



UPSC HUB

KASHMIR ISSUE • EXPLAINED

Kashmir Issue Explained: Accession, Article 370, Insurgency & Abrogation

Kashmir issue explained for UPSC: 1947 accession, Article 370 & 35A, 1965/1971/
Kargil wars, insurgency since 1989, 2019 abrogation. 50 topics with dates, tables, tips
& FAQs.

FREE PDF NOTES

100% original exam-oriented notes • UPSC Prelims & Mains

Table of Contents

1. The Accession Story, 1947–48

1	1. The Princely State on the Eve of Partition	5
2	2. The Standstill Agreement Gambit (August 1947)	5
3	3. The Tribal Invasion — October 1947	6
4	4. The Instrument of Accession — 26 October 1947	6
5	5. The Airlift to Srinagar — 27 October 1947	7
6	6. Sheikh Abdullah and the National Conference	7
7	7. The First India-Pakistan War, 1947–48	8
8	8. Kashmir at the UN: Resolution 47 & the Ceasefire	8

2. Article 370 and the Special-Status Years

9	9. Article 370: The "Temporary" Provision	9
10	10. Article 35A: The 1954 Presidential Order	9
11	11. The Delhi Agreement, 1952	10
12	12. Sheikh Abdullah's Arrest, 1953	10
13	13. The Erosion Years: Autonomy Diluted by Degrees	11
14	14. The Hazratbal Relic Crisis, 1963	11
15	15. The Indira–Sheikh Accord, 1975	12
16	16. Article 370 Before the Supreme Court	12

17	17. Why UPSC Keeps Asking About Article 370	13
----	---	----

3. Kashmir in the India-Pakistan Wars

18	18. 1965: Operation Gibraltar	13
19	19. 1965: Operation Grand Slam and the Great Tank Battles	14
20	20. The Tashkent Declaration, 10 January 1966	14
21	21. 1971: Kashmir on the Western Front	15
22	22. The Shimla Agreement, 1972: From CFL to LoC	16
23	23. Siachen, 1984: Operation Meghdoot	16

4. The Insurgency Years, 1987–1998

24	24. The 1987 Election Controversy	17
25	25. 1989: The Turn to Militancy	17
26	26. The Kashmiri Pandit Exodus, 1990	18
27	27. Hizbul Mujahideen and the Pakistan Angle	18
28	28. AFSPA Comes to J&K, 1990	19
29	29. Hazratbal 1993 and Charar-e-Sharief 1995	19
30	30. The 1996 Elections and the "Normalcy" Narrative	20
31	31. Kargil's Shadow Over Kashmir, 1999	20
32	32. Why 1989–90 Still Appears in UPSC Answers	21

5. Kargil, Peace Processes and the 2000s

33	33. The Lahore Declaration, February 1999	21
34	34. Kargil 1999: The Kashmir Connection	22

35	35. The Agra Summit, July 2001	22
36	36. Parliament Attack and Operation Parakram, 2001–02	23
37	37. The LoC Ceasefire of November 2003	23
38	38. Musharraf's Four-Point Formula, 2006	24
39	39. The Amarnath Land Row, 2008	24
40	40. The 2010 Unrest: Kashmir's Stone-Pelting Summer	25
41	41. The AFSPA Debate of the 2010s	26
42	42. 2016: The Killing of Burhan Wani and Its Aftermath	26

6. Abrogation and After

43	43. The Road to August 2019	27
44	44. 5 August 2019: How Article 370 Was Read Down	27
45	45. 6 August 2019: The J&K Reorganisation Act	28
46	46. What Actually Changed After Abrogation	28
47	47. Detentions, the Clampdown and the Courts	29
48	48. How the World Reacted	29
49	49. The Constitutional Debate: Federalism and "Temporary" Provisions	30
50	50. Writing on Kashmir in UPSC Answers Today	30

If there is one topic in the UPSC syllabus that shows up everywhere — Prelims, GS-II, GS-III, the Essay paper — it is Kashmir. It touches the Constitution, federalism, India-Pakistan relations, internal security, and post-independence history all at once. Most aspirants know scattered facts: 1947, Article 370, 2019. What they lack is the full chain of events in the right order, with the right dates. This book gives you that chain, topic by topic, from Hari Singh's decision in October 1947 to the reorganisation of the state in 2019.

