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Political History of Jammu and Kashmir
Political History of Jammu and Kashmir

Jammu and Kashmir well-known as Kashmir and also the ‘Paradise on earth’ was the largest among the princely states until the partition. The state was under the Muslim rule from 1400 to 1819 when Maharaja Ranjit Singh, the ruler of the Sikh state of Punjab, took it over from the Afghans. The state of Jammu and Kashmir in its present form came into being on March 16, 1846 when the British handed over the state to Maharaja Gulab Singh by means of a treaty which is historically known as the Treaty of Amritsar. Before this treaty, the state had three broad regions namely Kashmir Valley, Jammu and Ladakh which were governed separately by different rulers. But after signing the Treaty of Amritsar, the territories of Jammu and Kashmir, which formed part of the Sikh State were separated from it. The provinces of Kashmir and Gilgit were handed over to Gulab Sing, a feudatory of Sikhs, for a cash payment of 75 Lakhs of rupees by the British, which marked the foundation of the Dogra Rule in the state. The Muslim subjects who formed the bulk of the population bore the heaviest brunt of the Dogra exploitative autocracy. The general uprising of the Muslim subjects against the Dogras in 1931 was the culmination of a number of early political struggles and trends towards social reforms, which took the shape of the freedom movement and was actually a struggle against the oppressive rule of the Dogras.

During the period of Dogras, the people of the state suffered miserably. No doubt the British gave the state a semblance of peace to some extent ameliorated the conditions of the people but actually the policies at best helped ‘the upper classes of Hindus in particular’. There was no change in the economic condition of the masses. ‘The reasons for the economic backwardness of the masses were due to very character of the state, its institution of the Jagirdari system and the system of revenue,
taxation and above all a corrupt administration'. The feudal character of the state was evident in the claim of its ruler that 'all lands in Kashmir belong to him'.

The Maharaja was, thus, the biggest Jagirdar at the apex of the chain of Jagirdars subordinate to him. Most of the state was divided into a number of Jagirs (estates) and these estates were granted by the Maharaja to the members of the royal family, to their relatives, to the persons who belonged to the same caste and religion and to those persons who had proved by service or otherwise, their loyalty to the ruler as well as his throne. The Maharaja also enjoyed unquestioned authority to deprive any person from the estate granted to him.

The population of Kashmir suffered a lot at the hands of these Jagirdars. Jammu and Kashmir is an agricultural state and more than 80% of the people lived in Villages. Farming was the backbone of economy. Defective revenue system accompanied by corrupt officialdom, exploitation of the cultivators by the Jagirdars crippled the peasants economically. The Jagirdar was practically the master of his estate. The peasant was nothing more than a slave. The Jagirdar was 'the judge, the administrator and the police'. Within his estate, he had un-limited power of collecting revenue in his Jagir through men or servants employed by him for the purpose. Below the Jagirdars were Chakdars who used to be temporary land-lords. The chakdar like the Jagirdar was equally harsh with the cultivator. 'He was entitled to one-half of the produce of his chak'. Apart from cultivation they also rendered other services to the Jagirdars, for which they were never paid. Under the system of Jagirdari, the peasants were virtually reduced to the state of serfs, which is the sine quanon of a feudal state.

The most notable feature of this agrarian state was the unsound system of land revenue. This system was run by officials whose corrupt
practices had not only brought the peasants moral degeneration but it also had a ‘more momentous effect on the character and development of people than it had in any other native state’, of the Indian sub-continent. Almost the entire land revenue establishment in the province consisted of the Pandits to the general and to the ‘Musalmans of Kashmir’ in particular. The first fifty years of the Dogra Rule was responsible for disseminating in the minds of its subjects the seeds of resentment against its very existence.

In 1880’s the state resolved to realize the land revenue through the revenue officials. But the worst part of this was that the officials exploited the system more in their own interests than in the interests of the state. The revenue was collected with such severity and harshness that the cultivators had to sell off even their cattle and house-hold articles. Most of the cultivators were not in a position to pay the revenue and they were forced to leave their homes under fear of severe penalty. They migrated to other villages where they worked as farm labourers with some privileged landholders. This system was soon found un-successful and it was replaced by a new device known as ‘Izad Boli’. Under this system, the village land began to be auctioned to the highest bidder. The contractors at the convenience of the revenue officials exploited the cultivator in the name of collection of revenue, adding to their miseries. Apart from the revenue of the produce, the peasants were also subjected to the payment of various other kinds of taxes.

The low salaries of the revenue officials often compelled them to join hands with the contractors. The Tehsildar (a revenue officer) for instance, was paid a salary of thirty rupees a month which was hardly sufficient to meet his ends. He also used to keep his relatives and friends with him known as mudabir (men of trust and confidence) and to whom he assigned the duties of his office. Even the Tehsil police, lived on the forced hospitability of the villagers as they were exempted from the State tax. The villagers were also subjected to physical torture. The Muslim cultivators
who formed the majority were the worst sufferers. The deteriorating economic conditions had virtually reduced the villagers to pauperism. More than 80% of the people living in villagers were under debt.

The forced labour was the most pernicious method of exploitation and oppression which breaks the heart of the cultivators. The beggary was at vague and its main cause was the lack of avenues of employment for the poor, oppressed and the labour class. The system of beggary was an insult to humanity and degradation to society economically. The absence of the peasants from their fields lowered the agricultural productivity which resulted in heavy losses to the state. The villagers were forced by the officials for their services in building their houses in the cities or in cultivating their waste lands without wages. The industrial labour such as shawl bafs (Shawl Weavers) working as labourers and artisans in the silk factory, carpet weavers, paper machie workers, wood carvers, gabba makers were also affected badly during the Dogra regime. The monthly income of a shawl baf for example, did not exceed seven or eight rupees and out of these, they had to pay five rupees as tax, which usually left him with three rupees, or so to live on. The worst part of it was that they could not change their profession for improving their economic conditions because shawl baf was not permitted to change his profession because of the fear on part of the government that ‘it would reduce the Maharja’s revenue’. The shawl weaver therefore was forced to remain economically backward and subservient. Same was the case with the people involved in silk industry. By 1921, the factory had, over fifty thousands rears of silk worms in the villages and five thousand labourers were engaged in the factories in Srinagar. Their plight was equally pitiable.
DISCRIMINATION UNDER THE DOGRAS

In Education

Politically suppressed and economically exploited, the Muslims of the Jammu and Kashmir state also suffered from educational backwardness. The main cause of their educational backwardness was their poverty. In addition to their own ignorance, the conservative outlook of their religious leaders, the un-sympathetic attitude of non-muslims towards the Muslim students in the schools and the discriminatory policies of the Dogra government, have contributed to the plight of Muslims. The rot lies at the root, poverty which was ‘not an excuse but a real impediment’. Generally speaking the Muslims were not given adequate educational opportunities in the schools and colleges.

The anti-Muslim attitude of the Dogra Raj further added to their miseries. In 1909, Maharaja Pratap Singh had directed his Education Minister to draw up a scheme for making primary education free and compulsory throughout the state, but the Minister was reluctant to do so on the plea that it would be looked upon as an act of tyranny. He also pleaded that if the wage earning children of Muslim parents were interfered with, the parents would take it otherwise the benefits of the policy would not be understood by the people, etc., hence, the programme was dropped. The Muslim subjects thus came to realize that nothing could save them but their own efforts. They start their own efforts in this regard but their pleas and petitions went unheaded, thus they began to contact the influential Muslims outside the state to brief them about their despicable conditions. As a result, the all-India Mohammedan conference sent in 1913, a deputation headed by Sahibzada Aftab Ahmad Khan. The deputation presented a memorandum to the Maharaja, ‘requesting him to provide his Muslim subjects facilities for education’. Two years later, the government sent their own Education
Commissioner, Sharp, 'to investigate and advise the Durbar on educational arrangements in the state', who on the basis of his survey admitted that the Muslims of Kashmir had been suffering from educational disabilities and that the need of the hour was to improve their conditions. He recommended an increase in the number of primary schools so that each village with a population of 500 or more have at least one school, provide training to the students in Government schools in such arts as calligraphy, accountancy etc., increase in the number of Arabic teachers by at least one hundred, provide staff to the village schools, as far as possible with teachers from the majority population, provide training to the sons of artisans in works of their respective professions. He also recommended a special scholarship for Muslim students as well as Muslim teachers to further pursue their studies.

Most of these recommendations were accepted by His Highness but were lightly treated by his Ministers and instructions issued by him were seldom followed by those in charge of education department - who were invariably (non - Muslims) 'non-Kashmiris'.

