

Journal of Politics and International Studies

Vol. 8, No. 1, January–June 2022, pp.1–16

Kashmir as the Disputed Legacy and Flash Point in Nuclear South Asia

Abdul Rehman

Visiting Faculty Member, Department of Political Science,
Government Murray Graduate College Sialkot, Pakistan.

Email: polscience56@gmail.com

Abstract

The qualitative and descriptive study examines the intensity of Kashmir conflict between nuclear India and Pakistan. How India and Pakistan are caught in the situation of mutual distrust, antagonism, border conflicts, and water disputes? What kind of mindset works behind the wall to flare up the situation in South Asia? What are the active and hardliner forces led the deterioration of bilateral relations along with a continual propaganda, allegations against one another in respect of dealing with the Kashmir issue? There have been certain positive initiatives and important diplomatic developments in the form of bilateral talks and reciprocal visits between India and Pakistan throughout the history, but could not exactly achieved for lasting peace and stability in the region. The bilateral relations frequently face ups and downs due to certain core issues are yet to be redressed under the rational and diplomatic approach sought to be mediated by international institutions and effective players in the regional and global politics. The dialogue diplomacy, trade and people to people contact method can be other option for the solution of the world's most dangerous dispute.

Key Words: Disputed Legacy, Flashpoint, Geo-Strategic, Domestic Factors, Bilateral Diplomacy

Introduction

Kashmir possess a great significance in the context of its geo strategic outlook in the region of South Asia is a reality. Since the partition of United India Jammu and Kashmir has emerge as a disputed territory that led four open wars between India and Pakistan beside numerous short-term border clashes. It is neither a jugular vein of Pakistan and nor a part of India, which requires a solution through talks. The people of Kashmir had been struggling for their right of self-determination, independence and freedom from the illegal occupation of India. Over one hundred thousand lives have been sacrificed in the struggle of freedom of Kashmir. Ghulam Muhammad Shah former chief minister of UK said that, the Kashmir's history, whereas, it indicates that Kashmir is an integral part of Pakistan, and geographical, political, cultural and religious factors determines this claim. It has been considered quite dangerous, devastating and horrible if the conflict has not been addressed through bilateral or multilateral diplomatic services. If the Kashmir disputes is not solved it can create a very critical situation of social, political, economic and geo-graphical destruction which will close all the windows of development in South Asia.

The Kashmir issue has ever jeopardized the peace process, socio-economic and political development in the regional politics. Both India and Pakistan occasionally presented their own interest oriented stance to address the Kashmir cause which lost a huge economic and materialistic potential of the neighboring states. Therefore, the Indo-Pakistan relations have remained in the situation of uncertainty, trust deficit, ambiguity and chaos. Due to the conflicted relationship of India and Pakistan regional and global powers could not conclude the serious results in the perspective of Indo-Pakistan conciliation and conflict resolution. Pakistan.

The Geo-Strategic Environment

Kashmir is a landlocked area. (Ahmed, Sultan, 2006). Kashmir turned into a heaven lost. Its families were stuck in an intense situation. It turned into main interstate rivalry and the question once again seen as a domain problem and observed substantial battling (Bose, 2004). In this general population, Muslims are in larger part and underlying foundations of this issue lies amongst Pakistan and India regional dispute (Mufti, G.M. 1990). It is encompassed by incredible Himalayas and beginning purposes of numerous waterways (Menon, 1957). Because of regular excellence of the valley, Kashmir is called Paradise on Earth. In term of regional control India possesses 45% of Kashmir, Pakistan possesses 35% while China involves 20%. The crisis had appeared from its Hindu Maharaja Hari Singh who decided its accession against the wishes of the masses and majority of its people want to live free (Gupta, Sisir, 1966.). The role of Mountbatten, Jawaharlal Nehru, Gandhi and Patel made the entire issue of Kashmir more obstinate and entangled by their words and deeds. (Philip, Ziegler, 1985). Kashmir is a profound established and noteworthy clash amongst India and Pakistan. Rivalry between two South Asian countries on this issue is expanding attention toward international peace and security. Three notable and worthy wars fought between Pakistan and India and one noteworthy conflict over the issue. (Hashmi, 2005). Presently this contention covers with security issue, ethnic clash, cross-border terrorism, human rights violation and nuclear growth in South Asia. Both states have neglected to actualize its choice with respect to the destiny of Kashmir. So, political power of international community and military intervention of both countries can't achieve any possible solution of the problem. Thus, there were numerous endeavors started with respect to the peaceful arrangements of conflict yet all remained useless. It moved towards the situation of the one-step forward, two steps backward (Khan, Rashid & Alqama, 1996).

The Diplomatic Developments

At the beginning, it should be noted that the leaders of freedom movement in both the countries did not predict the confrontational relationship between the two independent countries. On an occasion, Quaid-e-Azam showed his interest to support Pak-India cooperation in international level, and even collaboration in defense. "Personally" he said in an interview with a foreign journalist, it is my view that both countries are independent and should play a vital role on international; platform it would be better in favor of these states and at regional level at large (Treiff, 1948). The statements of Quaid were taken as an offer of joint defense to India and Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru welcomed it. But Quaid had qualified his offer with the condition that differences between India

Kashmir as the Disputed Legacy and Flash Point in Nuclear South Asia

and Pakistan be resolved. But this (the offer), he had said during the same interview, he started that we should be prosperous internally and then it would be possible to do good job for others on different platforms, he further said. Unfortunately, Pakistan and India were only unable to resolve their differences inherited from a long colonial rule over the sub-continent, new issues were added to an already tense relationship between the two countries with the passage of time. At very after the partition of Pakistan had to face numerous disputes but the Kashmir ever considered as the most serious one.