A word of caution before you begin. Kashmir is a sensitive subject, and UPSC rewards answers that are calm, factual, and balanced. This book sticks to verifiable events — dates, agreements,

court rulings, official positions. Where figures or claims are disputed, they are marked as such. Learn the facts cold, and you will be able to write on any Kashmir question without taking sides.

1. The Accession Story, 1947–48

1. 1. The Princely State on the Eve of Partition

On the eve of independence, Jammu and Kashmir was the largest princely state in British India — roughly 222,000 sq km, stretching from the Punjab plains to the Tibetan plateau. It was ruled by Maharaja Hari Singh, a Dogra Hindu, over a population that was about three-fourths Muslim. This mismatch between ruler and ruled made J&K unlike Hyderabad or Junagadh, where the mismatch ran the other way. The state also shared borders with the new India, the new Pakistan, and (through a thin corridor) with Afghanistan and China — geography that turned a local succession question into an international dispute.

Inside the state, politics was already polarised. Sheikh Abdullah's National Conference, rooted in the Kashmir Valley, demanded responsible government and had launched the "Quit Kashmir" agitation against the Maharaja in 1946. The Muslim Conference, by contrast, leaned toward Pakistan. Hari Singh himself dreamed of independence — "Switzerland of the East" was the phrase his court used — and stalled on choosing a dominion right up to 15 August 1947.

Why it matters for UPSC: Every Kashmir answer begins here. Examiners expect you to explain why J&K was a special case among the 552 princely states: size, location, and the ruler-people mismatch. **How UPSC tests it:** Prelims has asked about the Instrument of Accession's date and about Hari Singh directly. In Mains, this background earns you the opening paragraph of any Kashmir or integration question.

2. 2. The Standstill Agreement Gambit (August 1947)

When a princely state could not decide by 15 August 1947, one option was a Standstill Agreement — an arrangement to keep existing administrative links (posts, telegraphs, trade) running with a dominion while the ruler made up his mind. On 12 August 1947, Hari Singh offered Standstill Agreements to both India and Pakistan. Pakistan signed promptly. India did not: New Delhi replied that it would need time and discussion, and asked the Maharaja to send a representative for talks.

This asymmetry mattered. Pakistan read the signed agreement as a commitment that Kashmir would eventually come its way. India read the delay as proof that the Maharaja was still weighing his options. Within weeks, Pakistan began squeezing the state economically — reports from the time describe fuel, salt, and essential supplies being held up on routes running through Pakistani territory, which J&K depended on for winter stocks. Whether this was a deliberate blockade or administrative friction is debated, but in Srinagar it was read as pressure.

It helps to know what a Standstill Agreement actually covered: postal and telegraph services, trade flows, and the supply of essentials like food grain, salt, and fuel. For landlocked Kashmir,

these lifelines ran through territory that became Pakistan, which is why the signed agreement with Pakistan carried economic weight beyond symbolism. Hyderabad, the other great undecided state, signed its Standstill Agreement with India instead — the mirror image of Kashmir's choice. In both cases, the agreement was meant to buy time; in both cases, time ran out within months.

Why it matters for UPSC: The Standstill Agreement is the kind of precise, lesser-known fact that separates toppers in Prelims. It also shows the legalistic way accession questions were handled — agreements first, force later. **How UPSC tests it:** A classic Prelims trap asks which dominion signed a Standstill Agreement with J&K. Answer: Pakistan only.

3. 3. The Tribal Invasion — October 1947

On 22 October 1947, armed tribesmen (lashkars) from Pakistan's North-West Frontier Province crossed into Kashmir, advancing down the Jhelum valley road toward Srinagar. Muzaffarabad fell on 24 October. The invaders' discipline broke down at Baramulla, where they stopped to loot instead of pressing on to the capital — a delay that historians widely treat as decisive, since it bought Srinagar two precious days.

