



AL-SHAJARAH

JOURNAL OF ISLAMIC THOUGHT AND CIVILIZATION
OF
THE INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA (IIUM)

2017 Volume 22 Number 1

AL-SHAJARAH

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

MOHAMED AJMAL ABDUL RAZAK AL-AIDRUS, IIUM, Malaysia

EDITORIAL BOARD

MOHD KAMAL HASSAN, IIUM, Malaysia

MOHAMED AJMAL ABDUL RAZAK AL-AIDRUS, IIUM, Malaysia

DOCUMENTATION EDITOR

SUZANA SUHAILAWATY MD. SIDEK, IIUM, Malaysia

ADVISORY BOARD

HASSAN AHMED IBRAHIM, IIUM, Malaysia

KHALIQ AHMAD MOHD. ISRAIL, IIUM, Malaysia

HUNUD ABIA KADOUF, IIUM, Malaysia

MOHD ZAMBRI ZAINUDDIN, UM, Malaysia

HAMID AMINUDDIN BARRA, Mindanao State University, Philippines

ALPARSLAN ACIKGENC, Yildiz Technical University, Turkey

AMER AL-ROUBAIE, College of Business and Finance, Kingdom of Bahrain

MALIK B. BADRI, IIUM, Malaysia

OSMAN BAKAR, SOASCIS, University of Brunei, Brunei

ABDEL WAHAB EL-AFFENDI, University of Westminster, UK

KHALID MASUD, The Council of Islamic Ideology, Pakistan

HASSAN KO NAKATA, Doshisha University, Japan

SEYYED HOSSEIN NASR, The George Washington University, USA

SUN ZHENYU, Ningxia University, China

Al-Shajarah is a refereed international journal that publishes original scholarly articles in the area of Islamic thought, Islamic civilization, and Islamic science. The journal is especially interested in studies that elaborate scientific and epistemological problems encountered by Muslims in the present age, scholarly works that provide fresh and insightful Islamic responses to the intellectual and cultural challenges of the modern world. *Al-Shajarah* will also consider articles written on various religions, schools of thought and ideology and subjects that can contribute towards the formulation of an Islamic philosophy of science. Critical studies of translations of major works of major writers of the past and present and original works on the subjects of Islamic architecture and art are welcomed. Book reviews and notes are also published.

The journal is published twice a year, June-July and November-December. Manuscripts and all correspondence should be sent to the Editor-in-Chief, *Al-Shajarah*, F4 Building, IIUM Journal Publication, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), No. 24, Persiaran Tuanku Syed Sirajuddin, Taman Duta, 50480 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. All enquiries on publications may also be e-mailed to alshajarah@iium.edu.my. For subscriptions, please address all queries to the postal or email address above.

Contributions: Submissions must be at least 5,500 words long. All submissions must be in English or Malay and be original work which has not been published anywhere else in any form (abridged or otherwise). In matters of style, *Al-Shajarah* uses the *University of Chicago Manual of Style* and follows the transliteration system shown on the inside back cover of the journal. The Editor-in-Chief reserves the right to return accepted manuscripts to the author for stylistic changes. Manuscripts must be submitted to the Editor-in-Chief in Microsoft Word. The font must be Times New Roman and its size 12. IIUM retains copyright to all published materials, but contributors may republish their articles elsewhere with due acknowledgement to *Al-Shajarah*.

©International Islamic University Malaysia
(IIUM)

ISSN 1394-6870



THE NEVER-ENDING KASHMIR DISPUTE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON THE CONTEMPORARY GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND PEACE¹

Abdullah al-Ahsan

Abstract

The Kashmir dispute is one of the oldest unresolved conflicts in the annals of the United Nations. India has concealed its duplicity behind “democracy” in this dispute. As a result of the romantic fascination for his ancestral land, the first Indian Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, wanted to retain Kashmir as a part of India which turned out to be one of the deadliest international conflicts of the 20th century. On the surface Nehru wanted to demonstrate India’s “secular” character by incorporating Muslim-majority Kashmir into India. The Delhi administration has consistently manipulated this dispute in India’s favor through political, diplomatic, emotional and intellectual means and has successfully used the media and think-tanks to solicit support for it. Pakistan, on the other hand, although initially committed to the idea of self-determination for the people of Kashmir, has been inconsistent and undiplomatic in supporting the cause. Clandestine agencies have created groups among Kashmiri people, and occasionally made them fight against one another. The conflict in neighboring Afghanistan contributed to the deteriorating situation in Kashmir. Overall, Kashmir has become a source of constant intimidation within the Muslim society today.

Keywords: Kashmir dispute, Indo-Pak relations, US Foreign Policy, democracy, United Nations, OIC, intimidation, terrorism.

¹ Article received: February 2016; Article submitted: April 2017; Article accepted: May 2017

Introduction

Kashmir is again burning. Since the killing of Burhan Wani, a 22 year old Kashmiri by the Indian security forces on July 8, 2016 everyday one or two Kashmiri have been killed. “Who Was Burhan Wani And Why Is Kashmir Mourning Him?”² Was the title in a *Huffington Post* article, and it provides some background information. Earlier following an election held in late November and December 2014, the Indian government once again imposed central government rule in the state. This happened in spite of the well timed relatively peaceful elections held with over 60 percent participation in the process. In September 2013 former Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh, accused Pakistan at the United Nations General Assembly that it had become the “epicenter of terrorism” in the region. On the surface one may find plenty of evidence to support the Indian PM’s claim, but an examination of Indian democracy in action may reveal considerable discrepancy in such practices. The Kashmir Dispute is just another evidence of double standards in Indian democracy. With the growth of insurgency in neighboring Afghanistan and Pakistan, this problem has gained significance in recent years. In this paper we shall discuss the background of this dispute and its impact on the Muslim community in the region.

In 1947, when India and Pakistan became independent, Kashmir was part of one of almost 600 hundred princely states, which were not directly ruled by the British Indian colonial administration. The princely states were advised to join either of the two countries on the basis of their geographical proximity and the desire of their population. By the time of their independence, most states decided to join either India or Pakistan. However, a problem remained with three states – Hyderabad, Junagarh and Kashmir: the earlier had geographical proximity to India and had a majority Hindu population with Muslim rulers who were reluctant to join India. In the case of Kashmir, the situation was the opposite: it had proximity with Pakistan and the population was mostly Muslim, but it had a

² <http://www.huffingtonpost.in/burhan-wani/who-was-burhan-wani-and-why-is-kashmir-mourning-him/>

Hindu ruler. In the first two cases India exerted force and made them accede to India, while Kashmir turned out to be a disputed territory. In order to comprehend the nature of this dispute, we shall briefly describe the geographical location and history of Kashmir.

Kashmir is located in the Himalayan Mountains on the Northwestern tip of the South Asian subcontinent surrounded in the north and east by China and with a small corridor in the Northwest with Afghanistan. Kashmir is overwhelmingly Muslim and Islam was spread in the area mainly by Sufis. Mughal emperors called Kashmir “paradise on earth” and erected magnificent gardens for enjoyment during breaks in their busy life in Delhi. By the early 19th century, invading Sikhs from the Punjab, who were eventually defeated by the British East India Company, defeated Muslim rulers of Kashmir. In 1846 the Company sold the territory to the Hindu ruler of neighboring Jammu. Thus the territory came to be known as Jammu and Kashmir.