Emergence of the Kashmir Dispute

On the eve of partition, 564 states were agreed to choice either to join India or Pakistan. (Rehana, 1996). Everything except three states whose boundaries were touching to India. These special cases were noteworthy. All states used their choice to join one of the two states. The state of Hyderabad and Junagadh, where Hindus were in large number ruled by Muslims, were engaged by the Indian military in 1947 and 1948 respectively. They created further tensions. The leader of Junagadh a small state in Kathiawar agreed to join Pakistan and it acknowledged settlement despite the fact that majority of the people in the state were overwhelmingly Hindu. The general population constrained to escape and forced to welcome Indian government to mediate. Hyderabad a dominant Hindu part, showed desire to join Pakistan and created more confused circumstances. However, it looked for freedom, Indian standstill agreement continued with expanding issue and the rising impact of rebellion. (Fadia, DR B L, 2011). In its natural geo-geographical outlook Kashmir should have completed its natural succession to Pakistan. (Lamb, Alaister, 1991). Kashmir was princely state, which had been under the British control as internally autonomous units. (Ziring, 1980). The Indian hands, according to the decision of the British Government were that these states are independent. Politically, however, the situation was different. The British government made it clear that it would not recognize the independence of these states. (Cheema, 2014). The All Indian National Congress took advantage of the fact that Kashmir, was being ruled by a Hindu ruler and Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, the leader of National Conference had developed a personal friendship with Nehru. (Arif, 2001). The efforts of the Congress Leader to take hold of Kashmir were facilitated by the plan for the partition of Punjab, under which two tehsils namely Gurdaspur and Batala were to be part of the dominion of India. This plan existed as way back as in May, 1947. (Sarwar. 1973).

As indicated by division plan Kashmir was the vital princely state of British India. Islam went in the state from that point forward Muslim society has been overwhelming populated. Just coincidentally ruling authority bargain and leaders exchanged force or choice of staying free. (Choudhry, 1971). The British sold the state to Maharaja Gulab Singh for just 7.5 million rupees. (Rashid, 1996). These Muslims were living in utmost misery and poverty in the reign of Maharaja. The processions against the autocratic regime of Maharaja Hari Singh initiated as early as 1890. Muslims Conference was established in this year and Kashmir is demanded their fundamental rights. These chains of protest continued till 1947. (Safdar. 1989). However, the leader of the state of Kashmir was not consented to new territories, most likely because of individual's rebellion in this state. The issue

of states accession to India had been started a conflict. (Gulshan, 2013). The Dogra ruler rejected to acknowledge the Muslims claim of joining to Pakistan and rather let free supremacy of terror and threats against the Muslims. The Maharaja (ruler of Jammu and Kashmir) took a step by October 27, 1947. The instrument of accession was not marked until after the Indian intervention on October 27, it was said that it was signed at all. Given the reality as they are presently known, it might be that a fair-minded worldwide tribunal would choose that India had no right to be in the state of Jammu and Kashmir. (Lamb, 1991). There was a mass pro-Pakistan rising throughout the state and an equipped resistance started. The resident of Gilget agency also revolted and fed away the Maharaja's multitudes. To help out the Kashmiris, Lashkars from the tribal areas of Pakistan rushed to the valley and by 26 October 1947, they had arrived at the border of the Srinagar. The Pakistan-Indo clash over Kashmir had been started. The Pakistan vision was clear while leader of Kashmir made a condition. It showed that presence of an instrument of accession was against the will of individuals, it was just a control of state, and the advancement of India was legitimate and protected. The primary problem included in debate was setting the promotion according to the wishes of Kashmir. On the other hand, it was claimed that the division of princely states was announced and it is the problem of self-determination why the issue has not been resolved according to the general population of the state for looking their agreement. (Khan, 2004). It was proclaimed that when peace has been restored, it would be cleared up and it is problem of general population. The people are main part of South Asia. Pakistan unequivocally challenged and disliked the advancement and it challenged the validness of accession. (Adikhari & Kamie, 2006). Not long after this Indian armed forces took legal step without hesitation. Following the war over Kashmir in 1948, the two resolutions were passed by Security Council, the resolution of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, which requested India and Pakistan to order a ceasefire. (Lamb, 1992). These resolutions accorded to the right to Kashmir is but still this right has not been given to the Kashmir is. Although Kashmir is an old dispute but people who have insight and foresightedness, they claim it the problem of self-determination and the natural right of Kashmir is to live independently and free. (Mahmood. 2013). Reasons for this question neither include fundamental material nor a territory of unusual geopolitical significance.

