

## **KASHMIR CONFLICT BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN: A REALIST PERSPECTIVE**

**Mohd. Shekaib Alam<sup>\*</sup>,<sup>1</sup> Muhammet Ali Guler<sup>2</sup>, Moyenul  
Hasan<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Master Candidate, Department of Political Science, International Islamic University  
Malaysia (IIUM), P.O. Box 10, 50728 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

<sup>2</sup> Master Candidate, Department of Political Science, International Islamic University  
Malaysia (IIUM), P.O. Box 10, 50728 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

<sup>3</sup> Master Candidate, Department of Political Science, International Islamic University  
Malaysia (IIUM), P.O. Box 10, 50728 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

---

**Keywords:**  
*Kashmir; India; Pakistan;  
Instrument of Accession;*

---

### **ABSTRACT**

The dispute over Kashmir between India and Pakistan is an international issue which arose on the world scene in 1947, when Maharaja of Kashmir, Hari Singh signed on instrument of accession to India on 26 October 1947. Since beginning, this verdict was questioned by the government of Pakistan arguing majority of state's population was Muslim and due to this four times both countries India and Pakistan went for war over this issue. Observing the nature of politics by both governments, this article argued both countries are driven merely by their national interests and have no sympathy with the people of Kashmir at large that how they feel. To analyse above argument, article has adopted classical realism as theory to study this subject.

---

**Publisher All rights reserved.**

---

## INTRODUCTION

India and Pakistan whenever aim to initiate a peaceful, mutually acceptable solution to the Kashmir dispute, they came across a number of constant threat of disruptions, especially recurring tensions between India and Pakistan. Incidences such as the 2008 terror attack in Mumbai, cross-border firing between the two armies in January and August of 2013 etc. that stop both countries to move forward. Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, in reaction to the death of two Indian soldiers in January 2013 said “After this barbaric act, there cannot be business as usual (with Pakistan)” (Kashmir Initiative Group n.d.). Currently, when both countries were planning to initiate talk to resolve 6 decades dispute, On January 2, 2016, India's sprawling Pathankot airbase came under a remarkable four days of attack from a handful of gunmen that derailed India-Pakistan peace talks (Joshi 2016).

Therefore, the issue of Kashmir is very complex and bewildering in nature. In 2002, the former American President, Bill Clinton described Kashmir as most dangerous place on the surface of the earth (Mishra 2010). Discussing the issue of Kashmir is not an easy task and it is very difficult to reach at the bottom of the conflict as well to draw a line of true and false based on writings provided on the issue. This article attempts to explain the issue of Kashmir through realist perspective of international relation. It has number of underlying objectives. Firstly, it will present the background of the issue in brief. Secondly, it will highlight the basic stands of both countries India and Pakistan over the issue. Thirdly, it will show significant of Kashmir for both countries. Fourthly, it will analyze the issue on realist paradigm by seeing how Kashmir matters to both countries India and Pakistan.

Realist assume international system as anarchy where a central authority does not exist. States are sovereign and autonomous. They are the actors whom concerns own security and national interest. In order to be secured and obtain its national interest, they have to struggle for power as much they can. The ideal is to be hegemonic power (Slaughter 2011). Morgenthau, the father of realism assumes that desire to dominate is central cause of conflict. According to him, there are six principles of realism which can be summarized as it is based on objective laws which are rooted in unchanging human nature of selfish, sort, and brutal, rulers act and think in terms of power only, they struggle for it and largely they are not motivated in statecraft from ethical norms (Art and Jervis 2009). Thus, this study will how far India and Pakistan are relevant to this perspective and does Kashmir issue really strengthen their powers. Power has multi-facets in realist view, it could be economically, socially, politically etc. but more important and desired aspect is militarily. The argument of this study is India and Pakistan's concern over Kashmir is to just accumulate power, therefore, they don't have any sympathy on suffering of the Kashmiri people from which they are going through.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

