

**Embassy of India  
Washington DC**

\*\*\*

**The US Media coverage on India**

# THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

## *Modi's Kashmir Gambit Puts Pakistan in a Tough Spot*

Islamabad has little clout, what with its support for terrorism and an economy one-eighth India's size.

By

[Sadanand Dhume](#)

Aug. 8, 2019 6:01 pm ET

After India terminated the autonomy of Kashmir and Jammu, Pakistan reacted angrily to Prime Minister Modi's unilateral actions in the disputed territory. Image: Shutterstock

One of Asia's oldest disputes reached an inflection point this week as India suddenly terminated autonomy for Jammu and Kashmir, the Muslim-majority province claimed by both India and Pakistan. The long-term implications are unclear, but one thing appears obvious already: **When it comes to the seven-decade-old Kashmir conflict, Pakistan has few cards left to play.**

**Newly re-elected Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi fulfilled a longstanding campaign promise by ending a constitutional provision that gave Jammu and Kashmir extra autonomy from the federal government.** India has divided the state into two—Muslim majority Jammu and Kashmir and Buddhist-majority Ladakh—both of which will be ruled directly by an official New Delhi appoints. At least in theory, all Indians will now be allowed to buy property and settle in

either state, as well as attend universities and fill public-sector jobs long reserved for locals.

Critics predict an upsurge in violence as disaffected Kashmiri Muslims, denied meaningful recourse at the ballot box by the state's downgrade, take to the gun. They accuse the government of violating the rights of Kashmiris, flouting constitutional safeguards, and besmirching Indian democracy. "If we let democracy die a silent death in Kashmir, it will die a silent death in the rest of India as well," says Shehla Rashid Shora, a Kashmiri activist, in a phone interview from Delhi.

Fearing protests, India has locked down the already heavily militarized Kashmir Valley by pouring in thousands of fresh troops, arresting leaders of local political parties, and shutting down phone services, cable TV and the internet. In a nationally televised address Thursday, Mr. Modi vowed to bring prosperity and good governance to the territories.

It's too early to say whether the prime minister's audacious gamble, wildly popular among his supporters and welcomed by many other Indians, will pay off. India's Supreme Court may well declare the decision unconstitutional. But Pakistan, which has long made Kashmir a central plank of its foreign policy, lacks the wherewithal to force India's hand. By backing jihadist groups in India and Afghanistan and neglecting its economy, Islamabad has ensured that it lacks the stature to make India take its views on board.

The Kashmir dispute dates back to the 1947 partition of British India into Muslim-majority Pakistan and Hindu-majority but officially secular India. Under the terms of Britain's departure, native princes who ruled hundreds of nominally independent kingdoms had to choose between India and Pakistan. For the most part, these choices broke along religious lines. But in Jammu and Kashmir the Hindu ruler of a Muslim-majority kingdom, faced with an invasion by Pakistan-backed irregulars, acceded to India. In return, New Delhi promised to respect

the state's right to make its own laws in most matters. Now it has voided that agreement.

India controls 55% of the disputed territory, including the populous Kashmir Valley. Pakistan holds 30% percent and China 15%, including a part ceded to it by

Pakistan. Generations of Pakistanis have grown up regarding Kashmir as “the unfinished business of Partition.” The word Pakistan, which means “land of the pure,” is an acronym in which the K stands for Kashmir. India and Pakistan have fought three wars over the territory.

Pakistan reacted angrily to India's latest actions. It downgraded diplomatic relations, ended bilateral trade, banned Indian movies, and suspended a train service between the two countries. Prime Minister Imran Khan has promised to take his case to the United Nations and appealed Sunday to President Trump to mediate. Last month, in a press appearance with the visiting Mr. Khan, Mr. Trump claimed Mr. Modi had asked him to mediate the dispute, which New Delhi promptly denied as contrary to its policy of treating Kashmir as a bilateral dispute with Pakistan.

So far Pakistan has little to show for its efforts. The U.S., mindful of Indian sensitivities about mediation, urged “all parties to maintain peace and stability along the line of control,” the de facto border in Kashmir. China made a tepid statement about India's act being “unacceptable” after Home Minister Amit Shah reiterated Indian claims to Chinese-controlled territory. The U.N. expressed concern about “the human rights situation in the region.”

