CONCLUSION

This is an exploratory study of conflict in the state of Jammu & Kashmir. The conflict has been persisting for very long period of time and has intensified since 1989. It is a conflict of both national and international importance. The conflict has attracted attention of innumerable scholars and media persons. But so far no prominent sociological study is available about the conflict. In this way we can say our study is first of its kind about the conflict in Kashmir. For this study we have selected descriptive research design and collected data through the mechanism of interview-schedule and case study method. We have selected 310 respondents from three geographical regions and from four major religious communities of the state. It is not an experimental study so we have not tested any hypothesis. Rather we have tried to identify major factors and consequences of the conflict as well as strategies for its resolution.

Sociologically conflict is a universal phenomenon it exists in each and every society. Conflict has both functions and dysfunctions for society. Sociologists both of functional and Marxist school of thought have explained causes of conflict in terms of social structure. Various sociologists have identified the causes of various kinds of conflicts differently. But among innumerable structural causes of conflict some major causes are as follows.

1. Unequal distribution of scarce resources in a system.

2. the more subordinate groups become aware of their true collective interests, the more likely are they to question the legitimacy of the existing pattern of distribution of scarce resources.

3. Opposed interests inherent in the social structure.
4. The more membership in privileged group is sought by subordinates and the less mobility allowed, the more likely are they to withdraw legitimacy.

5. The fewer are the channels for redressing grievances over the distribution of scarce resources by subordinates, the more likely are they to question legitimacy.

6. The more deprivations of subordinates are transformed from absolute to relative, the greater will be the sense of injustice and hence, the more likely are they to initiate conflict.

Similar to the causes, consequences of the conflict are differently explained by sociologists. A conflict may have both positive and negative consequences.

According to Marx conflict is not a goal but a means to achieve an integrated social structure. He is an importance thinker who considers social conflict as a driving force of society, and also leads to redistribution of scarce resources- wealth and power.

German sociologist, George Simmel says: "Conflict is thus designed to resolve dualisms it is a way of achieving, some kind of unity; even if it be through the annihilation of one of the contending parties. This is roughly parallel to the fact that it is the most violent symptom of a disease, which represents the effort of the organisms to free itself of disturbances and damages caused by them".

Moreover, he conceptualized the consequences of conflict for the parties involved in it and for the whole society one of the propositions of Simmel is the more violent is the conflict, the greater will be the internal solidarity of conflict groups.
According to L.A. Coser, social conflicts allow expression of hostility and the mending of strained relationships. It leads to the elimination of specific sources of conflict between parties and enables them to redress their grievances through the establishment of new norms or the affirmation of old ones. Hostility towards the out-group unifies the in-group. Social conflicts not only generate new norms and institution but also new coalitions and alliances. They bring about technological improvements, revitalize economy, and lubricate the social system; they facilitate the release of tension and frustration and enable the social system to adjust itself.

Moreover, social conflicts that do not attack the basic values or assumptions upon which the foundation of any society is based are positively functional or advantageous for the society. These kind of conflicts may occur in open or plural societies because these societies not only allow the contending parties to express their anger but also institute variety of institutional safeguards against the type of conflict that might endanger the basic values of the society. These institutional safeguards could also be in the form of bringing marginalized groups within the fold of mainstream society, that is by increasing their share of income, wealth, power or prestige. Infact, social conflicts have positive consequences for a society when it is waged within the limits of consensus.

Social conflicts in which the contending parties in conflict do not share the basic values upon which the legitimacy of the social system rests are dysfunctional or harmful for the social system. Such conflicts are rampant in closed societies or in societies, which are plural by name, but not in practice e.g. if major strata of a society’s population are permanently excluded from participation in the societies benefits they will tend to reject the very assumptions or values of a society upon which the society is built. And, if the systems
of legitimation no longer fully operate or solve the problems of the people they will attempt to attack the social order through revolutionary violence.

Other destructive or harmful consequences of conflict are: it diverts energy from the real task, destroys morale, polarizes individuals and groups, deepens differences, obstructs communication and cooperation, produces irresponsible behavior, creates suspicion and distrust and decreases productivity. Moreover, destruction of public property, innocent killings, children migration and refugee problems like their displacement, procurement and rehabilitation are other consequences of conflicts like war, racial, ethnic and communal violence or conflicts between dominant and subordinate groups in or between the societies. In such kind of conflicts powerful groups frequently use force to suppress voices of powerless or marginalized sections and consequently result into extreme form of human rights violation. In fact, it is these horrible consequences of conflict with which social activists, planners and policy makers are concerned.

Sociologists generally do not offer any concrete plan for conflict resolution. The plan for conflict resolution may be derived from the causes of conflict which they have identified. After world war second conflict resolution has developed as a major area of study in Europe and America. Scholars have identified different techniques for resolving conflicts. These techniques differ from one conflict to another but some well known approaches are: Avoidance, sanctions, war, negotiations and its special forms like use of good offices and mediations, Inquiry and conciliation commissions, Arbitration, Adjudication etc., these techniques of conflict resolution are generally used in track-one diplomacy – term used to describe official government-to-government negotiation among instructed representatives of sovereign stats, and may prove useful and
effective in settling conflicts at smaller scale and those conflicts in which clash of interest is not very visible.

Since long at track one level fore mentioned techniques of conflict resolution have been used by official representatives of India and Pakistan but could not solve the dispute. The ongoing conflict in Jammu & Kashmir is protracted. It involves society – wide actors. Prominent actors involved in the conflict are Kashmiri Muslims, Hindu dogras of Jammu and Buddhists of region–Ladakh. However there are some other ethnic groups whose identity urges have remained either unheard or ignored because of their less political clout. Among these groups Hindus of region-Kashmir, Balti-speaking Muslims of Ladakh, Pahari and Gogri speaking Muslims of region-Jammu and Sikhs in region-Kashmir as well as in Jammu too. Their political aspirations for the future of the state (J&K) are different and cross cutting in such a way as to make the resolution of conflict very difficult. Urge of independence that we found among Muslims of all ethnicities in the state where not found among Hindus and Sikhs of all ethnicities as well as among Buddhists also.

Moreover, they not only question the representative character of each other in the state but some of them question the legitimacy of both India and Pakistan.

Resolving such a conflict requires a full and fair hearing of all ethnic groups in Jammu & Kashmir. Track one mediation whether done by representatives of governments (India and Pakistan) or international bodies are unsuitable to deal effectively with Kashmir conflict because they do not take various ethnic groups in Jammu & Kashmir into consideration, denies the legitimacy of non-state actors or Kashmiri militants and some other ethnic groups. In fact for addressing the protractedness of conflict involvement of Kashmiris in
any dialogues process going on between India and Pakistan are must. As it is Kashmiri ethnic group especially Muslims from whom militancy emerged. It is therefore unless dialogue and reconciliation with Kashmiri Muslims and other ethnic groups in the state will be made part of composite dialogue between India and Pakistan, the protracted ethnic conflict in Kashmir could be resolved easily.

In case of Kashmir conflict non governmental approaches track two and multi-track diplomacy, stand good chance of directing the negotiation process in right direction. Track two diplomacy involves unofficial mediators they work with parties in conflict and facilitate agreements among them. The strength of track two approach on conflict resolution is based on the idea that informal negotiations allow the parties to come together more easily to explore mutual fears, grievances and demands. It also provides the opportunity of tentative negotiation offers to be floated, policy linkages to be broached in ways that formal negotiations might preclude.