India's position, stated then and since, is that the invasion was planned and backed by Pakistan — its army officers on leave are documented to have accompanied the lashkars. Pakistan's stated position at the time was that these were independent tribesmen acting on their own, moved by reports of communal violence against Muslims in Jammu. UPSC does not ask you to settle this; it asks you to know both the event and the competing claims. What is not disputed is the military fact: a foreign armed force was inside the state, the Maharaja's small state forces were collapsing, and Srinagar was about to fall.

Why it matters for UPSC: This is the trigger for everything that follows — the accession, the airlift, the war, the UN reference. **How UPSC tests it:** Dates (22 October), the Baramulla halt, and the "tribesmen" framing appear in both Prelims and Mains. In answers, describe it neutrally: an armed incursion from across the border, with attribution stated as each side presents it.

4. 4. The Instrument of Accession — 26 October 1947

With raiders closing in, Hari Singh appealed to India for military help. New Delhi's condition was accession first, troops after. V.P. Menon, Secretary of the States Ministry, flew to Jammu on 26 October 1947; the Maharaja signed the Instrument of Accession that day, acceding on the three standard subjects — defence, foreign affairs, and communications — exactly like every other acceding state. Lord Mountbatten, the Governor-General, accepted the accession on 27 October, adding a personal remark that the question of the state's final status should be "settled by a reference to the people" once law and order were restored.

Two legal points matter enormously for UPSC. First, the Instrument was legally complete on signature — under the Government of India Act 1935, as adapted, a ruler's signature was sufficient; no popular ratification was required. Second, Mountbatten's plebiscite remark was his own addition, not part of the Instrument's text. Pakistan later argued the accession was secured under duress and was therefore void; India has consistently held it final and irrevocable. Know both positions and the document itself.

Why it matters for UPSC: The date (26 October 1947) is one of the most-asked Kashmir facts in Prelims. The Mountbatten plebiscite rider is the hinge of the entire later dispute. **How UPSC tests it:** Expect statements like "Mountbatten's acceptance was conditional on a plebiscite" — the correct response is that the remark accompanied acceptance but was not a legal condition of the Instrument.

5. The Airlift to Srinagar — 27 October 1947

On the morning of 27 October 1947, the first Dakota aircraft of the Indian Air Force landed at Srinagar airfield carrying troops of 1 Sikh Regiment — the first of a massive airlift that historians rank among the most remarkable in military history. The soldiers fanned out to defend the airfield itself, because if the raiders had seized it, no reinforcements could have landed and Srinagar would have fallen. By early November, Indian troops had pushed the invaders back from the capital's outskirts.

The airlift's significance goes beyond the military. It is the physical proof of the accession's timing: Indian troops entered the state only after the Instrument was signed on 26 October — a sequence India cites against the charge that the accession was extracted at gunpoint. For UPSC, note the civil-military coordination involved: the airfield at Srinagar was barely prepared for heavy aircraft, and the operation ran on improvisation.

The scale of the operation deserves a moment's attention. Srinagar's airfield had a rough, barely prepared strip, yet Dakota aircraft — military machines of No. 12 Squadron supplemented by civilian airliners — flew shuttle sorties for days, ferrying an entire infantry brigade into the Valley within the first week. Without that air bridge, the road-bound Indian columns advancing from Jammu could never have reached Srinagar in time. Military historians treat the 1947 airlift as the operation that made the accession militarily real: the signature on paper on the 26th became boots on the ground on the 27th.

Why it matters for UPSC: Military-history questions in GS papers occasionally touch the 1947 airlift as an example of air power deciding a campaign's opening phase. **How UPSC tests it:** Prelims-style facts: 27 October 1947, 1 Sikh Regiment, Srinagar airfield. In Mains, use it as the concrete illustration that accession preceded intervention.

