



Military Attaches of foreign Missions Briefed over Kashmir issue

By

Sardar Mohammad Abdul Qayyum Khan

Prime Minister Azad Jammu & Kashmir

29th April, 1994

Military Attaches of foreign Missions briefed over Kashmir Issue
by Sardar Mohammad Abdul Qayyum

Khan, Prime Minister Azad Jammu & Kashmir

29th April, 1994

You to Azad Kashmir, perhaps it is the Kashmir issue itself and the sacrifices being offered by the people of Kashmir on the other side which has made it possible for us to meet very important people so frequently. For the past two and half years, we have had a number of visitors from abroad, from all over the world, this gives us an opportunity to explain our position directly to such important people. Although your friends located here in Islamabad, must all ready be knowing a lot and be quite conversant with the situation, yet it is a privilege for me to have you here and speak to you about the present situation which is confronting this part of the world in particular, and its possible spill over. It may create a concern to the rest of the world also.

Friends! I will not go in to the geneses and past history of the Kashmir issue as to what happened-although that also needs to be looked in to –for the simple reason that most of the historical facts have gone by default as far as we are concerned. That has provided an advantage to the other side to put so much of camouflage and so much dirt over the situation that the real face of historical facts is very difficult to find out. One has to dig deep to clear off the debris and find out the real picture. A number of things have been constantly and persistently been projected by the other side. I want to clarify a few of them without going into the details'

It started with the Indian petition to United Nations in 1948 which resulted in an agreement, which is known as the UN resolutions

on Kashmir –UNCIP resolutions .With regard to these resolutions one thing I would like to repeat. These resolutions are not the same as resolutions on Palestine and elsewhere with division of vote. They are not only unanimous but they are agreement. That lends them far greater credibility. They were brought about by the United States, Britain and Canada working together and mediating and passed by consensus. So they constitute agreement by consensus rather than being mere resolutions. From the very first day of their inception India tried to defy them. If one goes through the history of events in chronicle order, one finds that that from the very first day they were flouted by India in one way or the other. At times they were repudiated on one excuse or the other It was said now that they are redundant and no more effective. So on and so forth. At the same time India continued to enhance and re-enforce its military occupation of the state to the extent that today half a which is too small for huge military concentration. If I am not wrong I have yet to find out in history a parallel of such a small area against such a small number of people. This is perhaps the highest concentration known in the history. However moving on from this position we have the political side where the government of India, The India leadership sought protection in almost every event in

the word, howsoever, challengeable whether it be SEATO,CENTO defense pacts or cold war with RUSSIA. India took advantage of every position because of its own weight and size. With international historical clout, she is able a blackmail Russia America, blackmail -blackmail china and others and very squarely get away with it. Well, the current movement started 1989 in the present shape. If I may be allowed to say, the armed struggle started 1931.The people of Kashmir revolted against the then Maharajah and a number of people were shot. Then in 1947,I had the honors of leading that armed revolt myself and that

lasted for fifteen months resulting in liberation of the present Azad Kashmir territory's ,this is the third time in the history. That a proper armed revolt has taken place not the first time that the people may say that, Kashmiris have all of a sudden risen up.

This is not for the first time. If you go back beyond that, you will find that in one part or the other of the state of Jammu and Kashmir there has been some re-volt somewhere. Next door ponch was very well known for it. Muzzaffarabad is still recognized for it and like that an money other places people have been revolting locally from time to time It is not for the first time .it is chain of historical events. After this movement started in the present shape in 1986, India is continuously propagating that it is because of Pakistan's interference. This was to divert the world attentions from the realities of the situation. Another factor was the Afghan war. The leaders of India were quite a live and conscious of the consequences of this war and the effects it could possibly have on the sub- -net contuse in order to preempt that they stepped up their previous plan and in that they setup the program me of change the demographic complexion of the state, diluting there religious and cultural identity and on stop of all that making efforts all to strangulate the economy of the state. These things could have happened any where in the world regardless of whether it was Kashmir or elsewhere. And I think everybody would agree that the reaction would be the same as we see in Jammu and Kashmir. so the Kashmir could not remain detached from what was happening around and hence they reacted the idiom side tried to con-Vince the world that it was purely an infiltration from across and that Pakistan was a betting and supporting a movement of secession. they call it secession. in fact when they say secession, am reminded that the Indian government successfully usual all the phraseology which place upon the sensitivities of the world,

