

Kashmir As the Core Conflict Between Pakistan-India: A Historical Analysis

Dr. Tahira Mumtaz

Lecturer, Department of Politics & International Relations

Government College Women University, Sialkot

Correspondence: tahira.mumtaz@gcwus.edu.pk

Humaira Batool

MS Scholar, Politics and International Relations

Government College Women University, Sialkot

humairabatool420@gmail.com

Tayyba Azhar

MS Scholar, Department of Politics & International Relations

Government College Women University, Sialkot

tayybaazhar03@gmail.com

Abstract

The study's main objective is to find out the reasons for tension between India and Pakistan, two major nuclear powers of South Asia. The oldest and most significant conflict between India and Pakistan is over Kashmir. Numerous bilateral and multilateral initiatives failed to address this issue. Their hot and cold war conflicts have weakened the two nations' bilateral ties. This research is carried out using the qualitative research design, which has been conducted using the case study method. Pakistan, which backs Kashmir's claim for the right to self-determination under the UN Resolution of 1948-49, has consistently questioned India's attempts to increase its authority over Kashmir through the use of force. This research examines the causes of the conflict in Kashmir, how it has affected relations between India and Pakistan and the likelihood that it will be resolved.

Keywords: conflict, bilateral relations, United Nations, Human rights violations, right of self-determination

Introduction

Kashmir is a disputed territory and a reality dispute that should be resolved immediately. It is neither a part of India nor a jugular vein of Pakistan, this challenge can only be effectively resolved through constructive dialogue. It is the territory of all individuals who spent their whole lives for independence. In the view of Ghulam Mohammed Shah, July 2002, former chief minister of IJK, (Current News Service, Srinagar, 2002, July) the history of Kashmir bespeaks the truth that this land is an integral part of Pakistan and this claim is ever sustained by geographical, political, cultural and religious factor. In this research, the details of the Kashmir dispute will be discussed. The problem has become a common consideration that if this conflict remains unsettled, both countries will stay tense even the normal relations in other areas. (Ahmed, Rafique, 1966, 51)

The conflict over Kashmir, therefore, has been the actual existing interruption in the path of lasting peace and friendship and these states always met a setback due to unresolved dispute over Kashmir as both the countries have been emotionally involved in this conflict which touched the vital interests of the two countries. Pakistan considers that it has been wronged by India over Kashmir by the unjust implementation of the formula under which India was divided. (Khan, Dr. Rashid Ahmed & Alqama, Dr. Khawaja. 1996, 34).

Over the years Pakistan-India relations have slumped over several issues, the Afghanistan Crisis, the Siachin conflict the nuclear question etc. However, Kashmir is the centred and overriding concern for both the countries. Seven decades and four wars later, Kashmir remains the testing ground for the future relations between India and Pakistan. (Vendana, A. Ashok C. Shukla, 2004, 93)

Demographic and Geographical Aspects

Kashmir is a landlocked area (Ahmed, Sultan, 2006, 1). It has become a heaven lost. Its families are stuck in an intense situation. It has become the main interstate rivalry, and the question is again seen as a domain problem and observed substantial battling (Bose, 2004, 25). The majority of the general population are Muslims, and the underlying foundations of this issue lie in the Pakistan-India regional dispute. (Mufti, G.M. 1990,15)

It includes the amazing Himalayas and the original intent of many streams (Menon V P, 1957,14). Paradise on Earth is the name given to the valley because of its consistent excellence. Pakistan holds 35 percent of Kashmir, China holds 20 percent, and India holds 45 percent of the area. Since most of its citizens wished to live freely, the Hindu Maharaja Hari Singh's decision to grant it admission against popular will caused the conflict. Sisir Gupta, 1966, p. 34 The words and actions of Mountbatten, Jawaharlal Nehru, Gandhi, and Patel made the Kashmir situation more stubborn and complicated. Philipp and Ziegler (1985, 443) A long-standing and significant conflict between India and Pakistan is Kashmir. International peace and security are receiving more attention due to the rivalry between two South Asian nations on this matter. (Nawa-e-Waqt, October 27, 2013).

The issue sparked three significant wars and one significant dispute between India and Pakistan (Hashmi, Rehana Saeed, 2005, 104). This argument currently encompasses South Asian nuclear proliferation, human rights abuses, cross-border terrorism, ethnic conflicts, and security challenges. Neither state has followed through on its decisions about Kashmir's future. Therefore, neither the military intervention of any nation nor the political might of the international community can resolve the issue. As a result, several attempts to resolve conflicts peacefully were initiated, but they were all fruitless. One step forward, two steps back was the direction it took (Khan, Dr. Rashid & Alqama, Dr. Khawaja 1996, 18).

Wishes of good Offices with India

It should be mentioned from the outset that the leaders of the freedom movements in both nations did not foresee a hostile relationship between the two sovereign states. The Quaid-e-Azam once expressed interest in promoting international cooperation between Pakistan and India, including defence cooperation. In an interview with a foreign journalist, he stated, "In my opinion, both nations are autonomous and ought to be prominent on the global stage; this would benefit these states and the region as a whole." (Mr. De Eric Treiff, 1948, 459) Jawaharlal Nehru, the prime minister of India, hailed the Quaid's remarks, which were interpreted as an offer of united defense. However, Quaid-e-Azam once expressed interest in promoting international cooperation between Pakistan and India, including defense cooperation. In an interview with a foreign journalist, he stated, "In my opinion, both nations are autonomous and ought to be prominent on the global stage; this would benefit these states and the region as a whole." (Mr. De Eric Treiff, 1948, 459) Jawaharlal Nehru, the prime minister of India, hailed the Quaid's remarks, which were interpreted as an offer of united defense. However, the Quaid had made his offer contingent on the resolution of India-Pakistan disputes. However, he had claimed in the same interview that this (the offer) He added that if we achieve success on our own, we would be able to serve others well on other platforms.

Origin of Kashmir Conflict

564 states decided to join either India or Pakistan on the eve of separation. (Mushtaqur Rahman, 1996, 23) Everything except for three states that bordered India. These were notable special cases. Each state joined one of the two states using their own preference. In 1947 and 1948, respectively, the Indian military invaded the Muslim-ruled states of Hyderabad and Junagadh, which were home to a sizable Hindu population. They exacerbated already existing tensions. Even though the state's population was

predominately Hindu, the leader of the little state of Junagarh in Kathiawar consented to join Pakistan and acknowledged settlement.

The general populace was compelled to accept the Indian government's mediation and was confined to flee. Hyderabad, a predominantly Hindu region, expressed a wish to join Pakistan and further complicated matters. But despite its search for freedom, Indian standstill agreement persisted despite the growing problem and the growing influence of insurrection. (Dr. B. L. Fadia, 2011, 62)

In a normal scenario, Kashmir should have naturally succeeded in Pakistan as a heavily Muslim state due to its geographic location. (Alaister Lamb, 1991, 12) Under British rule, Kashmir was a princely state with internal autonomy (Ziring, Lawrence, 1980, 20). The British government decided that these states should be independent (BBC News, 7 August 2012/Asia). On a political level, however, things were different. The British government made it apparent that it would not acknowledge these states' independence. (Pervaiz Iqbal and Cheema, 2014,2) The fact that Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, the head of the National Conference, had become close to Nehru and that Kashmir was administered by a Hindu was exploited by the All-India National Congress (AINC) (Arif, Dr. Muhammad, 2001,215). The plan for the partition of Punjab, which called for the inclusion of two Tehsils—Gurdaspur and Batala in the Dominion of India, provided a topographical rationale for Kashmir's accession to India and aided the Congress leader's attempts to seize Kashmir. This plan was in place as early as May 1947. (Hassan, K. Sarwar, 1973, 67)

Kashmir was the important princely state of British India, as the division plan stated. Islam entered the state where a large portion of the population is Muslim. Coincidentally, leaders traded force or the option to remain free in a deal with the reigning power (G W Choudry, 1971, 55). For just 7.5 million rupees, the British sold the state to Maharaja Ghulab Singh. (Dr. Rashid Ahmed, 1996, 45) During the Maharaja's rule, these Muslims were extremely poor and miserable. As early as 1890, processions were organized against Maharaja Hari Singh's dictatorial rule. Kashmiris claimed their basic rights when the Muslim Conference was founded this year. These protest chains persisted until 1947. (Mahmood, Dr. Safder. 1989, 180) Nevertheless, the leader of the state of Kashmir refused to accept more lands, probably as a result of his discontent with the uprisings against this state. A battle had been sparked by the question of states' accession to India. (Gulshan, Majeed, 2013, 224).