The Strategic Significance of Kashmir

Kashmir has constantly seen as integral part of the Pakistan. Also, there have been solid ethnic, social, geographical and economic linkages. Pakistan views the Kashmir as the unfinished plan of partition. (Norman. 1972). In the two-nation theory, Kashmir has sole importance and Muslim League showed interest for a different country. (Bhutto, 1969). In the view of ideology of Pakistan, establishment of Pakistan after the division of India still remains on a very basic level deficient. (Basrur, 2008). The main importance of Kashmir for Pakistan likewise laid in ideological components, for example, a two-nation theory, whereupon Jinnah based his interest for a separate Muslim country. (Malik, 2002). As indicated by General Akbar Khan, "Kashmir's agreement was not just a question of desirability but have importance for our separate survival." While summing up the hugeness we may presume that "the contention is as much as conflict between characters, imaginations and history as it is a conflict over

Kashmir as the Disputed Legacy and Flash Point in Nuclear South Asia

domain resource and peoples.” (Mujahid, 1964). From Pakistan’s perspective, the Indian ground powers positioned in Southern Kashmir undermine the Shakargarh noteworthy, and all the more critically, the Grand Trunk Street connecting Lahore and Islamabad. (Robert, 1994). In this, setting Pakistani powers began trusting that without Kashmir Pakistan could not safeguard itself against a deceitful government that might come in India. Strategically Indian’s military presence in Kashmir extends Pakistan’s terrifyingly expensive safeguard parameters and cuts it off from the source of its lifesaver of waterways. (Ahmed, 1996). Pakistan’s military base trust that inclusion of Kashmir into Pakistan would give it a vital importance that it generally does not have. (Khan, 1990). While the entire Pakistan is helpless against Indian air attacks, the better portion of India stays beyond the span of Pakistani aircraft. Another element additionally upgrades Kashmir’s strategic significance for Pakistan was its geo-strategic location as it is encompassed by China and Russia toward West and land mass of subcontinent to the South. (Schafied, 2002). In this sense, strategically Kashmir and northern domains give that reliability to Pakistan’s existence, which its four provinces don’t have. (Khan & Rabia, 1999). The economic significance of Kashmir has a great importance for both Pakistan and India. Its detachment has implied financial interruption, since its waters and waterways; its willow and pitch utilized as a part of Pakistani industry. (Mahnaz, 1989). Economically, Kashmir is of crucial significant to the requirements of Pakistan producing timber and lodging three waterways, Indus, Jhelum and Chenab which spill out of Kashmir area into Pakistan and area essential for the agricultural development. These waterways are a potential hotspot for a large-scale hydroelectric power for the nation. (Brecher, 1982). Building a container of water was in the interest of India. (Zahra, 2011). Zardari indicating the circumstances by building dams on the waterways streaming would harm the respective states throughout the time. For Pakistan Kashmir has so much importance that this issue is the core basis of policy and every government is Pakistan has been consistently maintaining that the only solution of the Kashmir dispute will accepted as per the Security Council resolutions. The government of Pakistan has also tried its best to resolve this dispute. (Ahmed,2005). Resultantly, at the ending years of 1990’s, Kashmir was considered as a flashpoint between Pakistan and India. The issue has transformed into a nuclear flash point as had been mentioned president Clinton, Kashmir has turned into the most dangerous place on earth. (Khan 2000). In the UNSC Pakistan rejected every single Indian affirmation from claiming unlawful activity in helping the Kashmir is. It furthermore expressed and developed on extortion, cruelly in this manner, couldn’t be perceived. (Ali, 1973). Not very few issues rising up out of the division turned out to be as troublesome and dangerous on the earth. (Gangly, 2007).

How the New Delhi Perceives?

Kashmir rose to a great extent plugged and regularly proclaimed conviction that India’s personality could assimilate and in addition suit different sorts of social gatherings. Kashmir was noteworthy for highlighting this rational self-view particularly in light of the fact that is populace was Muslim. The Muslim dominant part of Kashmir was vast for India because of its significance. (Malik, 2002). There are more than 1000 groups affected by the religious pioneers in double religious frameworks. (Das, 2006). In these circumstances, making a unified

character of India is troublesome, likewise in the light of fact that aggression happens frequently in the same group. In India, state working through the majority rule government has frequently been defaced by customary and genuine bends as violence for the sake of religion, rank and tribe and additionally financial abuse and monetary. (Basrur, 2008). India showed its interest and keenness over Kashmir because it was hereditary state of its pioneer. Nehru showed his keenness to control over Kashmir. Progressive different journalists set typical purpose behind its assurance to get this area. Rational purpose behind this thought was its hugeness. (Arshi, 2003).

The Domestic Factors

No doubt, Pakistan had has always been supporting the Kashmir cause. However, internal political factor has also been a cause of hardening of Pakistan's attitude on Kashmir. The political parties in Pakistan have sought to gain popularity by whipping up anti-India feelings on the population of the two major political parties, the Pakistan Muslim League (PML) and the PPP have vied with each other in rounding tough on Kashmir. Similarly, the Jamat-e-Islami has always been ahead of everyone else in breathing fire on Kashmir and in fanning hatred against India. Moreover, Pakistan's army, which holds a strong influence in policy matters, always maintained a hard line attitude towards India in such a volatile scenario. In India, the political parties have been adopting the similar rigid stance on Kashmir in their internal politics as in Pakistan. The Congress party was in power for the first thirty years after independence and the Kashmir issue started under congress rule. The two wars between India and Pakistan were also fought when Congress was in power. Particularly Prime Minister Indra Gandhi and her son Rajiv were habitual in stepping up war fear against Pakistan whenever they needed to raise their popularity in India. Such an attitude against Pakistan was their trump card. The other political parties have also not been far behind. The popularity of Bhartya Janata Party (BJP), The Hindu fundamentalist party has been based due to the antagonistic attitude against Pakistan. When BJP came into power in 1998, the relation between India and Pakistan became very tense, in particularly, after conducting nuclear explosions. After mentioned rigid and emotionally charged attitude, which have been adopting by both countries for last many decades are cause of serious strain in bilateral relations of Pakistan and India. This tense situation is primarily because of the deadlock over Kashmir issue. (Amin, 2000).