IN ADMINISTRATION

From the very beginning of their rule, the Dogra Maharaja had adopted a well calculated policy of keeping the Kashmiris out of the Government jobs. The administration was manned with personnel from outside the state who used to be mostly Punjabis. Also as compared to Kashmiri Pandits, the Muslim subjects share was next to nothing. The exclusion of Kashmiris from the military services was another feature of the policy of discrimination followed by the Dogra rulers. So, the question of Kashmiris in government services was also raised, time and again. There were many Muslims who had passed the First Arts as early as 1909 and the B.A. as early as 1915. By 1925, there were sizeable number of Muslim graduates, F.A’s and matriculates in Kashmir. Almost 100 young Muslims
were educated in Urdu and Persian. Yet between 1910 and 1930 the Muslim representation in the state service did not exceed 15% both in gazetted and non-gazetted ranks. An appalling discrimination against Muslims was evident in the Medical Department. In fact non-Muslims predominated as cooks, compoundars and khidmatgars. The relative strength of Hindus and Muslims in the posts is clear from the following table.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Non-Muslims</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Khidmatgar 12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cooks 9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Compoundars 4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar was the case with other Departments such as Forest, Agriculture etc. Kashmiris held many distinguished positions in the British Indian Army but in their own state, they were debarred.

Ban on Political Freedom

The political freedom, press, platform and forming of associations, was totally banned in the state during the first eight decades of the Dogra rule. In the absence of freedom of press and platform, there was hardly any public option. As far the press, “it is practically non-existent with the result that the government is not benefited to the extent that it should be by the impact of healthy criticism”. The situation was so worse that “no meeting could be held in a public place without the permission of the District Magistrate”. And, “no new Sabha or society or association shall be formed within the state without the permission of his Highness”. Thus, the nature
and character of the political system under the Dogra rulers as explained above implied that it was despotic and tyrannical in which the rulers ruled their helpless subjects, especially Muslims, with cruelty and callousness.\textsuperscript{32}

**Religious Disputes**

Disputes over religious places were frequently repeated in the Dogra regime. Apparently the relations between the Hindus and Muslims were very cordial and peaceful. But in fact, there was a deep wave of suspicion, hostility and bitterness running at the bottom of their social relations. These disputes goes back to 1893, when a dispute between the two communities arose over a bathing place and claims and counter claims of each community over certain religious places. There was also a dispute between the two communities over a piece of land known as the Hari Masjid. It happened on 10\textsuperscript{th} of May in 1916 when a foundation stone was laid for the construction of Jamia Masjid in Srinagar. While the construction of this Muslim religious place was in progress, the Kashmiri pandits claimed that the land of the Hari Masjid belonged to them and that they wanted to construct a temple there. A similar dispute over a piece of land between the two communities was reported in 1924, some 64 Kilometers away from Srinagar at Nagbal in Islamabad (Anantnag). The Pandits wanted to construct a temple on a piece of land just opposite a Mosque at Nagbal. The Muslims raised an objection on the grounds that the land belonged to the Mosque. There was a similar dispute over the Khankah Shrine, Srinagar on August 24, 1924.

Thus, there was unrest on almost all fronts. The Dogra rule was marked by injustice, exploitation and oppression. The Muslims were its worst victims. The travesty was that the privileged class of Hindus, especially the Dogra Rajputs, Kashmiri Pandits and Punjabi Hindus got the maximum benefits from the Dogra princes. In fact, majority of the higher posts were held by the Dogra Rajputs themselves. The Muslims, despite
their numerical preponderance, were kept consciously out of power patronage and remained alienated from the feudal regime. There was a negligible proportion of Muslims in the government services in the year 1930 and 1931 as indicated below.

Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total No. of Officials in number</th>
<th>Non-Muslims in number</th>
<th>Muslims in number</th>
<th>Muslims %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educations</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure police:</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From I.G.P. to Sub-inspectors</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constabulary</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: G.H. Khan, op. cit., P. 120.

The freedom struggle

On account of its being a princely state, the freedom struggle in Jammu Kashmir remained focused against the Dogra regime. This movement became organized and intensified by the end of 1920's. The force behind the movement's spread was the neo-educated class of Muslim youth, who after completing their higher education at different places including Aligarh returned to the state and started mobilizing people against the feudal regime. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, had done his M.Sc. from Aligarh in 1930 but failed to get any suitable government post. This took the form of mass meetings followed by agitations against the Dogra (non-Muslim) rule.
The focus of their demands at the initial stages remained concentrated around matters of state employment and other such rights of the Muslim Community. The communal consciousness among the Muslims was basically created and reinforced by the structure and policy of the Dogra regime itself. In 1924, Earl Reading visited Kashmir on the invitation of Maharaja Pratap Singh. The Muslim delegation had a secret meeting with the viceroy and presented to him a memorandum of their grievances and demands. The important demands in the memorandum included expansion of educational facilities for the Muslims; reservation in state services; proprietary rights to the peasants; restoration of the Mosques lying under the control of the government; and abolition of forced labour. The viceroy instead of looking into the problems sent the memorandum to Maharaja, who got furious and, "confiscated the pensions and grants which most of the signatories to the memorandum received from the state and their activities were banned in the Kashmir". It further intensified the movement among the Muslims. Maharaja Pratap Singh died in 1925, and was succeeded by his Nephew Maharaja Hari Singh. Hari Singh after ascending the throne announced a number of concessions which infact benefited the landowners among them. The prevailing discontent among the bulk of the Muslim population remained unchanged. Adding fuel to the fire, in March 1931, a number of incidents like the desecration of certain Muslim scriptures and the demolition of Mosque in Jammu, further alienated the Muslims from the state. These incidents evoked wide spread responses from a number of Muslim organizations in the Punjab. A number of Kashmir committees sprang up all over India to help the Muslims to resist oppression in the state and central Kashmir Committee was constituted at Lahore to coordinate the work of different Kashmir committees and Muslim organizations. Realizing the gravity of the problem, the government appointed a committee to enquire into the causes of the incidents and invited a delegation of Muslims to present their grievances to Prime Minister. A Muslim delegation of seven
members including Sheikh Abdullah, a teacher in a government school, was constituted in Srinagar to present the Muslim grievances to the government.

In June 1931, a resident of the Frontier Province, Abdul Qadeer, who had come to Srinagar in the service of an English man was arrested and put on trial on charges of having delivered seditious speeches criticizing the Maharaja and the Dogra rule in Jammu and Kashmir. The situation witnessed the first violent agitation against the ruler. On 13th July 1931, mob of Muslims clashed with the Dogra troops in the premises of Srinagar Central Jail, where trial proceedings against Abdul Qadeer were being conducted. The troops opened fire as a result of which twenty-two demonstrators were killed. Since then 13th of July is celebrated as the ‘Martyrs Day’ in Jammu and Kashmir. As the news of the firing in jail spread, communal riots broke out in Srinagar and other parts of the province and the government imposed Martial law in the riot affected areas to bring the situation under control. Thus, Muslims “rose as one man” against the Dogra regime. But the Muslim agitation was suppressed with a heavy hand and outwardly peace was restored in the province. However, the imposed peace was short-lived and the Muslim agitation grew up once again in September, and engulfed the province of Jammu also. Troops were once again called to quell the disturbances. Maharaja Hari Singh commissioned Sir Barjir Dalal, the chief Justice of the State High Court, to conduct an enquiry into the cause which led to the firing in the Srinagar Jail. The Muslims boycotted the Commission of Enquiry and demanded the appointment of an English man or a Muslim to conduct the said enquiry. The Government of India lost no time to instruct the British President in the State to convey the ruler that their government was concerned with the developments in the State. The Government of India asked the resident to advise the ruler to seek the assistance of the Government of India in the appointment of a Commission of Enquiry or at best make a request for the
services of a Muslim High Court Judge from India, to join the Committee of Enquiry already appointed by him. The resident conveyed to Hari Singh the instructions of the Government of India.

Hari Singh sent a long dispatch to the viceroy in which he explained the genesis of the entire crisis and assured him that the situation in the State was well under control. Hari Singh politely refused to accept the suggestions of the Government of India. Meanwhile, Maharaja Hari Singh dismissed his Prime Minister, G.E.C. Wakefield and Raja Hari Krishan Koul, a Kashmiri Brahman, domiciled outside the State was appointed as the Prime Minister of the State. Shortly, after assuming office, the new P.M. opened negotiations with the Muslim leaders. An agreement was signed which stipulated the suspension of the agitation and release of political detainees and prisoners. The agreement also stipulated that the Muslim grievances would be considered after the enquiry into the disturbances.

