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Indeed, Asia’s ugliest unsolved problem had been the constant bad relations between India and Pakistan. The roots of crises extend to the disastrous partition of the two countries in 1947 when British government left the region after a 250 years period of rule characterized by exploitation and divide and rule conquer course.

The British empires divisive policies which were aimed at creating crack between Hindu and Muslims in order to dilute any possible cohesive opposing force.

Because it felt its interests would not be represented in the Hindu majority India. On august 15, 1947 after ruling the sub-continent the British surrendered the power India and Pakistan became two sovereign nations.

Readapt and departer Partition created several problems like property, shearing of assets and integration of princely states etc the dispute over.

The accession of princely states ;junagadh ,Hyderabad and Kashmir in less than five months after independence two countries were on the verge of war over this issue.

The trouble in India Pakistan relations begin in 1947 when Hindu maharaja wanted to accede against the wishes of overwhelming majority of its population.

This dispute is poisoned well from which infection has spread to every other point of contact between two countries. The importance of Kashmir to Pakistan can hardly be exaggerated. If in Delhi Kashmir question represents an issue of prestige or principle in Rawalpindi it looks like the matter of life and death.

II. Part A: Pre-Independence-Era (Before 1947) almost from the very beginnings of recorded history, India had to face a long succession of foreign invasions.

1 See, A .v. Williams Jackson volume 1 ,especially chapter1 for history of India.
Being attracted to commercial potential of India, it was 17th century that the Europeans for the first time began taking interest on large scale. The most important early entrants were the Portuguese, the Dutch, the French and the British.

None of them come to India to settle here, they were all attracted by the stories of India’s fabulous wealth and affluence and by the excellence of her manufactured goods, which had big market in Europe the British also first time come to India as trading company like other Europeans.

The company which latter come to known as, East India company. The company increased its power and influence in the Indian sub-continent.

The situation deteriorated further after the death of Mughal emperor Aurangzeb in 1707. The empire began to disintegrate and central authority weakened. The company which could now change the Nawab at its will become the de-facto head of state power.

The Establishment of British rule in India was an entirely novel phenomenon for her, every previous ruling class, weather it has originally come from outside or was indigenous, had accepted the structural unity of India’s social and Economic life and tried to fit in to it. It had become Indianized and had hurt roots in the soil of the country.

The new rulers were entirely different, with their base elsewhere, between them and average Indian there was vast and un-bridgeable-gulf a difference in tradition, in outlook, in income and way of living.

There were two worlds: the world of British officials and the world of Indian millions, and there was nothing common between them except a common dislike for each other.

The East India Company’s victory in the battle of Plessey in 1757 and the Battle of Buxar in 1764 gave them political control over the eastern states of Bengal and Bihar, and laid the foundation of the British Empire in India.

Over next hundred years several areas were annexed to the British Empire in 1858, the administration of the India was taken over by the British crown from the East India Company and there were no further seizure.
The British government directly assumed the power and responsibility with respect to Indian administration in 1858, from the East India Company.

Thus the British crown becomes the head of the state ruler of India and Governor General of India was also designed as governor of India.

The rulers of princely states were assured by the British government that their autonomy and freedom would not be infringed upon in the future and Governor General of India would deal with them as governor of India.

The British government tried to introduce various reforms in Indian government through the acts of 1861, 1892, 1909, 1919 and 1935.

The reforms were also intended to calm Indian people and leaders of the congress, which represented the intellectuals of India from different walks of life.

Though the elements of nationalism were known to Indians, yet it practically developed in British period. There were many reasons for it, the British ruled over India in their self interests, Indians realised their motives they were fed up and oppressed by alien rule, their attempt to interfere in religious and social practices irritate the Indians and their anger resulted in the armed revolt of 1857.

The British crushed the revolt, but they couldn’t crush the spirit of nationalism among Indians. The English education was introduced in India to prepare the clerks and to mentally win over Indians.

But when Indians studied the European history they began to think in terms of Indian freedom from British slavery. The partition of Bengal in 1905 by Curzon irritate the Indians and there began a craze for freedom movement in the country.

The partition of Bengal by Lord Curzon in 1905 led to Swedish movement and protest presentation by Indians which resulted in the emergence of revolutionary elements within the congress.
The evil design behind this was clear “in East Bengal the Muslims, politically less advanced and more loyal to British than Hindus, would be in a majority, while in Bengal the Bengalis would form minority by the inclusion of Bihar and Orissa.

Thus the Bengalis would be divided from their relation and family, the Bengali Hindus, hated and dreaded by Curzon for their advanced political Ideas, would from minority in both region, and a thin wedge would be driven between the Hindus and the Muslims of Bengal. It was undoubted a master plan to destroy the beginning nationalism in Bengal”.

Exploiting Hindu, Muslim difference at all levels of public life was an important characteristic of British rule and the government tried its best to practice this policy as the comprehensible and the most practical to maintain their power in India.

The poisoning of Indian brain or the Brian-washing of many true nationalists by the British rulers in the interests of British expansionism was a regular feature of the then rule.

The growth of Hindus or Muslims was no matter to British, but they were greatly worried over the unity of the two, which in every way would adversely affect their interests. So they started playing cleverly, turning one community against the other.

The exploitation of communal difference was taken to further heights by Lord Minto, who in close cooperation with Lord Morley, incorporated communal representation in the new councils created under the Minto-Morley reforms.

The Minto-Morely reforms thus gave a permanent shape to the policy “counterpoise of native against native” initiated by Lord Curzon. “Indians were politically divided into communal compartments, to frustrate the growing national unity.

The seed of Pakistan was sown. The partition of Bengal in 1905 brought some kind of hope to Bengali Muslims who were politically, socially, economically and culturally crushed after the fall of Muslim rule in Bengal in 1757.

The Trauma continued and when in 1905 the British government divided Bengal into two parts to solve their administrative problem, the Hindus, generally of the subcontinent and particularly
of the Bengal launched a severe demonstration campaign to the extent that even the British authority alarmed and ultimately cowed down before the Hindu disturbance.

On the other hand Muslims of Bengal supported the partition scheme which made them majority in the newly formed area and also get their due share in the administration and economic spheres.

But the Hindu opposition to the scheme was harmful to their hope and aspiration, this consciousness of the Muslim Bengal gave birth to certain political organisation some of which played very important role in the political field not only of Bengal, but also the entire sub-continent.

The first Muslim political organisation which comes into being after the partition of Bengal was called “Mohammedan provincial Union” with the objective of “uniting the Mohammedans of new area of East Bengal and Assam into a compact body and representing to government views and aspirations of Muslims in social and political matter.

The Muslims of Bengal soon accomplished that the problems of the Muslims of Bengal could not be solved locally and so they immediately began to organise the Muslims of all over the sub-continent to adopt more effective strategy to India and Pakistan.

III. Post Independence Era ;( After 1947)

The present of a society is always an outcome of its past, which in turn, sets out the astrology of its future. Partition has also been the result of several forces, social, economic, political and religious at work in the life of the Indian people. The Hindus the Muslims, the Christians and others.

The British and their modus operandi, the divide and rule policy hatched it for maturity. Partition has been an period making event in Indian history, it marks the march of nation from slavery to self rule, but through the pool of blood of their assembly, and unfortunately by their own swords. Anyway 15 August presented two aspects.
It was the day of the defeat communal angry ever registered in human history. At the same time, it was the day of independence of India. The British rule came to an end. The Indian independence Act, 1947 come as a reward and punishment to its off-springs.

The study of communication between Indian and Pakistan is dominated by different variables such as conflicts, crises and cooperation. Since the partition both India and Pakistan have been looking at each other with mistrust, suspicion and fear.

The creation of Pakistan gave Hindu, Muslim rivalry a great degree of justice. Unfriendliness, communal riots refugee property, migration refugees, distribution of asset and so many other burning problems caused by the haste with which partition took place, added to already existing bitterness.

After partition, Indian and Pakistan have never settled to conduction of adjustment and amity As Pakistani columnist wrote recently, India and Pakistan are two men who have married each other’s sisters. If one male treats his wife, he should be sure enough that his sister will face the same treatment and problem in her husband’s house.