Pakistanis who find this response underwhelming ought to blame their army. Its support for jihadist proxies has made Kashmiri separatism synonymous with Islamist extremism. Pakistan could step up that support, but at the risk of both international censure and Indian military retaliation. With its economy in the midst of an International Monetary Fund bailout—the 13th in three decades—

Islamabad has limited ability to leverage its role as a facilitator for the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Meanwhile, India's \$2.7 trillion economy, more than eight times as large as Pakistan's, gives it international heft. The Pakistan army's own shabby treatment of journalists, opposition leaders and ethnic movements representing the minority Baluch and Pashtuns, makes it hard for Islamabad to argue that Kashmiris will be better off in Pakistan.

In the long term, Mr. Modi's Kashmir gamble may flounder. If it does, it will be because India foolishly forces its diversity into a Hindu nationalist straitjacket, not because of anything Pakistan does.

# The New York Times

## ***Pakistan Runs Out of Options as India Tightens Grip on Kashmir***

By [Maria Abi-Habib](#), NYT

NEW DELHI — The dispute over Kashmir has long been a flash point between India and Pakistan, with each nuclear-armed country holding the threat of retaliation over the other. But when India [stripped the Indian-controlled region of Kashmir of its autonomy](#) this week, [Pakistan's reaction appeared to be limited to high-level hand-wringing.](#)

[As Pakistan marks its independence day next week, it increasingly feels like a nation with its back against the wall, with few options to protect its existential interests. Its \[economy is teetering on the brink of collapse\]\(#\), and its international allies have either stayed silent over Kashmir or defected in support of India.](#)

A conventional military reaction is probably too costly as Pakistan seeks to shore up its finances. And one of the most effective strategies Pakistan has traditionally employed — using an array of militant groups as proxies to keep neighbors in check — has become a liability, amid the threat of international sanctions. (Pakistan has denied that it uses militant groups to achieve its foreign policy objectives.)

[\[Some of the first images emerge from Kashmir as photographers work around a blockade.\]](#)

[“The economy is hindering Pakistan's options. As economic growth slows, can they really afford a war right now?” said Arif Rafiq, the president of Vizier Consulting, a consulting firm on South Asian political and security issues. “Their capacity to bear the cost of a fullfledged conflict with India over Kashmir, whether via insurgent networks or conventionally](#)

[— there just are not a lot of options Pakistan has.”](#)

Last year, in an effort to end its global isolation, Pakistan agreed to help the United States end its war in Afghanistan by delivering the Taliban leadership to the table for peace talks. In doing so, Pakistan employed one of its greatest sources of leverage with the United States. Those talks are now nearing a conclusion, with American negotiators sitting across the table from their Taliban counterparts and aiming to reach a settlement soon.

In recent days, several Pakistani government officials have demanded that their country end its cooperation in the peace talks to protest American silence over India's

elimination of Kashmir's autonomy. But the Taliban on Thursday issued a forceful statement warning against any meddling.

"Linking the issue of Kashmir with that of Afghanistan by some parties will not aid in improving the crisis at hand because the issue of Afghanistan is not related, nor should Afghanistan be turned into the theater of competition between other countries," the Taliban statement read.

The outcome of the peace talks and Pakistan's role in them will likely influence whether the country finds itself blacklisted internationally over its continued support of terrorist organizations, a move that could save or break its faltering economy. The Paris-based group that monitors terrorism financing, the Financial Action Task Force, will vote in October on whether Pakistan has done enough to crack down on militant networks at home.

Pakistan hopes to make the case that it has moved against militant groups and should be taken off the gray list on which the watchdog placed it last year. Pakistan deeply fears it could be blacklisted and denied access to international financial markets at a time when it desperately needs loans to stay afloat. If Pakistan is blacklisted, that could tip its economy into recession.

American diplomats and representatives of the Taliban in Doha, Qatar, in February. Pakistan agreed last year to help the United States end its war in Afghanistan. Credit: [Untitled/Qatar Ministry of Foreign Affairs](#), via Associated Press

Prime Minister Imran Khan of Pakistan seemed worried about the lack of options to force India to renounce its new Kashmir policy.