A section of the Muslim leadership disapproved of the agreement and termed it as a betrayal of the Muslim cause. On September 21, disturbances broke out once again in the Kashmir province. Troops were once again called out to put down the disturbances in Sopore, Baramulla, Shopian and Islamabad (Anantnag) major townships of the Kashmir province, the troops opened fire on the Muslim demonstrators and a number of them were killed.\(^{40}\) On 28th Sept. a week after the Muslim agitation had restarted, the Government of India issued a peremptory warning to the ruler asking him to take immediate steps to redress the grievances of the Muslims in the State and institute an enquiry headed by a British officer into the causes of the disturbances in the State. The Government of India also asked the ruler of the State to appoint a British officer, nominated by the Government of India, as his P.M.\(^{41}\)
Two more instances of interference with the religious affairs of the Muslims took place in Jammu in April 1931. On April 29, 1931, when the Muslims were busy in a prayer on the Eid, a sub-inspector, Babu Khem Chand tried to stop the Imam, Moulvi Atta-Ullah Shah Bukhari, from reading out the Khutba in which the Imam 'spoke of pharaoh as a cruel and tyrant king'. The sub-inspector warned the Imam that he should stop delivering a political speech. He told the Imam that only the Namaz was permitted. He forgot that the Khutba is also as important as Namaz. The sub-inspector's behaviour was taken as an affront. A protest was arranged by the Young Muslim Association, presided over by Mistry Hussain Baksh, Choudhary Gowher Rehman, the secretary of the Association, observed, that "the conditions under which the Muslims of Kashmir live were known to the entire world. Our political suppression and educational backwardness were responsible to ruin our lives. Our little left religious freedom is now being crushed. We remained silent when we saw the State ignoring our economic backwardness and poverty. We did not utter a single word when things lawful for us were made unlawful.... for God's sake, tell us, how long we shall be forced to remain mum. Muslims should now make every effort to live a life of peace and honour". Several resolutions were passed at the meeting. The Government was requested to punish the police officer for his gross misbehaviour. The copies of the resolution were sent to the Maharaja and other authorities of the state.

Another incident occurred the same day at Dgora in Samba Tehsil about 15 miles from Jammu over a water tank used by the Hindu - Brahmans and the Muslim weavers. In order to offer their Eid prayer, the Muslims began to draw water from the tank for performing the ablutions. The Brahmins tried to prevent the Muslims from using water. Soon, communal riots broke out in Mirpur (presently in Pakistan occupied Kashmir called as Azad Kashmir) and Poonch districts of the Jammu
province. This and other similar incidents prompted the young men of the Reading Party to prepare a draft of demands and presented them to the Maharaja. On June 18, 1931, Moulvi Mohammad Yousuf Shah (a well known Islamic scholar of Kashmir) sent a circular letter to the presidents and secretaries of different Anjumans, inviting them to attend a meeting to consider the draft of demands, which was prepared by the youngmen. On June 20, 1930, the meeting took place at the office of the Anjum-I-Nusratul-Ul-Islam and a draft of demands was unanimously approved. Five persons namely Ghulam Ahmad Ashai, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, Moulvi Mohammad Yousf Shah, Mriwaiz Hamadani and Syed Ghulam Hassan Shah were selected as the representatives of the Muslims of Kashmir in all public and political matters. To introduce the leaders to the public, the young-men of the Reading Room Party organized a public meeting at Khanqah-I-Mualla on June 21, 1931. Thirty thousand people attended the meeting. Ghulam Ahmad Ashai announced the names of the representatives to the people. The names of Saad-Ud-Din shawl and Munshi Shihab-Ud-Din were added to the list of the five already approved. The group reflected a blend of divergent views. On the same day and at the same place, the Governor of the State had to address the public. When he rose to deliver his speech, the people refused to listen to him. Instead they proceeded towards the Jamia Masjid where a public meeting was instantly organized. At this meeting Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah announced that in case he was arrested, Ghulam Nabi Gilkar would succeed him to lead the movement. An important feature of this formative period of freedom struggle in Kashmir was the task of the leaders to prepare the people for any kind of eventuality they might have to face in the future. To forge unity among the people was the main objective of the leaders at that time.

The scenario, in the state led to hostility between Hindus and Muslims. The open appeasement of Hindus by the state and the harrasment of
Muslims created a gulf between Hindus and Muslims on one hand and Muslims and the State on the other. It was against this backdrop that the Kashmir committee was formed on July 13, 1931 with a view to bring pressure upon Government of India to bestow basic human rights on the Kashmiris, to acquaint the ruler with the sordid affairs of his state, to impress upon the viceroy and the Foreign Department of the Government of India the need for an independent commission of inquiry in Kashmir affairs, to seek a new interpretation to the Treaty of Amritsar which had deprived the Kashmiris of their Property Rights in the State and to make the Kashmir affairs known to entire world through books, pamphlets, press etc.

The Kashmir Committee despite its best efforts failed to make adent in the State politics. The Maharaja was adamant as before to negotiate with the newly formed committee. The Kashmir Committee out of frustration celebrated the Kashmir Day on August 14, 1931, both within and outside the State, in Delhi and other places. The State responded by arresting Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah in September, which witnessed agitations all over the state. The police resorted to firing at a number of places, the worst being at the Jamia Masjid on September 22, where about twenty two thousand people assembled for a meeting. It resulted in many casualities. There were also incidents of violence from other parts of the State, which only augmented the revolutionary fervor of the people.

At last better sense was dawn on the Maharaja, who on October 5, 1931 granted general amnesty to all political prisoners and they were unconditionally released. This was the first victory of the masses. After the release of Sheikh Abdullah, he diverted his energies to the task of party organization. So in order to erect a mass-based political organization in the state for the conduct of freedom struggle in a well disciplined and orderly manner, the Sheikh founded, the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference in October 1932. A charter of demands made by the Muslim
leaders was presented to the Maharaja on October 19, 1931 in order to receive the honour of acceptance so that the Muslim subjects also may come out of their degraded position and attain a place of honour in their own country. The demands marked a new approach in the politics of the State. Huge public meeting was held on October 20, 1931 at Khanqua-I-Maulla and on October 26, 1931 the Central Standing Committee of the All India Kashmir Muslim Conference passed a resolution at its meetings held at the Barkat Ali Mohammad Hall, Lahore urging upon the Maharaja to accede to these demands without any delay as these demands reflect the feelings and aspirations of the majority of the subjects. The resolution also emphasized that the non-acceptance of the demands 'will be a source of constant disharmony, un-rest and dis-content.' Just after the presentation of demands, the political disturbances were reviewed and the leaders were arrested in January 1932. The Kashmir agitation started by the Majlis Ahrar of the Punjab assumed great dimensions in the beginning of 1932. With a view to bring pressure on 'the state government to remove the disabilities of the Muslims and accept their demands', the Ahrar's dispatched groups of volunteers to Kashmir to launch Satyagrah there. But in the meantime, the Ahrar leader, Maulvi Mazhar Ali, who had organized the Ahrar Jathas, was arrested and sentenced to two years imprisonment. Also the arrest of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah on January 25, 1932 worsened the situation, which resulted in replacement of Raja Hari Krishan Kaul by Lt. Col-Elliot James as P.M. in February 1932. A series of steps like the grant of freedom of press and platform, release of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, were taken to restore normalcy in the State. It was in such conditions that Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah laid the foundation of "All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim conference" on October 16, 1932 to spearhead an organized struggle against the Jammu-based Dogra ruler. Thus, the atmosphere was surcharged with communal feelings. Making political speeches from mosques had become a routine affair. The ragged and bare footed Muslims
used to be addressed by reciting verses from the Quran. The Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah himself often recited verses from the holy Quran. In one of his most successful initial speeches in 1931, while reciting verses, he promised to carry on the agitation till the desecrates of the Quran were punished and all the grievances of Muslims were removed in a satisfactory manner.\textsuperscript{53} Agitated over these developments, the Hindus launched protests and agitation all over the state. As a result, communal politics “reigned supreme both among the Muslim and the non-Muslim Communities”.\textsuperscript{53} The Hindu and Muslim groups had taken contradictory stands on major issues. When the Muslim organizations demand a “responsible government”, their Hindu counterparts apprehended that it was an effort to replace the Hindu Raj by the Muslim Rule. Some Kashmiri Pandits even went to the extent of suggesting to all minority groups in the state to unite and organize under an “All Jammu and Kashmir Hindu conference” for fighting their political and other demands separately.\textsuperscript{54} The Government instead of succumbing to these pressures dealt with the situation firmly and many Pandit leaders were arrested. On the other hand, the Muslims, despite the prima facie unity, failed to consolidate themselves into an organized and well-knit group. The mutual rivalries among them resulted in the break up of the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference with Mirwaiz Moulvi Mohammad Yousf Shah parting ways from the Sheikh as setting up of the “The Azad Muslim conference”.\textsuperscript{54} The Muslim Conference to make it more broad based, made an appeal to the Hindus and Sikhs to join it in its struggle against the oppressive policies of the State. It succeeded, to a large extent, in projecting the image of a secular organization. Encouraged by the response, the working committee of the Muslim Conference met in Srinagar in February, 1936 and adopted resolutions demanding establishment of responsible government, legislative assembly and abolishing of separate electorates and introduction of Universal Adult Franchise.\textsuperscript{55}
During 1934 Praja Sabha elections, sharp communal cleavages were witnessed between the Muslims and non-Muslims on the one hand and within the Muslims on the other. Within the Muslims, the behaviour of the two Muslim parties i.e., the “All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference” and the “Azad Muslim Conference” was so intensely communalized that the fight for votes became virtually a war between believers and non-believers or what has been termed as “war between Islam and Kafirs (infidels). Even the ballot box was religionized by the Azad Muslim Conference”. The Hindu voters were also mobilized on emotive considerations by various communal groups such as the “Sanatan Dharma Sabha” of the Kashmiri Pandits and the “Hindu Sikh Naujawan Sabha”, of Jammu Province. The resolutions adopted by the Muslim Conference during its meeting in February, 1936 also appealed to the ruler that the constitutional reforms introduced in 1934 had done considerable harm to the evolution of representative and responsible political institutions in the state and urged upon him to widen the scope of constitutional provisions envisaged by the constitutional Act of 1934 and introduce a substantial measure of responsibility in the state government. The working committee also took a decision to organize a demonstration on 8th May 1936 in support of establishment of responsible political institutions in the state. It was, however, made clear that the protest would not be against the Dogra Rule as such but for peaceful establishment of responsible government. The freedom movement in Kashmir got momentum with this. Soon some members of the legislative Assembly also joined the movement infavour of responsible government. The Government, however, did not respond and consequently on May 8, 1936, the Responsible Government Day was observed all over the state, at the call of the Muslim Conference.