In spite of the best wishes of the leaders of both sides since the partition of the country, the hostility between India and Pakistan has not been lessened; rather Indian and Pakistan have been involved in such endless despite that the word peace is not found in the history of India and Pakistan relations.

DISPUTES EMINETED FROM PARTITION OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN
1947 - 2017

1947: August 14/15. British India is partitioned into India and Pakistan as part of the independence process. Majority Muslim areas in the West (now all of Pakistan) and East (the place now called Bangladesh) form Pakistan. The British also allow the nominal rulers of several hundred “princely states,” who were tax collectors for the British and served at British pleasure, to decide whether they wanted to join India or Pakistan. Pakistan demands Kashmir agreed to it.

The Hindu ruler of Kashmir does not make a choice. Kashmir has three major native areas: Ladakh in the northwest, which is majority Buddhist; the Kashmir Valley (controlled by India) and the part now controlled by Pakistan, which is majority Muslim, and Jammu (in the south), which is majority Hindu. The overall majority is Muslim.

1948: “Tribesmen” from Pakistan interfere Kashmir with the support of the Pakistani government. The ruler of Kashmir asks India for help. India demands that Kashmir should accepted to India first. The ruler agrees.

India sends forces to Kashmir and the breach is blocked. Kashmir is divided into a Pakistani controlled part and an Indian controlled part. This actual partition continues to this date with the dividing line being known as the Line of Control.

1948: India taken the Kashmir issue to the U.N. Security Council, which passed a resolution calling on Pakistan to do all it can “secure the withdrawal” of Pakistani citizens and “tribesmen” and asking that a election be held to determine the wishes of the people of Kashmir. Neither the force withdrawal nor the election has taken place.

1962: India and China fight a border war. China occupies a piece of Ladakh.

1965: India and Pakistan fight a border war along the India-West Pakistan border and the Line of Control in Kashmir. U.N. brake cease fire and withdrawal to pre-war lines maintained by the leaders of the two countries at a 1966 summit meeting in Tashkent, USSR (now Toshkent, Uzbekistan).

2 See, A .v. Williams Jackson volume 1 ,especially chapter1 and 3 for history of India.
1970-1971: An election in (East and West) Pakistan results in an overall more for an East Pakistani party, which is ethnically mainly Bengali. The Pakistani military refuses to allow the Parliament to hold meeting. East Pakistanis demand freedom, then independence in the face of harsh control by the Pakistani military.

Guerilla warfare appear. About ten million refugees stream into India from East Pakistan. India also provides sanctuary to Bangladeshi guerillas. Pakistan attacks airfields in India and Indian-controlled Kashmir. India strikes back in West Pakistan and also come between in the East on the side of the Bangladeshis.

The U.S, in a angle towards Pakistan, sends a nuclear-armed aircraft carrier, the Enterprise, and its battle group, to the region, in an implicit nuclear threat to India (which influences nuclear politics of India in favour of nuclear testing). Pakistan loses the war on both fronts and Bangladesh becomes independent.

1972: India and Pakistan sign a peace concert, known as the Simla (or Shimla) agreement, according to which both sides agree “to settle their differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations or by any other peaceful means mutually agreed upon between them.” Both countries agree that they will not independent try to adapt the Line of Control in Kashmir.

1974: India tests a nuclear device. Pakistan advanced its nuclear weapons program.³

1980s: U.S. supports Islamic opposition to Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and also the dictatorship of Zia-ul-Haq in Pakistan, which promotes Islamic fundamentalism in Pakistan.

Late 1980s: There is a state-level election in the Indian-controlled portion of Kashmir. There is evidence of fraud. Militancy rises in Kashmir. In 1989, the Soviets quit Afghanistan. Islamic militants from outside South Asia now become engaged in Kashmir, with the support of the Pakistani government. The violence in Kashmir becomes more dominated by foreign fighters and by religious fundamentalist. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Hindu fundamentalist begins to become more powerful as a political force in India.

³ See , the times of India by times group India
1990s: Violence boost in Kashmir. Islamic militants carry out racial cleansing in the Kashmir Valley, terrorizing Non-Muslims, mainly Kashmiri pundits, causing large numbers of people to run, mainly to Jammu. Pakistan supports the cross border invade. The Indian military responds with crushing to the terrorism, foreign invade, and the domestic rebel, which are now all mixed up. There are serious human rights abuses on all sides.

1998: A union led by the Hindu-fundamentalist party, the BJP, comes to power in India. India and Pakistan carry out nuclear weapons tests and declare themselves nuclear weapon states. Pakistan announces that it may, under certain circumstances, use nuclear weapons first to offset India’s conventional superiority, making reference to NATO’s Cold War doctrine of potential first use in case of a European war with the Soviets. India said that it will not used nuclear weapons first.

1999: Indian Prime Minister, AtalBihari Vajpayee, travels to Lahore, Pakistan for a peace meeting with Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. There is great hope for peace. Three months later Pakistan-based militants invade the Kargil area in Indian-controlled Kashmir, with the support of the military. A military conflict, with the possibility of nuclear war, result. Nawaz Sharif travels to Washington and President Clinton convinces him to withdraw Pakistani forces from Kargil. Conflict ends. Nawaz Sharif is overthrown in a military coup led by General Musharraf, one of the architects of the Kargil war. (Musharraf proclaims himself President of Pakistan in the year 2000.)

September 11, 2001: Well-known terrible events in the United States. Terrorist attacks kill about 3,000 people.

October 1, 2001: A terrorist attack on the Kashmir state legislature in Srinagar. 38 people are killed.

October 7, 2001: U.S. launches a war in Afghanistan, under the rubric of the War on Terrorism. President Musharraf becomes a U.S. associate and permit, Pakistan to become a base of operations for the United States. Al Qaeda, Taliban, and their supporters in Pakistan feel severe pressure.

---

4 See ,the times of India by times group India
December 13, 2001: A terrorist attack on India’s Parliament. Fourteen people (including five attackers, as well as security guards and two civilians) are killed.

After of December 13 2001: India organized and moved hundreds of thousands of soldiers to the border with Pakistan, including the Line of Control in Kashmir. The danger of traditional and nuclear war rises.


The greatest threat of nuclear war arose since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. U.S. troops and war strategy in the region imperilled. U.S. shuttle address defuses the immediate crisis as Pakistan promised to end cross border infiltration. India does not revenge. Tensions remain high and the foreboding of war and nuclear weapons use persists.

2003: After Musharraf calls for a ceasefire along the Line of Control during a United Nation General Assembly meeting in September, the two countries reach an agreement to cool tensions and cease hostilities across the actual border.

2004: Vajpayee and Musharraf hold direct talks at the 12th SAARC summit in Islamabad in January, and the two countries, foreign secretaries meet later in the year. This year marks the beginning of the composite Dialogue process, in which bilateral meetings are held between officials at various levels of government (including foreign ministers, foreign secretaries, military officers, border security officials anti –narcotics officials and nuclear experts)

In November on the evening of a visit to Jammu and Kashmir, the new Indian Prime Minister, ManmohanSingh, announced that India will be reduced its grouping of troops there.

2005: In defeated attempt, six terrorists belonging to Lashkar-e-Toiba stormed the AyodhyaRam Janmbhomi complex on 5 July 2005. Before the terrorists could reach the main disputed site, they were shot down by Indian security forces. One Hindu worshipper and two policemen were injured during the incident.

---

5 Times of India news paper 13 December 2001 by times group
2006: India arranged 5000 troops from Jammu and Kashmir, citing an improvement in the situation there, but the two countries are unable to reach an agreement on withdrawing forces from the Siachan glacier.

In September, president Musharraf and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh agreed to put into place an India-Pakistan institution anti-terrorism mechanism.

2007 SAMJHAUTA EXPRESS BOMBINGS

6 The 2007 on February 18, Samjhauta express bombing, which killed 68 civilians (most of whom were Pakistani), was also a crucial point in relations.

2008: 7 India joins a framework agreement between Turkmenenistan, Afghanistan and Pakistan on a $7.6bn gas pipeline.

