

**RESEARCH PAPER****Role of United Nations in Kashmir Conflict: An Exploratory Study****¹Saman Mehmood Sultan* and ²Sawera Mohsin**

1. MS Scholar, Department of Political Science G.C Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan

2. MS Scholar, Department of Political Science G.C Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan

Corresponding Author

samanmehmod82@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Since its beginning in 1947, the Kashmir conflict—one of the longest and most acrimonious territorial disputes in modern history—has attracted considerable attention from around the world. The United Nations' (UN) role in mediating and overseeing the dispute between India and Pakistan over the Kashmir area is examined in this essay. The UN has attempted to resolve the conflict and advance regional stability through diplomatic initiatives, peacekeeping missions, and resolutions. However, due to geopolitical complications, competing national interests, and enforcement mechanism constraints, its efforts have been met with differing degrees of success. This study investigates how the UN's role has changed and assesses how well it has worked to promote peace and reconciliation in Kashmir by examining the historical background, significant UN actions, and their effects. The results provide insights into the UN's ability to handle complicated international conflicts in the current geopolitical environment, highlighting both the organization's successes and difficulties.

Keywords: Dispute, Involvement, Third Party, United Nations, UNSC**Introduction**

The conflict over Kashmir is essentially a territorial conflict between India and Pakistan. This conflict has a deep ideological component to the motivations of the two nation states in addition to being primarily territorial and geopolitical (Masood, & Muzaffar, 2019; Shakoor, 1998). Kashmir is located in the Himalayan Mountains, where Pakistan, India, Afghanistan, and China converge. The Mughal emperors of India referred to Kashmir as "heaven" due to the superiority of its natural features. The entire region of Kashmir, which spanned 86,023 square miles, was once a regal realm of English India. In the last 70 years, Kashmir has become a lost paradise. Its relatives got entangled in an unfortunate dispute between Pakistan and India. It became a focal area of state conflict in the first and second India-Pakistan wars, and the dispute over Kashmir started in 1947–1948 and 1965. The region also saw intense fighting in the third war in 1971. (Bose, 2004).

It is true that Kashmir became the focal point of the India-Pakistan conflict after many years. The Kashmir crisis is become more than just a problem for India-Pakistan ties; it is a unique challenge for the global community. Kashmir is undoubtedly a twentieth-century issue that emerged from the decolonization process, as evidenced by the prevalent notions of nation-state, sovereignty, and the right to self-determination. (Sidhu, 2007).

From Pakistan's opinion, the possession of Kashmir might be very significant to her ideology, primarily spiritual philosophy that might function the cornerstone of a state. On the other hand, Kashmir is strategically significant from India's perspective. When the Kashmir issue arose, it might be quite difficult to identify. One way to resolve a dispute is by the agreement or involvement of a third party. The method of resolving conflicts is agreement. The United Nations (UN) is primarily involved in the conflict resolution process in Kashmir. In actuality, the centralization and overcentralization processes have suppressed Kashmiris. In any case, the fact that the UN almost failed in the Kashmir dispute

to finalize its rulings is also a reality. Furthermore, the war in Kashmir continues to be a long-standing point of contention in international politics. If the United Nations had assumed responsibility, the Kashmir crisis might have been resolved (Masood, Sultana, & Muzaffar, 2020; Sidhu, 2007).

In actuality, the Kashmir issue resulted from the British inability to find a good way to unite the princely states into independent India and Pakistan, which replaced the British raj. However, India's adamant opposition to third-party agreements is the primary reason why they have failed in the Kashmiri context. Kashmiris' demands for their rightful portion and rights—namely, the right to freedom and self-determination—are not incorrect. The United Nations' agreements, rulings, and complimentary coverage of mortal blood should be admired by all sides involved in the Kashmir dispute. In the end, it may be claimed that India cannot win the hearts of Kashmiris with force and muscle; rather, it can only do so by showing them love, patience, admiration for their qualities, and, most importantly, by granting them less autonomy. The world's oldest unresolved international conflict is the one in Kashmir. The Kashmir issue can be seen as a direct result of the British inability to come up with a workable plan for the merger of India and Pakistan. While Indian security forces are waging an unknowable reign of terror in Occupied Kashmir, the Indian government is neither prepared to resolve the conflict with Pakistan through bilateral accommodations nor willing to negotiate the matter globally through a transnational agreement. The UN's ruling is inextricably related to the history of the violence in Kashmir. This paper aims to discuss the United Nations' involvement in this significant issue that both India and Pakistan, two nearby countries, face. (Lamad, 1996).

