

CHAPTER I

INRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The aim of this thesis is to analyze and examine the impacts on Jammu and Kashmir and India-Pakistan relation after Indian revoked its special status and the consequences of such revocation under the Narendra Modi government in 2019.

The state of Jammu and Kashmir (J&K), which is located at the northernmost tip of the Himalaya, is renowned for its beautiful natural scenery and abundance of species (Dar & Khuroo, 2020). The state has a total area of 228070 square kilometers, however according to preliminary estimates, 138134 square kilometers along the "Actual Line of Control" are Indian Territory. Ladakh alone makes up 70% of the actual territory under Indian control, Jammu makes up 19%, and the Kashmir region makes up the final 11% (Koul, 1991). Jammu, the Kashmir Valley, and Ladakh are the three regions that make up the state.



Map of Jammu and Kashmir (commons.wikimedia.org, 2019)

The allocation of Jammu and Kashmir is a complex issue, as the region is disputed by three countries: India, Pakistan, and China. India controls most of the region, including the Kashmir Valley, Jammu, and Ladakh. The Indian government divides the region into two union territories: Jammu and Kashmir, and Ladakh. Pakistan controls the northwestern portion of the region, known as Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas. The Pakistani government divides the

Jammu and Kashmir into two administrative divisions: Azad Kashmir, and Gilgit-Baltistan. China controls the northeastern portion of the Jammu and Kashmir, known as Aksai Chin and the Trans-Karakoram Tract. The current allocation of the Jammu and Kashmir is as follows: India controls 55.5% of the region, including the Kashmir Valley, Jammu, and Ladakh. Pakistan controls 33.7% of the region, including Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas. China controls 10.8% of the region, including Aksai Chin and the Trans-Karakoram Tract (Hussain, 2021). The allocation of the region is a source of tension between India and Pakistan, as both countries claim the entire Jammu and Kashmir region.

The State of Jammu & Kashmir, like the other princely kingdoms of India, was ruled by Dogra King Maharaja Hari Singh at the time of the partition of India into India and Pakistan in 1947. As a result of their collaboration with Pakistan's Pashtun tribal Kabailis, their Muslim people revolted and attacked him. In October 1947, a Pashtun militia from Pakistan breached the state's border. When he saw the Kabailis' threat, Maharaja, who before had opposed integrating Kashmir with India, begged India for help. The Government of India agreed to the request, but assistance was only provided after he had signed an instrument of accession to India. When Pakistani soldiers joined the conflict in 1948 to help the Kabailis, they

forcefully took certain territory in Kashmir that had already been annexed by India before being pushed out by the Indian Army. After the truce at 00:00 on December 31, 1948, a Line of Control was established between the two nations. Pakistan never gave these sections back. Kashmir, which is now controlled by Pakistan, has been claimed by India since 1948 and is regarded as being a natural extension of the Indian Republic (Dr.Arti, 2021).

Many groups in Kashmir, including the king himself, wanted the State of Jammu & Kashmir to completely adopt the Indian Constitution, while Shaikh Abdullah, who favored the overthrow of monarchy, wanted the state to have its own constitution. A constituent assembly was established in 1951 to investigate the situation, and the Indian Constitution's Article 370 was added to provide Jammu and Kashmir unique status. The whole princely state of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India, according to a unanimous resolution made on February 15, 1954, by the elected Jammu and Kashmir Constituent Assembly (Dr.Arti, 2021).

Aside from foreign affairs, defense, and communications, Article 370 permits Jammu and Kashmir to have its own constitution, distinct flag, and independence in all other administrations affairs. During the last few decades, this autonomy has been severely diminished. The Bharatiya Janata

Party (BJP), led by prime minister Narendra Modi, pledged to remove Article 370 during 2019 national elections, which it easily won. This occurred via presidential order on August 5th, 2019, except for one phrase to which the government had no objections (Lunn, India revokes Kashmir's special status, 2019).