In July, is India blames Pakistan inter service intelligence (ISI) directorate for a bomb attacked on the Indian embassy in Kabul, which kills 58 and injured another 141.

In September Pakistani president Asif Alizardari and in Prime Minister Manmohan Singh formally announced the opening of several trade routes between the two countries.

In October cross Line of control trade commences though it is limited to 21 items and can take place on only two days a week.

On November 26, armed opened fire on civilians at several sites in Mumbai, India. More than 160 people are killed in the attacked.

Mumbai attacked carried out by Pakistani militants resulted in a severe blow to the ongoing India-Pakistan peace talks.

---

6 The Hindu news paper 18 February 2007
7 The times of India News paper 1 July 2008
2009: Pakistani prime minister Yusuf Raza Gilani and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh meet on the sidelines of non aligned movement (NAM) summit in Sharm el Sheikh, Egypt issuing a joint statement charting future talks.

In August, India gives Pakistan a new dossier of evidence regarding the Mumbai attacked, asking it to prosecute Hafiz Mohammad Saeed, the head of Jamatud Dawa, an Islamic charity with ties to Lashkar-e-Taiba.

2010: In January Pakistan and Indian forces fire across the LoC Kashmir, the latest in a string of such incidents that have led to rising tension in the area.

In February, India and Pakistan foreign secretaries meet in New Delhi for talks. This meeting is followed by the two countries foreign ministers meeting in Islamabad in July.

2011: In January India home secretary G K Pillai says India will share information with Pakistan regarding the 2001 Samjhauta express bombing.

The two countries foreign secretaries meet in Thimbu, Nepal in February.

2012: In November, Ajmal Kasab is found guilty of murder, conspiracy and of waging war against India in the Mumbai attacked case. He is sentenced to death.

2013: In January India and Pakistan trade accusations of violating the cease fire in Kashmir, with Islamabad accusing Indian troops of cross border raid killed a soldier and India charging that Pakistani shelling destroyed a home on its side.

2014: On February 12 India and Pakistan agree to release trucks detained in their respective territories, ending a three week impasse triggered by seizure of a truck in India administered Kashmir coming from across the de facto line of control for allegedly carrying brown sugar.

On May 1, Pakistan’s Army chief General Raheel Sharif calls Kashmir the “jugular vein” of Pakistan, and that disputes should be resolved in accordance with wishes and aspirations of Kashmir and the line with UNSC resolutions for lasting peace in the region.

---

8 Times of India newspaper July 2009
On May 25 Pakistan’s releases 151 Indian fishermen from its jails in goodwill gestures ahead of swearing in ceremony of Narendramodi as prime minister.

On May 27, Indian Prime Minister Narendramodi holds talks with Pakistan’s Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in NewDelhi. Both sides express willingness to begin new era of bilateral relations.

May, 2015 : As part of the Friedrich-Ebert-Sifting (FES) efforts for enhancing regional cooperation and peace in the South Asian region, the offices in Pakistan and India jointly organized a track 1.5 dialogue titled “Pakistan-India Peace Process”.

Scenarios for the Future” from October 13-15, 2014 in Dubai, United Arab Emirates (UAE).

- Leading figures from politics, military, former diplomats, economists, media and Civil society of the two countries participated in this scenario-building exercise.

- During this trust-building dialogue, the dignitaries from both countries discussed the Pakistan-India relations, military cooperation and security management, bilateral trade, role of media and civil society on both sides of the border.

- At the end of the conference, participants developed worst case, business-as usual and best case scenarios.

In November 2015, the new Indian Prime Minister, Narendra Modi and Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif agreed to the restarting of bilateral talks; the following month, Prime Minister Modi made a brief, unscheduled visit to Pakistan while en route to India, becoming the first Indian Prime Minister to visit Pakistan since 2004.

Despite those efforts, relations between the countries have remained frigid, following repeated acts of cross-border terrorism.

In September 2016: A terrorist attacked on in Indian-administered Kashmir, the deadliest such attacked in years, killed 19 Indian Army soldiers. India’s claim that the attacked had been orchestrated by a Pakistan-supported jihadist group was denied by Pakistan, which claimed the
attacked had been a local reaction to unrest in the region due to immoderate force by Indian security personnel.

The attacked sparked a military conflict across the Line of Control, with a growth in ceasefire violations and further militant attacked on Indian security forces.

As of December 2016, the ongoing conflicts and the increased in nationalist address on both sides have been resulted in the collapsed of bilateral relations, with little expectation they would recovered.

Since the election of new governments in both India and Pakistan in the early 2010s, some steps have been taken to improved relations, in particular developing a consent on the agreement of Non-Discriminatory Market Access on Reciprocal Basis (NDMARB) status for each other, which will liberalized trade.

After a brief thaw following the election of new governments in both nations, bilateral discussions again stalled after the 2016 Pathankot attacked.

On 29 September 2016, a military conflict between India and Pakistan began. India said that it had conducted "surgical strikes" against militant launch pads across the Line of Control in Pakistani-administered Azad Kashmir, and inflicted "significant casualties"

**28–29 September**

Indian versions

9 Indian officials said the strike targeted areas close to the Line of Control (LoC), where it believes militants congregate for their final briefings before sneaking across the Line of control.

An Indian security source said the operation began with Indian forces firing artillery across the frontier to provide covered for three to four teams of 70–80 commandos from the 4th and 9th battalions of the Parachute Regiment (part of Para (Special Forces)) to cross the Line of control at several separated points shortly after midnight IST on 29 September (18:30 hours UTC, 28 Sep).

---

9 The Hindu Newspaper 28, and 29 September 2016
Teams from 4 Para crossed the LoC in the Nowgam sector of Kupwara district, with teams from 9 Para simultaneously crossing the LoC in Poonch district. By 2 a.m. IST, according to army sources, the Special Forces teams had travelled 1–3 km on foot, and had begun destroying the terrorist bases with hand-held grenade and 84 mm rocket launchers. The teams then swiftly returned to the Indian side of the Line of Control, suffering only one casualty, a soldier wounded after tripping a land mine.

**From 30 September**

India and Pakistan increased their exchanges of small arms and mortar fire across the Line of Control.

On 1 October, Pakistan said its soldiers had come under fire in Bhimber and they responded to the attack. Indian media stated that Pakistan had started the firing. 6 Indian civilians in Poonch district were reported to be injured in firing from Pakistani soldiers on 3 October.

On 4 October, the Indian Border Security Force said it witnessed Pakistani-operated unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) flying close to the border, presumably to survey Indian positions. The same day, an Indian soldier was injured by Pakistani fire in the Naushera sector of Rajouri district in the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir.

Three to at least four Indian soldiers were injured on 5 October because of firing and shelling. Nine Pakistani soldiers were also reported to be injured in retaliatory fire.

Border skirmishes continued throughout the month of October. An Indian soldier was killed by Pakistani fire in the Rajouri District of Indian controlled Jammu and Kashmir on 16 October.

One Pakistani civilian was stated to have been killed by Pakistani authorities while 12 others were stated to have been injured in firing by Indian forces on 19 October.

On 21 October, the BSF said that it killed 7 Pakistan rangers, a militant and injured 3 other Pakistani soldiers in disciplinary fire after a sniper attacked by Pakistani forces injured an Indian soldier, Gurnam Singh in Hiranagar, who later broke down to his injuries in hospital.

---

10 The Times of India 1 October 2016
The BSF claimed that the Pakistani media confirmed the "fatalities suffered by Pakistani rangers" with a news report that put the number of dead at 5. Pakistan's ISPR (Inter service public relation) denied that any of its soldiers died and claimed that Indian forces resorted to unprovoked firing, which was dealt by Pakistani soldiers.

On 24 October, a BSF personnel and an Indian civilian were reported to have been killed in exchanged of fire between both countries, while nine Indian civilians were reported to be injured. BSF also stated that five Pakistan Rangers were injured in firing from Indian side.

Pakistani authorities also stated that 2 Pakistani civilians were killed in firing by Indian forces, with 6 civilians had been injured.

Pakistani military claimed that it had killed 5 Indian soldiers and destroyed 4 Indian military outposts on 25 October.