By the early 1930s the indigenous Muslim population of Kashmir began to rise against the Jammu based ruler demanding self rule in the form of a legislative assembly similar to the one practiced in the rest of India and many other British colonies around the world at that time. Activists demanding self-rule, however, were brutally suppressed.³ A number of Muslim peasants were reportedly burnt alive by the ruler’s army. In 1947 the ruler began to play political games in an apparent attempt to keep his territory independent. The population, however, wanted to rid of the ruler; a segment aspired for an independent Kashmir without him, and others demanded that Kashmir join Pakistan. Soon, these conflicting demands turned into a civil war. The conflict began just before India and Pakistan became independent in August 1947 when the ruler, with the consent of Hindu landlords in a district called Poonch, imposed new taxes on Muslim peasants in the area. The peasants rebelled and the ruler deployed Hindu and Sikh troops to contain the insurgency. These troops created havoc by killing and expelling Muslims.⁴ On October

³ See Prem Nath Bazaz, *Struggle for Freedom in Kashmir*. (Delhi: Kashmir Publishing Co, 1954), 140-160. Prem Nath Bazaz (1905-1984) was a Kashmiri statesman and intellectual.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 325-327. For an extensive coverage, see Alastair Lamb, *Kashmir: A*

10, 1947 the London *Times* reported that Muslims were “systematically exterminated” from the area.⁵ Many Muslims took refuge in neighboring Pakistan where some of the refugees took up arms and returned to fight back for their right of self-determination. Some from Pakistan’s tribal belt also joined the refugees in support of their fellow Muslims. The frightened Hindu ruler fled from the capital Srinagar “with his family and treasured jewels”⁶ and took refuge in his paternal original state, Jammu. He reportedly agreed to accede to India and sought Indian help to fight against the insurgents.⁷ The Government of India in Delhi was waiting with “more than 100 civil and military transport planes fueled up and kept ready to fly India’s First Sikh Battalion”⁸ for an opportunity to enter Kashmir. The Indian troops, landed in Srinagar on October 27 – a date the people of Kashmir call the “Black Day.” The Kashmiri struggle for self-determination, however, became a conflict between India and Pakistan.

The Indian leadership seemed to have been divided on the future of Kashmir. When the question of its accession was raised, the Indian leader M. K. Gandhi is reported to have said, “The people of Kashmir should be asked whether they want to join Pakistan or India. Let them do as they want. The ruler is nothing. The people are everything.”⁹ But Jawaharlal Nehru, the prime minister, had a different vision: he wanted to achieve two goals; one ideological, the other personal. Ideologically he wanted to demonstrate that India was a “secular” nation and that Muslim majority Kashmir joining India would demonstrate that Muslims favored his vision of what he called secular India. Reporting his personal commitment to Kashmir, American historian Stanley Wolpert noted:

Disputed Legacy 1846-1990, (Hertfordshire: Roxford Books, 1991). This has been recorded in many other sources.

⁵ Quoted in Stanley Wolpert, *Shameful Flight*, (London: Oxford University Press, 2006), 183.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 184.

⁷ Many historians dispute this claim because India never showed the original document of accession request by the ruler to any international forum.

⁸ Wolpert..., 184.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 185. Gandhi said this in his prayer meeting on July 29, 1947.

Though Prime Minister Nehru's Kashmiri Pandit ancestors had abandoned Kashmir's Vale almost two centuries before Jawaharlal was born... Nehru always spoke of Kashmir as his "family home..." after returning from years of study at Harrow and Cambridge... he was married... then took his bride to Kashmir for their honeymoon. ... Nehru wrote of Kashmir as a "beautiful woman," retaining his romantic fascination for and devotion to her the rest of his life.¹⁰

As the prime minister of India, he maneuvered India's defense and foreign policies to make Kashmir a part of the nation. He appointed one Kashmiri general "to launch secret operations throughout Kashmir, including trying to bomb several bridges over the Jhelum River."¹¹ This was necessary perhaps because Kashmir was connected with the outside world through territories that are now part of Pakistan. When reports of heavy fighting between the two newly independent nations reached London, Prime Minister Attlee became worried; as the leader of the former colonial power, he cabled Nehru suggesting to take the case to the International Court of Justice as an impartial arbitrator in order to bring an end to the conflict in the "speediest and most satisfactory way." Nehru replied, "I am grateful to you for your message regarding Kashmir ... (but) we do not, however, consider the International Court of Justice to be the appropriate organ for providing requisite machinery."¹² Meanwhile Nehru developed a personal friendship with Kashmiri leader, Sheikh Abdullah, who like the ruler, dreamt of an independent Kashmir, but a democratic one: one without a hereditary ruler. This led the ruler to imprison Sheikh Abdullah. On Nehru's intervention, however, Abdullah was later released to work for Kashmir's accession to India. In reality, none of these worked as Nehru wanted: neither was Abdullah willing to accept the idea on Nehru's terms nor was he perhaps able to secure an overwhelming popular support for accession to India nor did the military succeed in achieving the desired goal of occupying the whole of Kashmir by

¹⁰ Ibid., 184-185.

¹¹ Ibid., 185.

¹² Ibid., 188.

force. In fact, all Kashmiri opposition parties and tribal chiefs in the Northern region vehemently opposed the idea of Kashmir's accession to India.

On November 1947 India proposed that Pakistan exert pressure on the volunteer tribesmen so that India could conduct a plebiscite of all Kashmiri people to decide their fate.¹³ Pakistan rejected the proposal of holding a plebiscite in the presence of the Indian troops in the territory, particularly in view of the Indian prime minister's personal interest in Kashmir. Pakistan made a counter proposal suggesting that they would request the tribesmen to withdraw, while simultaneously, India also withdraw its troops and the proposed plebiscite conducted under international supervision.¹⁴ India rejected the proposal. Pakistan responded by sending regular troops to Kashmir. Finally an all out war broke out.¹⁵

Origin of the Dispute

The State of Jammu and Kashmir eventually became a disputed issue at the United Nations. On January 1, 1948 India took the problem of Kashmir to the UN seeking "pacific settlement of the dispute" and in his speech, the Indian delegate complained against infiltration of Pakistani tribes and troops into Kashmir. India ignored the fact that the insurgency was a spontaneous response to brutality committed against Kashmiris and many of these armed men were in fact the refugees who were forced out by the ruler's troops and Pakistani tribesmen. Later Pakistani troops went there to control and guide them.¹⁶ It is also noteworthy that many from among the refugees there were WW II veterans. As for the UN, the world body was no International Court of Justice: the UN was more interested in maintaining peace between member nations without getting involved in examining the moral grounds of the conflict. In 1948 alone, the UN Security Council adopted six resolutions on Kashmir, but

¹³ For India's position on the dispute, see www.indianembassy.org/policy/kashmir/kashmir_MEA/Indian_Position.html

¹⁴ For Pakistan's position on the dispute, see www.mofa.gov.pk/pages/brief.htm

¹⁵ For a general description on the situation, see Alastair Lamb, *Incomplete Partition*, (Hertfordshire: Roxford Books, 1997), 217-222.