particularly the western world. Secession, terrorism, fundamentalism, infiltration, all these attention catching words are used to detract the people from perceiving the real situation. The west alone did provide military support for the Afghan war and they were permitted. They were rather encouraged perhaps. The Kashmiris did not stay back and they also joined. Hundreds joined the Afghan war and remained there for four, five, six years. Naturally the purpose was very evident- it was not to liberate Afghanistan but to acquire skills to liberate themselves from the Indian occupation. Generally, the world diplomats have become oblivious to this fact and they think that the Pakistan government was doing something here. Wish Pakistan had done much because they are an equal party in the game. Mean their participation or their liability should not be less than the one that India enjoys. So, Sir, gradually as the time went on, then of course India having failed on all these fronts, they ultimately started exploiting certain known notions though wrongly. For quite some time they have been floating the idea that Pakistan refused to withdraw its troops as provided in the UN agreement, therefore, plebiscite could not be held. Gradually the world started believing it. Rajiv Gandhi himself went to the United Nations in an interview said that Pakistan had defaulted and they did not withdraw the troops and, therefore, plebiscite could not be held. After some time the people came to realize the truth of the matter. Ultimately it has been said that if the Kashmir issue is solved, India will break-up. I say it is not my responsibility to keep India together yet the idea is of serious international concern particularly after the collapse of the Soviet Union. In order to stop this then, of course, the people start moving about. There are many other things which the Indian side presents as possibilities to follow if the Kashmir issue is selected. According to them there is a danger that India's democratic stance and its secularism will be affected as if the whole India

society revolves around Kashmir, and the biggest Muslim minority of 10 million people will be affected. This is one of the things which has been very effectively propagated amongst the Muslim states of the Gulf and around the Gulf. Our Arab brothers are particularly very easily misled by the proposition regarding the fate of 120 million Indian Muslims. Indians misuse every catch-word over the word. I have been arguing with these people that if 120 million Muslims are safe in India, then 6 or 7 million Kashmiris can be done away with but things will have to be viewed in the light of what has been happening in the past 50 years. Certain things have been made fait accompli but the de-facto position may not be tenable de-jure-wise. The big power like India having created a de-facto position naturally has the advantage of acceptability. But then we have been arguing the other side also and discussing the possible repercussions in both the cases namely if Kashmir issue is not settled and remains as it is and secondly if Kashmir issue is settled and remains as it is and secondly if Kashmir issue is settled in other words –whether danger is lessened by having it settled or otherwise. I personally very sincerely feel that in case the Kashmir issue re-mains as it is the danger to this sub-continent is far greater than any danger in case it is settled.

I have been discussing with the people as to what is the way out, if it is accepted that India might dis-integrate in case Kashmir issue is settled. Can we do something to do that, then something to avoid disintegration? And if it is possible to do that, then something must be done- and then who is there to do something about that: for example. I said that if the movement show balls and it increases in its area of involvement, then what is going to happen? And is there really a genuine threat of its snow balling or is there any possibility of increase in its area of involvement? On any simple calculation, which is quite understandable, one