The revocation of Article 370 includes a key provision added under it, known as Article 35A, which grants special privileges to permanent residents, such as state government jobs and the exclusive right to own property in Jammu and Kashmir. It is intended to protect the state's unique demographic character as the only Muslim-majority state in India (Syed, 2021). However, others, including the BJP, view it as discriminatory against non-Muslims and damaging development.

The revocation allowed the central government to have greater control over the affairs of Jammu and Kashmir. The area was divided into Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh, two distinct Union Territories that are now directly under the control of the federal government. The Indian government can have more control and decision-making ability over the area thanks to this centralized governance structure, including in terms of security, development, and resource distribution.

Despite the extensive domestic and world media coverage of the repeal of autonomy in Kashmir, there is still little understanding of the importance of Articles 370 and 35A for Kashmiris and little is discussed about the consequences of repealing these articles for Kashmiris and the impact on India-Pakistan relations.

The leadership of the Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf believes that dialogue between Pakistan and India should be used to tackle the key problem of Kashmir. Imran Khan, the chairman of the PTI, declared his willingness to strengthen Pakistan's relations with India in his winning address on July 26, 2018, following the general elections. According to him, the blame game needs to end because it threatens the peace and stability of South Asia. According to him, if India moves in the direction of Pakistan, Pakistan will follow suit, but both sides must make a move. Kashmir was viewed as a "core" issue by Imran Khan, who indicated that it might be managed through diplomacy (Shafiq, Sultana, Munir, & Shoaib, 2019).

Initial diplomatic efforts by Pakistan in relation to the Kashmir issue were conducted over the phone. For instance, during their talk, Imran Khan and his Iranian counterpart agreed that there is no military solution to the Kashmir problem. Later, PM Imran Khan made two trips to the US and spoke at the UNGA. Pakistan successfully communicated with

representatives of other nations to draw attention to the Kashmir issue. It was Pakistan's achievement that the presidents of China, Malaysia, and Turkey strongly denounced the Indian government's abrogation of Articles 370 and 35-A regarding Kashmir and called for a peaceful resolution at the UN General Assembly meeting in September 2019 (Khalid, 2022). It is imperative that Pakistan strengthen its bilateral ties with other nations to win their support. Pakistan even withdrew its ambassador to India and suspended trade.

The conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir is a protracted and deeply entrenched issue, primarily fueled by their respective national interests. For India, controlling Kashmir is crucial as it represents an integral part of its territorial integrity and sovereignty. The Indian government asserts that Kashmir's accession to India was lawful and legitimate, emphasizing historical, cultural, and administrative ties dating back centuries. Furthermore, maintaining control over the region is seen as essential to safeguarding its secular identity and demonstrating its ability to preserve unity among its diverse population. Additionally, the strategic location of Kashmir, bordering several countries and providing access to crucial water resources, makes it geopolitically significant for India's regional influence and security.

Pakistan's claim to Kashmir is grounded in its aspiration to be the guardian of the Muslim population in the region and the principle of self-determination for the Kashmiri people. Pakistan believes that the majority Muslim population in Kashmir should have the right to decide its political future, and aligning with Pakistan would be the natural choice given religious and cultural ties. Moreover, the conflict over Kashmir serves as a powerful rallying point for Pakistani nationalism, fostering a sense of unity and cohesion among its citizens. The prospect of gaining control of the entire region also holds strategic importance for Pakistan, allowing it to challenge India's dominance in South Asia and strengthening its bargaining power in international forums.

Despite international efforts to mediate and find a resolution, both India and Pakistan's unwavering pursuit of their national interests has perpetuated the Kashmir conflict, leaving the region in a state of persistent instability and tension. Kashmir has long been a source of tension between India and Pakistan because both nations claim it as their own. Pakistan viewed India's revoke of Article 370 as a unilateral action to assert its sovereignty over Kashmir, which heightened Pakistan's concerns that India was attempting to annex the area.