¹⁶ There were reports of indiscriminate looting by tribal soldiers.

achieved little in securing peace on the ground. The UN portrayed the situation as a dispute (since then the conflict was generally referred to as Kashmir dispute) and adopted resolutions on the principle of self-determination for the Kashmiri people and demanded that a plebiscite be conducted to determine whether the people wanted to join India or Pakistan. The UN also established the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) “to investigate and mediate the dispute.”¹⁷ In the end, however, the UN failed to free Kashmir either from the Indian troops or from the Pakistani tribes. India refused to withdraw its troops stating that the ruler of Kashmir had legally acceded to India and therefore the troops had to stay there in order to maintain Indian “sovereignty” and law and order in the territory.¹⁸ As for the Pakistani tribes, they were civilian helpers of the refugees; they went there in response to genocidal atrocities committed by the ruler’s forces. The government of Pakistan, on the other hand, argued that although some military personnel assisted the tribes, most tribesmen were not under its control. In fact, they manufactured their own arms and entered into Kashmir on the invitation of the refugees who were earlier persecuted by Kashmiri armed forces, and they deserved moral support from the government of Pakistan.¹⁹

One year later, on January 1, 1949, a ceasefire was declared with UN mediation. By then India had occupied two thirds of the state of Jammu and Kashmir, while the rest was declared ‘Azad’ or free Kashmir by the people in the area with the support of the tribesmen who enjoyed support from the government of Pakistan. UN resolutions demanded that a free, fair and independent plebiscite be conducted to decide the future of the territory, but the world body failed to demilitarize the territory to ensure this. The UN first appointed Sir Owen Dixon, a senior Australian judge, to undertake the UN mission who later wrote in his report:

¹⁷See www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/mission/unmogip/background.shtml. Accessed on September 16, 2010.

¹⁸ For Indian position, see Sisir Gupta, *Kashmir: A Study of India Pakistan Relations*. (Bombay: Asia Publishing, 1966).

¹⁹ M.Yousuf Saraf, *Kashmiri’s Fight for Freedom*. 2 vols. (Lahore: Ferozsons, 1977).

There were large numbers of regular soldiers of the Indian Army as well as the State Militia and police and more often than not they were under arms. The State Government was exercising wide powers of arbitrary arrest. Those are not matters that the Kashmiris inhabiting the valley could be expected to disregard in choosing between voting as the Government of Kashmir asked them and voting for accession to Pakistan. ...

I could not expose a plebiscite conducted under the authority of the United Nations to the dangers which I believed certainly to exist.²⁰

A frustrated Dixon failed in his mission and eventually resigned. The former US Senator, Frank Graham, was then appointed as the UN representative for the dispute; he too was equally disappointed with the Indian attitude. According to one author, "From the date of his appointment to March 1958, he submitted to the Council six reports on the demilitarization of the state. The fate of the Graham mission was no different from that of Sir Owen Dixon's. As before, Pakistan accepted all the different proposals made by Graham while India rejected them all."²¹

Indian Manipulation of the Dispute

Although India took the issue to the UN, it continued with its own scheme on Kashmir with an aim of establishing its total control over the territory. Ignoring UN resolutions, which had declared Kashmir a disputed territory; in October 1949 the Indian Constituent Assembly incorporated an article in its constitution declaring Kashmir within Indian jurisdiction ensuring "internal autonomy" in defense, foreign policy and communication. Initially the UN seemed to ignore this. In 1951, when India declared holding of an election for a legislative assembly in Kashmir, the UN reminded the parties that "the final disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir will be made in accordance with the will of the people expressed through the

²⁰ Quoted in Ijaz Hussain, *Kashmir Dispute: An International Law Perspective*. (Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies, 1998), 22.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 24.

democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations.”²² Yet the Indian authorities went ahead to hold what they called a democratic election. It was a total sham: With blessings from Delhi, Sheikh Abdullah’s party won 73 seats out of a total of 75. All seats were won uncontested because the Election Commission refused to accept opposition candidates. According to opposition sources, all subsequent elections in Kashmir were heavily rigged. The Indian administration, however, continued to maneuver the scenario in Kashmir.

In July 1952 Sheikh Abdullah signed an agreement with the Indian Government in Delhi and secured a separate flag for the state. Sheikh Abdullah seemed to have believed that this would ensure Kashmiri people a sort of special status within India. To reinforce Abdullah’s desire Jawaharlal Nehru declared in the Indian Parliament that, “Ultimately – I say this with all deference to this Parliament – the decision will be made in the hearts and minds of the men and women of Kashmir; neither in this Parliament, nor in the United Nations nor by anybody else.”²³ Was Nehru sincere? The events that followed suggest otherwise. Within a year Sheikh Abdullah was already at odds with the Delhi Government. He undertook land reforms for the benefit of common farmers, who happened to be mostly Muslims. He also invited the American politician, Adlai Stevenson, in 1953, perhaps, to promote some form of independent status for Kashmir. Nehru immediately took notice of this: Kashmiri Hindu landlords were already discontented with Sheikh Abdullah, now Nehru’s displeasure led Delhi administration not only to remove Abdullah from his position as Prime Minister” (because of the special relationship between the two entities, the head of Kashmir government was given this title), he was also imprisoned. He was replaced by another loyal friend of Jawaharlal Nehru who also was imprisoned after serving Nehru’s cause for almost a decade.^{24 25}

²² www.kashmir-cc.ca/un/sc30mar51.htm. Accessed on April 8, 2010.

²³ See “White Paper on Elections in Kashmir,” by The All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC), Sri Nagar, Kashmir. At www.kashmir-cc.ca/mic/whitepaper.htm. Accessed on April 8, 2010.

²⁴ Quoted from Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru in www.indiatogether.org/peace/kashmir/intro.htm. Accessed on April 9, 2010.

²⁵ Sheikh Abdullah was replaced by Bakshi Ghulam Muhammad, who did

Years later another Kashmiri – B. K. Nehru – who served as Governor of Kashmir from 1981 to 1984, later said about Delhi's manipulation of the situation that, "From 1953 to 1975, Chief Ministers of that State [of J&K] had been nominees of Delhi. Their appointment to that post was legitimised by the holding of farcical and totally rigged elections in which the Congress party led by Delhi's nominee was elected by huge majorities."²⁶ One should, however, note that the only election that was held before 1953 was not fair because almost all members of the assembly belonged to Abdullah's party and were declared elected by default.