Official diplomacy and unofficial second track approaches may also be complemented by a range of multi-track solutions. Multi-track diplomacy is the application of peace making from different vantage points within a multi centered networks, reflects the different levels and variety of factors which need to be addressed. It is a new form of diplomacy, involving a strategic shift from purely state controlled diplomacy towards a greater division of labour between governments, NGO’s and other organizations. In fact, protracted ethnic conflict in Kashmir could not be resolved without involving reliable non-governmental organizations will play an important role in bridging the gap between the states and conflicting parties in Jammu & Kashmir.

Conflict in Kashmir is multi-dimensional. It involves question of International law, right of self-determination and socio-historical,
economic and religious factors. To study such a complex conflict is a very difficult task. It is also difficult to arrive at very definitive conclusion. Therefore, our findings about the conflict are of suggestive in nature.

We have explored responses of our respondents regarding political, economic, religious and ethnic factors of the conflict. In regard with our question related to the background factors we found that of the 310 respondents, the highest percentage (59.03%) of respondents at state-level consider Maharaja (Hari Singh) responsible for creating the problem. While, 16.31% held Britishers responsible for originating the conflict. For the same, 15.81% believed that the hasty partition of India by Britishers created the problem. Very small percentage of respondents expressed opinion to remaining two factors i.e. strategic location of the state (3.55%), Boundary commission’s role in partitioning the Indo-Pak boundary at Panjab (5.48%). In this way, majority of respondents at state-level think Maharaja responsible for creating background of Kashmir conflict.

Religion and region-wise data reveals that majority of Muslim respondents of valley and Muslims of other two regions (Ladakh & Jammu) along with Sikhs of valley held maharaja responsible for creating the conflict's background.

While, Hindus of Jammu and Buddhists of Ladakh held the policy of the Britishers responsible for created background of the conflict. In this way we can say that no non-Muslim community in the state held Muslims responsible for creating the problem’s background.

Other questions related with exploring those political factors which appear prominent in keeping alive, promoting and flaring up the conflict we found that the highest percentage of respondents (42.90%) at state-level viewed the denial of plebiscite right to the
people responsible for promoting the conflict in post-accession era. While the next major response (19.68%) went each to two factors i.e. weakening the special status that was grated to the state in the form of article-370 by central govt. and the nepotism and corruption promoted by Kashmiri politicians. 11.29% and 4.52% respondents hold the exploitation of Kashmir politicians by central govt. and the amendment of Jammu & Kashmir constitution by central government through unpopular local governments responsible for promoting the conflict. Thus we found majority of respondents in Jammu & Kashmir viewed the denial of plebiscite right, major factor promoting the conflict in post-accession era. This opinion of Muslims is supported by Hindus of the valley-Kashmir. However, Buddhists of Ladakh, Hindus and Sikhs of Jammu have different opinion. They regarded nepotism and corruption as major factors for promoting the conflict. Thus it can be established that the legal factor, denying of plebiscite right and political nepotism and corruption are two major factors in view of people for aggravating the conflict.

Concerning with increasing violence, the highest number of respondents (40.65%) at state-level held United Nations Organization (UNO) responsible as it has failed to persuade India for the plebiscite. While, 31.29% think electoral malpractices in 1987 assembly elections there arose violence. This shows that majority of respondents is of the opinion that issue of plebiscite and political corruption are major factors which make conflict violent.

No doubt there is difference of opinion among people of different religious communities in three regions of the state. Majority of Muslims in all the regions (K, J&L) appear to be unanimous in making failure of UNO for settling the dispute through the mechanism of plebiscite. This opinion is shared by most of the Hindus of the valley-Kashmir and Sikhs of the Jammu-region. However, Hindus in Jammu,
Sikhs in valley and Buddhists in Ladakh differ from this opinion as their majority thinks political nepotism and corruption is the major factor that promotes violence in the state.

We have again questioned our respondents in different way, asked them to point out the root cause of the conflict. At state-level the highest percentage of respondents (44.48%) said mishandling of politics in Jammu & Kashmir by central Government is the major factor. While, 33.55% respondents view the potential factors of the conflict lied in political and economic alienation of the people. 16.45% respondents hold the undemocratic and dishonest politics by politicians in the state responsible for causing the conflict.

It is commonly believed outside the state that Pak support to militancy in Kashmir is the root cause of the conflict but this view do not have support in majority of population in Jammu & Kashmir as only 4.52% respondents were found in support of the view.

There is wide spread notion among both scholars and laymen in the country that rise of Islamic resurgence is the factor which makes Muslims everywhere militant and “terrorist”. This view is also held about the rise of violent conflict in Kashmir. Surprisingly we have found only 0.65% respondents at state-level were in support of the view-rise of Islamic resurgence is the root cause of the conflict. In this way we found majority of respondents at state-level considered the mishandling of polities in Jammu & Kashmir by central government responsible for causing the conflict.

When we see our data region and religion-wise we found that majority of Muslims of all the regions, along with Sikhs of region Kashmir and Jammu as well as Hindus of Jammu share similar opinion regarding the role played by Government in mishandling polities in the state. However majority of Hindus in Kashmir, unlike
their co-religionists in Jammu, attributed the root cause of the conflict to the political and economic alienation of the people. While Buddhists of Ladakh held undemocratic and dishonest politics by political leaders of Jammu & Kashmir responsible for the conflict.

This shows that at regional-level too the mishandling of polities in Jammu & Kashmir by central government emerged as a major factor involved in the conflict. Some importance has been given to political and economic alienation of the people led by undemocratic and dishonest politics of the state’s political elites.

With the analysis of four questions related to political factors it has emerged that denial of plebiscite right, corruption and nepotism as promoted both by central government and local politicians there are two major political factors, which keep the conflict alive and make it violent.

It is commonly believed outside the state that Pak support to militancy in Kashmir is the root cause of the conflict but this view do not have support in majority of population in Jammu & Kashmir as only 4.52% respondents were found in support of the view.

Moreover, there is wide spread notion among both scholars and laymen in the country that rise of Islamic resurgence is the factor which make Muslims every where militant and terrorist. This view is also held about the rise of violent conflict in Kashmir but surprisingly we found only 0.65% respondents in Jammu & Kashmir in support of the view – rise of Islamic resurgence is the root cause of the conflict.

Besides political, economic factors play an important role in integrating people to any social system. In case of Kashmir conflict in regard with economic factors like lack of governmental will in creating better economic and employment opportunities we found at state-
level majority of respondents (78.39%) think that if government had created better economic and employment opportunities there would have been no conflict. However 21.61% respondents did not corroborate the majority view.

Seeing the responses region and religion wise, we founded majority of Hindus, Buddhists, Sikhs and Muslims in all regions (K, J & L) share the same view that lack of economic and employment opportunities promote Kashmir conflict.

In fact due to lack of governmental will to create better economic and employment in this hilly state have resulted not only to promote conflict but also severe kind of economic hardships among the people. Therefore, we have found that majority of respondents (83.87%) at state-level think those economic hardships as a factor motivates Kashmiri youth towards the militancy.

Moreover, examining the responses region and religion-wise we found that majority of Hindus, Sikhs and Buddhists respondents in all regions (J, K, L) consider that economic hardships motivate people towards the militancy there.

Thus, economic factors like the lack of governmental will to create better economic and employment opportunities and the economic hardships that people suffer in the state are the major factors that stir up the conflict.