may see that movement at the beginning was restricted to valley, but now it has entered the Southern part also where it has become quite active and may be increasing. You see there is firing on the ceasefire line every other day from across, Peaceful innocent citizens are being killed. Even India does not claim that there have been any nuisance of there have been any mischief and how the poor citizens can do any mischief when massive military is deployed on the other side. And Indians also don't worry about that except on one spot where they say there was infiltration so they used their medium batteries. So this activity goes on and every other day the people are killed, wounded and the properties destroyed on this side of ceasefire line. And I am sure you know this area, known as Azad Kashmir. It has been in the past inhabited by martial races and even today ore than 200,000 ex-service men are living over here. If these 200,000 people get mobilized and we indigenious resources, who can stop them. And if no-thing more happened, I had pledged during elections in 1971 to allow free of license arms to the people living on the border line. In the border areas I have often been reminded by the people of my commitment of free license and somehow or the other I have tried to explain to them that this might boomerang. But if I only allow people to have arms without license on the border line, and half of Azad Kashmir is on the borderline, it would be easy for the people to buy indigenious weapons in order to defend themselves. If they move a hand, go hand take them on their will be retaliation from that side and counter retaliation from this side. It all will trigger of into a much bigger trouble. And then, of course, it will not be fair on the part of anybody to think that the people from Azad Kashmir will sit tight holding back doing nothing and watching the genocide on the other side. So we have information that many youngster have trickled out. Of course so for there is no mobilized, organized

infiltration from this side but activities do go on and half a million plus Indian army is not able to seal the border. How can we expect Pakistan army to go and seal the border, and why should they seal it at all. I don't think that anybody in the government of Pakistan will try to take on the responsibility to seal the border from this side because that will be tantamount to fight the Indian battle on our own soil and there will be nothing more foolish than to do that short of think. So, if the activities go on like that, it will snow ball, the people of Azad Kashmir and trained the people of Azad Kashmir will join in. We have commandos; we have retired SACP people from Pakistan Armed Forces in a grade number. If they are slightly motivated to go and join in, they can certainly prove their skill against heavy military deployment. As you know heavy military concentration in a smaller area is more dangerous for the people who do it than the people who confront it. And then, of course, the indigenous people belong to the same area, same terrain, speaking the same language, with the hideouts easily accessible and there is no logistic problem for them. They can be a great nuisance for the Indian army. And if the people from Azad Kashmir start joining in, then there is very likelihood, that people from Punjab and Frontier, (They have relatives and kith and kith on both sides), they might individually start joining too and nobody can stop this. And we have reports, in the sense that when somebody gets killed in Kashmir the families come to know about it that so and so was there. They never know before that so and so was there.

If that happens then Afghanistan next door people who have always been itching to look for battle affected areas.... And they have been giving us impression that, if given a call they would come to our rescue and help and that will certainly enlarge the area. Then there are other forces around the world who are quite capable of jumping in. I was just sketching out as to what are the

possibilities of increase in the areas of involvement. I think if that starts happening, then who is there to control it. Government of Pakistan is absolutely not in position to do it either. Because if I cannot help the people on that side, then why should I stop somebody helping them. This is quite human. As regards the atrocities in Kashmir, the Indian army is fighting the militants alone. Gentleman; kindly imagine, how many militants would there be who have taken up arms against half a million plus army for the last four years. Even a layman would like to think that against half a million troops at least hundred thousand militants would be there who are fighting. But it is surprising that they are only a few hundred. How many youngsters can be there in five million population of Kashmir? And the people of the valley who like to live in Kashmir, literally known as heaven, have been traditionally pacifists for many many years. So far india has failed to curb the will of the people. There has been some decrease, of course, in the quantity of operational activity. But it continues primarily because it is not merely the militants who are engaged in this fight. It is the hundred percent populations, you see. It is unlike the Sikh movement, where only militants were involved and it was easily to fight against the militants. But there in Kashmir it is men, women, children, old, young and everybody is involved. If somebody does not have the means to fight, he condemns and it's the occupation forces even that is good enough. So, these handful of militants have been taken on the Indian army which has failed to curb them so far. And of course I was referring to the quality and intensity of atrocities being committed. There is no atrocity which human mind can ever conceived which is not being practiced in Kashmir. If you compare it with Mizos, Tamils and Sikhs, you would see that the army had fought against the militants alone. Not a single Sikh lady has been touched by any one, not the speak of gang raping, to which Muslim women were