Literature Review

The Kashmir issues continue to exacerbate the already tense relations between India and Pakistan even after many years of independence. Although there are several issues between the two countries, the Kashmir dispute is the main one. Regarding the Kashmir problem, the United Nations Organization (UNO) has played a crucial role. A significant mediating role in the Kashmir dispute was played by the UNCIP, Mr. Mcnaughton, Mr. Owen Dixon, and Mr. Frank P. Graham. The current article briefly describes the role of the UN in the 1948–1953 Kashmir dispute and examines the type of resolution that was suggested using it. (Das, 2000).

The United Nations Security Council's first mention of an interstate conflict was the 1947–1949 Jammu and Kashmir conflict between India and Pakistan. This assessment appears to be based on the opinions of the government and the delegation of Great Britain, one of the five permanent members of the Safety Council, on Kashmir during the year 1948. It contends that Imperial and Commonwealth strategic and ideological imperatives in South and critical Asia and the Middle East, rather than the merits of the disputants' positions, were what caused the British attitude to shift to an extra level. (Shakoor, 1998).

Working against the dual backdrop of decolonization and the bloodless war, the British legitimately considered the following: India's complaint of aggression against Pakistan, Pakistan's demand for a plebiscite in Kashmir, and Kashmir's accession to India. They did this while keeping in mind their own hopes and concerns in the region, which they saw as the primary advantage over Islam and Communism. (Shakoor, 1998).

Since 1947, the final reputation of the former principedom of Kashmir has remained uncertain. In particular, by renouncing certain provisions of the Indian charter that granted the country autonomy with regard to the majority of internal administrative issues, the Indian authorities announced on August 5, 2019, that it was officially ending the "unique fame" of its Muslim-majority Jammu and Kashmir (J&okay) country, placing two-thirds of Kashmir under New Delhi's control. In addition, New Delhi plans to divide the country into two "union territories," each of which will have less native administrative powers than the

Indian states. For the purpose of correctly integrating J&Okay and promoting its economic development, Indian officials explain the acts as internal domestic politics.(Wani, 2015).

The process that India's authorities are using to carry out this endeavor has drawn harsh criticism for its purported reliance on repressive pressure in J&Okay as well as for dubious prison and constitutional arguments that may likely be made before India's preferred courtroom. The move caused controversy around the world as a "unilateral" attempt by India, with assistance from the UN, to improve the reputation of an area that is seen as disputed by China and neighboring Pakistan. The harsh safety crackdown in the distant nation by New Delhi also raises concerns about human rights.(Wani, 2015).

The long-standing U.S. stance on Kashmir is that negotiations between India and Pakistan must be used to resolve the region's reputation while also taking into consideration the desires of the Kashmiri people. Since 1972, the Indian government has generally refrained from participating in the 1/3-birthday celebration. Regarding Kashmir, Pakistan's government has persisted in its attempts to internationalize it, primarily through moves taken by the U.N. Security Council (America). Another little party to the conflict is China, Pakistan's close friend. Concerns have been raised globally regarding the potential for further civil unrest and violence in the Kashmir Valley, as well as the ripple effects this could have on the regional equilibrium. The Trump administration has so far refrained from making public demands to uphold peace and stability and to respect human rights.(Sindhu, 2007).