Social movements or struggle for achieving collective goals generally emerge when people experience or perceive political and economic deprivations. Both political and economic deprivations have been experienced by people of Jammu and Kashmir as we have explored it in preceding pages. However, people are mobilized on the basis of symbols and beliefs. There are many examples in Indian society
where people have been mobilized on the basis of caste, language, tribe and religion for expressing their political and economic grievances as well as achieving their goals. Religion is very important basis of exploiting sentiments of people or mobilizing opinion for struggle. In case of Kashmir conflict we found that at state-level majority of respondents (64.52%) think religion inspires Kashmir youth for the movement.

When we examine our data region and religion wise it could be found that majority of Muslims in all regions along with majority of Hindus (72.00%) and Sikhs (60.00%) in Jammu share the same opinion i.e. religion motivates people for the movement.

However, majority of Hindus in Kashmir (75.00%), and Buddhists in Ladakh (60.00%) do think that religion inspires people for the separatist movement.

Thus we found at regional-level except majority of Buddhists in Ladakh and Hindus of Kashmir, majority of Muslims in all regions (J, K & L), Sikhs and Hindus of region-Jammu opined unanimously that religion inspires people towards the militant movement.

In another question related to role of religion, we found at state level majority of respondents (73.55%) believe Hindu doubt about the quality of Muslim patriotism in India is one of the factors with the persistence of Kashmir conflict.

Seeing responses region and religion-wise we found majority of Muslims in all regions and Sikhs of Kashmir (80.00%) share the same view i.e., Hindu-Muslim mistrust factor in India promote conflict in Kashmir. However, majority of Hindus in Kashmir (55.00%), in Jammu (64.00%) along with Sikhs in Jammu (70.00%) and Buddhists of Ladakh (80.00%) have different opinion i.e. they think that Hindus
do not doubt loyalty of Muslims in India. Thus, this factor is not at play in Kashmir conflict.

Thus we found at regional-state level only majority of Muslims in all regions of the state hold that mistrust between Hindus and Muslims in India as a factor promote conflict in the state.

Therefore from the analysis of various questions related to religion we found Kashmiri militants derive inspiration from religion in the current ongoing struggle in Jammu & Kashmir. Moreover, Mistrust between Hindus and Muslims as a factor also promote conflict in the state.

Besides religion, there are many issues which come under the scope of ethnic diversity. These are socio-cultural, linguistic and tribal differences. Both intra-religious and inter-regional ethnic divisions exist in the state we have explained such divisions in chapter number two of the study. In order to find out relevance of such differences to Kashmir conflict, we found at state-level that majority of respondents (79.35%) think that ethnic and cultural diversity is the internal source of the conflict. This shows majority of respondents in Jammu & Kashmir consider ethnic and cultural diversity of the state as an endogenous source of the conflict.

Region and religion-wise analysis of data in regard with ethno-cultural diversity, majority of Muslims (78.57% of Kashmir 80.0% of Jammu & 53.33% of Ladakh) in all regions shared the same view i.e., ethnic and cultural diversity is the internal source of Kashmir conflict. The same view is shared by Hindus in region Jammu (100.00%) and 50.00% Kashmiri Hindus. Similarly 100.00% Buddhists in region Ladakh too consider that ethno-cultural diversity of the state promote the conflict.
However, majority of Kashmiri Sikhs (60.00%) in their opinion differ from the majority of Sikhs (90.00%) in Jammu-region. The former attribute the conflict to ethnic and cultural diversity of the state while the latter do not hold so, like 50.00% Kashmiri Hindus. This shows that all major ethno-religious groups like Kashmiri Muslims, dogri speaking Hindus of Jammu and Buddhists in region Ladakh consider unanimously that ethnic and cultural diversity in the state constitute one of the endogenous sources of the conflict.

There is a section of scholars who believe that Kashmir conflict has emerged and persisted due to quest of Kashmiri speaking Muslims to establish their political hegemony over other ethnic groups. They also believe Kashmiri speaking Muslims discriminate against non-Muslims and non-Kashmiri speaking people. In order to confirm this view we have included question in regard of persistence of the conflict due to dominance of Kashmiri speaking Muslims over other ethnic groups. At state level we have found that majority of respondents (71.61%) do not believe Kashmir conflict persist because of Kashmiri speaking Muslim hegemony over other ethnic groups in Jammu & Kashmir.

At regional-level we found only majority of Hindus (96.00%) in region Jammu and Buddhists (93.33%) in Ladakh region think about the persistence of conflict due to Kashmiri speaking Muslims endeavor to impose their dominance over other ethnic groups in the state.

Thus, we found majority of ethno religious groups in different regions of the state attributed Kashmir conflict to the ethno-cultural diversity factor. Infact it emerged as the major factor that promotes conflicts there. But regarding the superiority of Kashmiri Muslims as a factor we did not find majority of respondents in support of this factor at state-level.
Although we found political, economic, religious and ethnic factors are responsible for creating and sustaining Kashmir conflict but it appears so far very difficult to identify the factor which respondents think is the major factor involved in Kashmir conflict. From the analysis of multi-factorial question which involves-political, economic, religious, cultural, regional and outside support factors, we found at state level the highest percentage (47.09%) of respondents believe political factor is major. While 28.38% view economic factor is major while 9.03% respondents think that major factor is cultural. Small percentage of respondents have expressed their opinion to remaining three factors i.e., 6.45% respondents to outside support factor, 6.12% to religious and 2.90% to regional factors, respectively. This shows at state level majority of respondents consider political and economic as major factors involved in Kashmir conflict.

When we see our data related to fore mentioned factors region and religion-wise we found the highest percentage fo Muslims (52.14%) in valley Kashmir think political the major factor, like their co-religionists in Jammu (50.00%) and Ladakh (53.33%) this view is shared by the highest percentage of Sikhs in Kashmir (50.00%) and Jammu (40.00%). 46.66% Buddhists respondents in Ladakh view political as a major factor. Related to political factor, however, differences were found between the opinion of Hindus in Jammu and in region Kashmir. The former has given the highest percentage (36.00%) of response to political factor while the later (45.00%) consider economic as major factor. This shows almost all the religions at regional level believe that Kashmir conflict is a political phenomenon.

In regard with economic factor we found among Kashmiri Hindus (45.00%) economic factor has got the highest percentage of opinion, while other ethnic groups irrespective of religion like 28.00% Hindus in Jammu 30.00% Muslims each in region Kashmir and Jammu as
well as 20.00% in Ladakh region share the same opinion related to economic factors as shared by Hindus in Kashmir but they in their opinion have given second highest percentage of response to it (economic factor). This shows almost all the religious communities at regional level view economic factor’s importance in the conflict. Concerning cultural factor’s involvement in the conflict we found all religious communities (10.00% Hindus of Kashmir and 12.00% of Jammu, 10.00% Sikhs each in valley Kashmir & Jammu, 6.67% Buddhists and Muslims (13.33%) in Ladakh region, 10.00% Muslim of Jammu and 7.14% of valley) at regional level have given some significance to it. This shows cultural factor’s also induces the conflict. Over religious factor’s involvement in the conflict we found almost all religious communities (8.57% Muslims of Kashmir, 8.00% of Jammu and 6.66% of Ladakh, 5.00% Hindus of Kashmir, and 10.00% Sikh respondents of Jammu) in different regions have given fourth highest percentage of response to it. This also shows that religion plays some role in the conflict.

