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**The Kashmir issue**

As long as the territory’s existence was guaranteed by the United Kingdom, the weaknesses in its structure and along its [peripheries](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/peripheries) were not of great consequence, but they became apparent after the British withdrawal from South Asia in 1947. By the terms agreed to by in india and pakistan for the partition of the Indian subcontinent, the rulers of princely states were given the right to opt for either Pakistan or India or—with certain reservations—to remain independent.Hari singh, the maharaja of Kashmir, initially believed that by delaying his decision he could maintain the independence of Kashmir, but, caught up in a train of events that included a revolution among his Muslim subjects along the western borders of the state and the intervention of Pashtun tribesmen, he signed an Instrument of Accession to the Indian union in October 1947. This was the signal for intervention both by Pakistan, which considered the state to be a natural extension of Pakistan, and by India, which intended to confirm the act of accession. Localized warfare continued during 1948 and ended, through the intercession of the united nations, in a cease-fire that took effect in January 1949. In July of that year, India and Pakistan defined a cease-fire line—the line of control—that divided the administration of the territory. Regarded at the time as a temporary expedient, the partition along that line still exists.

## **Attempts at resolution and legitimization**

Although there was a clear Muslim majority in Kashmir before the 1947 partition, and its economic, cultural, and geographic contiguity with the Muslim-majority area of the Punjab could be convincingly demonstrated, the political developments during and after the partition resulted in a division of the region. Pakistan was left with territory that, although basically Muslim in character, was thinly populated, relatively inaccessible, and economically underdeveloped. The largest Muslim group, situated in the vale of kashmir and estimated to number more than half the population of the entire

Many proposals were subsequently made to end the dispute over Kashmir, but tensions mounted between the two countries following the Chinese incursion into Ladakh in 1962, and warfare broke out between India and Pakistan in 1965. A cease-fire was established in September, followed by an agreement signed by the two sides at Tashkent (Uzbekistan) in early January 1966, in which they resolved to try to end the dispute by peaceful means. Fighting again flared up between the two in 1971 as part of the India-Pakistan war that resulted in the creation of Bangladesh. An accord signed in the Indian city of Shimla in 1972 expressed the hope that henceforth the countries in the region would be able to live in peace with each other. It was widely believed that Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, then prime minister of Pakistan, might have tacitly accepted the line of control as the de facto border, although he later denied this. After Bhutto was arrested in 1977 and executed in 1979, the Kashmir issue once again became the leading cause of conflict between India and Pakistan.

region, lay in Indian-administered territory, with its former outlets via the Jhelum valley route blocked.

A number of movements have variously sought a merger of Kashmir with Pakistan, independence for the region from both India and Pakistan, or the granting of Indian union territory status to Buddhist Ladakh. To contend with these movements, confront Pakistani forces along the cease-fire line, and support the administrative structure of Jammu and Kashmir state, the Indian union government has maintained a strong military presence there, especially since the end of the 1980s.

## **Insurgency and counterinsurgency**

Disillusioned with lack of progress through the democratic process, militant organizations began to pop up in the region in the late 1980s. Their purpose was to resist control from the Indian union government. By the early 1990s the militancy had evolved into an insurgency, and India engaged in a crackdown campaign. The rigour of the fighting died down in the mid-1990s, though occasional violence continued to take place.

The kargil area of western Ladakh has often been the site of border conflicts, including a serious incident in 1999. In May of that year Pakistan intensified artillery shelling of the Kargil sector. Meanwhile, the Indian army discovered that militants had infiltrated the Indian zone from the Pakistan side and had established positions within and west of the Kargil area. Intense fighting ensued between the infiltrators and the Indian army and lasted more than two months. The Indian army managed to reclaim most of the area on the India side of the line of control that had been occupied by the infiltrators. Hostilities finally ended when Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan gave his [assurance](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/assurance) that the infiltrators would retreat.

However, shelling across the line of control continued intermittently into the early 21st century, until a cease-fire agreement was reached in 2004. Tensions in the region subsequently diminished, and India and Pakistan sought more cordial relations in general and greater regional cooperation. Limited passenger bus service began in 2005 between Srinagar and Muzaffarabad on either side of the frontier, and, after the devastating earthquake in the region later that year, India and Pakistan allowed survivors and trucks carrying relief supplies to cross at several points along the line of control. In addition, in 2008 both countries opened cross-border trade links through the Kashmir region for the first time since the 1947 partition; trucks carrying locally produced goods and manufactures began operating between Srinagar and Muzaffarabad and between Rawalkot, Pakistan, and Punch, India.