Meeting with Pakistani journalists on Thursday, Mr. Khan dismissed using "jihadi organizations" against India in Kashmir. "There are more disadvantages than advantages," Mr. Khan said, [according to Amber Rahim Shamsi](#), a reporter for Samaa TV who attended the meeting.

The possibility of international sanctions also seemed to weigh on Mr. Khan.

"Pakistan has taken every step to get itself out of the baggage of the past," the prime minister told the group of journalists, according to [a second account of the meeting](#).

He said the government had undertaken "a complete cleansing operation" against terrorist groups. "My government has ensured there is a complete and sincere effort to bring Pakistan out of FATF," Mr. Khan added, referring to the Financial Action Task Force.

Pakistan's foreign minister has said he would raise the issue of Kashmir to the United Nations Security Council for a vote. But so far, the country's closest allies have remained silent on the matter.

Prime Minister Imran Khan of Pakistan meeting with President Trump at the White House in July. Mr. Trump promised to intervene on Kashmir. Credit: Anna MoneyMaker/The New York Times

Muslim nations have usually supported Pakistan's claims on Kashmir. But with their own economic and political troubles at home, many have tilted toward India, looking to [secure lucrative deals](#) with the ascending economic power.

The biggest blow came [from the influential United Arab Emirates](#), which stated that Kashmir was an internal matter for India, withdrawing any support to raise the issue internationally.

India has long maintained that Kashmir is an internal issue; the disputed territory chose to join India rather than Pakistan during partition in 1947, based on assurances that its autonomy would be maintained. Pakistani forces invaded part of Kashmir and now control that part of the territory.

When Pakistan agreed after the September 11, 2001 attacks to help the United States fight terrorist groups, it asked for a favor in return — American help mediating on Kashmir and pressing India to make concessions. When the United States refused, Pakistan felt betrayed.

Just last month Pakistanis felt more upbeat about their country's prospects. Mr. Khan had returned from a visit to the White House where he met with Mr. Trump, who promised to intervene on Kashmir. But India's swift action days later to strip Kashmir of its autonomy plunged Pakistan back into isolation.

"The U.S. has again let us down, and those who were starry-eyed about the American trip have got a wake-up call," Senator Mushahid Hussain said in a speech this week.

Salman Masood contributed reporting from Islamabad, Pakistan.

## Expect little international support on J&K, says Pakistan foreign minister August 14, 2019

**Shah Mehmood Qureshi**, the **Pakistan Foreign Minister** has asked his countrymen to be realistic regarding the international support on India's move on Jammu and Kashmir. Telling Pakistanis not to live in a "fool's paradise", Qureshi said that **Pakistan should not expect support at the United Nations Security Council regarding its opposition to India's decision to end the special status granted to J&K.**

Giving vent to emotions is easy and raising objections is much easier. However it is difficult to understand the issue and move forward. They are not waiting for you with garlands in their hands. Any members out of the P-5 nations can be a hurdle... Do not live in the fool paradise. - **Shah Mehmood Qureshi, Pakistan Foreign Minister**

Qureshi made these comments at a press conference and his statement comes a day after Russia becomes the first UNSC member to support India over the removal of Article 370. Russia said India's action was under the constitutional framework. United States has so far stayed neutral and not taken sides. The US government has said there is no change in its policy on Kashmir and called on India and Pakistan to maintain restraint and hold direct dialogue to resolve their differences.

Speaking to the US media, India's ambassador there **Harsh Vardhan Shringla** said that **President Donald Trump** had made it clear that there was no offer to mediate either. **"President Trump has made it very clear that his offer to mediate on Jammu and Kashmir is dependent on both India and Pakistan accepting it. Since India has not accepted the offer of mediation, he has made it clear that this is not on the table anymore".** He also said that the measures taken by the Indian government in Kashmir are temporary and **preventive in nature.**

Only China has expressed concern over the current developments in Jammu and Kashmir.

Qureshi, who visited China last week, said the government there would support Pakistan in the UNSC over Kashmir.