The United States of America must also use moderation whenever possible. For example, a "informal" August 16 United States of America assembly resulted in no subsequent credible U.N. Assertion New Delhi's August maneuvers have angered Pakistan's officials and raised fears concerning escalation between South Asia's nuclear-armed nations, which almost resulted in war following a suicide bombing in the Kashmir Valley in February 2019 and subsequent Indian airstrikes(Gangula, 2006).

Many commentators argue that the actions may also have an impact on India's democracy and human rights. Both in recent years and with the repeal of Article 370, those were damaged. Furthermore, the secular, pluralist traditions of the United States may be being undermined by Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi and his Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata party (BJP), which was strengthened by a strong May election mandate and a growing number of people who are pursuing Hindu majoritarian policies. While maintaining human rights protections, the UN aims to maintain stability in the pursuit of a larger U.S.-India collaboration. (Behar, 2004).

After British India gained its independence and was divided into the dominions of India and Pakistan in 1947, the United Nations took an advisory role in maintaining peace and order in the region of Kashmir. Meanwhile, a dispute arose between the two new states over who would be allowed to join the princely nation of Jammu and Kashmir. After several years of independence, the already tense relations between India and Pakistan continue to worsen due to the Kashmir conflicts. Although there are numerous problems between the two nations, the Kashmir dispute is the main one.(Suwirta, 2014).

Regarding the Kashmir problem, the United Nations Organization (UN) has played a crucial role. One way to resolve a dispute is by the agreement or involvement of a third party. The method of resolving conflicts is agreement. The United Nations (UN) is primarily involved in the conflict resolution process in Kashmir. In actuality, the centralization and overcentralization processes have repressed Kashmiris. In any case, the Kashmiri liberation movement was reinforced by UN rulings. However, it's also a fact that the UN almost failed in the Kashmir dispute to put the finishing touches on its rulings. Furthermore, the conflict in Kashmir continues to be a long-standing issue in international politics.(Karned, 2004).

If the United Nations had assumed responsibility, the Kashmir crisis might have been avoided. On the other hand, India's adamant opposition to third-party agreements is the primary reason why they have failed in the Kashmir environment. Demanding their just share and rights—namely, the right to freedom and self-determination—is not incorrect on the part of Kashmiris. The United Nations' agreements, rulings, and complimentary coverage of mortal blood should be admired by all sides involved in the Kashmir dispute. In the end, it may be claimed that India cannot win Kashmiris' hearts with force and muscle; rather, it can only do so by showing them love, patience, admiration for their qualities, and, most importantly, by granting them less autonomy. (Basrur,2008).

The Kashmir conflict is regarded as one of the longest and most continuing conflicts in the world. The reality is that the Kashmir issues yet to be resolved until moment. As a consequence there's the question of the part of the UN as the world body in resolving the issue. The question arises because UN is a transnational body and one of its main operations is to resolve conflict among the world countries through peaceful means. The fact is that the UN did play its part and the substantiation is the many judgments that the UN passed throughout its involvement in the Kashmir peace pains since 1947. Still the mystification remains as the Kashmir conflict is yet to be resolved indeed after all these pains. As a result, this investigation looks at the role of the UN and the various difficulties it encounters when handling the crisis in Kashmir. The study begins by tracing the conflict's history and its varied phases. (Snedden, 2003).

Finding the primary barriers to dispute resolution is crucial. In addition, it offers the foundation for examining the role of the UN and the difficulties it has encountered. Examined are the roles of the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the Secretary-General. It implies that Pakistan might take part in bilateral confidence-boosting measures (CBMs) and ignore the issue of Muslim terrorism in the disputed area, while India could lessen pressure in that region. It suggests that Pakistan should fortify its internal political stability while India should violate the 1960 Indus Water Treaty (between India and Pakistan). It comes to the conclusion that these actions would greatly aid in resolving disputes and strengthening the UN's role as a mediator.(Malik, 2006).