6. Sheikh Abdullah and the National Conference

No Kashmir story is complete without Sheikh Abdullah — the "Lion of Kashmir." His National Conference, founded as the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference in 1939, was the Valley's dominant political force, and its 1944 "Naya Kashmir" manifesto promised land reform and responsible government. Abdullah had been jailed by Hari Singh for the 1946 Quit Kashmir agitation; the Maharaja released him in September 1947 as the crisis deepened, calculating that only Abdullah could rally the Valley's Muslims behind accession to India.

The calculation worked. When the raiders approached Srinagar, National Conference volunteers organised the city's defence alongside Indian troops — a fact India cites as popular endorsement of the accession. On 30 October 1947, Abdullah was appointed head of an emergency

administration. He would become the state's Prime Minister (the title then used) in 1948, and his later break with New Delhi in 1953 is one of the great turning points of the story.

Why it matters for UPSC: Abdullah embodies the "popular will" argument in India's Kashmir case, and his later dismissal embodies the Kashmiri grievance narrative. You need both halves.

How UPSC tests it: Questions on the National Conference, Naya Kashmir, and Abdullah's 1947 role appear across Prelims and Mains. Remember: released September 1947, emergency administration 30 October 1947.

7. 7. The First India-Pakistan War, 1947–48

The war that began with the tribal invasion lasted fourteen months. After the defence of Srinagar, the fighting settled into brutal mountain warfare. Key moments: the battles of Naushera and Jhangar in early 1948, where Brigadier Usman — the "Lion of Naushera" — was killed in action; and the capture of Zoji La in November 1948, where Indian tanks were dismantled, carried over the 11,500-foot pass, and reassembled — an operation still studied in military academies. By late 1948, India had retaken roughly two-thirds of the state; Pakistan held the western and northern areas (what Pakistan calls Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan).

The war ended not with a treaty but with a UN-brokered ceasefire on 1 January 1949. The resulting line — the Cease Fire Line (CFL), formalised by the Karachi Agreement of 27 July 1949 — froze the military positions into a de facto border. It is the ancestor of today's Line of Control.

Why it matters for UPSC: This war fixed the territorial status quo that every later negotiation has started from. **How UPSC tests it:** The ceasefire date (1 January 1949), the Karachi Agreement, and the CFL-to-LoC evolution are standard Prelims material. Note the casualty of memory: many aspirants confuse the CFL with the LoC — the CFL is the 1949 line, the LoC its 1972 successor.

8. 8. Kashmir at the UN: Resolution 47 & the Ceasefire

On 1 January 1948, India took the Kashmir question to the UN Security Council, asking it to direct Pakistan to withdraw the invaders. Pakistan countered with its own charges against India. The Council's response, Resolution 47 of 21 April 1948, laid down a three-step sequence: Pakistan was to withdraw its nationals and tribesmen, India was then to reduce its forces to the minimum needed for law and order, and a plebiscite would follow under a UN-appointed administrator. Neither side ever completed step one, so the plebiscite never happened — and each side blames the other for the deadlock.

India's later position is that the resolutions were overtaken by events: Pakistan never vacated the territory (the precondition), the state's Constituent Assembly ratified the accession in 1954, and the Shimla Agreement of 1972 made Kashmir a bilateral issue. Pakistan's stated position is that the resolutions remain valid and the plebiscite commitment unfulfilled. For UPSC, you must be able to state the resolution's actual content — most aspirants wrongly believe it ordered an immediate plebiscite.

Why it matters for UPSC: Resolution 47 is the legal core of the international dimension of Kashmir. **How UPSC tests it:** Prelims asks the resolution number and year; Mains asks you to

evaluate the "UN route" and why it stalled. The three-step sequence is the detail that earns marks.

2. Article 370 and the Special-Status Years

9. Article 370: The "Temporary" Provision

Article 370 entered the Constitution on 17 October 1949, placed in Part XXI under the heading "Temporary, Transitional and Special Provisions." Its core bargain was simple: except for defence, foreign affairs, and communications (the Instrument of Accession subjects), Parliament could legislate for J&K only on matters the President specified in consultation with — and later with the concurrence of — the state government. Other constitutional provisions could be extended to the state only through Presidential Orders.

