CHAPTER-IV

PROCESS OF INTEGRATION FROM 1964 TO 1974

The Shamsuddin’s term, as Prime Minister of the state of Jammu and Kashmir, began with an unfortunate incident of the disappearance of holy relic of Prophet Mohammad on 27th December, 1963. The relic of prophet Mohammad was kept at Asaar Sharif in the famous Hazratbal Shrine at Srinagar. The Kashmiri Muslims regarded it as their most sacred and precious possession and hence its loss caused an unprecedented shock and anger throughout the Kashmir valley.¹ The relic consisting of a single hair from the beard of the Prophet Mohammad, had been an object of supreme veneration in Kashmir, ever since it was installed there during the reign of the Mughals. On special occasions during the year, the relic lodged in a small crystal tube, was brought out and shown to the faithful gathered at the Shrine.² The news of the disappearance of the holy relic spread like wildfire and caused widespread dismay and anger among the people. Despite the harsh winter, thousands of people congregated around the mosque, protest demonstrations paralysed the government. Bakshi Abdul Rashid tried to stem the tide of fury, but the frenzied mob burnt down a cinema hall and a hotel owned by the Bakshi brothers.³ The whole valley went into mourning; thousands of black flags were thrust into the hands of the people who came out enmasse into the streets and open spaces of Srinagar. The people were so shocked that they stopped lighting their kitchen fires. Women came out into the streets in black gowns crying and wailing, though luckily there was no communal tension.⁴ There was remarkable communal harmony among Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs throughout the anxious days since the theft of the sacred relic on 27th December, 1963 and the ‘Public Deedar’ on 6th February, 1964.⁵

The Government of India took up the investigation of the theft. The Director of the Intelligence Bureau, B.N. Mullik had reached Srinagar from Delhi and had begun investigating the case with the assistance of the Inspector-General of the state police, Lakshman Das Thakur and the Assistant Director of the Intelligence Bureau, Hamir Singh.⁶

The local administration was paralysed in the wake of huge anti-government demonstrations. There were protest meetings and rallies and outbursts against the ruling National Conference and the Government headed by Shamsuddin.⁷ So on 2nd
January, 1964 Sadar-i-Riyasat flew to Delhi where he had a meeting with Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru which was attended by Home Minister, Gulzari Lal Nanda, the Minister without portfolio, Lal Bahadur Shastri, the Home Secretary, V. Viswanathan and the Cabinet Secretary, S.S. Khera. Jawaharlal Nehru was deeply worried at the crisis. Finally on 3rd January Central government deputed a high level team of officers, headed by the then Home Secretary, Vishwanathan, to Srinagar to assist the local authorities in dealing with the movement and finding out the sacred relic. Viswanathan’s team included several IAS officers, including P.K. Dave, Srinivas Vardhan and Sushital Banerjee, as well as a senior Muslim police officer from Uttar Pradesh. On 4th January, 1964 Sadar-i-Riyasat reached Srinagar and visited Hazratbal where he was greeted warmly by the people which showed that there was not communal anger but simply the cry of the heart of the Kashmiris. Sadar-i-Riyasat organized prayers in all the temples for the recovery of the Mo-e-Muqaddas, the holy relic.

A fifteen member Action Committee had been formed under the chairmanship of Maulvi Mohammad Sayeed Maoodi and including Sheikh Abdullah’s eldest son Sheikh Farooq and Mirwaiz Maulvi Farooq. The state administration had virtually came to a standstill, the National Conference was nowhere to be seen and the Action Committee was in effect running an unauthorized parallel administration, controlling traffic, prices and commerce.

B.N. Mullik, after investigation, disclosed that the windows of the Sanctum sanctorum, where the relic had been lodged, were broken outwards, which clearly showed that it was an insider’s job or atleast that one of the accomplices had worked from within the shrine. On the evening of 3rd January, he devised a brilliant strategy, it was made public that for the next 24 hours all guards around Hazratbal would be withdrawn, so that whoever had taken the relic could put it back without arousing suspicion.

A little after five in the evening, B.N. Mullik and Lakshman Das Thakur walked into Hazratbal and went to the first floor. The Mo-e-Muqaddas was resting in its familiar wooden box, now broken of course. In relief and triumph B.N. Mullik picked up the Holy Relic, placed it reverently on his head, walked to the balcony and announced to the excited throng that Kashmir’s symbol of Islam had returned to its people. There was wide spread rejoicings all over the valley. The state and central
governments heard a sigh of relief. But the Action Committee was not in a mood to surrender so easily on this issue. On 4th January, 1964 the Action Committee held a public meeting in Srinagar and raised five demands:

(i) that the relic should be identified by a panel of people known for their integrity and fearlessness.

(ii) that it should be returned as early as possible to the Hazratbal Shrine under the legal custody of responsible officials;

(iii) that the investigation of the case should be taken over in its entirety by the Government of India.

(iv) that the case against the culprits should be tried by a High Court Judge from outside the state.

(v) that those arrested on the 28th evening in connection with the public demonstration should be released.

Regarding these demands the members of Action Committee met Sadar-i-Riyasat on 7th January, 1964. According to Shri Karan Singh these demands were moderate and sensible and despite the virulent propaganda from Pakistan in its press and radio ever since the disappearance of the relic, the Action Committee did not allow the movement to fall into anti-national hands. While their distrust of the Shamsuddin government was total, their appeal was not to any outside power but to the Government of India. So Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru entrusted Lal Bahadur Shastri, Indian Minister without portfolio, with the task of sorting out the political problems in the state.

Lal Bahadur Shastri came to Srinagar on 30th January, 1964 on a three day visit to make on the spot study, to help in doing away with the controversy over the question of identification of the holy relic and to execute Jawaharlal Nehru’s scheme for bringing about change of the local Government. Immediately after his arrival, Lal Bahadur Shastri had a 45 minute meeting with Shamsuddin. Shastriji’s second meeting with Shamsuddin late in the night on 30th January made the latter uneasy. He also had long meeting with Maulana Masoodi and six other members of the Action Committee on 31st January, 1964. He also met Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq, Syed Mir Qasim, D.P. Dhar and Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad.
The important question that had to be solved was to verify the authenticity of the relic. With characteristic patience and strong commonsense he worked out a mutually acceptable formula for identification of the holy relic by Muslim divines before the ‘public deedar’ was fixed. On the 21st day of Ramzan corresponding to 6 February, 1964, despite B.N. Mullik’s stiff opposition to the whole idea, the date for identification was fixed for 3rd February, 1964 and the time 2o clock in the afternoon. The identification was held by a band of 15 Muslim divines headed by Sayed Mirak Shah, whose integrity was beyond dispute. In a packed hall in the presence of Lal Bahadur Shastri, the sage slowly raised the crystal tube to the light. For a long moment he peered at the tiny hair suspended within it, while everyone in the hall held his breath. Then in a firm voice he announced, ‘Al Haq’ (it is real). Kashmir had literally been saved by a hair’s breadth. People in general and authorities in particular had a sigh of relief on 3rd February when Shastri Ji handled the situation with wisdom, courage and foresight. After this the agitation came to end.

Almost all the basic questions in regard to this incident still remain unanswered. Who committed the theft? Was it the work of a Pakistani agent or some elements in the plebiscite Front or was the holy Relic taken out at the instance of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed to show it to his ailing mother lying on her death bed at Jammu? The whole incident of theft of holy relic showed that the Government of Jammu and Kashmir does not enjoy the confidence and support of the people of the state.

On the other hand Central Intelligence Officer, B.N. Mullik was praised for acting so promptly and efficiently in tracing the stolen relic. Meanwhile there was a change in the attitude of Central Government towards the Prime Minister Shamsuddin. Therefore, with the advice of the Central Government, the National Conference legislators elected Mr. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq as their leader. On 28th February, 1964, Prime Minister Shamsuddin was replaced by Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq.

With the coming of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq as head of the new Government, a new chapter was opened in the development of relations between state and Indian Union. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq enjoyed Jawaharlal Nehru’s unqualified support. Actually central leaders were of the opinion that Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s
political thinking and vision were not confined to the boundaries of Jammu and Kashmir. They had been convinced that Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq believed in the irrevocable nature of the state’s integration with India not as a piece of political expediency but as a matter of intellectual conviction.\(^{27}\)

Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq who had played a prominent role in the freedom struggle under the leadership of Sheikh Abdullah and later held ministerial posts in his and Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad’s governments, began his administration with announcement of the liberalisation and normalisation of government policy towards all elements in the state politics. In his first policy statement on, 1\(^{st}\) March, 1964 Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq called upon the people “to breakup down the barriers that stood in the way of fuller participation of state subjects in national life.”\(^{28}\) This can be brought about as much by a dynamic process of emotional integration as by greater uniformity or parliamentary practices and usages, the people of Jammu and Kashmir have given splendid proof of this unity during the theft of holy relic from Hazratbal shrine, when all sections of the people of state demonstrated the remarkable unity and harmony despite strong and grave provocations from interested foreign quarters. Our borders are defended by our officers and men of the Armed Forces. Our Army and Air Force are capable of dealing with any situation. It is however, the duty of the people of the state to strengthen these defences by a resolute will to resist disruptive tactics of our foreign enemies.” He further said “the most vital task before the government relates to the economic reconstruction of the state and we have to go a long way in catching up with other advanced states of the country in matter of industrialization and education”.

He further said, “poverty, illiteracy and backwardness even now haunt the lives of our people. In tackling these problems we shall no doubt be assisted by the Central Government. It will be our earnest effort to pay special attention to the problems of the weaker sections of the state population and to do away with the regional imbalances. The resources that become available to the state will have to be distributed equitably and no consideration will be shown to the vested interests. The corner stone of the government’s policy has been to ensure fair and adequate wages for honest toil. In pursuance of this policy, seniority, merit and efficiency are being given the fullest consideration in the matter of promotions and recruitments in the
government services. We will not give any quarter to corruption and malpractices in our public services”.

Prime Minister Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq further said “we shall do our best to ensure that the fundamental rights guaranteed to the citizens under the constitution become a reality so that opportunities of greater and free participation in the economic development and social progress of the state are open to them. It will be the earnest endeavor of my government to ensure the rule of law and respect for the rights and liberties of the people.”

In pursuance of the policy statement of Prime Minister Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq of 1st March, 1964, the government took following steps:

Firstly, curbs on freedom of speech and assembly were removed. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq removed the various curbs which had been imposed on civil liberties to stifle legitimate expression of public opinion. He felt that such curbs tend to tarnish the image of India’s democracy in this part of the country. The removal of these restrictions became essential to enable the people of Jammu and Kashmir to participate on terms of equality in the broader current of national life. The measures taken by the government to normalise the situation were the restoration of freedom of press and platform to meet political challenges by political rather than authoritarian methods.

Secondly, the ‘Kashmir conspiracy case’ against Sheikh Abdullah, Mirza Afzal Beg and others which had been dragging on endlessly were withdrawn, thereby, making it possible for him and his associates to come in the open so that the ambiguity and inconsistency of their political views could be challenged on the forum of public opinion in the country. The benefits of this liberal policy were extended to all shades of political thought and in consequence, other cases of political nature were also withdrawn followed by general release of detenues.

Thirdly, the Government disbanded the special police (peace Brigade) organization which had acquired an unsavory reputation as an instrument of repression.

Fourthly, the Preventive Detention Act of the State was made more liberal and brought at par with the law in force in the rest of the Country. Thus the special laws and regulations which did not form part of the country’s statutes and had been
promulgated with the object of exercising arbitrary powers at the expense of liberties of the citizens, were done away with. The restoration of democratic freedom served as an outlet for vocal expression of opinion in the press and platform. Consequently a new phase of intense political activity was witnessed in the state for first time since 1947.\textsuperscript{36}

The spirit of accommodation and tolerance which is the essence of democracy was steadily growing. Within four or five months about three dozen new Journals and newspapers had been started in the state, representing various points of view and political trends.\textsuperscript{37}

**Clean and Healthy Administration**

In the field of administration, some important measures had been taken to lay the foundation of an efficient, healthy and clean public service. A favourable climate was created for the promotion and encouragement of high standards of honesty and integrity to eliminate corruption and malpractices.

Vigilance was maintained so that no public servant including ministers could accumulate private property disproportionate to his income. It had been made incumbent upon the government servants to submit statements of their assets for examination and scrutiny to the government. The ministers and ministers of state were also brought within the ambit of this procedure for the first time and they too had submitted the statements of their assets to the Prime Minister including the assets of their dependents and families. Besides this Ministers and Members of the legislature had been debarred from buying Government property or selling personal property to the Government. Where a deviation from the principle became necessary, the advice of the Chief Justice had to be sought which would be binding on the Government.\textsuperscript{38}

**Selection to Services**

Similarly, to eliminate jobbery and nepotism in the matter of recruitment to government services, it had been ensured that merit and ability would be the sole criteria in future. In this connection a State Subordinate Services Selection Board was setup. All heads of departments and other appointing authorities were required to place their demands for recruitment with the Board. The Board also gave advice to the government on matters of qualifications and methods of recruitments to non-gazetted services and in making promotions and transfers from one service to another.
At district level, District Selection Board was setup. The welfare of the low paid government employees had received due attention of the government. To afford relief to such employees the rates of dearness allowance was increased in a manner which had conferred the maximum benefit on the lowest paid. These benefits had been extended to low paid pensioners, industrial labour and even those employed on a casual basis.

Anti-Corruption

Under the Prime Ministership of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq the State Anti-Corruption Commission had been given wide powers to deal with complaints of corruption and malpractices against government servants. Therefore, an Anti-Corruption Investigating Agency was set up comprising of one Deputy Inspector General of Police, four Superintendents of Police, two Deputy Superintendents of Police, five Inspectors, twenty Sub-Inspectors, five Head Constables and fifty one Constables. On the technical side, the organization was assisted by an Executive Engineer, an Assistant Engineer and two overseers.

Further he empowered the Chief Secretary to issue suspension orders of gazetted officers against whom prima facie cases were established by the Anti-Corruption Commission. This measure was taken to ensure speedy action against corrupt officers. The Sadachar Samiti had extended its activities to the State. Branches of the Samiti had been set up in Jammu and Srinagar to elicit and canalise public cooperation in routing out the evil of corruption. The Samiti had evoked encouraging response from all sections of the people in the state. This signifies the keenness of the people of the state to make their contribution in the countrywide crusade against corruption.

While the object of these measures was to evolve a sound and stable system, steps had been taken by the government to eradicate the evil of corruption from public life. The most glaring examples of malpractices related to the misuse of road transport permits and import Licenses of raw material. The question regarding route permits was examined by a committee of officials and non officials appointed for the purpose. In the meantime, all such persons who operated vehicles but possessed no permits had been advised to approach the authorities for issue of permits immediately. This step had removed the difficulty of a large number of transport operators who used to ply vehicles by paying huge rents to the owners and permit holders. Similarly, the system
of issuing import licenses was rationalized in order to afford adequate opportunities to small industrialists to obtain raw materials for genuine and fair use.\textsuperscript{43}

**Education**

In the field of Education emphasis was laid on improving qualitative standards of instructions in schools and colleges. The Government paid attention to the problem of secondary education and training of teachers. Under the Ganguli Report two Universities were set up, one at Srinagar and the other at Jammu with independent faculties of post graduate teaching, which helped in balanced growth of university education throughout the state.\textsuperscript{44}

**Release of Sheikh Abdullah**

Prime Minister Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq adopted a soft attitude towards Sheikh Abdullah. He withdrew the cases against him, he held that Sheikh Abdullah was an important political force in the state and that it was necessary in the interest of restoration of public confidence in the government of the state to release him and to let him have full freedom and exercise normal democratic rights.\textsuperscript{45} Also Jawaharlal Nehru had all along been feeling uneasy about Sheikh Abdullah’s trial in the Kashmir Conspiracy case which had been going on since 21\textsuperscript{st} May, 1958.\textsuperscript{46} Jawaharlal Nehru realized, particularly after the way the entire administrative and political system collapsed in the upheaval following the loss of the holy relic (Prophet Mohammad’s hair) from the Hazaratbal shrine that the integration measures would be counterproductive.\textsuperscript{47} Jawaharlal Nehru appreciated Sheikh Abdullah’s efforts and believed in his friendship towards India and in his faith in secularism. He thought that no lasting settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir problem was possible without the help and co-operation of Sheikh Abdullah.\textsuperscript{48}

In this context, Prime Minister Jawahar Lal Nehru had said: “After being associated with us for a period of over fifteen years, if Jammu and Kashmir is so destabilised that an ordinary incident of the theft of a relic provokes the people to the extent of trying to overthrow the government, it is time to adopt a new approach and to bring about a revolutionary change in our viewpoint. He fully admitted that even after having done so much for the people of Jammu and Kashmir, they were not satisfied. The prime minister stressed that Sheikh Abdullah was still popular and in
the changed situation of Jammu and Kashmir no political accord was possible without his participation."