Role of United Nations in Kashmir conflict

Historical Background to the Kashmir Sub-Conflict and its resolution by united Nations

The core of all issues between India and Pakistan is the sub-conflict over Jammu and Kashmir. Since 1947, when they gained independence from British authority, it has caused problems in bilateral relations. The fact that areas with a majority of Muslims were to be allocated to Pakistan and areas with a majority of Hindus to India when British India was divided in 1947 is the cause of this sub-conflict. One of the 562 princely states in British India was Jammu and Kashmir. It was ruled by a Hindu maharaja who signed a standstill agreement with Pakistan and began committing atrocities against the kingdom's Muslim populace. The state had a majority of Muslims. The populace revolted in response.

United nations new technique for mediation(McNaughton, Dixon, Graham Plan)

Under the direction of Canadian Fashionable McNaughton, the Security Council developed a new approach to the Kashmir issue in December 1949. He started working as a "mediator" on the side, and on December 22, he presented the idea to the governments of India and Pakistan. According to those concepts, security and law and order do not need the departure of Pakistan's and India's regular armies. reducing local troops by disarmament and disbandment, which includes, on the one hand, the state of Kashmir's armed forces and, on the other, the Azad forces. This type of demilitarization plan should include the northern regions. Pakistan has long respected the idea of making the smallest possible

reservation. However India rejected the McNaughton motion on the Floor, in impact that it represented a legitimization of the motion of Azad Kashmir. As a result, the McNaughton mediation may be characterized as a failure, and the United Nations may propose using another mediator, such as Sir Owen Dixon, a distinguished Australian jurist, to take over the UNCIP's role. Arriving in the Subcontinent on May 27, 1950, Sir Owen Dixon carried on with his mediating duties till August 21, 1950. On September 15, 1950, he turned in his file to the Safety Council.

The proposals of the file are precis beneath

A) Dixon recommended that the evacuation of Indian soldiers (not just the majority) be followed by the withdrawal of Pakistani forces first. The authorities on both sides of the Give Up-fire line would consult the UN navy adviser over the forces to be stored of their respective Jones for the purpose of regulation and order prior to a referendum following complete demilitarization together with these traces.

B) Dixon also suggested that upon demilitarization, local district magistrates would administer the areas occupied by Pakistani and Azad forces under the supervision of UN officers.

C) Dixon ultimately attempts a solution that could result in the country being divided between India and Pakistan, excluding the Vale of Kashmir. The UN mandated that management below the plebiscite administrator prepare for the plebiscite, which was held after all tropes were excluded from the area (Dasgupta 1968, pp. 167–178).¹² India again turned down the proposal on the well-known floor of:

Any privilege or right Pakistan may have in a plebiscite In an area where its violence was unopposed. In this regard, Dr. Frank P. Graham, a former US senator from North Carolina, succeeded Sir Owen Dixon as a UN expert. sent five proposals to the UN between 1951 and 1953, but he was unable to provide a resolution to the Kashmir issue. Dr. Graham suggested demilitarizing Kashmir (Seven Inspiration). Similar to the success of earlier UN mediation, the demilitarization plan was rejected by India and became a daily reality through Pakistan. Following this, Graham was inspired to use each nation to gradually reduce its forces to a minimum and proportionate to the forces of both nations that had been in Kashmir on January 1, 1949. Once more, the idea became well-known through Pakistan and disapproved of by India. Graham once more provided the international locations for the withdrawal of forces from Kashmir on July 16, 1952, but India and Pakistan once more rejected the idea. A document was eventually presented by Dr. Graham on March 27, 1953. The two issues that India and Pakistan disagreed on during this mediation were how many troops each side should have after demilitarization and whether the plebiscite management should ensure their commitment.