Pakistani authorities on 26 October declared that two civilians were killed while nine others were injured in firing by Indian troops at the working boundary in Chaprar and Harpal sectors and on the Line of Control in Bhimber sector on 25–26 October.

11 ABSF personnel was reported to be killed on 27 October in R.S. Pora sector while ten Indian civilians were reported to be injured along the International Border in Jammu region in firing by Pakistani forces. BSF claimed that it killed one Pakistan Ranger and injured another in disciplinary firing.

6 Pakistani civilians were killed and 22 were injured in firing by Indian forces at Shakargarh and Nikial sectors on the same day in a claimed made 2 days later by Pakistani authorities.

In addition, another two civilians were reported to be killed while nine others were reported to be injured in Chaprar, Harpal and Bhimber sectors.

Two Indian civilians were reported to be killed, while four civilians were reported to be injured in shelling by Pakistani forces on 28 October.

11 The Hindu newspaper 27 October 2017
A BSF constable was killed in an accident while repaying to fire by Pakistani forces on the same day. Meanwhile, BSF claimed that 15 Pakistani soldiers had been killed in retaliatory fire. Three Pakistani civilians were reported to have been killed while five others were injured in firing by Indian forces on the same day in Nakyal sector.

A soldier was killed in Tarkundi area of Rajouri while a civilian was killed in Mendhar and another was injured in firing and blast by Pakistani forces on 31 October.

12 Pakistani authorities claimed on the same day that 4 Pakistani civilians were reported to be killed while 6 were injured in firing by Indian forces. 8 Indian civilians were reported to be killed in firing and shelling by Pakistan Rangers while 23 were injured on 1 November.

The Indian Army stated that it had killed 2 Pakistani soldiers and destroyed 14 military posts in punishment.

2 Indian soldiers were reported to be killed while two other soldiers and a woman were reported to be injured in firing by Pakistan Army who was trying to facilitate a attacked declaration on 5 November in Poonch district.

Pakistani officials stated on 7 November that 3 Pakistani civilians were killed while 6 civilians were injured in firing by Indian troops. On 8 November, three Pakistani civilians were killed while three were others were injured in shelling by Indian troops according to a senior police official of Poonch district. On the same day, an Indian soldier was reportedly killed while another was seriously injured in shelling by Pakistani troops in Nowshera sector.

Another 4 Indian soldiers were also reported injured in shelling by Pakistani troops on the same day. The soldier who was seriously wounded in Rajouri departed to his injuries on the following day while another was killed in sniper fire by Pakistani troops in Machil sector of Kupwara according to an Indian Army official. On 9 November, Pakistani authorities stated that 4 civilians were killed while 7 were injured in firing by Indian troops in Khuirata and Battal sectors on the previous day.

12 Times of India newspaper 1 November 2016
An Indian soldier was reported killed in Keran sector on 11 November in firing by Pakistan Army. While 6 soldiers were injured. Pakistani authorities stated on 14 November that 7 Pakistani soldiers had been killed in gunfire by Indian forces. General Raheel Sharif later claimed that they had killed 11 Indian soldiers on the same day in retaliatory firing. The Indian Army rejected the claim. On 17 November, Northern Command of the Indian Army said in a tweet: "No fatal casualties due to Pak firing on 14,15 or 16 Nov. Pak Army Chief claim of killing Indian soldiers on 14 November false."

On 18 November, the Pakistan Navy alleged that its worshiped had been intercepted and prevented the covert pervaded of Indian submarine in Pakistan's seaborne territories on 14 November. The ISPR released the military video footage of the supposed Indian submarine patrolling in the Arabian Sea. However, Pakistan had not identified the type of submarine it claims to have intercepted.

The Navy claimed that its worshiped had been intercepted the incurred Indian submarine once it was detected on their military radars, and diverted the submarine from its course of actions. The Indian Navy strongly rejected the claims and termed Pakistan's interception claims as shameless. The Indian Navy also said that none of its ships are near Pakistan." A Indian Navy officer said in a statement, "Why would an Indian submarine surfaced or come to snorkelling depth near Pakistani waters?", Submarines are meant to be stealthy, and they do not reveal their presences so easily whether they are on intelligence gathering or in battle missions. Another navy officer stated that there are more than 150 ships in the northern Arabian Sea and the Persian Gulf of different nations included submarines of the China, "either the Pakistan Navy mistook some other nation's submarine as an Indian one or is just done propaganda warfare of our soldiers embraced martyrdom" and claimed: "they [Indian Army] lost more than 40 soldiers".

On 18 November, Commander of X Corps of the Pakistan Army Lieutenant-General Malik ZafarIqbal said to a selected gathering of Pakistani parliamentarians and journalists in GilgitOnly 20.

---

13 The Hindu newspaper 18 November 2016
On 19 November, the Pakistani military claimed that it shot down an Indian quad-copter typed drone that had been alleged crossed the Line of Control into Pakistani controlled Kashmir. The same day, the Pakistani police said that four Pakistani civilians was killed in cross-border firing.

On 22 November, Indian reports said that militants or a Pakistani "Border Action Team" killed three Indian soldiers and savagely mutilated one of the bodies in Machhil sector of Kupwara district along the LoC. The Northern Command of the Indian Army said that "retribution will be heavy for this cowardly act". This was the second such incident of mutilation of an Indian soldier's body in the same sector since October 28, when the militants mutilated the body of Mandeep Singh of 17 Sikh Regiment. Before retreating back into Pakistan controlled Kashmir under covering fire from Pakistan Army.

Pakistan denied the accusation, calling it fabricated.

On 23 November the Indian army launched a massive attacked. 120 mm heavy mortars and machine guns was used in the attacked on Pakistani army posts. Artillery fire and outside from India targeted several Pakistani villages and struck a passenger bus near the divided line in the disputed region of Kashmir on Wednesday killing 9 civilians. Pakistan announced that it also killed 3 soldiers including an army captain. Two more civilians were also killed in another region of Kashmir. Pakistan military also claims 7 Indian soldiers have been killed in retaliatory fire, which was not confirmed by India.

Following the incident, DGMO of Pakistan requested for unscheduled talked on hotline and complains about killed of civilians caused by Indian Army fire. However, Indian DGMO, Lt General Ranbir Singh made it cleared to its counterparts about the unprovoked firing by Pakistani trooped to provided cover fire to the terrorists coming from POK.

On 29 November, Pakistan and India exchanged fire on the Line of Control north of Baramulla sector as well as in Uri sector. On 2 December, a Border Security Forces trooper was wounded by a Pakistani sniper in BhimberGali sector of Rajouri district. On 29 December, it was reported
that Pakistan Army fired at Indian placement in Gulpur sector of Poonch district. No casualties was reported on the Indian side.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{2017:} On 13 February 2017, Pakistan Army's official public relations outlets, the ISPR stated that three Pakistani soldiers were killed in cross-border firing by Indian troops.

The Indian Army stated on 1 May that the Border Action Team (BAT), which is assumed, had been made up from terrorists and soldiers of Pakistan's Army, killed and mutilated bodies of 2 Indian soldiers. Pakistan's government denied it.

On 11 May 2017, the two countries exchanged artillery and small-arms fire. Pakistan's foreign office stated that a civilian had been killed while 2 others were injured by Indian cover in SubzKat in Azad Kashmir while the Associated Press reported that an Indian civilian had been killed in Nowshera.

On 14 May 2017, an Indian army official claimed that Pakistan shelling in Nowshera killed 3 Indian civilians and injured 9 others including a BSF officer.

\textsuperscript{15}On 23 May 2017, the Indian Army claimed it had been "bombed" Pakistani army check posts in Nowshera Sector along the border. An Indian military spokesman said the action was taken to prevent pass into of militants into the Indian side. However, the Pakistani military swiftly rejected the claim as "false".

The Indian Army stated on 26 May that it had scuttled the attempts at a cross-border pass into by BAT, killing 2 BAT terrorists.

2 days later it stated that an army porter was killed and another injured in firing by Pakistan Army in Keran sector.