Jayapraaksh Narayan was one of the few national leaders who supported the release of Sheikh Abdullah. He condemned his arrest in August 1953 without a trial. So from 1953 to 1975 Jayapraaksh Narayan continued his campaign for a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir issue through negotiations between the Government of India and Sheikh Abdullah as also with Pakistan. He felt that the Jammu and Kashmir issue was a black spot on the fair name of India. In order to release Sheikh Abdullah, one day Jawaharlal Nehru called the Home Minister, Gulzari Lal Nanda and inquired about the Kashmir Conspiracy case. Gulzari Lal Nanda did not want the case withdrawn. Jawaharlal Nehru lost his temper and threw the case file at him and said, ‘Let the file go to hell. I want Sheikh Abdullah to be released.’ This shows Nehru’s concern for Sheikh Abdullah.

On 5th April, 1964, Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq issued a statement saying that the Kashmir Conspiracy case against Sheikh Abdullah could be withdrawn soon. On 8th April, 1964 Sheikh Abdullah was released after a long detention of about eleven years. Sheikh Abdullah’s release was hailed by almost every section of opinion in Jammu and Kashmir as a correct decision, although some people in India felt that the state government had taken a calculated risk. However, the Government of India appreciated the action of the State Government. On 2nd April 1964 the then President of India, S. Radhakrishnan, described the decision “as an act of faith in which we expect the Sheikh Abdullah and his friends to justify our faith.”

Sheikh Abdullah was invited to Delhi by Jawaharlal Nehru as his personal guest. But Sheikh Abdullah wanted to visit Kashmir valley before going to New Delhi. Firstly be visited Jammu, where he met Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad to condole the death of his mother. In a press conference at Jammu he clearly declared that he stands exactly where he was eleven years ago. He made it clear that it was for the people of Jammu and Kashmir to decide the future. Before press and people he rejected the claim, that the state’s accession had already been settled.

On 9th April, 1964 speaking before a public meeting he said that the people of Jammu and Kashmir had not been given an opportunity, so far, to decide their future and to exercise the right of self determination. He said that public opinion holds high
in a democratic set up. He said that we stand by this democratic principle, but India backed out from it. He further said, “Jammu and Kashmir was a constant irritant to the relationship between the two countries and gravely endangered the peace of the sub-continent, in fact, the whole of Asia and the world. The people of Jammu and Kashmir felt that the dispute should not go on for long and should be resolved amicably”.

On 17th April, 1964 Sheikh Abdullah along with Mirza Afzal Beg and others reached Srinagar. In the evening on 17th April when he reached Mujahid Manzil, a huge crowd of men and women gathered there to welcome him. Sheikh Abdullah received tumultuous receptions wherever he went in the state. There was never any doubt that he was the most popular and charismatic Kashmiri leader. In Kashmir he addressed a mass meeting in Hazuri Bagh and declared that peoples opinion holds high.

“So long as India and Pakistan do not resolve their differences, the Jammu and Kashmir skein will remain tangled up. It is therefore, in the interest, not only of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, but those of India and Pakistan as well, that they should learn to live like good neighbors’. I believe nature has preserved me for this purpose.”

As expected, Sheikh Abdullah had lost no time in rejecting its claim that the issue of the states Accession had been already settled. Both at his press conference and at the public meetings he categorically said that the people of the state have yet to exercise their right of self-determination. Politically it did not seem that Sheikh Abdullah had appreciated the changes in the situation since 1953. He refused to accept that the accession of the state to India was permanent and final, he came out openly in favour of the plebiscite front which had been founded by his Lieutenant Afzal Beg and he seemed to equate India and Pakistan by reiterating that a solution of the Kashmir dispute should be found which is acceptable to all three parties. His tour and speeches created a tremendous impact in the valley.

On the other hand Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq, the Prime Minister of the state, while speaking in Jammu on 6th April, 1964 said, “No power could move us from the path we have chosen. We are as much part of India as Bombay, Calcutta or Madras.
We occupy an honoured place in India and you should believe that we stand like rock on our position."\(^{64}\)

Thus, the whole political situation in effect had become destabilized. A situation in which the masses were with Sheikh Abdullah, the party machine with Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad and the government with Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq. The other political groups in the Kashmir valley were the Action Committee led by Maulana Masoodi, the Political Conference led by Mohiuddin Quarra. All these groups were overshadowed by Sheikh Abdullah, though they retained their separate entities.\(^{65}\)

Thus, the liberal policy of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq encouraged on the one hand, the moribund democracy to revive and on the other hand, provided an opportunity to anti-India and pro-Pakistan sections to come into open and start new platforms to popularise their views. The plebiscite Front was revitalised to press the demand for grant of self-determination right to the Kashmiris.\(^{66}\)

So, Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s Government had an uneasy time, because some secessionist leaders and Sheikh Abdullah, gave vent to feelings highly critical of India, the Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s government was opposed by the ultra nationalists and the state administration was declared incompetent to deal with the situation. G.M. Sadiq and his colleagues did not give up the policy of liberalization, indeed, they were determined to disallow any disruption and disturbance of peace. In this the state government had to make use of force a number of times.\(^{67}\)

Mr. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq had declared repeatedly that “he entertains no apprehensions at all that a few challenging voices can alter the set course of state’s position as an integral part of the Indian Union. As a matter of fact by abolishing special courts and throwing open jails, the Government has proved to the hilt that the finality of state’s accession is an immutable reality and an established fact.”\(^{68}\)

The dividends of the new policy announced by G.M. Sadiq regarding restoration of democratic standards and establishment of rule of law had come in the shape of people’s refusal to be swayed by the slogan of plebiscite, and the steady decline in the popularity of Sheikh Abdullah and his friends, who used to carry a halo of martyrdom previously by their continued incarceration in jail. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that the annual convention of the Plebiscite Front held in Sopore
recently proved from all accounts to be a tame affair. In spite of the wide publicity, the attendance at the open session was thin and even the frequent appearance of Sheikh Abdullah on the stage failed to inspire any enthusiasm in the audience. Mirza Afzal Beg tried repeatedly to generate heat by raising the bogey of “suppression of Muslims” but this hardly created any stir among the delegates.69

Although the intemperate utterances and inflammatory speeches of the Plebiscite Front leaders had been in no way a source of satisfaction to those who had sincerely hoped that Sheikh Abdullah and his friends would adopt a constructive approach and reconcile themselves to the existing realities after their release, there had been no reversal of the policy of liberalisation and democratic freedom announced by the state government.

The new leadership under Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq had firmly decided to face these elements politically. Therefore the government deliberately refrained from imposing any curbs on civil liberties. Instead, Sadiq’s government took various steps to revitalise the National Conference to enable it to take up the challenge posed by separatist elements in an open debate. The state government took the task of consolidation of democratic and secular forces in the state. Two leaders Syed Mir Qasim and Shri Trilochan Dutt Step down from office and took up party work. Mir Qasim worked as General Secretary of the National Conference and Trilochan Dutt worked as president of the provincial committee for the Jammu province. A new political faith and vigour had been generated in the rural areas by the appointment of adhoc committees in place of old discredited organs of the party as well as by intensive campaign tours undertaken by the leaders of the party to educate the masses about the sinister role of communal and disruptive elements.70

Mr. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq himself had made a direct approach to the people in most parts of the valley choosing deliberately to go to those very areas where the Plebiscite Front had been trying to build a strong hold. The meetings addressed by him were throughout well-attended. It was estimated that over two lakhs people heard his speeches and another lakh of people attended public receptions arranged in his honour at Beerwah, Romoh, Pattan, Baramulla, Uri, Bandipore and Anantnag. Appeals made by Plebiscite Front leaders for observance of hartals proved a singular failure. The highlight of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s campaign was the unprecedented welcome which he received at Anantnag, the home town of the
Plebiscite Front president, Mirza Afzal Beg, where thousands of people joined in the procession and thousands more attended the public meeting.

The warm and willing response evoked by the tours of the leaders of the government, both in Kashmir and Jammu, provides clear testimony that offered a sound political ideology and well defined social objectives, the people of Jammu and Kashmir as anywhere else in the country were keen for rally behind forces of progress and given proper political training and education, they refused to be misled by disruptive and parochial slogans like the demand for self-determination etc.71

Sheikh-Nehru Meeting

In order to promote the friendly atmosphere and to promote the speedy settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir problem Sheikh Abdullah was invited to Delhi by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru.72 On 29th April, 1964 Sheikh Abdullah reached Delhi. He was accompanied by his lieutenant, Mirza Afzal Beg and his eldest son, Farooq Abdullah, then a medical graduate.73 Sheikh Abdullah had an emotional meeting with Jawaharlal Nehru with whom he stayed at Teen Murti House as his personal guest. He had prolonged meetings with the Prime Minister as well as a number of Cabinet Ministers and other political leaders who had always been friendly towards him.74 He also met President Radhakrishan and Vice President Dr. Zakir Hussain.

Sheikh Abdullah visited Madras to talk to C. Rajagopalachari and went to Wardha to visit Jayaprakash Narayan and Acharya Vinoba Bhave.75 After meetings with these leaders Sheikh Abdullah realized that all these leaders felt the necessity of establishing lasting and friendly relations between India and Pakistan. The strained relation between India and Pakistan was a source of constant tension which sometimes took the form of brute violence.76 So, Sheikh Abdullah persuaded Jawaharlal Nehru to let him have one more try at building a bridge between India and Pakistan. Jawaharlal Nehru was no doubt disturbed at the growing rift between the two countries and his thinking had obviously been influenced by the ill fated border war with China. Also, the USA and Britain had kept up their strong pressure on him to come to some sort of an agreement with Pakistan and perhaps he saw Sheikh Abdullah a person who might possibly achieve this and also relieve India of the constant pressure vis-à-vis Jammu and Kashmir.77 So on 6th May, 1964 Sheikh
Abdullah received an invitation from President Ayub Khan of Pakistan to visit Pakistan.\textsuperscript{78}

On 12\textsuperscript{th} May Sheikh Abdullah issued a statement in which he mentioned his various meetings and discussions, reiterated the importance of India and Pakistan coming to an agreement over Kashmir and announced that he was visiting Pakistan shortly to have discussions with President Ayub Khan and other leaders there.\textsuperscript{79} On 15\textsuperscript{th} May, 1964 at the All India Congress Committee session in Bombay, Jawaharlal Nehru supported Sheikh Abdullah, where he said, “Sheikh Abdullah is wedded to the principles of Secularism and does not want anything to be done to vitiate these in any way. He does not believe in the two nation theory which was the basis of formation of Pakistan. Nevertheless, he hopes that it should be possible for India, holding on to her principles, to live in peace and friendship with Pakistan and thus incidentally to put an end to the question of Jammu and Kashmir. I cannot say if we shall succeed in this, but it is clear that unless we succeed India will carry the burden of a continuing conflict with Pakistan. I hope Pakistan will get rid of its hatred and fear of India. She has nothing to fear from India, unless she herself attacks India. I hope that it may be possible for the two countries to develop closer and more intimate relations to the advantage of both. If sheikh Abdullah can help in bringing this about, he will have done a great service to both the countries. We are prepared to help him in this attempt, but in doing so we must adhere to our principles as well as our basic attitude in regard to Jammu and Kashmir.”\textsuperscript{80} This marked a dramatic change in Jawaharlal Nehru’s policy vis-à-vis Jammu and Kashmir.

Sheikh Abdullah returned to Srinagar from Delhi on 13\textsuperscript{th} May, 1964 and addressed a public meeting that afternoon in Srinagar. His tone was more balanced and moderate than in his earlier speeches. He reiterated the importance of safeguarding the interests of the minorities both in India and Pakistan and counselled patience while negotiations were in progress. His emphasis shifted from ‘self
determination’ to Indo-Pakistan reconciliation, and he announced that he would leave for Delhi on 21\textsuperscript{st} May enroute to Pakistan. According to Balraj Puri during the Nehru-Abdullah talk in April, 1964, Jawaharlal Nehru offered to reverse the integration process. But the Sheikh Abdullah was of the view that no solution of Jammu and Kashmir was possible without involving Pakistan.\textsuperscript{81} Similarly according to white paper on Kashmir published by Joint Human Rights Committee, Jawaharlal Nehru
offered Sheikh Abdullah to recognise Jammu and Kashmir as an autonomous Muslim state in India and abrogate the changes in Article 370, which had been brought about after 1953. But Sheikh Abdullah rejected the offer made by Jawaharlal Nehru and refused to accept any proposal which left out Pakistan from a settlement on Jammu and Kashmir.\textsuperscript{82}

Finally on 23\textsuperscript{rd} May, 1964 Sheikh Abdullah along with Mirza Afzal Beg and Maulana Masoodi left for Rawalpindi. Sheikh Abdullah was given a heroic welcome at Chaklala Airport and received by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Habibullah Khan, Minister for Home and Kashmir Affairs and some important personalities of Azad Kashmir. Sheikh Abdullah got \textquoteleft tumultuous welcome\textquoteright in Pakistan. In Rawalpindi Sheikh Abdullah made several statements before and after his meeting with President Ayub and addressed a public meeting on 25\textsuperscript{th} May. He referred the secular character of India and the need to strengthen Indian secular forces which tarnished his conspiratorial image.\textsuperscript{83}

On 25\textsuperscript{th} May, Sheikh Abdullah met President Ayub Khan and presented him a musical instrument called \textquoteleft Santoor\textquoteright which has a hundred strings and was introduced in Jammu and Kashmir by Muslims.\textsuperscript{84} Sheikh Abdullah told him the concept of confederation - a confederation of India, Pakistan and Kashmir but President Ayub Khan immediately rejected the idea of any confederation, which obviously disappointed Sheikh Abdullah.