Role of United Nations on Kashmir conflict

In an effort to end the war between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, the UN has been instrumental. When Kashmir, a princely state, was offered the option to join either India or Pakistan following the 1947 partition of India, the conflict began. India and Pakistan, who both claim the entire territory, are engaged in a territorial dispute as a result of the Maharaja of Kashmir's decision to maintain neutrality. On November 1, 1947, India's popular governor, Mountbatten, flew to Lahore for a meeting with Muhammad Ali Jinnah after the Indo-Pakistani war broke out. He presented the idea that, in all princely states where the ruler had not yet joined a Dominion that matched the majority of the population (which may have included Hyderabad, Kashmir, and Junagadh), the accession must be decided by a "impartial connection with the desire of the human beings." Jinnah turned down the offer. During their subsequent meeting in December, High Minister Jawaharlal Nehru told Liaquat Ali Khan of India's intention to take the matter to the United Nations

under article 35 (chapter VI) of the UN charter, which permits member states to present interest conditions to the Security Council that could jeopardize the preservation of world peace. On January 1, 1948, India requested that the United States of America's UN Safety Council decide the matter. On April 21, 1948, the UN Security Council adopted decision 47, which established the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP). A direct end-hearth was enforced by the act, which was directed at the Pakistani government "to cozy the withdrawal from the country of Jammu and Kashmir of tribesmen and Pakistani nationals not normally resident there who have entered the kingdom for the cause of preventing." Additionally, it asked Indian authorities to reduce their forces to the bare minimum of force before holding a plebiscite "at the query of Accession of the nation to India or Pakistan." However, the ceasefire was not put into effect until January 1, 1949, when it was signed by popular Roy Bucher on behalf of India and well Gracey on behalf of Pakistan.

In an effort to establish a solution that would satisfy both India and Pakistan, the UNCIP visited the subcontinent three times in 1948 and 1949. In August 1948, it informed the Safety Council that "the presence of troops of Pakistan" in inner Kashmir constituted a "fabric trade" in the context. For the force withdrawal, a two-element method is put forth. Pakistan was required to remove its troops and certain Pakistani citizens from the country as part of the first component. India was required to withdraw the majority of its soldiers in the second section, "whilst the commission shall have notified the authorities of India" that Pakistan's evacuation was complete. A plebiscite may be held following the completion of each withdrawal. India made the choice popular, while Pakistan essentially rejected it.

Because of the unique characteristics of the kingdom's accession, the Indian government believes it has legal control over Jammu and Kashmir. The assistance provided by Pakistan to the Pakhtoon tribes and rebel forces was deemed to be a negative act, and the Pakistani navy's involvement was interpreted as an invasion of Indian territory. According to India, the purpose of the plebiscite was to confirm the accession, which was already complete in every way, and Pakistan was not allowed to compete on an equal basis with India. The kingdom of Jammu and Kashmir finalized a standstill arrangement with Pakistan, according to Pakistani authorities, which prevented it from entering into deals with other foreign countries. Additionally, it stated that the Maharaja had to leave the capital due to a mutiny by his subjects, which meant he had no more power to carry out accession. It held that both the Azad Kashmir movement and the tribal invasions were native and unplanned, and that Pakistan's support for them was no longer subject to criticism. To put it briefly, Pakistan demanded parity whereas India demanded an asymmetric response from the two foreign locations in the pullout plans regarding Pakistan as a "aggressor." The United Nations mediators tended toward parity, which is presently not to India's liking. In the long run, no pullout became ever accomplished, India claiming that Pakistan had to withdraw first, and Pakistan disputing that there was no ensure that India could leave later. There will be no agreement reached on the demilitarization process between the two international locations. The failure of the Security Council's mediation efforts has been attributed to the council's perception of the issue as a purely political dispute without looking into its underlying prison issues.

UN Resolution on Kashmir Conflict

The conflict in Kashmir has been the subject of multiple UN resolutions. UN Security Council Resolution 47, the inaugural resolution, was adopted in 1948. It demanded a plebiscite to decide Kashmir's future status and a ceasefire between India and Pakistan. However, because India and Pakistan cannot agree on the terms for its execution, the plebiscite has never taken place.