The Indian authorities continued with their design to get total control over Kashmir. In October 1956 the so-called Kashmir State Assembly adopted a resolution declaring Kashmir an integral part of India. Almost immediately the UN Security Council adopted a resolution saying, "the final disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir will be made in accordance with the will of the people expressed through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations."²⁷ On its part, however, India declared that Kashmir was already an integral part of India, and there was no space for a plebiscite. In April 1959 the requirement of special permits for Indian citizens to enter Kashmir was abolished. In October of the same year India extended the jurisdiction of its national Election Commission to Kashmir. The Kashmir High Court was also brought at par with other High Courts in the rest of India. Objections were raised at the United Nations Security Council against Indian schemes. All UNSC resolutions now, however, were vetoed by the Soviet Union with which India had developed close relations in the 1950s. Indian actions only created more anger and frustration among the people of Kashmir.

"By the end of 1963," observed Alastair Lamb, "the majority of foreign observers of the Kashmir scene had little doubt that a

everything that Nehru requested, was imprisoned in 1965 after Nehru's death.

²⁶ Quoted from B.K. Nehru's *Nice Guys Finish Second* (614-5) at Home.comcast.net/raman_akhila/kashmir/elect.htm. Accessed on April 9, 2010. Also see Akhila Raman, "Kashmir: Terrorism or Freedom Movement," in www.Countercurrents.org (March 22, 2007).

²⁷ See www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/kasun122.htm. Accessed on April 13, 2010.

plebiscite treating the State of Jammu and Kashmir as a single voting unit would lead to a clear call for the transfer of the entire State from India to Pakistan.”²⁸ Jawaharlal Nehru, therefore, undertook a new diplomatic initiative to address the situation in Kashmir. In 1964 he released Sheikh Abdullah from prison, issued a special passport to him indicating his Kashmiri nationality, and sent him to Pakistan in an effort to resolve the dispute by directly negotiating with Pakistan. He passed away, however, when Sheikh Abdullah was still engaged in his discussions with Pakistani leaders. As a result of Nehru’s death, the new process of reconciliation ceased. It is not clear what Nehru wanted to achieve; however, this indicates how individuals matter even in a “democracy.” In May 1965 Sheikh Abdullah was rearrested on his return to India. A new anti-India movement called *satyagraha* (a Gandhi style non-violent protest movement) began in Kashmir. Many protesters were arrested and imprisoned. Within days India accused Pakistan of sending infiltrators from across the border in order to destabilize Kashmir, and a second all-out war between India and Pakistan began in August and September of 1965. The war ended through Soviet mediation and both India and Pakistan agreed to return to the line of control (LOC) reached at the end of the 1948 war. The divided Kashmir began to be referred to as Indian occupied Kashmir (IOK) and Azad Kashmir (AK), which years later the international press began to refer to as Pakistan administered Kashmir. India and Pakistan fought another war in 1971. In 1972, in an accord known as the Simla Agreement, the two countries agreed to resolve the dispute bilaterally. Indian authorities succeeded in converting the Kashmir dispute from an international one to a bilateral one: a dispute between India and Pakistan. Interestingly, however, the UNMOGIP continued to maintain its presence in Kashmir with the same mandate, i.e., “to investigate and mediate the dispute” between India and Pakistan.

Meanwhile, following the 1965 war, the indigenous forces demanding independent Kashmir began to gain more momentum, not only in Indian and Pakistani administered Kashmir, but also in the United Kingdom where many Kashmiris had migrated since 1947. Both from the UK and Azad Kashmir, the demand for an independent

²⁸ Lamb, *Kashmir: A Disputed Legacy*. 210.

Kashmir began to grow stronger. After the 1971 war, which dismembered Pakistan, however, many activists in Indian occupied Kashmir seemed to have become convinced that they could perhaps lead a peaceful democratic movement, like the one that Bengali-speaking East Pakistanis just had. As a result the late 1970s and early 1980s witnessed an increased popular participation in the political process in Indian occupied Kashmir. Describing the problem of handling the issue by Delhi, one author says, “[t]he first genuine Assembly elections in the State in July 1977, under the Janata regime, restored the people’s faith in the democratic process.”²⁹ Although complaints of election rigging continued, the election results of 1977 and 1983 reflected more diverse political opinions. Elections conducted in 1987, however, changed the scenario again. According to Alastair Lamb, “the 1987 elections were as unfree and unfair as any others held in the history of the State, with the arguable exception of those of 1977.”³⁰ 1987 was unique because opposition forces had united their muscle and was poised to gain a significant number of seats. The BBC also reported that the election was massively rigged.³¹ This created enormous disillusion; soon many turned to militancy. The militants increasingly began to use Islamic terminology. According to one Indian author, since the elimination of Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF), “a relatively secular force that stood for the independence of Kashmir, that the insurgency in the Valley came to be dominated exclusively by the Islamicist and *jehadi* groups wholly loyal to Pakistan.”³² Alastair Lamb has rightly pointed out that “In India it has been convenient to blame the collapse of all vestiges of democratic government in the State of Jammu and Kashmir on the meddling of Pakistan.”³³ We shall discuss the problem of the role of clandestine agencies later, but to continue the story of the rise of discontents in Kashmir one needs to

²⁹ Anuradha Dutt, “The Insurgency,” *The Illustrated Weekly of India* (February 4, 1990).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 331.

³¹ http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/2/south_asia/222336444/stm. Accessed on September 15, 2010.

³² Aijaz Ahmad, ‘Ceasefire as Smokescreen’ in *Frontline* (India’s national magazine published by *The Hindu*). 17: 19 (Sept 16-29, 2000).

³³ Lamb, *Kashmir: A Disputed Legacy*, 331.

highlight the fact that the intensity in protests began to take root immediately after the 1987 elections, and by 1989, Kashmiris began a Palestinian *intifada* type stone-throwing protests against Indian troops in the territory. Since then the uprising has continued unabated; thousands of civilians including children and women have been killed, reports of women being raped and then murdered and news of naked prisoners paraded through streets have been frequent. Currently the Indian authorities are reported to have deployed more than 700,000 security personnel in a population of about 4 million. The Indian occupying authorities seem to have lost all civilized decorum in handling the situation in Kashmir. Recently an Indian army officer strapped a Kashmiri man with his jeep in order to save his vehicle from stone-throwing protesters. Although this constituted using a human being as a shield, a war crime, the officer was "awarded the Chief of Army Staff's Commendation Card "for his sustained efforts in counter-insurgency operations."³⁴

Reputed author, Arundhati Roy, wrote in the British newspaper, *the Guardian*, while covering the Indian national day celebration in Sri Nagar, the capital of Indian held Kashmir in 2008:

Everywhere there were Pakistani flags, everywhere the cry Pakistan se rishta kya? La illaha illallah. (What is our bond with Pakistan? There is no god but Allah.) *Azadi* ka matlab kya? La illaha illallah. (What does freedom mean? There is no god but Allah.) For somebody like myself, who is not Muslim, that interpretation of freedom is hard – if not impossible – to understand. I asked a young woman whether freedom for Kashmir would not mean less freedom for her, as a woman. She shrugged and said "What kind of freedom do we have now? The freedom to be raped by Indian soldiers?" Her reply silenced me.³⁵

Arundhati Roy's observation obviously demonstrates the anti-Indian sentiment among people in Kashmir, but it also raises

³⁴<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/05/outrage-india-award-human-shield-soldier-170523110224040.html>