subjected in Kashmir. If they fight against the militants alone that is understandable, but why they are damaging the civilian population. The damage done to the civilian population is colossal. It is for more than that done to the militants. It is not that they are killing the militants, they are killing every youngster that they come across-every young man, militant or non-militant, they don't discriminate. It is a total genocide of the people and ethnic cleansing as they call it. And then of course, it is not like Afghanistan where the whole world right from George Bush down to everybody here, was there to support. In Kashmir almost every country is against it. Pakistan is under tremendous pressure from all over the world not to lend any support. Pakistan does not get support even on moral grounds. In Geneva, everybody knew that human rights question was not going to give freedom to the Kashmiris tomorrow, but the whole world- the European, the Eastern and the Western, Northern and Southern world-everybody backed out. I don't know how could that have happened. The people who are champions of human rights in the world, become mum when it comes to Kashmir and India. Kashmir is totally land-locked area. And all pressure is on Pakistan and on everybody not to do any thing in aid of the Kashmiris. Still the movement is going on and it has the potential to sustain itself. And if it does sustain itself for quite some time, then of course, the danger is growing up. I read in newspapers today, I do not know how far it is correct, that the Deputy Foreign Minister of the United States has made a statement about the current Kashmir situation and the dangers which are brewing up.

Some quiet diplomacy has also been going on. A number of options have been under discussion. But let me tell you from my own information, although the people discuss a number of options and we also discuss them, yet the discussion is purely hypothetical, theoretical, Nobody seems to shoulder the

responsibility about any one of those options and they only talk in philosophical terms. This might be a good thing. But they find it difficult to present it to India. India has the audacity to say “No” to every body — “No” to the United States, Russia etc. When they say a big “No” to them, they find no other way except to come and pressurize us. Then I tell them alright when I accept an opinion, are you in a position to implement it? They say no, we can’t do that. I say then what is the use of offering us any option. If the government of Pakistan accept an option then who is there to implement that. We have been adhering to one option i.e. the plebiscite and if you are to change y position then you want me to go for another forty years for another option and thereafter another option and then another option. So, our position is very simple that we just cannot afford to make a shift from the plebiscite formula. Even if for the sake of argument we accept a change, then we lose the case in total and India is free to take any decision that she likes. Today there is a rope hanging around India’s neck of the plebiscite that is a sort of check on India if tomorrow we give up our stand, then we are not left with anything at all. So, the scope of our going for any option is as simple as that. So many things have been said about various options whether it is partition, whether it is regional plebiscite, whether it is an independent Kashmir, whether it is trusteeship, whether it is mediation, whether it is reversion to 1947 position. We have been discussing in good faith various possibilities hypothetically as if there is something which could apply to it, but every thing gets blocked when you come across the Indian side and they say “No” to every thing and the people lick their wounds and have nothing to fall back upon. Therefore, we have no alternative. I was talking about some quiet diplomacy, as they all it, or the second track diplomacy as the American people call it, we have not rejected the idea either. On the other hand for the last six or seven years I

have been sponsoring and trying to project the idea of a meeting of recognized Kashmiris; call them notables, call them leaders, call the intellectuals from both sides of the ceasefire line, so that the people who are affected, may be they are in a position to do something about it. The idea no doubt, got a great response and it gained currency and it started to be discussed all over the world and two meetings in that respect have already been held in Washington by the Peace Institute and one in Brussels last year. The purpose was almost the same to bring the Kashmiris from both sides to gather and India's and Pakistan's intellectuals and notables to sit together and to see what has to be done but that has not led anything tangible so far. There is yet another exercise going on between us and Delhi and Kashmir, sponsored jointly by myself and the leader of the Panthers Party, Mr. Bhim Singh on the other side who is also a member of legislative assembly and a member of the Indian security council. We are coming close to it, we will be fixing the date when to meet in Vienna, but much will depend on what kind of people are permitted by India to leave for that country. We had been asking to have the first line leadership on the other side who are engaged in the struggle and represented in several parties combined known as the APHC and from this side there is no problem. Any one of us could go, say one, two, three or four people could go. There is no difficulty to evolve consensus here but we are still waiting. May be, in the middle of May it comes off. And then of course, I have been asked time and again by foreign friends as to what is the objective and how it is going to work and what is to be done in the conference. I have been telling them very frankly that we start from a very low profile. We do not pin high hopes on this meeting. Let it be, in the least, a meeting of separated friends from both sides and try to evolve consensus on as many points as possible. If that happens then we present that consensus to both sides-