The second anniversary of the Responsible Government Day was equally observed with the same enthusiasm on August 5, 1938 by organizing
demonstrations and protests and the government reacted by placing Srinagar under section-144 on August 26, 1938 by serving notices on Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, Sardar Badhu Singh, Moulana Syed Masoodi and Ghulam Mohammad Saddique requiring them to present themselves before the Additional District Magistrate on 29 August and to furnish securities of 1000 rupees each for keeping good behaviour. The leaders did not take cognizance of the notices and openly defied section-144 by organizing public meetings at Hazrat Bal and Azad Park on 28 and 29 August respectively. This resulted in the state vandalism in the form of indiscriminate arrests, raids and worst of all children’s books, the ornaments of women and even cooking utensils were sold to realize fines. The agitation lost for about one and a half month. During this period 975 persons were arrested out of whom 500 were arrested under 19-L, in which the cause of arrest need not to be disclosed. The imprisonment of top political leaders caused slackness in the movement. The police atrocities and extortion of heavy fines from poor compelled the Secretary of war council to suspend the movement in mid-November, 1938. The movement, however, continued in some form or the other, expressing resentment against the government.

**Politics From 1931-1947**

During the period 1931-1939, the struggle for freedom in Kashmir had assumed various dimensions. One of the most important dimensions was the rise of radical forces in the ranks of the leaders, making not only the movement more dynamic but also setting it on the new pattern of nationalism and secularism. These new forces appeared in the politics of state from 1933 onwards in the shape of a Young Men’s Muslim Conference, the Kashmir Youth League, the Kisan Sabha, the Mazdoor Sabha and other progressive forces. The net result of the role and performance of these new forces was the spread of a feeling of nationalism.
and secularism among the masses. Besides the Muslims, there existed an equally suffering vast Hindu population in the State. The leadership of the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference responded to the non-Muslim desire and invited them to join the movement. Without involving them in the freedom struggle, the movement would not have acquired the vigour and proportions that it achieved between 1939 and 1947. It was on the background of this that the conversion of Muslim Conference into National Conference was considered essential. The Muslim conference was, thus, changed into “All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference” on June 10 and 11, 1939. The movement in the state not only became widespread but also acquired a secular, progressive and nationalist dimension.62

Immediately after the change in the nomenclature of this major political organization, a new working committee was set up which included several non-Muslim members, namely, Sardar Budhu Singh, Pandit Jai Lal Kilam, Lala Girdhari Lal Dogra, Kayshup Bandhu and Pandit Prem Nath Bazaz. The first annual session of the Jammu and Kashmir National Conference was held at Anantnag from September 30 to October 2, 1939. The National Conference adopted, among other things, a resolution embodying the “National Demand” which was already issued on August 29, 1938. The National Demand had asked for the replacement of the then existing system of administration by a Responsible Government subject to the general control and Residuary powers of the Maharaja. It also contained the demands relating to the establishment of a Ministry responsible to the legislature with the powers to control the purse of the state. However, the Maharaja was to exercise control over such matters as expenditure on the military services, political and foreign affairs, the Darmarth Trust etc.63

From 1938 onwards Sheikh Abdullah came under the influence of Jawaharlal Nehru and the Policies of the Indian National Congress, thus adopting a more secular approach. It was mainly under the influence of
Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru the Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah had converted the Muslim Conference into the National Conference. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah was a religious man but not communal and his adherence to religious system was not communalism, which was need of the hour. The secular approach in Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah’s actions and speeches could be seen right from very beginning. Once in 1935 he said, “Let us all arise above petty communal bickering and work jointly for the welfare of the masses”. I appeal to my Hindu brethren not to entertain imaginary fears and doubts. Let us assure them that their rights shall not be jeopardized if they join hands with the Musalmans. Earlier in 1933, the party had constituted a sub-committee to find out ways and means of bringing the Hindus and Muslims together in the struggle against the autocratic Dogra regime. These developments, obviously, made a significant impact on the entire political movement in the state.

The Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah had also moved closer to some progressive and enlightened Kashmiri Pandits like Prem Nath Bazaz with whom he started editing a secular weekly “Hamdard” in 1935. But the authorities in Kashmir as well as in Delhi suspected him of being a Bolshevik agent because of his close association with the communist leaders in the state. Sometimes his rivals also alleged that his movement was backed by the communists in order to win over the Maharaja and the British masters. On the other hand, some also suspected him to be a British agent. Moreover, some of his political rivals characterized him as a communalist in Kashmir, a communist in Jammu, and a nationalist in India. Some even alleged that “Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah would exploit any body for his personal ends but was never anybody’s man, nor was even dependable. He could shift and reshift his loyalties within no time”. Whatsoever the accusations, or vice-versa, his progressive leanings and sympathetic
attitudes towards the improvised sections were widely known among the people in the state.

After the conversion of Muslim Conference into the National Conference the distance between the mainstream Muslim politics and the Kashmir Movement was further widened. However, among the Muslims, it received some setback when the dissidents under the leadership of Chaudhary Ghulam Abbas came out from the party and revived the Muslim Conference with the support of religious leaders like Mirwaiz Yusuf Shah in June 1941. The revived party had full sympathy of Mohammad Ali Jinnah and his Muslim League. A few days later, the Muslim Conference also accepted the Muslim League’s resolution for creation of Pakistan.67

Mohammad Ali Jinnah, during his trip to Kashmir in the summer of 1944, openly talked in favour of the Muslim Conference and neglected the role of National Conference. In order to reinforce his position, Jinnah also declared that “99% of the Muslims who met me are of the opinion that the Muslim Conference alone is the representative organization of the State Muslims”.58 He pleaded with the Muslims to come under the banner of the Muslim Conference because “Muslims have one platform, one Kalma and one God”. But it failed to affect the dominant position of the National Conference in the valley. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, while reacting to Jinnah’s utterances, reiterated that “ills of this land can only be remedied by carrying Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs together”. Again Mohammad Ali Jinnah, while addressing the annual session of the Muslim Conference, called the National Conference a “band of gangsters”. It obviously infuriated and provoked Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and his associates to launch a tirade against Mohammad Ali Jinnah. The Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah lashed out and said, “If Mohammad Ali Jinnah does not give up the habit of interfering in our politics, it will be difficult for him to go back in an honourable manner”.69 Further, in a statement issued on June 24, 1944,
Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah said that Ali Mohammad Jinnah had violated the spirit in which he was received on his arrival in Kashmir. Mohammad Ali Jinnah's visit thus failed to evoke any positive response from the Kashmiri Muslims. In Baramulla when he spoke against the Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah “the people jeered at him and he was immediately whisked away to a safer place”. It clearly reveals that he had failed to improve the position of Muslim Conference, an ally of his Muslim League. Unlike the Muslim League, the Congress party and its important leaders provided full support to the Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and his party in their fight against the autocracy of the Dogra rulers.

The most important contribution of the National Conference to the freedom movement in Kashmir was the adoption of “New Kashmir plan” at its annual session held in September, 1944 at Srinagar. The New Kashmir plan had two parts; the first part dealt with the constitutional structure of the state of Jammu and Kashmir and second part with the National Economic plan. So the programme of New Kashmir was well-oriented plan whose aim was to base the state-structure on a strongly built plinth of democracy, secularism, nationalism and socialism. However, the programme was criticized by two main rival political groups of the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference and the Sanatan Dharm Yuvak Sabha. As a result of this criticism, a number of public meetings were held in different parts of the city of Srinagar wherein the party explained the benefits of the New Kashmir plan to the people. The main objective of the New Kashmir plan was to transform the state into a secular and socialistic oriented democracy.

