CONCLUSION

Generally speaking all political formations, movements and parties are products of historical situations. All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC) which emerged in 1993 could not be an exception to this phenomenon. It has emerged as an important political force particularly Tehreek-i-Hurriyat Jammu and Kashmir (THJK) led by Syed Ali Shah Geelani in the contemporary political history of Jammu and Kashmir.

The most momentous incident in the political history of Kashmir is the eruption of armed insurgency in early 1990s. The study assigns it to the failure of Indian State to respect the original constitutional relationship with Jammu and Kashmir by abrogating autonomy of the State, subversion of democratic process and institutions and so on. All this co-existed with a demand for the solution of Kashmir conflict in the form of Plebiscite Front, Al-Fatah, and Jama’at-i-Islami and so on. The rigging of 1987 election proved the immediate cause; it is here that people began to challenge physically the sovereignty of the Indian Union over the state. JKLF was the first militant organization to oppose with arms while advocating an independent, secular, democratic Jammu and Kashmir based on pre-1947 geography. However, later the armed movement was hijacked by other militant organizations like Hizbul Mujahideen (HM), Muslim Janbaz Force (MJF) and Al-Umar (AU) etc. to further the cause of Pakistan by destabilizing Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. Amid this armed struggle, various socio-political and religious organizations amalgamated under the banner of All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC) in 1993 to channelize the armed movement and provide a political platform to it.

Regarding the accession of the State with the Indian Union, APHC challenges its legality. It is of the view that the accession was conditional and temporary. It maintains that the issue should be resolved either through plebiscite under the supervision of UN or through tripartite dialogue among India, Pakistan and people of Kashmir.
APHC has grown with internal conflict. It witnessed clashes within its ranks on many issues. Fielding of proxy candidates in 2002 elections by People’s Conference, Hurriyat’s approach regarding the boycott campaign in the elections in the absence of Syed Ali Shah Geelani and dilution of avowed stand that the UN resolutions form the necessary basis of Kashmir conflict, were some of issues of contention in various constituents of the APHC. It made cleavage among the APHC and therefore, the amalgam got divided into two factions what came to be known as APHC (G) and APHC (M). Subsequently, one group was labeled as moderate group. This group held negotiations with the Indian Union, supported a bilateral dialogue process between India and Pakistan and also accepted some other resolutions like General Parvaiz Mushrraf’s Four Point Formula. Something is better than nothing, realism or something between everything and nothing, became their new slogans instead of Right to Self-Determination as envisaged by various UN resolutions on Kashmir problem. The prominent figures of this group are Mirwaiz Umar Farooq, Prof. Abdul Gani Bhat and Molvi Abas Ansari. However, the other group labeled as hardliner, remained steadfast on their stand viz-a-viz Kashmir issue, i.e. Right to Self-Determination as the only solution to Kashmir issue as guaranteed by the UN. The hardliner group of the Hurriyat Conference always vehemently criticized the policies and programmes of the APHC (M). The prominent persons of this group included Syed Ali Shah Geelani, Mohammad Ashraf Sharie, Masrat Alam Bhat and Gulam Nabi Sumbji. Thus, both factions are working separately with separate Executive Councils and offices. Many attempts were made to bridge the gap between the two factions but without any success.

Soon after the split of APHC, differences also erupted within the ranks of Jama’at-i-Islami regarding its policy towards Kashmir issue. One group was of the opinion that Jama’at can not afford to work for the Kashmir Issue on the forefront and therefore, will struggle only in the manner the other organizations and groups are doing. The other group spearheaded by Syed Ali Geelani was of the opinion that Jama’at should act at the vanguard of the freedom movement.
The differences between the two groups deepened and eventually resulted in the creation of the Tehreek-i-Hurriyat Jammu and Kashmir in 2004. Thus, Tehreek-i-Hurriyat is an outgrowth of Jama’at-Islami rather it is the political front of Jama’at.

Besides the broad division in APHC, there are differences in ideology and methodological ways of mass mobilizations in the various constituents of APHC. Tehreek-i-Hurriyat wants the establishment of an Islamic System of Governance (Shar’iah) in Kashmir and accession to Pakistan while Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) seeks the establishment of an independent, secular and democratic state in Kashmir on the basis of pre-1947 geography. This represents a major difference regarding the political future of Kashmir in Hurriyat camp.

All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC) failed to sustain itself as a united front as it witnessed clashes and subsequent divisions within itself and got divided at a crucial juncture. It has also communalized the issue owing to its failure to reach to other parts of state, Jammu and Ladhak. These two regions of the state do not have their representation in APHC. It is mainly confined to Kashmir Valley and has assumed a communal colour. This shows the limitation of resistance in Jammu and Kashmir. Despite these failures and challenges, it was found that the role of APHC has increased because of the recent changes in the political scenario of Jammu and Kashmir. In the recent protest movements over a number of issues like human rights violations, it has increased its role by providing leadership to the masses during these protests movements.

By analyzing various solutions provided by APHC as well as mainstream political parties, it is found that there are diverse views regarding the solution of Kashmir problem. The existence of various views represents differences not only in separatist camp but also other political forces about the political future of the state. It is also found that some peace-building measures are necessary before arriving at any solution. However, the broader acceptance of any solution lies in its acceptance by all the three parties-India, Pakistan and
Kashmir. All these three parties shall agree. This only can end the conflict and provide lasting peace in South Asia.

In conclusion, it can be said that APHC is an amalgam of many parties with maximum differences instead of maximum similarities. Unless, Hurriyat is able to remove its ideological and personal differences by producing a concrete common programme with a mass appeal, its effective role in Kashmir problem seems to be a distant dream.