UN Military Observers Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP)

The conflict in Kashmir has been the subject of multiple UN resolutions. UN Security Council Resolution 47, the inaugural resolution, was adopted in 1948. It demanded a plebiscite to decide Kashmir's future status and a ceasefire between India and Pakistan. However, because India and Pakistan cannot agree on the terms for its execution, the plebiscite has never taken place.

Good Offices Mission

In order to promote communication between India and Pakistan about the Kashmir issue, the UN has also designated a number of Good Offices Missions. The 2006 mission headed by former Norwegian Prime Minister Kjell Magne Bondevik stands out among these. The opening of roads and trade connections across the Line of Control was one of the actions the team suggested to boost confidence.

Mediation efforts

Additionally, the UN has attempted on multiple occasions to arbitrate the dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. A ceasefire, troop withdrawal, and a plebiscite were the three components of the UN Secretary-General U Thant's 1962 plan to end the conflict. India, however, turned down the plan, declaring that it would not accept any alteration to the current situation unless Pakistan withdrew its troops from the area.

UN Resolution 47

The United Nations adopted Resolution 47 in 1948, calling for a plebiscite in Kashmir to ascertain the people's preferences. Pakistan rejected the resolution, alleging that India lacked a legitimate claim to Kashmir, whereas India accepted it.

UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan:

The United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) was created by the UN in 1949 to oversee the truce in Kashmir between India and Pakistan. Since then, UNMOGIP has maintained a presence in the area.

Shimla Agreement

The Shimla Agreement, which India and Pakistan signed in 1972, stipulated that bilateral talks would be used to settle all outstanding issues between the two nations, including the dispute in Kashmir. The deal was not directly influenced by the UN.

UN Secretary-General's Good Offices

In order to promote communication between India and Pakistan about the Kashmir issue, the UN Secretary-General has made use of his good offices. When Kofi Annan, the Secretary-General at the time, offered to help settle the conflict in 2004, India turned him down.

UN Security Council Resolutions

A number of resolutions on the war in Kashmir have been enacted by the UN Security Council, including the previously mentioned Resolution 47. Other resolutions urge India and Pakistan to engage in bilateral discussions, refrain from employing force, and respect the Line of Control (LoC) in Kashmir.

UN Human Rights Reports

A number of UN reports on human rights abuses in Kashmir have also been released. A study published in 2019 by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) detailed grave human rights abuses in Kashmir, which is governed by India.

Mediation efforts

The European Union, China, and the United States are among the nations and international organizations that have tried to mediate the dispute in Kashmir. However, India has continuously insisted that the matter be settled bilaterally with Pakistan and opposed third-party mediation.

UN's Current Position

Through UNMOGIP, the UN continues to keep an eye on the situation in Kashmir and backs efforts to end the conflict through bilateral talks. Human rights abuses in the area have also drawn the attention of the UN.

Challenges faced by the UN

The situation in Kashmir has presented the UN with a number of difficulties. The main obstacle is that neither India nor Pakistan have the political will to address the problem. Both nations have been resistant to making major changes, and their stances on the matter have not changed. Furthermore, India's refusal to permit the UN to have a direct role in the conflict has hampered the UN's engagement.

Role of civil society

In order to advance peace and find a solution to the Kashmir dispute, civil society organizations have been crucial. These groups have promoted a peaceful settlement of the conflict, increased awareness of the human rights situation in Kashmir, and enabled communication between Indian and Pakistani civil society actors. The UN has asked for civil society's participation in peacebuilding initiatives, acknowledging the crucial role it plays in resolving the conflict.

