



**India's Kashmir Conundrum:
A Strive after Burhan Wani Demise and Implementation of Article 370**

Farzana Zaheer Syed,¹ Asia Saif Alvi,² & Sultan Mubariz³

Abstract:

Kashmir, a beautiful valley in northern Pakistan, has been a source of contention between India and Pakistan for many decades. The Kashmiri freedom fighters' unwavering commitment to the right to self-determination has fuelled the two countries' efforts (Pakistan and IOJK) to seek long-term peace in the region through the liberation of the Kashmiris from Indian aggression. This paper focuses on the Kashmiris' never-ending freedom struggle, particularly in light of the murder of Burhan Wani and its ramifications for Pakistan-India relations, which are already strained. The Indian government imposed Article 370 in order to consult credible secondary data, books, journals, research articles, and renowned magazines. Pakistan has long sought an empirically peaceful solution to the region's nuclear threat. It is high time for both neighbouring countries to maintain the Composite Dialogue Process and engage in diplomatic efforts to bring this conflict to a lasting and peaceful conclusion.

KEY WORDS: Kashmir, Terrorism, Hindutva, secularism, Article 370, Burhan Wani

INTRODUCTION

Since the belligerent occupation of the disputed territory by Indian forces, Kashmiris have been denied their basic right to self-determination. The unwavering determination of Kashmiris to free their motherland from the tyrannical Indian occupation has captivated the international community. Because Indian forces continue to deny Kashmiris their right to self-determination through brutal means, it is likely that the holy war against the Indian occupation in Kashmir will last until their goal is achieved (Hussain, 1998, p.185-6). The Kashmiris' all-out efforts with a full-fledged strategy since 1987 have astonished both Pakistan and India. Pakistan is a major supporter of human rights, while India is a violator of human rights. India has always reacted impulsively, leaving a legacy of disheartening anecdotes.

It is a harsh reality that the Kashmiris' ongoing struggle is solely their own battle to rid Kashmir of Indian forces. The truth, on the other hand, has been quite different. Since the precise moment of

¹ Assistant professor, Government College Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: Fazanasyed@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan Email: asia.saif@uos.edu.pk

³ Assistant professor, University of Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: sultan.mubariz@uog.edu.pk

their independence, India and Pakistan have become increasingly separated, and their approaches, both domestic and global, have advanced in increasingly disparate ways. One concealed justification, arguably the most important, can be found in the outcomes of the dispute over the ownership of the state of Jammu and Kashmir (Hussain 1998, 185-6).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review in this study focused on two aspects: the death of Burhan Wani and the imposition of Article 370 in Indian-occupied Kashmir. In his article "A study on Jammu and Kashmir Present, Past, and Views of Students on Article 370 Abrogation," Bilal Ahmad elaborates on the numerous writ petitions filed by Kashmiri leaders in the Indian Supreme Court to challenge the implementation of Article 370 in the region. The region's youth confront multiple challenges as a result of the violent conflict, including unemployment, stress, and a lack of business opportunities as a result of the lockdown.

The majority of these people are opposed to Article 370, believing that it will incite hatred toward Indian authorities and Jammu and Kashmir. Natives in government are gaining advantages as a result of two strategies. According to Lalwani et al., "India's Kashmir Conundrum: Before and After the Abrogation of Article 370," on August 5, 2019, India imposed Article 370 in Jammu and Kashmir to revoke Muslims' legitimate self-rule. It has evolved the nature of conflict to a political manoeuvre, and the circumstances are cranium.

In a report titled "The Martyrdom of Burhan Wani and the Recent Indian Violence in Indian-held Kashmir," Fahad Nabeel implies that Burhan Wani repudiates Indian forces and their illegal and criminal activities in the region. His actions were in response to Indian forces' excessive brutal killing of innocent Kashmiri men, women, and children for no apparent reason.