Despite these advances, tensions have continued to erupt periodically in the region. Prolonged violent protests flared up over control of a piece of land used by Hindu pilgrims visiting the Amarnath cave shrine east of Srinagar in 2008 and again in 2010 after Indian soldiers killed three Pakistani villagers who they claimed were militants trying to infiltrate across the line of control. A subsequent investigation revealed that the soldiers had in fact lured the men to the area and murdered them in cold blood.

Another cycle of unrest began after the Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) swept elections across India in 2014. The party had won an outright majority in the national legislature and began pushing policies nationwide to promote hindutva (“Hindu-ness”). The BJP, which strongly favoured the union of Kashmir with India, had become the second largest party in the Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly and formed a unity government with the slightly larger People’s Democratic Party (PDP), whose platform centred on the implementation of self-rule in Kashmir. As the hindutva and pro-India policies of the BJP stoked the anxieties of the region’s predominantly Muslim population, Kashmir saw an uptick in unrest. The growing tensions erupted into rioting in July 2016 after the commander of an Islamic militant group was killed in an operation by Indian security forces. India’s union government, dominated by the BJP, began asserting increased control over the state as a matter of national security and launched a crackdown on militants. In late 2018 the union government dissolved the government of Jammu and Kashmir and began direct rule of the state after the BJP left the state’s unity coalition and caused its collapse.

Kashmir experienced its greatest friction in decades in February 2019. On February 14 a suicide bomber associated with a militant separatist group killed 40 members of India’s Central Reserve Police Force, the deadliest attack on Indian security forces in three decades. With a tough election cycle approaching, India’s BJP-led government faced pressure from its supporters to take forceful action. Days later India sent fighter jets across Kashmir’s line of control for the first time in five decades and later claimed to have conducted air strikes against the militant group’s largest training camp. Pakistan denied the claim, saying that the jets had struck an empty field. The next day, Pakistan shot down two Indian jets in its airspace and captured a pilot. Yet, despite the aggravation, many analysts believed that both India and Pakistan intended to avoid escalation. In the aftermath, Pakistan [implemented](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/implemented) a crackdown on militants in its country, issuing arrests, closing a large number of religious schools, and promising to update its existing laws. A few months later the BJP won a landslide victory in India’s elections, expanding its representation in the parliament’s lower chamber.

As the BJP continued along its forceful push in Jammu and Kashmir, the union government in [August](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/August) built up its military presence in the state and within days undertook action to formalize its direct control there. Exploiting a [constitutional](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/constitutional) provision that allowed the union government to [integrate](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/integrate) Jammu and Kashmir upon the approval of a no-longer-extant elected body, it suspended Jammu and Kashmir’s [autonomy](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/autonomy) and applied India’s constitution fully to the territory. It also passed legislation to downgrade the state at a later date to a union territory—thereby allowing the union government full control over its governance—and to split off the Ladakh region into a separate union territory of its own.

## **Chinese interests**

China had never accepted the British-negotiated boundary agreements in northeastern Kashmir. This remained the case following the communist takeover in China in 1949, although the new government did ask India—without success—to open negotiations regarding the border. After Chinese authority was established in Tibet and reasserted in Xinjiang Chinese forces penetrated into the northeastern parts of Ladakh. This was done mainly because it allowed them to build a military road through the Aksai Chin plateau area (completed in 1956–57) to provide better communication between Xinjiang and western Tibet; it also gave the Chinese control of passes in the region between India and Tibet. India’s belated discovery of this road led to border clashes between the two countries that culminated in the Sino-Indian war of October 1962. China has occupied the northeastern part of Ladakh since the conflict. India refused to negotiate with China on the alignment of the Ladakhi boundary in this area, and the incident contributed significantly to a diplomatic rift between the two countries that began to heal only in the late 1980s. In the following decades, China worked to improve its relations with India, but there has been no resolution to the disputed Ladakh frontier.

**My Views on Kashmir issues**

More than five decades after independence, Pakistan is no closer to a resolution with India of the dispute over Kashmir. Pakistan and India have fought three wars, two of them over the status of Kashmir. They have been on the brink of war on several other occasions, including in Siachen in 1987 and in Kargil in 1999. From December 2001 to October 2002, the nuclear-armed protagonists came close to war once again when India mobilised along its international border with Pakistan following the terrorist attack on the parliament in New Delhi. Intense diplomatic and political pressure by the U.S., in coordination with other G-8 countries, averted what could have been a catastrophic clash.