Concerning outside support factor we found that 10.00% Hindu respondents each in Kashmir and Jammu regions, 10.00% Sikhs each in Jammu and region Kashmir, 20.00% Buddhists in Ladakh, 4.28% Muslims in Kashmir, 2.00% in Jammu and 6.66% in Ladakh ‘share same opinion i.e., outside support plays some role in making the conflict. Moreover, compared to other factors outside support factor has got fifth highest percentage of responses.

In regard with regional factor at regional level we found only 14.00% Hindus of Jammu and 13.33% Buddhists of Ladakh there think that it promotes the conflict. This also shows regional factor has got sixth position in the hierarchy of response percentage. Thus from the analysis of data we found that political and economic are major factors involved in making the conflict in Jammu & Kashmir. Although
some significance has been given to cultural and religious factors. But the remaining two factors i.e. regional and outside support factors have got least importance. This also shows that conflict in Jammu & Kashmir is multidimensional as political, economic, cultural and religious considerations are at play in making, promoting and sustaining it.

Every conflict is the product of some factors and it has some consequences. Consequences may be both positive and negative depending upon the nature, scale and location of the conflict. Kashmir conflict has its long history and is the cumulative result of various factors which we have explained in the preceding pages. Kashmir conflict is of a nature which has largely negative consequences because Kashmiri nationality involved in it is attacking the values upon which the foundation of Indian state is based. Internally the conflict appears to be between the Kashmiri – nationality and an Indian state, between Muslims and non-Muslims. Externally this is a conflict between the two states i.e. India and Pakistan in which Kashmiri nationality is smashed. It is therefore the conflict has more negative consequences for the relationship between state and nationality, among various ethnic groups and for the socio-economic development of the Jammu and Kashmir.

Concerning political consequences we have found that majority of respondents (75.16%) at state level think that they feel alienated from the political system.

When we examine our data region and religion-wise we found that majority of Muslims respondents (92.86% in Kashmir, 80.00% in Jammu and 100.00% in Ladakh) in all regions of the state feel politically alienated.
However, opinion of Hindus in region Kashmir differ from the opinion of Hindus in Jammu. As 100.00% Kashmiri Hindus think that they feel alienated politically, unlike majority of their co-religionists in Jammu (72.00%) who do not think so. While majority of Kashmiri Sikhs (80.00%) and 60.00% Sikhs living in Jammu share the same opinion i.e. both feel politically alienated. About, 100.00% Buddhists in the region of Ladakh do not feel any political alienation.

This shows the conflict has thrown negative repercussion over the political integration of religion communities. At regional level although majority of Muslims and Sikhs in different regions of the state feel more politically alienated as compared to majority of Hindus of Jammu and Buddhists of Ladakh, this shows upon the political integration of respondents the consequences of conflict has remained uneven.

In fact, alienation of people has enabled them to form soft opinion about the slogan like freedom rhetoric and extremism. Concerning their support to what is called in Kashmir valley freedom movement, we have found that at state level majority of respondents (58.71%) maintain that they support the freedom movement. Remaining 41.29% respondents do not support the movement.

However, analysis of data region and religion wise shows that majority of Muslims in all regions (82.14% in valley, 92.00% in Jammu and 86.66% in Ladakh region) have expressed their opinion in support of the movement. While majority of Hindus (95.00% in Kashmir and 100.00% in Jammu), Sikhs (80.00% in Kashmir and 90.00% in region-jammu) and Buddhists (100.00%) in Ladakh do not support the movement.

Therefore we found only Muslims irrespective of their ethnic affiliations are in support of the movement where as non-Muslims do
not support it. Moreover, this also shows that religion rather than region plays an important role in shaping the opinion of people in supporting the movement. In fact rampant political corruption and nepotism in the state has not only alienated people especially Muslims from the politics but also softened their attitude towards extremism/militancy.

Apart from political, the conflict has badly affected the economic prospects of people. At state level we have found that majority of respondents (75.16%) believe that their economic prospects declined in the period of militancy. Remaining 24.84% respondents think their economic prosperity remained uninfuenced in the period of turmoil. This shows the ongoing conflict in Jammu & Kashmir has badly affected the economic prospects of people.

For the same, if seeing our data region and religion wise it could be found that majority of Muslim respondents (90.00% in Kashmir, 84.00% in Jammu and 100.00% Buddhists in Ladakh) in all regions think that in the period of militancy their economic progress declined.

For the same, the opinion of Hindus in Kashmir differ from the opinion of Hindus in Jammu. As 90.00% Kashmiri Hindus consider that their economic prosperity declined in the period of conflict, whereas, 84.00% Hindus in Jammu region do no consider so. While, majority of Sikhs in Kashmir (100.00%) and Jammu (80.00%) opined that conflict has blocked their economic prospects. While 100.00% Buddhists in Ladakh believed that the conflict has not damaged their economic prosperity. This shows at regional-level majority of Hindus in region Jammu and Buddhists of Ladakh think that in the period of militancy their economic prospects do not decline. However majority of Muslims and Sikhs in all regions and Hindus of Kashmir region share the same view that in the period of turmoil their economic progress
hampered. Thus, like political, the consequences of the conflict over economy of religious communities there has remained uneven as some dominant ethno-regional groups (Buddhists of Ladakh and Hindus of Jammu) think their economic prospects hardly declined than other ethno-religious communities at regional level.

Apart from the arrest or disruption of politico-economic development growing alienation and poverty among people, conflict in Kashmir has serious repercussions for family and marriage organizations. At state level we have found that majority of respondents. (60.65%) think that since the emergence of conflict number of widows and their children have not only increased but created problems in the family and marriage systems. 13.23% respondents believe that parental authority has declined in the family. About, 4.84% respondents said divorce rate has increased. This shows majority of respondents at state level opine that increasing the number of widows and their children in the family and decline of parental authority in the family are the consequences of ongoing conflict in the state. Our case study also shows that problem of wido-remarriage and rehabilitation of the orphans especially among those families that have become the victims of violence are some other issues related to impact of the conflict over family and marriage like organizations.

Related to issue of family and marriage when we see our data region and religion-wise it could be found that majority of Muslims (70.71% in valley, 68.00% in Jammu and 100.00%) in all three regions believe that in the ongoing conflict increasing number of widows and their children have created problems in the family and marriage systems there. Similarly majority of Hindus (80.00% in Kashmir and 32.00% in Jammu) in both regions share the same opinion as shared by majority of Muslims. Correspondingly 80.00% Sikh respondents in region Kashmir hold the same view, unlike their co-religionists in
Jammu (0.00%). Like Sikhs in Jammu, Buddhists (0.00%) in Ladakh do not express any opinion on the impact of conflict over family and marriage systems. This shows majority of Muslims and Hindus in all regions as well as Sikhs in Kashmir believe that increase in the number of widows and their children due to the conflict created problems in the family and marriage systems.

In regard with the impact of conflict on parental authority we found 20.71% Muslims in Kashmir 8.00% in Jammu think that it has declined in the family.

For the same, 20.00% Hindus in Kashmir share their opinion with 4.00% Hindus in Jammu while 20.00% Sikhs in region-Kashmir think that parental authority has declined in the family in the period of conflict. This shows Buddhists of Ladakh (0.00%) and Sikh respondents of Jammu have expressed no opinion over the issue. However some Muslims and Hindus of region-Kashmir and Jammu think that ongoing militancy has declined parental authority in the family.