METHODOLOGY

The research was carried out using available resources and data gathered from national and international newspapers, books, and reports on Kashmir. A qualitative method with a descriptive approach was used to investigate the Indian occupied Kashmir problem, with particular reference to the implementation of Article 370. The brutal killing of Burhan Wani by Indian forces has exacerbated the existing situation in Indian occupied Jammu and Kashmir.

KASHMIR ISSUE AND PAKISTAN STANCE

There are opposing views on Jammu and Kashmir's accession to India. Pakistan makes its case by citing a Standstill Agreement signed by the State of Jammu Kashmir with Pakistan on 15th August 1947, which makes the State of Jammu Kashmir's accession to India illegal under the law, and this agreement negates India's claims. Pakistan also acknowledged that the opportunity development of Kashmiris was native and unrestricted as a result of the Maharaja's Government's restraint and mismanagement (Cohen, 2002). Pakistan's position on the Kashmiri freedom struggle is relatively categorical. Pakistan believes that the Kashmiri freedom struggle in Jammu and Kashmir is the result of the brutality of the Indian occupying forces against the will of the Kashmiris who do not want Indian rule in their motherland.

Pakistan has the right to defend its own territory and respond to Indian aggression as and when it sees fit. It is clear to the world that allegations of Pakistani interference receive less condemnation

than the punitive rebuke received by India from around the world for her unjustified atrocities against the armless and helpless native population of the state of Jammu Kashmir. The natives of Jammu and Kashmir have stated unequivocally that the path to peace and the halting of the native Kashmiris' freedom movement is contingent on the decision of the native population to self-rule and the withdrawal of the Indian occupied forces from their homeland.

The region known as Kashmir is the homeland of Kashmiri people, and they are the rightful rulers of their homeland (Wirsing, 1998). They will fight until the last Kashmiri dies for their freedom. So, for perpetual and lasting peace, it is unavoidable that the people of Jammu and Kashmir be granted the right to self-assurance. In his book "Kashmir: A Disputed Legacy 1946-1990," Alastair Lamb stated that "without a doubt, the Indian mediation occurred before the customs of increase had been completed." By mid-1948, the position of the 26th October Instrument of Accession in the arsenal of Indian support had been established; why, furthermore, was the Instrument of Accession not distributed in the 1948 White Paper? "Alastair Lamb" reveals in his book "Incomplete Partition" how the instrument of promotion was discovered missing from the record of Indian government. Until today, India has not created an alleged "Instrument of Accession" at any public or global level. The Indian claim of accession contradicts reality and the wishes of Kashmiris, and India has so far failed to prove its claim of the so-called Instrument of Accession in any forum.

FREEDOM MOVEMENT IN KASHMIR

The struggle for Kashmir began in 1931, prior to the formation of Pakistan and India, when some newly elected authorities forbade the prayer leader of Muslims from delivering his sermon during Friday prayers, as is customary throughout the Muslim world. The prohibition moves sparked animosity, prompting the prayer leader to go on the offensive against the incumbent ruler who was a non-Muslim. When police attempted to apprehend the prayer leader, Imam Abdul Qadeer, Kashmiri Muslims resisted, resulting in police shootings that killed twenty-two Kashmiri Muslims. The Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference was founded on October 14, 1932, under the leadership of Shaikh Abdullah. It marked the beginning of the movement against the Maharaja's brutal regime (Amin, 1995).

BEGINNING OF AN ARMED RESIST OF KASHMIRIS

The freedom movement has, to a large extent, galvanised the entire Muslim community of Kashmir against the oppressive rule of non-Muslim forces; however, relatively insignificant internal schisms have hampered the otherwise strenuous struggle (Freedom struggle of Kashmir, 2016). If the minor stumbling blocks in the struggle for Kashmir's liberation from the occupation of Indian forces are removed, India may face a precipitous loss, forcing her to agree to terms in accordance with the wishes of the indigenous people (Yasin, 1980). It is essential to emphasise that it was the educated middle class, not the illiterate section of society, that fuelled the struggle and brought the grievance to light.