On 29 May 2017, the Indian media reports, citing defence sources, said that Special Forces of the Indian Army foiled an attack by Pakistan's Border Action Team, killing 2 Pakistani soldiers along the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir's Uri sector.

\textsuperscript{14} See , the Hindu by The Hindu Group, India 
\textsuperscript{15} Hindustan times newspaper 23 may 2017
On 1 June 2017, Livemint reported, quoting an Indian government official that the Indian Army's Special Forces eliminated a Pakistani Border Action Team composed of five enemy soldiers along the Line of Control in the Muzaffarabad sector.

The same day, two Pakistani civilians were killed and 6 others including 4 women were injured by Indian army's cross border firing in Battal, Jandrot and Hotspring sectors.

On 4 June, Pakistan's ISPR said that the military destroyed Indian bunkers during cross-border firing, in which five Indian soldiers were killed. It released video footage showed the Pakistani forces' destruction of the posts.

However, the Indian Army denied the claim. "No casualties have been caused to our own soldiers in ceasefire violation along Line of Control," a senior officer of 16 Corps of the Indian Army said. "The claim of the Pakistan Army that it killed 5 Indian soldiers, destroyed bunkers in firing on Line of Control, is totally wrong," he said. Following hotline contact, the ISPR stated any Indian violations had been responded with "full force at the time and placed of our selections with the charged of responsibility on Indian aggressive behaviour."

Dawn reported the number of Indian ceasefire violations in 2017 at over 400, crossing last year's 382. Pakistan's DGMO, Major-General Sahir Shamshad Mirza, said that Indian forces were killing civilians and inadvertent crossers of the Line of Control and labelled them informers, which was "highly unprofessional and unsoldierly". He told his Indian counterpart to "look inwards" instead of at Pakistan for the unrest in Kashmir.

On 10 June, a Pakistani civilian was killed by Indian army's firing in Chirickot sector. On 14 June, a cross border firing between Indian and Pak army, in Poonch and Rajouri area across Line Of Control, left two Pakistan soldiers dead. On June 16, An Indian soldier was killed by Pakistan army's cross-border firing on forward posts along the Line of Control in Rajouri district of Jammu and Kashmir.

On June 22, Pakistan Border action team (BAT) sneaked 600 metres across the Line of Control into the Poonch sector and killed two Indian jawans. The same day, two Pakistani civilians was injured by Indian army's firing in Kotli district of Azad Kashmir.
On June 25, Pakistan army cross border firing resulted in death of 1 civilian in Naushera sector.

On 28 June, Indian army's cross border firing left a civilian dead and 3 others injured in Kotli District of Azad Kashmir.

On 1 July 2017, a Pakistani civilian was injured by Indian army's cross border firing in Rawlakot, Azad Kashmir.

On 8 July, an on leave Indian soldier and his wife were dead and their three children was injured as Pak army opened fire in Poonch district along Line Of Control, said Indian officials.

According to a statement released by Pakistan military affairs, Indian Army fired into Pakistan administered Azad Kashmir's area of Chirikot sector and Satwal which resulted in death of two people included a 22 years old girl, Pakistan responded with the cross-border fired.

On next day of incident, Pande Rajiv Omparkash, SSP Poonch, said that Indian army destroyed a Pakistani checkpost.

On 10 July, Pakistan's ISPR said that Pakistan army responded with an attack that destroyed two Indian posts and killed four of their soldiers.

On 12 July, two Indian soldiers were dead after a cross border firing by Pak army in Kupwara area along Line Of Control.

On 15 July, an Indian soldier was killed by Pakistan army's cross border firing in Rajouri.

On 16 July, Indian army targeted one of the armoured vehicles of Pak army which finally, fall into Neelum River at Athmuqam along Line Of Control resulting in deaths of 4 Pakistan army soldiers.

On July 17, an Indian army men and a minor girl were killed while 2 other civilians were critically injured in cross border firing by Pakistan army along the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir on Monday in Rajouri’s Manjakote sector.

---
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On July 18, 2017, two Pakistani civilians were killed and 13 others were injured by Indian army's firing at Samahni sector of Bhimber district and the Nakyal sector of Kotli district.

The deceased included a minor. Later two Indian army men were killed by Pakistan army's firing in Rajouri district. The deceased were rifleman Vimal Sinjali and Sepoy Jaspreet Singh.

On July 19, 2017, an Indian army Junior Commissioned Officer (JCO) Shashi Kumar succumbed to his injuries. He was critical injured as a result of Pakistan firing in Naushera. That same day, the Pakistan Army said that it targeted Indian posts in response to ceasefire violations the previous day, which killed one Pakistani soldier and two civilians and critically injured seven others including two soldiers, and claimed that five Indian soldiers were killed.

On July 21, An Indian Army jawan was killed in cross-border firing across the Line of Control on Friday by Pakistani army in Sunderbani sector of Jammu and Kashmir's Rajouri district.

On 8 August, an Indian soldier was killed by Pakistani fire in skirmishing through the Line of Control.

On 12 August, a 45 year old civilian Indian woman killed by Pakistani shelling in Mendhar sector of the Poonch district of Kashmir.

On 13 September, three BSF troopers sustained injuries in unprovoked firing by Pakistani forces on BSF posts in Poonch and Jammu districts.

On 14 September, the BSF said it killed two Pakistani soldiers in retaliatory fire.

On 15 September, a Indian border guard was killed by Pakistani fire in conflict along the Line of Control. On 22 September, six Pak civilians were killed while 26 others including 15 women and 5 children was injured by Indian army's firing in Charwah and Harpal sector.

2017 June 3, the Pakistanis military claimed to have killed five Indian soldiers amid clashes in the disputed border region of Jammu and Kashmir which has long been site of violence between the two challengerneighbours.
According to a 2017 BBC World Service poll, only 5% of Indians view Pakistan's influence positively, with 85% expressed a negative view, while 11% of Pakistanis view India's influence positively, with 62% expressing a negative view.¹⁷

Kashmir is a divided state. Two of its regions are controlled by Pakistan and three regions are controlled by India. Both countries, however, lay claim to the entire state of Jammu and Kashmir.

The Kashmiri people themselves have long been striving for autonomy and ultimately independence. At its core therefore, this is a conflict that is both intrastate and interstate in its nature.

Much of the scholarship on the India-Pakistan relationship characterized it as an implacable, and unrelenting, conflict. The literature on this issue is often couched in the symbol of a bitter family feud, and described through the terms of two ‘blood brothers, caught in a ‘deadly embrace’, in pursuit of a suicidal ‘sibling rivalry’, which dates from when both was born in difficult circumstances, under the aegis of a misguided ‘midwife’.

This relationship, so the argument goes, was doomed to violent show downs and hostile acrimony from the very began, because of the bitterness left on both sides by the traumas of partition, and the continued conflict in Kashmir.

There are a number of reasons to support such a depiction. India and Pakistan have entered into three full scale wars, border conflict taken place almost daily, and both try for their diplomatic spat thoroughly and with zeal.

They point out each others’ shortcomings at the United Nations, and they spend vast sums of money on maintaining armies on the border in preparedness of an attacked. A slice of land, approximately 90,000 square miles in size, had been contested between the two for more than six decades. A state of ‘thaw’ between the two countries is the exception, rather than the rule, and, in general, the two countries are held to be in a situation of a powder keg close to an accidental match.

¹⁷According to a 2017 BBC World Service poll,
So it is not surprising that bilateral relations in the subcontinent are believed to be doomed to a dangerous volatility, and seized periodically by violent outbursts, because of the numbers of factors, including a bitter partition, deeply seated religious rivalry and, as well as the continuing conflict in Kashmir, which predispose the two towards war.

These factors are believed to have exercised a vice like grip in subsequent dealings between India and Pakistan, and ensured that bilateral relations could not be freed from a mutual suspicion and jealousy. In such circumstances, a bitter rivalry was deemed inescapable; and the choices made with regard to bilateral relations seemed too entangled with these emotions, which led to both sides compulsively taking action that would be to the detriment of the other.