After this, Sheikh Abdullah suggested for a summit meeting between President Ayub and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in New Delhi. But President Ayub Khan continued to harp on confederation. Again Sheikh Abdullah asked him to consider the proposal as this exercise, may, lead to the lessening of tension. Finally Ayub Khan agreed to visit Delhi.\textsuperscript{85} Sheikh Abdullah’s idea of confederation means intermediate position for the state of Jammu and Kashmir agreed by both India and Pakistan.\textsuperscript{86} On 26\textsuperscript{th} May, 1964 at a news conference in Rawalpindi, Sheikh Abdullah declared that President Ayub and Jawaharlal Nehru were expected to meet in New Delhi in June, to end the dispute over Kashmir. But before India’s High Commissioner to Pakistan G. Parthasarathi could cable his comments to New Delhi, Jawaharlal Nehru was dead on 27\textsuperscript{th} May, 1964.\textsuperscript{87} On 27\textsuperscript{th} May, 1964, when Sheikh Abdullah had just begun a tour of Azad Kashmir, he learnt of the passing away of his friend Jawaharlal Nehru so he immediately flew back to India to attend the funeral.\textsuperscript{88}
With Jawaharlal Nehru’s death, India lost a patriot and politician, historian and litterateur, administrator and world statesman. In accordance with Panditji’s last will and testament, an eloquent and moving document, his ashes were to be scattered throughout the length and breadth of India. So, Jawaharlal Nehru’s ashes were placed in a large number of urns and carried to different parts of India. Sadar-i-Riyasat Karan Singh took one urn and left by train for Pathankot on 4th June. Thousands of people had gathered there to pay homage to Jawaharlal Nehru and from the railway station he brought the urn in an open car seventy eight miles to Jammu. People had gathered throughout the route, and at Jammu there was a very large turnout. The ashes were kept on a special rostrum at the parade ground until they were immersed in the Tawi river on 8th June, 1964.

Similarly, Prime Minister, G.M. Sadiq had flown up to Srinagar with a handful of the ashes on the 6th June, 1964. On 8th June Sadar-I-Riyasat Karan Singh and Prime Minister G.M. Sadiq drove with ashes in an open car for Rajgadh to Shadipur. There they boarded a boat painted white and rowed by white-uniformed oarsmen, the very boat which had on so many occasions taken Panditji up the Jhelum in Joyous river processions while the citizens of Srinagar lined both sides cheering and waving. He always had a special attraction for Jammu and Kashmir, the land of his forefathers and it was significant that till the very end of his unique and inspired life he was attempting to solve the Jammu and Kashmir imbroglio. They immersed the ashes at the confluence of the Jhelum and its tributary the Sindh, because a sangam between two rivers always considered particularly auspicious for the Hindus. Kushak Bakula took some ashes to Leh and immersed them in the Indus, the river from which our country originally gained its name.

After four days of Jawahar Lal Nehru’s demise, on 31st May, 1964 during the inauguration of some divisional Muslin league Conference, President Ayub Khan said that he had conveyed to Sheikh Abdullah, during their talks with him in Rawalpindi, his opposition to a Federation or a Confederation of India and Pakistan. Since the Ayub Khan had turned it down, the story was dead. But Ayub Khan raked it up in his book ‘Friends Not Masters’, he says, “When Sheikh Abdullah and Mirza Azal beg came to Pakistan in 1964, they (too) had brought the absurd proposal of a confederation between India, Pakistan and Kashmir. I told him plainly we should have nothing to do with it. It was curious that whereas we were seeking the salvation...”
of Kashmiris, they had been forced to mention an idea which, if pursued, would lead to our enslavement. It was clear that this was what Mr. Nehru had told them to say to us....."92

When Sheikh Abdullah studied this passage he wrote a letter to the President Ayub on 1st September, 1967. Sheikh Abdullah said in his letter:

“We never carried any cut and dry proposal for the solution of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and, to be fair to the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, he never forced us to put before you any particular proposal. No, we are not made that why.... of course, this particular proposal was vehemently denounced by you... My advice to you, however, was not to reject any proposal outright, but discuss its pros and cons in a friendly manner at a conference table and convince the other side that a particular solution would not lead to ultimate peace which ought to be the common objective of all.... You were kind enough to agree to come to Delhi and meet late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru but, to our misfortune, his sad and untimely death robbed us of this opportunity”93

After the passage of time and emergence of serious political problems on the subcontinent, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto wrote: “Sheikh Abdullah visited Pakistan in May 1964. After his release from an Indian Jail in Jammu and Kashmir, Abdullah was flattered by Nehru, who sent him to Rawalpindi to woo President Ayub, I had cautioned Ayub Khan against Nehru’s game. Abdullah was not the leader- and is not the leader- of the people of India; he was and, indeed, is ambitious and emotional; he wanted to be the architect of a rapprochement between India and Pakistan, without realising that his role as an ‘architect’ of the so-called Indo-Kashmir link has already exposed him as a man with greed for gain. Abdullah was a welcome visitor to Ayub Khan. He persuaded the President of Pakistan to undertake a trip to New Delhi in June, 1964, for talks with Nehru on the Indo-Pakistan problems, including Jammu and Kashmir. Nehru’s death upset Abdullah’s apple-cart. Abdullah had to cut short his visit to Azad Kashmir; he flew back to India to attend the funeral of Nehru.”94

After death of Jawaharlal Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri was unanimously elected leader of the Indian National Congress parliamentary party and became Prime Minister of India. He had excellent grass roots support in the party. Jawaharlal Nehru himself has shown his clear preference by singling him out for recall from among
those who left the cabinet under the Kamraj Plan. Lal Bahadur Shastri was a gentle person and a moderate statesman.

With the coming of Lal Bahadur Shastri as Indian Prime Minister, the internal situation in Jammu and Kashmir continued to be eventful. The Plebiscite Front intensified its activities in Jammu and Kashmir. On 11th June, 1964, Sheikh Abdullah addressed a public meeting organized by the Plebiscite Front in Srinagar, during which he broke down several times, when referring to Jawaharlal Nehru. He said that his talks with President Ayub Khan had gone well and that had Pandit Ji lived the two leaders would have met shortly. He hoped that Lal Bahadur Shastri and Ayub Khan would pick up the threads at the forthcoming Prime Ministers Conference in London.

Further on 9th August, the date upon which Sheikh Abdullah had been arrested eleven years ago was observed as a ‘Black Day’ by the Plebiscite Front with a general strike and a huge procession in which Sheikh Abdullah participated and which he later addressed. This time his speech had acquired markedly anti India overtones. He launched a frontal attack on Indian leaders for their involvement in the 1953 event and lashed out not only at Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad but also at Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq, Mir Qasim and D.P. Dhar, whom he accused of being arch conspirators against him. Thus, for the first time, Sheikh Abdullah took a hostile stance vis-à-vis the Sadiq Government. The Shastri-Ayub meeting had not materialised and he was becoming restive and frustrated.

Regarding this Sheikh Abdullah said: “Lal Bahadur Shastri was very cordial and it seemed as if he was keen to complete the work initiated by Jawaharlal Nehru. But he lacked Jawaharlal Nehru’s popular appeal and did not have the strength to bring his colleagues round to his viewpoint.” Thus the Sheikh Abdullah was not yet in a mood to accept the reality of Jammu and Kashmir being part of India.

On the other hand the enemies of Liberalism among the Hindus and the Muslims did not allow the Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq government to have an easy time. The struggle for power between Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq and Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad became more acute. Bakshi, once again, tried to gain power. On 2nd September, 1964 Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad showed to Sadar-i-Riyasat, the list of signatures of 35 members of the Legislative Assembly and disclosed his plan to
move a vote of no-confidence against the Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s government. Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad exhibited his extra ordinary skill at political manoeuvering by winning overnight the majority of members of the state Assembly. Sadar-i-Riyasat Karan Singh advised Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad not to move the no-confidence motion in view of the activities of Sheikh Abdullah and his Plebiscite Front Party. Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad did not see eye to eye with the Sadar-i-Riyasat’s arguments; in fact he explained to Sadar-i-Riyasat that it was not easy for him to ‘shut the mouths’ of 35 members of the Legislative Assembly. He further told him that members of his group had conveyed to Shankar Prasad, their resentment against Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq and his associates.

Immediately after this leadership of the ruling government met Sadar-i-Riyasat to discuss the problem that had arisen from Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad’s threat to topple the government. Accordingly on 21st September, 1964 at 10:00 pm, Girdhari Lal Dogra was sent to meet Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad. Girdhari Lal Dogra made an attempt to impress upon him not to excite his legislators. He pleaded for his cooperation and opposed his plan to move a vote of no-confidence against the Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s government. Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad looked obdurate and determined and Girdhari Lal Dogra failed to woo Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad. So he rushed to Shri Karan Singh’s palace and apprised Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq and others of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad’s plan. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq and D.P. Dhar had hurried consultations with Central leadership in Delhi on phone; line of action was prepared following a meeting in the palace where the then Divisional Commissioner of Kashmir, S. Banerji was also present. At 11:30 pm some senior police officers were summoned to the palace to receive instructions. Indeed, some senior officials of the Indian Home Ministry knew well the line of action formulated in Shri Karan Singh’s Palace. Lal Bahadur Shastri and Shankar Prasad too knew what was to happen on 22nd September, 1964.

Finally on 22nd September, 1964 Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad and four other members of the Jammu and Kashmir legislative Assembly were arrested in Srinagar under the Defence of India Rules. Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad was taken for detention to Tara Niwas in Udhampur. After this Sadar-I-Riyasat, Karan Singh prorogued both Houses of the state legislature of autumn session which had begun a day earlier on 21st September.
The reaction to the arrest of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad was mild. Sixteen of Bakshi’s supporters wrote to Sadar-i-Riyasat protesting against it and urging that the Assembly be reconvened at once, and fourteen of them went to Delhi to meet the Prime Minister and pleaded Bakshi’s case. Here Sheikh Abdullah tried hard to exploit the situation to his political advantage by reiterating that the arrest was ‘a very bad practice for democratic functioning’ and highlighted the ‘non-representative’ character of the Assembly. In his speeches at Hazratbal and the Shrine of Char-i-Sharif he continued to attack the arrest and indirectly praised Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad. Here it was analysed that directly or indirectly, he had blessed Bakshi’s moves to destabilise the state government so as to pave the way for fresh elections.109

On 30th January, 1965 one man commission of inquiry under Justice Rajagopala Ayyangar was appointed to inquire into the charges against Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad.110 There were 38 cases of corruption against the former Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad. This commission held Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad guilty of having misused his official position as the state’s premier. Ayyangar Commission submitted its voluminous report to the Government in June, 1967, in which commission had held that Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad and members of his family obtained an ‘improper benefit’ or ‘undue financial advantage’ to the tune of Rs. 54 lakhs. The commission had examined 4,000 documents and over 400 affidavits during the 28 months it took to complete the inquiry.111

Amidst this political crisis in the state, the process of integration was continued which was started by Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad. The state government under Prime Ministership of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq took steps to put the state’s relationship with the Indian Union at par with those of the other states. Towards the end of December, 1964, the Government of Jammu and Kashmir felt the need for the centre to exercise its Emergency powers over the state because of internal and external pressures.112 G.M. Sadiq said: “….the state is passing through times which cannot be called normal and, besides, it has also its internal problems. The state has been a victim of aggression by Pakistan and China. In Bengal, Bombay, Kerala or Madras there are no abnormal conditions, but Articles 356 and 357 are still in force. We therefore, feel that the extension of these Articles to this state in view of its abnormal conditions is more necessary”.113 After this state legislature of Jammu and
Kashmir had passed necessary resolution asking for the extension of the Centre’s Emergency powers to the state. And accordingly the President of India issued the constitution (Application to Jammu and Kashmir) third Amendment Order, 1964, on 21st December, 1964. Under this order centres emergency powers were extended to the state under Article 356 and 357. Thus the extension of Article 356 and 357 was to serve as a safeguard against sudden emergency. Under Article 356 the President can proclaim President’s rule in case of failure of Constitutional machinery in a state and by Article 357 parliament got the power to confer on the President of India the power of the state legislature to make laws and also delegate powers to specified authorities. Centre-State governments did this because the Chinese massive attack in 1962, over Ladakh, was an eye opener, even for such people who from time to time had been opposing the application of these two articles for the upkeep of the State’s internal autonomy.

Plebiscite Front protested against the extension of Article 356 and 357 to the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Plebiscite Front President Mirza Afzal Beg and Awami Action Committee Chief Mirwaiz Maulvi Mohammad Farooq gave a joint call to observe a protest day in Jammu and Kashmir on 15th January, 1965 against “unconstitutional and undemocratic measures” adopted by India to grab Jammu and Kashmir completely. Addressing the protest rally at Hazratbal in Srinagar Sheikh Abdullah said that “India had started process of tightening its tentacles over Jammu and Kashmir and ‘thus reverted from the part of late Pandit Nehru who believed that Jammu and Kashmir issue be settled peacefully and honourably.” He further said: “it is futile to expect anything from new leadership in New Delhi.”

The measures of constitutional integration were followed by what was called a step towards political integration of the state with the rest of India by converting the ruling National conference into a branch of the Indian National Congress. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq was instrumental in converting National Conference into the unit of Indian National Congress. By the efforts of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq and the Congress high command, the Indian National Congress, the national party was formally launched on 26th January, 1965 in Jammu and Kashmir. The entry of the premier national political party in the state was important in strengthening the integration of Jammu and Kashmir with the rest of the Country. While Constitutional, legal, financial and administrative ties were important in a democratic system. It was
the political parties that provided the flesh and blood to the functioning of the whole system. The Indian National Congress with its magnificent record of national service first under giants like Sri Aurobindo and Lokmanya Tilak and Later under Mahatma Gandhi and his brilliant band led by Jawaharlal Nehru was clearly the predominant political force in India and should have certainly extended its activities to the state. Thus, the induction of the Indian National Congress in place of the State’s premier political organization, National Conference was the most significant step in attracting the masses of Jammu and Kashmir towards the main current of Indian public life, thereby ending the fragmentary and parochial character of state politics. In this way the process of emotional and political integration was started under the leadership of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq.

The merger of National Conference with Indian National Congress further provoked Kashmiri sentiments and Sheikh Abdullah’s described it as a threat to the identity of Kashmiri Muslims and said: “A Muslim who becomes a member of the Congress Party will dig his own grave, not only of his own, his family but also of his nation.” He lost all hopes for getting justice and fair-play for Muslims from India. He declared every pro-India muslim to be a ‘traitor’. Speaking at Chirar-e-Sharif mosque, Sheikh Abdullah thundered: “our nation cannot be kept enslaved with the help of the army….. Kashmiris are no more to be enslaved as they were before 1947. Today they can firmly stand against a volley of bullets.” He gave a call for complete social boycott of those Muslims who became members of Congress and said: “those who refuse to join the boycott would be traitors.” In response to this call, marriages, religious functions and funerals of Muslim Congressmen were not attended by many people in the Kashmir valley.

Pakistan fully exploited the growing anti India sentiments in the valley. Her Foreign Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto threatened to “take retaliatory measures to counter the Indian attempt to merge Jammu and Kashmir with the Indian Union”. Pakistan President Mohammad Ayub Khan, who received “heartiest congratulations” from Sheikh Abdullah on his re-election, also declared that neither Pakistan nor world opinion would recognize any Indian step to integrate the state of Jammu and Kashmir.
But Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq believed in the policy of greater integration with India. So with the consent of state Government following Central laws were made applicable to the state of Jammu and Kashmir in 1964.

(i) The companies (profits) Surtax Act, 1964 (7 of 1964).

Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq was instrumental in extending the code of civil procedure to the state whereby the corresponding provision in the Jammu and Kashmir Civil Procedure Code, where amended in August, 1964. The Central Advocate Act was also extended to the state, thereby allowing the legal practitioners from all over India to practice in the Jammu and Kashmir High Court. Similarly, the legal practitioners from the state were allowed to practice in any other court of India. The Press Bill was extended to the state of Jammu and Kashmir on 18th February, 1965, thereby, extending the jurisdiction of the Registrar of Newspapers to Jammu and Kashmir as well.