So far as the impact of conflict on marital break up is concerned we found only 8.57% Muslim respondents in valley-Kashmir and 6.00% in Jammu believe that divorce rate has increased in the period of militancy.

Thus we find majority of Muslims and Hindus in all the regions think that increase in the number of widows and their children and decline of parental authority are the horrible consequences of Kashmir conflict. Majority of Sikhs in region Kashmir share the same view.

Related to increase in number of widows and their children Buddhists of Ladakh and Sikhs in Jammu have expressed no opinion. We also found related to divorce rate only small percentage of Muslims think
that divorce rate has increased since the emergence of militancy. Over other issues like practice of Dowry and increase in illegitimate relations in the period of militancy no religious community has expressed any opinion.

Kashmir conflict appears to have adversely affected the syncretic cultural identity (Kashmiryat) of the state. Kashmiryat cements religious communities together since long there. In regard with consequences of conflict over Kashmiryat at state level we have found that majority of respondents (62.90%) believe that it cements religions together. Remaining 37.10% respondents consider Kashmiryat has lost its influence to hold religions together after the emergence of militancy. This shows at state-level majority of respondents in the state think that Kashmiryat in still alive even in the period of conflict.

At regional level, we have found that majority of Muslims in Kashmir (86.43%) and in Ladakh (80.00%) differ in their opinion from majority of Muslims in Jammu (56.00%). The former hold Kashmiryat is still alive there whereas the later do not think so.

Majority of Hindus in Kashmir (85.00%) think that in the period of militancy Kashmiryat still hold its influence there, however, majority of Hindus in Jammu do not consider so. While we also found majority of Sikhs in region – Kashmir (100.00%) said that in the period of militancy Kashmiryat has not lost its influence to hold religions together. Whereas some significant percentage of their co-religionists in Jammu (50.00%) believe that militancy has damaged sprit of Kashmiryat among people. Buddhists respondents (100.00%) in the region of Ladakh too think Kashmiryat has lost its influence to hold religions together due to emergence the conflict.
This shows at regional-level majority of Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs in region Kashmir consider that militancy has not influenced Kashmiryat, but majority of their co-religionists (H, M, S) in region Jammu along with Buddhists of region-Ladakh consider the impact of militancy on Kashmiryat.

Concerned with inter-religious relationship we have found at state-level highest percentage (64.19%) of respondents think that militancy has increased the gulf between religious communities in J&K and outside of it also.

Religion-wise analysis of data at regional level reveal that majority of Muslims in valley Kashmir (78.57%) and Jammu (90.00%) hold the same view i.e. militancy has not disturbed the religious harmony, however, majority of Muslims in Ladakh (60.00%) think that it has disturbed the inter-religious harmony.

Similarly, majority of Hindus (80.00%) and Sikhs (80.00%) in region Kashmir share the same opinion, however, majority of Hindu (80.00%) and Sikh (60.00%) respondents in region-Jammu consider unanimously that militancy is responsible for disturbing the inter-religious harmony. 80.00% Buddhist respondents in Ladakh region shared the same opinion. Thus, we find, majority of Buddhists and Muslims in Ladakh along with Hindus and Sikhs in region Jammu opin that widening of gulf between religious communities in the state and outside of it is the outcome of conflict in Kashmir. However this view do not get significant support among Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims of Kashmir region.

Apart from breaking the syncretic cultural identity, widening the gap between religious communities, the conflict is said to have adversely affected respect of people of J&K in other parts of India. We have found at state level majority of respondents (60.97%) perceive that
emergence of conflict in the state resulted loss of respect of people in other parts of India. However, 39.03% respondents do not think so. This shows that majority of respondents at state level view that they are not getting due respect from people living in other parts of India after the emergence of militancy there.

Seeing our data region and religion wise we found disparity in the opinion of Muslims, Majority of Muslims in valley (95.71%) and Jammu-region (90.00%) perceive loss of respect after the emergence of militancy in various states of India, however, majority of Muslim respondents in region-Ladakh (60.00%) do not perceive so.

Moreover, majority of all non-Muslim religious communities (100.00% Hindus of Kashmir and 100.00% Hindus of Jammu, 80.00% Kashmiri Sikhs and 80.00% in Jammu, and 100.00% Buddhists in Ladakh) in all regions there think that they have not experienced any loss of respect from people of other parts of India in the period of turmoil.

Thus we found only majority of Muslim respondents in Kashmir and Jammu regions experience loss of respect from people living in different parts of India after the emergence of militancy in Jammu & Kashmir.

In fact during survey number of Muslim respondents who work outside the state said that some people in other states of India suspect them as "terrorists". Moreover, while frisking disdainful remarks by police or security agencies are other examples of humiliation.

Consequences of the ongoing conflict in Jammu & Kashmir could be seen in the form of curtailing the rights and liberties of people as the fundamental rights guaranteed to every citizen of India under the Indian constitution have been denied to them.
The emergence of militancy is no doubt one of the factors responsible for this unhealthy development. But the various policies that central government formulated for checking militancy in Kashmir, in practice turned out to be an exercise directed against the vast masses of Kashmiri people. In one of the questions related to consequences of the conflict on rights and liberties of people we have found at state-level majority of respondents (90.00%) opine that their freedom of speech, to protest and form the government of their choice got curtailed. Remaining 10.00% respondents do not share the view as expressed by majority of respondent in the state. This shows majority of respondents at state level believe that their rights and liberties got curtailed due to prevailing conflict in the state.

When we see responses region and religion wise we have found that majority of Muslims (89.29%, 86.00% in Jammu and 80.00% in Ladakh) respondents in all regions understand that in the period of conflict their fundamental rights got curtailed.

Similarly, all Hindu respondents in valley (100.00%) and Jammu (100.00%) have expressed the same opinion as expressed by majority of Muslims in all regions there. Also, majority of Sikh respondents in valley Kashmir (60.00%) and Jammu (80.00%) along with majority of Buddhists (80.00%) in Ladakh have expressed the same opinion.

Thus at regional level too we found that majority of respondents irrespective of religion think that their freedom of speech, right to protest and form government of their choice have got curtailed since the emergence of violent conflict in the state.

Apart from curtailing the rights and liberties, the prevailing conflict appears to have affected adversely the religious life of people in the state. In this regard we have found at state level majority of
respondents (54.19%) think that in the period of conflict they suffered loss of religious freedom. However, 45.81% respondents do not think so. This shows at state level majority of respondents have suffered loss of religious freedom.

When we see our data region and religion-wise we found differences in the opinion of Muslim respondents. Majority of Muslim respondents in both Kashmir (81.43%) and Jammu (56.00%) think their religious freedom suffered whereas Muslims (100.00%) in Ladakh do not suffer loss of religious freedom. Hindus in valley (100.00%) and Jammu (100.00%) as well as Sikhs (100.00% in valley and 100.00% in Jammu) have experienced no loss of religious freedom. Also, Buddhist (100.00%) in Ladakh hold the same view. Thus we found at regional level only Muslims in valley Kashmir and Jammu viewed that after the emergence of conflict their religious freedom suffered.

In fact at the time of survey most of the Muslims in valley said us that current turmoil has adversely affected their religious life as they could not offer Namaz in mosques especially those prayers which are offered in dark hours. Moreover, Muslims there think that because of the fear of military for perceiving them as terrorists they do not organize Ijtemas (one of the religious duties) in mosques and homes, they used to organize there before the emergence of militancy.