The agreed ceasefire at the Line of Control (LOC) produced by Pakistan’s unilateral announcement on 23 November 2003 and India’s acceptance the following day, and confidence building measures (CBMs) proposed by India in October 2003, have raised hopes of an improved environment for negotiations. Nevertheless, the potential for yet another Kashmir crisis that could result in armed conflict looms large, since mutual distrust and hostility remain high, and both countries’ substantive positions are rigid. Meanwhile the Kashmiri people are caught in the crossfire between the militants and Indian security forces.

This report lays out the public and private position of the government in Islamabad on Kashmir and relations with India. It also examines the way the issue is tackled by Pakistani politicians of all parties and the media. ICG is releasing simultaneously reports that look at how the conflict is seen in New Delhi and at the history of the crisis and past efforts to resolve it. An earlier report examined views from within the Kashmir Valley. Taken together, the series analyses the positions and looks at the constraints in terms of ending the conflict as they are perceived on all sides. A subsequent final report in this series will offer extensive recommendations on how to move forward with a process of reconciliation between India and Pakistan and within Kashmir.

Islamabad is under military and diplomatic pressure from India and the international community to stop the infiltration of militants across the LOC into Indian-controlled Kashmir. Stressing that his government has lived up to its pledges to prevent cross-border incursions, President Musharraf has asked India to reciprocate by engaging in a substantive dialogue on the Kashmir dispute, which, his government believes, India has thus far avoided. In the perceptions of influential international actors as well as India, however, Pakistan has yet to curb all cross-border infiltration across the LOC.

Pakistani governments have depicted the Kashmir conflict as a clash of the same competing national identities that lay behind the creation of two separate states, India and Pakistan, out of British India. Pakistan insists that India has no legal or moral right to Muslim majority Kashmir and rejects its attempts to gain international acceptance of the territorial status quo.

Pakistan’s policy towards Kashmir is shaped by perceptions of an Indian threat and a history of war but also by the wider question of its relations with India. It is also influenced by domestic imperatives. The conflict is placed on the backburner when relations improve. Some governments have used the Kashmir conflict to reinforce Pakistani nationalism and others to strengthen pan-Islamism. Pakistani governments have also used the dispute to acquire domestic legitimacy or to ensure regime survival.

Pakistan governments would prefer the implementation of UN Security Council resolutions that envisaged the Kashmiri people determining in a plebiscite, under UN auspices, whether to accede to Pakistan or India. Conscious that a plebiscite is unacceptable to India, Pakistan is also exploring, albeit unofficially, other solutions, including the possibility of restructuring the current LOC in a way that would best promote Pakistan’s strategic and political interests.

Any progress towards a negotiated settlement of the dispute with India, however, depends on a Pakistani reassessment of the internal and external costs of the confrontation, including the growth of sectarian violence, a by-product of Islamabad’s support for religious extremists in Kashmir. Above all, the military would have to abandon the belief that the insurgency in Kashmir benefits Pakistan by undermining India, politically, economically and militarily.

While sympathy and support for the Kashmiri people is fairly widespread in Pakistan, the politically dominant military and the religious parties are the strongest proponents of claims to the state. Previous attempts by elected governments, headed by centre-left or centre-right parties, to normalise relations with India have been derailed by the military. Since the Pakistani military continues to dictate Kashmir policy, its retention of power and the increasing salience of the religious parties after the October 2002 national elections have further complicated relations with New Delhi. Conversely, a democratic transition in Pakistan would likely improve the prospects of a substantive and sustainable dialogue between Pakistan and India on all contentious issues, including Kashmir.

The international role could be crucial. The Security Council’s aversion to mediating the Kashmir dispute notwithstanding, influential actors, particularly the U.S., have been pro-active in reducing tensions between Pakistan and India, given the risk of nuclear war. U.S. facilitation could help to create an enabling environment for negotiations on the Kashmir dispute. The ultimate responsibility for resolving the dispute will depend, however, on reciprocal willingness by the two parties to bridge the wide gap in their positions.

**Women’s empowerment in Islamic system of life**

The prevailing idea of a woman’s place in Islam is that women are deprived of freedom and equality. This is the result of either ignorance about Islam or the biased propaganda of anti-Islamic ideology and a prejudiced media. The fact is just the opposite.

It is not out of place here to examine the place given to women in some of the so-called glorious civilizations prior to Islam. For instance, in Greek mythology a woman, Pandora, was considered to be the source of all evil. In the name of art, the Greeks depicted women in such a way that promoted unbridled sex. In the second civilization, the Roman one, their philosopher, Seneca, reprimanded Romans about the degenerating family system. A sport named “Floralia” promoted licentious atmosphere.