Bilateral Diplomacy on Kashmirissue

Bilateral efforts to resolve Kashmir dispute started almost immediately after its emergence. The first and most important effort was the meeting between Quaid-e-Azam and Lord Mountbatten. Quaid discussed the issue when the latter visited Lahore on 1 November 1947. During this meeting three suggestions were made: "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 plebiscite. On the initiative of Pakistan, a meeting was arranged but this meeting could not take place owing to Nehru's illness (diplomatic or real?)"In June 1953, after the common wealth meeting the premiers of both countries met first in London but in vain. "Both the countries should settle the question without any disturbance in both states. There is only a

Kashmir as the Disputed Legacy and Flash Point in Nuclear South Asia

solution of this problem to hold up a plebiscite in this area.” During this period, Pakistan negotiated with the United States, which changed the Indian approach drastically. Nehru came forward with an unacceptable agreement, addressing to ‘Lok Sabha’ in December 1953, he said, “India is not bound to the agreement in the joint communiqué as the decision has changed the whole context of Kashmir issue.” In fact, India was looking for some excuse for the other to shelve the issue. No worthwhile contact between India and Pakistan took place for nine years on the issue but under western pressure, following Sino-Indian border clash of 1962. India agreed to hold talks with Pakistan on Kashmir dispute and total six rounds of these talks were held in 1963 between foreign ministers Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and Sardar Sawarn Singh. But these talks too failed to produce any result. Although president Ayub Khan indicated that, he was prepared to consider a solution other than plebiscite. The talks failed because as the New York Times remarked, “India failed to show its readiness to come to any proper solution.” After this high-level contact the fourth round of bilateral talks revolved around the signing the Simla Agreement in 1972 whose underlying idea was that both the countries would settle their disputes through bilateral relations.

Kashmir in the Post Nuclear Era

On May 11, 1998 India carried out a series of five nuclear tests, which exposed the Indian aggressive design and it was proved that India does not care a fig for the established international norms. “These nuclear denotations explicitly reveal the Indian desire not only to show her influence to South Asia but to world in general too.” (Akram, 1999). This is the reason that after these tests India started threatening, not accepting a dialogue and not talking about peace. It also announced its readiness to join Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in order to put Pakistan in an embarrassing situation before the International Community. The Indian interior minister Lal Krishna Advani said, “It is for Pakistan to turn the page of its anti-Indian policy, especially the one related to Kashmir, otherwise our government will take a firm stand.” The Indian minister for Parliamentary Affairs, Madan Lal Khurana said, “We can’t afford any intervention from Pakistan in Kashmir’s issue.” These statements were the first fruit of the Indian nuclear tests. These tests created a strategic imbalance between India and Pakistan.” So after the nuclear capability of sub-continent, the resolution of the dispute has acquired an urgency which was never felt before and the world community is convinced that Kashmir dispute could trigger a nuclear war which will destroy South Asia and the world. For peace and security of the region, The Kashmir issue was included in the international agenda from Clinton to Nelson Mandela who were anxious for its resolution. It was also in response to the nuclear explosion that Vajpayee visited Pakistan both the countries signed Lahore declaration. The joint declaration says, “Both countries vow to take immediate step to reduce nuclear risk, to provide advance information of missile tests, to implement Simla Agreement”. (The News, 1999) At this occasion, both the premiers Nawaz Sharif and Vajpayee stressed seriously the importance of dialogues as a means to solving the problems. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif while mentioning the right of Kashmir is emphasized its acceptance; invited India to join the race of economic development instead of military one. He further said that the central point of conflict between countries is

Kashmir issue and without a dialogue on it no progress is likely on any other issue.” (Daily Pakistan, 1999).

The Kargil Conflict

The kargil operation of Mujahedeen has led the Kashmir issue right into the hearts of the capitals of big countries. They must realize now that this issue can't be resolved through bilateral dialogues as is proved by the history of this process. To witness Indian show of defiance will be a flagrant violation of international peace, justice, equity and human rights. The UN resolution holds primary importance regarding to Kashmir problem. These resolutions have provided the basis for struggle for self-determination. It is now incumbent upon international community to play their due role in solving this problem according to UN Resolutions. Until and unless the problem is solved, cordial relations between India and Pakistan will remain only an illusion; not only the peace in South Asia will remain jeopardized, the world peace will be constantly threatened as well. If the international community helps to settle the dispute over Kashmir, it would be everlasting peace for whole region.”

Role of United Nations

Pakistan's efforts have had only limited success by raising Kashmir issue at platform of international community as the UN has largely showed unresponsiveness. The last time the Security Council discussed the Kashmir issue was way back in 1964, when it couldn't even reaffirm on a new resolution and the meeting ended with no conclusion since the majority have not been found, there in the world body to reaffirm the United Nations own resolution on Kashmir, the last of which was passed in 1957. Pakistan's effort to raise the Kashmir issue in UN forum during 1990's and also during the first decade of 21st century, the period under study, thus got nowhere. (Amin, 2000).