As there was no sign of any change visible in the attitude of the Maharaja towards the popular demand for the establishment of a responsible government, the people continued to suffer at the hands of the autocratic government headed by the Prime Minister, an ambitious Kashmiri Pandit,
who cared more for his personal position and power as an active loyal agent of the Dogra prince. Since Maharaja Hari Singh did not appear to move with the time, the National Conference leadership decided to make the ruler move. Thus, on May 5, 1946 Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, launched the historically famous “Quit Kashmir” movement. He declared that the sale of the valley of Kashmir by the British had no legal validity and, therefore, the Maharaja must quit Kashmir. Within a few days of the movement, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah was arrested and the familiar pattern of protests, processions, and hartals went on and police firing killed scores of people. The Dogra military not only killed innocent and unarmed men and women, but also “misbehaved with them”. Finally martial law was declared and Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah was sentenced to three years imprisonment on charges of sedition. During this period the Muslim Conference could not play any major role and contributed with the ‘Quit Kashmir’ movement. It is to be noted that the ‘Quit Kashmir’ movement was not officially supported by the Indian National Congress. Instead Nehru’s support to the movement and his participation was in his private and personal capacity of his love with his ancestral mother land. During the Sheikhs imprisonment, there took place certain significant political developments in Indian sub-continent of very great and vital importance.\footnote{71}

The discussion under review highlights the following main points:

- There has been a communal divide in Jammu and Kashmir since 1920;
- The agitational approach has always been followed against ‘outsiders’. This has invariably led to violence, police firing on ‘Commemoration Days’ of the ‘martyrs’ and more agitations;
- The pro-Pakistan elements have always been active in the valley supported and backed by a significant proportion of Muslim population. They, however, were being contested by pro-
independence or secular elements. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah was opposed by both—the Maharaja Prince and the Muslim Conference which was supported by all Indian Muslim League;

- Religion and religious shrines have always played a major role in Kashmir politics.

**Indian Independence Act and the States Accession to India**

In July 1947, the British Parliament passed, the Indian Independence Act, in order to free India from their hold. The most important event was the historical announcement of India’s Governor General, Lord Mountbatten, with regard to the “date of British withdrawal from India to August 15, 1947, which conceded the Muslim League’s demand for Pakistan and provided for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal”.

The Act created two new dominions, India and Pakistan. Both these new dominions were given freedom of either to continue to be members of the British common-wealth or to leave it. The power was to be transferred to the Constituent Assemblies of the Dominions of India and Pakistan which were created by the Act itself to frame the Constitutions for their respective countries.

With the transfer of power and partition of the sub-continent, new problems cropped up. The State of Jammu and Kashmir like Hyderabad and Junagadh neither joined the Indian Union nor the State of Pakistan, which induced both the Countries in trouble in the fish waters. Geographically, it could be a part of India or Pakistan but since the majority of the population constituted Muslims, the case of Pakistan apparently seemed strong. Besides, its best communication with the outside world lay through Pakistan, and this was the route taken by the bulk of its exports. Moreover, the waters of the Indus, Jehlum and chinab which flow through Jammu and Kashmir were essential for the prosperity of agricultural life of Pakistan.

Realizing the strategic importance of Kashmir instead of solving the
problem through dialogue and negotiations with the Maharaja resorted to clandestine activities by sending armed tribesmen. The Maharaja got panicky and made frantic requests to India to send its army to crush the rebellion. India taking advantage of the situation briefed the Maharaja that he should sign the instrument of accession first, which he promptly accepted on 26 October 1947 and India flew its troops into the state the next day.

When Maharaja signed the instrument of accession, Mountbatten introduced a provision that he will only countersign the instrument on the condition that Nehru would hold a plebiscite to ascertain the wishes of the Kashmiri citizens. Simultaneously India also lodged a complaint with the UN to call upon Pakistan to withdraw its troops. The India promised in the United Nations to hold plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir and accordingly, the Council passed its first resolution on 17th January, 1948 calling on both sides to help ease tension. Three days later, the Council passed another Resolution to crate a United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) to exercise a mediatory role to investigate facts including the charges made by Pakistan. By the time UNCIP reached the sub-continent in July 1948, the Council through its Resolution on 20th January, 1948 had raised the Commission’s strength to five and had instructed it to use its mediatory role to restore peace and to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir in cooperation with both the Governments. Initially India also agreed to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir, which is evident from the joint communiqué of the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan in November 1953. It provided, “The Kashmir issue was read threadbare, it was opined that this should be settled in accordance with the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The most feasible methods of ascertaining the wishes of the people were by fair and impartial plebiscite”. Such a plebiscite has been agreed to some years back but progress, however, could not be made because of lack of agreement in regard to ascertain preliminary issues. The P.M.’s now decided to settle
down these preliminary issues in order to arrive at agreement. The Security Council's president McNaughton, proposed that India and Pakistan should withdraw their forces immediately from Kashmir. New Delhi rejected the proposal and made the problem more severe. Since then nothing concrete emerged and the tension between the two countries got further accelerated. The two wars created further bitterness and Kashmir became an irritant for all times to come between India and Pakistan. In fact, neither of the two countries is serious about resolving the issue as it became politically significant to both the countries to project it as and when it becomes necessary for their political matters. The first serious effort to sort out the Kashmir tangle was made in December 1962, two months after India's defeat at the hands of China. Both the USA and UK which stood by New Delhi during the war influenced Nehru to initiate talks with Ayoub Khan. The two countries held six rounds of talks spread over six weeks but could not reach an agreement. The specific points which the two sides covered were:

a) A proposal to hand-over Poonch Town and a few other places (about 3000 sq. miles) to Pakistan.

b) Pakistan's suggestion of a boundary which would give India Jammu plus a small tract of land in Kashmir. Pakistan renewed its demand for a plebiscite under the aegis of the UN.

After the war of 1965 between India and Pakistan, Soviet Union took the initiative and brought the Indian Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri and Pakistan's President Ayoub Khan to Tashkent, where a declaration was signed. This was first time that Pakistan affirmed in writing 'not to resort to force' and to settle the Kashmir dispute through peaceful negotiations. The same peaceful approach was underlined in the Shimla Agreement, in 1972 between Indira Gandhi and Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto. Under the Shimla Agreement, the two countries resolved to settle down their
differences by peaceful means and promised not to unilaterally alter the situation. The two also undertook not to provide assistance or encouragement to any act detrimental to the maintenance of peaceful and harmonious relations between the two.79

However, Islamabad was in no position to bargain at that time because in the 1971 war it had lost its Eastern part and a large tract of land in West Pakistan. New Delhi also had with it 90,000 Pakistani soldiers as prisoners of war. There was no conflict between India and Pakistan since the Shimla Agreement but there has been no settlement either. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah had signed a six point agreement with Mrs. Indra Gandhi on 24th February, 1975, as known “The Kashmir Accord”. It essentially reaffirmed Kashmir’s status in continuation of Article-370, as a part of India and on 25th February, 1975 Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah was once again enthusiastically sworn in as the Chief Minister of Kashmir after nearly twenty two years of his forced imprisonment. But his popularity had suffered due to local criticism of his ‘deal’ with Mrs. Indra Gandhi and he has to be soon showed regrets for his association with the Congress party.80

An important element in the Kashmir psyche has always been a sense of discrimination by New Delhi towards Kashmir both politically and economically. The attempts for abrogation of Article-370 by New Delhi and providing insufficient funds for economic development are its well known evidences. The accession was followed by the 1952, Delhi-Agreement between Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and Jawaharlal Nehru, whereby autonomy was constitutionally guaranteed by providing that ‘the Indian parliament could not frame laws without the consent of State Assembly except in the areas of defense, external affairs and communication’.81 The Agreement also recognized the state Flag, common unique citizenship and appointment of the head of state. It also formalized the Union State financial arrangements. Ironically between 1953 and 1975, both the instrument of
Accession and Delhi Agreement were fragrantly violated and laws were passed by the Union infringing the autonomy of the state which represents the dark chapter in the history of Kashmir.\(^2\) It is clear from the Accord between Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and Indira Gandhi which admitted that ‘many of the laws passed after the 1953 had eroded the State’s autonomy’.\(^3\) The Accord was severally criticized and the Sheikh who reposed faith in the Accord and had given up the demand of plebiscite soon realized his folly but it has damaged his popularity severely for which most of the historians and Kashmir’s held India responsible. Disenchaunted supporters of the plebiscite broke away and the seeds of discontent were sown in the Kashmir, which in the years to come assumed dangerous proportions. The present crisis and turmoil is the product of top-sided politics and politics of convenience and manipulation on the part of New-Delhi towards Kashmir. Repeated rigging of elections coupled with unprincipled compromises created a dismal mosaic of national and secular life in the state. The Nehru-Abdullah Accord of 1952, the Indira-Abdullah Accord of 1975 and the Rajiv-Farooq Alliance of 1986 provided more cosmetic touches rather than healing the wounds. The congress, in spite of its rule for about twenty years between 1953 and 1973 failed to crate a secular atmosphere. Its rule only alienated people and gave a new impetus to the communal problem.

Meera Sharma, rightly observed that fourty years of misrule and manipulation by Delhi, erosion of the powers enshrined in Article-370 of the constitution which gives Jammu and Kashmir a special status, putting into cold storage of the promise of plebiscite have consolidated the people’s desire for a separate state. The political leadership in the state failed miserably on all fronts, political, economic, educational, secular, to give proper directions. As a result, lack of economic development, illiteracy, unemployment and sense of alienation and discontent reigned supreme in the
state. The political leadership definitely lacked consistency and a sense of vision. Of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah for instance it is said that he is ‘a communalist in Kashmir, a communist in Jammu and a Nationalist in New-Delhi’. It is this scenario, which was exploited by the Plebiscite Front set up in August, 1955 by Mirza Afzal Beig and other organizations, which gradually drifted towards militancy.