When it came to Christianity, Chrysostom says: “Woman is an unavoidable evil, a delicious calamity and an attractive trouble.” Aristotle declared: “The female state is a deformity.” A Roman Catholic, Aquinas, believed: “A female is a misbegotten male.” Nietzsche, the German philosopher, opines: “Woman is the source of folly, unreason.” In modern Europe, women were not given equal rights and the situation led to feminist movements that have been constantly struggling for equal rights for women.

Before the advent of Islam in Arabia, the position of the fair sex was appalling. Girls were sometimes killed as soon as they were born. The infant girls were buried alive. A man could marry and abandon or divorce a woman any number of times. The number of wives was unlimited. Islam emancipated woman in all respects. Provisions for empowerment of women in the Islamic system of life:

1. Freedom. Girls are as free to receive education as boys are. “It is obligatory for every man and woman to receive education.” Education and training in etiquette is the best gift of parents to children. A girl cannot be married off to anybody without her consent. As man has liberty to divorce; a woman is also allowed to take “khula” (divorce) if she dislikes her husband who is cruel, unjust or impotent. A widow or a divorcee is allowed to re-marry if she wishes. In Islam it is preferred that women remain at home to look after the family and train children. Still if no male guardian lives with her or if he is ill or his income is insufficient, she may go out to earn but in hijab. During the time of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), there were women traders and there were instances when women participated in wars to supply water or to nurse the wounded. At present thousands of Muslim women in hijab work in hospitals, banks, schools, colleges and many other congenial working places.

2. Equality. There is no gender disparity in Islam. “And whoever does righteous good deeds — male or female — and is a true believer in the Oneness of Allah, such will enter Paradise and not the least injustice, even to the size of a Naqira (speck on the back of a date-stone), will be done to them.” (Qur’an, 4:124) Man is the head of the family. Critics of Islam quote this out of context. This position of man is to safeguard and strengthen the institution of the family. It is the responsibility of man to provide food, shelter and other needs to all family members. Women are equal to men in all civil and criminal acts of judiciary.

3. Security: The security of woman in Islam is very important. She is not inferior to a male. “The person to whom a daughter is born and he does not ... mete out preferential treatment to boys, Allah will reward him with heaven.” (Hadith i.e. saying of the Prophet). Parents are motivated to nurture girls. The responsibility to provide bread and meat to girls and women lies with the male guardian. “You should feed her when you eat, and clothe her when you yourself put on clothes. And in case of temporary boycott due to strained relations, it should be limited to the four walls of your house.” (Hadith). When she travels a long distance, a male guardian must accompany her to facilitate her journey. Islam restricted the number of wives to four. Divorce, though permissible, is not encouraged.

4. Economic empowerment. Women receive money in the form of bride price (mehr). She gets bread and meat from either father or husband. She has a lawful share in property. “For men is a share of what the parents and close relatives leave, and for women is a share of what the parents and close relatives leave, be it little or much — a legal share.” (Qur’an, 4:7)

5. Dignity: In contrast to the Christian idea that woman is the source of evil and she opened the door to Satan, Islam believes that Satan simultaneously seduced both Adam and Eve. The mother’s place is higher than the father’s. Heaven lies under the mother’s feet. Woman is the ruler/queen of her husband’s establishment. The veil is only a protective device to shield her from mischievous staring eyes. When women are asked to wear veil, men are ordered not to stare at women. “And tell the believing women to reduce (some) of their vision.” (The Qur’an: 24:31)

Thus Islam gives dignity, respect, protection, and an appropriate place to women.

**Example of a Pakistani female struggle in pakistan**

And for women are rights over men similar to those of men over women.” (Quran, 2:228)

This quote sums up everything a woman can be if she is not chained to patriarchal norms. Women have struggled for the right to vote, empowerment, employment, education and more, for centuries.

Women’s Day as a commemoration dates back to 1909 when the first National Woman’s Day was observed in the United States on February 28. On March 19, 1911, International Women’s Day was observed for the first time in Germany, Austria, Denmark and Switzerland. In 1975 the United Nations declared March 8 as International Women’s Day, and since then it is being celebrated worldwide.

Pakistan also celebrates Women’s Day with great fervour. Today women in Pakistan can be seen in every sphere and excelling with great energy; however that does not mean they have not gone through a struggle to achieve something in life. Millions of women are still living a very hard life without knowing about or exercising their rights.

**Lawyer**

**Nida Usman Chaudhry**, a lawyer and founder of Women in Law and LEARN, said, “As a female lawyer the struggle begins from the very first day when we enter law school. Even when we are making a point in class that itself is an issue because usually people don’t want to listen to or respect a woman’s point of view.