The Regional Implications

The regional organizations are made to build up a region as far as a monetary and social advancement through collective activities. They likewise encourage the state to rise as independent states undermining their long history of animosities and threats. (Kizilbash & Hamid 1984). The European Union coordinated the European countries and reinforced the economy of states. Taking after the point of suggestions, these states incorporated for holding unique character of South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation. The idea created cooperation. Zia-ur-Rehman saw the local participation as far as a potential for peacekeeping in the event that, it is executed in accordance with some basic honesty by every one of the members, which would offer financial advance as well as lessen the political dividends. (Rai, 1989). The thought to bring the states nearer its functional framework and course of action at primary level, which rolled out the intense improvements, happened in residential power structure, an overthrow ousted Zia-ur-Rehman and Indian prime minister Indra Gandhi was likewise killed. In any case, the main meetings of heads and settled time of pioneers of states joined a discussion. Following four and half years of preparation, SAARC was built up at last. The ninth summit held in Male and chose to continue the discussions. (Mehmood 2000). These discussions brought no fruits. In the meantime, the two countries carries out the nuclear tests on 11th and 28th may 1998. These states

Kashmir as the Disputed Legacy and Flash Point in Nuclear South Asia

carried out their nuclear tests due to various motives. India declared its program to counter China and was likewise careful about point of cooperation with Pakistan and to maintain the issue in the region. (The News, 1999)

The Global Prospects

Kashmir problem is not only of Pakistan but also of all the Muslim countries as a whole Muslim world have supported self-determination of Kashmir is. Especially during last ten years of Kashmir freedom movement has seen considerable supportive headway among the Muslim countries. The four Islamic summit conference held during this period gave much importance to the Kashmir issue and as a result, the pressure of the Islamic world on India increased. The issue of Kashmir is strongly examined in numerous meetings of Organization of Islamic Conference nearby collaboration of it demonstrated reminder for the determination of Kashmir. Pakistan then again prevailing about securing the entry of determination critically reported violation of human rights. This meeting was concrete and monetary. It picked up quality of a time frame. Important battle is impossible without the best possible assets and help on high stage. It must have adequate group and particularly gather factual and useful information. Every exertion and advice legitimate privileges of Kashmir is brought about go forward of this comprehension. (Raj, 2006). The attempt and reaction from the organizations played a key role. The sixth session of O.I.C. held in Dakar-Senegal in Dec. 1991 paid a tribute to the Kashmir freedom movement along with Palestine. This meeting supported determination on Kashmir. The resolutions additionally denounced the proceeded with violation of human rights. This session upheld the right of self-determination declaring it their birthright. It also demanded that Kashmir issue should be resolved immediately and peacefully. (Daily Jang,1997). The OIC summit held on 13, 14 December 1994 in Casablanca-Morocco demanded in one of its declaration according to the resolutions of UN. This session negated the Indian claim that UN resolution has become outdated. The eighth summit was held in Tehran and lasted from December 9 to 11 in 1997. Besides the support of Kashmir cause, a representative of Kashmir was given a first ever chance to address the summit on the last day of Tehran conference, Muhammad Safi, the representative of all parties Hurriyat Conference addressed for self-determination despite Indian atrocities. Pioneers professedly “criticized unfortunate moved toward member state for essential influences.” (Sultan, 1999). The resolution furthermore required “the all-inclusive community of Kashmir to practice their right of self-determination.” (The Hindu, 2003). 10th OIC summit was held in Malaysia, Portugal with hopeful communiqué in which, along with and Iraq, the Kashmir issue had also been highlighted. The Muslim world condemned the Indian obstinacy and tyranny against Kashmir is without its and buts. This conference was being considered more effective and successful than many summits had been held in the past and was compared with the second summit of Lahore held in 1974. The role of the Muslims leadership like Mahathir Muhammed, General Pervez Musharraf, and Saudi Crown Prime Abdullah was decisive and conspicuous. In this conference, Mahathir Muhammad shacked the Muslims to rise for unity, they had population more than one billion but were not effective as the Jewish with small population. This statement was not to be considered against the Jews but to stir up the Muslims. (Haqqani, 2003).In

unexpectedly OIC Summit was held in Makkah in December 2007, president general Pervez Musharraf raised the Kashmir problem with his full force on the eve of Umrah performing and said Ummah leaders recognize the dire need of resolve the Kashmir is problem in their struggle for their rights.

The Major Powers Policy Perspective

Relations among the states had always been developed in national interests of each other. Similarly, the US has its own interests in the region. It was in the national interest of US that it supported the UNO resolution on Kashmir along with other permanent measure of UN in 1948. Pakistani leadership had expected the same policy on US post as in 1948. Now both Pakistan and India are nuclear powers of South Asia so the US intervention to settle the Kashmir dispute can be viewed as more significant than ever before. Such arguments have importance in accordance with Pakistani point of view but the present international political realities and the US priorities are totally different. US viewed that her policy toward Kashmir has never got even a slight change and it is the same as it was adopted before. Whereas it means that Kashmir is a dispute between Pakistan and India, which could be settled through bilateral talks. (Khan, 2013).

The United States and Kashmir issue

United States tried its best to pass the UN resolution on Kashmir. It was supposed that the option of plebiscite was given by the US and it could not become the final disposition without the consent of United States. (Meenu, 2010). These resolutions could possibly give a chance to Kashmir is to choose their predetermination themselves. India implemented a double approach on the issue of Kashmir. It communicated its goals that this question ought to be settled by Kashmir is through a free and fair-minded plebiscite. (Patrick, 1988). However, with the passage of time Indian pioneers pronounced Kashmir as part of India. In 1975 India executed, another policy consolidated the general population. The long battle for self-determination builds up that they wish to protect their disposition. Tragically, the extreme military activity by the Indian Authorities has offered ascend to an anti-Hindu feeling among the Kashmiri freedom fighters. (Rizvi, 2004). Washington proposed to put Kashmir in their plan of dialogues. India pleased with this new US policy. This policy was portrayed and gave much importance on fair contact between India and Pakistan. (Ahmed, 1998). International community and major powers are concerned to defuse pressure amongst Pakistan and India because of the accompanying reasons, for example, firstly, clashing circumstances can upgrade odds of encounter, besides a showdown will influence the actions of ongoing attempt against terrorism. (Dixit, 2004). for solid peace, determination is profoundly imperative. Toward the end of year 2011, Pakistan has conceded Most Favorite Nation MFN status to India. Indian public exhibition in February 2012 and now the exchange meeting “Dividends” in Pakistan is a decent begin following a delay of two years between India-Pakistan talks. Agra summit did not deliver fruitful outcomes because of its position and India was entirely requesting the arrangements of cross border terrorism. (Khalid, 2005).

