
Role of United Nations in Indo-Pak Relations with Special Reference to Kashmir Issue

Dr. Joginder Singh

Lect. In Pol. Science G.S.S.S. Samargopalpur, Distt. Rohtak (Haryana)
Email: drjoginderdhull@gmail.com

Abstract: *Kashmir issue has always been a bone of contention between India and Pakistan. Moreover, it is the oldest unresolved international conflict in the world today. The conflict of Kashmir with its origin in the partition of the subcontinent by the British in 1947 with the passage of time has turned into a bitter legacy. The first war over Kashmir between India and Pakistan in 1948 activated the United Nations which produced a plethora of resolutions. These resolutions formed the important part of UN's involvement in the Kashmir. However, India made many efforts to settle the Kashmir dispute with Pakistan, nevertheless it failed. In 1964 Security Council passed a resolution proposing that Kashmir dispute should be solved through mutual negotiations. But Pakistan has always attempted to secure Kashmir by force and its efforts are still continued through terrorist activities. The present research paper focuses on the Peacekeeping missions mandated by the Security Council to investigate and mediate in the dispute between two countries.*

Keywords: Bone of Contention, Kashmir Issue, Peacekeeping, United Nations, Security Council.

Introduction: The fact is that the partition of British India in 1947, which resulted in the emergence of the states of India and Pakistan, created many loopholes and gaps which from time to time influenced the relations of both countries. Of the many legacies of partition, one and the most sensitive issue was the Kashmir dispute on October 23, Maharaja Hari Singh decided to accede to India and he signed the instrument of accession to make the Kashmir a part of India. Here it is noteworthy to say that the state of Jammu and Kashmir, which had a predominantly Muslim population but was subject to the rule of a Hindu Maharaja, shared borders with both India and West Pakistan. This religious dispute made it substantially more difficult for the Dominion of Pakistan to appeal to Kashmir. Pakistan was worried about the Maharajah deciding to join India. With these worries, Pakistani tribesmen invaded Kashmir. The Maharajah asked India to intervene in Kashmir and signed an "Instrument of

Accession” with India ceding control over foreign and defence policy to India. Thus, the conflict between India and Pakistan became direct and violent, and the value of Kashmir rose significantly.

Now elaborating her views on Kashmir, Pakistan held that the Hindu Maharaja of Kashmir knew very well that his subjects wanted to accede to Pakistan and Pakistan requested the security council to examine her case with new look. Consequently it created dispute in Indo-Pak relations. India later decided to pursue a resolve by referring the ongoing conflict to the United Nations Security Council under article 35th of the UN Charter, which allows the UN member states to bring to the Security Council attention situations ‘likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace’. As a result, the Security Council established the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) where it worked on resolutions to prevent the First Indo---Pakistani War from advancing further.

Thus, to investigate the Kashmir dispute and mediate between the two countries, the UN Security Council by its resolution 39 (1948) established the United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan (UNCIP). At that time there were Pakistani tribal attacks and both Indian and

Pakistani military were present in Jammu and Kashmir. The justification of the India’s presence in the Jammu and Kashmir was based on the validity of Maharaja’s accession to India. However Pakistan denied the charges and held that conflict in Kashmir was a revolt against the Maharaja’s tyrannical rule. Led by Britain and the United States, the UN Security Council passed a resolution 47 (1948) on 21, April 1948 and decided to enlarge the members of UNCIP from 3 to 5. The UNCIP reached Kashmir in July 1948 and after deliberations with Indian and Pakistani leadership, produced a proposal, which called for an immediate ceasefire and called on the Government of Pakistan to secure the withdrawal from the state of Jammu and Kashmir of tribesmen and Pakistani nationals not normally resident therein who have entered the state for the purpose of fighting. It also asked the India to reduce the bulk of its forces to minimum strength, after which the two countries would hold a plebiscite which should be put into effect on the question of accession of the state to India or Pakistan. However, both the countries failed to arrive at a truce agreement due to differences over interpretation of the procedure for and the extent of demilitarization. Furthermore, in November 1948, although both countries agreed to the plebiscite but Pakistan refused to withdraw their

forces from Kashmir on the grounds that India was allowed to retain some of its troops to maintain order, which could potentially lead to compulsion or coercion of voters by Indian forces to influence the outcome of the proposed plebiscite on the Kashmir issue.