The Dogra king allowed intimidation and threats against Muslims to flourish instead of acknowledging the Muslims' claim to join Pakistan. On October 27, 1947, the Maharaja, the ruler of Jammu and Kashmir, took action. It wasn't until October 27, following the Indian Intervention, that the Instrument of Accession was marked and allegedly signed. Considering the current state of affairs, it is possible that an impartial international tribunal would decide that India did not have the right to be in the Jammu and Kashmir state. (Lamb Alastair, 1991, 14) The state saw a surge in pro-Pakistan sentiment, and an armed resistance movement was initiated. Additionally, the maharaja's masses revolted and were nourished by the Gilgit Agency's happenings. Lashkars from Pakistan's tribal regions flocked to the valley to aid the Kashmiris, and by October 26, 1947, they had reached Srinagar's boundary. The conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir had begun. (February 5, 2004; The News). When the leader of Kashmir imposed a condition, Pakistan's vision became evident. It demonstrated that the advancement of India was legal and protected and that the existence of an instrument of accession was against the desire of Indians and only a state control. The main issue raised in the discussion was establishing the promotion of Kashmir's desires. However, it was asserted that the announcement of the princely state partition and the reason the matter has

not been settled in the opinion of the state's general populace seeking their consent is due to the question of self-determination. (G H Khan, 2004, 19).

It was declared to be the general population's problem and would be resolved once peace was restored. The majority of South Asia is made up of people. Pakistan categorically opposed the progress and questioned the legitimacy of the admission. (Suhdepto Adikhari, Mukkul Kamie2006, 74). Soon after, the Indian military's development proceeded without hesitation and legally.

The Security Council enacted two resolutions after the 1948 conflict over Kashmir, on August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949, asking India and Pakistan to impose a truce. (Alaster Lamb 1992, 237). Although these resolutions granted Kashmiris the right, they have yet to receive it. Even though Kashmir is a long-standing issue, those with wisdom and vision assert that it is a matter of self-determination and the inherent right of Kashmiris to live freely and independently. Khurshid Mahmood and Kasuri (2013), 144. Neither basic material nor a region of exceptional geopolitical importance is cited as reasons for this query. One might look for the origins of this problem in the several originations about this area. In India, popular patriotism was the main focus. Hasan Askari and Rizvi (1993, 19). Thus, to demonstrate its secularism, it was necessary to include Kashmir, primarily the Muslim state. India accentuated secularism without reservation, arguing that a Muslim-majority group could thrive within the given constraints. Its founders discussed that without its inclusion, the nation is still insufficient.

(Ganguly, 2006,17).

The state's citizens have long enjoyed freedom, and even the previous ruler once declared that Kashmir is a fundamental issue. Another editorial editor, Singh, Dr. Karan (May 2000), has stated his opinions: It is a contentious territory that will be stabilized and tended to as soon as time permits. It has become a nuclear hot spot. I uphold the rights of the broader public. (Ved Bhasin, Editor, Greater Kashmir, May 12, 2002)

Kashmir has become a regional and global flashpoint due to a localised race for faster weaponry (BBC News, 7 August 2012). The stakes in the region have significantly increased since both hostile states declared their intention to become nuclear powers. While the general populace of Kashmir has ultimately rebelled against the status quo and is engaged in a guerrilla war against the Indian government for their rights, Pakistan and India remain unaffected and maintain their traditional stances on the matter (Ahmed, Mushtaq, 1995, 80). It is the perfect chance for everyone involved to look for feasible options to decide the matter under international justice norms.

(Shahid M. Amin, April 2003, 29)

Strategic and Economic Importance of Kashmir for Pakistan

Kashmir has long been seen as an essential component of Pakistan. Strong ethnic, social, geographic, and economic ties have also been established (Amin, Shahid M.2003, 38). Pakistan views Kashmir as an unresolved issue from the partition plan. Norman Brown (1972, 45). Kashmir is the only important country in the two-nation theory, and the Muslim League expressed interest in another nation (Bhutto Z.A. 1969,145). The creation of Pakistan following the partition of India is still "on a very rudimentary level deficient," according to Pakistani ideology. (Basrur, 2008,67).

The ideological elements of Kashmir were also crucial to Pakistan; for instance, Jinnah's interest in a separate Muslim nation was founded on the two-nation idea (Malik, Iffat, 2002, 267). "Kashmir's agreement was not just a question of desirability but had importance for our separate survival," General Akbar Khan stated. (Akber, Khan, n.d. 10) "The contention is as much as the conflict between characters, imaginations, and history as it is a conflict over domain resource and people," we may assume when succinct the enormity. (Shariff-al and Mujahid, 1964, 43) The Indian ground forces in Southern Kashmir, according to Pakistan,

threaten the Shakergarh area and, more importantly, the Grand Trunk Street that links Lahore and Islamabad (Wrising, Robert G., 1994,86). In this context, Pakistani authorities started to believe that without Kashmir, Pakistan would not be able to protect itself from an incompetent Indian government. India's military presence in Kashmir strategically stretches Pakistan's very wide boundaries and isolates it from the source of its vital waterways. (Ahmed, Iqbal, 1996, 22). The military establishment in Pakistan believes that incorporating Kashmir into Pakistan would give it a crucial significance that it does not already possess (Khan, Sardar Abdul Qayyum, 1990, 47). The majority of India remains outside the range of Pakistani aircraft, but the entirety of Pakistan is defenceless against Indian air strikes. Kashmir's strategic location, bordered by China and Russia to the west and the Indian subcontinent to the south, significantly enhances its importance for Pakistan. (Schafiled, Victoria,2000,225).

In this regard, Pakistan's existence is given the stability that its four provinces lack thanks to the strategically located Kashmir and Northern domains (Khan, Ishtiaq Ahmed, Rabia, Miss. 1999, 77). Both India and Pakistan place a high value on Kashmir's economic significance. Why Kashmir "had various connections to Pakistan's region" is explained by Mahnaz Ispahni. Since its waters and waterway, as well as its willow and pitch, are used in the Pakistani industry, its detachment has meant financial disruption. (Mahnaz Ispahni, 1989, 184). In terms of the economy, Kashmir is vital to Pakistan's needs since it produces lumber and houses the Indus, Jhelum, and Chenab waterways, which flow into Pakistan from the Kashmir region and are vital for the growth of agriculture. These rivers have the limit to be a major source of hydroelectric power for the country. Michael Brecher (1982, 45). India had an interest in building a vessel for water. (Farah Zahra, July 29, 2011) Asif Ali Zardari expressed concerns that the construction of dams on streams may lead to adverse long-term effects on the states involved. (Editorial), 2011, July 11).

Kashmir is so crucial to Pakistan that it forms the cornerstone of its policies, and all of its governments have maintained that the Security Council's resolutions are the only way to resolve the conflict. The Pakistani government has also made every effort to settle this conflict. (Salahuddin Ahmed,2005,54) As a result, Kashmir was seen as a potential hot spot between India and Pakistan in the latter years of the 1990s. As President Clinton had previously stated, the problem has escalated into a nuclear flashpoint, making Kashmir the world's most dangerous location. (Khan, Amanullah, 2000, 12). Pakistan denied all of India's affirmations at the UNSC, alleging illegal actions in assisting the Kashmiris. Additionally, it relied on and expressed extortion; cruelty in this way was invisible (Ali, 1973, 88). A limited number of issues within the division have proven particularly challenging and hazardous. (Ganguly, 2007, 45).

Indian Point of View

Kashmir became heavily engaged and frequently articulated the belief that Indian culture could adapt to and fit various societal events. Kashmir was notable for accenting this logical self-perception, especially given that its populace was Muslim. (Amin, 2000, 213). The Muslim-dominant part of Kashmir was huge and had enormous significance for India because of its location. (Malik, 2002, 67). The religious pioneers in double religious frameworks have an impression on over a thousand groups. (Das, 2006, 98). It is challenging to create a cohesive image of India under these circumstances, particularly with the prevalence of violence within the same group. States operating under the majority rule system in India have regularly been damaged by traditional and real-life abuses such as violence motivated by religion, rank, or tribe, as well as financial abuse and financial aid. (Basrur, 2008, 56). Since Kashmir was the founder state's hereditary state, India showed interest and eagerness in the region. Nehru demonstrated his desire to rule over Kashmir. The commitment to acquire this region is usually backed by progressive media.. This idea was rationally motivated by its enormity. (Saleem Arshi and Hashmi, 2003, 151). Kashmir's primary significance increased after 1947 because of

its interconnected threats. the portion of Kashmir that the country could firmly control. In terms of money, the production of timber, and prominent waterways contributed to the financial ties between regions, which later became distinguished areas of division. (Malik, 2002, 25).