Kashmir as the Disputed Legacy and Flash Point in Nuclear South Asia

The Russian Perception on Kashmir Conflict

The Russian President visited India in December 2002. At Delhi, in a news conference, he blamed Pakistan that Pakistan is supporting groups of Jihadis in Jammu and Kashmir and it should stop infiltration of freedom fighters across the line of control in Kashmir. Also, Pakistan was supporting terrorism and it should dismantle the infrastructure of terrorism in Pakistan occupied Kashmir and in Pakistan. The Russian Foreign minister, Igor Ivanov, has called for settle their relations as priority basis for Russian foreign policy in the year 2004. He cleared the Moscow's point that it has hope and suggest both Pakistan and India to work on elimination of terrorism in the region. He stressed Pakistan and India to resolve Kashmir conflict according to the Simla and Lahore Declaration and it would open a new way of peace and prosperity in the region. (The Hindu,2004).

The Chines Policy Perspective on Kashmir

China views Kashmir as a dispute between Pakistan and India, as always china's position remained neutral and proposed bilateral talks and resolves their all conflicts including Jammu and Kashmir. In 1957, China's premier went to Ceylon, where both China and Ceylon prime ministers gave joint statement that both states ought to resolve it properly through peaceful measures. (Corbel.1966). In 1964 China's Prime Minister Zhou Enlai went by Pakistan and announced support of China for the resolution of Kashmir dispute. (Arif, 1980). In late 1990's China encouraged a policy of restraint on the part of India and Pakistan and supported a dialogue between them for evolving a mutually acceptable solution of the Kashmir problem. China's ambassador to India said in Calcutta in April 1994 that Pakistan and India should avoid international mediation in this conflict and should settle their all issues bilaterally. China always supported Pakistan's stand on Kashmir conflict because Pakistan always supported the resolution of United Nation's Security Council. China always supported the elimination of conflicts between two states e.g. Pakistan and India. The nuclearization of South Asian region has nuclearized the Kashmir conflict. There have been a lot of tensions, conflicts and wars between two states and there is no nearer solution of Kashmir conflict. (Amin, 2000).

CONCLUSION

This particular research work reflects various findings in the form of the historical, eventual, social, political, geo-graphical, conflict prone relationship between India and Pakistan throughout their diplomatic history. Although different initiatives have been taken for the normalization process in the region with practical and theoretical norms of confidence building measures at unofficial and official levels between both the neighboring states. Unfortunately, the peace efforts adopted to make the environment peaceful and ordinary but could never be fruited and went into worst again and again. There are certain historical factors involved to make the situation more critical, uncertain and tight diplomatic relations between India and Pakistan. The ideological, communal, ethnic, diversity of socio-political dialectics between the Hindus and Muslims of sub-continent sowed the seeds of antagonism even after the partition of united India. The mind-set, thought, manifesto and programs of the hard-liner groups have also played a pivotal role to promote hater, controversy and trust deficit between the both neighboring countries. Both the nations propagated a huge work of animosity towards each and

other, which did not let them to fill the gap of distrust, confidence building and the normalization in South Asia. Moreover, the lack of patience, non-cooperative behavior, espionage interests have also fractured the peacekeeping efforts initiated by external entities to bring India and Pakistan for the cultivation of normal diplomatic relations. Since the independence, Pakistan and India have made the region of South Asia vulnerable. The major factors are involved the earlier problems of the issue of military shares, the Indus Water conflict, the cash balances, the problem of refugees settlement, the matter of evacuee property, the Kashmir as a core conflict, the border clashes, the security issues, state-terrorism and the cross border terrorism. The political dialectics among the leadership of India and Pakistan has ever victimized the peace process and normalization during and after the cold war environment. The hard-liner decision makers, extremist elements and ideological pressure groups have exploited each and every situation to create uncertain and sensational nature of the reciprocal relationship. Consequently, both neighboring nations have to suffer from bilateral wars, negative propaganda, distrust which generated numerous social, economic and geo-graphic issues. The Indo-Pakistan mutual relations are adhered with an important issue of nuclear race in South Asia started by Indian nuclear underground tests in 1974. Although Pakistan presented its reservations about Indian nuclear program during 1970s but could not create an obvious deterrence that was properly managed in May 1998 when India tested its nuclear explosion and led Pakistan to follow the suit. Pakistan India remained engaged with one another on the both ends of flaring up the conflict and conflict resolution. The nuclear tests of Islamabad and New Delhi guided to begun another era of détente in the world politics especially in South Asian perspective. The Kargil crisis of 1999, the Agra Summit 2001, the military escalation of 2002, the Lahore Declaration, the Katmandu peace process in the form of hand-shake diplomacy, the cold war strategy, the strategic restraints regimes, the GDMO's hotlines, Kashmir talks, Musharraf's four point agenda, the bus, train and cricket diplomacy are the important developments of Musharraf era in Indo-Pakistan ties. Despite the desire of leadership of Pakistan that the bitterness of the past should be forgotten but the Indian leadership had left no trace of friendly relationship, which produced the conflicts between the neighboring countries. The study reveals that the region of South Asia has been considered as the flashpoint due to acquiring the status of nuclear powers by both India and Pakistan with the unsettled Kashmir issue.