NATURE OF THE KASHMIR STRUGGLE

It was previously observed that a significant portion of the opposition is disturbing the peace, unconstrained, and a power expressing profound indignation felt by the majority against the ruthless constraint imposed by the Indian State (Kashmir Struggle in Changing Regional Setting,

2001). The massive constraint strategy initiated by Governor Jagmohan and continued by his two replacements, Girish Chandra Saxena and K.V. Krishna Rao, is, in fact, an impression of Hindu India's common face in a Muslim-majority state. Long curfews, unpredictability of endings on unarmed peaceful parades, armed crackdowns, widespread assault and attack on women, 'catch and slaughter' strategy against Muslim youth, custodial passing, intentional demonstrations of torching, plunder, looting, and plundering by the Indian military and military powers, and debasement of mosques have left the populace with little choice but to retaliate. The unprecedented heart-wrenching events of the Indian forces' unrivalled brutality have pushed the indigenous population to the breaking point, resulting in an unstoppable resistance to liberate Kashmir from the cruel occupation of the Indian forces. Because of her animosity toward the Kashmiris and her unwavering commitment to victimising the innocent youth of the occupied valley, India is solely responsible for the ever-spurring liberation movement by the Kashmiris.

The Mujahideen, who were numbered in the hundreds by credible Indian authorities and informal sources in 1989, had grown to over 30,000 by 1995. (Freedom struggle of Kashmir, 2015). The increase in the number of Mujahideen since 1989 has perplexed the Indian occupation forces, as instead of slowing, the liberation movement is gaining momentum, with almost every Kashmiri taking part as a moral obligation. "We should grant gold decorations to these Indian lead representatives after the freedom of Kashmir who have worked with our ultimate struggle with such commitment and speed," said an opposition leader. The collective idea of the Indian State strategy has also resulted in a strong resurgence of Islamic slants among Kashmir's Muslim populace, which has turned out to be favourable to Pakistani sentiments. The India-centric Kashmiri patriotism espoused by Shaikh Abdullah and his family was utterly humiliated. Shaikh Abdullah's bicentennial is commemorated as a Youm-e-Matam (day of mourning), and his death is commemorated as a "Youm-e-Nijat" (day of liberation).

His ancestral home was destroyed, and his grave is guarded by Indian safety officers motivated by paranoia about despoiling. Kashmiris have a natural kinship with Pakistanis, and Pakistan's Independence Day, August 14, is celebrated with a slew of festivities throughout the valley, with exuberance radiating from Kashmiris' faces. On the contrary, the National Day of India on August 15 is marked by the presence of black flags indicating animosity towards India.

Despite the presence of Indian military, this is eagerly done each year, particularly since 1985. (Korbel, 2015). The entire world must be aware that the entire Kashmir region adheres to Pakistan Standard Time rather than Indian Standard Time across the occupied valley. Apparently, the tide of time has shifted in favour of Islam, and Hindutva-inspired patriotism has receded. This is a pattern that can be found all over the world in Islamic polities. Both the Islamic upheaval in Iran (1979) and the productive Afghan hostility adjacent to the Soviet Union (1979-1988) had a significant impact on the Kashmiri public, who believed that they could also end Indian occupation through a similar equipped battle. Occurrences in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and other parts of the world sparked a wave of scepticism throughout the world. In retrospect, these developments have had a significant impact on the Kashmiri people. No state contraption, no matter how amazing, appeared to be fruitful in halting these overall patterns (Wakefield, 1975).