This is a wide-ranging literature, and has the same conclusion arrived at via a variety of approaches. One set of assessments is premised on the understanding of India-Pakistan relations being essentially an extension of an older Hindu-Muslim rivalry; or, in more nuanced explanations, of the old rivalry between the Congress and the Muslim League.

For example, In S. M. Burke’s analysis of the India-Pakistan relationship, the religious complexion of India and Pakistan proves to be the decisive factor: ‘It is difficult to think of any two religions more antithetical to each other than Hinduism and Islam’, and this, Burke argued, had been prevented any last solution to the India and Pakistani hostility.

The Reconciliation between Hindus and Muslims in the subcontinent, difficult to begin with, was made impossible in the context of the politics in the subcontinent in the first half of the twentieth century.

Finally, Burke suggests that these tendencies came to the fore in the making of bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, when ‘this deep seated reluctance on the part of Hindu leaders to accept the separate existence of Pakistan had been a principal factor in hindering conflicts between India and Pakistan.'
Similarly, in his analysis of the dynamics at play in the Indian and Pakistani relationship, Duncan McLeod argued, ‘India and Pakistan was founded on two very different ideological and theological foundations.

India, a constituted secular state whereby religion would play no part in the body politic; Pakistan founded as a Muslim state, a home for the Muslims of South Asia who would have been subordinated by Hindu majoritarianism without the creation of Pakistan. The crux of these antagonisms has manifested itself in a conflict of self and other with both states questioning the permitted of the other.

In McLeod’s argument, therefore, the ideological differences between the two states caused their relationship and responsible for the nature of tension between India and Pakistan. Such an assessment, is, however necessary to pull apart.

The nature of the bilateral relationship, as well as the extent of cooperation that does take place within it, is often carried out regardless of the ideology of the government in power.

Moreover, the mechanisms for cooperation which does exist in the relationship sprang from an imperative that was deeply seated in the logic of both nation states. In order to carve out an independent and viable existence, it was necessary for the two to come to agreements on the fallouts from partition.

A closer scrutiny of the India and Pakistani relationship shows that there was nothing particularly ‘emotional’ or irrational about the choices made by both governments in handled their bilateral relationship.

In fact, decision-making on bilateral relations was, as this thesis will show, a more pragmatic process on both sides. Moreover, a mechanism towards a peaceful coexistence was also built into the India Pakistan relationship from the beginning.

The progressive of this period is littered with events which suggest that the relationship was not necessarily inevitably predisposed towards conflict, and that the leadership of both sides often, and carefully considered avenues that could enable a stable coexistence.

---
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In the period that followed the partition, it will be demonstrated that both governments actively try to find out means by which lingering uncertainties over the process of partition could be settled.

Both governments quickly recognized that the process of separation needed to be speedy, and as complete, as possible. This mutual aim led to cooperation between the two governments on a variety of levels.

A great deal of inter-governmental dialogue was thus carried out over the logistics of implementing and finalising the partition, such as such as the ways in which the two governments could handle inter-dominion migration, control over the ownership of evacuated property, and the means by which inter-dominion trade should be carried out.

In fact, the leadership on both sides, rather than seeking revenged from the other was also looking for means to give closure to the process of partition, and fashion states which that were self-contained, and completely independent of each other.

All this meant that the governments of both country, even in the midst of serious potentialities for war, worked out between them a fairly substantial extent of cooperation, negotiation and exchanged.

Underneath the causes of conflict in the bilateral relationship, therefore, there also underlay a strong basis for agreement of the need to in fact uphold the fact of the partition as completely as possible.

Such cooperation was, moreover, critical in established the jurisdiction of both new nation states. It was undertaken in order for both to disentangle themselves from one another, and to be able to assert the finality of their separation.

While it was in fact impossible for either to completely sever the many linkages between the two dominions, such as inter-dominion trading, and the questions about claiming compensation for evacuate property, what both did was to insert the infrastructure of their separate state apparatus in areas where the clarity of the division could be questioned.
The infrastructure for such cooperation, moreover, remained in place even when tensions between the two countries were at their highest, since it was in fact impossible for either to withdraw these from the bilateral framework.

The India and Pakistan relationship thus is more complex than a series of violent conflicts, and in order to understand a completed understanding of its nature, it is important to examine the nature of cooperation between them.

**THE BRITISH EMPIRES DIVISIVE POLICIES**

The British Empires divisive policies, which was aimed at creating a rift between Hindus and Muslims in order to dilute any potential cohesive opposing force, began in a large scale in the early 1900s, it started to fear the perceived growing strength of the Hindu nationalist movement.

In order to counterbalance this perceived threat, the colonialist British government began to actively support Muslim league, a political entity spearheaded by Mohammad Ali Jinnah that aimed to represent sub-continent Muslim interests.

The British pitted these two groups against one another, and eventually the Muslim league was forced to demand the creation of a separate state, to be called Pakistan, because it felt its interests would not be represented in a Hindu majority India.

Jinnah’s efforts to promote Hindu Muslim unity reached a climax. After Nehru’s report was published in 1928, which faced criticism and certain amendments were proposed, when these were rejected.

Jinnah finally decided to part away with congress.It was 1906 Muslim league was founded in Dacca to protect the interests of Muslims. The objectives of league was to secure the rights and privileges of the Muslims. “It was on these grounds that M.A. Jinnah rejected the Nehru report of 1928 which in-turn had rejected a separate Muslim electorate and any claim for increased representation.

---

19 Nehru’s report was published in 1928
In 1940 it had passed a resolution aimed at independence from both British rule and also Hindu majority dominance of India. It considered the Muslims of India to be not a minority, but in fact a “nation within a nation”. After 1940 the league stuck to its demand of a separated state throughout the negotiations under the August offered, Cripps proposals, Simla conference and cabinet mission plan.

Muslim league under Jinnah’s leadership succeeded in getting its terms accepted and Pakistan was formed. Demand for a separate state for the Indian Muslims was first proposed by Sir Dr Mohammad Iqbal, the poet philosopher.

In his presidential address at annual session of all India Muslim league in 1930, at Allahabad a city in the heart land of Hindu India. The demand for separate state for Muslims was further crystallized on the basis of “two nation theory” which was elaborated into a political doctrine by Mohammad Ali Jinnah.

Jinnah declared that Hindus and Muslims were two nations by any definition or test of nation. Pakistan was claimed as homeland for Indian Muslims on the principal of the right of self-determination. But the idea of separated Muslim state was totally hateful and revolting to the congress leaders, for whom unity of India was Article of faith.

Thus began the bitterness, conflicts between the two communities. For Muslims it was struggled for survival, for the Hindu it was to avoid vivisection of motherland.

When British government decided to grant self rule to India in 1946. The two communities was engaged in a bitter struggled involved violence and communal disturbance on a vast scale.

The all India congress party was forceful opposed to partition, so much so that Mahatma Gandhi had vowed that Partition could be brought about only on his dead body. Mahatma Gandhi Joined the Indian political activity in 1920, and converted the congress into a mass movement.

The non-cooperation movement, the civil disobedience movement and Quiet India movement launched by him got active support of people on large scale.
The British saw in Lord Mountbatten and his family, the potential to influenced the congress through Pt. Nehru to accept partition, both Lord Mountbatten and Lady Mountbatten worked day and night, and ultimately they succeeded in enticing Nehru to their scheme.

The two major communities in the Indians sub-continent had lived peacefully for centuries prior to the arrival of British and any political matter could have been resolved through negotiation and implementation of the constitution and an independent and strong Judiciary, which could protect the rights of Muslims, Hindus and other communities.

The divide and rule policy manifested itself in the form of the two nation theory. Which as stated and espoused that Muslims and Hindus needed two separate sovereign home land The two nation theory would not have been allowed to propagate, if British rulers were not supporting it behind the scenes.

On 3rd June Lord Mountbatten announced the plan of partition, which was accepted by Muslim league, the congress and the Sikhs.

On the basis of Mountbatten plan, the Indian independence bill was introduced in the British parliament on 4, July 1947. The bill was passed into law on 18 July. The Indian independence Act provided for the establishment of the dominions of India and Pakistan. The British government divested itself of all authority over the dominions with effect from 15 August 1947.