India and Pakistan and ask them to work out whether it is acceptable to them. So, from a very low profile like this we want to take a start and hope that some good sense prevails on the Indian side. India wants to induct a political process in Kashmir, of their own making under Indian constitution, but according to my own assessment, it will not be possible at the moment for the time being. So, this is with regard to the second track diplomacy. One of the difficulties is that the government both in India and in Pakistan have become weak and they are gradually becoming weaker and weak governments are not in a position to take bold and strong, daring steps. And unfortunately politics both in India and Pakistan is becoming opposition-oriented. They look to the opposition to react and opposition wants to remove the government, no matter what happens. So that sort of game has really left nobody in a position to take a daring step and to put his food down like De Gaulle and other such people who when confronted with certain situations put their food down and said no, you do this and do that. That is the position now and it lends a great weakness to the situation. I know for sure that the two Prime Ministers whenever they meet inside the room they talk sense, but outside they are speaking differently and nobody dares to spell out what they are saying inside. So, you see, that is another unfortunate position. I have just run through briefly the situation as I see it and with that I think you very much. We shall revert to question and answer. You are free to ask any question without reservation and try to understand the position from both sides. I am not an expert as it but I am undoubtedly involved in it. We have our own limitations and we mutually educate ourselves by question/answer session.

Question: Sir, what is the state of UN Resolutions?

S. Qayyum: The UN resolution was not merely a resolution adopted by some people. It was an agreement by all parties, it was unanimous agreement by India, Pakistan and all the countries and even the Kashmiris. Sheikh Abdullah represented that side and Sardar Mohammad Ibrahim Khan represented this side. It was a total agreement among all the parties. And the second point of the agreement was that all parties have to honour the same. Although India was committed to that agreement but later they deviated from their commitment.

Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru had declared; “Morally, politically I assure the whole world that we will abide by the decision taken by the Kashmiris, no matter what decision they make. “That was the assurance given by no less than a person like Mr. Jawahar Lal Nehru in his own words. He repeatedly made the same statement in the Indian parliament and to the press, and still they have backed out all those commitments.

Question: You say Indians backed out their commitment on the plebiscite. Do they now offer any other commitment?

S. Qayyum: We have been trying to tell this to our foreign friends who are coming to see me. Every other day I have foreign friends who are coming here. And one of them asked, “what is the border line between you and India?”. I said, I don’t hold a brief for the Government of Pakistan. Board line, I said, however, is that India forgets about its Atoot Ang stance as you might be understanding, Atoot Ang means integral part i.e. Kashmir being integral part of India. I said it is their stand and we are committed to plebiscite. I said it is their stand and we are committed to plebiscite. I said they forget about that and we forget about plebiscite and let us discuss openly and frankly leaving those things behind, but unfortunately nothing happened.

Question : *could you please brief us about the simla Agreement?*

S. Qayyum: Sir, the Simla Agreement is in fact not wholly in favour of anybody and it is open to various interpretations. It is not a religious document. It is a diplomatic document open to interpretations and anybody can interpret the way he likes. So, they have been interpreting it in their way and we have been interpreting it our own way, but even that has not worked because it needs a peaceful atmosphere to have negotiations and dialogues about Kashmir and to resolve it through talks.