The negotiations over Kashmir have a history of failures and mistrust between India and Pakistan. Numerous rounds of negotiations came to an end without any fruitful outcomes. Kashmir's calls for a referendum and demilitarization have never been approved by India. According to this perspective, Kashmir continues to be the primary source of contention between India and Pakistan. However, India's stance on the Kashmir issue is politically and ethically unjustifiable, and the problem is purely regional in origin. Kashmir has been a source of misery, tension, instability, and violence in South Asia since its inception. India is unwilling to accept the UN (UN) resolution and flatly rejects all of its responsibilities. India contends that the principles of self-determination, which are outlined in the United Nations resolutions of August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949, are untouchable. It's safe to say that throughout the span of around five years, the UN made no progress at all in finding a long-term solution to the Kashmir issue. It had played a pivotal role in democratizing the cease-fire line and creating a cease-fire. The UN had offered a number of recommendations to end the conflict in Kashmir. But the process was hindered by the hostility between the two countries. Furthermore, this situation is the result of the Cold War between the Great Powers. At the moment, the Kashmir issue is a very sensitive and complex topic. Two countries are no longer at odds over this. South Asia and probably the entire world are now in risk as a result of this problem.

Material and Methods

A methodical approach to gathering, assessing, and interpreting information from historical, legal, and political viewpoints is part of the process for examining the UN's role in the conflict in Kashmir. To give a thorough grasp of the UN's actions, efficacy, and difficulties in resolving the conflict, qualitative research methodologies are used in this study.

Following the first India-Pakistan war, the UNSC passed Resolution 47 in 1948, calling for a truce, troop withdrawals, and a referendum to decide Kashmir's status. This marked the beginning of the UN's involvement in the conflict. Disagreements about demilitarization between India and Pakistan hindered the referendum in spite of these attempts. The 1972 Simla Agreement, which moved conflict resolution to bilateral talks, reduced the role of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP), which the UN had set up to monitor the ceasefire line. Human rights abuses in the area have been brought to the attention of the world by recent UN findings, but India has resisted. Overall, geopolitical factors and the absence of enforcement tools have limited the UN's influence.

Conclusion

The UN's role in the Kashmir issue is still restricted in terms of finding a lasting solution, despite its historical significance. To expand its function, the UN must adopt a more comprehensive, inclusive, and aggressive approach. By placing a strong emphasis on human rights, mediation, confidence-building, and regional collaboration, the UN may play a critical role in fostering a peaceful resolution to one of the world's most enduring and destabilizing crises. Ultimately, the success of these efforts will depend on how willing Pakistan, India, and the Kashmiri people are to communicate and reach a solution. The United Nations has been actively involved in attempts to resolve the dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir for more than 70 years. Despite the UN's repeated efforts to bring the parties to the negotiating table and find a peaceful resolution, no lasting solution has been achieved. However, the UN's continued involvement in the region is essential to maintaining peace and security in South Asia. The United Nations has long been involved in attempts to resolve the Kashmir conflict, which remains a contentious issue between India and Pakistan. Even though the UN has not been successful in resolving the conflict between the two parties, it still monitors the situation and supports peace attempts. Ultimately, the resolution of the Kashmir problem requires the political will and commitment of both India and Pakistan.

Recommendations

Kashmir's potential resolution must be quite gentle.

It is extremely difficult for the mediators to maintain the status quo while also implementing changes that align with the goals that all parties to the dispute have agreed upon. It demands the wisdom of the outside mediators and the rational mindset of all parties involved in order for them to offer such solutions, which may result in enduring peace and bury all of the factors that could jeopardize it.

Negotiations on this delicate matter between India and Pakistan must be arranged. Reduce the usage of guns and the harm they pose in Kashmir.

If the sub-conflict, which concentrates and intensifies all of the historical, religious, and political animosities between the two warring nations, is not resolved, the dangerous standoff will go on forever and could potentially lead to war at any time.