³⁵ Arundhati Roy, *The Guardian*, August 22, 2008.

many other questions. Do they want to join Pakistan? Or do they want independence? Both demands have been defined as *la ilaha illa allah* or there is no object of worship, but Allah (*tawhid*). What does this mean in terms of the political system that they would like to be governed by? Pakistan came about at the middle of the 20th century based on the same idea, but would the people of Kashmir like to associate their fate with what Pakistan has achieved in the past six decades? Although an examination and translation of the idea of the unity of God (*tawhid*) in governing a modern state does not fall within our immediate domain, one must note that Muslim scholars in our contemporary times have not resolved this question. As for the people of Kashmir, they are now emotionally charged because of the treatment they have received from the Indian authorities. They seem to be least worried about this question. The situation in Kashmir has significantly deteriorated since 2008.³⁶

The Role of Indian Academia and Media on the Issue

Pro-Indian academics and journalists have played a very significant role in an attempt to dilute the Kashmir dispute. They have not only hidden or ignored certain information and continued blaming Pakistan and some extremists for the current situation in Kashmir but they have also underestimated scholarly works on the subject. Describing the reception of one of his works on Kashmir, Alastair Lamb said with reference to another of his earlier works on the subject:

Kashmir, A Disputed Legacy (1991) received some extremely hostile reviews from Indian critics. Some of these were frivolous and just what one would expect in a situation so dominated by national polemic; but some have merited serious attention, coming as they have from writers who know a great deal about the recent history of the Subcontinent. I have, in any case, looked into all criticisms to see if behind the occasionally offensive language there might lurk a nugget of truth. As a result of such comment, for example, I re-examined

³⁶ See www.kmsnews.org for the latest information on the issue.

very carefully the journal and other papers of Sir George Cunningham to see what light they might cast upon the events which immediately preceded the formal Indian intervention in Kashmir on 27 October 1947.³⁷

This re-examination of documents had no impact on Lamb's overall observation and conclusion on the issue. He still held the view that, "The real area of conflict is confined to the Vale of Kashmir on the Indian side of the cease-fire line." Yet some Indian intellectuals continued to manipulate the Kashmir dispute to hide India's international responsibility on the issue. On the one hand attempts have been made in describing this international humanitarian dispute as one of the internal problems of India. On the other hand Pakistan and Muslim extremists were blamed for the deteriorating situation in Indian occupied Kashmir. One Indian author, Neera Chandhoke, for example, recognizes the gravity of the situation in Kashmir, but calls the issue a "problem," not dispute.³⁸ Without giving background information about how Kashmir was incorporated into India, the paper suggests that "due to infringement into social contract by the central government," there has been an upsurge in violence in Kashmir. The paper recognizes the "lack of principled democracy," "degeneration of democratic institutions," and "rigging of 1987 elections" as the causes for rise of insurgency in Kashmir, but compares the situation with other ethno-nationalist sentiments in other parts of India. Similarly, another US-based Indian academic, Sumit Ganguly, in his attempt to "Explaining the Kashmir Insurgency" blames the lack of political mobilization and institutional decay on the part of the Indian government and Pakistan's support for militants, all of which contribute to the deteriorating situation in Kashmir.³⁹ He dismisses the British author Alastair Lamb's conclusions without any assessment. He simply

³⁷ Alastair Lamb, *Birth of a Tragedy: Kashmir 1947*. (Hertingfordbury: Roxford Books, 1994), viii.

³⁸ Neera Chandhoke, "Of Broken Social Contracts and Ethnic Violence: The Case of Kashmir," *Working Paper No. 75*, Developing Countries Research Centre, University of Delhi. December 2005.

³⁹ Sumit Ganguly, "Explaining the Kashmir Insurgency: Political Mobilization and Institutional Decay," *International Security*, Vol. 21, no. 2, (Fall 1996).

accuses Lamb of possessing “deep-seated belief in Indian malpractice.”⁴⁰ Ganguly also dismisses Pakistani author, Mushtaqur Rahman, on the same grounds. Was not the holding of “elections” in Kashmir since 1951, which we have discussed earlier, not evidence of malpractice? Were they simply institutional decay? Why did Nehru want Sheikh Abdullah to negotiate with Pakistani leaders in 1964 with a special passport recognizing the latter’s Kashmiri nationality? Is the current situation in Kashmir normal? One should only read annual reports of Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch in order to find out whether or not Alastair Lamb and Mushtaqur Rahman are influenced by a “deep-seated belief in Indian malpractice” or is Sumit Ganguly trying to maneuver scholarship on the subject.

Manipulation of writing on the subject is not confined to only Indian academics; many Western authors have been deceived by the democratic whitewash of Delhi’s official position. Explaining the fresh uprising in Indian occupied Kashmir in August 2010, one Indian author wrote in *the Guardian* newspaper of Great Britain:

(i) intellectuals preoccupied by transcendent, nearly mystical, battles between civilization and barbarism tend to assume that “democratic” India, a natural ally of the “liberal” west, must be doing the right thing in Kashmir, i.e. fighting “Islamofascism.”

The author has rightly pointed out that:

Electoral democracy in multi-ethnic, multi-religious India is one of the modern era’s most utopian political experiments, increasingly vulnerable to malfunction and failure, and, consequently, to militant disaffection and state terror.⁴¹

And pointing out to the role of media on the subject, the author says:

Indian media now acts in concert with the government
“to deny any legitimacy to protests in Kashmir.”

⁴⁰ Sumit Ganguly, *The Crisis in Kashmir: Portents of War, Hopes of Peace*. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 17.

⁴¹ See Pankaj Misra, “Silence Over Kashmir,” *The Guardian*. August 14, 2010.

Indian academics and journalists have not only suppressed news about Kashmir; they have blamed squarely Pakistani intelligence services for the uprising in Indian occupied Kashmir. We shall discuss the question of the role of spy agencies in political conflicts below, but at this stage one must point out that in Indian media and academia there are many fair-minded voices that have stood for justice for the people of Kashmir.⁴² In the “preface” of the book *Kashmir Bleeds* human rights activist, Inder Mohan, says:

[t]he deliberate disinformation regarding the stark realities of inhuman repression and people’s valiant movements, spread by the J&K administration all over, is a serious breach and violation of human rights, which humanity will neither forgive nor forget.⁴³

Most articles in the compilation were published in some leading Indian newspapers and magazines. Yet the reality of media coverage remained the same. Summarizing the trend, Pankaj Mishra says:

Indian writers and intellectuals, who witnessed the corrosion of India’s secular democracy by Hindu supremacists, seem better acquainted with the messy realities concealed by stirring abstractions. But on Kashmir they often appear as evasive as their Chinese peers are on Tibet. They may have justifiably recoiled from the fundamentalist and brutish aspect of the revolt in the valley. But the massive non-violent protests in Kashmir since 2008 haven’t released a flood of pent-up sympathy from them.⁴⁴

The Role of Spy Agencies

The question of the role of spy agencies in current international

⁴² On the writings of Arundhati Roy and Pankaj Misra quoted above, see the compilation of articles on human rights violations in Kashmir by Syed Noorul Hassan Rafai and Abdul Kabeer Karipak, Ed. *Kashmir Bleeds*. (Sri Nagar: The Human Rights Commission, 1990). Also see Vir Sanghvi, “Think the Unthinkable” *Hindustan Times* (August 16, 2008).