India maintains that J&K is an integral part of India and that the issue is internal. Pakistan has initiated a series of decisions, including downgrading bilateral relations

with India and suspending bilateral trade, halting of Samjhauta Express and Thar Express trains from its side and banning of Indian movies from Pakistani cinemas.

## India's Ladakh Buddhist enclave jubilant at new status but China angered

Alexandra Ulmer

MUMBAI, India (Reuters) - The Buddhist enclave of Ladakh cheered India's move to hive it off from Jammu and Kashmir state, a change that could spur tourism and help New Delhi counter China's influence in the contested western Himalayas.

Beijing, though, criticized the announcement, made on Monday by the Indian government of Prime Minister Narendra Modi as part of a wider policy shift that also ended Jammu and Kashmir's right to set its own laws. In a statement on Tuesday, China said the decision was unacceptable and undermined its territorial sovereignty.

Ladakh is an arid, mountainous area of around 59,146 square kilometers (22,836 square miles), much of it uninhabitable, that only has 274,000 residents. The rest of Jammu and Kashmir is roughly 163,090 square kilometers (62,969 square miles) with a population of some 12.2 million.

China and India still claim vast swathes of each other's territory along their 3,500 km (2,173 mile) Himalayan border. The Asian rivals had a two-month standoff at the Doklam plateau in another part of the remote Himalayan region in 2017.

"The fact that India took this move ... can be seen as one way that India is trying to counter growing Chinese influence in the region," said Sameer Patil, a Mumbai-based fellow in international security studies at the Gateway House think-tank.

In a statement, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman Hua Chunying said China contests the inclusion of what it regards as its territory on the Indian side of the western section of the China-India border.

"India's unilateral amendment to its domestic law, continues to damage China's territorial sovereignty. This is unacceptable," Hua said.

In response to a question about Hua's statement, Indian Foreign Ministry spokesman Raveesh Kumar said on Tuesday the Ladakh decision was an internal matter.

"India does not comment on the internal affairs of other countries and similarly expects other countries to do likewise," said Kumar, without directly mentioning China.

Patil from Gateway House said monks he interviewed in Ladakh told him China-endorsed monks had been extending loans and donations to Buddhist monasteries in the area in an apparent bid to win influence.

Reuters was not able to contact any monks in Ladakh.

"OUR OWN DESTINY"

By announcing it would turn Ladakh into its own administrative district, the Indian government fulfilled a decades-long demand from political leaders there. Ladakh locals were tired of being hurt or ignored because of the many years of turmoil in the Kashmir Valley resulting from separatist militant activity and the Indian military's moves to crush them.

Local politicians and analysts expect the change to bring Ladakh out of the shadow of Kashmir, which has long been a flashpoint with Pakistan. It could also help the area pocket more government funding as it seeks to build up its roads and facilities to lure tourists.

"We are very happy that we are separated from Kashmir. Now we can be the owners of our own destiny," Tsering Samphel, a veteran politician from the Congress party in Ladakh, said on Tuesday. He added the area felt dwarfed by Jammu and Kashmir - which is a majority Muslim area - and that the regions had little in common culturally.

In Ladakh's city of Leh on Monday, members of Modi's ruling Bharatiya Janata Party danced in the streets and distributed sweets, Reuters partner ANI reported.

Ladakh will be governed by a centrally-appointed lieutenant governor, handing New Delhi stronger oversight over the area.

However, while Ladakh will become a Union Territory, it will not have its own legislature - a sore point for some locals.

"Hopefully we will be getting that also, slowly," said Samphel, 71, adding that local politicians would put that demand to New Delhi.

Ladakh's economy, traditionally dependent on farming, has benefited from tourists visiting ancient monasteries and trekking up mountain peaks.