India and Pakistan's dispute over Kashmir is an International issue. Due to this, number of researches and scholarly works has been produced concerning this issue but majority of works are developed in the conflict resolution perspective. *India, Pakistan and the Kashmir Dispute* by Robert G. Wirsing (1994) is one of finest work which discusses the issue extensively with insightful analysis. Another great work is *Kashmir: A Disputed Legacy, 1984-90* (1991) written by a British historian Alastair Lamb. He argues that Maharaja Hari Singh did not sign the Instrument of Accession on Oct. 26, 1947 but it is a conspiracy between Indian National Congress leaders, the Maharaja Government and senior Indian army officers including few British. Therefore, India's legal claim to the state of Jammu & Kashmir (J&K) is deceitful. Similar thought is expressed by Victoria Schofield in her book *Kashmir Conflict* (1996). She argues that according to confirmed source Maharaja Hari Singh left Srinagar for Jammu at 2am of 26<sup>th</sup> October 1947, where journey requires 16 hours. Therefore, it is hard to believe session of Instrument of Accession has been taken place upon his arrival in the evening of the same day.

In another hand, Prem Shankar Jha in his book *Kashmir, 1947: Rival Versions of History* (1996) deals the issue of instrument in detail and rebuttal claims of Lamb and alike. He proved the Instrument of Accession that had actually been signed by providing historical material and testimonies such as that of Field Marshal Sam Manekshaw. Ayesha Jalal in her book *The State of Martial Rule* (1990) argues that Kashmir dispute is a bone of contention between India and Pakistan since independence of India and formation of Pakistan. According to her the percentage of Pakistan Army members among the tribal raiders in 1947 was not more than 5% and due to this it is incorrect to say Pakistan actively promoted the sentiments that had encouraged the tribesmen to invade Kashmir. She further says keeping Kashmir dispute alive, both countries India and Pakistan are spending endlessly on military. Her more focus in this book was on Pakistan's political economy. Based on *Subalterns and Raj: South Asian since 1600* by Rispin Bates (2007) the Instrument of Accession was signed by Maharaja of Kashmir but on the condition of having a referendum. Even at the time of the ceasefire the main condition of ceasefire agreement was that a referendum should be held to determine the fate once normality was restored. *The roots of Kashmir Problem* edited by Devendra Swarup and Sushil Aggarwal gives another perspective on the issue of Kashmir. It argues the issue of Kashmir is exploiting major economic and military resources of the country. This issues made Kashmiri Hindus refugees in their own homeland. According to this book, the reason of continuity of this dispute is Kashmiri militancy. An article which has studied the issue of Kashmir from neorealist perspective where the focus of the writer was to explain underlying conflict between two

states. It is believed neorealist explains inter-state conflict in a good manner (Rajagopalan 2014). This research's focus will be to analyze how India and Pakistan is practicing classical realist perspective in order to accumulate power over Kashmir.

### **KASHMIR AND ITS CONFLICT IN BRIEF**

Kashmir is located in the far north-west of the south Asian subcontinent. It enjoys strategic location between Central Asia and South Asia and it shares border with India and Pakistan, Afghanistan and China. The total area of Kashmir is 86023 square miles which are divided between Pakistan which possess 32358 square meters and India which possess 53665 square meters based on 1972 agreements where both countries had signed. People of Kashmir are combined with different races, such as Aryan, Mongol, Afghan, and Turks (A'ti 2004 ). Three states, India, Pakistan, and China, control parts of Kashmir, which despite a large Muslim majority is host to important Hindu and Buddhist minorities and seven major language families (The Carter Center 2003).