Kashmir as the Disputed Legacy and Flash Point in Nuclear South Asia

REFERENCES

- Afzal, Rafique. (1966). Selected Speeches and Statements of Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah (1911-34 and 1947-48). Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Ahmad, Ayaz (Retd) Air Marshal, (1998) "Society and Defense problems of Pakistan", Defense Publishers.
- Ahmad Mushtaq. (1985). Pakistan at Cross-Roads. Karachi: Royal Books Company.
- Ahmad Salahuddin Syed. (2005). Foreign Policy of Pakistan: A critical study. Karachi: Arshi Publishers.
- Ahmed, Dr. Syed Sallahuddin. (1996), Foreign Policy of Pakistan: A Critical Study, Karachi: Arshi Publishers.
- Ahmed, Sultan. (2006). The Kashmir issue, At a Glance. Special Committee of the Parliament on Kashmir. Islamabad: Parliament House. .
- Basrur, Rajesh M. (2008). South Asia's Cold War: Nuclear Weapons and Conflict in Comparative Perspective (Asian security Studies). New York: Routledge.
- Bhutto Z. A. (1969). The Myth of Independence, London: Macmillan.
- Border dispute with Pakistan, New Delhi: Epitome books.
- 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. Massachusset: Harvard University Press.
- Cheema, Pervaiz Iqbal. (2014). The Kashmir dispute: Key to South Asian Peace. IPRI Journal, 14 No. I, Islamabad: National Defense University.
- Choudhary, G.w. (1995). India Pakistan, Bangladesh and major powers: politics of a divided sub-continent. New Delhi: concept Publisher Company.
- Das, N.K. (2006). People of India and Indian Anthropology, Economic and Political Weekly. 3156-59.
- Dixit, J. (2004). Indian and Regional Developments through the Prism of Indo-Pak Relations. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Ejaz Ahmad, (1996) Kashmir dispute and US security concerns in South Asian, Lahore: South Asian Affairs vol.1, No.1, Center for south Asian studies, University of Punjab
- Ejaz, Ahmed. (1998). "Towards Normalization: India-Pakistan Peace process 1997-1998," South Asian affairs, vol. 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.
- Ejaz, Dr. Ahmed. (2016). US Security Policy towards South Asia and Kashmir Dispute. Lahore: Pakistan Study Center: University of the Punjab.
- Fadia, Dr. B L> (2011). India government and politics, Agra: Shitya Bhawan
- G H Khan, (2004) government and politics of Jammu and Kashmir, Dhaka: Academic publishers
- G W Choudry, (1971) Pakistans arelations with India, New Dehli: Meenakshi Parkashan Meerut.
- Gangulay, S. (2007). The Roots of Religious Violence in India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. London: Routledge.
- Ganhuly, summit and Bringer, Kent.L. (2005). Nuclear Crises Stability in South Asia. New Delhi: Elegant Printers.

- Haider, Zabgal. (2002 spring). "U. S policy towards nuclear South Asia at the Dawn of the 21st century, In state of regional studies, Vol. XX<. No.2 Harry S. Truman, (1949) US participation in the UN: Reports to the president to the Congress, 1948, Washington, department of state publication
- Hameed, A. K. Rai, (1989). International Relations: Theory and Practice, Lahore: Aziz Book Depot.
- 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.
- Hashmi, Saleem Arshi. (2003). Armed Conflicts in South Asia: Need for a Preventive Mechanism. Current Affairs Digest. Islamabad: National Defense University.
- Hyder Sajjad. (1989). Foreign policy of Pakistan: Reflection of an Ambassador. Lahore progressive publishers.
- J.N. Dixit, 2002. War and Peace in India and Pakistan. London: Routledge
- Jakub Stephen. (1997) Indian way to independence, the Indian nation national Congress, Dakha: Academic publishers
- Jalalzai, Musa Khan, (2002). Pakistanis foreign policy, Sectarian impacts on diplomacy, Lahore: Khan book company.
- Jalalzai, Musa Khan, (2004). The foreign policy of Pakistan and Afghanistan, Kashmir and international Security threats, Lahore: Arianna publications.
- Jamal-ul-din Ahmad, (1970) Historical documents of Muslim movement, Lahore: publishing house..
- Kasuri Khurshid Mahmood (2015). Neither a Hawk nor a Dove, Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Kazimi, Muhammad Reza. (1997). Liaqat Ali Khan, His Life and Work. Karachi: Oxford.
- Khalid Dr. Irum, (2013). Pakistan foreign policy, Evolution, development and strategies, Lahore: Peace publication
- Khalid Iram, Dr. (2013). Pakistan Foreign policy: Evolution, Development and strategies(Ed). Lahore: peace publications.
- Khan. Dr. Rashid Ahmed & Alqama, Dr. Khawaja. (1996). Pakistan, India and Kashmir. Journal of Political Science, Vol, XIX. Lahore: Govt. College.
- Khan. Dr. Rashid Ahmed & Alqama, Dr. Khawaja. (1996). Pakistan, India and Kashmir. Journal of Political Science, Vol. 19, No. 1, 2. Lahore: Department of Political Science, Government College.
- Korbel, J. (1966). Danger in Kashmir, New Jersey, US: Princeton University Press.
- Krepon, Michael. (1997). "US perception of Pakistan's Security," Pakistan Horizon, Vol. 50, No. 2. See also The Hindu, Delhi, May 15, 1997.
- Lamb, Alaster. (1992). Kashmir: A Disputed Legacy 1946-1990. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Lavoy (Ed), A Symmetric warfare in Outh Asia: the causes and consequences of Kargil conflict, London: Cambridge University Press
- Mahammad, Dr. Safdar. (1989). Pakistan-Tareekh-o-Siyasat. Lahore: Jang Publishers.
- Mahdi, Niloufer, (1999), Pakistan's foreign policy 1971-1981: The search for security, Karachi: Feroxsons (Pvt) Ltd.