In January, 1965 Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad had suddenly developed symptoms of cardiac arrest when he was under detention at Udhampur. Subsequently he was released from detention. On 5th February, 1965 Sheikh Abdullah accompanied by his wife, chief of Plebiscite Front Mirza Afzal Beg, Pir Abdul Ghani and a cook, Ghulam Mohammad went out of India for performing Haj and to visit some of the Islamic countries in west Asia like Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan. They also planned to visit Britain and France. Incidentally, all of them described their nationality in their passport applications as Kashmiri Muslims. The Government of India took exception to Sheikh Abdullah’s statements and activities abroad. Sheikh Abdullah met and talked with some political leaders of the Muslim countries of the Middle East. He met president of Egypt, Gamel Abdel Nassar. In Saudi Arabia he met King Faisal. They supported the right of self determination of the Kashmiri People. They favoured friendly relations between India and Pakistan. Gamel
Abdul Nasser and King Faisal said that the strained relations of the two countries were harming even the nations of the Middle East.\textsuperscript{132}

In the beginning, Government of India by and large ignored Sheikh Abdullah’s tour, preferring to concentrate its attentions on the Kashmir valley, where plebiscite Front activists continued agitation\textsuperscript{133} under the acting President of the Plebiscite Front, Sofi Mohammad Akbar.\textsuperscript{134} Accordingly on the night of 6-7 March about 200 Plebiscite Front activists were arrested.\textsuperscript{135}

Meanwhile the process of integration continued once again under Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s regime appropriate steps were taken to remove the impression of an exclusive constitutional pattern created by the distinctive nomenclatures of the Sadar-i-Riyasat and Prime Minister of the state by bringing the constitutional position in harmony with the pattern obtaining in other states of the Union. The Jammu and Kashmir state Assembly passed the constitution of Jammu and Kashmir (Sixth Amendment) Bill on 10\textsuperscript{th} April, 1965. This amendment, together with the consequent changes in other provisions of the constitution of Jammu and Kashmir, formalized the change in the designations of the Sadar-i-Riyasat and the Prime Minister to the Governor and Chief Minister respectively. This amendment further changed section 27 of the constitution, thereby giving the president of India the power to appoint the Governor in the same manner as in the other states of India.\textsuperscript{136}

With this change, the state administration was brought at par with rest of the Indian states. Hereafter, the Governor of this state was to be appointed by the President of India in the same manner as is done in the case of all other Indian states. Before this amendment, the state legislature used to elect its own Sadar-i-Riyasat, who had been a permanent resident of the state, with certain specific qualifications. After this change, any citizen of India could, as well, be appointed to act as the Governor of the state, provided he possessed the requisite qualifications prescribed by the Constitution. He could only be removed by the president of India without any prior consultation of the state legislative assembly. Previously, the Sadar-i-Riyasat could be removed by the president, if the legislative assembly with a majority of not less than $2/3$rd of its total membership asked for such removal on the ground of the violation of the Constitution.\textsuperscript{137} Thus these were the symbolic measures in Indian federalism designed to bring the state more closely at par with other constituent units of the Republic. Shri Karan Singh was the first Governor who was administered oath
of the office on 10th April, 1965.  

The practice of dismissal and removal of state employees brought at par with other Indian states by amending section 126 of the state constitution and substituting a new sub section 2 whereby no state employee could now be dismissed, removed or reduced in rank except after an inquiry wherein he was given a reasonable chance of being heard and defend himself.

Prime Minister Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq also amended the fifth schedule of the state constitution. It deals with oaths and affirmation for Ministers, Deputy Ministers, candidates for elections, members of the state legislature and the Judges of the High Court. In all the oath forms, the words- ‘that I will uphold the sovereignty and integrity of India’, were inserted after the already existing expression: “that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the constitution of the state as by law established”. By inserting the first expression all the oath takers were responsible to uphold the sovereignty and integrity of India which also includes the state as its integral part. It was only a minor step towards emotional integration of the state with India, which is a union of states including Jammu and Kashmir.

In the Kashmir valley the Plebiscite Front launched a series of protest meetings against these measures at which strong anti-India speeches were made, while at abroad Sheikh Abdullah, began acting in a provocative manner. Throughout the period he remained outside India, he made best of the available opportunity and explained his view point to the leaders of various nations and had also the benefits of knowing the view point of the leaders of other nations. In India his utterances were subject of criticism both by the press and top leaders of the Indian National Congress. The criticism reached highest pitch following his meeting with the premier of China in Algeria. The premier of China Chou-En-Lai and Sheikh Abdullah met on 31st March, 1965 at Algeria. China publically supported ‘Self-determination’ for Jammu and Kashmir and Sheikh Abdullah welcomed this support.

Sheikh Abdullah asked him certain questions regarding China’s understanding with Pakistan vis-à-vis Gilgit which was a part of Jammu and Kashmir state. In reply Chinese premier said, “China wants to have good relations with the neighbouring countries. It wants to settle all disputes, including the border ones, amicably. At present, Gilgit is under the control of Pakistan and therefore, we entered into an agreement stipulating that the agreement shall remain valid only as long as
Gilgit is under the control of Pakistan. In case the situation changes and India or any other country gets control over Gilgit the treaty can be suitably modified.”

After this, Sheikh Abdullah and Chou-En-Lai discussed Indo-China relations. Chou-en-Lai accused India of expansionism, asserting that China was not expansionist. It was a huge country which had no desire or inclination to grab fresh territory. He also quoted certain excerpts from Jawaharlal Nehru’s writings and said that Nehru clearly upheld expansionism and wanted to remove old Hindu imperialism-extending up to Java and Sumatra. Then he invited Sheikh Abdullah to visit China which was accepted by Sheikh Abdullah.

As the relations between India and China were tense because of the Sino-Indian war of 1962, the Government of India did not like Sheikh Abdullah’s acceptance of Chou-En-Lai’s invitation to visit China. There was an outcry in the press and in the parliament and finally the Minister for External Affairs announced that all endorsements on the passports of Sheikh Abdullah and his party had been cancelled except those necessary for the purpose of Haj. The Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, made a statement in parliament on 5th April, 1965, in which he said that Sheikh Abdullah’s conduct—“in seeking China’s support” in regard to Jammu and Kashmir was “a highly prejudicial act” and his acceptance of Mr. Chou-En-Lai’s invitation to visit China was “extremely objectionable”. To cut his tour short, the Foreign Minister said, Sheikh Abdullah had been informed (presumably through our Embassy in Jeddah where the Sheikh Abdullah then was) that the validity of his passport would be terminated as on 30th April, 1965, which it was expected, would enable him to complete the Haj. All other endorsements on the passport, other than those necessary for the purpose of the Haj, he was also told, were being cancelled.

On 7th May, 1965, Sheikh Abdullah and others landed at palam airport, Delhi and were served with an order under the Defence of India Rules. Sheikh Abdullah along with Mirza Afzal Beg was whisked away to Bangalore in another plane. Begum Abdullah and others were allowed to enter Delhi but served with an order of no entry into the state of Jammu and Kashmir. From Bangalore they were driven to ootacamund, a pretty enough hill station in the far south but which probably made him all the more nostalgic for his beloved vale of Kashmir. Enroute, they visited Tipu Sultan’s grave and by evening they were in Ooty. Sheikh Abdullah was permitted to move about within the Ooty Municipal limits and lodged in a bungalow.
called ‘Kohinoor’. Begum Abdullah was permitted to join him and their children were also allowed to visit occasionally.\textsuperscript{151} Kodaikanal is a beautiful small town.

After the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah and Mirza Afzal Beg there was vociferous and violent protest in Jammu and Kashmir which faced strong repression. According to Balraj Puri who himself visited the valley in May, 1965 “the repression that was let loose was neither always necessary nor discriminate, for instance the severe beating that Maulvi Mohammad Sayed Masoodi and Ghulam Mohiduddin Kara received at the hands of the police. Likewise, resentment of the people was neither always non-violent nor non-communal nor did they always remain disciplined.”\textsuperscript{152} Thus Indian Federalization received a more serious shock in Jammu and Kashmir in 1965 than it did twelve years ago: quantitatively as well as qualitatively. For this time, it was not merely on emotional rupture between Jammu and Kashmir and the rest of India as it was in 1953 but this time it marked a perceptible ideological divergence between them.

At the height of his differences with the Government of India in 1953, Sheikh Abdullah who more than anybody else represented the popular mood of the valley continued to swear by Indian values like secularism, socialism and Gandhism. He did not repudiate them in 1965 but indicated a tilt in the other direction also. He based his nationality on religion as implied in his passport application, in which he described himself as a Kashmiri Muslim. Photos of Gandhiji, Jawaharlal Nehru, Abul Kalam Azad and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan that used to adorn his political headquarters Mujahid Manzil, in Srinagar were removed and replaced by that of Pakistan’s founder Mohammed Ali Jinnah. His official organ the Plebiscite Front eulogised Jinnah and Gandhi alike.

Similarly the political system of Pakistan was appreciated by the Plebiscite Front and the socialist red banner of the freedom movement was substituted by a green flag, officially interpreted as the symbol of Islam. However the slogan of Hindu-Muslim-Sikh unity was never given up.\textsuperscript{153} On the other side Pakistan got opportunity to exploit the situation, she called the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah ‘reckless’ and again lodged a complaint with the security council on 20\textsuperscript{th} May, 1965. But that was only the official face of its response.\textsuperscript{154}
So the rise of secessionist sentiments in the valley might have been one of the temptations for Pakistan to send armed infiltrators into the state in August 1965 for its forcible annexation leading to Indo-Pakistan war. So convinced that this time the people of Jammu and Kashmir would cooperate rather than confront it, Pakistan speeded up the time table for its second major military adventure in the Jammu and Kashmir.

There were many factors which Pakistan considered to be in her favour. (i)

With the passing away of Jawaharlal Nehru in May, 1964, the world in general and Pakistan and her allies, in particular, had expected dismemberment of the Indian Union into various racial and communal groups. They were confident that at least in the case of Jammu and Kashmir, the new government in India would yield ground. They thought that Jawaharlal Nehru had refused to hand over Jammu and Kashmir on a silver platter to Pakistan because of his personal attachment to the state of Jammu and Kashmir.

(ii) President Ayub Khan had expressed several times the opinion that Jammu and Kashmir was of no value to India, and it was only their “false prestige” which prevented the Indian leaders to give it up.

(iii) There was acute shortage of food and foreign exchange plaguing India. To add the worries and difficulties of the Union Government, there had cropped up the serious language controversy. The fissiparous tendencies highlighted by the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) party agitation in the south and the demand of the Punjabi Suba in the North, had convinced the rulers of Pakistan that the time was ripe for a final blow to complete the process of disintegration in India.

On 22nd March, 1965 it was written in the ‘Dawn’ of Karachi “let us prepare for war, a jihad.” The fighting began in the early hours of 9th April, 1965 at the opposite end of the India-Pakistan border from Jammu and Kashmir-the southern tip of Gujarat, the Rann of Kutch. Pakistan attacked the Indian border post of Sardar in Kutch (Gujarat) with heavy mortar and medium machine gun fire which was followed by artillery fire. But on 10th April, 1965 Indian Army units re-occupied the Sardar post after throwing back the Pakistan Army battalions. However, Pakistan
concentrated further armed forces on the border behind its troops inside Indian territory.\textsuperscript{159}

These attacks continued for a number of days. All these attacks for effecting illegal military occupation of Indian territory amounted to acts of naked aggression against India. Pakistan had chosen to mount on armed attack on territory over which she had never exercised possession and over which she, in fact, admitted India’s possession.\textsuperscript{160} With the good offices of the British Prime Minister negotiations were carried on for sometime between India and Pakistan. In the meantime, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri and President Ayub Khan met informally in London on the occasion of commonwealth Prime Minister’s conference on 17\textsuperscript{th} June, 1965. In London prolonged negotiations resulted in a tentative accord on the broad principles of an immediate ceasefire and of the Kutch border demarcation by peaceful negotiations.

Finally on 30\textsuperscript{th} June, 1965 an agreement was signed between the two governments for an immediate ceasefire and restoration of status quo ante in the area of the Gujarat-West Pakistan border. The agreement provided a plan for ‘determination and demarcation of the border in that area after the status quo ante had been restored. The agreement directed the two governments to order a ceasefire with effect from 00.30 hours on 1\textsuperscript{st} July, 1965. The troops of both sides were required to withdraw to the position occupied by them on 1\textsuperscript{st} January, 1965 within seven days of the ceasefire.\textsuperscript{161} But Indo-Pak conflict did not end here. According to Pakistani Foreign Minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, Pakistan had a ‘master plan’ for Jammu and Kashmir and that they proposed to follow this plan ‘step by step.” The aggression in Kutch was the first step which did not go wholly against their expectations. Pakistan confidently and fearlessly embarked upon the second step of her master plan because of United States of America’s aid.

Meanwhile Pakistan had developed closer relations with China. In March, 1965 President Ayub Khan visited China where he said, that, his people deeply appreciate the fair and equitable stand taken by China, that, the Jammu and Kashmir dispute must be settled in accordance with the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Similarly on 28\textsuperscript{th} May, Marshal Chen Yi visited Karachi and said that Pakistan ‘\textit{can repel all aggression}.” Borrowing a technique guerrilla warfare perfected by her new found friend Mao Tse-Tung, Pakistan ‘\textit{put the fish in the water}
to test the temperature.’

Ayub Khan was confident now about the success of his two pronged strategy for Jammu and Kashmir, the Gibraltar punch backed up by the Grand slam knockout. In the first, trained raiders would immobilize and weaken the Indian Army in Jammu and Kashmir and in the second, the regular army would decapitate the valley from the rest of India. Now he only had to wait for operation weather.

**Indo-Pak War of 22nd Days in 1965**

On 5th August, 1965 several thousand fully armed Pakistan soldiers in civilian clothes slipped across the 470 miles long ceasefire line into Jammu and Kashmir. They came in twos and threes, through many gaps and trails that criss cross the mountainous terrain. Dense woods, ravines and gorges provided the infiltrators excellent cover.

The task allotted to the infiltrators were: destruction of bridges; disruption of lines of communication; raiding of Indian Army convoys, headquarters, supply dumps, Police stations and important installations; inflicting casualties on troops, civilian officials and VIPs. The raiders banked on getting local support, failing which they were instructed to terrorise the local population by setting fire to their houses and property.

**Jammu and Kashmir Replies Pakistan**

The people of Jammu and Kashmir who were supposed to rise as one against India, rose instead against the raiders precisely as they had done in 1947. Ever since the attack on 5th August, Pakistan had acted as an official spokesman of the infiltrators. Pakistan Radio and press were every day giving fantastic reports of their exploits. In addition, a radio station styled “Sada-i-Kashmir” (Voice of Kashmir) had been set up under the control and command of Pakistan authorities, at a place Khari six miles from Muzaffarabad in Pakistan occupied Kashmir, to broadcast distorted news. The people of Jammu and Kashmir, however, saw through the game early. They gave the lie to the lurid accounts of “popular uprising” put out by ‘Sada-i-Kashmir’ and echoed by the Pakistan press and radio, by cooperating with the authorities and giving valuable information which helped the security forces to trace and round up the infiltrators. In some cases, the villagers captured the infiltrators themselves and handed them over to the police.
It must had been a great disappointment for Pakistan as far many years she worked to sow seeds of disaffection among the people of Jammu and Kashmir and invoked religion to wean them away from opposition to the so called two nation theory.\textsuperscript{168}

Regarding this the staff writer of the Washington post, Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts, wrote in September, 1965, “The Moslem Pakistanis, led by President Ayub Khan had expected the infiltrators to be able to produce a general uprising of the predominantly Moslem Kashmiris, it is believed here. But there was no uprising and this is Ayub’s first disappointment. By the end of August, when the Indians were sufficiently alarmed by the infiltration, however, they countered with infantry offensives cross the ceasefire line.”\textsuperscript{169}

Similarly Swantantra Samachar of Nepal wrote in its edition of 22\textsuperscript{nd} August, 1965: “It has been quite clear that this Pakistani infiltration is wholesale aggression, presenting a great challenge to world peace. Pakistan should realize that she will not be saved from the flames of this challenge.”\textsuperscript{170}

No wonder that, Pakistan believed that, the moment the infiltrators set their foot in the valley, the people of Jammu and Kashmir would throw in their lot with them and helps them in overthrowing the state. Government of Jammu and Kashmir they believed would fall like a ripe fruit, but to their dismay that did not happen. As Jacques Nevard, the New York Times correspondent wrote in his paper from Srinagar on 14\textsuperscript{th} August, 1965: “Reports from Pakistan that the trouble in Indian held Jammu and Kashmir is a popular revolt against Indian rule appears to be without foundation.”\textsuperscript{171}

The voice of Jammu and Kashmir was truly spoken by the State Chief Minister, Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq when he declared: “We in Jammu and Kashmir have become victims of Pakistani aggression twice during the last eighteen years. Over these years our people have become all too familiar with the real designs of Pakistan. In embarking upon this present act of aggression, Pakistan should have realized that the people of this state through decades of experience are imbued with a sense of deep political understanding which cannot be easily affected either by use of force, acts of deceit or blandishments by our old enemies. This was amply demonstrated by the stout resistance which our people put up against Pakistani
invasion in 1947. Now that Pakistan has dared to try a similar misadventure again, history is repeating itself and once again our people are giving a determined and fitting reply to the aggressor”.