EVALUATION OF THE RECENT STRUGGLE OF KASHMIRIS:

To assess the current state of mass development in Kashmir, it is necessary to examine the accomplishments and disappointments from 1990 to 2005. The current wave of mass development in Kashmir is being pursued both politically and militarily (Amin, 1995). It is clear from the Kashmiri struggle that the struggle is not based on nationalism, but rather on religious values, which categorises Indian rule as unacceptable to the Kashmiris, while they want to align themselves with Pakistan due to their religious values. The resurgence of Islamic identity is the fundamental difference that distinguishes the current mass development objectively from previous developments in Kashmir's history. This can be attributed to Islamic parties, which have played a critical role in establishing the backbone of the current mass resistance movement in Kashmir. There is no doubt that this emphasis on Islamic identity has been effective in drawing the attention of the world's attention to the Kashmir issue.

The tenacious Kashmiri opposition has paralysed the Indian organisation and inflicted critical misfortunes on the Indian military in terms of men, material, and good; however, their internal contradictions, lack of coordination among political and military techniques, or more broadly, their failure to meet an exceptional adversary, have so far prevented them from wreaking sufficient havoc. The Kashmiri insurgency has the potential to increase India's costs to the point where it will seriously consider withdrawing its troops from Kashmir.

A close examination of history reveals numerous parallels between the two occupations, namely the Indian occupation of Jammu and Kashmir and the Israeli occupation of Palestinian lands. Historically, Israel withdrew its military forces from South Lebanon in May 2000 and Gaza in September 2005. Following that, India can engage in genuine discussions on the goal of the Kashmir issue in light of the desires of the Kashmiri people. Regardless, the resistance movement requires more visible solidarity in its positions, strong coordination between its political and military methodologies, and a general subjective improvement when confronted with a clearly better prepared foe. It is a time of embodiment here, as the Kashmiri obstruction desperately needs to fortify its military muscles in order to force India to have a meaningful conversation about the Kashmir issue. The mass development was aimed at three goals: preparing the populace, deadening the Indian organisation, and internationalising the issue. This development procedure has proven to be successful. The current mass development has been beneficial in preparing Kashmir's Muslim population.

Individuals respond to the All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC) calls, which address the political essence of the Kashmiri obstruction development, as well as issues of common liberties infringement and the desire for the right to self-assurance. Three events are particularly significant in the Kashmiri opposition battle. The indigenous Kashmiris' struggle is centred on ending the occupation by Indian forces, not on Hindus or Indians themselves. Second, the movement's dogma and aspirations are explicitly Kashmiri; in other words, its fight is entirely focused on Kashmir (Brecher, 1953). The entire struggle is aimed at breaking free from India's occupation and assimilating into Pakistan. Third, the Kashmiri opposition has no plan for expansion; it has previously exercised the lines of Kashmir somewhere inside India, and they have no intention of interfering in Indian endeavours following Kashmir's liberation. When the Kashmir issue is resolved by liberating the region from Indian control, India and Pakistan will want to establish friendly relations. This arrangement of self-actualization by the Kashmiris is viewed as answer to

the Kashmir emergency and a successful method for building up harmony and warm relations between Pakistan and India. The basic hypothesis is that the disagreement over Kashmir is the underlying driver of tensions between the two countries, and the reasons for the momentum mass development are a mix of different turns of events - India's denial of Kashmiris' right to self-assurance, its ruthless concealment of the Kashmiri battle that resulted in the martyrdom of thousands of Kashmiris (Yousaf, 1979, p.269).

During the last decade, the Bush administration gave the impression of favouring India, requesting that Pakistan cease its support for the Kashmiris. In fact, strict terms stated that continuing to do so would be equivalent to supporting 'psychological oppression.' When New Delhi joined the US-led alliance against 'psychological warfare,' it was clearly based on the assumption that Pakistan would be held responsible for 'illegal intimidation' demonstrations in Kashmir. Pakistan's vital position in the West had been put in grave jeopardy. It is critical to understand Pakistan's geography, particularly its clearly risky local agreements. This geography of Pakistan gives rise to the concept of strategic depth. Since the Taliban's inception in 1994, Pakistan has been regarded as a strong ally by American think tanks. Afghanistan, as a major reason, was viewed as providing Pakistan with needed 'key profundity' or strategic depth, admittance to energy-rich Central Asia, so Pakistan's decision to support the US against Taliban-administered Afghanistan for holding al-Qaida was a difficult one.