P. C. Thakur, general manager of The Zen Ladakh hotel in Leh, hopes that dissociating from

Jammu and Kashmir will further attract visitors. He expects the hotel's occupancy to jump by up to 7 percentage points from an average of around 80-85% currently. "Next year will be good," he said

## Tilting at More than Windmills in South Asia

Aug 14, 2019 **RICHARD N. HAASS**

*After nearly two decades of sacrifice, the US is looking for a way out of Afghanistan, and Pakistan, which has provided a sanctuary to the Taliban, is seen as critical to America's ability to withdraw its troops without enabling the group to overthrow the Afghan government. But the US cannot afford to alienate India.*

NEW YORK – "Tilt" is a word with a history in South Asia. Nearly a half-century ago, Pakistan's government brutally repressed its citizens in the eastern part of the country. Millions of refugees streamed into India, which mobilized its armed forces. Pakistan attacked, and India responded. Full-scale war ensued. When the dust settled, Pakistan had been dismembered, with its eastern part becoming the independent country of

The US government watched these events unfold with concern. India's claim to be nonaligned was not taken seriously, and President Richard Nixon and National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger judged victory for India to be a gain for the Soviet Union. In addition, the South Asia conflict occurred just as the United States (with Pakistan's assistance) was seeking to establish a relationship with the People's Republic of China. Nixon and Kissinger feared that China's interest would diminish if the US appeared unwilling to stand up to India, a country backed by the Soviets and one with whom China had fought a war a decade before.

The US dispatched an aircraft carrier to the Bay of Bengal, ostensibly to deter further Indian military action, but in fact more as a signal of American support for Pakistan. The show of force did not change the trajectory of the crisis, but the US decision to tilt toward Pakistan (a phrase that made its way into newspapers) was infamous in India for decades to come.

The US continued to favor Pakistan in the wake of the 1971 war. Pakistan was a close US partner in the effort to raise the costs to the Soviet Union of its occupation of Afghanistan, teaming up with the Americans to arm the local Afghan opposition. But

with the end of the Soviet military presence in Afghanistan in February 1989 – and the end of the Cold War just months later – the US chose to reconsider its stance toward both India and Pakistan.

Successive US presidents sought improved ties with India, owing to India's growing economy, robust democracy, and the increasing importance of the Indian-American community. More recently, India has come to be perceived in some quarters as a potential partner in balancing a rising China. At the same time, US relations with Pakistan deteriorated, initially over its nuclear program, but, after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, also because of its ties to the Taliban and other extremists.

Now, the question is whether thinking in Washington, DC, is again evolving and the US is considering another "tilt." After nearly two decades of sacrifice, the US is looking for a way out of Afghanistan, and Pakistan, which has provided a sanctuary to the Taliban, is seen as critical to America's ability to withdraw its troops without enabling the group to overthrow the Afghan government. At the same time, there is frustration with India over its trade policies.

The new tilt was manifested weeks ago when Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan visited the White House. US President Donald Trump made the stunning declaration that Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi had asked him to mediate the Kashmir dispute, the most sensitive issue dividing India and Pakistan since partition and independence in 1947.

Such a request by India would represent a fundamental shift in its policy, and India's government was quick to deny that such a request had been made. This was followed by India's announcement that it planned to strip much of this Muslim-majority region's autonomy. There is a possibility that Pakistan will respond by renewing its support for terrorism, which could lead to another war between Pakistan and India, two nucleararmed countries.

Against this backdrop, the US would be unwise to turn to Pakistan as a strategic partner. Pakistan sees a friendly government in Kabul as vital to its security and competition with arch-rival India. There is little reason to believe that the military and intelligence services, which continue to run Pakistan, will rein in the Taliban or rule out terrorism.

Equally, the US would be unwise to alienate India. Yes, India has a tradition of protectionist trade policies and often frustrates US policymakers with its reluctance to cooperate fully on strategic issues. But democratic India, which will soon surpass China as the world's most populous country and will boast the world's fifth-largest economy, is a good long-term bet. It is a natural partner to help balance China. India has rejected participation in China's Belt and Road Initiative, whereas Pakistan, struggling economically, has embraced it.

The US would also be unwise to race for the exits from Afghanistan. Peace talks with the Taliban mostly look like a means to extract US forces from the country. The process is reminiscent of Vietnam, where a 1973 agreement between the US and North Vietnam provided a pretext for US withdrawal from the South but not a basis for peace. The notion

of a coalition government, with power shared by the current government and the Taliban, is optimistic at best, fanciful at worst.

