993 when Robin Raphel, the then US Assistant Secretary of States for South Asian Affairs,


\(^{69}\) B.P. Saha, *Trans-Border Terrorism, Internationalisation of Kashmir Tangle*, Har Anand, New Delhi 1994, p-162

commented that Kashmir is a disputed territory and USA did not recognize
the Instrument of Accession under which Kashmir became part of India
which in turn increased separatist tendencies in the valley. Such stand of
USA boosted Pakistan to support separatist movement in Kashmir. In order
to strengthen its claim on Kashmir, Pakistan made use of All Party Hurriyat
Conference which stresses on the role of USA in Kashmir in order to garner
international image of representing the wishes of the people of Kashmir. 71

The accession of Jammu and Kashmir being questioned by Robin
Rapheal infuriated New Delhi and brought to forefront suspicions of
American intentions about Kashmir. 72 However, after 1995, the perception of
the external countries particularly the western powers regarding Kashmiri
separatism began to change. Since then separatism in Kashmir is designed
more by Pakistan than by internal dimensions. 73 Similarly, a broad shift in
the Chinese position over Kashmir was observed during 1990s. Thus, from
Chinese perception of aggressively supporting pro-Pakistan position on self-
determination of people of Kashmir during 1970s, it emphasized on the
resolution of Kashmir bilaterally. In 1996 Jiang Zemin, the then President

71 Ibid, p. 114
72 C. Raja Mohan, Crossing The Robicon, The Shaping of India’s Foreign Policy,
Penguin, India, 2003, pp. 96-97
73 Vergheese Koithara, n.22, p. 128
of China told the Pakistani Senate that if the Kashmiri separatism is not solved immediately, it should be put on back burner and South Asia should concentrate on economic cooperation. As a result of this rapprochement with China, India at the United Nation Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR) in Geneva voted against western attempt to condemn human rights violation in China. Thus, Beijing which used to provide active assistance to Pakistan put pressure on Pakistan to withdraw her condemnation of Indian human rights violation in Kashmir.\(^74\)

Meanwhile, after Kargil crisis, USA pressured Pakistan for unilateral withdrawal from Kargil sector of India. It was because of the pressure from Clinton administration that Nawaz Sharief, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan agreed to withdraw force from Kargil. This reflected the shift in the policy of US in dealing with separatist issue of Kashmir vis-à-vis India. This change in the US policy was visible when Albright, the then Secretary of State on March 14, 2000 during Clinton visit to India reaffirmed, that tangible steps must be taken to respect the line of control. For so long as this simple principal is violated, the people of Kashmir have no real hope of peace. Similarly, USA emphasized the need for peaceful dialogue for dealing with separatists rather than the concept of self-determination. While

\(^{74}\) C. Raja Mohan, n. 72, p 98.
elaborating his views on the status of Kashmir, Bill Clinton said, “Our policy is first to respect the line of control, Second, do not promote violence by the third parties in Kashmir. Third, negotiate and fourth that there is not a military solution to Kashmir’s problem and that the Kashmiris deserve to have their own concerns addressed on the merits. But I do not think that an ethnically diverse country like India can not exist anymore. I do not agree with that.”\textsuperscript{75}

The United States of America under Clinton administration therefore, set aside the idea of self-determination in dealing with Kashmir and suggested government of India and Pakistan to address the grievances of people so as to resolve the long-standing issue of Kashmiri separatism. Moreover, after the terrorist attacks of October 2001, December 13, 2001, (on Indian Parliament) and May 14, 2002 (Kaluchak army camp) USA put pressure on Pakistan government to restrain from supporting separatists activities in India. Besides change in policy of America to confront Pakistan on the question of supporting separatists was observed after 9/11 when George W. Bush administration acknowledged Pakistan’s responsibility to end

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid, p.99.
separatism emanating from its soil. Since then USA has been insisting on the resolution of separatist issue bilaterally between India and Pakistan.76

Thus, the terrorist attack on Pantagon changed the USA’s policy towards separatist politics in Kashmir. The separatists who are fighting for the separate state of Kashmir and whom Pakistan is labelling as freedom fighters are now projected as terrorists for the rest of world77. Since then USA and other members of international community support India’s right to retaliate against separatism. In July 2002 Colin Powell, the then US Secretary of States ruled out plebiscite as an option to deal with separatism78 Consequently Pakistan shifted its policy of seeking redressal of grievances of people of Kashmir from human rights violation to Jihad. Former Inter Service Intelligence (ISI) Chief and creater of Taliban in Pakistan said, “we are fighting a jihad and this is the first Islamic international brigade in the modern era. The Communists have their international brigades, the West has NATO, why can not the Muslims unite and form a common platform.79” Such Jihadi agenda soon made its strong hold over separatist movement in Kashmir and people were forced to obey the commands of the jihadis.