As for the current position of Jammu and Kashmir, it goes back to 1846, where British ruler bought it for Ghulab Singh, a Hindu ruler from a Sikh ruler in 7.5 million rupees which is known in history by Amritsar Convention and Ghulab Singh kingdom lasted till 1947 (Rai 2004). The ruler was Hindu while majority of the subjects were Muslims. British when announced that all princely ruled states have autonomous to choose India or Pakistan, all of them joined either India or Pakistan except three Jaunagarh, Hyderabad and Kashmir (Schofield 2000). Jaunagarh since it is located on west side of India, bordering Pakistan, had intention to join Pakistan but due to India's intervention on the basis of large Hindu population in state, it joined India. With regard to Hyderabad, ruler was Muslim and he wanted to be independent but due to protest of Hindu majority population and India's help, it joined India too. Kashmir's ruler was Hindu and he wanted independent state too to secure his position and further to strengthen Kashmir and Pakistan relation he signed an interim "stand still" accord in order to maintain transport and other services with Pakistan (India 1994), but since majority of population belonged to Muslim community, they protested to join with Pakistan and Pakistan helped them too, when Maharaja saw the situation is out of his control, he asked India to help, using this opportunity, India asked Maharaja for "Instrument of Accession" and this took place in 26 October, 1947, and all problem started (Maududi 1986). Since then, India and Pakistan has gone for four wars on the issue of Kashmir in 1947, 1965, 1971, and 1999 (Adhikari and Kamle 2010). The 1947 war occurred due to Maharaja's decision of considering Kashmir an independent state. However, this was stopped by UN resolutions where India had brought the issue to UN. According to UN resolutions, both countries had to stop firing, both had to

take out their troops from Kashmir valley except a minor size of Indian troops to stabilize the civilian and both had to negotiate and solve this using people of Kashmir opinion (Wirsing 1994). In 1965, again war took place between them, and it is ended with Tashkent Agreement in 1 January, 1966. The war of 1971, occurred, when Pakistani Air force plane hit Indian airfields at the western part which ended by signing the Shimla Agreement between Indra Gandhin and Zulfaqar Ali bhuttu in 1972 (The Telegraph 2011). The war of 1999 is known as Kargil war which occurred due to seeping Pakistani soldiers and Kashmiri militant in Kashmir. However, one thing should be noted that in 1957 Kashmir was given a special status in Indian constitution. The basic premise of this is non-Kashmiri cannot buy a land in it. In Kashmir history, the insurgency of 1989 is very famous where some pro-independence demanded India to free Kashmir, thus Indian troops have brutally stopped it that's why Amnesty International accused India of not caring public safety act. Still protest are going on such as what took place in 2008, 2009, and currently on 9 October, 2014, Indian and Pakistani military forces fell in gun-firing which led 17 civilian's death and dozens got injured on both sides of Kashmir border. On 10 October, 2014 Indian defense minister Arun Jetly accused Pakistan on escalating the conflict on the Kashmir border. He further said "If Pakistan persists with this adventurism; our forces will make the cost of this adventurism unaffordable" (Kumar 2014).

This is a brief description of Kashmir and India and Pakistan relations over it. However, the great challenge which lies in Kashmir is that there are people who want to join with India such as secularist parties *Kashmir National Conference*, headed by Farooq Abdullah, who believes Kashmir is part of India but he seeks good and wide control over it. The another party is independence seeker such as *Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front*, headed by Mr. Yasin which was established in 1965, and rest wants to join with Pakistan. They are for example people of *Jamaat-e-Islami Kashmir*, headed by Ghulam Butt, as well *Conference of Muslims in Kashmir*, headed by Abdul Ghani butt and others. Therefore, it looks very hard for Kashmiris to determine where they want to go (Murad 2009). According to an empirical research, out of 116 Kashmiri respondents, 61.2% believed that the best solution for Kashmir imbroglio is independence because they were promised by the government of India the right of self-determination through a plebiscite by virtue of which they can choose between acceding to India, Pakistan or independence. A total of 19.8% respondents said that Kashmir cannot survive economically if it will be free from the Indian control. Only 2.6% said that the idea of free Kashmir is not possible due to lack of consensus among separatists. However 16.4% respondent felt that this is a peaceful option (Sehgal 2011).