Internal Politics of India and Pakistan over Kashmir

Pakistan has undoubtedly always backed the cause of Kashmir. Nonetheless, Pakistan's stance on Kashmir has also become more antiquated due to internal political considerations. Pakistan's two main political parties, the Pakistan Muslim League (PML) and the PPP have competed with one another to impose strict policies on Kashmir in an attempt to increase their support among the populace. In a similar vein, the Jamat-e-Islami has always been at the forefront of inciting enmity against India and stoking tensions with Kashmir. Furthermore, in such a hazardous situation, Pakistan's army, which has significant governmental power, has consistently maintained a hard-line stance toward India. (Shahid M. Amin, 2000,166-67).

Similar to Pakistan, India's political parties have been taking an extreme stand on Kashmir in their domestic affairs. For the first thirty years following independence, the Congress party held sway, and it was the time when the Kashmir dispute began. Congress was in power when the two wars between India and Pakistan were fought. Whenever Prime Minister Indra Gandhi and her son Rajiv sought to boost their popularity in India, they would routinely incite war fear against Pakistan. Their trump card was their approach toward Pakistan other political parties are not far behind, demonstrating a competitive and engaged political landscape. The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), a Hindu fundamentalist party, has gained popularity due to its hostile stance against Pakistan. Relations between India and Pakistan became extremely strained when the BJP took power in 1998, especially after carrying out nuclear explosions. Bilateral relations between India and Pakistan are severely strained as a result of the two nations' emotionally charged and inflexible stances that have been established over the past many decades. The impasse over the Kashmir problem is the main source of this heated scenario. (Shahid M. Amin, op cit,167)

Bilateral Efforts

Almost immediately after the Kashmir issue arose, bilateral efforts to resolve it began. The meeting between Lord Mountbatten and Quaid-e-Azam was the first and most significant attempt. Quaid talked about the problem. "That the two Governor Generals ask the opposing forces to declare a cease-fire, departure of all alien forces, and that the two Governor Generals after taking over the government for the arrangement of the plebiscite" were the three recommendations made during this conference (Nawa-e-Waqt, 2013, October, 24). A meeting was planned on Pakistan's initiative, but it was cancelled due to Nehru's illness (diplomatic or actual?) (The World Today,1998,20-21).

The first unsuccessful meeting between the premiers of the two nations took place in London in June 1953, following the Commonwealth meeting. "The matter should be resolved amicably in both states by both nations." The only way to resolve this issue is to postpone a vote in this field (Ahmed Shujja Pasha, op. cit., 264). Pakistan's negotiations with the US during this time significantly altered India's strategy. Addressing the "Lok Sabha" in December 1953, Nehru proposed an unacceptable deal, stating that "India is not bound to the agreement in the joint communique as the decision has changed the whole context of the Kashmir issue." (Ibid).

India was actively looking for a reason to put the matter on hold. After the Sino-Indian border clash in 1962, India agreed to hold talks with Pakistan on the Kashmir dispute after nine years of no meaningful contact. In 1963, foreign ministers Sardar Sawarn Singh and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto held six rounds of these talks prompted by Western pressure. However, these discussions were also fruitless. Despite this, President Ayub Khan stated that he was willing to look at alternatives to a vote. (Opcit, 21; The World Today). According to the New York Times, the negotiations broke down because "India failed to indicate its desire to come to any proper solution (Shahid M. Amin, 200024)

The Simla Agreement, which was signed in 1972 as part of the fourth round of bilateral discussions following this high-level contact, was based on the principle that both nations would resolve their differences through bilateral ties (The World Today, Opcit, 21). It was believed that the normalization of ties would make some headway after the Simla Agreement was signed. Unfortunately, it didn't happen because the Kashmir issue didn't get any better. While India came out with the view that the Simla Agreement had resolved the Kashmir issue, Pakistan pushed to find a solution to this issue, such an interpretation was rejected by Pakistan. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto stated that Pakistan "remained committed to the Kashmiris' right to self-determination." Mr. Bhutto During his November 1973 visit to Azad Kashmir, Mr. Bhutto made this statement and added that he firmly believed that Pakistan and Kashmir were one and inseparable. (The Journal of Political Science, Opcit,28)

There hasn't been any meaningful and serious dialogue between India and Pakistan since the signing of the Simla Agreement. The 1990s Kashmir independence movement was the catalyst for the issue's resurgence. In January 1990, I.K. Gujral and General Muhammad Ayub Khan met at the level of a foreign secretary in Islamabad to discuss the Kashmir dispute. Since then, secretaries have met four times: in Delhi in April 1997, in Islamabad in January 1994, in Islamabad in June 1997, and in Colombo in July 1998 (The World Today, Opcit, 28). India never really sought to find a solution to this issue, therefore these negotiations ended without an agreement. As a result, the nuclear testing and the Kargil dispute prompted the tense situation between India and Pakistan near the end of the 20th century.

Kashmir after Nuclearization

Five nuclear tests conducted by India on May 11, 1998, revealed the country's aggressive plans and showed its complete disregard for accepted international standards. "These nuclear explosions demonstrate India's intention to demonstrate her power not only in South Asia but also globally." (Akram Zaki, 1999, 78). For this reason, following these tests, India began to threaten, refuse to engage in negotiation, and avoid discussing peace. To humiliate Pakistan in front of the world, it also said that it was prepared to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Additionally, it vowed to seize Azad Kashmir, which is under Pakistani administration. "It is for Pakistan to turn the page of its anti-Indian policy, especially the one related to Kashmir," stated Indian Minister Lal Krishna Advani. "If not, our government will take a firm stand." "We cannot afford any intervention from Pakistan in Kashmir's affairs," stated Madan Lal Khurana, the Indian Minister for Parliamentary Affairs. The initial result of India's nuclear testing was these declarations. India and Pakistan now have a strategic imbalance as a result of these tests. (Monthly Press Review,1998,42)

Pakistan carried out its six nuclear tests on May 28 and 30, 1998, in response to hostile Indian policy and to preserve the balance of power. The majority of the analysts declared that the strategic equilibrium had been reached following this reaction to India's hegemonic status. Following these tests, the Indian belief that Pakistan has not been treated equally since 1971 was shown to be false. (Zaki, Opcit, and Akram) The biggest benefit of these blasts was that the Kashmir problem became internationalized in all its ferocity and lost its regional focus. India and Pakistan are receiving a lot of attention from the world right now, especially because of their conflict over Kashmir. (October 16, 1998, 19) The Voice In this regard, India's menacing tone shifted. The Prime Minister of India declared, "We will not do anything detrimental to Pakistan. It has nothing to be afraid of in India. We are prepared to have a conversation. The international community is prepared to support and actively participate in these initiatives (Press Review, Opcit, 34). The urgency of the issue has increased to the point that should they be unable to address it bilaterally, the US will offer suggestions. (Press Review, Opcit,49-50).