76 Ibid. p. 103
77 Summit Ganguly, n. 18, p.49.
78 C. Raja Mohan, n. 72, p. 106
The reason why Kashmir receives the foremost attention of external powers is because of several factors. First, because of its geographical location as it shares common frontiers with India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, China and Central Asian Republics. Second, since last two decades, Kashmir has been witnessing an enormous increase in flow of arms and drugs from Afghanistan and Pakistan as well as rise of Islamic fundamentalism. Third, the Kashmir dispute has made South Asia the most dangerous place in the world. As far as Kashmir separatism is concerned, different leaders hold different views. It was regarded as an indigenous movement of separatists by late Abdul Gani Lone who ruled out it to be a part of global agenda of jihad. While commenting on the external linkage, he said that foreign separatists should not play any role in Kashmir as their presence in Kashmir creates a hindrance in the solution of Kashmir issue. Though initially foreign separatists had come to help local separatists in their struggle for freedom, yet with the passage of time, they assumed the role of owners of the freedom movement which he viewed as an intervention in the indigenous separatist movement of Kashmir. On the other hand, other section led by Syed Ali

---

Shah Geelani defined separatist movement in Kashmir not as a struggle of Kashmiris alone, but treated it as a global Islamic movement.\textsuperscript{81}

While commenting on the Pakistani support to separatists, Mirwaiz Umar Farooq said, “The issue of Pakistan giving support to or not does not present a problem for us. The US gave help to Afganistan, they were not asked to explain why they were supporting the Afgains. So if Pakistan supports the Kashmiris on whatever ground, it does not matter. You see ours is a totally indigenous movement, and it is the Kashmiris who are getting killed. If they are helping us, no one should be concerned, because historically they belong to the state of the Jammu and Kashmir and they have a duty towards their people who are occupied.”\textsuperscript{82} Besides, Syed Ali Shah Geelani urged Islamic countries throughout the world for the severance of diplomatic ties and economic blockade to India so that the powers used by security forces against the people of Kashmir in their struggle for freedom may get lost. He further drew the attention of international community to the killing, arson, loot, plunder which he alleged has become the daily routine of Indian security forces in Kashmir. He also appealed the Muslim countries to

\textsuperscript{81} The Economic and Political Weekly, June 22, 2002, Volume XXII, Number.9 pp. 2398-2399.

\textsuperscript{82} Victoria Schofield, n. 68, pp. 271-272
declare India as a terrorist state. Since the inception of armed separatism in Kashmir, US officials have been frequently visiting and interacting with the leaders of Kashmir. Consequently, former President of Pakistan, Pervez Mussaraf called upon George Bush, the then President of USA to involve himself in a roadmap on Kashmir. However, such a move was rejected by India as India wants bilateral solution on Kashmir separatist issue and denies any third party intervention (of either United Nations or USA) in the talks over Kashmir.

Another external linkage to separatist politics of Kashmir can be seen from China’s action of projecting Jammu and Kashmir as a separate country as well as to provide staple visas to Indian passport holders from Jammu and Kashmir. Such a move with regard to Kashmiri travelers is an attempt by China to question the status of Jammu and Kashmir as part of Indian Union. In yet another attempt to seek external intervention to solve Kashmir issue, chairman of moderate faction of Hurriyat Conference Mirwaiz Umar Farooq urged Hillary Clinton, US Secretary of States during

83 Suresh G. Sharma, et. al, n. 1, p. 400
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86 *The Hindu*, June 27, 2003
87 *The State Times*, October 20, 2009
her visit to India to pressurize India and Pakistan to resolve the longstanding dispute of Kashmir.\textsuperscript{88}

**Table 4.3.**

**Role of world community particularly USA in dealing with separatist politics.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes it has its role</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No it has no role</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Questionnaire

However, Barrack Obama, the President of USA ruled out any mediation over the Kashmir and insisted on the reduction of tensions between India and Pakistan through bilateral dialogue. While ruling out any mediation over Kashmir, Barrack Obama said, “I believe that there are opportunities, may be not starting with Kashmir, but starting with other issues, that India and Pakistan can be in a dialogue together and overtime to try to reduce tensions and find areas of common interests.” On observing silence over Kashmir he

\textsuperscript{88} *Greater Kashmir, July 18, 2009*
said, “India and Pakistan being close friends of US, should resolve their differences bilaterally.\textsuperscript{89}

To sum up we can say that despite consistent efforts on the part of America, Britain, Russia and China both in and outside the United Nations, the mistrust and acrimony between the India and Pakistan continues till date. Despite achieving little progress in the economic and bilateral trade, Islamabad and New Delhi have failed to find any basis for discussing the Kashmiri separatists issue and also prevented the construction of suitable ties with those countries who have their strategic interests in Kashmir. All this strengthen the separatist forces in Kashmir. It is pertinent to mention that initially separatist politics originated indigenously, yet it could have not survived without support from external forces in general and Pakistan in particular. It has been observed that some Islamic groups under the banner of OIC are also extending support to separatist politics. Until and unless the external support is not met with diplomatically and politically it will be difficult to handle separatist politics in the Kashmir.

In table 4.1 seventy two percent respondents have expressed their opinion that separatist politics is having links with Pakistan. While twelve

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{The Epilogue}, July 2009, p. 8.
percent say that there is no link. Sixteen percent respondents said that they cannot comment. Therefore, Pakistan have to be tackled, both diplomatically and politically to deal with separatist issue in Kashmir.

In table 4.2, seventy four percent of respondents have expressed their opinion that separatist politics affects Jammu and Kashmir politics. While twenty six percent respondents opine that they cannot comment. Separatist politics, therefore be dealt with to reduce its pressure on state politics and maintain peace in the state.

In table 4.3, sixty two percent of the respondents have opined that world community particularly USA has a role in dealing with separatist politics while thirty percent expressed their opinion that world community has no role. Only eight percent of respondents have said that they cannot comment on this issue. The world community, particularly USA therefore should play a positive role and facilitate Indian initiatives in Kashmir to deal with separatist politics.