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁴⁴ Pankaj Misra, “Silence Over Kashmir,” *The Guardian*. August 14, 2010.

conflicts is very important, sensitive and serious. What role do spy/intelligence agencies play in political events? How much can one theorize human behavior while information about the role of these agencies is not made public? How much maneuvering of human behavior enables nations or groups to achieve their political goals? Books have been written not only on the American CIA and the Soviet KGB, but also on Indian RAW and Pakistani ISI. Googling for the role of Pakistani ISI in Kashmir and in politics elsewhere, one will find numerous articles and books. Although one finds not as many books and articles on Indian RAW, there are plentiful *YouTube* postings and Google sites on India's role in subversive activities in Pakistan. One would also find interviews of captured Indian spies in Pakistan.

Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) was established in 1948, two decades earlier than the Indian RAW. On its part, India had inherited the British Intelligence Bureau which was functioning on the pattern of MI5. Frustrated with its performance in the war against China in 1962 and against Pakistan in 1965, the Indian government decided to establish the Research and Analysis Wing (RAW) in 1968. With its headquarters in Calcutta, RAW performed very well in 1971 against Pakistan, helping to create Bangladesh. Since then, all successive Indian governments have supported RAW without having to answer to parliament about their activities. Pakistani ISI came into prominence during the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in the 1980s. By the end of the 1980s, both ISI and RAW began to accuse each other of unlawful activities in Kashmir and other parts of India and Pakistan. The situation has continuously deteriorated since then.

The sensibility of this question increases when activities of these agencies become public, and they are not addressed on the basis of common acceptable values such as accountability and transparency. Such questions become even more serious when they are used by various interest groups for promoting self-interests. The situation is complicated further when sponsored interest groups, think-tanks and lobby groups produce alleged crimes as evidences to promote their desired designs. Although a thorough treatment of problems of accountability and transparency in modern democracies

and the role of lobby groups in modern democracies are not within the scope of our present discussion, it is important to highlight the point that injustices towards the people of Kashmir and maltreatment of the whole issue are directly related to the rise of extremism in the area. This also includes the situation in Afghanistan.

In order to illustrate this point, we would like to stress that the Indian government, with the assistance of their spy agencies, intellectuals and journalists, continued to manipulate the Kashmir dispute. Describing the chronology of events, the Indian website www.indiatogether.org – which claims to stand for independent journalism and which claims to stand for cultivating better relations between the two neighboring countries – has reported that:

In the *Indian Defence Review* of July 1989, one of India's top defence specialists, K.Subrahmanyam, cites the existence of a secret Pakistani plan to start a Kashmiri uprising, code-named 'Operation Topac', that the late General Zia-ul-Haq reportedly set in motion. However, this plan is later shown to be false and concocted by Indian analysts as a hypothetical exercise, a fact Subrahmanyam later acknowledges. Curiously, Operation Topac continues to be quoted by Indian officials including the Indian Embassy.⁴⁵

Is there an acceptable solution to this problem? How should one develop mutual trust? Take, for example, the attack upon the Indian parliament on December 13, 2001. Indian authorities accused Pakistani ISI for the attack and claimed that “the attack was planned in training camps in Pakistan.” What is interesting, however, is that, all terrorists were killed in the “encounter” and the Indian authorities refused to show faces of the terrorists to reporters. India also rejected the offer by the Pakistani authorities for a joint investigation of the event. As a result, no common ground was found in addressing the situation of mistrust between the two countries. Meanwhile terrorist attacks continued, and it is really difficult to understand how they managed to attack such high profile targets. Yet, Indian writers

⁴⁵ Quoted in Edward Desmond, “The Insurgency in Kashmir (1989-1991),” *Contemporary South Asia* (March 1995), 4 (1), 8.

continue to accuse Pakistan for all kinds of attacks on Indian soil in their attempts to prevent any meaningful engagement with Pakistan.⁴⁶

In recent years the US agency, the FBI, has joined this fiasco by arresting the Executive Director of Washington based Kashmiri American Council (KAC), accusing him of being an agent of Pakistani ISI. KAC claims to be “a not for profit organization dedicated to raising the level of awareness in the U.S. about the struggle” of the people of Kashmir.⁴⁷ The Council has been engaged in inviting Indian and Kashmiri intellectuals and journalists to the United States to educate policy makers about the plight of the people of Kashmir, and there has been no complain of any sort of violence by the people attached to the organization. In one of his last public appearance, the accused had “urged President Obama to listen to Mrs. Kati Marton, the widow of Ambassador Richard Holbrook who told Mr. Nicholas D. Kristof of *New York Times* that President Obama's best tribute to Richard Holbrook would be to listen to his (Holbrook's) advice. She said that he (Holbrook) believed that a crucial step to reducing radicalism in Pakistan was to ease the Kashmir dispute with India, and he (Holbrook) favored more pressure on India to achieve that.”⁴⁸

From the activities reported in its official website the organization does not seem to be doing anything illegal; however, this paper is not designed to examine this question. Yet one must underscore the point that the arrest and treatment of its chairman in a non-transparent approach will only frustrate those who want a peaceful solution to the problem.

Our concern at this stage is not to investigate which spy agency is more responsible for the continuation of the dispute and what they want to achieve; our main interest is to demonstrate that the Kashmir dispute has continued since 1947, more specifically since October 27, 1947 – the day the Indian troops landed in Sri Nagar to occupy the territory – and it continues now with the

⁴⁶ See an Indian author's message to Obama on the eve of his visit to India, Sumit Ganguly, “New Delhi Surprise: Beneath the Smiles, India is not Happy with Obama,” in *Foreign Policy*. (November 5, 2010).

⁴⁷ See, www.kashmiri.com

⁴⁸ “President Obama Must Listen to Richard Holbrook's Advice,” in www.kashmiri.com. Accessed on Aug. 10, 2011.

presence of more than 700,000 troops for a population of about 4 million people. Reports of murder, rape, humiliation and disappearances of civilians have increased with the passage of time. Naturally this frustrates many Muslims not only in Kashmir and neighboring Pakistan, but also in other parts of the Muslim world. Why does the dispute in Kashmir frustrate Muslims in other parts of world? This question leads us to a discussion on the role of the OIC, a political institution based on the Qur'anic concept of *ummah* which claims to represent Muslim interests in international affairs, especially regarding the Kashmir issue.