The world community is therefore certain that the Kashmir dispute might lead to a nuclear war that would wipe out South Asia and the entire planet, and the resolution of the conflict has taken on a sense of urgency never previously experienced since the subcontinent became nuclearized. From Clinton to Nelson Mandela, everyone is eager for this issue to be resolved for the sake of regional peace and security. Vajpayee visited Pakistan in response to the nuclear blasts, and the two nations signed the Lahore Declaration. "Both countries pledge to take immediate steps to reduce nuclear risk, to provide advance information of missile tests, and to implement Simla Agreement," the joint declaration states. (The News, Feb 22, 1999) Both premiers Nawaz Sharif and Vajpayee emphasized the value of conversation as a solution to the issues on this occasion. While discussing the rights of Kashmiris, Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif underlined their acceptance and asked India to compete in the economic race rather than the military one. He added that the Kashmir dispute is the main source of contention between the two nations and that no other topic is likely to advance without a discussion on it. (Editorial, Daily Pakistan, February 22, 1999) In response, the Indian PM stated that we are in favour of candid discussions on contentious matters, such as Jammu and Kashmir. "They didn't want to leave a legacy of problems for future generations," he said. There is a lot of unfinished business. In conflicts and animosity, a lot is undone. We must now move on and look to the future. (Ibid). It is no doubt that Lahore Declaration came to be generally understood as a positive step towards the solution to the Kashmir impasse but Vajpayee's statement on March 2, 1999, that "Pakistan should note it down that neither India was going to abdicate from any of its territories nor did we give our land to any neighbouring country, (Daily Nawa-i-Waqt, March 3, 1999) and then Agni II ballistic missile test by India was a clear violation of Lahore Declaration. Despite Lahore Declaration India seemed non-serious in resolving disputes through bilateral dialogues. But India had better keep in mind that a prolonged occupation of Jammu and Kashmir is difficult to sustain for long". The occupation of Kargil by Mujahideen was the proof, and then the world realized how far the Kashmiris had gone for their rights. The Kargil issue has locked both states in the den of the holocaust. But Pakistan saved South Asia from destruction through the Washington Accord; and Nawaz Sharif has proved that Pakistan is a peace-loving country that wants the resolution of this dispute in accordance to the desires of Kashmiris, the principles of peace, justice, and equity. Thus, Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif employed not impulsive - emotions but experienced wisdom that stopped the way to nuclear confrontation (Qureshi, Altaf Hussain, July 17, 1999) and he as a repercussion, even had to face the political music of his decision as well. The speech of Pakistan's prime minister on 14th July 1999, had a significant place in understanding the Kashmir issue in the context of the Kargil dispute as under:

The "Mujahideen's" Kargil operation has brought the Kashmir dispute directly to the capitals of powerful nations. They now need to understand that, as the history of this process has shown, this problem cannot be settled through bilateral discussions. It would be a blatant violation of international peace, justice, equity, and human rights to watch an act of defiance by India. When it discusses the issue of Kashmir, the UN resolutions are crucial. The fight for self-determination has its roots in these resolutions. According to UN resolutions, it is now the responsibility of the international community to contribute appropriately to the settlement of this issue. Friendly relations between India and Pakistan will only exist in theory until and unless the issue is resolved; and the world's peace will be continuously imperilled, in addition to the peace in South Asia. Permanent peace in the entire region would be possible if the international community assisted in resolving the Kashmir conflict." (Ibid)

Kashmir at the United Nations

Due in large part to the UN's lack of reaction, Pakistan's attempts to bring up the Kashmir problem on the international community's platform have only partially succeeded. The Security

Council last addressed the Kashmir issue in 1964, when it was unable to even reach a consensus on a new resolution and the meeting adjourned without a resolution. (Shahid M. Amin, 2000, 240) Because the majority of the world body has not been present to repeat the United Nations resolution on Kashmir, the most recent of which was enacted in 1957. Therefore, Pakistan's attempts to bring up the Kashmir problem in UN forums in the 1990s and the first ten years of the 20th century, the period under consideration, were unsuccessful.

Kashmir as a Regional Issue

Through collaborative efforts, regional organizations aim to strengthen a region's economic and social standing. Additionally, they support the states' ascent to independence, thereby renouncing their lengthy history of hostility and danger. (Hamid H. Kizilbash, 1984, 285) The European Union strengthened state economies and facilitated coordination among European nations. Following the recommendation, these nations joined to preserve the distinctive identity of the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC). The concept fostered collaboration. Zia-ur-Rehman viewed local participation as having the capacity to maintain peace if it were carried out with a certain level of integrity by all participants, which would reduce the political benefits and provide financial advancement.

(Hameed, A. K. Rai, 1989, 882).

Zia-ur-Rehman was overthrown, Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was also assassinated, and the idea of bringing the states closer to their functional framework and course of action at the primary level was implemented, resulting in significant advances in the residential power structure. In any event, a conversation was joined by the principal gathering of heads of state and the established time of state pioneers. After four and a half years of planning, SAARC was finally established. The deliberations were decided to continue at the ninth summit, which took place in Male. Tehmina and Mehmood (2000), 19–21. These conversations produced no results. On May 11 and 28, 1998, the two nations conducted nuclear tests in the interim. These states implemented their programs for a variety of reasons. India announced its plan to compare China and was cautious about working with Pakistan and keeping the regional conflict in check (The News, 1999)

A casual joint meeting of the leaders side-lined and obtained incredible importance. In any case, the summit proceeded with its usual business (The Nation, February 23, 1999). Similarly, an action finishes up an agreement. It was considered to talk about contention under the sponsorship of SAARC (Riffat Hussain, 2000, 40) it was Pakistan's viewpoint to discuss the Kashmir dispute especially and it was possible through talks and it was a proper platform to raise the voice of Kashmiris. The Lahore Meeting was the first meeting of two heads (Prakash Chander 2003, 70) and the first bilateral summit in the post-nuclearization era (New York Times, 12 August 1999). Both states repeated to determine the problem through peaceful measures. Islamabad's perspective was distinctive; whatever was gained in different sections regarding normal relations not the perpetual main problem of Kashmir was resolved (Suman Sharma, op cit., 153).

Pakistan confronted the Kargil problem and the US was involved in this issue to deal with this problem. Occupying the Kargil region, the main cause of the Pakistan army was to underestimate India and by entering the forces in the valley, it would be possible to convince India for the settlement of the Kashmir problem. But unfortunately, the US is involved in this issue. In May, while accommodating the welcome of President Musharraf to India it didn't make the desirable results and Summit was taken as a disappointment. After the attacks of September 11, 2001, the security sensitivities expanded in the area. (The News, 16, 2001), which got worst circumstances and troops of both states faced a deadlock until October 2002 (Khalid, Ms. Irum, 2005, 91).

The stress of these two states postponed the Summit. The eleventh Summit was planned to be held in Nepal in the second half of 1999 yet delayed the consequence of the Kargil

struggle. Furthermore, affirming its convenience. The state has participated in the Summit and needs their support on a settled date and if any state is not confirmed. India moreover indicated impoliteness and occasions prompting to delay of the eleventh Summit. Security contemplations couldn't be disregarded during cooperation. The eleventh SAARC Conference was delayed due to the strained relationship between India and Pakistan and at last held on the sixth of January, 2002 at Katmandu (Nepal) (Jang, 18 January 2004)

This conference was held in a bitter situation so that could not get fruits as were expected. The 12th SAARC Summit gave the stage to both states to begin exchange for settling the dispute. (Jang, January 23, 2004) To stay occupied with a procedure in the long run prompts to serene arrangement of the Kashmir dispute as indicated by the desires of Kashmiri individuals (Hussain Mushahid, March 4, 2003, 63). Though the twelfth Summit was led at Islamabad (Ali, Mayed, and Abbas Ansari, January 7, 2004). The 12th Summit gave a chance to improve bilateral relations. (Express Tribune, November 24, 2013).

India is also motivated by political and financial suggestions. The summit formed stopped the sponsoring of terrorism (Jang, January 23, 2004). Leaders guarantee loyalty to financial success and solidity. It was stressed that SAFTA would "make sure reasonable sharing of benefits of trade" (The News, October 19, 2005). Common reports stressed affairs of controversial problems. (The News, October 4, 2006). Consistently in the SAARC Summit, the same responsibilities between India and Pakistan are talked about yet next to no have been executed. Trusts were moreover high in the seventeenth SAARC Summit in November 2011 in Maldives. The statement gave importance to trust and it is the need of the hour of mutual understanding and flexibility in relations. (Jang, April 15, 2007).

Role of Muslim Countries

The issue of Kashmir affects not just Pakistan but all Muslim nations collectively. Every Muslim nation has backed Kashmiris' right to self-determination. The Muslim nations have shown significant support for the Kashmir liberation struggle, particularly in the last ten years. The Kashmir issue was given a lot of weight in the four Islamic summit conferences that took place during this time, which increased the Islamic world's pressure on India. Numerous Organization of the Islamic Conference meetings have a close examination of the Kashmir issue, which serves as a reminder for the region's resolution. Subsequently, Pakistan triumphed once more in gaining admittance to a highly publicized human rights violation.