Instead of embracing fantasy, the US should continue to keep a modest number of troops in Afghanistan to ensure the government survives and the country does not again become a terrorist haven. What is required is an endurance strategy, not an exit strategy, based on local conditions, not political calendars. As has long been the case, South Asia is at best a region to be managed, not a problem to be solved.



### [RICHARD N. HAASS](#)

Richard N. Haass, President of the Council on Foreign Relations, previously served as Director of Policy Planning for the US State Department (2001-2003), and was President

George W. Bush's special envoy to Northern Ireland and Coordinator for the Future of Afghanistan. He is the author of [A World in Disarray: American Foreign Policy and the Crisis of the Old Order](#).

## International Business Times

[Business](#) [Technology](#) [World](#) [National](#) [Media & Culture](#) [Opinion](#) [Sports](#) [Luxury](#)

### [World](#)

# Kashmir: India Shakes Up 7-Decade

# Long Status Quo, Scraps State's Special Status

By *Kalyan Kumar*

08/05/19 AT 10:50 AM

In a significant step, the Indian government led by Prime Minister Narendra Modi on Monday scrapped the 70 –year old special status of Kashmir state and announced its decision to split the state into two union territories-Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh. Announcing this, India's Home Minister Amit Shah said in Parliament that the government has annulled the special status of Jammu and Kashmir by modifying Article 370 of the Constitution.

Accordingly, the President of India issued a gazetted order called the Constitution Application to Jammu and Kashmir Order, 2019 superseding the incumbent Constitution (Application to Jammu and Kashmir) Order, 1954.

Shah said that Jammu and Kashmir along with Ladakh will become Union Territories. While Ladakh UT will be without a legislature, J&K UT will have a legislature.

Amit Shah said the entire Indian constitution will apply to Jammu and Kashmir.

The repeal of Kashmir's special status drew protests from opposition lawmakers including leaders from Kashmir.

**Alongside scrapping the special status, the government also lifted the ban on property purchases by non-residents. This means any Indian can buy a property, invest and settle in Jammu & Kashmir state just as he can in any other Indian state.**

Modi government's new initiatives on the border state made some hard India ne' beyond the usual efforts at combating militancy in the state.

## Privileges from the special status

The decade-long special status under article 370 had bestowed many privileges including reservation in government jobs and seats in academic institutions to local Kashmiris.

The status has been sacrosanct with the regional politicians and national parties like the Indian National Congress. They call it the soul of the state's existence.

But a sizable opinion in the national political spectrum wanted its abrogation citing it as a barrier to peace, development, emotional integration to the country, and curtailing

investment and blocking constitutional benefits to different sections of the population.

The decision to end special status drew a strong reaction from many sections. Some hailed it as a new chapter and peace and development while some local leaders called it a betrayal of people.

“Today marks the darkest day in Indian democracy,” said Mehbooba Mufti, a former chief minister of Jammu and Kashmir.

Ram Madhav, general secretary of ruling BJP hailed the government’s step as “glorious.”

### **Pakistan’s reaction**

Claims and counterclaims had made Kashmir a flashpoint between India and neighboring Pakistan. India’s step on abrogating the special status of the region drew a reaction from Pakistan.

Pakistan condemned the decision and said it would “exercise all possible options to counter the illegal steps,” its foreign ministry said in a statement.

While India blames Pakistan for fomenting militancy in the state it says it is only backing indigenous groups.

India, on its part, claims that part of Kashmir now ruled by Pakistan (POK) as its integral part and many political parties also talk about re-uniting it with the Indian Kashmir. Partitioning Jammu and Kashmir into two union territories will also increase the number of India’s centrally-ruled administrative divisions to nine.

## India Ends Special Status for Only Muslim-Majority Territory

Cleo Paskal  
Non-Resident Senior  
Fellow

The President of India issued an Order on Monday effectively repealing Article 370 of the Indian Constitution, a move supported by the Indian Parliament. **The Order fundamentally changes the relationship between terrorist hotbed Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) and the rest of India, potentially allowing for the long-term normalization of conditions in the area.**

J&K is in northwest India, where it borders both Pakistan and China. It is India's only Muslim-majority territory. During the turbulent years after India became independent in

1947, Article 370 was enacted as a 'temporary' measure ostensibly to reassure J&K's Muslim population. It gave substantial autonomy to J&K, including writing its own laws and barring non-Permanent Residents from owning land.