References

- Ali, C. M. (1983). *The emergence of Pakistan* (No. 29). Research Society of Pakistan, University of the Punjab
- Acharya, A. Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*: New Delhi: Viva Books Pvt. Ltd., 2010. Felluga, Dino. *Modules on Lacan: On Desire*". Introductory Guide to Critical Theory. Mukherjee, Bharati. *Miss New India*. New Delhi: Rupa Publication. *Literary Voice*, 1-176.
- Barua, P. (2005). *The state at war in South Asia* (Vol. 2). U of Nebraska Press, 1-319.
- Basrur, R. M. (2008). *South Asia's Cold War: Nuclear Weapons and Conflict in Comparative Perspective*. Routledge
- Basso, M., McCall, L., & Garceau, D. (2013). *Across the Great Divide: cultures of manhood in the American West*. Routledge
- Behera, N. C. (2007). *Demystifying Kashmir*. Brookings Institution Press
- Bose, S., & Jalal, A. (2022). *Modern South Asia: history, culture, political economy*. Taylor & Francis.
- Choudhury, G. W. (1968). *Pakistan's relations with India, 1947-1966*. Praeger.
- Das, N. K. (2006). *People of India and Indian anthropology: KS Singh: A tribute*.
- Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2014). The EMES approach of social enterprise in a comparative perspective. In *Social enterprise and the third sector* (pp. 58-81). Routledge.
- Dasgupta, C. (2002). *War and diplomacy in Kashmir, 1947-48*. SAGE Publications Pvt. Limited.
- Dasgupt, J. B. (1959). *Indo-Pakistan Relations 1947-55*. Amsterdam: Djambatan.
- Deshpande, N. R. (1967). *The Kashmir Problem: A Historical Survey*. By Alastair Lamb. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967. ix, 163 pp. Map, Bibliography, Index. \$5.00. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 26(4), 735-737.
- Das Gupta, J. B. (1968). *The State of Jammu and Kashmir*. In *Jammu and Kashmir* (pp. 12-33). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Franda, M. F., & Burke, S. M. (1975). *Mainsprings of Indian and Pakistani Foreign Policies*.
- Gupta, S. (2018). *Kashmir: A study in India-Pakistan relations. Issues and Prospects*.
- Ganguly, S. (1995). Wars without end: the Indo-Pakistani conflict. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 541(1), 167-178.
- Ganguly, S. (2007). *Kashmir: Roots of Conflict, Paths to Peace*.
- Ganguly, Š. (1996). Explaining the Kashmir insurgency: political mobilization and institutional decay. *International Security*, 21(2), 76-107.
- Ganguly, S. (2006). The roots of religious violence in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. In *Religion and Conflict in South and Southeast Asia* (pp. 80-94). Routledge.

- Hellmann, D. C. (Ed.). (1976). *Southern Asia: The Politics of Poverty & Peace* (Vol. 13). Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Johnson, R. (2005). *A region in turmoil: South Asian conflicts since 1947*. Reaktion Books.
- Kavic, L. J. (1967). *India's Quest for Security*. Univ of California Press.
- Karnad, B. (2004). A Strategy to Counter Pakistan Supported Terrorism. In "Pakistan in a Changing Strategic Context". Behera, AD and Mathew JC ed. New Delhi. *Knowledge World*.
- Kreutzmann, H. (2008). Kashmir and the Northern Areas of Pakistan: boundary-making along contested frontiers. *Erdkunde*
- Lamb, A. (1992). *Kashmir: A disputed legacy, 1846-1990*. Oxford University Press.
- Malik, I. (2002). Kashmir: Ethnic conflict international dispute. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Margolis, E. S. (2002). *War at the top of the world: The struggle for Afghanistan, Kashmir and Tibet*. Taylor & Francis
- Masood, H. & Muzaffar, M. (2019). Kashmir Conflict: A French Perspective, *Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 4 (I), 158-172
- Masood, H., Sultana, M., & Muzaffar, M. (2020). No Modus Operandi for Seeking Solution to Liberate Kashmiri Muslims. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4 (I), 167-178
- Nixon, R. (1992). *Seize the Moment: America's Challenge in a One-superpower World* (2012 edition). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Noorani, A. G. (1992). The Betrayal of Kashmir. *Perspectives on Kashmir: The Roots of Conflict in South Asia*. Raju, GC Ed. Westview Press.
- Schofield, V. (2004). *Kashmir in the crossfire: India, Pakistan and the unending war*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Sidhu, W. P. S., Asif, B., & Samii, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Kashmir: New voices, new approaches*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.