### **SIGNIFICANT OF KASHMIR**

India and Pakistan already went for four wars over Kashmir issue, and still no one wants to leave it. This simply indicates its significance for both countries. As for India, it is a very strategic place for its security against China and Pakistan. It considers it as geographical extension for many natural resources and a barrier to the philosophy of Pakistan Government which could threaten India's internal security (Swarup 1992). The third significant role of Kashmir for India is the fear that if it is allowed its independence on religious or racial ground, might it will open up door for other states especially North-Eastern seven states, even in this matter for South Indian states. The fourth reason is Kashmir valley is full with the plants which can be used to produce different medicine as well it is tourist attraction. The fifth reason is India likes to show to the world that its secular aim is such successful that large Muslim population, bordering Pakistan live in its territory happily (Cheema 2015). As for Pakistan it is vital for its security zone as well the presence of two major roads and railway network in the border help to strengthen its economy. Secondly, three major rivers come to Pakistan through Kashmir valley which is good for its agricultural product and India's occupation over Kashmir could lead to direct threat to its water security (Sarwar 1990).

### **STANDS OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN**

Since both countries have immense advantages due to acquiring Kashmir. It will be interested to know each country's claim with regard to Kashmir. As for Pakistan, it considers it as an unfinished agenda of the division of India in 1947. Pakistan regards it as an issue of giving the right of self-determination to the Kashmiris, a principle also accepted by the UN Security Council Resolution where original importance of Kashmir for Pakistan lies in the two-nation theory upon which All India Muslim League based its demand for a separate Muslim homeland (Cheema 2015). It also does not accept the "Instrument of Accession" signed by Hari Singh with India in 1947 because Hari Singh was not popular leader and he had lost authority over people during that time (Sarwar 1990). Pakistan also claims that according to guidelines of partition designed by British, Kashmir should merge with Pakistan because majority of the population are Muslims as India did with regard to Jaunagarh state. Pakistan also says after 1989 insurgency in Kashmir, that India is failed to protect Kashmiri rights, thus India should allow them to join Pakistan or be independent (Schofield 2000). Pakistan seeks India to let the people of Kashmir decide by themselves on plebiscite method suggested by UN Security Council resolution. Pakistan also says that India internally occupied Kashmir in order to cut Pakistan from the three great rivers (Sarwar 1990) As for India, it claims that Hari Singh, the Maharaja has already signed with India that it belongs to India, thus Kashmir is an integral part of India

(Saraf 1995). India also claims that Shaikh Abdullah, the leader of establishing a constitutional assembly has agreed on Hari Singh's instrument of accession to India and created a constitution for state saying Kashmir is permanent part of India. India refutes Pakistan's philosophy of two nation states, despite majority of the Kashmir population is Muslims but it matches with secular India in many ways. India also claims that it has put lot of effort to develop the region, thus asking letting it go, is garbage (Pal 1995). India also claims that people's participation in elections shows that people are happy and there is no demand for any plebiscite (Sehgal 2011).

### **ANALYSIS ON REALIST PARADIGM**

In order to analyze the India and Pakistan's stands over Kashmir, the researcher have applied some simple steps. First, he explained in introduction that the core of realist perspective is international system is anarchy, consequently state should move towards self-help, the guarantee of its survival is accumulating power till it became hegemonic in international system and rulers should not be motivated by ethical norms in diplomacy and statecraft. Therefore, firstly it will be analyzed how India and Pakistan are accumulating power on the issue of Kashmir, second step is researcher will observe nature of diplomacy played by both countries. Thirdly, he will see which country is more realistic in nature.

As for first step of comparison; India since its independence has shown its power in order to retain many states with it as discussed above and Kashmir is one of them. India is well aware of beauty of Kashmir that can bring tourists, that's why it had kept many troops there even conflict was not started (Sarwar 1990). The basic reason of allowing Indian troops in Kashmir territory by Hari Singh was that he was afraid on his position due to many demonstrations from Muslims such as workers revolution (*Raisham Khana*) in 1930, and in same year Ghulam Abbas established Syndicate Muslim Bank and in 1932 Islamic Conference Pan Jammu and Kashmir was established by some Muslim scholars in which Iqbal was one of them. The basic motive was to stop the injustice of ruler against Muslims and to get freedom (India 1994). The second thing what India did is when armed tribesmen from Pakistan helped people of Kashmir during partition to join with Pakistan and Hari Singh was in trouble, India immediately without any delay responded to his help, thinking this will create a special status for India in Hari Singh's heart, and that exactly happened and as India asks to sign for instrument of accession, he did it leaving his dream of being in power as an independent state. (Maududi 1986) The third thing what India did is first when Pakistan wanted to go UN Security Council with regard to 1947-1948 war between them, India stopped it, saying we should solve this mutually through negotiation, but after few days India went itself to UN Security Council showing that India