He further said: “The people of Jammu and Kashmir have learnt through the experience that religion cannot form a basis for the establishment of a state. It is the common economic needs and problems that unite people together whether they be Hindus, Muslims or followers of any other religion. In our country, India, there are crores of people professing different faiths. Each one of them is free to adopt the way of worship he chooses. However, what binds us together in our political life is a common approach to the economic and social problems”.172

He added that “1931 political struggle in Jammu and Kashmir started to establish a social order wherein Justice-social, political and economic, would infirm all institutions of the state. This objective was embodied in our ‘Naya Kashmir’ programme. Socialism applies equally to all, irrespective of their faith and religions. There is no such thing like ‘Hindu Socialism’, ‘Muslim Socialism’ and ‘Sikh Socialism’ Socialism means that everyone should be free to enjoy the benefits of the labour and there should be no exploitation. It is this belief in socialism that has brought us closer to India. Our political objective was identical with the national movement of the country. The issue before us was not of religion but one of eradicating poverty and exploitation. This proves that we have emotionally integrated ourselves with the rest of the country long before. The decision of accession to India taken in 1947 in reality concretised our long-cherished desire to come closer to the rest of the country and proceed ahead towards the goal of socialism and prosperity.”

Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq further said “the argument that Jammu and Kashmir should form part of Pakistan because the population of the state is predominantly Muslim is devoid of any sense or substance. Such types of arguments belong to 12th Century. In the present day world, these arguments can have neither weight nor appeal.173 Whenever Pakistani rulers see Jammu and Kashmir making progress they try to create disorder on one pretext or the other in the state. The Pakistani rulers have no sympathy with the Muslims of the state; they simply want to hamper our progress. In 1947, when Pakistan attacked us, our slogan was, Kashmiri’s are ready to face the aggressor. But today our slogan is that we, Indians, are ready to fight back the aggressor. Pakistan’s attack on our territory will not be
treated as an attack on Jammu and Kashmir alone but as an attack on India as a whole. Pakistan shall have to face not only the Kashmiri’s, but the entire Indian nation. The aggressor must know that the Indian nation is not so weak as to be overawed by any show of strength or armed might. It is fortunate that our people have once again proved their political maturity and understanding. The People of the state have stood with the government solidly and are rendering every help to the security forces in fighting the raiders. Valuable information regarding the hide-outs of the infiltrators was given to us by the people and we were able to track them down. One group of raiders who came via Toshamaid and sent a man to Tangmarg to fetch horses etc. believing that he would do their work. But the man instead informed the police and the army about their presence. This information exposed their whole plan. They wanted to take us by surprise by entering the city of Srinagar. But they could not succeed, thanks to the vigilance of the people.”

There were hundreds of instances in which the local population participated actively in tracing and rounding up the infiltrators. On the evening of 4th August, 1965, a young Gujjar, Mohammad Din was grazing his cattle in a meadow at Darakasi, above Gulmarg, east of the Uri-Poonch bulge, when he was accosted by two raiders dressed in green Salware-Kameez uniforms and carrying arms. They took him into their camp in a nearby forest where their leader solicited his assistance as a guide and informant. He was offered 400 rupees and asked to report back as soon as he had obtained the desired information about the location of grain stores and transport depots and procured certain supplies and transport. However Mohammad Din’s suspicions were aroused by the presence of so many armed ‘outsiders’ and he hurried down to the police station at Tangmarg and reported the incident there.

About 50 miles further south in a forest near Galuthi in the Mendhar sector of Poonch District, a villager, Wazir Mohammad, came similarly across some armed intruders the same evening. Likewise he promptly informed the nearest military authorities. Indian army patrols were alerted. Srinagar was informed and the hunt began. So there was close cooperation between the army and the people of Jammu and Kashmir in locating the raiders and taking them into custody. But before the security forces could be alerted, several groups of infiltrators had sneaked into the interior of the valley and had even reached the suburbs of Srinagar. Earlier another group penetrated 42 miles into the valley and reached the Badgam town where finding
the people attitude hostile to them, they set fire to two high schools. Another group infiltrating from the Tithwal sector reached Kupwara some 40 miles inside of the ceasefire line in the north of the valley. But the people of Jammu and Kashmir, undaunted by the atrocities committed against them by the infiltrators, presented an impregnable front of communal harmony and held the Pakistani invaders at bay. The infiltrators became desperate and were hunted men rather than guerrillas. Far from finding place in the homes and hearts of the local people as they had counted upon doing, they had to take cover in forests and ravines from where they where ferreted out. But the operation was still continued by Pakistan. A fresh wave of guerrillas was sent across the ceasefire line under cover of artillery fire from Pakistan posts. So the Government of India approached the United National observer Group to prevent these incursions by the Pakistani armed personnel in civilian clothes. But they were helpless. As the United nation Secretary General reported to the Security Council (4th September) he had been unable “to obtain any assurance from Pakistan that the ceasefire agreement and the ceasefire line in Kashmir would be respected henceforth”.

India Takes Action

Under such circumstances, the Indian army had no choice except to take action to block the passes through which the raiders had come. On 24th August, 1965 they crossed the ceasefire line at Titwal and occupied Pir Sahiba at 9,000 feet. On 28th August, 1965 Major Ranjit Singh Dayal took the vital Haji Pir Pass. But on 1st September, Pakistan expanded the war and they reached upto Chhamb.

Thus the threat was real and imminent. Pakistan’s attack was so formidable and so swift, said Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, “that we could not afford merely to talk to defending ourselves. We had to take decisive, effective action, without losing time. The needs of the situation could no longer be answered by local action. We could not afford to endanger the freedom of our country, no country in the world would have allowed its freedom to be threatened as ours was. We have always held fast to the principle of peace, but in the situation that was created, not to act would have been cowardice and sloth. The display of armed might we saw within our territory could be resisted only with arms. It is not customary to let our state secrets, but I can tell you that when our Generals consulted the Government about the
situation, I told them firmly that there was no room for indecision, that they must go ahead and not flinch.”

Accordingly, at the dawn on 6th September, Indian Army crossed the international boundary from Sialkot to Kasur and what was called the ‘All out war’ began. Abruptly the nature of the war had changed. Lahore was under threat. There were some massive tank battles, but eventual outcome was that each side managed to stop the other’s advance. A ceasefire was the logical conclusion, particularly with ammunition running low in both armies. On 23rd September, 1965, a ceasefire under the aegis of the United Nations Security Council came into effect. For the record, India had about 740 square miles under occupation, against 210 square miles by Pakistan, but the strategic balance was even.

Thus India’s main objectives were achieved. These were to prevent the annexation of Jammu and Kashmir by force; to give notice to Rawalpindi and the world that if Jammu and Kashmir was important for Pakistan, it was no less important for India.

**Indo-Pak War in Security Council**

In Security Council the foreign Minister of Pakistan stated: “The war with India is not of our seeking. It is a war of self-defence against an armed attack launched on our borders without warning on the morning of 6th September and aimed at the seizure of Lahore, our second largest city and the very heart of Pakistan.”

But in reply the Secretary-General of the United Nations said. How dare the Foreign Minister of Pakistan talk of the war not being of Pakistan’s seeking? Is there no limit of misrepresentation? Because the United Nations Secretary General himself recognised the facts and established that the war was forced upon India by Pakistan. According to United Nations Secretary General’s report: “General Nimmo has indicated to me that the series of violations that began on 5th August were to a considerable extent in subsequent days in the form of armed men, generally not in uniform, crossing the ceasefire line from the Pakistan side for the purpose of armed action on the Indian side. This is a conclusion reached by General Nimmo on the basis of investigations by the United Nations observers, in the light of the extensive character of the raiding activities and their proximity to the ceasefire line even though in most cases the actual identity of those engaged in the armed attacks on the
Indian side of the line and their actual crossing of it could not be verified by direct observations or evidence.”

United Nations General Secretary further said that “the world is fully aware of Pakistan’s direct complicity in dispatching armed troops in civilian disguise across the ceasefire line”. In this context, The Nationalist Arabic daily of Beirut, Al-Anwar says: “The infiltration operations carried out by the Pakistanis at the present time in Jammu and Kashmir are fruitless, and the infiltrators will not succeed in taking Jammu and Kashmir from India. What they are doing is to widen the conflict between the two countries and make the possibility of settling the Jammu and Kashmir problem more difficult than at any time before.”

Tashkent Declaration

Outside the United Nations there were forces working for a peaceful settlement of the India-Pakistan conflict. Immediately after Pakistan’s massive assault on India in Chhamb, the Soviet Union took active steps to prevent escalation of the war, on 4th September, the USSR premier, A.N. Kosygin expressed his concern over the fighting both to Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri and President Ayub Khan. The Soviet Union, he said, “would not be frank if we did not say that a military conflict in Jammu and Kashmir is a matter of concern to the Soviet Government because, apart from other things, it is a development in a region which directly borders on the Soviet Union.” He put forward certain considerations for the settlement of the conflict. These included an immediate ceasefire and withdrawal of forces of the respective countries to positions behind the ceasefire line.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republic assumed the role of an honest broker. It had special interest in bringing about peace between India and Pakistan, as it was apprehensive of China’s increasing influence in the region. Whereas, China assumed aggressive postures against India on 16th September, 1965, China gave a three day ultimatum to India “to dismantle all its military works for aggression on China-Sikkim boundary” Again on 19th September, China declared all out support to the people of Jammu and Kashmir in their ‘struggle for right of self-determination’. At about the same time, the Chinese declared that they would not sit idle. After the 1962 war, china had changed its stand with regard to Jammu and Kashmir. Earlier, it had taken either a pro-India or a neutral stand. For instance, on 16th March, 1956, Chou-En-Lai had told that Indian Envoy, “People of Jammu and Kashmir have
already expressed their will regarding accession with Indian Union.” Again, on 31st May, 1962, China had told India that “its attitude of never getting involved in dispute over Jammu and Kashmir is well known throughout the world.”\textsuperscript{187}

Pakistan accepted Mr. Kosygin’s proposal but Zulfikar Ali Bhutto laid down certain pre-conditions, particularly the re-opening of the Jammu and Kashmir question. However India made it clear that while accepting the good offices of Mr. Kosygin, she would not take part in a meeting where the talk was going to be held to discuss Jammu and Kashmir. But if talks on the total relationship between India and Pakistan-that India and Pakistan should live as good neighbours-Mr. Shastri would not like to say no to it-suggested by India. But finally Pakistan agreed.\textsuperscript{188} So at last by the efforts of USSR premier A.N. Kosygin both Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri and Pakistan President Ayub Khan agreed for a summit meeting anywhere on Soviet soil.

The Summit meeting was held at Tashkant on 4\textsuperscript{th} January, 1966. Premier Kosygin was helpful throughout the seven days that the meeting lasted in bringing about a successful conclusion of the talks over a varied number of subjects on which there existed conflicts and differences between the two countries. When almost a deadlock had been reached on 9\textsuperscript{th} January, he held long meetings with both the statesmen which resulted in Tashkent Declaration. According to Tashkent Declaration the two leaders of India and Pakistan announced their firm resolve to restore normal and peaceful relations between the two countries and to promote understanding and friendly relations between their peoples’.

They further agreed to exert all efforts to create good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan in accordance with the United Nations Charter and reaffirmed their obligations under the charter not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means.

The two leaders agreed to withdraw by 25\textsuperscript{th} February, 1966 all armed personnel of the two countries to the positions they held prior to 5\textsuperscript{th} August, 1965. Further, they announced that the relations between the two countries shall be based on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of each other. To further cement the relations between the two neighbouring countries, they agreed to discourage any propaganda directed against the other country and to consider measures towards the
restoration of economic and trade relations, communications as well as cultural exchanges between India and Pakistan. Another important article related to the setting up of joint committees to suggest further steps to be taken by the two governments to bring the people of the two countries nearer to one another. Thus the Tashkent talks gave the two neighbours their territories back.

The ink in the historic declaration was hardly dry when the joy at the successful conclusion of the Summit meeting, turned into sudden grief within a few hours of the signing of the declaration, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri passed away at Tashkent from a heart attack. Thus we conclude that Pakistan’s second war for Jammu and Kashmir added not an inch to what it had seized till 1948 and the people of Jammu and Kashmir had proved that they were Indians and they did not surrender Jammu and Kashmir to Pakistan. Lal Bahadur Shastri died as a valiant soldier of peace. In his last message to his people given a few hours before his death, he said: “We fought in this (Indo-Pak) war with all our strength. Now we have to fight for peace with all our strength.”

On 19th January, 1966 Indira Gandhi was sworn in as the Prime Minister of India. The Indo-Pak conflict of 1965 has been described by a number of observers as the most useless and fruitless war which cost both the countries heavily in terms of men, material and money. But this observation is not wholly true, India definitely stood to gain. After the Tashkent declaration, the interest of the International community in the Jammu and Kashmir problem abated. Pakistan also learnt to its cost that any future intervention in Jammu and Kashmir would not remain restricted to the area around Jammu and Kashmir but would amount to a full scale war between India and Pakistan.

Pakistan’s armed intervention in Jammu and Kashmir to settle the issue also unburdened conscience keepers of India who were till than mounting pressure on Government of India to negotiate future of Jammu and Kashmir with Pakistan and Sheikh Abdullah. Jaya Prakash Narayan declared that by her ‘deliberate and blatant action, Pakistan has forfeited whatever place it had obtained in the Jammu and Kashmir issue’. Similarly C. Rajagoplachari, who also used to plead for accommodating Pakistan on Jammu and Kashmir dispute warned: “The crushing defeat deservedly suffered by Pakistan should have taught her that she could no longer go on making trouble for India.”
The Republican party of India, the founder President of which the late Dr. B.R. Ambedkar had suggested partition of the state to bring peace between India and Pakistan, reversed its stand and declared Jammu and Kashmir as an integral part of India. For the manner in which Pakistan had committed acts of aggression and had refused to live in peace had “brought about a change in the circumstances.” Above all the Indo-Pak war decisively established India’s armed superiority over Pakistan and exposed latter’s utter incapacity to ‘liberate’ Jammu and Kashmir from India. Pakistan’s military and diplomatic reverses, reluctance of people of Jammu and Kashmir to translate their anti-India sentiments into pro-Pakistan sentiments and their non-cooperation with Pakistan infiltrators and a firm Jammu and Kashmir policy of India, without moral ambivalence, struck a serious blow to the secessionists in the state.