This was a financial and tangible meeting. It acquired a timeframe's quality. Without the greatest resources and assistance on the highest level, significant fights cannot be fought. It must properly classify and, in particular, collect accurate and practical data. Every effort and development of Kashmiris' legal rights led to the advancement of this understanding. Raj Kamla (2006), 109. This endeavour and the organizations' response were crucial (The News, Aug 31, 2000).

The Kashmir freedom movement and Palestine were honoured at the OIC's sixth session, which was held in Dakar, Senegal, in December 1991. This meeting was in favour of Kashmir's determination. The resolutions also condemned the human rights violations that were carried out. During this session, the right to self-determination was affirmed as a birthright. It also called for a speedy and peaceful resolution to the Kashmir dispute. (Daily Jang, December 20, 1997).

In one of its pronouncements, the seventh OIC summit, which took place in Casablanca, Morocco, on December 13 and 14, 1994, called for adherence to UN resolutions. The Indian argument that UN resolutions are no longer relevant was refuted during this session (Ibid) The eighth summit took place in Tehran between December 9 and December 11, 1997. In addition

to supporting the Kashmir cause, Muhammad Safi, the All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC) representative, was granted the opportunity to speak at this summit for the first time on the final day of the Tehran Conference. He spoke in favour of Kashmir's right to self-determination despite Indian atrocities. (The Weekly Nada-e-Millat, December 24, 1997). According to Ahmed and Sultan (1999,9) pioneers "criticized unfortunately moved toward member state for essential influences." Additionally, according to The Hindu on Saturday, October 18, 2003, the resolution mandated that "the all-inclusive community of Kashmir practice their right of self-determination." This has been rejected by India. India rejects the Kashmir OIC report. (Express News, 17 March 2008). On the occasion of Pakistan's Golden Jubilee, an extraordinary session of the OIC was convened to demonstrate solidarity with the Islamic Ummah. The way the assembly discussed the matter disproved all of India's assertions about Kashmir. The Pakistani president insisted that the Muslim Ummah is to blame for the Kashmir issue. The Muslim world has a responsibility to secure Kashmiri Muslims' right to self-determination, according to Prime Minister Muhammad Nawaz Sharif. In his statement, Iranian President Ali Akbar Hashmi Rafsanjani claimed that Muslim nations could work together to fix this issue and that if pressure was applied from a moral and diplomatic standpoint to trade, it would immediately have a beneficial effect. The Islamabad declaration recognized Kashmiris' right to self-determination, denounced India's infringement, and backed a just solution for the region. (Burki, Shahid Javed .1999,89)

The tenth OIC Summit took place in Malaysia, and Portugal, and had a hopeful communiqué that explicitly and prominently addressed the Kashmir issue in addition to Iraq. India's tyranny and stubbornness against Kashmiris without their butts were denounced by the Muslim world. (October 19, 2003, Jang). This conference was likened to the second summit of Lahore, which took place in 1974 and was thought to be more successful and effective than many previous summits. Muslim leaders such as Mahathir Muhammad, General Pervez Musharraf, and Saudi Crown Prime Minister Abdullah had a significant and noticeable influence. With a population of over a billion, the Muslims were not as effective as the Jews, who had a smaller number, but Mahathir Muhammad shook them to unity during this conference. The purpose of this comment was to agitate the Muslims, not to disparage Jews. (Haqani, Arshad Haqani,2003,4)

On the eve of the Umrah performance, President General Pervaiz Musharraf brought up the Kashmir issue forcefully during an unexpected OIC Summit in Makkah in December 2007. He claimed that Ummah leaders should understand the urgent necessity to address the Kashmiris' issue in their fight for their rights. (Pakistan pictorial, Directorate General of films and Publications, Sep-Dec,2008)

The Policy of the US, Russia and China towards Kashmir

The development of relations between the states has always been based on each state's national interests. The United States has interests as well. Supporting the UNO decisions on Kashmir and other permanent UN measures in 1948 was in the US's best interests as a nation. The leadership of Pakistan had anticipated the same course of action on the US post as it had in 1948. Given that India and Pakistan are now both South Asian nuclear powers, the US's intervention to resolve the Kashmir dispute can be seen as more important than ever.

From a Pakistani perspective, such reasons are significant, but US interests and current global political realities diverge. According to the US, her policy over Kashmir has remained unchanged from its initial adoption. On the other hand, it indicates that Kashmir is an issue between India and Pakistan that could be resolved through bilateral negotiations. (Khan, Dr. Rashid Ahmed.October,24.2013, Roznama Dunya.)

The question of when and where both countries will take any significant actions hinges entirely on the decisions and leadership of their respective governments. As for the United States, it has no plans to involve itself in this issue and does not aspire to take on the role of mediator in the unfolding situation. The U.S. remains focused on its interests

and is opting to maintain a hands-off approach for the time being. However, if both Pakistan and India jointly show their willingness then the US could provide help for a peaceful solution to the Kashmir issue. This policy of the US over Kashmir depicts that like other countries of the world, the US has not agreed with the Indian stance and viewed this dispute between Pakistan and India which still has to be finally settled. The US has been stressing both countries indirectly not only to resolve this issue but also to consider peace and cooperation between the two states which is imperative for peace and stability. The solution to this is envisaged only in bilateral talks. The peace processes the example, were started with secret initiatives including the US, China, Russia, the UK and the European Union. The US also played a key role in bringing Pakistan and India to the dialogue table in 1997, during the second term of Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif. So, the policy on Kashmir in bilateral dialogues between the two countries for solutions is acceptable for both countries and Kashmiris as well. (Khan, Dr. Rashid Ahmed, 1996, 3) Pakistan during the entire Cold War time expressed that Kashmiris must be given a chance to choose their fate themselves as indicated by UN resolutions (The News. December 13, 2002). India views it as its territorial problem. (Ganguly, 1986, 64-67; Naidu, 2005, 7)

The United States made every effort to get the UN resolutions on Kashmir passed. It was believed that the US offered the plebiscite option, and without US approval, it could not become the ultimate decision. (Meenu, Roy, 2010, 57) Kashmiris may be able to select their destiny thanks to these resolutions. Hussain (2006, 36) India had a two-pronged stance on the Kashmir dispute. It expressed its belief that Kashmiris should decide this issue in a free and impartial plebiscite. (Brogan, Patrick 1988, 76).

Over time, however, Indian pioneers declared Kashmir to be a part of India. Another measure that united the populace was implemented in India in 1957. They want to preserve their disposition as a result of the protracted struggle for self-determination. Unfortunately, the Kashmiri freedom fighters' anti-Hindu sentiment has grown as a result of the Indian government's excessive military actions. Ibrahim Hassan Askari Rizvi. October 8, 2004, 20. Washington suggested including Kashmir in their negotiation strategy. This new U.S. policy is welcomed in India. Fair engagement between India and Pakistan was portrayed as being very important in this approach (Ejaz, Ahmad 1998, 20). In any event, India went forward with her illegal large portion and refused to let Kashmiris make their own decisions. India moved forward in the domain with extreme secrecy. The Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) held incredibly noticeable meetings to bolster the self-government stance, and Indian producers were able to understand the problem and force Kashmiri youth to fight for their rights (CNN, September 26, 2010).

(Sattar Abdul, 2013, 33)

They didn't take in lessons from the repercussions of these wars. To ascertain various aspects of their dispute, the two states have met in large numbers and made several fruitless attempts. The readiness indicator shows how the conflict between India and Pakistan is progressing. Since the minute has come, no fewer cases have been understood. (September 28, 2013; Jang). The US has consistently emphasized that both nations should resolve their differences amicably and bilaterally. After weighing the costs and benefits of these initiatives, India and Pakistan took action. Both states are aware that their two-sided conflicts must be resolved. In any event, it was unable to reach a long-term or permanent resolution to their dispute.

(Chandran Suba and Rizwan Zeb, 2005, 21).

For several reasons, including the fact that conflicting conditions can increase the likelihood of an encounter and that a showdown will affect the course of an ongoing effort to combat terrorism, the international community and major powers (particularly the United States) are particularly concerned with reducing tensions between India and Pakistan. (Dixit, 2004, 78).