1.2 Research Question

Based on the discussion of the phenomenon in the previous section, this paper poses the question:

"What are the internal and external impacts of India revoking the special status of Jammu and Kashmir?"

1.3 Theoretical Framework

A theoretical framework is necessary for the author to make it simpler for them to describe the research analysis on the case that will be addressed and to make their writing coherent. The author makes use of:

1.3.1 Conflict Theory

Conflicts within the framework of international relations, whether these be domestic or interstate, have evolved into one of the most deeply felt security issues of the modern world. They are typically violent in nature, resulting in human casualties, which can turn into humanitarian catastrophes and result in significant material, human population, and ecological damage. Conflict zones are the origin of population migration, which increases pressure and creates an atmosphere that is conducive to the establishment of extremist and terrorist organizations. Conflicts' destructive power leads economies to deteriorate. This widens the gap between peaceful regions and

nations and those that are still involved in ongoing wars (Kazansky, 2020).

The 21st century saw a rise in the complexity of conflicts. The parties involved in conflict resolution, where one may find many different units in addition to states, as well as the parties directly involved in disputes, underwent this transformation. Most of the material focuses on the effects of conflict. The work reflects the situations that were prevalent during the preparation and implementation of provided facts, but the dynamics of current international relations shift the issues under consideration too quickly (Kazansky, 2020).

The definition of the word "conflict" is covered by several authors. According to O. Krejčí, a conflict is when a particular group (tribe, ethnic group, ideological organization, or state) or an individual is engaged in an intentional conflict with one or more other groups or individuals. A dispute is a struggle for beliefs that support or increase welfare, status, or power. These opponents' values seek to harm, neutralize, or eliminate their competitor or competitors. According to Š. Waisová, a conflict is a social reality in which at least two parties (individuals, groups, or states) oppose one another due to different, conflicting viewpoints or interests. She defines a conflict as a scenario in which at least two parties are engaged

in the simultaneous pursuit of an unsatisfied good that does not meet the demands of both parties (Kazansky, 2020).

Conflict is frequently characterized as "a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power, and resources" in general. The pursuit of desirable items intensifies in the absence of established guidelines for their fair distribution. As people's social and economic environment changes, so do their expectations. Governmental rules that are too rigid to adapt to changing demands and expectations produce resentment that can be used to mobilize groups that are unhappy with the way things are. The dynamics of actions and counteractions in conflict situations invariably involve attempts to control the behavior of the other party, frequently with the intention to harm or destroy. Violence may also occur after an unrestrained attempt to dominate in a conflict over power, fame, and material interests (Jeong, 2008).

According to John W. Burton, conflict is seen as a severe challenge to the relationships, conventions, and rules of decision-making that are already in place. The term "dispute," on the other hand, refers to management concerns and the suppression of dissent regarding the application of policies. By doing this, it may be able to address the injustice of authority choices without raising any issues with the validity of

judgments based on prevailing ideals and long-standing institutional practices (Burton, 1972).

The complexity of the conflict theory portrays just how many definitions there are. Some definitions just provide the most fundamental building blocks from which one can further examine this topic and define conflict in general. Other definitions, on the other hand, focus on, focused characteristics of conflicts depending on their typology. This framework focuses on the causes and consequences of conflict. It can be used to understand how the revocation of Article 370 has exacerbated the conflict in Jammu and Kashmir, by increasing tensions between the Indian government and the Kashmiri people.

The revocation of Jammu and Kashmir's special status can be viewed as an exercise of power by the Indian central government. It reflects the power imbalance between the central government and the Jammu and Kashmir region's inhabitants, particularly the Muslim-majority Kashmiri population. It can be seen as an attempt to assimilate the Jammu and Kashmir into the Indian Union, potentially diluting the distinct cultural, religious, and political identity of the Kashmiri people. This has generated a sense of alienation and discontent among many Kashmiris. Conflict theory emphasizes social inequality and the perpetuation of dominant power structures.