However, as patriotic credentials of Kashmiri Muslims became-less suspect, their assertion within the politics of the state and the country increased which strengthened Chief Minister, Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s political base. After the General election of 1967 when he became leader of the legislature party of his choice, he acquired an added self-confidence and became a champion of the autonomy of the state. Since then no major measure for the constitutional integration of the state with the Union was taken. The case for autonomy of the state within India was also strengthened as leaders like Jaya Prakash Narayan stepped up their Campaign for the solution of the Jammu and Kashmir problem on this basis.

Despite the external pressure Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s Government took another step towards constitutional integration. Members of the Lok Sabha from the state of Jammu and Kashmir used to be elected till then through the state legislative assembly. Towards the end of 1965, after consultations with the state government the system of direct elections of the members to the Lok Sabha was also introduced in the state, under Article 81 of the constitution of India. Thus in this respect, the state was brought at par with other states of the Union. It was also decided that the task of delimiting constituencies should be entrusted to the central delimitation authorities.

Expressing his belief in full integration, Sadiq said: “National Integration.....is..... fundamental.... to the strength of the Country as well as its internal peace and security, secularism and socialism”. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq was the first to agree to bring young direct recruits to the IAS and IPS into Jammu
and Kashmir. He had decided to amend Article 370 of Jammu and Kashmir and place it on the same footing as other states of the Union so that fundamental rights and other benefits may be equally available for the people of the state.201

In 1966 President of India issued the Constitution (Application to Jammu and Kashmir) Amendment Order, 1966 with the concurrence of the state government. Under this order following central laws were made applicable to the state.

(i) the produce cess Act, 1966 (15 of 1966)
(v) The seeds Act, 1966 (54 of 1966)202

Similarly in 1967 following Central Laws were applied to the state Jammu and Kashmir:
(i) The Passport Act, 1967 (15 of 1967)


(i) All political leaders and workers of Jammu and Kashmir who are at present in prison or in detention, including Sheikh Abdullah, Mirza Afzal Beg and Maulana Masoodi, should be released without delay. They should then be given full opportunity of mixing with their people and of guiding public opinion in the state.
(ii) Full Civil liberties should be restored in the state including freedom of speech, freedom of association, and freedom of press.

(iii) After the above has been done, representatives of the governments of both India and Pakistan and the leaders of various politics parties in Jammu and Kashmir, including Azad Kashmir, representing all shades of opinion, should meet together and thrash out a solution of this most agonizing problem acceptable to all concerned.

**Election of 1967**

In 1967 Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad revived its National Conference to return to active politics after his ouster under the Kamraj plan three years ago. Meanwhile by the summer of 1967 several cabinet ministers from New Delhi visited Jammu and Kashmir, including the Home Minister Gulzari Lal Nanda, the Defence Minster Y.B. Chavan and Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed to support Congress Party then functioning under G.M. Sadiq and Mr. Qasim. By the end of September, 1966 Indira Gandhi paid her first visit to the state as Prime Minister. She was given a warm and affectionate welcome in the state. The Chief Minster accompanied her in a procession in an open car through the city of Srinagar. She visited several forward areas by helicopter and addressed troops there. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi publically stated in her election tour that there was no need for an opposition party in Jammu and Kashmir which was opposed by the principal opposition parties and also protested against her statement. But Mrs. Indira Gandhi clarified that she had merely expressed her fear that the opposition in Jammu and Kashmir was likely to go astray. The administration however, got the signal to cut the opposition to size.

Meanwhile the Delimitation Commission under Justice J.L. Kapur announced their decision. The state legislative assembly seats were delimited so that the Kashmir valley got 42, the Jammu region 31 and Ladakh got 2 seats. As far as the Lok Sabha seats were concerned three seats went to the valley, 2 to Jammu and one for Ladakh. The General elections were due in 1967 and for the first time there were going to be direct elections from Jammu and Kashmir to the Lok Sabha, as previously the members were nominated by the state assembly under special dispensation. Here, Shri Karan Singh decided to leave the state and enter national politics to serve whole nation.
So, Shri Karan Singh wrote to the Prime Minister on 17\textsuperscript{th} August, 1966 as follows, “You will recall that over the last few months I have mentioned several times my desire to relinquish the office of the Governor and seek a more active participation in national politics. I have been Head of the state for almost half my life since, I first became Regent in 1949, and I do feel that it will now be desirable for me to change my field of public activity, even though it will be wrench for me to dissociate myself from close contact with the affairs of the state to which I belong. In view of the fact that the general elections are approaching, I write to seek your approval to my requesting the president to accept my resignation from the post of Governor of Jammu and Kashmir sometime next month”.\textsuperscript{210}

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi replied the next day: “Thank you for your letter of 17\textsuperscript{th} August. We have since met and talked about the matter raised by you. You have expressed your desire to be relieved of your present office more than once in the past and ever since you first did so, I have been giving anxious thought to your suggestions. I fully understand and appreciate that having served as Head of State in Jammu and Kashmir for nearly two decades now, you should wish to have a change and think of more active participation in national politics. With your ability and experience you would certainly be an asset to political life. You have held the office of Sadar-i-Riyasat and Governor with dignity and distinction in the midst of recurrent crises forced upon us largely by Pakistan’s hostile and aggressive attitude. Your contribution towards the handing of these difficult problems has been invaluable”.

However, as I have explained to you, we are passing through very critical times in economic and other fields. As the general elections approach, our problems will increase. The threat to our borders also continues. In these circumstances and in this delicate situation I am worried at the thought of a new person taking up your important position. That is why I should like you to agree to stay on in your present office for the time being. I hope that you will find this possible.\textsuperscript{211}

Thus, it was agreed that Shri Karan Singh would not contest the elections immediately and there was mutual understanding between centre and state that on one of the Jammu seats there would be a candidate of his choice on behalf of ruling party, who when the necessity arose, would resign his seat and make way for Sri Karan Singh to contest a bye-election. For this purpose Shri Karan Singh chose Brigadier Ghansara Singh.\textsuperscript{212} In addition to him the Congress chose their respected Head Lama
Elections were fixed for 21 February, 1967 and excitement began to mount. The major groups in the Plebiscite Front, claiming the blessings of the detained Sheikh Abdullah and Mirza Afzal Beg, took the line that as the party was committed to the ‘right of self-determination through a plebiscite’, there was no question of its participating in the elections. A second group supported by Maulana Masoodi and Mohiuddin Quarra, announced its intention to contest on independent tickets. When papers were scrutinized for the legislative assembly seats, 22 Congress nominees and one M.P. Shafi Qureshi from Anantnag, were declared unopposed because the returning officer had rejected all the papers of opposition candidates. This was the blatant misuse of power.

Opposition parties were furious, Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad’s National Conference, alleged misuse of government machinery and there were violent clashes with the Congress in various parts of the valley. An opposition delegation consisting of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad of National Conference, Pandit Prem Nath Dogra of Jana Sangh and Dhan Raj Badgotra of Praja Socialist Party went to Delhi to protest against the rejections. They demanded the dismissal of the Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq government and the imposition of president’s rule to ensure fair elections.

Regarding this the Governor of the state wrote a letter to President, Dr. Radhakrishnan in which he said: “It was clear that the large scale rejection had created a most unfavourable impression. On the one hand our foreign critics and Pakistan in particular, fully exploited the episode to justify their contentions that elections in Jammu and Kashmir have always been farcical, on the other indignation of the opposition parties found considerable prominence and sympathy in the national press and there was widespread resentment within the state.”

Accordingly central government deputed Election Commissioner K. Sundaram to Jammu and Kashmir to check the records and hear the complaints made by party representatives. Balraj Puri showed the Chief Election Commissioner K. Sundaram, a bundle of duplicate ballot papers, he argued that Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad also used to do the same. To this Balraj Puri retorted that he was not representing Bakshi’s
case but rather that of the citizen’s of the state who had been deprived of their democratic rights by Bakshi as well as by Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq. Instead of taking cognizance of his complaint, K. Sundram threatened to take action. He said that it was illegal to possess ballot papers. Obviously he too believed that: “The national interest” was more important than the demands of democracy and his office.

In this context Balraj Puri wrote in March, 1967: “If the people of Jammu and Kashmir get the impression that even in limited and safe choices, they cannot be trusted, no outside propaganda would be needed to undermine their loyalty. If badges of patriotism are issued to only those who do not cry for fair elections, how many honourable men and women would like to wear them?”

However, finally K. Sundaram declared by and large that the orders passed by the returning officers are justified from the records and that the aggrieved candidates will have to resort to the unusual remedy for filing election petitions. He recommended that the state electoral law should be brought into line with the national law as soon as possible so that the election petitions could be filed directly with the High Court as in the case of Parliamentary constituencies. Accordingly on 2nd February, 1967, state government issued an ordinance amending the representation of the people’s act to bring it at par with the central law. While this would not help the aggrieved candidates, it was a step towards trying to ensure fairer elections in future in the state.

India’s fourth general elections were held on 21st February, 1967. The Indian National Congress won a clear majority under the leadership of Indira Gandhi in the parliamentary party elections. From Jammu and Kashmir, Shafi Qureshi from Anantnag returned unopposed as papers of all opposition candidates had been rejected, while no papers were filed against Kushak Bakula in Ladakh. Both the Jammu seats were won comfortably by the congress candidates, as was the Baramullah seat in the Kashmir valley. Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad was elected to the Lok Sabha from Srinagar by defeating A.M. Tariq. An excellent opportunity to channelize the politics of the state into secular and nationalist lines, cutting across communal and regional barriers, was again squandered when Bakshi was readmitted into the Congress. Once again the entire national press welcomed the event as a “consolidation of the nationalist forces.”
In the state legislative assembly the congress won 26 of the 31 seats in Jammu, conceding three to the Jana Sangh and one to National Conference. In the valley the National Conference won 7 seats while two went to independent candidates including the ebullient young Journalist Shamim Ahmed Shamim. The polling in Ladakh was scheduled in June due to climatic conditions. Thus over all the Congress won 59 out of the 73 Assembly seats for which elections were held, 22 of them unopposed, whereas National Conference won 8 seats.

As the general elections in India greatly reduced the congress margin, Shri Karan Singh felt good time for him to enter the fray when Indira Gandhi needed all the support she could get. So he approached her Joint Secretary, Sushital Banerji. On 12th March, 1967 Sushital Banerji replied to Shri Karan Singh that Prime Minister allowed him to join her Cabinet as Minister for Tourism and Civil Aviation. Accordingly on 13th March, 1967, under Article 28(2) of the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir, Shri Karan Singh submitted his resignation to Dr. Radha Krishnan. The President of India accepted his resignation and appointed Chief Justice Shri J.N. Wazir, as acting Governor until a successor was appointed. Finally on 9th May, 1967 Shri Karan Singh is declared elected to the Lok Sabha from the Udhampur Parliamentary constituency in a by election.

On 12th April, 1967 several prominent people including C. Rajagopalachari, C.D. Deshmukh, G.L. Mehta and some other members of the parliament issued an appeal for the release of Sheikh Abdullah who has spent about 23 months in jail at Kodaikanal. This said: “Detention without trial for indefinite periods, of men with deep convictions, not only defeats its avowed purpose, but is utterly repugnant to all democratic principles and practices. Our appeal for the release of Sheikh Abdullah rests on the simple but unchallengeable basis of civil liberty.”

This dignified language apparently had some effect, though admittedly in slow motion. In July, 1967 Sheikh Abdullah was brought to Delhi to the medical institute- because he was suffering from diabetes and other ailment and was later moved to a bungalow at Kotla lane in New Delhi. But certain restrictions were imposed on his movements. He was allowed to move only in the Union territory of Delhi but was barred from granting any press interviews, addressing meetings or receiving foreign visitors without the permission of the Deputy Commissioner. Sheikh Abdullah refused to avail the facility of freedom of movement in the union territory and did not
seek permission to meet pressmen. Further on 25th December, 1967 an order allowed him to meet the press and foreign visitors and address public meeting but he again refused to avail these small mercies because his movements were still restricted to Delhi. Finally on 2nd January, 1968 all restrictions on him were removed and he was allowed to leave Delhi and go anywhere he pleased.225

Since independence the people of Jammu province were felt neglected by the state government.226 Similarly, Ladakh, the northernmost and largest district of India, felt neglected at the hands of state government. In August, 1967, Kushak Bakula threatened that if the state government did not redress the genuine demands of Ladakhis, they would be forced to ask for the separation of Ladakh from the state.227

Therefore during the Prime Ministership of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq on 6th November, 1967, the Jammu and Kashmir Commission of Inquiry was appointed under the chairmanship of P.B. Gajendragadkar by the efforts of both the Centre and the State Government.228 Two other members of the commission were Shankar Prasad and Badr-ud-Din Tyabji.229 This Commission was appointed to make an assessment of the development programmes of the various regions of the state and to recommend measures necessary to give assurance that available resources were being shared equally. The commission was also asked to examine the official policies regarding employment and admission to institutions of higher education. To consider generally the causes that lead to irritation and tensions and to recommend remedial measures.230 After one year extensive study of the areas the commission submitted its report in November, 1968. It recommended that there should be a statutory state Development Board and Statutory Regional Development Boards for the three regions- Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. The Regional Boards should be headed by the Chief Minister or the Planning Minister and should consist of legislators from the regions, economists, experts and concerned officials.

The function of the Regional Development Board will be:

(i) to draw up the regional plans,

(ii) to assign priority to schemes and projects include in the regional plans and

(iii) to supervise the implementation of the regional plans.

These Regional Development Boards must pay due regard to the special needs of the backward areas of their respective regions. The State Development Board and
each of the Regional Development Board will prepare at the end of each year a report of their respective activities giving details of the progress of the plan programmes and plan expenditure. All reports should be laid before the state legislature.  

**Employment**

Regarding employment in Government Services, the complaints were of discrimination on communal and regional grounds in recruitment, favouritism and nepotism in promotions and lack of reservations for the Scheduled castes and backward classes. Instances of unjust supper sessions in the matter of promotion were cited. So region wise representation in the services was advocated by the political parties. Communities such as the Gujjars, Rajputs, Shias, Christians etc. all desired special quotas and reservations of appointments for themselves on the ground of their backwardness.

After hearing these demands, the commission recommended:

(i) Recruitment rules for all the state services for which they do not exist at present should be framed and promulgated as early as possible. Recruitment rules for other services also should be speedily framed. Complete, tabulated results of all competitive examinations held by the public services commission and any other Recruitment Board that may be set up, should be published. These results should be sent to all candidates who have taken the examination or if this is not always feasible, the results should at least be made available for scrutiny on request.

(ii) Seniority lists for all services should be drawn up correctly and maintained up to date.

(iii) The existing list of backward classes should be revived and a fresh list drawn up by a high powered committee after applying the multiple criteria, relating to social, educational and economic backwardness.

(iv) Article 335 of the Constitution of India should be made applicable to the Jammu and Kashmir state and reservation for the Scheduled castes be made in the services in proportion to their population.

(v) Reservation in the services should also be made for the backward classes, as freshly determined, in proportion to their population, however subject to the
condition that the total reservation for the backward classes and the scheduled castes should not exceed fifty percent.\textsuperscript{233}

**Education Policies**

The commission recommended reservation for the backward classes and the scheduled castes in Educational and professional institutions. It recommended grant of scholarship and study loans to the students.\textsuperscript{234}

**Irritations and Tensions**

Gajendragadkar Commission recommended that the government and the people of the state of Jammu and Kashmir may themselves decide when Article 370 of the Constitution of India should be abrogated. Keeping in view the progress which has already been made over the years in the integration of Jammu and Kashmir with the rest of India, it did not advise the abrogation of Article 370.\textsuperscript{235} Further it recommended that the state government should immediately take all steps to arrange for the holding of elections to the local bodies as early as possible. These elections should be held regularly in future.