For a lasting peace, resolve is necessary. India was granted the Most Favourite Nation (MFN) designation by Pakistan towards the end of 2011. (Adnan Mubeen,2013,133)

After a two-year lag between India-Pakistan negotiations, the public exhibition in India in February 2012 and the current exchange conference "Dividends" in Pakistan are a respectable start. According to The Nation, April 1, 2005. Due to its stance and India's complete desire for the handling of cross-border terrorism, the Agra Summit did not produce positive results (Khalid, Ms. Irum, 2005, 93). These states ought to prepare and stay in a procedure for year-to-year premise then it would create the arrangement of the Kashmir issue (Gauhar Hamayun, 2004, 24). According to both sides' diplomats, 2007 might be a "watershed" in this conflict (The News, March 15, 2007). The US has consistently urged Pakistan and India to have bilateral discussions and emphasized that both countries should settle any disputes.

including Kashmir and Jammu. Russia's approach to Kashmir is to let India and Pakistan resolve their differences on their own. Russia backed its idea of resolving the dispute as well. The USSR claimed that these defense agreements were against Pakistan and all communist nations when it joined CENTO and SEATO. (The Statesman, May 13, 1955, New Delhi)

When in August 1956, Pakistan's Parliamentary delegation visited the Soviet Union and it had not fully committed to the Indian viewpoint on the Kashmir conflict that the main issue of the Soviet leaders that the membership of Pakistan with the United States. (Dawn, August 10, 1956, Karachi). On 18 February 1957, the Soviet representative, Arkady Sobolev suggested that holding a plebiscite without any other interference could sharpen the conflict and this complicated issue should be resolved under the Charter of the UN and the UN forces could only restore peace and harmony in the Indian Kashmir. Since the amendments proposed by the Soviets were not made in the draft resolution of 14th February 1957, the Soviet Union vetoed it. It was the first Soviet veto on Kashmir. It looks like the Soviet Union felt insecurity in the region. (Dawn, February 20, 1957, Karachi) The debate in the Security Council opened on 3 February 1964 and dragged on till 18 May 1964. Both the superpowers the USA and the USSR, wished to avoid a showdown on Kashmir. (Dawn, May 19, 1964, Karachi. Meeting of Security Council,1964). An Indian analyst appreciated the Soviet stand on Kashmir that the Soviet Union always supported the Indian stance that the conflict of Kashmir is an internal issue of India and there is no need for interference from any country and it is the fact that the US always pressurise Pakistan not to interfere in Jammu and Kashmir. (The Times of India, May 25, 1990).

In December 2002, the Russian president travelled to India. In a press conference in Delhi, he accused Pakistan of aiding jihadist organizations in Jammu and Kashmir and demanded that it prevent freedom fighters from infiltrating across the Kashmiri border. Additionally, Pakistan was aiding terrorism, and it ought to destroy the terrorist infrastructure in Pakistan and Pakistan-occupied Kashmir (Chandigarh Tribune, December 13, 2002). In 2004, Russian foreign policy prioritized resolving their relationship, according to Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov. He refuted Moscow's assertion that it has hope and recommended that India and Pakistan cooperate to eradicate terrorism in the area. He emphasized that a new path to peace and prosperity in the area would be made possible if Pakistan and India settled the Kashmir dispute under the Shimla and Lahore Declaration. (The Hindu, Delhi, February 14, 2004).

China believes that India and Pakistan are at odds over Kashmir. As usual, China maintained its neutral stance, suggested bilateral negotiations, and settled all of its disputes, including those involving Jammu and Kashmir. When China's premier visited Ceylon in 1957, the prime ministers of China and Ceylon jointly declared that both countries should settle the dispute amicably. J. Corbel (1966, 331). Zhou Enlai, the prime minister of China, referred to Pakistan in 1964 and declared China's support for a settlement of the Kashmir problem. (K. Arif, ed., 1980, 47) China-backed a policy of moderation on the side of India and Pakistan in the late

1990s and encouraged communication between them to develop a solution to the Kashmir issue that would be acceptable to both parties. In April 1994, China's envoy to India stated in Calcutta that Pakistan and India should resolve all of their differences amicably and refrain from using international mediation in this dispute. (Fazal-ur Rehman, 1998, 67). Because Pakistan consistently backed UN Security Council resolutions, China has consistently backed Pakistan's position on the Kashmir dispute. (Dec. 10, 1956, Dawn, Karachi). China has consistently advocated for the resolution of disputes between two states, such as those between India and Pakistan. The conflict in Kashmir has become nuclearized due to the South Asian region's nuclearization. There is no closer resolution to the Kashmir dispute, and there have been several tensions, disputes, and battles between the two states.

(Amin, Shahid Muhammad. 2000,211)

However, China's policy on Kashmir has varied from time to time. The Chinese leaders remained neutral when Pakistan joined the Western pacts. Chinese Foreign Minister Jan Tiaxuan arrived in Islamabad on 14th May 2002 on a two-day visit and held talks with Pakistani Foreign Minister Abdul Sattar. He also met with President Musharraf and assured him of full contribution and coordination for the resolution of the Kashmir conflict. (Dawn, Islamabad, May 28, 2002) The Chinese Foreign Office spokesman Liu Jianchao on 5th June 2002 told the newsmen that China supports third-party mediation for resolving the Indo-Pak dispute. He appreciates the offer of mediation made by Russian President Vladimir Putin. He hoped that the Russian President would play a vital and positive role in ending the ongoing hostility between the two states. (The Nation. Islamabad, June 7, 2002). China always supported the view that the Kashmir dispute should be settled but India rejected its point and described that Kashmir is its integral part. On the other hand, China and Pakistan consider Kashmir as a disputed territory. Presently there is an acknowledgement in India by numerous scholars, pioneers, human rights groups and the press who have understood the harmful strategy of staying on the warpath with Pakistan.

For a long time, India couldn't win over Kashmiris. Why 700,000 in number armed forces couldn't suppress a well-known movement of Kashmiris? (Khan, Amanullah, 2000, 13) Why ought to India request that America "Do MORE" to stop the invasion? (Khan, Brig (Retd) Muhammad Shafi, 2003, 55) India is confronted with a well-known Independence Movement. Since the beginning of the Cold War, the United States has impacted South Asian political and security decisions. It has played a significant role, particularly in stopping states from inciting conflict during the past fifteen years. Cohen, Stephen (2005), 87. All attempts, though, were temporary and limited in scope. The dispute in Kashmir has not been resolved by the United States. From a different angle, the U.S. strategy for South Asia requires reason. One reason for this is that, in light of its national interests, the United States has modified its practices and requires certain parameters. (Indian Express, March 4, 1990) It is well known that India opposes Pakistan's persistent desire for outside interference in the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. (Kanti Bajpai and Amitabh Matto, eds. 2000,8). After 9/11 when the U.S. and Pakistan started to settle relations, Pakistan requested for the U.S. to mediate the struggle.

The United States expressed its desire to get involved in the Kashmir dispute in 2001 in response to Pakistan's appeal. Schaffer, Howard B. (2001, 202) Despite this, India rejects any external involvement in the conflict. (October 15, 2001, Dawn) Given its ties to India, the United States has given both countries the authority to decide the issue through their peace process. Ryan Crocker, the U.S. foreign minister to Pakistan, observed that while the United States can help push the peace process forward to resolve the Kashmir issue, it will not get involved in it to intervene in a solution (Dawn, December 10, 2004)

On December 4, 2002, Russian President Vladimir Putin called on Pakistan to annihilate the organization of freedom fighters. (Ejaz, Dr. Ahmed, 2016,17) Despite that, Pakistan rejected

Putin's message and got some information about the killings, human rights violations, and assaults taken by India. (The Hindu, December 2, 2002). Russia views it as a piece of India. USSR considers that Pakistan's alliance with the US has changed the scenario. When Pakistan joined military pacts SEATO and CENTO it was a great threat for India that the financial and military assistance which is given to Pakistan by the US and Pakistan would use its capabilities against India. At that time USSR gave every type of support to India It considers that Pakistan is supporting terrorism. So, the Pakistani point of view is that Russia can't be a neutral third party to intervene in the Kashmir conflict. But with time Pakistan and USSR had good relations and understood the stance of Pakistan over Kashmir. USSR has changed its policy on the Kashmir conflict and now proclaimed that it is the problem of self-determination. China's declared stances evolved throughout the course of four distinct phases. Throughout the 1950s, Beijing remained neutral. (The Nation, 1951) China changed its position to publicly endorse Pakistan's viewpoint. Beijing returned to a position of non-involvement and sought to make adjustments in order to improve relations with India, while China and India proceeded to establish their separate conditions. By the middle of the 1990s, China's stance was clear that this was a bilateral problem that needed to be settled amicably. In any event, China is seen as a party to the Kashmir issue from an Indian point of view. Aksai Chin, which makes up 20% of all of Kashmir, is under Chinese sovereignty. CNN's Scratch Easen points out that although China is currently authoritatively maintaining fairness, there are personal interests involved in Kashmir. (Nick Easen.2002, May 24).