The revocation of Jammu and Kashmir's special status may exacerbate existing social inequalities within Jammu and Kashmir. It can widen the gap between those who benefit from the revocation, such as certain political and economic elites, and those who suffer its consequences, particularly marginalized communities.

1.3.2 National Interest

The revocation of Kashmir's special status by India is a complex issue that can be analyzed through the lens of national interest. National interest refers to the goals and priorities of a nation-state, which it seeks to protect and promote in the international arena. Understanding India's national interest in the revocation of Kashmir's special status requires considering numerous factors, such as territorial integrity, security concerns, domestic politics, and integration and development.

National interests, according to Robert Jackson and Georg Sørensen, are "the values and goals that a state regards as essential to its well-being and survival." They contend that the national interest is a concept that is continually changing in reaction to shifts in the international environment rather than a permanent or unchanging idea (Jackson & Sørensen, 2010).

Jackson and Sørensen identify three main factors that influence the definition of national interest. The first is the state's security concerns. The most basic element of national interest is the state's security. States are concerned with protecting their borders, their citizens, and their vital economic assets from threats both internal and external. The second is the state's economic well-being. Economic prosperity is another important element of national interest. States are concerned with promoting economic growth, creating jobs, and ensuring that their citizens have access to essential goods and services. The third is the state's cultural and ideological values. States also have a stake in promoting their own cultural and ideological values. They may be concerned with spreading democracy, protecting human rights, or promoting a particular religious or philosophical tradition (Jackson & Sørensen, 2010).

Jackson and Sørensen argue that the national interest is a complex and contested concept. There is no single definition of national interest that is universally accepted. However, they argue that the three factors they have identified provide a useful framework for understanding the concept of national interest and its role in international relations. In addition to the three factors mentioned above, Jackson and Sørensen also argue that the national interest is influenced by the state's domestic political system, its international relations, and its historical

experiences (Jackson & Sørensen, 2010). They argue that the national interest is not simply a matter of objective calculation but is also influenced by the subjective perceptions and values of the state's decision-makers.

In his definition of national interest, Scott Burchill says that they are "the goals and objectives that a state seeks to achieve in its relations with other states." He lists four key components that are frequently connected to the idea of national interest. Security is the first and most fundamental aspect of national interest. Protecting borders, citizens, and important economic assets from both internal and external dangers is a priority for states. The second is prosperity, as it is yet another crucial component of the country's interest. States are concerned with fostering economic expansion, generating employment opportunities, and guaranteeing that their people have access to basic goods and services.

The third factor is influence, where governments have an interest in enhancing their own influence in the global system. They can be worried about keeping their position as a big power or about getting a good deal in international organizations. The last is values, as States also have a role in advancing their own values and principles within the global order. They might care about advancing democracy, defending human rights, or advancing a specific philosophical or

theological tradition. (Burchill, 2005). Burchill argues that the national interest is not a fixed or unchanging concept. It is constantly evolving in response to changes in the international environment. For example, the rise of new threats, such as terrorism and climate change, has led states to redefine their national interests in recent years.

Through territorial integrity, India regards Kashmir as an integral part of its sovereign territory and has long asserted its claim to the territory. The revocation of Kashmir's special status can be seen as an attempt by India to strengthen its control and assert its sovereignty over Jammu and Kashmir. In terms of security, India faces security challenges in Kashmir, including cross-border terrorism and separatist movements. The revocation of Kashmir's special status can be seen as India's attempt to strengthen its security apparatus and assert greater control over the issue. India may perceive the special status as hindering its ability to effectively address security threats in Jammu and Kashmir.