really care, and it is serious for the people of Kashmir. The fourth thing what India did is it started election on democratic basis in the state and urged leaders to accept Kashmir as India's integral part and provided it a special status in constitution (Maududi 1986). As for Pakistan, yes it was also aware of richness of Kashmir from different aspects, therefore before Maharaja takes any decision, it sent its troop to help the people of Kashmir in order to merge Kashmir with Pakistan (India 1994). The second thing what Pakistan is constantly doing is sending their people inside Kashmir to encourage youth to demand for plebiscite and that's the reason India accused Pakistan for helping people on grassroots level in 1989 insurgency (Venkatraman 2008). The Mumbai attack and attack on Indian parliament are examples to show that India will not leave Kashmir, no matter whatever it has to face.

With regard to second point, India refused to initiate talk with Pakistan because the initiative came from Pakistan after consulting separatist leader Shabir Khan arguing if Pakistan wants to talk with India, should come directly after seeing what happened on 18 August 2014 (Allison Berland 2014). The reason of doing this, is to show India no longer accepts Kashmir as disputed area. In another word, it is integral part of India, thus talk should be directly on bilateral basis. On 26 September 2014, Nawaz Sharif, the current Prime Minister of Pakistan raised the issue of Kashmir in UN Security General meeting during his speech. He pointed out that Pakistan concern is good relationship with all its neighboring states. It is worth to fulfill the plebiscite promise of Kashmiri people, since they are leaving in constant violence. Pakistan tried to show its sympathy again to people of Kashmir in order to get support against India. The next day, Prime Minister of India, Narendra Modi refuted it saying it is not desirable to bring Kashmir issue in UN Security General. It is our own problem and it should be solved through bilateral discussion (Ghosh 2014).

With regard to third point, seems India is stronger in practicing the realistic hypothesis in accumulating the power due to some facts. First, according to guidelines given by British Indian ruler to princely ruled states, Kashmir should join Pakistan because it has many similarities such as culture, language, and majority of population is Muslims but due to India presence of mind and its Machiavellian trick, it was able to retain Jammu and Kashmir with India and day by day it is making Kashmir unbroken part of India. One agenda of current ruling government of India is to remove special status of Kashmir from Indian constitution. So might in near future, it will be ordinary state of India as others (Party 2014).



## CONCLUSION

As conclusion, researcher like to quote his first argument that India and Pakistan are more concerned to their interest rather they care about people of Kashmir. One reason of saying so is what I discussed above that how both are fighting for Kashmir, just to attain it. As for India it is estimated since 1989, 50,000 civilians are died during the conflict. Human Rights Watch issued a report where it demonstrates that civilians are tortured on security check points. Indian forces do rape of women (Suri 2006). As for Pakistan, in its Azad Kashmir the religious discrimination is at peak. The astonishing is Pakistan is yet to provide proper rights to the people who migrated from India during partition (Asif 2006). Both India and Pakistan use Kashmir to win election. Therefore, it is clear both do not have any sympathy towards its citizens, through which difficulties they are going through. India wants to capture Kashmir on the basis of gun, not with love and guarantying every Kashmiri security for their life, a decent job and a good and prosperous environment. Pakistan wants to snatch Kashmir through sending Mujahideen in Kashmir or supporting Kashmiri youth to rebel against India.