The word "temporary" needs care. It described the provision's intended life — it was meant to last until the state's own Constituent Assembly decided the state's constitution and the accession's final shape — not a fixed expiry date. In practice, Article 370 became the durable legal shell of J&K's special status for seventy years. Clause (3) of the article allowed the President to declare it inoperative, but only on the recommendation of the state's Constituent Assembly — which had dissolved itself in 1957. That dead clause became the central legal puzzle of 2019.

The "temporary" wording made sense in 1949 because a specific endpoint was imagined: the Constituent Assembly of J&K, convened in 1951, would frame the state's own constitution and pronounce on the accession's final shape. That Assembly adopted the state's constitution in November 1956 (in force from 26 January 1957) and then dissolved itself in 1957 — without ever recommending the removal of Article 370. From that moment, the provision's built-in exit route led nowhere, and the "temporary" article settled in for a seventy-year stay. Every later legal argument about 370 starts from this 1957 dead end.

Why it matters for UPSC: Article 370 is arguably the single most-asked constitutional provision on Kashmir. **How UPSC tests it:** Prelims probes the "temporary" heading, the 1949 date, and which subjects Parliament could touch directly. Mains asks you to trace how the provision worked in practice versus on paper.

10. Article 35A: The 1954 Presidential Order

Article 35A never went through Parliament. It was inserted into the Constitution's application to J&K by a Presidential Order of 14 May 1954, issued under Article 370 itself. It empowered the J&K legislature to define "permanent residents" of the state and to give them special rights — in state government employment, acquisition of immovable property, settlement in the state, and scholarships.

In plain terms, 35A was the legal wall behind which the state's demographic and land regime stood. Only permanent residents — generally those defined by the state's 1927-era notifications as state subjects and their descendants — could buy land or hold certain state jobs. Critics

argued it discriminated, particularly against women who married non-residents (a position the J&K High Court rejected in a 2002 ruling, holding that a woman did not lose permanent-resident status on marriage outside the state). Defenders called it the guarantee that gave the accession its meaning. Both readings appear in UPSC answers; the exam rewards knowing the provision's text and effects, not picking a camp.

Why it matters for UPSC: 35A's unusual birth — by executive order, not amendment — made it a favourite Prelims trap about constitutional procedure. **How UPSC tests it:** "Article 35A was inserted by..." — answer: the Constitution (Application to Jammu and Kashmir) Order, 1954. Mains links it to debates on asymmetric federalism.

11. 11. The Delhi Agreement, 1952

In July 1952, Prime Minister Nehru and Sheikh Abdullah announced the Delhi Agreement, settling the constitutional relationship in principle. Its terms: J&K would have its own constitution and flag alongside the Indian Union's; residuary powers of legislation would rest with the state (the reverse of the Union's residuary power elsewhere); the head of state (Sadar-i-Riyasat) would be elected by the state legislature rather than nominated; and Indian citizenship would extend to the state's people, with the state's legislature empowered on permanent-resident rights.

The agreement was the high-water mark of the autonomy bargain — and the beginning of its unravelling, because several terms were never fully implemented or were later diluted. For UPSC, the Delhi Agreement is the document to cite when a question asks about the "original terms" of the Centre-state relationship. It shows that special status was a negotiated political settlement, not a unilateral concession.

Measured against implementation, the Delhi Agreement had a mixed afterlife. Some terms were honoured: J&K framed its own constitution in 1956 and flew its own flag beside the national flag. Others withered: the residuary-powers promise was hollowed out as Presidential Orders extended Union subjects one by one, and the elected Sadar-i-Riyasat was replaced by a nominated Governor in 1965. For UPSC, this gap between promise and practice is the analytical core — it lets you argue, with evidence, that the autonomy bargain was renegotiated downward long before 2019.

Why it matters for UPSC: It is the primary source for "what was promised" versus "what happened" type questions. **How UPSC tests it:** Mains questions on federal asymmetry expect the Delhi Agreement's contents; Prelims occasionally asks its year and parties (Nehru-Abdullah, 1952).