China is aware that its chances of resolving the conflict are limited by its involvement in the issue and its unique relationship with Pakistan. Likewise, China's military assistance to Pakistan is the primary factor about India. India wants China to stop exchanging missile and nuclear upgrades with Pakistan. India believes that without the offer and support of China, Pakistan is unlikely to develop its nuclear program. India must decide to view Pakistan's military prowess as indirectly due to China. China does not fit the requirements to serve as a third-party mediator to resolve the Kashmir issue, given the ties between India and China.

References

- Amin, Shahid M. (2000). *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: A Reappraisal*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Amin, Shahid M. (April 2003). A Re-Evaluation of the Kashmir Dispute, *Pakistan Horizon*, 56.
- Ahmed, Mushtaq. (1995). *Foreign Policy: Pakistan's Options, Expansionist Designs*. Karachi: Royal Book Company.
- Salahuddin Ahmed. (2005). *Foreign Policy*

- Of Pakistan. Karachi: Arshi Publishers.
- Ahmar, Dr. Moonis. (Sep 14, 2000). Middle East: Wisdom of Peace Process. The News.
- Arif, Dr. Muhammad. (2001). Pak-Bharat Taluqat(Urdu). 1947-2000. Lahore: Daru Tazkeer, Urdu Bazar.
- Ahmed, Sultan. (1999). Flames of Freedom. Special Committee of the Parliament on Kashmir. Islamabad: Parliament House.
- Ahmed, Sultan. (2006). The Kashmir Issue, At a Glance. Special Committee of the Parliament on Kashmir. Islamabad: Parliament House.
- Abdullah, Sheikh Muhammad. (1966). The Kashmir Imbroglio, Kashmir: Muslim Leaders, Special Committee of the Parliament on Kashmir. Islamabad: Parliament House
- Adnan Mubeen. (2013). Areas of Engagement and Security Threats between India and Pakistan. Journal of Political Studies, Vol.20, Issue-1. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Akhtar, Shaheen. (1995). Uprising in Indian-Held Jammu and Kashmir. Islamabad: Institute of Regional Studies.
- Ali, Chaudhry Muhammad. (1973). The Emergence of Pakistan. Pakistan Historical Society.
- Ali, Mayed and Abbas Ansari. (January 7, 2004). Indo-Pak Talks from Next Month News International.
- Arif, K. (ed.). (1980). China-Pakistan Relations: 1947-1980. Lahore: Vanguard Book Ltd.
- Afzal, Rafique. (1966). Selected Speeches and Statements of the Quid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah (1911-34 and 1947-48). Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Address to the senior officers of Armed Forces and Civil Services by Muhammad Nawaz Sharif Prime Minister of Pakistan at National Defence College, Islamabad 19 May, 1999. BBC News, 7 August 2012/Asia.
- Burki, Shahid Javed. (1999). Historical Dictionary of Pakistan. London: The Scarecrow Press.
- Bhutto Z.A. (1969). The Myth of Independence, London: Macmillan.
- Burke, S.M. (1973) Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Basrur, Rajesh M. (2008). South Asia's Cold War: Nuclear Weapons and Conflict in Comparative Perspective (Asian Security Studies). New York: Routledge.
- Behera, N.C. (May 2007). Demystifying Kashmir. Washington D.C. Brookings Institution Press.
- Bose, S. and Jalal, A. Modern South Asia: History, Culture, Political Economy, 2nd Ed. New York and London: Routledge.
- Brogan, Patrick. (1988). World Conflict. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Brown, Norman. (1972). The US and India, Pakistan, Bangladesh. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Burki, Shahid Javed. (1999). Historical Dictionary of Pakistan. London: The Scarecrow Press.
- CNN, September 26, 2010.
- Cheema, Pervaiz Iqbal. (2014). The Kashmir Dispute: Key to South Asian Peace. IPRI Journal, 14 No 1, Islamabad: National Defence University.
- Cheema, Pervaiz Iqbal. (July 6, 2003). "Musharraf's recipe for Kashmir," News International.
- Choudhry, G.W. (1968). Pakistan's Relations with India, 1947-1966. London: Pall Mall Press.
- Choudhry, Ishtiaq Ahmed & Khan. Miss Rabia. (2004). Kashmir: Its Strategic Importance for India and Pakistan. Multan: Bahauddin Zakariya University.

- Controversial Projects (Editorial). (2011, July 11). Islamabad: Dawn.
- Das, N.K. (2006). People of India and Indian Anthropology, Economic and Political Weekly. 3156-59.
- Deepak B.R. (2006). Sino-Pak Entente Cordiale and India: A Look into the Past and Future, China Report 42, no. 2.
- Daily Pakistan, editorial, Feb 22, 1999.
- Daily Nawa-i-Waqt, March 3, 1999.
- Daily Pakistan, of Altaf Hussain Qureshi on Kashmir issue and Washington Declaration, July 17, 1999.
- Dawn, 2001.
- Dixit, J. (2004). India and Regional Developments through the Prism of Indo-Pak Relations. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Ejaz, Ahmad. (1998). "Towards Normalization: India-Pakistan Peace Process 1997-1998," South Asian Affairs, Vol.3, No.3. Lahore: Centre for South Asian Studies, University of the Punjab.
- Ejaz, Dr. Ahmed. (2016). U.S. Security Policy Towards South Asia and Kashmir Dispute. Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre. University of the Punjab.
- Express News, March 17, 2008.
- Express Tribune, November 24, 2013.
- G.W. Choudhury. (1968). Pakistan's Relations with India 1947-1966. London: Pall Mall Press.
- Gauhar Hamayun. (Oct 3,2004). Remember to Ask the Beloved, The Nation
- Ganguly, S. (2007). The Roots of Religious Violence in India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. London: Routledge.
- Hashmi, Saleem Arshi. (2003). Armed Conflicts in South-Asia: Need for a Preventive Mechanism. Current Affairs Digest. Islamabad: National Defence University.
- Hashmi, Rehana Saeed. (2005). Pakistan's Foreign Policy: Challenges and Options Security Concerns of Pakistan in the Changing Geo-Strategic Environment. Issue,8. Winter. Al-Siyasa: A Journal of Politics, Society and Culture Special Conference Issues. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Hassan, K. Sarwar (ed). (1973). Documents on the Foreign Relations of Pakistan, The Kashmir Question cited in Burke S.M., Op.cit.
- Haq, General Muhammad Zia-ul. (1986). Address: National Security and Foreign Policy. Karachi: Institute of International Affairs.
- Hellmann, Donald Ed. (1976). Southern Asia: The politics of Poverty and Peace. Toronto: Lexington Books.
- Hameed, A. K. Rai, (1989). International Relations: theory and practice, Lahore: Aziz Book Depot.
- Hussain, D. N. (2006). Resolution of Kashmir Issue: A Factor for Peace and Stability in South Asia in Peace and Security in South Asia: Issue and Challenges. (P. D. Javaid, Ed.) Lahore: Pakistan Study Centre.
- Hussain Mushahid. (March 4, 2003). Needed: A Creative India Policy. Indo-Pak Relations. The Nation.
- Howard B. Schaffer. (2001) "Reconsidering the U.S. Role," The Washington Quarterly Spring, Vol. 20.
- "India Rejects U.S. Mediation with Tie Pakistan". Dawn, October 15, 2001.
- Iqbal, Imran. (2005). Post 9/11 Security Environment and India's Coercive Diplomacy. Al-Siyasa: A Journal of Politics, Society and Culture. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Indian Express, 1990, March 4.
- Indian Express, April 10, 2003.