President Musharraf chose to assist in countering the Taliban and their alliance on the assumption that Americans would support Pakistan by assisting in resolving the Kashmir issue. The Bush administration most likely did not say good-bye to such a request. It was unavoidable when the US increased its pressure on Islamabad. According to the American organisation, Pakistan would abandon the equipped battle in Kashmir after more than fifty years of fighting India over Kashmir, and instead rely on political strategies to defy India.

Pakistan's government responded to mounting pressures by taking a number of extraordinary steps of its own. It declared a one-sided truce at the Line of Control (LOC) in November 2003, and India accepted it. During the first stage of the uprising (1989-1999), the Kashmiri military obstructed Indian security forces by keeping the country closed to them. This would ultimately confine the Indian military to their camps, where the Kashmiri opposition could gain an advantage. A total of 177 police stations, military camps, armed force fortifications, and government structures were heavily attacked.

Kashmiri opposition was outfitted and prepared in large part for quick in and out missions against delicately secured targets. The Kashmiri freedom fighters were only trained for strikes on secluded armed forces or police stations; ambushes, street mining, and damage to forces, correspondences, and transport offices; they were expert marksmen, good at besieging, and rocket assaults, but not for direct confrontations with India's regular or paramilitary forces. These developments give the impression of a subjective shift in the provided battle for opportunity in Kashmir, which took place in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The main stage (1989-99), as an overall uprising, provided an approach to better-coordinated activities against painstakingly chosen targets that were likely to put further strain on the Indian armed forces. The following stage (1999-2001) began with activity in the Kargil area in May 1999, when the Kashmiri obstruction clung to ridge positions and certain essential statures. Following 9/11, the development of mass obstructive forces in Kashmir entered

its third stage. The Indian administration is still considering starting a political cycle, but it appeared to be nothing more than a ruse to fool the United Nations designated conflicted area. In reality, the Indians have set out with the goal of annihilating the Kashmiri opposition movement using all military means at their disposal. The cordon and search activities are intended to obliterate people's desire by utilising extremely harsh strategies, for example, custodial killings, to give the impression of a determined Indian approach to threatening the populace into general acceptance. The Indian government clearly wishes to eliminate the Kashmiri impediment by postponing the trials of those detained. Furthermore, tactics are used to gain as much time as possible in order to avoid a public referendum by any means. They appear to have shifted from an incentivizing to an imposition strategy. Simply put, go from carrot to stick. Following the September 11, 2001 attacks in the United States, the United States declared a global war on terrorism known as 'psychological warfare.' India has flown in more troops in order to win the war against the Kashmiris at any cost. Essentially, India employs terrorism, a global phenomenon, to gain legitimacy for its occupation of Jammu and Kashmir.

To understand the recent developments, a reference to Kargil and subsequent developments is required. India refused to recognize Pakistan's military government, led by General Pervez Musharraf, and insisted that Pakistan end its support for the decade-old nonconformist uprising in northern Jammu and Kashmir before talks could resume. In 2011, the "Lahore Declaration" committed India and Pakistan to working together to resolve the Kashmir issue. The question of whether the Lahore Declaration served any purpose remains unanswered. The rest of the year, 2011, when the Lahore Declaration was signed, saw little progress toward peace, aside from a US-mandated withdrawal that ended the immediate emergency along the Line of Control. Pakistani authorities reported that they had agreed with India on a withdrawal that would put an end to the most serious nuclear threats between the two countries in nearly 30 years. The agreement that led to the withdrawal came after Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif visited Washington for talks with President Clinton and promised 'solid strides' to reestablish the Line of Control, which was considered in 1972 following the conflict of 1971." (Shah, 2007). In July, an Indian and Pakistani high level failed to reach an agreement on the Kashmir situation. Following India's highest point disappointment as a result of Islamic aggressor groups declaring a stage up in viciousness, India's decision party called for tougher measures to deal with the assailants in Kashmir by November.