Simla Agreement provides safeguard to the respective positions of the two countries alright, yet twenty years have passed and they have not held a single meaningful dialogue on Kashmir and to resolve it through talks. Simla Agreement provides safeguard to the respective positions of the two countries al rights, yet twenty years have passed and they have not held a single meaningful dialogue on Kashmir and there is no hope of any such thing in the future. So the Simla Agreement has totally and practically become redumdant .It has been flouted by Indian side. There has been a clear violation off all agreements, Indian so far made. So, it is at the will of that strong party. There are no restrictions onthem, they can do anything they like because they are strong. Even the united states, the only strongest power in the world, has rather been helpless in India's case. Indians have no regard and no respect for their words. They make commitments and flout and repudiate them afterwards. That bas been their practice in the past. Let them come forward and tell if they have anything on record to show that they have ever respected their words anywhere in the world particularly with is. They took advantage of the cold war with Russia are one time and they have tried to blackmail China and Iran and are now trying to blackmail the

United States and the Western world over Kashmir. I mean they can do whatever they like there is no check.

Question: *sir, if the present line control is made a permanent border line, will it be acceptable to both India and Pakistan?*

S. Qayyum: Primarily it is not practicable because of what is happening in Kashmir. That will invariably imply a license for India to go and kill everybody. It would mean complete genocide of the people of Kashmir who have been suffering for long. That I think is not really tenable. Secondly, if you can guarantee that having made this line permanent border, India will give up its expansionist designs,

India will reconcile to the geographical sovereignty and entity of Pakistan and that India would accept the two nation theory which created Pakistan, then I will get up and say to my brothers across the ceasefire line that you , five to six million people, have made sacrifices, you have to save bigger catastrophe which is in the offing. But the situation will become worse by making this line permanent. Number one: India will not reconcile to it in the long term. She will immediately start lodging a claim on Azad Kashmir and Northern areas because she has not given up her dream of United India, expansion designs and to weaken Pakistan. She has not reconciled to the geographical identity of Pakistan so far.

Number two: you are military experts, you can appreciate that, this decision will invariably mean straightening the ceasefire line and cutting out the vulnerabilities and the irritants from the ceasefire line. And if we do that it will place India in a far advantageous position. To remove these vulnerabilities to the satisfaction of India being a big country would bring Islamabad in the range of the heavy gun fire from the Indian side, not to speak of Azad Kashmir. If that starts happening the other day and we

have made the border permanent. A bigger country not respecting its words and if she only lets loose her heavy guns and medium guns on Azad Kashmir and Pakistan, then how are you going to face the situation? So I said that it is just not possible and it is not workable. There is no question of compromise doing this small or that little thing. How can you carve out a position when more than eight million people on the other side are in trouble. Now that eight million people are up in arms. How can you go and tell them to accept the Indian constitution? Who is in a position to do that? That is no possible So, Sir. All the time India has been intransigent and if it comes to a negotiated resolution on the basis of existing ceasefire line, they will say that we have become weak and we are surrendering and they will increase their demand instead of being sensible and realistic. That is the situation.

Question: *There is a controversy over the Gilgit and Baltistan between Azad Jammu and Kashmir*

Government and the government of Pakistan. Can you explain the real position?

S. Qayyum: You see according to us, historically Gilgit and Baltistan have been a part of the Jammu and Kashmir state all along, but for sometime Gilgit agency was dealt with the British government. They had appointed their agent there and that was. As you all know, to contain China from that side. At that time the situation was quite different from as it is today, but with the lapse of the British paramount in 1947, that area also reverted back to the Jammu and Kashmir and the Maharajah appointed a Governor. His name was Ghansra singh. He was appointed Governor of Gilgit by Maharajah and we had another Governor who belonged to Azad Kashmir. That is one part of it. And secondly: if you look at sino-park Agreement you will see, that area is recognized to be a part of the state of Jammu and

Kashmir. This is only through an agreement between the government of Azad Kashmir and thy government of Pakistan that the administrative control of these areas was transferred to the government of Pakistan, So, that is the leagal, constitutional and historical position. And this matter has been debated in courts, High courts. When there was a case in High Court, the Attorney General of Pakistan himself conceded the fact that it continues to be apart of Jammu and Kashmir State although the administrative control rests with the Government of Pakistan.