Another impact of Kashmir conflict we observed in the form of migration of Kashmiri Hindu families from region Kashmir to region Jammu. Though some of the families have migrated to other states of India. In this way migration led by Kashmir conflict is of intra-state and inter-state in nature. In regard with factors which became responsible for the migration of Hindu families we have found at state level the highest percentage of respondents (46.45%) think policy of the government responsible for it. 46.13% respondents view the rise
of militancy became responsible for migration of pandits (Hindus) from Kashmir. For the same, 7.42% respondents are of the view that pandits migrated because of the presence of employment and other economic opportunities in other parts of India.

This shows majority of respondents at state level think the policy of Government and emergence of militancy are the two main factors that triggered migration among Kashmiri Hindus.

If we analyse our data region and religion wise we have found differences in the opinion of Muslims. Majority of Muslims in Jammu (58.00%) and region Kashmir (60.00%) consider that it was the policy of the government to migrate Kashmiri pandits, unlike the highest percentage of their co-religionists in Ladakh (46.67%) who viewed rise of militancy became responsible for migration of Hindus from Kashmir.

Moreover, for migration of pandits all Hindus in Jammu (100.00%) and valley (100.00%) think emergence of militancy is responsible. Relatedly, majority of Sikhs (60.00% in valley & 50.00% in Jammu) at regional level share the same opinion as shared by Hindus. Similarly all Buddhists in Ladakh (100.00%) believe rise of militancy is responsible for the migration of Pandits from valley.

Thus, we found majority of Muslims in region Kashmir and Jammu regions believe the policy of government have encouraged migration among Hindus in Kashmir. Whereas majority of Hindus, Sikhs and Buddhists along with Muslims in LaJakh think emergence of militancy became responsible for migration of Kashmiri Pandits from Kashmir. It is therefore at regional level majority of non-Muslims said militancy as a factor has triggered migration of Kashmiri Hindus there.
After the emergence of militancy (1989) in Jammu & Kashmir government of India facing the imminent threat to the territorial integrity of the country resorted to heavy deployment of security forces there. Ironically heavy deployment of security forces for suppressing ongoing militancy lead to sharp escalation of human rights violation particularly custodial deaths reprisal killings rape torture and assaults on innocent people, incidents of firing on peaceful demonstrations, humiliating body searches and arresting someone on suspicious groups.

Human rights are not merely violated by armed forces they are violated by the militants also. There are two kinds of militants operating in the state. One is of those who claim themselves as freedom fighters and fight against Indian forces in Kashmir. Another kind of militant group is of those who surrendered themselves before Indian military and working on the behest of it. They are known as Nabedis or Ikhwanis in Kashmir. They terrorize people, loot and plunder their property and kill those whom they consider their enemies.

In regard with the question related to violators of human rights in Kashmir we have found at state level majority of respondents (64.52%) think that Indian security forces have violated Human rights. About, 20.00% respondents consider K. militants have mostly violated the human rights. And, 10.65% respondents view Ikhwanis (surrendered Kashmiri militants) the violators of human rights. Remaining 4.19%, 0.65% respondents believe Pakistan and some local Kashmiris as the main violators of human rights.

This shows majority of respondents at state level think that security forces of India and Kashmiri militants are the major violators of human rights in Kashmir.
At regional level our data show that majority of Muslim (84.29% of Kashmir, 86.00% of Jammu and 80.00% of Ladakh) respondents in all regions hold Indian security forces responsible for the human rights violation. However, we found difference in the opinion of Hindu respondents. As, majority of Hindu respondents in region Kashmir (70.00%) think security forces have violated the human rights. Whereas majority of Hindu respondents in region Jammu (70.00%) have different opinion i.e., they think militants as violators of human rights of the people. Sikhs respondents about 40.00% in region Kashmir hold security forced responsible for violating the rights of people, unlike the highest percentage of their co-religionists in Jammu (40.00) hold militants responsible. In the region of Ladakh Buddhist (100.00%) think that militants have violated the human rights of people brazenly. This shows at regional level we found Muslims in all regions hold security forces of India responsible for the violation of human rights. This view is also shared by majority of Kashmiri, Hindus and Sikhs.

Contrary to this, majority of Hindus in region Jammu and the highest percentage of Sikhs in the same region along with all Buddhists in region Ladakh share the same opinion i.e. they consider militants as the major violators of human rights of people there. Thus we found security forces of India and Kashmiri militants as the major violators of Human rights.

Kashmir conflict as we have explored in the preceding pages foregoing section has adversely affected the political atmosphere as majority of people there still feel alienated from politics which was revived in Jammu & Kashmir in 1996. It has hampered the economic property of people also. Both political alienation and decline in the economic prosperity there were found more in Muslim dominated areas of Jammu & Kashmir or in those areas which are more in
thrones of militancy. Moreover syncretic cultural identity called Kashmiryat which used to cement religious communities together too got weakened. Although Muslim along with Hindus and Sikhs in region Kashmir think sprit of Kashmiryat is still alive even in the period of militancy the impact of conflict on family and marriage organizations shows that it has declined parental authority in family and increased the number of widow and orphans especially in Kashmir and Jammu regions only.

Therefore problems of widow re-marriage and rehabilitation of orphans are other issues which need quick solution. Widening of gap between religious communities and influencing the honor of Muslims of valley and some parts of Jammu in other parts of India reveal the conflict has thrown negative repercussions on social relationships. In the prevailing conflict the rights and liberties including religious freedom of Muslim in valley and Jammu have also got curtailed. The conflict has drastically changed the demographics of the state to a great extent, because of the migration of most of the Kashmiri Hindu families from valley Kashmir.

As we have seen in preceding analysis, Kashmir conflict is complex and multi-layered phenomenon. It has a long history which involves legal questions and international diplomacy. It is not merely an ethnic conflict but also an issue of conflict between two sovereign states (India and Pakistan) and occupies a place in international peace keeping agenda. Scholars have suggested various strategies for resolving conflict in Kashmir. Some of these strategies are coercive in nature while others are reconciliatory in nature. Ethnic flooding, the mailed first strategy-suppressing militarily the ongoing struggle for independent Kashmir, the wear-down strategy, conceding the valley to Pakistan, shared sovereignty, Holding a plebiscite, independence, the protectorate option, An alternative strategy, A Trieste type
solution, creation of sovereignty association and creation of several independent states are the various strategies which we have described briefly in the preceding chapter.

Apart from describing the design and desirability of the aforementioned models of conflict resolution over which scholars have already reflected upon, we have sought to know the viewpoint of respondents related to resolution of Kashmir conflict. Concerning with granting full autonomy in politico-constitutional matters to Jammu & Kashmir, we have found at state level the highest percentage of respondents (50.97%) think that if government of India restore the autonomy powers of Jammu & Kashmir which existed there till 1952 the conflict would be resolved. Remaining 49.03% respondents do not think so. This shows at state level majority of respondents in the state opine that if autonomy of the state is restored the conflict would be resolved peacefully. If we see our data region and religion-wise we found majority of Muslims (54.28% in Kashmir, 60.00% in Jammu and 60.00% in Ladakh) in all regions of the state are in favour of resolving the problem through the mechanism of autonomy to Jammu & Kashmir. However we found difference in the opinion of Hindus in Kashmir and Jammu. Majority of Hindus (60.00%) in valley Kashmir opine that granting full autonomy to Jammu & Kashmir would solve the conflict, unlike the majority of Hindus (80.00%) in Jammu. Moreover, majority of Sikhs in Kashmir (70.00%) wish to resolve the conflict through the mechanism of autonomy, while 50.00% Sikhs in region Jammu too share the same opinion. In the region of Ladakh majority of Buddhists (80.00%) have expressed their opinion against granting any autonomy to the state. Thus, majority of Muslims in all regions, along with Kashmiri Hindus and Sikhs of both regions (Kashmiri & Jammu) share the same opinion i.e. if autonomous powers are restored to the state as existed there till 1952 Kashmir
conflict would be resolved. However, majority of Hindus in Jammu and Ladakhi Buddhists opine that granting autonomy to the state wouldn’t resolve the dispute.