"Fears of savagery are rising in Kashmir after India and Pakistan failed to reach an agreement over the contested area at their summit in Agra." Over the previous 16 years, mass obstruction has completely changed the course of history in Kashmir, making any out of line and low goal inadmissible to individuals (Haq and Ahmad, 2014). Possibly the most significant aspects of the current mass development that the legend of Indian predominance and power has detonated. The point is that specific events, such as the martyrdom of Burhan Wani, provided a new impetus to the Kashmiri resistance. It has been crushed, and its occupational profile has clearly declined. The Kashmiri opposition shows no signs of relenting; if anything, their determination is hardening as the development assumes a more Islamic personality, and the approaching opportunity offers a way to discuss a long obstruction ("For dialogue and armed struggle together", The Nation, 2003). The Kashmiri resistance movement does not appear to be abating, but rather intensifying with each passing day. Kashmiris will not consider any effort to find a solution that does not take into account the goals and desires of the people of Kashmir. It could be interpreted as making a mockery of their

struggle to free themselves from India's control. In political, financial, and philosophical terms, both stakeholders, India and Pakistan, legitimize the meaning of Kashmir for which there are several reasons.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN KASHMIR: POST BURHAN WANI'S DEMISE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 370, 35-A IN IOJK

In Indian-occupied Kashmir, the military-to-civilian ratio is the highest (IOK). Half of the total active Indian armed force, or approximately 700,000 troops, are stationed in IOK. The narrative told to the world and the Indian nation by those in power in India is that this massive army deployment is to combat the terrorist and separatist elements found in IOK. According to the Indian foreign office and media outlets, the number of terrorists is limited to four to five hundred.

The question is whether this massive state-imposed lockdown was intended to change the demographics of the region and spread the fascist designs of the Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP). In the face of Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi, the world in general, and the South Asian region in particular, has become aware of the "Hindutva" ideology, which is diametrically opposed to India's claim to be the world's largest democracy and casts serious doubt on the country's secularism. The interconnections between the Rashtrya Swayam Sevak Sangh (RSS) and the Indian Prime Minister were highlighted in the aftermath of the Gujrat Massacres. Ministers such as Amit Shaw are steadfast in their pursuit of the ultimate goal of a united "Hindustan" (land of Hindus). In this context, on 5 August 2019, Indian President Ram Nath Kovind revoked Article 370 of the Indian Constitution through a presidential order.

SIGNIFICANCE OF ARTICLE 370, 35-A IN THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION:

In order to understand the Indian Conundrum before and after the abrogation of the article 370 fists this very article has to be understood.

➤ ARTICLE 370: INDIA'S ATTEMPT TO PULL OFF A SECULAR NARRATIVE

Article 370 served as the foundation for Jammu and Kashmir's admission to the Indian Union at a time when former princely states had the option of joining either India or Pakistan following their independence from British rule in 1947. The article, which went into effect in 1949, exempts the state of Jammu and Kashmir from the Indian constitution. It gives the Indian-ruled region the authority to enact its own laws in all areas except finance, defence, foreign affairs, and communications. It established a separate constitution and flag, as well as denying outsiders property rights in the region. This means that residents of the state are subject to laws that differ from those of the rest of the country in areas such as property ownership and citizenship.

➤ ARTICLE 35A: AN EXTENSION OF THE ARTICLE 370:

In 1954, a presidential order established Article 35A to continue the old provisions of the territory regulations under Article 370 of the Indian constitution. The article empowers the Indian-administered Kashmiri legislature to define permanent residents of the region. It prohibits outsiders from permanently settling in the region, purchasing land, working in local government, or receiving educational scholarships. The article, known as the Permanent Residents Law, also deprives female residents of Jammu and Kashmir of property rights if they marry someone from outside the state. The provision also applies to the children of such women" ("Kashmir's Special

Status: Five Things to Know”, Al Jazeera, 2019). Essentially, according to the Indian Supreme Court's interpretation, women who marry someone other than a Kashmiri resident retain their property rights. However, the children of such a marriage would have no claim to their mother's inheritance.