Regardless, J&K has been a focal point of multiple wars between India and Pakistan, as well as clashes between India and China. Beijing backs its ally Pakistan to advance Chinese interests such as access to Gwadar Port on Pakistan's southern coast.

Several Islamist terrorist groups, some backed by Pakistan, seek to ethnically cleanse J&K, join it to Pakistan, and then use it as a base for further incursions into the rest of India. In late 1989 and early 1990, in targeted attacks, Islamists murdered, raped and kidnapped Kashmiri Hindus, driving hundreds of thousands from their homes. In February 2019, a suicide bomber killed 40 police in Pulwama, J&K. Pakistan-based Jaish-e-Mohammed claimed responsibility. In response, the Indian Air Force crossed into Pakistan to bomb what it claimed was a terrorist training camp.

Article 370 inadvertently legitimized part of the Islamist agenda by implying a Muslim majority region should be separate from the main body politic. Since Article 370 allows only Permanent Residents of J&K to own land, Islamists were incentivized to expel non-Muslims, who could not be replaced, thereby changing J&K's demography by force. Article 370 also enabled discrimination against women, limited investment from the rest of India, and made it difficult to use land as collateral for loans, stifling economic growth and making residents more dependent on local power structures.

India's home minister has called Article 370 "the root of terror" in the region. Both advocates of J&K independence from India and terrorist elements stand to lose substantially from the repeal and are likely to increase pressure. Pakistan Prime Minister

Imran Khan said, "[I]ncidents like Pulwama are bound to happen again. I can already predict this will happen." Pakistan's army chief said its military "stands by the Kashmiris in their just struggle to the very end."

For its part, India has put regional political leaders under house arrest, called on Hindu pilgrims to avoid the region, put a curfew in effect, increased military presence, and restricted communications. There may be operations involving summary execution of terror suspects, with the attendant civilian casualties causing unrest, as happened in the past. The security situation may worsen in the short term, and human rights organizations are likely to highlight abuses.

Over the longer-term, as residents of J&K see more opportunities for economic development, as women have more rights, and as there is more integration and identification with the rest of India, there is hope the appeal of extremism will wane and the lives of the people of J&K will normalize.

For Delhi, the repeal of Article 370 is a core issue of national identity and security.

India is saying the people of the region, whatever their faith, are Indian citizens and should have the same rights and responsibilities as all other citizens. Washington should consider the repeal of Article 370 to be an internal Indian decision based on a reasonable approach to citizenship, rather than seeking to interpose itself between India and Pakistan.

*Cleo Paskal is a non-resident senior fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies*

*(FDD), where she also contributes to FDD's Center on Military and Political Power (CMPP). Follow Cleo on Twitter @CleoPaskal. Follow FDD on Twitter @FDD and @FDD\_CMPP. FDD is a Washington, DC-based, nonpartisan research institute focusing on national security and foreign policy.*

## Pakistan's Kashmir hypocrisy

by Michael Rubin | August 22, 2019 12:17 PM | Washington Examiner

On Aug. 5, 2019, Indian President Ram Nath Kovind formally [revoked](#) Article 370 of the Indian constitution which protected Kashmir's special status and tightened the Indian central government's grip over the Muslimmajority region.

Pakistan has roundly and repeatedly condemned India's move on Kashmir. Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan [said](#) that Pakistan would "teach India a lesson," and [promised](#) to "fight until the end." Put aside the fact that India likely never would have changed the status quo had it not been for decades of overt [Pakistan-sponsored terrorism](#). Terrorism is a tactic the states use to achieve aims at a relatively low cost. In this case, the Pakistani gamble backfired, and Khan, as well as Pakistan's InterServices Intelligence, have no one but themselves to blame. Lost in the Pakistani criticism of India's actions, however, is recognition of Pakistan's own hypocrisy. For four and a half decades before India revoked Article 370, Pakistan stripped both Gilgit-Baltistan and Azad Kashmir (as Pakistan calls the portion it occupies) of their special status.