Then regarding the Kashmir Dispute, over the next few years, the UN Security Council passed four new resolutions, revising the terms of Resolution 47 to include a synchronous withdrawal of both Indian and Pakistani troops from the region. To this end, UN arbitrators put forward eleven different proposals for the demilitarization of the region. All of these were accepted by Pakistan, but rejected by the Indian government, which maintained that the State had become a part of the Indian Union. In December 1949, UNSC President General A. G. L. McNaughton tried to seek a mutually satisfactory solution between India and Pakistan. His proposals for the demilitarization of Kashmir to ensure an impartial Plebiscite in Kashmir were rejected by India. After the failure of Mc Naughton proposals, the United Nations on 14 March 1950 replaced the UNCIP by a single U.N representative Owen Dixon, a judge from Australia to seek the UN objective of demilitarization. He suggested two plans

including the division of the state. The government of India rejected both the proposals as these provided for the establishment of an UN authority in the state. After the failure of Dixon, Dr. Frank Graham was appointed as the UN representative by a UN resolution (30 March 1951) to mediate between India and Pakistan to get them to agree on holding a Plebiscite in Kashmir. Dr. Graham worked from 1951-53 without meeting any success. Frank Graham was followed by Gunnar Jarring in 1957 who also failed to make any headway on Kashmir.

Meanwhile following the termination of the mandate of UNCIP, the Security Council, by its resolution 91 (1951) on 30, March 1951, established the United Nations Military Observer Group in India & Pakistan (UNMOGIP) to supervise the ceasefire in Jammu and Kashmir. UNMOGIP functions were to observe and report, investigate complaints of ceasefire violation and submit its findings to each party and to Secretary General. In 1965, the second war broke out between India and Pakistan and the question of India- Pakistan was once again at the forefront of Security Council. The number of observers was doubled as the hostilities spread to Kashmir. At the end of 1971, the third war

broke out between India and Pakistan and by the time the war ended, number of positions on both sides of original ceasefire line had changed. The Security Council (SC) on 21 December adopted resolution 307 (1971) by which it demanded that a durable ceasefire in all the areas of the conflict remain in effect until all armed forces had withdrawn to their respective territories and to positions which fully respected the ceasefire line in Jammu and Kashmir supervised by UNMOGIP. In July 1972, India and Pakistan signed an agreement defining line of control which, with minor deviations, followed the same course as the ceasefire line established by Karachi agreement. The Simla Agreement of 1972 between India and Pakistan obliged both the states to deal with their issues bilaterally. India has since argued that this precludes third party intervention, including that of UNMOGIP. On the basis of Simla Agreement India ignores UNMOGIP and took that the mandate of UNMOGIP had lapsed. However Pakistan did not accept this position.

Nevertheless, the military authorities of Pakistan have continued to lodge complaints with UNMOGIP about ceasefire violations. The military authorities of India have lodged no complaints since January 1972 and have restricted the activities of the UN observers on

the Indian side of the Line of Control. They have, however, continued to provide accommodation, transport and other facilities to UNMOGIP. However, Pakistan continues to welcome the UNMOGIP mission based there. Speaking in Islamabad, Pakistan Foreign Secretary Aizaz Ahmad Chaudhury said “Pakistan will continue to facilitate the UNMOGIP, which is a source for providing credible information to the U.N. Security Council through its regular periodic reports. We have noted with concern that there were some administrative issues for the UMMOGIP in New Delhi but we believe it needs to be facilitated in the performance of its very important role.” India has asked a United Nations military observer group on Kashmir to vacate a government provided bungalow in New Delhi, in a toughening stance against a mission that Indians have long opposed. New Delhi considers the whole of Kashmir as an integral part of the country and has bristled against external involvement in the region including the U.N. Military Observers Group on India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) that was set up in 1949 after their first war. India maintains that the U.N. had no role to play after India and Pakistan signed the Shimla Pact in 1972 under which the two countries agreed to resolve all disputes including Kashmir bilaterally.

On the basis of disagreement between India and Pakistan over UNMOGIP's mandate and functions, the secretary General's position has been that UNMOGIP could be terminated only by a decision of Security Council. In the absence of such an agreement, UNMOGIP has been maintained with the same arrangements as established following December 1971 ceasefire. This clearly suggests that while Indian government can bulldoze the UN body out of its office building, it cannot ask the group to leave the country, if it has to follow the international law. In addition the closing down of UNMOGIP's operations would break UN's promise to the Kashmiri people made in 1948 and would also break down the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. India and Pakistan have fought two of their three wars since independence in 1947 over Muslim-majority Kashmir. Tension between the nuclear-armed neighbours often escalates in cross-border firing in the region. Both sides often accuse each other of violating a ceasefire agreement that kills dozens of people including civilians. The UN was most active in the Kashmir dispute in the very first months of India's and Pakistan's existence, when the two countries were at war. The role of UN has been very limited in recent decades. Even during the popular Kashmir uprising in 1989-90, when

hundreds of thousands of Kashmiris marched in pro-freedom processions in Kashmir Valley and when thousands crossed the LOC to receive arms training, the UNMOGIP remained in hibernation in its Srinagar office.