AFTER EFFECTS OF THE REVOCATION AND THE INDIAN NARRATIVE

For first off, the administrative structure of Indian-occupied Kashmir has shifted. Kashmir and Ladakh are two Union territories that have been formed from the valley. In turn, the territory of Ladakh includes the territory of Leh. Declaring this occupied region to be Union territories means that the Indian constitution, which was not applicable in the region prior to the revocation of Article 370, is now in effect. Second, the revocation of 370, 35A would mean that the Muslim majority region would gradually become a Hindu majority region on the social spectrum. The United Nations has repeatedly emphasised that the ultimate solution to this disputed territory lies in a free plebiscite in which the people of Kashmir would decide whether to join India or Pakistan, or to remain independent. The outcome of this impending demographic shift can be predicted in the context of the BJP's fascist Hindutva ideology.

INDIA'S KASHMIR CONUNDRUM: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

“According to the United Nations Human Rights report for 2018-2019, 29 civilians were killed in 2018 as a result of shelling and firing along the Line of Control with Pakistan. Armed groups were responsible for the deaths of 43 civilians. The remaining 71 people are said to have been killed by Indian security forces.” (Al Jazeera, what's going on in Kashmir?) India has claimed for the past seventy years that it is the world's largest democracy. Along with this claim, India is proud of its secular values. It is not true that things were good in Kashmir prior to 2019. The martyrdom of Kashmiri youth Burhan Wani in 2016 and the subsequent upheaval of events can be used as an example. The revocation of Article 370, on the other hand, has revealed the ground reality about the Indian government's authoritarianism. Prime Minister Narendra Modi has derailed Indians' hopes of becoming the Asian Tiger during the tenure of former Prime Minister Manmohan Singh. The only plausible way the BJP government could think of was to divert the world's attention. Over the years, the Indian government has used the Pakistani context to gain the sympathy of its general public. In order to comprehend India's design, inferences can be drawn from Israel's occupation of Palestinian territory. Persecution of Muslims and other minorities in India brings to mind the atrocities perpetrated by Hitler's Germany. It is past time for India to be called in for questioning. Doesn't the repeal of Article 370 cast doubt on the morals of the Indian state? The true perplexity of India is its irony. On the one hand, it makes far-fetched claims and dreams of uniting the shattered state. Are there, on the other hand, ground realities that speak otherwise? The Indian media has been desperately searching for moral authority that will allow the government to undo the damage. Incidents such as Pulwama and others were allegedly staged in order to recoup lost goodwill. Even a flop false flag operation was carried out against Pakistan as everyone knows of the case of Abhinandan.

CONCLUDING ARGUMENTS

The first signs of the current mass resistance movement in Kashmir appeared on the political horizon in 1987, when circumstances began to change rapidly following fraudulent state elections