“After making dedicated efforts to attain a law degree, when she wants to start practicing as a lawyer, they are usually told to avoid litigations and going to court, In short to not be a trial lawyer. They are given the impression that they would be a liability in law firms if they are taken to court for cases so they should stay in offices and do the back end work.

**Democracy in Pakistan**

Democracy([Urdu](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Urdu_language" \o "Urdu language): جمہوریت‎; pronounced *jamhooriat*) is ten of the ideologies and system upon with Pakistan was sought to be established in 1947 as a nation-state, as envisaged by the leader and founding father of the nation, Muhammad Ali Jinnah . Pakistan constitutionally is a democratic parliamentary republic with its political system based on an elected form of governance. Since the establishment of the current system in 2003, Pakistan is one of the youngest democracies in the world. The democratic elections held in 2008 were the first to conclude a complete 5-year term in the nations' political history. CurrentlyPakistan is the 4th largest democracy and the largest Majoritarian democracy. It is also the largest non-liberal democracy in the world.

## **History**

It was one of the earliest and largest ancient human civilisations alongside Mesopotamia, the Nile Valley, Anatolia and ancient China, known for its highly developed, sophisticated and urbanised culture and much later also old Greece which had some form of democratic rule.

Historians and social scientists studying the civilisation's social structure observe that the Indus Valley had an organised planning system, including standard architecture, civic controls, consistent grid layouts and uniformed sanitary facilities. This well-disciplined lifestyle and a common *Rule of Law* extending throughout a large area leads some historians to believe and suggest the Indus Valley civilisation in Pakistan as possibly the earliest cradle and model of democracy; one which was based on a "popular rule by the people" based on the conceptions of Welfare State and Rule of law (and hence the presence of some form of Democracy) which even predated old Greece.

In the wake of intensifying political instability, the civilian bureaucracy and military assumed governing power in 1958. Since its independence, Pakistan's naked system has fluctuated between civilian and military governments at various times throughout its political history, mainly due to political instability, civil-military conflicts, political corruption, and the periodic coup d'états by the military establishment against weak civilian governments, resulting in the enforcement of martial law across the country (occurring in 1958, 1977 and 1999, and led by chief martial law administrator -generals Ayub Khan, Zia-ul-Haq and Pervez Musharraf  respectively).Democracy in Pakistan, however imperfect, has been allowed to function to varying degrees. Until 2013, Pakistan did not experience even one democratic transfer of power from one democratically elected government that had completed its tenure to another. All of its previous democratic transitions have been aborted by military coup .

**Why Democracy for Pakistan:**

The wave of democracy that forcefully hit Europe at the end of the World War I touched the shores of Asia in mid-twentieth century. The World War II replaced dictatorships by democracy in such important countries as Germany, Italy and Japan. The second half of the century experienced wide spread decolonization following struggles for self rule and independence. In the beginning of 1960s, more than 120 episodes of democratization took place in about 90 countries. The social, religious and political conditions in which democratization was introduced in Europe and Asia were more or less similar.1 Democracy, though difficult to practice, is one of the best available systems to govern. According to J. S. Mill, ‘democracy is difficult to establish in societies having disorder, disobedience, segmentation, passive and parochial interests, selfishness, and incapable controlling body’.2 Democracy can flourish in a country having democratic norms and values. It entails attempts for building consensus among all the stakeholders, groups and elites in a society. Patience, tolerance and faith in democratic doctrine are its

pre–requisites. Democracy assists the communities in responding to a continuously changing world: that is conscious of and responsive to the needs of all the communities to achieve common goals, and empower individuals within the community and in international community. Democracy helps nations to accommodate diversified cultures and religions. It enhances the participation of citizens in policy making, gives unified direction in public actions and builds institutional apparatus.3 Democracy is more meaningful for the third world countries as it is intended to promote human values and wellbeing through such elements as good governance, justice, security, tolerance, equality of man and opportunities, human rights, freedom of ideas, press and speech. The most acknowledged definition of democracy is “government of the people, by the people and for the people”.4 The foundation of Pakistan is embedded in democratic principles as it reflects the collective will of the people for a separate homeland. Yet its history is replete with periodic and prolonged military rules and autocratic governments. Even democratic rules were subjected to non-democratic interventions. Many factors can be linked to this situation. Pakistan lacked democratic experience through which it could initiate an effective process of democratization.5 In the beginning there was little positive growth in politics as political development depends on political institutions and traditions which were non-existent, fragile and instable. Effective leadership helps in developing
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