12. 12. Sheikh Abdullah's Arrest, 1953

On 8–9 August 1953, Sheikh Abdullah — the man who had backed accession in 1947 — was dismissed as Prime Minister of J&K and arrested. The official reasons given were his flirtation with independence rhetoric and his establishment of the Plebiscite Front's precursors; his supporters called it a political removal for refusing to surrender autonomy. Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, his deputy, was installed in his place and promptly ratified the accession through the state's Constituent Assembly.

Abdullah would spend most of the next two decades in and out of detention, becoming an international symbol of the Kashmir question. The 1953 dismissal is the event that Kashmiri narratives of betrayal return to again and again, while New Delhi's narrative treats it as a necessary step against separatism. A UPSC answer should record the fact, the stated reasons, and the long shadow — eleven years of detention followed, then release, then re-arrest cycles until the 1975 accord.

Why it matters for UPSC: 1953 is the hinge between the "accession with consent" phase and the "autonomy eroded" phase. **How UPSC tests it:** The date and the successor (Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad) are standard facts. In Mains, it is the go-to example for questions on Centre-state trust deficits.

13. 13. The Erosion Years: Autonomy Diluted by Degrees

Between 1954 and the 1980s, a series of Presidential Orders under Article 370 extended most of the Indian Constitution and central laws to J&K. The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the Election Commission, and the Comptroller and Auditor General was extended; fundamental rights were applied (with modifications); and central subjects from income tax to customs reached the state. In 1965, the state's own constitution was amended to replace the elected Sadar-i-Riyasat with a Governor nominated by the President, and the state's "Prime Minister" became a "Chief Minister" like everywhere else.

Scholars describe this as autonomy eroded "by a thousand cuts" — each order defensible on its own, cumulatively transformative. By the 1980s, J&K's special status survived more in symbols (its own flag, its own penal code — the Ranbir Penal Code) than in substance. Understanding this slow dilution is essential: it explains why the 2019 abrogation, though dramatic, was acting on a provision already hollowed out in practice.

Why it matters for UPSC: "Erosion of Article 370" is a ready-made Mains theme on how constitutional provisions change without formal amendment. **How UPSC tests it:** Questions ask for the mechanism (Presidential Orders under 370) and emblematic changes (1965: Sadar-i-Riyasat to Governor).

14. 14. The Hazratbal Relic Crisis, 1963

On 27 December 1963, the Moi-e-Muqqadas — a relic believed to be a hair of the Prophet Muhammad, housed at the Hazratbal shrine in Srinagar — was reported stolen. The Valley erupted in mass agitation that cut across political lines; even pro-India leaders joined the protests. The relic was recovered and restored in early January 1964, authenticated by religious elders, and the agitation subsided.

The episode matters for UPSC less as a religious event than as a political lesson: it demonstrated the Valley's capacity for unified mass mobilisation, a pattern that would repeat in 2008, 2010, and 2016. It also embarrassed the Bakshi government, whose handling of the crisis was widely seen as clumsy, and it forms part of the backdrop to the political churn of the mid-1960s. Note the

neutral framing: a revered relic, a theft, a mass agitation, a recovery — no communal gloss needed.

The crisis had a political aftershock worth noting. Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, already weakened, resigned in 1964 under the Congress party's Kamaraj Plan, and Sheikh Abdullah was released from detention the same year. Abdullah's 1964 visit to Pakistan — where he met President Ayub Khan — and his talks with Nehru in May 1964 briefly raised hopes of a settlement, but Nehru's death that month closed the window. The episode shows how Kashmir's internal upheavals repeatedly spilled into the India-Pakistan diplomatic channel.

Why it matters for UPSC: It is the earliest example of Valley-wide street mobilisation, useful as historical context in answers on Kashmiri political consciousness. **How UPSC tests it:** A niche Prelims fact (Hazratbal, 1963–64); more likely to appear as background colour in Mains answers on the roots of alienation.