Question: Is it true that Chitral was also a part of Jammu and Kashmir State?

S. Qayyum: Yes, Yes, Chitral, Mansehra, Abbottabad right upto Taxila. This was part of Jammu & Kashmir State and we sometime intend to lodge a claim on that also.

Question: What about Laddakh?

S. Qayyum: Gentlemen, Laddakh, Gilgit, Baltistan and Jammu and Northern areas all were in Kashmir. You see when we talk of Kashmir as 84.000 square miles of area and we talk of plebiscite, the Un resolutions elearly mention these areas as part of plebiscite exercise So, there os no ambiguity about that.

Question: Is it indicated in the UN resolutions?

S. Qayyum: Yes, it is provided in the UN resolutions which have been accepted by all parties. It is by name mentioned in the resolutions. We have not claimed Chitral as part of Jammu and Kashmir State. That was long ago during British Empire when some changes were made and we accepted them as fait accompli and we did not bother about that. But the US resolutions clearly mention about 84,000 square miles of areas which include Jammu, Gilgit, Baltistan, Laddakh and Azad Kashmir areas

besides the valley. That is clearly mentioned in the UN resolutions.

Question: If sometimes the Kashmir dispute is resolved, what would be the fate of Hindu populated areas???? Will they join India or opt for Pakistan?

S. Qayyum: You see it is generally said that the Hindu population, or non-muslim population dominates Jammu. We must bear in mind that it is not the whole of Jammu with Hindu majority. It is only three districts out of six districts of Jammu which are Hindu majority areas and the rest three districts are Muslim majority areas. So, the non-Muslim majority areas are generally considered to be opting ultimately for India and Muslim majority areas, in general, ultimately opt of Pakistan. There is an element for independence of sovereign Jammu and Kashmir State. You know independence freedom, liberation and all these words have become fashion of the day and are easily understood. The word "accession", politically speaking, only a man of my age group would understand, but the youngsters would not understand what accession really means unless that they go through all those UN resolutions and all the pre-independence exercises but people have no time for it. And when countries other than India and Pakistan talk of Kashmir problem and look at it from the point of India and Pakistan, they in all honesty say that they would not like to take sides between the two countries and the simple way out is a third option i.e. independent sovereign state. So there has been much talk about it and this idea has attracted attention of the youngsters in the sense that if there is no solution coming forward and this might be the only solution then it should be acceptable. But when the people like me look at it in the applied form of politics, then in application this is non-existent. This will mean, for example, we talk of independence of

Jammu and Kashmir. It will mean re-opening of the total partition plan. Now, who on earth can really afford today to think of re-opening the partition plan? Then it will also mean redesigning the UN resolutions. Now who has the authority to re-design the UN resolutions and provide for independent Kashmir? And against the Indian intransigence, who is there to force upon India in the face of argument that they advance, viz that in case of independent Kashmir, more than six hundred states in India will want to be independent and therefore the whole thing will break up. So, practically speaking, the people who understand the philosophy of politics, they have been averse to this idea. Then, of course, the Kashmir is contiguous with Pakistan along 1400 km border. Its economy, culture, defence and every thing is so mixed up with Pakistan that the people can only stay with Pakistan. An independent sovereign state will have to be guarded by India, by Pakistan, by China and by Russia. And what is the compulsion that all these countries will go on guarding it as a sacred cow, and they will be looking after Kashmir and providing for its interests. This is absolutely redundant in the practical, applied form of things. Philosophically people may talk about this and that and when they get disappointed, they say alright hell with this and that and let us take another position without holding any responsibility. I discussed this in quite detail with a number of our foreign friends who have been coming and visiting us and then ultimately they agreed that this is not workable at all.