**THE RISE OF KASHMIR SECESSIONISM IN INDIA:**

While the past 1947 political history of Kashmir was at the times turbulent and a separate ethno-national consciousness among the Kashmir Muslims remained constantly strong, it was only in the 1980s that widespread frustration among the Kashmiri Muslims against some of their own leaders and the policies pursued by New Delhi erupted into a full blown secessionist movement against India.

The catalytic event had been the 1987 elections when newly formed but un-popular coalition between Indian congress and states ruling national conference party rigged the assembly elections and deprived the dissident groups of representation in the new legislature.
Then during 1988 several separatist leaders crossed the border to Pakistan controlled Azad Kashmir received training and weapons.

And returned to valley ready for political rebel. division prepared in the valley with the increased incidents of communal violence leading to flight of Hindu Kashmiri pundits from the valley to Jammu region and very soon the revolutionary movement, spearheaded by the aforesaid pro-Pakistani Muslims, fundamental organisations, engulfed.

The entire valley the government of India petition the Jammu and Kashmir disturbed area act and Armed forced special power act (AFSPA). To deal with secessionist forces, tension between India and Pakistan become so intense that in may 1990 the Pakistan headed by General Mizra Aslam Beg was willing to use nuclear weapon to “take out new Delhi” it was president Bush’s National security Advisor Robert gates and assistant secretary for middle eastern and southern Asian affairs who reported helped arrested a deadly encounter between them by visited India and Pakistan. The two countries however increased their exchanged of cross border firing Line of Control.

Since the partition of British India into India and Pakistan in 1947, the Kashmir dispute between them has become intractable one. They fought three wars over it in 1947, 1965, 1999, but have not resolved it.

The India and Pakistan like Israelis and Palestinians make claimed to the same territory Instead of the peace and progressed which the both countries expected.

The year since independence had been brought warfare vituperation frustration and fear. Instead of devoting all their resources to economic development both countries had been spent millions of rupees on defence against each other.

The root causes of trouble lies for backed in history, present day India and Pakistan tension was a prolongation of Hindu Muslim feelings that characterised India long before Independence and partition.

When the British government in 1892, introduced in a early way the principle of election and representative institution. The Muslim expressed their apprehension of being dominated by a majority with whom they differed in every sphere of life.
The Muslim leaders of period, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan warned the Muslims against the danger of majority rule in India dispute that the larger community would totally over ride the interests of smaller community.

The Muslim majority in undivided India itself to be in continued danger of domination by a one sided majority. Instead of resolved political issue, the partition of India in 1947 left behind a legacy of hostility in the region. Present day circumstances offer a clear proved that partition was not successful.

The concept of partition was touted as a means of bringing security and property to the region. However today’s circumstances reveal quite adverse. Broadly speak four factors could be considered for the growth of Muslim separatism which later took the form of “two nation theory”.

First the British policy of divide and rule, second the emergence of Muslim middle class. Third the growth of communal sentiments, fourth the mistakes committed by the Indian national congress.

THE WAR BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN
The India and Pakistani War of 1965 was a critical mass of battle that took place between April 1965 and September 1965 between India and Pakistan. This conflict became known as the Second Kashmir War fought by India and Pakistan over the disputed region of Kashmir, the first having been fought in 1947.

The war began followed the failure of Pakistan's Operation Gibraltar, which was designed to invade forces into Jammu and Kashmir to precipitate an insurgency against rule by India.

The five-week war caused thousands of casualties on both sides. It ended in a United Nations (UN) mandated ceasefire and the subsequent issuance of the Tashkent Declaration.

Much of the war was fought by the countries’ land forced in Kashmir and along the International Border between India and Pakistan.
This war saw the largest aggregate of troops in Kashmir since the Partition of India in 1947, a number that was overshadowed only during the 2001-2002 military stands off between India and Pakistan.

Most of the battles were fought by opposing infantry and armored units, with substantial backing from air forces. Many details of this war, like those of other India and Pakistan Wars, remained unclear and many media reports had been riddled with media biases.

**PRE-WAR ACCELERATION**

Since Partition of India in 1947, Pakistan and India remained in arguments over several issues. Although the Kashmir conflict was the predominant issue divided the nations, other border disputes existed, most notably over the Rann of Kutch, a barren region in the Indian state of Gujarat.

When Junagadh, a former princely state, had been combined into India, its borders, especially in the marshlands to the west, remained ambiguous.

On March 20, 1965, and again in April 1965, fights broke out between India and Pakistan in the Rann of Kutch. Initially involved border police from both nations, the disputed area soon witnessed alternated conflict between the countries' armed forces.

In June 1965, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson successfully persuaded both countries to end hostilities and set up a tribunal to resolved the disputes.

The verdict, which came later in 1968, saw Pakistan awarded 350 square miles (900 km²) of the Rann of Kutch, as against its original claim of 3500 square miles.

After its success in the Rann of Kutch, Pakistan, under the leadership of General AyubKhan, believed the Indian Army had been unable to defend itself against a quick military campaign in the disputed territory of Kashmir as the Indian military had suffered a loss to China in 1962.

Pakistan believed that the population of Kashmir was generally discontented with Indian rule and that a resistance movement could be ignited by a few work into underground.
Pakistan attempted to ignite the battle movement by means of a covert infiltration, codenamed Operation Gibraltar. The Pakistani mole was soon discovered, their presence reported by local Kashmir’s, and the operation ended in a complete failure.

Pakistan claimed to have been concerned by attempts of India to absorb Kashmir - a state internationally recognised as "disputed", into the Indian Union. The basis for this claim was Articles 356 and 357 of the Indian constitution that allow the President of India to declared President's Rule in the disputed state.

**INDO-PAK WAR OF 1947**

This is also called the First Kashmir War. The war started in October 1947 when it was feared by the Pakistan that Maharajah of the princely state of Kashmir and Jammu princely State of might accepted to India as choice was given to him on the matter to accede to any of the newly independent nations.

Tribal forces from Pakistan attacked and occupied the princely state, resulted in Maharajah signing the agreement to the accession of the princely state to India.

The United Nations was invited by India to mediate the quarrel resulting in the United Nation Security Council passedResolution 47on 21 April 1948.

The war ended in December 1948 with the line of Control dividing Kashmir into territories administered by Pakistan (northern and western areas) and India (Southern, central and northeastern areas).

**INDO-PAK WAR OF 1965**

This war started followed Pakistan's operation Gibraltar, which was designed to infiltrate forces into Jammu and Kashmir to precipitated an insurgency against rule by India. India retaliated by launched an attacked on Pakistan.

The five-week war caused thousands of casualties on both sides and was witness to the largest tank battle in military history since World War II. The outcome of this war was a strategic stalemate with some small tactical victories for both sides.
The war concluded after diplomatic intervention by the Soviet Union and USA and the subsequent issuance of theTashkent Declaration.

**INDO – PAK WAR OF 1971**

The war was unique in that it did not involved the issues of Kashmir, but was rather precipitated by the changed created by the political battle between Sheikh Mujib, Leader of East Pakistan and Yahya-Bhutto, leaders of West Pakistan brewing in erstwhile East Pakistan culminating to the declaration of Independence of Bangladesh from the state system of Pakistan.

Followed Operation searchlight and the 1971 Bangladesh atrocities, about 10 million Bengalis in East Pakistan took refugees in neighbouring India. India intervened in the ongoing Bangladesh liberation movement.

After a large scale strike by Pakistan, full-scale hostilities between the two countries commenced. Within two weeks of intense fought, Pakistani forces in East Pakistansurrendered to the joint command of India and Bangladesh forces followed which the people’s republic of Bangladesh was created.

This war saw the highest number of mortality in any of the India-Pakistan conflicts, as well as the largest number of prisoners of war since the Second World War after the surrender of more than 90,000 Pakistani military and civilians.

**KARGIL WAR 1999**

Commonly known as Kargil war, this conflict between the two countries was mostly limited. Pakistani troops along with Kashmiri revolutionary invade across the line of Control and occupied Indian Territory mostly in the Kargil district.