The UNMOGIP has played virtually no role in the conflict after 1972. When a popular uprising broke out against Indian rule in Indian-administered Kashmir in 1990, large pro-Independence processions of Kashmiris would often lead to the UNMOGIP headquarters in Srinagar to lodge protests and call on the U.N to implement its resolutions on Kashmir. Millions of Kashmir's marched up to UNMOGIP headquarter in Srinagar on 1 March, 1990, submitted memoranda to UN Secretary-General urging him to intervene and push India into granting Kashmiris their 'right to self-determination'. Although it is now becoming the common practice in Kashmir to send memoranda to the UNMOGIP, demanding implementation of U.N resolutions in Kashmir or the fulfilment of the right of self-determination of Kashmiris. On August 18, 2008, responding to the call of separatist leaders for a mass march up to UNMOGIP office, hundreds of thousands of people from every nook and corner of the Kashmir valley converged near the Tourist Reception Centre,

close to the UNMOGIP office in Sonwar, locality of Srinagar to urge on the U.N to intervene in Kashmir. The sea of people comprising students from schools, colleges and universities, doctors, teachers, para medics, thousands of Kashmir government employees, professionals and peasant masses carried placards which read, "Stop Genocide of Kashmiris, Intervene UNO", " Ban ki Moon, Come soon", "We want Plebiscite" etc. The state is very strict regarding the protests outside the UN building in Srinagar. The government uses different means to block the protesters before they reach to UN office. UNMOGIP has not been able to stop human right violations in Kashmir. The UN has not been able to resolve the Kashmir conflict but it represents the international dimension of the Kashmir issue. The past involvement of UN in Kashmir Conflict has undoubtedly provided legitimacy and strength to the separatist argument in Kashmir but on the other hand the framing of the Kashmir Conflict as an India-Pakistan (Inter-State) Conflict in the U.N has prevented international recognition of the Kashmiri nationalist movement as the defining characteristic of the present day Kashmir Conflict.

Conclusion: To conclude we can point out that the development between Indo-Pak relations after many wars could not reached any peaceful solution of the Kashmir dispute. Reason behind it was that the UN was most active in the Kashmir dispute in the very first months of India's and Pakistan's existence, when the two countries were at war. After the 1972 Shimla Agreement UNMOGIP has been rendered completely ineffective in solving the Kashmir conflict between India and Pakistan. The non-implementation of various UN resolutions passed from time to time regarding the Kashmir issue reminds that international body is yet to play its full role as far as the issue of Kashmir is concerned. The UN involvement needs to focus on getting the two sides to the table to resolve the issue. The small arm firing across the line of control has become the norm and has started to affect the civilians more than what typically is the case. Even though the U.N's complete failure in Kashmir, the presence of UNMOGIP office in summer Capital of Jammu and Kashmir continues to symbolically affirm the Kashmiri sentiments that their land is not yet another Indian State but an internationally recognized disputed territory and that their cause is a historical and just one. Today both the countries need to adhere towards confidence building measures on the issue.



References:

- [1] A. Lamb, **Kashmir: A Disputed Legacy**, Rexford Books, Hertingfordbury, 1992.
- [2] V. Grover, **The Story of Kashmir: Yesterday and Today**, Deep & Deep Publication, New Delhi, 1995.
- [3] BalrajPuri, "Kashmiriyat: The Vitality of Kashmir Identity", **Contemporary South Asia**, Vol. 4(1), March 1995.
- [4] SumitGanguly, **The Crisis in Kashmir: Portent of War, Hope of Peace**, Foundation Books, New Delhi, 1997.
- [5] N. Jayapalan, **India and Her Neighbours**, Atlantic Publishers, New Delhi, 2000.
- [6] S. N. Kaul, **Internationalization of Kashmir Issue**, Rajat Publication, New Delhi, 2002.
- [7] Bharti Das, **Irritants in Indo-Pak Relations**, Kilaso Books, New Delhi, 2005.
- [8] S. P. Vats, "Obstacles to CBMs between India and Pakistan", **Third Concept**, Vol. 20(232), June 2006.
- [9] **The Times of India**, New Delhi, 5 April 2007.
- [10] **The Times of India**, New Delhi, 28 September 2007.
- [11] B. L. Pharia, **International Relations**, SahityaBhawan, Agra, 2016.
- [12] <http://www.dw.com/en/how-could-the-un-help-resolve-the-kashmir-dispute>.
- [13] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UN_mediation_of_the_Kashmir_dispute.
-