In terms of domestic politics, India has domestic political considerations that often affect the national interests of a country. In India, the repeal of Kashmir's special status is a longstanding demand of certain political groups and parties. Addressing this issue aligns with the political interests of the ruling party and aims to consolidate domestic support. In terms

of integration and development, India thinks that the goal of closer integration of Kashmir with the rest of the nation and supporting its growth may be in the national interest. With the intention of promoting economic growth and boosting social cohesion, the removal of the special status might be considered as a step to promote Kashmir's integration into India's administrative and economic framework.

The national interest theory provides a framework for comprehending how states decide on their foreign policy. It contends that governments are logical agents who work to advance their own interests, which are characterized by power, security, and prosperity. It is possible to see India's decision to revoke Jammu and Kashmir's special status as an effort to push its own national interests in the area. The abolition of Article 370 provides India greater authority over Jammu and Kashmir, which is something it has always seen as a strategic asset. Increased hostilities with Pakistan, which also claims Kashmir, could result from this. The following are some ways in which the national interest theory can be used to comprehend the potential effects of the repeal of Article 370 on India-Pakistan relations:

It can help to explain why India made the decision to revoke Article 370. India's government may have believed that the revocation of Article 370 would help to consolidate its

control over Kashmir and improve its security interests in Jammu and Kashmir. It can help to predict how Pakistan may respond to the revocation of Article 370. Pakistan may see the revocation of Article 370 as a threat to its own national interest, and it may respond by taking steps to increase its own control over Kashmir. It can help to assess the potential consequences of the revocation of Article 370 for India-Pakistan relations. The revocation of Article 370 could lead to increased tensions between India and Pakistan, and it could even increase the risk of conflict between the two countries.

1.4 Hypothesis

The author was able to formulate a hypothesis on the circumstances surrounding the removal of Jammu and Kashmir's special status under the Narendra Modi administration in 2019. Internally, the revocation has led Indian government bring Kashmir more fully under its control, economic slowdown and increase in unemployment, and make the situation more tense on the Jammu and Kashmir. Externally, the revocation worsened tension ties between India and Pakistan, trade suspension, and diplomatic issues between two countries.

1.5 Research Objective

To examine the impact that arose and occurred after the revocation of the special status of Jammu and Kashmir on August 5, 2019, on the internal territory of Jammu and Kashmir and relations between India-Pakistan.

1.6 Research Boundaries

In this thesis, the author has chosen to focus on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute within the time frame of 2019 to 2023. This specific period is significant as it coincides with the revocation of Jammu and Kashmir special status during the leadership of Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi. By selecting this period, the author seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis of the events leading up to the revocation of the special status, as well as its consequences implications.

1.7 Research Methodology

The author adapts a qualitative approach to describe and analyze the subject of the study. The qualitative method is an effective writing technique that seeks to provide a rich and detailed description of the circumstances surrounding the problem being investigated. To collect the necessary data for

this research, the author has employed a range of literary methods, including document analysis, literature review, and content analysis.

The data and information used in this thesis are sourced from a wide range of scholarly materials, including books, textbooks, articles, journals, papers, and electronic publications. The author has meticulously reviewed and analyzed these sources to identify key themes, patterns, and insights related to the Jammu and Kashmir dispute.

1.8 Structure of Writing

The author has divided the writing of this thesis into four parts to produce a thesis that is cohesive, organized, and systematic in each explanation. These chapters are:

CHAPTER I : The first chapter will introduce the topic, research question, the hypothesis, the research boundaries, the research methods, outlining the research aims and objectives, as well as the theoretical frameworks that will guide the study, and concluding with the structure of writing.

CHAPTER II : In this chapter, the author will explain the dynamic impact of the conflict on the revocation of Jammu and Kashmir's special status. There are three impacts

that will be discussed in this thesis, namely: The revocation of the special status of Jammu and Kashmir, Internal impacts between Jammu and Kashmir and the Indian government which include Political Impacts, Socio-Economic Impacts, and the Security Situation, External Impacts between India-Pakistan Relations which include Rising Tensions, Trade Suspensions, and Diplomatic Issues.

CHAPTER III : Conclusion and recommendations.