Related to autonomy, we have asked another question to respondent in order to ascertain their viewpoint on separate regional autonomy. At state level only 17.74% respondents believe that granting autonomous status to all three regions would resolve Kashmir conundrum. This shows among majority of respondents (82.26%) at state-level regional autonomy model lacks appeal.

If we see our data region and religion wise it could be found that only majority of Hindus in Jammu (68.00%) and Buddhists in ladakh (80.00%) have opined in favour of regional autonomy model. However majority of Muslims and Sikhs in all regions and Kashmiri Hindus have expressed their opinion against the model, i.e. Kashmir conflict wouldn’t be resolved if govt. gives autonomous status to all regions like Kashmir valley, Jammu and Ladakh.

Another legitimate and democratic way to resolve the Kashmir problem is to ascertain the wishes of people through an impartial plebiscite. In this regard at state level we have found majority of respondents (75.48%) think that if plebiscite is allowed there and its result honoured Kashmir problem would be resolved.

Seeing responses of respondents region and religion-wise we found majority of Muslims in all regions 95.00% in Kashmir, 94.00% in Jammu and 100.00% in Ladakh) believe that holding plebiscite and honouring its result is the best way to resolve the conflict. Majority of Hindus in Kashmir (85.00%) have expressed their view in favour of the plebiscite, however, majority of Hindu respondents in Jammu (76.00%) do not share their views with Kashmiri Hindus i.e., they view holding of plebiscite would not resolve the conflict. We also found the
opinion of Sikh respondents in Kashmir valley differ from the opinion of Sikh respondents in Jammu region. The former (60.00%) hold that Kashmir conflict would not be resolved through the mechanism of plebiscite, however, the latter (60.00%) in Jammu opined that plebiscite if allowed can resolve the conflict. While all Buddhist respondents (100.00%) in Ladakh opined against the resolution of conflict by allowing plebiscite there.

This shows at regional level majority of Muslims in all regions think it plebiscite is allowed in J&K the conflict would be peacefully resolved. Similarly majority of Sikhs in Jammu and Hindus in Kashmir-region in Kashmir too share the same opinion on plebiscite. However, ethno-religious communities among whom we did not find acceptability of the model (holding impartial plebiscite) are majority of Hindus in Jammu and Sikhs in Kashmir valley as well as majority of Buddhists in Ladakh.

In another question concerning plebiscite respondents were asked what options should be given in plebiscite if it is allowed in the state. We have found at state level majority of respondents (74.19%) there wish that Jammu and Kashmir should be a sovereign country. About 28.81% respondents desire that option like the state should go with India be included if plebiscite is held there. This shows that no respondent in Jammu & Kashmir wishes the state to go with Pakistan, majority of respondents their desire to retain Jammu & Kashmir an independent country.

When we see responses of respondents region and religion wise it could be found that majority of Muslims in all regions (98.57% of Kashmir valley, 96.00% of Jammu and 100.00% of Ladakh) share the same opinion i.e. they prefer independence of the state. Similarly majority of Kashmiri Sikhs 980.00%) sharer the same opinion.
However, majority of Hindus (70.00% of Kashmir valley and 80.00% of Jammu) along with 60.00% Sikh respondents of Jammu and 93.33% Buddhists of Ladakh region think that the state should go with India. This shows in regard with what options should be given in plebiscite we found two prominent opinions. Majority of Muslims in all regions along with Kashmiri Sikhs wish the state should be sovereign country. Whereas majority of Hindus (in Kashmir & Jammu regions) and Buddhists in Ladakh opined that the state should go with India. Similarly majority of Sikhs in Jammu share the same opinion as shared by Buddhists and Hindus i.e. in plebiscite option like Jammu & Kashmir should go with India be included.

Geographical area of Jammu and Kashmir is quite large. Some portion of this state is under control of Pakistan called Pakistan occupied Kashmir (POK). People in POK and those in Indian part of Kashmir have religious affinity & ethnic affiliations. Many of them are close relatives and feel alienated and marginalized when they are not allowed to see each other due to border restrictions since 1948 war. In this way people living in both parts of Kashmir (POK and Indian part of Kashmir) have lost social contact.

It is therefore large number of social activist propose that India and Pakistan should encourage free movement of Kashmiris in order to restore peace in the region. Recently governments of both countries have implemented steps in this regard i.e. launching bus services between Srinagar and Muzaffarabad in 2006, however, we have conducted our fieldwork before these steps were taken.

In one of the questions we asked respondents would Kashmir conflict be resolved if Government of India allow free movement of Kashmiris across the boarder. At state level we have found that majority of respondents (94.52%) there think that free movement of Kashmiris
across the boarder would not resolve the conflict. However, very small percentage of respondents (5.48%) view that it would help to resolve the conflict.

Examining the data region and religion-wise shows that majority of Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs and Buddhists in different regions of the state view that free movement of Kashmiri people across the boarder would not resolve the conflict. Thus, we found all religious communities at regional level think Kashmir conflict would not be resolved merely by allowing free movement of Kashmiris across the border (LOC).

We have described in the preceded chapter there is a small section of people in India who believe that if Kashmir valley is granted to Pakistan, the ongoing conflict in the state would be resolved. In this regard at state level we found that majority of respondents (96.45%) consider if Kashmir valley is given to Pakistan the conflict would not be resolved. Only 3.55% respondents view allowing valley Kashmir to go with Pakistan would end the conflict.

Seeing our data region and religion-wise show that all four religious communities (H,M,S,B,) living in different regions think unanimously that Kashmir conundrum wouldn’t end if valley Kashmir is granted to Pakistan. Thus, strategy of conflict resolution, which grants valley to Pakistan, lacks appeal among both Muslims and non-Muslim respondents at regional as well as state level. Therefore our finding also rejects the viewpoint of scholars who think Kashmiri Muslims want to go with Pakistan or accession of Jammu & Kashmir to Pakistan.

Another way to resolve the conflict is revitalizing polity and economy of the state. Moreover, taking measures for providing education and employment opportunities to large number of people there. In this
regard at state level we found majority of respondents (55.48%) think that ensuring proper functioning of democratic politics, economic development and education and employment opportunities to large number of people would be sufficient for conflict resolution there, however, remaining 44.52% respondents have opined against the majority view. This shows at state level majority of respondents consider if political and economic development of the state is ensured Kashmir conflict would be resolved.