Kashmir as the Disputed Legacy and Flash Point in Nuclear South Asia

- Mahmood Safder. Dr. (1995). International affairs. Lahore: A.H Publishers.
- Majeed Gulshan. (2013). South Asian Security Compulsions: A Historical Analysis of India-Pakistan Relations. Journal of Political Studies, vol.20, Issue: 2,219:232. Lahore: University of Punjab.
- Malik Abdullah, Mr. Abdul. (2013). Address of Pakistan's high commissioner in Australia at RUSI of Australia entitled "Pakistan's perception on war on terror."
- Malik, I. (2002). Kashmir Ethnic Conflict: International Dispute. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Mazari, Shireen M. (2003). The Kargil Conflict 1999: Separating Facts from Fiction. Islamabad: Ferozsons.
- Meeno, Roy. (2010). India and her Sub-Continent Neighbors: New Pattern of Relationships. New-Delhi & Deep Publications.
- Menon. V. P. (1961). The Story of integration of Indian States. Orient: Longman.
- Nizamani, H. (2003). "Whose bomb is it anyways? Public opinion and perceptions about nuclear weapons and policy", in the post-explosions phase in Pakistan, social science research council, June 14.
- P R Chari, Parveez Iqbal Cheema, (1972) the Shimla agreement, its wasted promises.
- Pakistan india Relations, Prospects for a Durable Peace, Lahore: Center for South Asian studies, University of Punjab
- Philip, Ziegler. (1985). Mountbatten: The Official Biography, London: Oxford.
- Pijl, Kees Van Der, (2006). Global rivals from the Cold war to Iraq. London: Pluto Press
- Prakash, Chander (2003). "India and Pakistan Unending Conflict III", New Delhi: A. P. H. Publishing Cooperation.
- Rai, Hameed A.K (1989). Foreign Policy of Major Powers. Lahore: Aziz publishers, Lahore, 1989.
- Rizvi, Hassan Askari. (1993). Pakistan and Geostrategic Environment, London: The Macmillan Press.
- e.
- Saleem Arshi Hashmi. (2013). Armed Conflicts South Asia: Need for a Preventive Mechanism. Monthly Current Affairs Digest, Book: 227, 138-156.
- Samarjit Ghosh, (2009), Indo-Pak composite dialogue, 2008 IPCS, Special report No 65, February 2009
- Sattar, Abdul. (2010). Pakistan's foreign policy (1947-2012), Karachi: Oxford Printing Press.
- Sattar, Abdul. (2010) Pakistan's foreign policy (1947-2012), Karachi: Oxford Printing
- Sattar, Abdul. (2013). Pakistan's foreign policy: 1947-2012. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Sayeed K.B. (2015). The Political System of Pakistan. Lahore: Peace Publications.
- Scott D. Sagan. (2009) "Evolution of Pakistan and Indian nuclear doctrine." In Scott D. Sagan, ed., Inside nuclear South Asia. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Shahid M. Amin. (2000). Pakistan's Foreign Policy: A Reappraisal. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- India: Diplomacy, Democracy and the Bomb. New Delhi: Penguin Publishers.

Ziring, Lawrence. (1980). *Pakistan: The Enigma of Political Development*. Folkstone and Colorado: Dawson, Westview.

Daily jang, 1997, December 20.

Monthly press Review. (August 1998). Rawalpindi: Defense and Media Publications.

The News, February 22, 1999.

Zaki, Akram. (June 1, 1999). Senator as a Guest in PTV Programm-Swarey-Swarey.

Abbas Rashid. (1999, July 10). "Raising the Ante in Kashmir," Imtiaz Gull, "Retreat Dictated by Economic Compulsions," *The News International Pakistan*: Shafqaat Mahmood, "Losing the peace"; Mahdi Masud, "Kargil Crisis; A Balance Sheet," *The Dawn*, July 16, 1999; Altaf Gauhar, "Four Wars, One Assumption," *The nation*, September 5, 1999.

Khan, Amanullah. (August 31, 2000). *Kashmir: A Formula for Peace in Kashmir*. The News.

Amin, Shahid M. (April 2003). *A Re-Evaluation of the Kashmir Dispute*, *Pakistan Horizon*, 56.

The Hindu, Saturday, 18 October 2003.

Gauhar Hamayun. (Oct 3, 2004). *Remember to Ask the Beloved*, *The Nation*.

Malik, Mehreen Zahra. (February 2-8, 2007). "Kashmiris are not tried but they need a change in strategy", *Friday Times*.

The Indian Express, 2011, July 28

Khan, Muhammad, (2012, Feb 15) "Granting MFN status to India" *Pakistan Observer*

Khan, Dr. Suhrab Aslam. (2016, June). *Prosecution of Musharraf: Right Method to proceed with (Correct Perspective of National Interest)*. *Monthly Current Affairs Digest*, Lahore: A. H. Publishers.