Role of the OIC

The Kashmir dispute as an agenda item in OIC gatherings entered into the list as soon as the organization was established. Pakistan, one of the founding members of the OIC, took the issue to the forum and since then it continued to be an issue of regular importance. When the situation in Indian occupied Kashmir deteriorated significantly in 1989, the OIC Foreign Ministers Conference in 1990 demanded that India and Pakistan resolve the issue in light of the 1948 and the 1949 UN Security Council resolutions.⁴⁹ The OIC seemed to recognize that the Kashmir dispute was a bilateral issue between India and Pakistan. According to the Secretary General, the OIC, “[o]ffered its good offices for settlement of the dispute. The offer was refused by the Indian Government which continues to characterise the legitimate Kashmiri struggle for self-determination as a Pakistan-sponsored terrorist activity.”⁵⁰

In 1991 the OIC decided to send a fact-finding mission to Kashmir, but India refused to allow the mission to the territories it controlled – where, in fact, human right violations were most frequent – as a result, the mission failed to achieve its desired goal. Based on the reports of international human right monitor groups, however, the OIC fact-finding mission recommended that:

Muslim states review their trade ties with India, that

⁴⁹ OIC resolution 21/19-P.

⁵⁰ Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu, *The Islamic World in the New Century: The Organization of the Islamic Conference*. (London: Hurst & Company, 2010), 119.

Indian labourers be prevented from working in the Gulf states, that the Kashmir human rights issue be raised in all international forum, and that the Muslim world use its influence over India to cease human rights violations.⁵¹

The OIC also established a Contact Group on Jammu and Kashmir and continued to adopt resolutions on Kashmir. According to the Secretary General of OIC:

The OIC Contact Group on Jammu and Kashmir established since 1994 meets on the sidelines of all OIC Summits and ministerial meetings, and invites the representatives of the Kashmiri people to bring to the attention of the international community their point of view, especially on the human rights of Kashmiri people.⁵²

The OIC has continued its diplomatic support for the people of Kashmir. But what difference has this OIC gesture made to the people of Kashmir? As we have noted earlier, the human right situation in Kashmir has been continuously deteriorating, particularly since 1989. The OIC undertook the issue because of its stated commitment to secure Muslim interests, but its failure to serve this interest seems to add to disappointment and discontent among many Muslims.

Some Concluding Remarks

The people of Kashmir have been deprived of their right of self-determination. The conflict began in 1947 and the UN declared the territory disputed, and on the basis of the principle of self-determination, the world body resolved to conduct a plebiscite in order for the people of Kashmir to decide the future of the territory. This resolution seeking peace, however, turned out to be just the beginning of a long and bloody conflict in the history of the UN. In fact, along with Palestine, Kashmir is the only other unresolved

⁵¹ Ibid., 120.

⁵² Ibid., 120-121.

conflict in the world today.

Since then India – which is sometimes romantically called the largest democracy in the world – has flouted democratic principles and has been trying to incorporate and digest Kashmir within its territory. In the international front it has pursued “diplomacy” and tried to convince the world that it has a secular constitution ensuring equal rights for all citizens and secured veto power of the former Soviet Union. In fact, India has clearly hidden its hypocrisy behind democracy. It has conducted rigged and engineered elections in order to justify its legitimacy over Kashmir, which the people of Kashmir have generally boycotted. In 1951, seventy three out of a total of 75 candidates in the state assembly were elected unopposed. The two seats where elections were conducted were located in the Hindu majority Jammu area. In 1956 this so-called State Constituent Assembly defied all UN resolutions on the subject and adopted a resolution declaring Kashmir an integral part of India. India made another mockery of democracy by holding a further election in Kashmir in 1957 in which 65 candidates of the ruling party was elected unopposed. Such election mockery continued, creating frustration among people which turned many toward militarism, some of which sporadically produced extremist actions.

Why has India been so adamant in acquiring Kashmir? Alastair Lamb points out Jawaharlal Nehru’s romantic attachment to Kashmir. He has rightly observed:

Nehru... just could not bring himself to stand by and permit his ancestral homeland, the Vale of Kashmir, pass into hands of Pakistan. Indian public opinion, increasingly convinced of the merits of the accession argument, supported him to the full. ... since 1989... India had to abandon those high moral principles, the message of Mahatma Gandhi, in which it used to take such pride, and resort to methods of repression which rival, indeed probably exceed, anything the British ever wrought against their Indian colonial subjects since 1858.⁵³

⁵³ Alastair Lamb, *Birth of a Tragedy: Kashmir 1947*. (Hertingfordbury: Roxford

Kashmir has suffered not only from Indian democracy; it has suffered from American democracy as well and that too in the hands of the champion of democracy and equality, Barack Obama.

In an interview with MSNBC, president-elect Barack Obama expressed the view that militancy in Afghanistan and Pakistan could not be handled properly without addressing the problem of Kashmir dispute. He also announced that he would appoint the former president, Bill Clinton, to mediate in the crisis between India and Pakistan.⁵⁴ An unhappy Indian minister of External Affairs immediately reacted saying, "Essentially it has been stated that it is a bilateral issue between India and Pakistan."⁵⁵ Increasingly the Obama administration came under pressure from the pro-Indian lobby, which was supported by the pro-Israeli lobby, to drop the idea: So the idea of appointing Bill Clinton to mediate on the issue was abandoned. Immediately after taking office, President Obama appointed senior diplomat, Richard Holbrooke, to deal with the Afghan-Pakistan conflict. The pro-Indian lobby in Washington intervened and got Kashmir off Holbrooke's assignment. The *Foreign Policy* reported:

But the omission of India from his title, and from Clinton's official remarks introducing the new diplomatic push in the region was no accident -- not to mention a sharp departure from Obama's own previously stated approach of engaging India, as well as Pakistan and Afghanistan, in a regional dialogue. Multiple sources told *The Cable* that India vigorously -- and successfully -- lobbied the Obama transition team to make sure that neither India nor Kashmir was included in Holbrooke's official brief.

"When the Indian government learned Holbrooke was going to do [Pakistan]-India, they swung into action and lobbied to have India excluded from his purview,"

Books, 1994), 176-177.

⁵⁴ See, www.nowpublic.com/world/obama-mulls-clinton-special-envoy-kashmir. Accessed on September 4, 2011.

⁵⁵ www.indiandaily.com/editorial/20540.asp

related one source." And they succeeded. Holbrooke's account officially does not include India."⁵⁶

Should democratic principles be driven by lobby groups? Or should democracy ensure human dignity and individual rights to self determination? Does democracy incorporate accountability and transparency? Positive responses to these questions are essential for gaining the trust of the Kashmiri people.

The people of Kashmir have also suffered from Pakistan's "democratic" and military dictatorships. Like India, Pakistan has been involved in the question. In fact, the whole question was viewed as a dispute between the two countries. Because of this perception the people of Kashmir have suffered. Initially Pakistan played a positive role in Kashmir both for its own sake and for the people of Kashmir. This was reflected in Pakistan's acceptance of UN resolutions on the subject. Pakistan, however, began to compromise on Kashmir following its defeat with India in 1971. It signed the Simla Agreement declaring the international dispute to a bilateral issue. One Indian document claims that:

Pakistani Prime Minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, also promised the then Indian Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, that his country would accept the Line of Control (LOC) in the state of J&K as the de facto border and would not try to de-stabilise it. This was not formally entered in the agreement because Bhutto said it would cause domestic problems for him at this juncture. Mrs. Gandhi magnanimously accepted his promise and did not formalise that part of the agreement. But Pakistan, as later events were to prove, never kept its part of the deal.⁵⁷

The Indian document seems to have rightly pointed out that Pakistan didn't "keep its part of the deal" because all Pakistani administrations have not only expressed their rhetorical support for the people of Kashmir in international diplomacy, they have also reported to have

⁵⁶ See, "India's Stealth Lobbying against Holbrooke's Brief," in *Foreign Policy*, (January 24, 2009).