## REFERENCES

- Adhikari, Suddepto, and Mukul Kamle. (2010). "The Kashmir: An Unresolved Dispute Between India and Pakistan." *Geopolitics Quarterly* 59-107.
- Allison Berland, Michael Kugelman. (2014). "Is There Any Hope for India-Pakistan Relations?" *Foreign Policy*.
- Art, Robert J., and Robert Jervis. (2009). *International politics: Enduring concepts and contemporary issues*. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Asif, Bushra. (2006). "How Independent is Azad Jammu and Kashmir." In *Kashmir: New voices, New approaches*, by Waheguru Pal, 33-45. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- A'ti, Mohammad Abdul. (2004). "Kashmir: A half century of conflict." *Aljazeera.net*, March 10.
- Cheema, Musarat Javed. (2015). "Pakistan – India Conflict with Special Reference to Kashmir." *Journal of South Asian Studies* 45-69.
- Ghosh, Deepshikha. (2014). "PM Narendra Modi Raises Nawaz Sharif's Kashmir Comments With UN Secretary-General." September 27.
- India, Pakistan and the Kashmir Dispute... (1994). *Robert G. Wirsing*. London: The Macmillan Press LTD.

- Joshi, Shashank. (2016). "Pathankot attack: India-Pakistan peace talks derailed?" <http://www.bbc.com>, January 1.
- Kashmir Initiative Group. n.d. *Background to the Kashmir Conflict: Challenges and Opportunities*. Srinagar.
- Kumar, Hari. (2014). "Indian Defense Chief Blames Pakistan for Kashmir Conflict." *The New York Times*, October 10.
- Maududi, Abul A'la. (1986). *The issue of Muslim Kashmir*. Kuwait: Da'r al-Qalam.
- Mishra, Pankaj. (2010). "Kashmir: The World's Most Dangerous Place." *New York Daily*, March 4. Accessed 3 2, 2016. <http://www.nybooks.com>.
- Murad, Sarah Mustafa. (2009). "The issue of Kashmir." *Civilized Dialogue*, February 2. Accessed 2 28, 2016.
- Pal, Khagendra Chandra. (1995). "The relations between the Indian Union and the state of Jammu and Kashmir." In *The Story of Kashmir: Yesterday and Today*, by Virinder Grover, 192 - 206. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications.
- Party, Bhartiya Janta. (2014). *Election Manifesto 2014*. New Delhi: BJP Manifesto Committee.
- Philosophy, Stanford Encyclopedia of. (2013). "Political Realism in International Relations." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Rai, Mridu. (2004). *Hindu Rulers, Muslim Subjects*. London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd.
- Rajagopalan, Rajesh. (2014). "Neorealist Theory and the India-Pakistan Conflict." *Institute for Defense Studies and Analysis*.
- Saraf, Om Prakash. (1995). "Kashmir's Constitutional Status in India." In *The History of Kashmir: Yesterday and Today*, by Virinder Grover, 167 - 172. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications.
- Sarwar, Tarik Jan & Col Ghulam. (1990). *Kashmir Problems: Challenges and Responses*. Islamabad: Institute of Policy Studies, Islamabad.
- Schofield, Victoria. (2000). *Conflict in Kashmir*. New York: I.B.Tauris & Co. Ltd.
- Sehgal, Rashmi. (2011). "Kashmir Conflict: Solutions and Demand for Self-determination." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 188 - 195.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. (2011). *Anne-Marie Slaughter*. Oxford: Wolfrum, R. (Ed.) Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law.
- Suri, Kavita. (2006). "Women in the Valley: From Victims to Agents of Change." In *Kashmir: New Voices, New Approaches*, by Waheguru Pal, 81-95. Colorado: Lynee Rienner Publishers, Inc.

- Swarup, Devendra. (1992). *The Roots of Kashmir Problem*. New Delhi: Siya Ram Printers.
- The Carter Center. (2003). *The Kashmiri Conflict: Historical and Prospective, Intervention Analyses*. [www.cartercenter.org](http://www.cartercenter.org).
- The Telegraph. (2011). "A brief history of the Kashmir conflict." [www.thetelegraph.com](http://www.thetelegraph.com), September 24. Accessed 2 27, 2016.
- Venkatraman, Amritha. (2008). *Understanding Islam and Terror*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG, Dudweiler Landstr.
- Wirsing, Robert G. (1994). *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute on regional conflict and its resolutions*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.