that were nearly completely rigged, which proved to be the catalyst for the beginning of a new phase of the mass struggle. The Indian authorities believe that they can wear down the Kashmiri resistance through massive repression over time, or that it will break down with the passage of time; they appear to want to prolong the ordeal of the Kashmiri people in order to break their will, but in a movement like this, there are ups and downs (Yoginder, 2001). The Kashmiris have waited more than four decades for the UN to recognise their right to self-determination ('Kashmir struggle in changing regional setting,' *The Nation*, 2001). They had been denied the exercise of this right, and as a result, they resorted to armed uprising against Indian occupation forces in Kashmir; the resistance is essentially a popular movement for the Kashmiri people's right to self-determination. The uprising is entirely indigenous, and it is the result of the cumulative effect of the Indian occupation's tyrannical political, economic, and cultural policies (United Nations Resolution, 1948). The movement was sparked by a lack of political representation, unemployment, cultural discrimination, and Indian use of military force. Young Kashmiris began to see India as a colonial power bent on erasing their identity. On September 11, 2001, the world declared it as a "cross-border" "terrorist" faction projected by Pakistan. In reality, Pakistan was also caught off guard by the sudden emergence of a powerful movement in Kashmir. It is true that neither Pakistan nor India was aware of the precipitous struggle waged by Kashmiris for self-determination and freedom in the face of India's brutal occupation of the valley. The revocation of Article 370 was only the beginning. The Indian Citizenship Act, the passage of agricultural laws, and the ensuing protests in Indian Punjab demonstrate the state apparatus's tilt toward securing Hindu majority and sympathies. The fault lines in the Indian state can be understood historically by looking at how the Indra Gandhi government carried out Operation Blue Star or India's involvement in Tamil Nadu. However, Pakistan's current government has made significant efforts to raise global awareness of the plight of Kashmiris.

References:

- Bhat, B. A. (2019). A study on Jammu and Kashmir Present, Past and Views of Students on Article 370 Abrogation. *International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)*, 1-11.
- Brecher, M. (1953). *The struggle for Kashmir*. Ryerson Press.
- Cohen, S. P. (2002). India, Pakistan and Kashmir. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 25(4), 32-60.
- Freedom Struggle of Kashmir, (2015, October). Retrieved from <http://freedom-movement-in-kashmir.blogspot.com/2009/04/freedom-struggle-of-kashmir.html>
- Haq, I, and Ahmad, M. (2014). Human Rights Violation in Kashmir. For dialogue and armed struggle together", *The Nation*, Islamabad, June 08, 2003. Interview with Syed Salahuddin <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9nNwwX2s1IM>
- Hussain, I. (1998), pp. 185-6. *Kashmir Dispute: An International Law Perspective*. Quaid-i-Azam Chair, National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i- Azam University, Islamabad.
- Kashmir struggle in changing regional setting, (2001, October). *The News International*, n. page.
- Kashmir's Special Status: Five Things to know. (2001, March). Al Jazeera, n. page. [www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/8/5/kashmir-special-status-explained-what-are-articles-370 and 35a](http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/8/5/kashmir-special-status-explained-what-are-articles-370-and-35a).
- Korbel, J. (2015). *Danger in Kashmir*. Princeton University Press.

- Lalwani, S., & Gayner, G. (2020). *India's Kashmir Conundrum: Before and After the Abrogation of Article 370*. United States Institute of Peace.
- Nabeel, F., Riaz, H., & Muneer, Z. (2016). The martyrdom of Burhan Wani and the recent Indian violence in Indian-held Kashmir. Resolution 47 (1948) |United Nations Retrieved from <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/111955/?ln=en>
- Schofield, V. (2004). Kashmir in the crossfire: India, Pakistan and the unending war.
- Shah, S. (2007). An in-depth analysis of the evolution of self-determination under international law and the ensuing impact on the Kashmiri freedom struggle, and present. *N. Ky. L. Rev.*, 34, 29.
- Sikand, Y. (2001). Changing course of Kashmiri struggle: from national liberation to Islamist jihad? *Economic and Political Weekly*, 218-227.
- The News (2001). Kashmir struggle in changing regional setting,
- Wakefield, W. (1975). *History of Kashmir & the Kashmiris: The Happy Valley*. Seema Publications.
- Wirsing, R. G. (1998). *India, Pakistan and the Kashmir Dispute; On Regional Conflict and Its Resolution*. The MacMillan Press. Ltd.
- Yasin, M., & Rafiqi, A. Q. (Eds.). (1980). *History of the Freedom Struggle in Jammu & Kashmir*. New Delhi: Ligth& Life.
- Yousuf, M. (1979). *Kashmiris fight for Freedom. Vol. 11, Lahore*.

Date of Publication	May 10, 2021
---------------------	--------------