The Pakistani government believed that its nuclear weapon would deter a full-scale escalation in conflict but India launched a major military campaign to flush out the infiltrators.

Due to Indian military advances and increased foreign diplomatic pressure, Pakistan was forced to withdraw its forces back across the Line of Control.
REFUGEE TREATY BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN:

20The following points of agreements:

A. The Governments of India and Pakistan solemnly agree that each shall ensure, to the minorities throughout its territory, complete equality of citizenship, irrespective of religion, a full sense of security in respect of life, culture, property and personal honour, freedom of movement within each country and freedom of occupation, speech and worship, subject to law and morality.

Members of the minorities shall have equal opportunity with members of the majority community to participate in the public life of their country, to hold political or other office, and to serve in their country's civil and armed forces.

Both Governments declare these rights to be fundamental and undertake to enforce them effectively. The Prime Minister of India has drawn attention to the fact that these rights are guaranteed to all minorities in India by its Constitution. The Prime Minister of Pakistan has pointed out that similar provision exists in the Objectives Resolution adopted by the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan. It is the policy of both Governments that the enjoyment of these democratic rights shall be assured to all their nationals without distinction. Both Governments wish to emphasise that the allegiance and loyalty of the minorities is to the State of which they are citizens, and that it is to the Government of their own State that they should look for the redress of their grievances.

B. In respect of migrants from East Bengal, West Bengal, Assam and Tripura, where communal disturbances have recently occurred, it is agreed between the two Governments:

(i) That there shall be freedom of movement and protection in transit;

(ii) That there shall be freedom to remove as much of his moveable personal effects and household goods as migrant may wish to take with him. Moveable property shall include
personal jewellery. The maximum cash allowed to each adult migrant will be Rs. 150 and to each migrant child Rs. 75;

(iii) That a migrant may deposit such of his personal jewellery or cash as he does not wish to take with him with a bank. A proper receipt shall be furnished to him by the bank for cash or jewellery thus deposited and facilities shall be provided, as and when required for their transfer to him, subject as regards cash to the exchange regulations of the Government concerned;

(iv) That there shall be no harassment by the Customs authorities. At each customs post agreed upon by the Governments concerned, liaison officers of the other Government shall be posted to ensure this in practice;

(v) Rights of ownership in or occupancy of the immoveable property of a migrant shall not be disturbed. If, during his absence, such property is occupied by another person, it shall be returned to him provided that he comes back by the 31st December, 1950. Where the migrant was a cultivating owner or tenant, the land shall be restored to him provided that he returns not later than the 31st December, 1950. In exceptional cases, if a Government considers that a migrant's immoveable property cannot be returned to him, the matter shall be referred to the appropriate Minority Commission for advice. Where restoration of immoveable property to the migrant who returns within the specified period is found not possible, the Government concerned shall take steps to rehabilitate him.

(vi) That in the case of a migrant who decides not to return, ownership of all his immoveable property shall continue to vest in him and he shall have unrestricted right to dispose of it by sale, by exchange with an evacuee in the other country, or otherwise. A committee consisting of three representatives of minority and presided over by a representative of Government shall act as trustees of the owner. The Committee shall be empowered to recover rent for such immoveable property according to law. The Governments of East Bengal, West Bengal, Assam and Tripura shall enact the necessary legislation to set up these Committees. The Provincial or State Government, as the case may be, will instruct the District or other appropriate authority to give all possible assistance for the discharge of the Committee's functions. The Provisions of this sub-paragraph shall also apply to migrants who may have left East Bengal for any part of India, or West Bengal, Assam or Tripura for any part of Pakistan, prior to the recent disturbances but after
the 15th August, 1947. The arrangement in this sub-paragraph will apply also to migrants who have left Bihar for East Bengal owing to communal disturbances or fear thereof.

C. As regards the Province of East Bengal and each of the States of West Bengal, Assam and Tripura respectively the two Governments further agree that they shall:

(1) Continue their efforts to restore normal conditions and shall take suitable measures to prevent recurrence of disorder.

(2) Punish all those who are found guilty of offences against persons and property and of other criminal offences. In view of their deterrent effect, collective fines shall be imposed, where necessary. Special Courts will, where necessary, be appointed to ensure that wrong doers are promptly punished.

(3) Make every possible effort to recover looted property.

(4) Set up immediately an agency, with which representatives of the minority shall be associated, to assist in the recovery of abducted women. 53 NOT recognise forced conversions. Any conversion effected during a period of communal disturbance shall be deemed to be forced conversion. Those found guilty of converting people forcibly shall be punished.

(6) Set up a Commission of Enquiry at once to enquire into and report on the causes and extent of the recent disturbances and to make recommendations with a view to preventing recrudescence of similar trouble in future. The personnel of the Commission, which shall be presided over by a Judge of the High Court, shall be such as to inspire confidence among the minority.

(7) Take prompt and effective steps to prevent the dissemination of news and mischievous opinion calculated to rouse communal passion by press or radio or by any individual or organisation. Those guilty of such activity shall be rigorously dealt with.

(8) Not permit propaganda in either country directed against the territorial integrity of the other or purporting to incite war between them and shall take prompt and effective action against any individual or organisation guilty of such propaganda.
D. Sub-paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (7) and (8) of C of the Agreement are of General scope and applicable according to exigency to any part of India or Pakistan.

E. In order to help restore confidence, so that refugees may return to their homes, the two Governments have decided

(i) To depute two Ministers, one from each Government, to remain in the affected areas for such period as may be necessary;

(ii) to include in the Cabinets of East Bengal, West Bengal and Assam a representative of the minority community. In Assam the minority community is already represented in the Cabinet. Appointments to the Cabinets of East Bengal and West Bengal shall be made immediately.

F. In order to assist in the implementation of this Agreement, the two Governments have decided, apart from the deputation of their Ministers referred to in E, to set up Minority Commissions, one for East Bengal, one for West Bengal and one for Assam. These Commissions will be constituted and will have the functions described below:

(i) Each Commission will consist of one Minister of the Provincial or State Government concerned, who will be Chairman, and one representative each of the majority and minority communities from East Bengal, West Bengal and Assam, chosen by and from among their respective representatives in the Provincial or State Legislatures, as the case may be.

(ii) The two Ministers of the Governments of India and Pakistan may attend and participate in any meeting of any Commission. A Minority Commission or any two Minority Commissions jointly shall meet when so required by either Central Minister for the satisfactory implementation of this Agreement.

(iii) Each Commission shall appoint such staff as it deems necessary for the proper discharge of its functions and shall determine its own procedure.

(iv) Each Commission shall maintain contact with the minorities in Districts and small administrative headquarters through Minority Boards formed in accordance with the Inter-Dominion Agreement of December, 1948.
(v) The Minority Commissions in East Bengal and West Bengal shall replace the Provincial Minorities Boards set up under the Inter-Dominion Agreement of December, 1948.

(vi) The two Ministers of the Central Governments will from time to time consult such persons or organisations as they may consider necessary.

(vii) The functions of the Minority Commission shall be:

(a) to observe and to report on the implementation of this Agreement and, for this purpose, to take cognizance of breaches or neglect;

(b) to advise an action to be taken on their recommendations.

(viii) Each Commission shall submit reports, as and when necessary, to the Provincial and State Governments concerned. Copies of such reports will be submitted simultaneously to the two Central Ministers during the period referred to in E.

(ix) The Governments of India and Pakistan and the State and Provincial Governments will normally give effect to recommendations that concern them when such recommendations are supported by both the Central Ministers. In the event of disagreement between the two Central Ministers, the matter shall be referred to the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan who shall either resolves it themselves or determines the agency and procedure by which it will be resolved.

(x) In respect of Tripura, the two Central Ministers shall constitute a Commission and shall discharge the functions that are assigned under the Agreement to the Minority Commissions for East Bengal, West Bengal and Assam. Before the expiration of the period referred to in E, the two Central Ministers shall make recommendations for the establishment in Tripura of appropriate machinery to discharge the functions of the Minority Commissions envisaged in respect of East Bengal, West Bengal and Assam.

G. Except where modified by this Agreement, the Inter-Dominion Agreement of December, 1948 shall remain in force.