⁵⁷ See www.Jammu-kashmir.com/document/simla.html

assisted Kashmiri protesters against Indian military rule, at least that is how the Indian government and spy agencies have perceived the role of Pakistan in Kashmir. This diplomatic support, however, has hardly changed anything in the life of the people of Kashmir. In fact, since the Simla Agreement Pakistan's so-called diplomatic support has had a negative impact on the issue. To complicate the matter Kashmiris burned the effigy of another "democratically elected" Pakistani leader, Asif Zardari, when he claimed that terrorists were operating in Kashmir.⁵⁸ Many Desperate Kashmiris, as we have noted earlier, are now demanding independence of their homeland from India. They do not seem to be interested in joining Pakistan.

An independent Kashmir was not within the framework of either the British partition of India Act of 1947 or of the UN recommendation for the solution of Kashmir dispute, but it is clear that the people of Kashmir are not satisfied with the current situation. In this context, the first UN recommendation known as the Dixon Plan seems to have been the most appropriate solution to the problem. It had assigned Ladakh to India, the Northern Areas and Pakistan-Occupied Kashmir to Pakistan, split Jammu between the two, and envisaged a plebiscite in the Kashmir Valley. He made this recommendation on the basis of demographic composition and geographical proximity of the territory. Developments during the past sixty years have demonstrated that it is only in the Indian controlled Vale where people are most dissatisfied and the Indian administration maintains an enormous number of troops in controlling them. Under the circumstances, the Dixon recommendation seems to have been the best solution to the problem. Most observers of the situation would agree that Dixon's frustration has now spread to the whole region – perhaps the most volatile region in the world today. President Obama had rightly identified an acceptable method to solve the problem by announcing Bill Clinton to mediate in the conflict, but such a noble idea should not have been dumped for political expediency. Most importantly, there should be transparent investigations of terrorist acts in the region with the participation of all parties in the presence of international observers. Also in this context, one should emphasize that the people of Kashmir should be

⁵⁸ See www.rediff.com/news/2008/oct/05indpak.htm

allowed to opt for an independent and sovereign state: let them decide their own future line of action.

Let us return to the Burhan Wani story to understand feelings of the local population. *The Huffington Post* article narrates:

Speaking to Youth Ki Awaaz, Muzaffer Ahmed Wani, Burhan's father, explained why his son couldn't be held back. *"Almost everyone here has been beaten up by the Army. You also must have had your share. But everyone didn't become a militant. It depends on how much one can take. Yeh aap ki ghairat pe depend karta hai (It depends on your self-respect). Someone's 'Ghairat' got challenged time and again, so he decided to answer back. Others decided to stay quiet. My son couldn't bear to see the atrocities and the humiliation, so he was forced to choose the path which he is on right now."*

This “*ghairat*” or self-esteem, in other word, human dignity is the key core issue here. It seems to be the main motivating factor for the Muslim youth today. It is true not only in Kashmir, but all over the world. Yes the Muslim youth derives his motivation from Qur’anic teachings. But it is not only Islam that upholds human dignity; all major world religions stand for human self-esteem. This is the most important civilizational value that has motivated millions throughout history to action. That is why the civilized world must be aware of India’s double standards in the name of democracy. Failure to address the problem will only increase the potential for more violence affecting not only immediate neighboring areas, but much beyond, creating havoc in global governance and threatening international peace and security.

TRANSLITERATION TABLE

CONSONANTS

Ar=Arabic, Pr=Persian, OT=Ottoman Turkish, Ur=Urdu

Ar	Pr	OT	UR	Ar	Pr	OT	UR	Ar	Pr	OT	UR	
ء	'	'	'	ز	z	z	z	ک	—	g	g	g
ب	b	b	b	ژ	—	—	ʒ	ل	l	l	l	l
پ	p	p	p	ژ	—	zh	j	م	m	m	m	m
ت	t	t	t	س	s	s	s	ن	n	n	n	n
ث	—	—	ṭ	ش	sh	sh	ʃ	ه	h	h	h¹	h¹
ث	th	th	th	ص	ṣ	ṣ	ʃ	و	w	v/u	v	v/u
ج	j	j	c	ض	ḍ	ḍ	ʒ	ی	y	y	y	y
چ	—	ch	çh	ط	ṭ	ṭ	ṭ	ة	-ah			-a²
ح	ḥ	ḥ	ḥ	ظ	ẓ	ẓ	ẓ	ال	al³			
خ	kh	kh	kh	ع	‘	‘	‘					
د	d	d	d	غ	gh	gh	ğh					
ڈ	—	—	d	ف	f	f	f					
ذ	dh	dh	dh	ق	q	q	q					
ر	r	r	r	ک	k	k/g	k/ñ					

¹ – when not final

² – at in construct state

³ – (article) al - or l-

VOWELS

	Arabic and Persian	Urdu	Ottoman Turkish
Long	ا	ā	ā
	آ	Ā	—
	و	ū	ū
	ي	ī	ī
Doubled	ي	iy (final form ī)	iy (final form ī)
	و	uww (final form ū)	uvv
		uvv (for Persian)	uvv
Diphthongs	و	au or aw	ev
	ی	ai or ay	ey
Short	ا	a	a or e
	و	u	u or ū
	ی	i	o or ö
	ی	i	i

URDU ASPIRATED SOUNDS

For aspirated sounds not used in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish add h after the letter and underline both the letters e.g. چھ jh گھ gh

For Ottoman Turkish, modern Turkish orthography may be used.

AL-SHAJARAH
Vol. 22, No. 1, 2017

Contents

ARTICLES IN VOL. 22, No. 1, 2017

THE NEVER-ENDING KASHMIR DISPUTE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON THE CONTEMPORARY GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND PEACE <i>Abdullah al-Ahsan</i>	1
THE TRUE INVENTOR OF SOME EARLY MECHANICAL ENGINEERING DEVICES AND MECHANISMS <i>Waleed Fekry Faris</i> <i>Salah Elmoselhy</i>	29
MODERN CRITICISM OF THE <i>SAHABAH</i> : AN APPRAISAL <i>Serdar Demirel</i>	65
THE CONCEPT OF EUROPE AS A CULTURAL IDENTITY <i>Fatmir Shehu</i> <i>Bukuri Zejno</i>	85
THE JEWISH QUESTION IN VICTORIAN HISTORICAL ROMANCES <i>Mafaz M. Mustafa</i> <i>Sharifah Aishah binti Osman</i>	113
NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS	147

WoS-Indexed under *Arts & Humanities Citation Index, Current Contents/Arts
and Humanities* and **Scopus**

ISSN 1394-6870



9 771394 687009