A convention should be established that if the Chief Minister belongs to one region, there should be a Deputy Chief Minister belonging to the other region. And the number of Cabinet Ministers belonging to the two regions should be equal. There should also be a full-fledged Cabinet Minister belonging to Ladakh.\textsuperscript{236} This was important step towards the integration of the three regions of the state.

For Judiciary the commission recommended that when the High Court of Jammu and Kashmir functions at Srinagar, there should be at least one High Court Judge stationed at Jammu to dispose of the cases there. Similarly, when the High Court is functioning at Jammu, there should be at least one High Court Judge stationed at Srinagar to deal with the cases arising in Kashmir.\textsuperscript{237}

In case of Higher Education the commission recommended that there should be a separate full-fledged University in both Jammu and Kashmir regions. One of them, preferably in Jammu should immediately start a faculty of Law because in Jammu there was not any professional college. Subsequently, Law classes will also have to be started in the other University. As all technical and the profession colleges were located in Kashmir. So the commission recommended to open a new medical college at Jammu. It recommended one degree college for Leh and another for
The commission further recommended that the State Government should review the entire policy of food grain prices, both for procurement and for issue and introduce uniform prices for food grains throughout the Jammu and Kashmir regions.

**Ladakh**

The single line administration which was introduced in Ladakh some time ago should be revived in its entirety. The post of Development Commissioner should be merged with that of the Deputy Commission and the incumbent of the post should function as the Head of all Departments in Ladakh and the Ladakh Affairs Secretary should be the secretary for all subjects so far as Ladakh is concerned. He should work under the Ladakhi Minister who could hold charge of the portfolio of Ladakh Affairs.

The Transport facilities available to Ladakh should be improved. In particular the number of buses and trucks plying between Srinagar and Leh should be substantially increased and transport facilities made available for access to the interior places in Ladakh.

**Regional Autonomy**

Earlier, Balraj Puri, a political activist of Jammu met Jawaharlal Nehru on the eve of the finalization of the Delhi Agreement and demanded the regional autonomy on the same basis on which Kashmiri leaders were demanding autonomy for the state. Jawaharlal Nehru agreed to his demand and while releasing the text of the Delhi Agreement told a press conference on 24th July, 1952 in the presence of Sheikh Abdullah that “the State Government was considering regional autonomies within the larger state.” Sheikh Abdullah endorsed the commitment. This would have been an ideal way of reconciling the aspirations of the three regions. But the Praja Parishad rejected the Delhi Agreement and launched a massive agitation for ‘one constitution, one flag, and one president’ for Jammu and Kashmir and the rest of India. Thousands of agitators were imprisoned and about two score persons were shot dead by the police for hoisting the ‘Indian tricolour’ on the state buildings in Jammu province. This agitation shocked Jawaharlal Nehru who for the first time started feeling doubtful about the future of Jammu and Kashmir. So on 5th February, 1953 Jawaharlal Nehru wrote a letter to Jana Sangh President Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee that “he did not have a shadow of doubt that the communal agitation of the Praja Parishad supported by communal and narrow minded elements in India would
bring disaster in its train, not only for Jammu and Kashmir but also to the larger interests of India.”

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee in his letter of 17th February, 1953 to Jawaharlal Nehru, offered to withdraw the agitation and to support Article 370 on the condition that “the principle of autonomy will apply to the province of Jammu as a whole and of course, also to Ladakh and Kashmir valley.” Accordingly the Jammu Satyagraha was withdrawn on an assurance from the state government and the government of India conceding the demand of regional autonomy.

During National Conference rally on 25th July, 1953, Sheikh Abdullah said on impact of Praja Parishad agitation that: “The confidence created by the National Conference in the people here (regarding accession to India) has been shaken by the Jana Sangh and other communal organization in India.” On 2nd July, 1953 Jawaharlal Nehru issued a statement that, “the state government was considering grant of autonomy to its regions, particularly to Jammu, while framing the Constitution of the state.”

Accordingly on next day the then Deputy Prime Minister of the state, Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad commented on Jawaharlal Nehru’s announcement, that it reflected the policy of the state government and said Sheikh Abdullah has consented to the proposed scheme of autonomy for the constituent units of the state to ensure its unity. The Constituent Assembly of the state accordingly appointed a sub-committee to recommend a substantial measure of autonomy for each region including the power of taxation and legislation. But nothing substantial came out of it and consequently ‘the Jammu Autonomy Forum’ was set up to get the scheme of regional autonomy implemented to remove the regional tension in the state.

But later Gajendragadkar commission conceded in its report that regional autonomy “may lead to greater consolidation of the Jammu region with rest of the state”. But commission refused to accept demand of autonomy for Jammu for two reasons:

(i) there was no popular support.

(ii) It may finally lead to the disintegration of the state.

After the release of Sheikh Abdullah in January, 1968 he constantly propagated the view that the accession of the state to India was a temporary one. He
did not like Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s policy of greater integration with India. Therefore, he organized an All Party Convention to thrash out a generally acceptable solution to the problem of the state’s relationship with India. The Government usually looked on this move with suspicion. About 200 personnel attended the convention, but congress, Jana Sangh and the Swatantra party stayed away.

Jayapprakash Narayan, while inaugurating the convention, was unequivocal in his stand that after the 1965 war with Pakistan any solution of these relations could only be found “within the framework of the Indian Union.” He reiterated that no Central Government, present or future, could allow any part of the Country to break away from the Union. It annoyed the Sheikh Abdullah, who wanted to keep all options open. On 18th October, 1968, the convention ended by adopting a resolution affirming that any solution to be acceptable to the people of the state must keep in mind the interests of all three regions of the state. Only such a solution could restore normalcy and tranquility in Jammu and Kashmir and in the subcontinent. The proceedings of this convention dragged on but no final solution of the accession issue was recommended up to 1970. Shortly afterwards, Sheikh Abdullah got involved again in the anti-India activities of the Plebiscite Front, a party which continued its agitation for holding of a plebiscite initiating violent incidents in the valley. On 19th October, 1968, in a public meeting at Huzoori Bagh, Sheikh Abdullah expressed his support for the people’s right of self-determination, a stance which was resented by Jaya Prakash Narayan.

The unconditional release of Sheikh Abdullah in January, 1968 provided a measure of encouragement to the plebiscite Front and likeminded organization in Jammu and Kashmir. On 4th March, 1968 Sheikh Abdullah returned to Srinagar. The people of Jammu and Kashmir extended the usual welcome. Although after his release the Kashmiri leader laid emphasis on the question of bringing India and Pakistan closer to each other, his opinion that the Indo-Pak friendship hinged on Jammu and Kashmir remained unchanged. He did not oppose plebiscite as one of the means to settle the Jammu and Kashmir issue. Nor did he show his willingness to compromise with the Government of India’s unaltered pronouncement that the state’s relationship with the Indian Union was not to be questioned. Sheikh Abdullah wanted the ouster of the Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s Government which he insisted was ineffective and unrepresentative in character. Happily for the state government the
Sheikh Abdullah was not prepared to embark upon an agitational course because he feared that if he mobilised the public opinion against the government he could find himself behind the bars. At a reception arranged in his honour by the Kashmir Swatantra Forum in Srinagar in April, 1968, Sheikh Abdullah said: “Give me a solution on which I can carry the people with me. Once I am convinced about its soundness, it will not take me a minute to change my attitude.” His plea for a solution on which he could carry the Kashmiris with him evidently ran counter to his repeated assertion that it was the basic right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to shape their destiny. Secondly, his pronouncements in regard to the future of Jammu and Kashmir at different places after his release from detention in the beginning of January, 1968 led the Indian patriots to brand him “undependable”. Sheikh Abdullah’s unexpected remark that India was in ‘forcible occupation’ of Jammu and Kashmir had shocked both the State Government and the Central Government headed by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Sheikh Abdullah’s hostile attitude towards New Delhi could also be borne out by his utterances at a public meeting at Shopian, where he questioned the presence of the Indian army in Jammu and Kashmir. Luckily for Sheikh Abdullah, nobody on the occasion found it necessary to stand up and tell him that he himself played the prominent role in getting the Indian troops in 1947 to fight back the Pakistani invaders. As the atmosphere was changed with emotions not in favour of India’s stand on Jammu and Kashmir, the excited audience at Shopian never bothered to recall that, in October, 1947 Sheikh Abdullah and the then Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir Mehr Chand Mahajan had dashed to Delhi to request Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Patel for drafting the Indian army to the state to push back Pakistani invaders.

In April 1968 Indian Deputy Prime Minister Morarji Desai gave a statement in which he said that “Kashmir’s accession to India could not be reopened.” In reply to this statement, Sheikh Abdullah told B.L. Kak in an interview at Jammu on 24th April, 1968 that “I differed politically with the Indian rulers whose stand on Jammu and Kashmir continued to be very rigid. It will not be useful if India does not alter her rigid attitude towards our cause. She may go down much before and a long and serious confrontation cannot be ruled out in view of the resistive younger generation in Jammu and Kashmir. Youth of Jammu and Kashmir may become uncontrollable some day if no solution to the Jammu and Kashmir problem is reasoned out.”
When asked to divulge his line of action in case New Delhi insisted on its claim that Jammu and Kashmir was part and parcel of India. Sheikh Abdullah said, “We will continue our struggle until we achieve our goal—grant of self-determination right to the Jammu and Kashmir.” He argued that it was preposterous to think that Indian money and Indian army could hold the people of Jammu and Kashmir for long.

Sheik Abdullah’s frequent reference to a plebiscite and Kashmiri’s “temporary” accession to India did not place Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq and his supporter, Mrs. Indira Gandhi on tenterhooks, because Sheikh Abdullah was compelled by the circumstances to talk of the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir and secondly he was not prepared to annoy the fanatically pro-Pakistan opinion in the valley.

At this time, the Indian Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq adopted a rigid attitude towards the pro-plebiscite camp in other words, the secessionists. In June, 1968, Mrs. Indira Gandhi paid a brief visit to Jammu and Kashmir. In her inaugural speech at the two day conference of the National Integration Council in Srinagar on 21st June, Mrs. Gandhi said that the time had come when a ‘multipronged attack’ had to be launched on forces of disintegration and called for steps to create adequate machinery for permanent vigilance against revival of these forces. Mrs. Indira Gandhi and some other Indian leaders wanted Sheikh Abdullah in particular and pro-plebiscite organizations in general to adopt a ‘realistic’ approach to what they described as the ‘changed situation’ in Jammu and Kashmir. But the Sheikh Abdullah insisted on the fact that the State’s accession to India had not been brought about by the will and consent of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

After the announcement of his decision in July to hold the state people’s convention to spell out an agreed formula for the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir issue, Sheikh Abdullah created a breeze in the pro-India lobby in mid-August, when he supported the statement of Maulvi Farooq, President of the Awami Action Committee, that “in 1947 the majority of the Kashmiris were prepared to merge with Pakistan and they could not do so as certain individuals thrust on them the decision of the state’s accession to India”.

Whatever be the criticism, Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s government continued the process of integration with India by applying the union legislations to the state
under Article 370. Defending the same process he remarked, “Article 370 is the enabling provision in the constitution for the application of Parliament legislation to the State. Its abrogation will remove the instrument for the application of the Union legislations to the state; and the result will be that the Union laws will cease to apply to the state.”  

By then the mineral resources of the state were developed to some extent and the central government was bound by the international labour organization conventions, to apply the central labour laws there. As a result thirteen such laws were extended to state for the first time, to widen the scope of the legal rights provided to labour and to make available to them the rights and facilities being enjoyed by labourers in other parts of the Indian Union.  

With the concurrence of the state government following central laws were made applicable to the state of Jammu and Kashmir:

III. The Civil Defence Act, 1968 (27 of 1968)
IV. The Gold (Control) Act, 1968 (45 of 1968)
V. The insecticides Act, 1968 (46 of 1968)
VI. The Border Security Forces Act, 1968 (47 of 1968)
VII. The Central Industrial Security Force Act, 1968 (50 of 1968)
VIII. The Judges (Inquiry) Act, 1968 (51 of 1968)
IX. The State Agricultural credit corporation Act, 1968 (60 of 1968)
X. By the central laws extension to Jammu and Kashmir act, 1968 (25 of 1968)-the following Central laws were made applicable to the State of Jammu and Kashmir.  

(i) The official Trustees Act, 1913 (2 of 1913)
(ii) The Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 (4 of 1939)
(iii) The Chartered Accountants Act, 1949 (38 of 1949)
(iv) The transfer of prisoners Act, 1950 (29 of 1950)
(v) The Road Transport Corporation Act, 1950 (64 of 1950)
Further, Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq constituted a committee to go into the recommendation of the Gajendragadkar commission regarding regionalisation of cadres and the setting up of Regional and District Recruitment Boards to ensure the rationalization of the recruitment procedures.\(^{265}\) Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq’s Government also accepted the reservation of 42 percent of the posts of the state services and institutions of higher and professional education for backward classes and 8 percent for scheduled castes as recommended by the Wazir Committee.\(^{266}\)

After his release in 1968, from all accounts, Sheikh Abdullah looked an utterly frustrated man. All his attempts since his release in the beginning of 1968 to coerce or coax the Government of India into a dialogue with him without his accepting Jammu and Kashmir as an integral part of India, had failed.\(^{267}\) His 8 days people’s convention which he convened in October, 1968 had proved as futile for him as his hectic campaign during the summer that year to strengthen his followers. Neither Pakistan which had its own difficulties nor any world power for obvious reasons had been able to came to his rescue.\(^{268}\)

On 15\(^{th}\) July, 1970, Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, told in a public meeting in Srinagar that the issue of Jammu and Kashmir had been settled and there would be no reopening of it. Accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India was ‘a part of India’s history and history cannot be rewritten at will’.\(^{269}\) She said that India desired friendship with all including those who had committed aggression on her. Mrs. Gandhi was aware of the frantic military buildup across the Indian borders. She told
the audience, which consisted of a large number of local Muslims, that if any Country dared to commit aggression on the frontiers of India, Suitable answer would be given: “India is much stronger than before and the Indian armed forces are ready to fight aggression and defend the country” she said:

Mrs. Gandhi’s utterances in Jammu and Kashmir clearly indicated two things: a measure of satisfaction over the defence preparedness in the Country and secondly the Government of India’s determination to effectively deal with any mischief by Pakistan.270

During the second half of the year 1970, the future of the ruling party at centre was a hot issue in the country and the rumours, whether Indira Gandhi, would or would not remain in power, were quite prevalent. The lady Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi accepted the challenge and on her suggestion Parliament was dissolved by the President and midterm elections were announced on 17th December, 1970.271

Now the most crucial question in Jammu and Kashmir was: would Sheikh Abdullah and his followers participate in the forthcoming elections? After a great deal of thought, Sheikh Abdullah advised the Plebiscite Front to contest the elections. He also filed his nomination papers.