After the 1964 Holy Relic Movement, there was a phenomenal rise in the secessionist youth politics in the state. Two prominent youth organizations—Students and Youth League and Young Men’s League emerged on the political canvass at the convenience of the front, creating further unrest in the state. Apart from these, other organizations such as Youth Action Committee and Youth Plebiscite Front also dominated the political scene, although for a brief period. It is alleged that some of these organizations had established rapport with the Pakistani infiltrators who made their presence felt on August 15, that year. At the beginning, these organizations confined themselves to the right of self-determination as its main plank and their movement was by and large peaceful, with no trace of militancy in it. The fragmentation of youth organizations and multiplicity of their number, however, infused an element of militancy in some of them. It was in 1968, that groups of students from Gandhi Memorial College resolved to initiate an armed struggle in the state, by forcibly entering the Islamia College premises in the dead of night with the intention of stealing rifles from the NCC room of the college. However, the Chowkidar of the collage grappled with the intruders and nabbed one of them. The incident made headlines and about eight students were arrested in this connection by the police. They were also tried in camera in what is properly known as the Islamia college conspiracy case. After two years, the students involved in this case were released on bail and case was withdrawn with the Sheikh’s return to power in 1975. Since 1967, small groups were nabbed for either
having planned subversive activities or having indulged in militancy related incidents. It was in January 1971, that authorities claimed to have unearthed a gang of subversives who planned large scale disturbances in the state. Some persons were arrested in connection with an attempt of looting Hazratbal Branch of Jammu and Kashmir Bank. The organization responsible for these activities was identified, namely the Alfateh, which soon emerged as a well organized and closely Knit militant organization, with an objective to liberate Kashmir by resorting to Armed struggle. Its genesis, however, is not known. It is commonly believed that it is the bran child of Plebiscite Front as several prominent leaders of Alfateh were known close confidants of Mirza Afzal Beig. In the wake of the Bank decoity, large scale raids were conducted and about 250 persons mostly students were arrested. But only sixteen were tried on charges of sedition. Persons were identified as having close links with the outfit, prominent among them were Ghulam Rasool Zahgeer, Nazir Ahmad Wani, then a district Agriculture officer in the state Government, Mohammad Fazul Haq, Farooq Bhat, Abdul Alla, Mohammad Altaf Khan alias Azam Inquilabi and others. Most of these leaders were arrested. In the Jail, the central leadership of Alfateh got divided into two groups, one led by Ghulam Rasool Zahgeer which was pro-plebiscite while the other headed by Nazir Ahmad Wani which was deadly against the Plebiscite Front leaders including late Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, who was the chief patron of the Front. Towards the end of 1973, when Beig-Partasarthy dialogue commenced, all the arrested activists of Alfateh were released on bail. The two factions inside emerged as two political parties, the Awami Inquilabi Mahaz (People’s Revolutionary Front) led by Ghulam Rasool Zahgeer and the peoples League headed by Nazir Ahmad Wani which raised the slogan of separation of Jammu and Kashmir from the Indian Union. It is commonly believed that Mirza Beig wanted to use it as a pressure group to foster his own political image. After the 1975,
Kashmir Accord, this organization was wound up and its members were either inducted into government service or given other favours.

On the other hand Peoples League emerged as a main anti-Accord Youth Organization. It held a number of demonstrations against the Accord and its members played an active role in making the bandh call given by former Pakistan Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhatto, against the Accord a great success. The league’s think-tank included Nazir Wani, Hamidullah Bhat and Azam Inquilabi. The most wanted Kashmiri youth Shabir Shah was then Junior Leader of the League and happened to be its district president. Later, the League also got divided into two on the issue, whether it should strive for an Islamic State or Islamic Socialist State, the later coinage then being popular among the pro-Bhutto youth. Azam inquilabi left League in 1974 to form the Islami Students Youth organization, which was later named Islamic-Jamit-ul-Tulba and Tajamul Islam, presently living in some Muslim country, became its first president. The separatist youth movement virtually slowed down from 1977 to 1982. The peoples League got confined to few youth like its president, Farooq Rehmani and then general secretary Shabir Shah. Nazir Ahmad Wani remained underground for some time and later fled to Saudi Arabia. Azam Inquilabi bid farewell to politics outwardly and joined Government service as a teacher. Tajamul Islam also went underground and settled in Iran if reports are to be relied upon. During these years, one would occasionally come across a press release from these organizations demanding that those arrested under Public Safety Act, be set free. It was only after the death of Sheikh Abdullah that the separatist groups got momentum. Azam Inquilabi in his book Quali-i-Faisal advocated for liberation of Kashmir. He left government service to join Mahaz-i-Azadi (Liberation Front) founded by a veteran Kashmiri leader and erstwhile confident of the Sheikh, Sofi Mohammad Akbar.
Political developments during 1982-1989

Faroq Abdullah succeeded his father Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah as Chief Minister of the state and in his very first address to the National Conference legislature party, he declared that he was a Kashmiri and would remain a Kashmiri. He described Kashmiri’s bond with India as unbreakable which infuriated the kashmiri youth and was seen with suspicion. He further assured that he would defend with all his might Article-370 of the constitution. The first acid test of Farooq’s ability to satisfy Kashmiri nationalism against centre’s attempts to dilute the state’s autonomy was the controversial Resettlement Bill which was introduced in the Assembly on September 23, 1982. However, despite strong opposition, the bill was readopted by both the Houses of Assembly on October 4, 1982 and on October 6, 1982. Governor B. K. Nehru gave his assent. But the Union Government referred it to the Supreme Court for its legal opinion. The passing of the bill was infact, a major political victory for Farooq. Being a popular piece of legislation, it was endorsed by even those persons who were hitherto opposing the National Conference’s policies. These included Jamati-Islami chief and veteran Kashmiri leader Syed Ali Shah Geelani, the chairman of the Peoples Conference, Abdul Gani Lone, the leader of the Inquillabi National Conference, Ibrahim Dhar and the state Janata Leader Abdul Rashid Kabli. On the other hand it was bitterly criticized by the traditional alley of the National Conference, the Congress. In the mean-time, the elections to the State Assembly were held in June 1983. The thrust of Farooq Abdullah’s election campaign was directed at the Congress—I whom he alleged, has indulged in communalism and regionalism. He warned the Union Government against its attempts to erode the state autonomy and emphasized that the National Conference alone could uphold the autonomous status of the state. Mrs. Gandhi herself campaigned for Congress against the National Conference. She conducted
an aggressive campaign with a distinct pro-Hindu bias so much so that a leader like L.K. Advani stated that, "Indira Gandhi played the Hindu card in the Jammu and Kashmir elections in 1983" which further created the sense of suspicion in Kashmiris. The National Conference swept the polls in the valley and grabbed eight seats in Jammu. It secured 47 seats while the Congress could manage only 26, which established the credentials of Farooq Abdullah.

The Resettlement Bill and the election outcome increased bitterness between the congress and the Farooq Abdullah, which increased further when Farooq Abdullah convened a conclave with sixteen opposition parties at Srinagar on October 5, 1983 to discuss Union-State Relationships. The Srinagar conclave was an important milestone in the history of autonomy of Indian States. According to Farooq Abdullah, the conclave sought to usher a new era, through its demand for an effective autonomy for the Indian States and the desire for setting up of a real federation in India. Referring to Article-356 and 357, Farooq charged that these provisions of the Indian constitution ‘where an antithesis to the concept of federal polity and, as such, needed to be abrogated’. This annoyed Indira Gandhi who was bent upon undermining states ruled by non-congress parties. The ouster of Farooq became eminent. The stadium incident wherein, the Indian Cricket Team was hooted while playing against West-Indies, proved the much needed opportunity to tarnish the image of Farooq Abdullah by depicting him as secessionist and anti-national. The bombardment of Golden Temple, on June 6, 1984 led to widespread violence by Sikhs against Hindu-Temples in the state. The entire blame was put on Farooq Abdullah by the Congress. The Governor, Jagmohan, provided the finishing touch by persuading 12 members of the National Conference to declare their support to Ghulam Mohammad Shah. Farooq Abdullah was dismissed and Ghulam Mohammad Shah was installed as the new Chief Minister of the state, who
continued in the office till 6 March, 1986 which was followed by Presidents rule till March, 1987 elections.

The announcement of elections brought Rajiv and Farooq to an electoral understanding resulting in the Rajiv-Farooq accord (1986). Dissatisfied with both the Congress and the National Conference, the Muslim United Front (MUF) was formed, and soon, it became a force to reckon with. But due to heavy and notorious mass-ragging in elections, the Congress–National Conference combine emerged victorious. The newly formed organization, the (MUF), was forcibly defeated which created discontent in its rank and Kashmiris were infuriated. Apprehensions were raised that fair and free elections in the state is still a distant dream. The anti-Farooq movement gained momentum.