The root of the Kashmir question rests in the 1947 partition of India. The princely state's leaders chose to join India, a move supported by the region's Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, and many of its Muslims. Other Kashmiri Muslims, however, wanted to join Pakistan. Still

others would have preferred outright independence, although this was not an option offered. The nascent Pakistani state responded by invading — first with irregular Pashtun tribesmen and then more formally with the Pakistani army, eventually occupying about 30% of the region. A UN ceasefire established a line-of-control solidifying Kashmir's division and UN Security Council [Resolution 47](#) called for a referendum to resolve the dispute. That referendum never happened and, despite multiple pledges to resolve the problem diplomatically, successive Pakistani governments sponsored terrorist groups to strike into India and twice, in 1965 and 1999, unsuccessfully started wars after seeking military to alter the line-of-control.

Pakistan gained control of Gilgit-Baltistan, previously called the Northern Areas and part of Jammu & Kashmir in October 1947, after the new Pakistani government infiltrated irregulars into the region.

Just as Pakistan partisans today say Kashmir's inclusion in India is illegitimate because, it claims, the Kashmiri people never accepted Maharaja Hari Singh's decision to join India, most of the people of Gilgit-Baltistan opposed

British Major W. A. Brown's decision to have Gilgit-Baltistan join Pakistan. Pakistan completed the evisceration of Gilgit's popular will in the then-secret Karachi Agreement of Apr. 28, 1949, [wherein](#) the Azad Kashmir government ceded complete defense and foreign affairs control over Gilgit-Baltistan to Pakistan, a move never approved by the population of Gilgit-Baltistan. The International Crisis Group — generally no friend to India and other democracies — [confirmed](#) the persisting unpopularity of the Karachi Agreement and Pakistani rule in the region.

**Pakistani occupation of Gilgit-Baltistan appears illegal, even under Pakistani law. In 1992, the Azad Kashmir High Court ordered the Azad Kashmir government to assume control**

of Gilgit-Baltistan since it found that GilgitBaltistan was part of Jammu and Kashmir. Article 257 of the Pakistani constitution, meanwhile, [confirmed](#) that Jammu and Kashmir is a disputed territory which does not belong to Pakistan.

The hypocrisy continues: In 1974, Pakistan abrogated the State Subject Rule in Gilgit-Baltistan as part of the process Islamabad initiated to change demography by transferring Sunni Muslims into what had been a predominantly Shiite-dominated region. While politics hamper accurate censuses, in 1948, the Gilgit-Baltistan region was at least 85% Shiite and Ismaili Shiite; after the 1974 State Subject Rule abrogation, the region is only 50% Shiite.

The Pakistani government has in recent years sought to blunt criticism of what, in effect, is its colonial attitude toward Gilgit-Baltistan. The 2009 Gilgit-Baltistan SelfGovernance Order, for example, feigned local empowerment, but real decision-making ability remains with the [appointed](#) governor rather than the chief minister or elected assembly. Likewise, while the Gilgit Baltistan Order of 2018 in theory transferred powers to the Gilgit-Baltistan Legislative Assembly, vested extraordinary powers remain with the Prime Minister of Pakistan who retains final say on all legislation and regional policies.

There can be a real and legitimate debate about Kashmir with regard to human rights and economic opportunity. The Indian government and Indian security forces are not without flaws and problems. Kashmiris themselves may debate the revocation of Article 370. What is certain, however, is first that Pakistan's own actions and attempts at unilateralism likely forced India's hand. Pakistani support for terrorism not only inside Kashmir but also throughout India lost Islamabad the moral high ground decades ago which is why, despite President Trump's egostroking of Khan during the Pakistani leader's recent visit, U.S.-Pakistani ties remained strained and most American officials consider

Pakistan more an adversary than an ally. More seriously, however, Pakistan has little authority to complain about India's decision to change Kashmir's status given that Pakistan itself created the precedent when Pakistan undermined Gilgit-Baltistan autonomy and self-governance.

Michael Rubin ([@Mrubin1971](#)) is a contributor to the Washington Examiner's Beltway Confidential blog. He is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and a former Pentagon official.