At regional level we have found that only majority of Muslim respondents in Kashmir-valley (77.14%) have opined against the model i.e. ensuring political and economic development of Jammu & Kashmir is not sufficient for conflict resolution there. However majority of Muslims in Jammu (58.00%) and Ladakh (80.00%) along with majority of Hindus (95.00% in Kashmir and 100.00% in Jammu) and Sikhs (80.00% in Kashmir & 70.00% in Jammu) as well as Buddhists (100.00%) in Ladakh share the same opinion i.e., they think proper functioning of democracy, economic development of the state, educational and employment opportunities to the large number of people would resolve the conflict.

Thus, at regional level we have found, except majority of Kashmiri Muslims, the majority of all other ethno-religious groups in different regions wish to resolve the conflict through the mechanism of politico-economic development strategy.

Another possible way to resolve the conflict in Jammu and Kashmir for India is to have direct negotiations with the separatist groups. In this regard we have found at state-level majority of respondents (68.71%) opine that there would be peace if Govt. of India takes into consideration those who have guns in their hands. Remaining 31.29% respondents do not opine so. This shows at state level
majority of respondents believe that if government of India hold talks with militants there would be peace in Jammu & Kashmir.

If we see data region and religion wise, majority of Muslims (90.71% in Kashmir, 94.00% in Jammu and 100.00% in Ladakh) share same opinion i.e., if government of India takes into consideration militants there would be peace. Correspondingly 60.00% Sikh respondents in Kashmir valley share the same opinion as shared by Muslims in all regions.

However, majority of Hindus in valley (95.00%) and Jammu (76.00%) as well as 80.00% Sikhs in Jammu and 80.00% Buddhists in Ladakh have different opinion i.e. they think there would be no peace if government takes militants into consideration. Thus, at regional level we found two prominent opinions. Majority of Muslims in all regions and Kashmir Sikhs wish for the peaceful settlement of the conflict government of India should take militants into consideration. However majority of Hindus in Kashmir and Jammu regions are not in favour of resolving the conflict if government takes militants into consideration like Sikhs in Jammu and Buddhists in Ladakh.

In regard with right of property for outsiders in J&K we have found at state level 88.39% respondents consider this model would not resolve the conflict. 11.61% respondent’s opinion have been found in support of the model. This shows majority of respondents at state level view that allowing outsiders to settle in the state is undesirable model for the resolution of Kashmir dispute.

Region and religion wise scrutiny of data reveal majority of Muslims (99.29% of Kashmir, 100.00% in all regions have opposed the model i.e., settlement of outsiders in the state would not resolve the conflict.
Similarly, majority of Sikhs (100.00% each of Kashmir and Jammu regions) along with 95.00% Kashmiri, Hindus and 60.00% Buddhists in Ladakh have shared the same opinion.

However, majority of Hindu respondents (56.00%) in Jammu-region have opined that allowing outsiders to settle in the state would help to resolve the problem, thus we find except Hindus in Jammu, majority of Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs and Buddhists in different regions believe that allowing Muslims and non-Muslims to purchase and own property in J&K is not right strategy for bringing peaceful settlement of Kashmir dispute, this shows strategy like “ethnic flooding” if implemented for resolution of the conflict would not remain successful.

Kashmir conflict can also to resolve by engaging United Nations Organizations (UN) in the process of conflict resolution. In one of the questions we have asked respondents can UN play an effective role in resolving the conflict. In this regard at state level we have found majority of respondents (65.81%) think that UN can resolve the conflict. Remaining 34.19% respondents do not think so.

This shows majority of respondents at state level are in favour of resolving the conflict through UN involvement.

Region and religion-wise analysis of data show that majority of Muslims in region Kashmir (90.00%) and Jammu (94.00%) hold UN can play an effective role in the conflict resolution, however, majority of Muslims in Ladakh (60.00%) do not think so. Moreover, Majority of Hindus (55.00% in Kashmir and 80.00% in Jammu) and Sikhs (60.00% in Kashmir and 80.00% in Jammu) as well as all Buddhists in Ladakh (100.00%) hold that UN involvement cannot resolve the conflict. This shows at regional level we found that only Muslims in both Kashmir and Jammu regions opined in favour of the UN
involvement. However majority of Muslims and all Buddhists in Ladakh along with Hindus and Sikhs in regions Kashmir and Jammu share same opinion i.e. they think UN cannot play an effective role in resolving the dispute. Thus, at regional level we found majority of ethno-religious groups are not in favour of resolving Kashmir conflict by engaging UN in the process.

There are some scholars who believe that a balanced American diplomatic investment, if encouraged between India and Pakistan would prove fruitful in resolving the conflict in Jammu and Kashmir. In one of the questions that we asked respondents at state level we found 58.39% respondents there think that sincere American intervention can resolve the conflict, However, 41.61% respondents do not opine it would help to resolve the problem. This shows that majority of respondents at state-level believe that balanced American intervention can solve the Kashmir problem.

Region and religion-wise examination of data show that majority of Muslims in all regions (85.00% in Kashmir, 86.00% in Jammu and 80.00% in Ladakh) share the same opinion i.e. balanced American intervention can resolve the conflict. However, majority of non-Muslims (95.00% Hindus in Kashmir and 96.00% in Jammu, 80.00% Sikhs in Kashmiri and 80.00% in Jammu, as well as all Buddhists in Ladakh (100.00%) have expressed their opinion against American involvement. This show at regional level only majority of Muslims in all regions think that balanced American Intervention could resolve the dispute, in like none-Muslim religious communities there.

We have sought to know from respondents would Kashmir problem be resolved if Muslim majority areas of Kargil (in Ladakh) and Doda, Poonch and Rajouri (in Jammu) are clubbed with Kashmir valley and allowing the entity to become a sovereign country. At state level we
have found 58.39% respondent in support of the strategy. However, 41.61% respondents have expressed their view against the strategy. This shows majority of respondents at state level seek to resolve the problem by clubbing the Muslim majority areas of the state and allowing the new entity to become independent.

Region and religion-wise analysis of data in regard with aforementioned strategy shows the highest proportion of Muslim respondents (82.14% in Kashmir, 64.00% in Jammu and 100.00%) in all regions have supported the strategy i.e., the conflict would be resolved if Muslim majority areas of the state are joined together. However, majority of non-Muslim communities in different region (100.00% Hindus of Kashmir and 76.00% of Jammu, 60.00% Sikhs of Kashmir and 80.00% of Jammu as well as 100.00% Buddhists of region Ladakh) have expressed their view against the model. Thus, at regional level we have found only Muslims in all regions of the state believe Kashmir conflict would be resolved if Muslim majority districts of Jammu & Kashmir are clubbed together and allowing the entity to become an independent country.

According to the findings mentioned in the study, there is no such perfect model of conflict resolution that could satisfy the aspirations of religious communities in Kashmir.

Our findings suggest that there are two ways to resolve the Kashmir conflict, peacefully.

Firstly, restoration of 1952 status, when the central government controlled only defence, external affairs and communication. Practical implementation of the Kashmir constitution will strength existing judicial bodies, electoral procedures and alter recruitment practices into administrative agencies. Such efforts could contribute significantly towards improving institutional procedures at the state
and local levels. Improving the functional efficacy and capabilities of such organization is critical for responding to the needs of a highly mobilized population. There is no denying of the fact that erosion of such institutional arrangements gave birth to the conflict. Secondly, immediate steps should be taken for proper implementation of democracy and economic development of the state. As, unemployed educated youths who join militant outfits due to lack of adequate economy and job opportunities would not be lured by militant organizations (55.48% respondents of the state supported this view).