The political analysts agree that one main factor responsible for the sudden growth of militancy in Kashmir was the manner in which the 1987 Assembly elections were held in Jammu and Kashmir. It is an open secret that majority of the youth who are at present involved in the militant movement, directly or indirectly took an active part in the election campaign of 1987 elections. They were in the forefront of the campaign launched by the newly born Muslim United Front, a loose alliance of about a dozen small parties and other groups. But the politics of convenience, the detention of political opponents under the Public Safety Act, lack of job avenues, corruption and such other factors alienated sizeable number of population from the mainstream and they sought refuge with the pro-Pakistani elements, who were too glad to welcome them in their outfits. It gave a new impetus to such groups. They got the first opportunity during the Eid-prayers on May 29, 1987, to create pandemonium and fear psychosis among people. It made the Chief Minister to leave the Eid-Gaah abruptly without even delivering the customary speech. What was surprising was, that the National Conference and the Awami Action Committee chose the Eid-
Cgaard to settle their scores with members of the Muslim United Front. Soon these disturbances also spread to other areas. These incidents had a demoralizing effect on the people especially the youth. This explains their crossing over the border.

The Pathetic case of slain Aijaz Dar, who was killed when he made an unsuccessful attempt on the life of Ali Mohammad Watali Inspector General of Jammu and Kashmir police, is one such instance of infuriated youth. Aijaz Dar was one of the prominent activists of Muslim United Front who took active part in the election campaign. He was arrested right inside the counting Hall during the counting of votes for Amirakadal constituency, from where Ghulam Mohi-ud-din Shah was declared elected unfairly, even the counting was still in progress. Aijaz Ahamd Dar was beaten up by Shah inside the Sheergardhi police station where he was lodged and that too in presence of senior police officers including Watali. He was detained under Public Safety Act later. After his release, he disappeared and nothing was heared about him till he tried to shot dead Mr. Watali but in retaliation was killed by security guards of Mr. Watali. Aijaz Dar’s case is not a solitary incident and there are so many Aijaz Dar’s in the rank and file of the well equiped armed militants. The death of Aijaz Ahmad Dar spread like the wild fire and rocked the whole valley. The government tried their best to project Aijaz Ahmad Dar as a militant or a terrorist but before the general mass he was innocent and his last rituals were performed with great respect and dignity. The Valley had witnessed a series of militant incidents between 1989 and 1990 which took a toll of 561 lives as is evident from the following table.
Table 2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explosion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Attack</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mob Violence</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2154</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Firing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Jammu Kashmir Student Liberation Front (JKSLF) claimed responsibility for the Kidnapping and subsequent murder of the General Manager of the Hindustan Machine Tools limited, Srinagar and the Vice-Chancellor of the Kashmir University and his private secretary in April 1990 when government denied to release the militants in custody. By the end of 1990, the situation in the valley had become very alarming. One Thousands Two Hundred and Twenty Five (1225) including 125 security personnel were killed in 1990. Those Killed included 294 militants and 606 civilians mostly killed by security forces in retaliation to the militant attacks. Seventy militants were arrested and 3282 surrendered apart from the recovery of 1208 AK-47 rifles, 707 pistols and revolvers, 84 general purpose machine guns, 129 rocket launchers, 2636 hand grenades and 262089 rounds of ammunition.

The trend of the militant activities suggests that their effort was to totally disrupt the political process and to paralyze the state administration in order to achieve their objectives. Use of sophisticated weapons and more extensive use of explosives intensified the situation. Selective explosions were carried to create an atmosphere of terror and panic. Infiltration of Pakistani trained Kashmir youths gained momentum. The year 1989 also saw a number of agitations by various secessionist groups fully backed and supported by general mass. The Kidnapping of Rubia Syed daughter of the
then Home Minister of India, Mufti Mohammad Syed on December 2, 1989 was the one incident which succeeded in attracting the attention from throughout world on armed movement in Kashmir. It was one of the most daring acts, successfully carried out by JKLF outfit and clearly demonstrated that militancy had resurfaced in the valley in a big way. Rubia was released from custody in exchange of five famous militants from Jails, which further boasted the morale of the militants. Simultaneously, many other organizations erupted during 1989 like Hizbe-Islami and Hizbul-Mujahedeen which provided increasing support to the movement.

The situation created total panic in the valley resulting in the allegedly mass migration of Hindus in February 1989 to April 1990 but other non-Muslim communities like Sikhs, Buddhists and Christians preferred to remain in valley. Around thirty thousand families of Hindus migrated from the valley to safer places in Jammu and other places in the country till the end of April 1999. Even the promulgation of Governor’s rule on January 19, 1990, hardly made an impact on the activities of the militants but the suppressive measures by the then Governor Jagmohan further deteriorated the situation. The public resorted to subtle methods like holding peaceful demonstrations, disruption of public meetings etc.

**Pattern of Militancy in J & K**

As we know that in 1987, the National Conference fought the Assembly elections in alliance with congress (I) though it won the elections unfairly, it lost political credibility for which its popularity suffered with irreparable loss. It is almost an established fact now that there was large scale-rigging during these elections to keep the Muslim United Front (MUF) out of power.\(^{103}\) But then the MUF had acquired quite a clout and the young people who had campaigned for it, felt betrayed. They came to the conclusion that power can not be gained in Jammu and Kashmir through the
democratic process. They turned to the secessionists for solace and raised the banner of revolt against what was termed as 'Indian Imperialism'. The discrimination against political opponents by the state further drove these people into the open armies of secessionists and militants which worked like a spark on dry fuel.\textsuperscript{104} The secessionist talked of an independent state but some other militant outfits like Hizbu-l-Mujahiddin, Harkatu-l-Mujahiddin, Tehrikulu-Mujahiddin etc. wanted merger with the Pakistan but none of these groups wanted to continue with India. The state was thus set for a violent struggle between these groups and the government of India. There were protests against every possible issue, for example, the agitation against shortage of power led to indiscriminate use of police firing. This became a rallying point for the militants to start a violent struggle against the Government. Heralded by bomb blasts, since then militancy dominated the whole Kashmiri scene for a pretty long time. Anti-Indian campaign, hurling of Pakistani flag, burning of the 'tricolour', became the order of the day. Violence became a norm of protest, which could be evoked any time. General Zia's death in the air crash, Protest against Salman Rasdie's book 'Satanic Verses' got mixed up with protests and 'Bandhs'. To commemorate the hanging of Maqbool Bhat represents highly volatile situation prevailed in the valley and caused major disturbances both in administrative setup and day to day life. The State Government remained either a helpless spectator or resorted to brutal repression, leading to further deterioration in the then ongoing situation.

The political process and the rule of law became things of the past. Anti-Indian sentiments in the Kashmir valley had mounted to a high pitch by the end of 1988. From all accounts, the secessionists had managed to bring the administrative machinery, to a stand still, the mass mobilization of the population against the State Government and the marked deterioration of law and order had completely democratized the state apparatus. The law and
order machinery lost its credibility. The secessionists argued that the Farooq Abdullah rigged the elections in alliance with Hindu congress to keep the Muslims of the J & K valley enslaved, erode the Kashmiri identity and rob the wealth of the State for himself and his family. There is, thus, no alternative left for the Muslims of J & K but to get together & wage a Holy war against the oppressors.\textsuperscript{105}

JKLF and Ansarul-Islam super headed the movement initially. They aimed to shake the foundations of the State Government through Militant attacks, protests and agitations. These crisis are largely a product of lack of political insight, indifference in the powers and brutal use of force to suppress all dissent etc. The situation was a manifestation of the accumulated anger of the Kashmiri’s and not just a reaction to a particular incident. An editorial team of the Indian Defense Review traced the turmoil in the valley to different phases.\textsuperscript{106}

**Phase I (1987 to mid 1988)**

During this phase, large number of Kashmiri youth crossed the Actual Line of Control to receive armed training in Azad Kashmir and to induct arms and ammunition in to the valley. This remained largely unnoticed by the security forces. No military operations were instituted during this period by the militants.

**Phase II (Mid 1988 to December 1990)**

The intensity of militancy related episodes increased. The secessionist leadership got inspiration from similar groups especially in East Europe, which managed to achieve their objectives through the use of force and intimidation.
Phase III (January to August 1990)

It witnessed mass migration of the Kashmiri Hindu community to Jammu and other parts of India.

Phase IV (September 1990 to mid 1991)

The militants became very active by indulging in the destruction of public property such as schools, bridges, Government buildings, buses etc. The intention was to undermine the Government’s authority by destroying the basic administrative infrastructure through which it could reach the people.

Phase V (Mid 1991 to fall 1992)

During this period the militancy aspects of movement were further refined and polished. Targets were selected for attacks with mathematical accuracy and operational capability.

Phase VI (Winter 1992 to Winter 1993)

During this period Pakistan accelerated its anti-India campaign by targeting the military posts on the Line of Control. India responded to these attacks by causing heavy causalities on the Pakistani side and losing considerable men themselves. Artillery duels in place of small arms exchanges, on the Line of Control, further worsened the situation.