- Jalalzai, Musa Khan. (2002). *Pakistan's Foreign Policy, Sectarian Impacts on Diplomacy*. Lahore: Khan Book Company
- Jang, January 18, 2004
- Jang, January 23, 2004
- Jang, April 15, 2007
- Jang, September 28, 2013.
- Karim, Abdul. (1996). *Kashmir: The Troubled Frontiers*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kasuri Khurshid Mahmood (2015). *Neither a Hawk nor a Dove*, Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Khan, Dr. Rashid Ahmed. (October, 24, 2013) *Kashmir and America*, Siyasi Uffaq. Roznama Dunya.
- Khalid, Ms Irum. (2005). *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: Challenges and Adjustments*. Issue VIII (Special Conference Issue). Winter-2005. *Al-Siyasa: A Journal of Politics, Society and Culture*. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Khan, Amanullah. (Aug 31, 2000). *Kashmir: A Formula for Peace in Kashmir*. The News
- Khalid, Dr. Irum. (2013). *Pakistan Foreign Policy, evolution, development and strategies*. Lahore: Peace Publications.
- Brig(Retd), Muhammad Shafi. (2003). *Indo-Pak Relations: Created Tragedy*. The Nation, Press Review.
- Kizilbash, Hamid H.(Ed). (1984). *Pakistan's Security and Foreign Policy: Regional Disparities and South Asian Cooperation*. Lahore: Progressive Publishers.
- Karnad, B. (2004). *A Strategy to Counter Pakistan Supported Terrorism*. In "Pakistan in a Changing Strategic Context". Behera, A.D. and Mathew J.C. ed. New Delhi. Knowledge World.
- Kazimi, Muhammad Reza. (1997) *Liaqat Ali Khan, His Life and Work*. Karachi: Oxford.
- Korbel, J. (1966). *Danger in Kashmir*, New Jersey, US: Princeton University Press.
- Khan, Dr Rashid Ahmed & Alqama, Dr Khawaja. (1996). *Pakistan, India and Kashmir*. *Journal of Political Science*, Vol, XIX. Lahore: Govt College.
- Khan, Amanullah, (August, 31, 2000). *Kashmir: A Formula for Peace in Kashmir*. The News.
- Khan, Dr. Rashid & Alqama, Dr. Khawaja. (1996). *Pakistan, India and Kashmir*. *Journal of Political Science*, Vol.19, No.1,2. Lahore: Deptt of Political Science, Government College.
- Kanti Bajpai and Amitabh Matto, eds. (2000). *Engaged Democracies: India-US Relations in the 21st Century* New Delhi: Har-Anand Publication Pvt. Ltd.
- Krepon, Michael. (1997). *US Perception of Pakistan's Security*," *Pakistan Horizon*, Vol. 50, No. 2. See also *The Hindu*, Delhi, May 15, 1997.
- Lamb, Alaister. (1991) *Kashmir: A Disputed Legacy, 1946-1990*, London: Oxford Books.
- Lamb, Alaister. (1995) *Incomplete Partition: The Genesis of the Kashmir Dispute 1947-48*. Herts: Oxford Books.
- Majeed, Gulshan. (2013). *South Asian Security Compulsions: A Historical Analysis of India-Pakistan Relations*. *Journal of Political Studies*, Vol.20, Issue-2. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Mufti, G.M. (1990). *Kashmir: Azadi ki Jadojehd*(Urdu). Islam-Abad: Institute of Policy Studies.
- Memorandum of the Foreign Ministry of Pakistan to the Russian Ambassador quoted in B. Muralidhar Reddy, *Pak. Resents Putins Remarks*," *The Hindu*, December 2, 2002, (Madras).

- Musssarrat, Prof.Dr. Razia. (2005). *An Analysis of Past Indo-Pakistan Nuclear Croises*. Al-Siyasa: A Journal of Politics, Society and Culture. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Musharraf, Pervez. (2006) *In the Line of Fire: a memoir*. New York: Simon and Schuster Press.
- Mehmood, Tehmina. (October 2000). SAARC and Regional Politics. *Pakistan Horizon*.
- Mahmood, Dr. Safder. (1989). *Pakistan- Tareekh-o-Siyasat*. Lahore: Jang Publishers.
- Monthly Press Review. (August,1998). Rawalpindi: Defence and Media Publications.
- Menon. V.P. (1961). *The story of the integration of Indian States*. Orient: Longman.
- Malik, I. (2002). *Kashmir Ethnic Conflict: International Dispute*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Maxwell, Neville. (1970) *India's China War*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Nixon, R. (1992). *Seize the Moment: America's Challenge in a One-Superpower World*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- New York Times, 12 August, 1999.
- Nasir Jamal. (2004). "Ambassadors Rules out US Mediation on Kashmir, Dawn, December 10, Nidaa-e-Millat Weekly, November 18-24, 2004
- Nawa-e- Waqt,2013, October,24
- Nawa-e-Waqt, October 27, 2013.
- Nick Easen. (2002, May 24). "Aksai Chin: China's Disputed Slice of Kashmir, CNN.com.
- Pervez, Muhammad Shoaib. (2013). *Security, Community in South Asia: India Pakistan*. London: Routledge Press.
- Philip, Ziegler. (1985) *Mountbatten: The Official Biography*, London: Oxford
- Prakash Chander (2003). "India and Pakistan Unending Conflict III", New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.
- Pakistan pictorial, Directorate General of films and Publications. (Sep-Dec,2005). Islamabad.
- Quoted by Abdullah, Sheikh Muhammad. (April, 1965). *Kashmir, India and Pakistan, Foreign Affairs*.
- Rahman, Mushtaqur. (1996) *Divided Kashmir*. New York: Lynne Reimer Publishers.
- Rahman, Rashed. (September 20, 2000). *Another Ceasefire? The News*.
- Roy, Meenu. (2010). *India and her sub-continent Neighbors, New Pattern of Relationships*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.
- Riffat Hussain. (2000). *Prospects for peace between India and Pakistan*, Rawalpindi: National Development and Security, Foundation for Research on International Environment.
- Rizvi, Hasan Askari. (1993). *Pakistan and Geostrategic Environment*, London: The Macmillan Press.
- Rizvi, Muhammad Hassan Askari. (October 8, 2004). *Changing the Mindset, New Beginning*. Dawn.
- Rizwan Zeb and Chandran Suba (2005). *Indo-Pak Conflicts Ripe to Resolve?* New Delhi: Manohar Publications
- Rehman, Fazal-ur. (1998). "Pakistan's Relations with China. Winter Spring. vol.XIX & XX. No.4. Islamabad: Strategic Studies.
- Salamat.Zarina. (1992). *Pakistan1947-1958. A historical review*. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.
- Sattar, Abdul. (2013). *Pakistan's foreign policy: 1947-2012*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

- Stephen Cohen. (January 2005). "The US and South Asia," The Brookings Institution. Available at: <http://www.brookings.edu/views/articles/cohens/20050101.pdf> (accessed on November 8, 2016).
- Summan Sharma. (2001). India and SAARC, New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Sisir Gupta. (1966). Kashmir: A Study in India-Pakistan Relations, New Delhi: A P H Publishing Corporation.
- The Voice, October 16,1998.
- The News, February 22,1999.
- The Nation, February 23, 1999.
- The News, Aug 31, 2000.
- The News, 16, 2001
- The News, December 13, 2002.
- The Hindu, Saturday, 18 October 2003.
- The News, February 5, 2004.
- The News,2004, September,25.
- The News,2004, November 6.
- The Nation, April 1, 2005.
- The News, October 19, 2005.
- The News on Sunday, September 24, 2006.
- The News, October 4, 2006
- The News, March 15, 2007.
- The World Today. (1998). A monthly review on national and international affairs. Lahore: Prime Publications.
- Treiff, Mr. De Eric. (1948). Special Correspondent of the New Zurcher. Selected Speeches and Statements of the Quid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah (1911-34 and 1947-48). Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Vendana, A. Ashok C. Shukla. (2004). Security in South Asia- Trends and Directions. New-Delhi: Aph Publishing Corporation.
- Weekly Nada-e-Millat, December 24, 1997. Lahore.
- Zahid, Chaudhary. (1990). Pak-Bharat Tanaza Aur Masla-i- Kashmir Ka Aghaz, Lahore: Idara Mutalaa-i- Tarikh
- Ziring, Lawrence. (1980). Pakistan: The Enigma of Political Development. Folkestone and Colorado: Dawson, Westview.
- Zaki, Akram. (June 1,1999). Senator as a guest in PTV Programm- Swarey-Saweray.
- Zahra, Farah. (2011, July 29). Sustaining the India - Pakistan Dialogue. Islamabad: Daily Times.