On 9th January, 1971, when Sheikh Abdullah, Mirza Afzal Beg and other colleagues, were getting ready to leave for Jammu and Kashmir they were all served with orders under the maintenance of public safety Act of Jammu and Kashmir forbidding them to enter the state of Jammu and Kashmir. The plebiscite Front was declared an unlawful organization under the unlawful activities (prevention) Act, 1969.272 On 12th January, 1971 plebiscite front was banned.273 The mid-term poll was over in March 1971. Under the leadership of Indira Gandhi the Congress was returned to power with more than two thirds majority in most of the states, including Jammu and Kashmir.274

In 1971 there was another partition on the subcontinent i.e. the partition of Pakistan. After the 1965 war Ayub Khan was replaced by Yahya Khan. Yahya’s only contribution to Pakistan was to hold the first honest election in its history.275 In the first ever General Elections held in Pakistan the Awami league led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman scored a land slide victory which gave a shock to Yahya Khan.276 A west Pakistani politicians refused to hand over power to the legitimate victors of the
general election simply because they were Bengalis and therefore worthy only of contempt. Anger in East Pakistan became an uprising and then a revolt and then a war. The military Junta led by the army chief, Gen. Yahya Khan had let loose a reign of terror to suppress the popular uprising against them in East Pakistan. For over 24 years the people there had been exploited by West Pakistan rulers. Finally on 25th March, 1971, the Pakistan Army swooped down on the people of East Pakistan with tanks, artillery and aerial bombing, spreading death, destruction and devastation. About one million people were killed in the blood bath that followed. To escape the butchery, some ten million people fled to India in the biggest ever migration in history. This avalanche of human beings imposed a heavy strain on India’s economic and social structure and threatened her security. Indian leaders tried to rouse the world conscience and appealed to world’s leaders to intervene so that the refugees returned to their homes with security and honour. But all their appeals went unheeded.

Meanwhile, the uprising spear headed by the Mukti Bahini or freedom fighters, assumed formidable proportions. India’s sympathy for the suffering refugees and the Mukti Bahini, provoked Pakistan to start border skirmishes which gathered momentum as days passed. When the military Junta found that it would not be long for the Mukti Bahini to inflict crippling blows on the occupation forces, they turned their attention to India. In her broadcast to the nation, the Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, said that the war on Bangladesh has became a war on India and warned the people to be prepared for a long period of hardship and sacrifice.

Fierce land and air battles followed for a fortnight. Finally on 16th December, 1971 Pakistan army surrendered to Indian and Bangadeshi army in east and thus liberated Bangladesh. Indira Gandhi in her hour of victory, called for a ceasefire on 17th December, 1971. Yahya Khan accepted the offer very kindly and hostilities came to an end. On the other hand process of integration continued. By the year 1969 some more central laws were applied to Jammu and Kashmir by the consent of state government under the Chief Ministership of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq.

(i) The Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969 (180 of 1969)
(ii) By the International Monetary Fund and Bank (Amendment) Act, 1959 (25 of 1959). The International Monetary Fund and Bank Act, 1945 was applied to the state.
(iii) By the Census Amendment, Act, 1959 (22 of 1959) - The Census Act, 1948 (37 of 1948) was applied.\textsuperscript{281}

Similarly during the year 1970 following Central laws were applied to the state of Jammu and Kashmir:\textsuperscript{282}


II. The Contract Labour (Registration and Abolition) Act, 1970 (37 of 1970)

III. The patents Act, 1970 (39 of 1970)


V. By the Central Labour Laws (Extension to Jammu and Kashmir) Act, 1970 (51 of 1970)-the following Central Laws were applicable to the state of Jammu and Kashmir:\textsuperscript{283}

(i) The Workmen’s Compensation Act, 1923 (8 of 1923).

(ii) The Trade Unions Act, 1926 (16 of 1926).

(iii) The Children Pledging of Labour Act, 1933 (2 of 1933).

(iv) The Payment of Wages Act, 1936 (4 of 1936).


(vii) The Industrial Employment (Standing orders) Act, 1946 (20 of 1946).


(x) The Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (11 of 1948)

(xi) The Employee’s State insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948)

(xii) The Factories Act, 1948 (61 of 1948)

(xiii) The Employment Exchanges (Compulsory Notification of Vacancies Act, 1959 (31 of 1959)

VI. By the diplomatic and consular officers (oaths and fees) (Extension to Jammu and Kashmir Act, 1970 (51 of 1970) - the diplomatic and consular officers (oaths and fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948) was applied to the state.

VII. By the Central Silk Board (Amendment) Act, 1970 (21 of 1970) - the Central Silk Board Act, 1948 (61 of 1948) was applied to Jammu and Kashmir.


Thus, during the Prime Ministership of Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq there was all around development in state. There were 18 industrial estates functioning in the state. 672 industrial units were registered till 31st, March, 1968. To improve the working of the various industrial units and for the establishment of new units the state government sanctioned loans under the State Aid to Industries Act from 1964 onwards. The State Financial Corporation also advances loans to the small scale industrial units for purchase of machinery, erection of buildings and creation of other fixed assets.284

During the 3rd Five Year Plan a wool spinning mill with a capacity of 12,000 spindles had been completed and commissioned. The Brick and Tile factory was established during the 3rd Five year plan. Similarly woolen machinery imported from Belgium and worsted spinning machinery imported from United Kingdom was also installed during 3rd Five year plan in the state of Jammu and Kashmir.285

The state made progress in power sector also by 1968-69 the total power generation capacity was 37.838 Mega watts as against only 4 Mega watts in 1947. The Kalakote thermal project with an installed capacity of 22.5 Mega watts was
completed in 1968. As many as 548 villages were electrified during the 3rd Five year plan.\(^{286}\)

During the year 1971 President of India issued the Constitution (Application to Jammu and Kashmir) order, 1971. Following central laws were made applicable to the state by the consent of its government.\(^{287}\)


(iii) The public premises (Eviction of unauthorized occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971). This act replaces the public premises Eviction of unauthorized occupants Act 1958 which repealed the public premises (Eviction) Act, 1950 (27 of 1950) which was made applicable to the state by Act 62 of 1956.


(vi) The Emergency Risks (Undertakings) insurance Act, 1971 (51 of 1971)

(vii) The small coins (offences) Act, 1971 (52 of 1971)

(viii) The Naval and Aircraft Prize Act, 1971 (59 of 1971)

(ix) The Companies (surcharge on income tax) Act, 1971 (62 of 1971)

(x) The Comptroller and Auditor General (Duties, powers and conditions of Service) Act, 1971 (56 of 1971).

(xi) The Prevention of Insult to National Honour Act, 1971 (69 of 1971)

(xii) The Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (70 of 1971)


It is quite evident that Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq contributed lot for the integration of the state of Jammu and Kashmir to Indian Union. However 12th December, 1971 proved to be a black day as on this day Chief Minister, Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq passed away. After his death Syed Mir Qasim, then President of the Jammu and Kashmir Congress Committee became the Chief Minister on 13th December, 1971. He remained in the office till the elections to the state assembly early in 1972. Elections to the state Assembly were held in early 1972 and state congress won 58 out of the 75 seats. Syed Mir Qasim was then formally elected as the Chief Minister. After this the ban on the entry of Mirza Afzal Beg and Sheikh Abdullah into Jammu and Kashmir was lifted on 11th May, 1972 and on 5th June, 1972 respectively.

With the independence of Bangladesh, there began an exchange of views between India and Bangladesh on their immediate problems viz., rehabilitation of the refugees and reconstruction of the shattered economy of Bangladesh. The bulk of the refugees returned to their homes by the end of February 1972. Since the Prime Minister of India had declared that Indian armed forces would not remain in Bangladesh any longer than was necessary, India took steps to their withdrawal which was completed by the end of March, 1972.

On the other side after the defeat of Pakistan in 1971 Zulfikar Ali Bhutto replaced Yahaya Khan as President of Pakistan on 20th December, 1971. One of the first acts of Mr. Z.A. Bhutto was to release Sheikh Mujib-ur-Rahaman from his detention in Pakistan. Sheikh Mujib-ur-Rahman was given a tumultuous welcome in Dhaka and in his first public speech in New Delhi on his way there, he expressed his gratitude for the generous help extended by the people of India to Bangladesh in her liberation struggle.

However, there remained the main problem of restoring peaceful relations with Pakistan. From very beginning India was against any third party mediation between India and Pakistan. On 14th February, 1972 India in a letter to the United Nations Secretary General offered to hold direct talks with Pakistan “at any time at
any level and without any precondition”. Later Prime Minister Indira Gandhi wrote to Pakistan President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto that emissaries should begin preliminary discussions. At the same time she ruled out any third party mediation finally on 25th April D.P. Dhar left for Islamabad for discussion and on 26th April, 1972 the emissary level talk were held at Murree (Pakistan). A joint statement, issued after four days of talks, announced that Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Mr. Z.A. Bhutto would meet in Delhi towards the end of May or beginning of June. But the Schedule was not kept by Pakistan as Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto preferred first to go on a visit to North African and west Asian Countries, presumably to solicit support for the stand he proposed to take at the summit. He wanted the prisoners of war to be repatriated the territories taken by India in the war to be returned and the right of self-determination conceded by India to the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

Finally the Indo-Pak summit meeting took place at Simla from 28th June to 3rd July, 1972. There were several deadlocks during the talks both at the official and summit level. The causes of conflict between India and Pakistan came to be regarded bigger than men during the course of talks between Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, at Simla in June 1972 Tension mounted in the Indian and Pakistani camps at Simla when Indira Gandhi refused to accept Bhutto’s suggestion for reduction of the number of Indian troops on the Indo-Pak border and for the stoppage of New Delhi’s search for sophisticated weapons until Pakistan was able to procure additional equipment to plug the gaps in Islamabad’s defence shield. Secret intervention by Russia saved the situation; arrival of a Russian Emissary in Simla quietly with Premier Kosygin’s messages for Mr. Bhutto and Mrs. Gandhi was followed by the signing of an agreement by the two leaders.

Shimla Agreement

Shimla Agreement on Bilateral Relations between India and Pakistan was signed by the prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi and President Of Pakistan Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, at Shimla, Himachal Pradesh on July 3, 1972. It was agreed that the two countries will put to end the conflict and confrontation that have hitherto marred their relationship and work for the promotion of friendly and harmonious relationship and the establishment of durable peace in the subcontinent, so that both countries may henceforth devote their resources and energies to the pressing task of advancing the welfare of their people.
In order to achieve this objective, the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan agreed that:

(i) The principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations shall govern the relations between the two countries.

(ii) The two countries are resolved to settle their differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations or by any other peaceful means mutually agreed upon between them. Pending the final settlement of any of the problems between the two countries, neither side shall unilaterally alter the situation and both shall prevent the organisation, assistance or encouragement of any acts detrimental to the maintenance of peaceful and harmonious relations.

(iii) The pre-requisite for reconciliation, good neighborliness and durable peace between them is a commitment by both the countries to peaceful co-existence, respect for each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty and non-interference in each other’s internal affairs, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.

(iv) The basic issues and causes of conflict which have been devilled the relations between the two countries for the last 25 years shall be resolved by peaceful means.

(v) They shall always respect each other’s national unity, territorial integrity, political independence and sovereign equality.

(vi) In concordance with the Charter of the United Nations, they will refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of each other.

Both governments will take all steps within their power to prevent hostile propaganda directed against each other. Both countries will encourage the dissemination of such information as would promote the development of friendly relations between them. In order to restore and normalise relations between the two countries it was agreed that:

(i) Steps shall be taken to resume communications, postal, telegraphic, sea, land including border, post and air links including over-flights.
(ii) Appropriate steps shall be taken to promote travel facilities for nationals of the other country.

(iii) Trade and cooperation in economic and other agreed fields will be resumed as far as possible.

(iv) Exchange in the fields of science and culture will be promoted.

In this connection delegations from the two countries will meet from time to time to work out the necessary details. In order to initiate the process of the establishment of durable peace, both the governments agree that:

(i) Indian and Pakistani forces shall be withdrawn to their side of the International border.

(ii) In Jammu and Kashmir, the line of control resulting from the cease-fire of December 17, 1971, shall be respected by both sides without prejudice to the recognised position of either side. Neither side shall seek to alter it unilaterally, irrespective of mutual differences and legal interpretations. Both sides further undertake to refrain from the threat or the use of force in violation of this line.

(iii) The withdrawals shall commence upon entry into force of this agreement and shall completed within a period of 30 days thereof.

This agreement will be subject to ratification by both countries in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures, and will come into force with effect from the date on which the instruments of ratification are exchanged. Both governments agree that their respective heads will meet again at a mutually convenient time in future and that in the meanwhile the representatives of the two sides will meet to discuss further the modalities and arrangements for the establishment of durable peace and normalization of relations including the questions of repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees, a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir and resumption of diplomatic relations.

Thus while external religious pull of Pakistan was one of the major hurdles in the extension of Indian federalisation to Jammu and Kashmir, the threat of its forcible annexation which also proved abortive by Pakistan and ultimately pushed it (Jammu
and Kashmir) politically emotionally and physically towards India and in addition reinforced the argument of fait accompli.\textsuperscript{297}

Chief Minister, Syed Mir Qasim continued the process of integration like his predecessors. Following central laws were made applicable to the state of Jammu and Kashmir during the year 1972 with the concurrence of the state government:\textsuperscript{298}


(ii) The Newspapers (Price Control) Act, 1972 (15 of 1972) (This Act shall cease to have effect on the expiry of two years from the date of its commencement i.e. 26th May, 1962)

(iii) Architect Act, 1972 (20 of 1972)

(iv) The National Service Act, 1972 (28 of 1972)

(v) The Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 (39 of 1972)

(vi) By the Drugs and Cosmetics (Amendment) Act, 1972 (19 of 1972)- The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (23 or 1940) was applied to the state.

(vii) By the Jammu and Kashmir (Extension of Laws) Act, 1972 (19 of 1972)- the Agriculture Produce Cess Act, 1940 (27 of 1940) was applied to the State.

(viii) By the Public Debt (Amendment) Act, 1972 (44 of 1972)- the Public Debt Act, 1944 (18 of 1944) applied to the State.


(xi) By the Antiquities and Art Treasures Act, 1972 (52 of 1972)- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Domains Act, 1958 (24 of 1958) was applied to the state.

By the Supreme Court (Enlargement of Criminal appellate Jurisdiction (Amendment) Act, 1972 (37 of 1972) - The Supreme Court (Enlargement of Criminal appellate Jurisdiction) Act, 1972 (28 of 1972) was applied to the state.


According to Gajendragadkar Commission, the causes of irritation and tension in certain regions of the state were “the feeling of political neglect and discrimination.” About Ladakh it says “By all accounts…. the conditions in the district are difficult and its people have a feeling of isolation and neglect.”

Keeping these remarks in view the Chief Minister, Syed Mir Qasim visited Ladakh on 9th September, 1973. He was the first Chief Minister who visited Ladakh. He conducted the meeting of the Ladakh Development Committee for the first time at Leh to have a firsthand knowledge of the problems of Ladakh district.

The setting up of this committee was a major step in direction of associating people of Ladakh in solving their problem. The other members of the Committee were: (1) Munshi Habibullah (2) Shri Kushak Tugdan (3) Shri Sonam Girgin (4) Shri Namgyal (a former MLC). Chief Minister Syed Mir Qasim was the chairman of Committee. Mr. Mir Qasim asserted: “it is the avowed policy of both the Central and the state governments that special measure be taken for speedier growth of all backward areas in the state, especially Ladakh.”
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When Sadar-i-Riyasat Karan Singh was returning from Bombay to Jammu in August, 1964 they stayed for few days in Delhi, where first meeting of Nehru Memorial Committee (Later Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund) was held. Sheikh Abdullah was also its member. There was a long conversation between Sheikh Abdullah and Karan Singh at Mansarovar (Dogra Residence in Delhi). Although Sheikh Abdullah asserted that he was not committed to any particular solution but, rather, was anxious to find some way out of the difficulty, it was clear to Karan Singh that he really favoured some sort of semi-independent status for the Jammu and Kashmir guaranteed both by India and Pakistan.
Internal Pressures: The group led by Bakshl Ghulam Mohammad continued to feel that they were not properly represented in the Sadiq Government and a number of political moves were being made to accommodate the claims of the various groups within the National Conference.

External Pressures: These derived from the insecure border of Jammu and Kashmir which were constantly threatened by aggression, infiltration and conspiracy by foreign powers. The Chinese aggression aggravated the situation and gradually the danger from Pakistan and China increased.
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