Phase VII (From October 1992 onwards)

The militant operations had acquired a new identity with Pakistan losing its grip over the Hizb-ul-Mujahideen and the creation of a holy mercenary force to fight against the Indian security forces. A systematic campaign to boost up the morale of the Kashmiri Militants, which was on
decline due to loss of lives at the hands of Indian security forces, was launched to mobilize the public opinion in the valley.

**Phase VIII (Hazratbal Siege and the Charar-e-Sharief Fiasco)**

The Hazratbal and the Charar-e-Sharief episodes created suspicion in the minds of the people about bonafides of the security forces and the Indian government and in the process, the militants got the sympathy of the people. A report for the US congress by its research service, (the CRS) sums up the initial events leading to militancy beginning in early 1990, tensions increased significantly as India sent more than 1,50,000 security forces into the State in response to an increasing militant secessionist movement which it contended was being armed and trained by Pakistan. As of mid of 1991, India had become ever more critical of alleged Pakistani interference, Pakistan for its part claims to provide only moral support for the right of self determination of Kashmiri people. However, the indisputable flow of arms into Kashmir and Pakistan’s public calls for holding a plebiscite under United Nation’s Resolutions, adopted in 1948 are viewed by many in India as a major threat to status quo.  

Between January, 1988 and March 1989, 61 blasts were witnessed by the valley in which 18 people lost their lives. This was acknowledged by the Farooq Abdullah during the question hour in the Assembly. According to his statement 194 people were injured in these blasts including 18 policemen. According to data furnished by the Jammu and Kashmir Association, more than 16,000 youth were arrested between April 1990 and December 1991 alone.

Two particular events had a great impact on the events that were to follow in the valley. The first was the Kidnapping of Rubiya Syed, the daughter of the then Home Minister, Mufti Mohammad Syed, who was
released in exchange for jailed Kashmiri Militants by the then coalition National Front Government in New Delhi, legitimatizing kidnappings which became common thereafter.\textsuperscript{108} The second was the killing of many innocent civilians brutally by the Indian forces accompanying the funeral procession of Moulana Mohammad Farooq, the Mirwaiz. The Mirwaiz was shot dead on 21\textsuperscript{st}, May 1990. As his funeral made its way through some of the narrow lanes of Srinagar, a group of CRPF personnel opened fire indiscriminately on a crowd of some 4,000 people, though official statements said 57 people had died but the locals claimed that 117 had died. The wreckless and unprovoked firing by CRPF infuriated the people and the situation went out of control of the authorities. The battle lines had from now been clearly drawn between the Kashmiris and the might of the Indian security forces.\textsuperscript{109} From 1990 onwards, there were a mushroom growth (increase) in the Tanzeems (militant outfits), between 100 and 200 became active in the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

The Government of India responded to activities of the militants with a heavy hand and in the process many innocents were also put to hardships. The worst victims were the members of the JKLF, which was heading the movement and openly advocated for an independent Kashmir. This was obviously against Pakistan’s agenda of including Kashmir in its fold. With the arrest of the prominent leaders of the JKLF, a vaccum was created which was filled in by pro-Pakistan Fundamentalist organizations, the Hizbul Mujahideen. Since then, a series of incidents rocked the valley. The kidnapping of 6 foreign tourists in 1995 from the US, UK, Germany and Norway near Phalgam once again brought Kashmir in the world news. The government accused the militant groups notably ‘Al-Faran’ for the ugly incident while the militants blamed the Government for kidnapping and in the accusations and counter accusations, the truth could not be find out even to this day. The Ayodhya fiasco and the subsequent rioting further generated
a sense of insecurity and alienation among the large Muslim population of India more so in Kashmir. By March 1994 itself over, 7,000 people had been killed in Kashmir of which over 1,000 were from security personnel, Government officials, politicians etc. There were about 700 incidents of kidnappings. The destruction of property has put aside decades of development in Kashmir.

The year 1998 was no better. About 999 militants were killed by the security forces, including 51 who were killed on the line of control and 948 in different encounters and operations. During the same period, 1228 militants were apprehended in different operations while 187 surrendered before the security forces. 529 militants were released after preliminary questioning and 457 booked under TADA and other emergency laws. As many as 128 persons arrested under Section-169 of Indian Penal code. Five hundred and fourteen persons were detained under the Public Safety Act. During the year under review, the militants carried out 1181 attacks on security forces. The security forces recovered 1520 AK rifles during the period under review while 584 pistols, 71 universal machine guns, 7-303 rifles, 24 sniper rifles, 140 rocket launchers and 293 rocket boosters were recovered during the year. Recovery of ammunition included 1.70 Lakh rounds of A.K. rifles, 58734 revolvers, 5791 UMG, 6510 of snapper rifles, 12 of 303 rifles, 80091 of rounds of belted ammunition were also recovered during the period under review. The security forces also recovered 5883 grenades, 514 IEDs, 2922 explosive devices, 614 electric detonators, 5511 detonators, 471 anti – personal mines, 70 anti-tank mines and 375 rockets during the period. In the Kashmir valley over the last decade the security forces recovered weapons worth Rs. 30 Crores. The arms seized by army alone included 12155 A. K. assault rifles, 755 machine guns, 623 rocket projectile guns (RPGs) 195 sniper rifles, 3973 pistol and revolvers, 25 mortars, 1160 wireless sets besides huge quantities of explosives. It amounts
to 75% of total arms seized by other security agencies. The killing &
counter killings and the terror let loose by the militants and security forces
have made the lives of innocent citizens miserable and retarded all
development activities in the state.

The amalgam of separatists came into existence in 1993 in the form
of All Parties Huriyat Conference with a manifesto to liberate Kashmir from
Indian occupation. They remained peaceful in their activities but supported
the militant outfits. The day to day processions and hartals called by militant
outfits was drastically reduced but was continued by APHC. The elections
were held after 1987 in 1996 after president rule of about 7 years in state.
This election was mostly boycotted by the people but security agencies
forced the people to participate in election but in Jammu province and
Ladakh good proportion of people participated in elections. As people in
Jammu and Kashmir held National Conference responsible for mass
uprising of militancy by manipulating election results once again was voted
to power which mostly because of boycott factor. The National Conference
came into power headed by Dr. Farroq Abdullah. The National Conference
tried to built the damaged infrastructure due to militants but people remain
mostly dissatisfied because miss governance, unemployment, custodial
killing, human rights violation and corruption was the daily routine. The
Mufti Mohammad Sayed a noted politician established Peoples Democratic
Party (PDP) in 1999 which highlighted the failures of the National
Conference regime. In 2002 again elections were held for State Assembly
and again boycotted by general mass in Kashmir valley and some Muslim
dominated parts of Jammu province, though proportion of voters increased.
The election results showed no majority by any party and a coalition
government between Peoples Democratic Party and congress (I) came into
existence headed by Mufti Mohammad Sayed for first three years and
another noted politician Ghlam Nabi Azad in last three years of government.
The PDP and Congress (I) coalition focused to built the infrastructure particularly roads, schools hospitals etc. The education system in state was completely reformed. Tourism was renovated and special steps were taken to absorb the unemployed educated youth in government services a part from providing job avenues in private firms and other fields. The significant decrease in custodial killing and human rights violation occurred because of disbanded the Special Task Force and notorious Special Operation Groups. The Peoples Democratic Party and congress (I) coalition came to end amidst Amaranath land row incident when Peoples Democratic Party unilaterally decided to part ways from government. Governor rule was again fourth time imposed in sate. The last period of PDP and congress (I) regime witnessed strong demonstration against Indian occupation and All Party Hurriyat Conference and other separatist groups renovated their influence. In 2008-09 again election were held for State Assembly which again showed no majority to any political party giving way to another coalition government in state but this time coalition came into existence between National Conference and Congress (I) headed by young National Conference Leader Omar Abdullah. The BJP made their presence by 11 seats, which was just one in 2002 elections. The opportunistic approach during Amaranth Land Row incident is responsible for their win. The PDP improved their number of seats to 21 from 16 in 2002, but was not supported by congress (I) because of parting ways from government in Amaranth land transfer case which widened the gap between PDP and Congress (I). The people of Jammu and Kashmir voted the National Conference and Congress (I) coalition for good governance, power roads and water but seem not to have withdrawn support to on going freedom movement. The NC and Congress (I) coalition headed by Omar Abdullah has major challenges to dealt with but what will be their success is the talk of hour.
The political leadership has shown lack of foresight and sagacity in dealing with the situation. Fake encounters (custodial deaths), indiscriminate killings, kidnappings and loss to public property by security forces can’t provided any solution to the problem, as is evident since past one and half decade. The remedy lies in opening a dialogue with the various militant outfits. However, the multiplicity of these organizations and lack of coordination among them has made the task of dialogue and negotiations difficult. The involvement of Pakistan in such exercises also seems to be a desideratum. Besides India never seemed to be serious and sincere in the dialogue or negotiation, if any. Therefore it becomes imperative to identify these organizations before initialing the process of dialogue.
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