15. 15. The Indira-Sheikh Accord, 1975

In February 1975, after years of negotiation, Indira Gandhi's government and Sheikh Abdullah signed what is known as the Kashmir Accord (or the Indira-Sheikh Accord). Abdullah agreed to return as Chief Minister, accepting that J&K was a constituent unit of the Union and dropping the plebiscite demand; in return, the Centre agreed that the state's residuary powers would remain with it and that central laws would be extended only with the state's concurrence. Abdullah took office in 1975 and won the 1977 Assembly election — widely regarded as the state's first genuinely free election.

The accord closed the book on the Plebiscite Front era and opened a decade of electoral politics. For UPSC, its significance is structural: it is the second great negotiated settlement after the Delhi Agreement, and it shows the recurring pattern — crisis, negotiation, a fresh bargain. Abdullah died in office in 1982; his son Farooq Abdullah succeeded him, setting up the dynastic politics of the next phase.

Why it matters for UPSC: The accord is the bridge between the autonomy era and the insurgency era. **How UPSC tests it:** Prelims asks the year (1975) and the parties; Mains uses it in questions on negotiated settlements and their limits.

16. 16. Article 370 Before the Supreme Court

Long before 2019, the Supreme Court examined Article 370 more than once. In *Prem Nath Kaul v. State of J&K* (1959), the Court held that the state's Constituent Assembly had to be in existence for certain actions — a ruling later distinguished. In *Sampat Prakash v. State of J&K* (1968), the Court upheld the continued use of Article 370 even after the state's Constituent Assembly dissolved, reasoning that the President's power under the article did not lapse with the Assembly. These rulings built the pre-2019 legal landscape: 370 was "temporary" in name but judicially treated as continuing.

For UPSC, the case law matters because the 2019 abrogation had to navigate around it — particularly the question of whether the President could act on the "recommendation" of a

Constituent Assembly that no longer existed. The government's 2019 answer was creative: read the Legislative Assembly's powers as exercisable by Parliament during President's Rule. Whether that reasoning holds became the very question the Supreme Court took up after 2019.

Why it matters for UPSC: Judicial history questions love this chain: 1959, 1968, then 2019. **How UPSC tests it:** Prelims may ask which case upheld Article 370's continuation after 1957 (Sampat Prakash, 1968). Mains expects you to connect the case law to the 2019 legal strategy.

17. Why UPSC Keeps Asking About Article 370

Step back and notice why this one article generates so many questions. It sits at the intersection of four GS themes: federalism (asymmetric federalism — can different states have different constitutional relationships with the Union?), constitutional procedure (can a Presidential Order amend the Constitution's application?), centre-state relations (the Sarkaria and Punchhi Commissions both touched J&K), and international relations (the bilateral-vs-multilateral framing after Shimla 1972).

Examiners also use Article 370 to test precision. Common traps: confusing it with Article 371 (special provisions for other states, which continue to exist), misdating it, or claiming Parliament could never legislate for J&K (it could, on the accession subjects and via the 370 mechanism). If you can state what 370 said, how 35A differed, and what the 2019 orders did — each in two sentences — you will collect full marks on any direct question.

A further reason examiners return to this theme: Article 370's removal did not end asymmetric federalism in India. Article 371 and its sub-clauses (371A for Nagaland, 371G for Mizoram, 371J for Karnataka's Hyderabad region, and others) continue to give special provisions to more than a dozen states — each born of its own historical bargain. A sharp Mains answer therefore distinguishes 370 (a sweeping, state-wide special status, now gone) from 371 (targeted protections, very much alive), and asks what, if anything, the Kashmir precedent implies for them.

Why it matters for UPSC: This is meta-preparation: understanding the examiner's mind. **How UPSC tests it:** Across papers — Prelims (facts), GS-II (federalism), Essay (asymmetric federalism as a theme). Keep a 100-word note on 370 ready for instant use.

3. Kashmir in the India–Pakistan Wars

18. 1965: Operation Gibraltar

On 5 August 1965, Pakistan launched Operation Gibraltar — infiltrating several thousand armed men across the Cease Fire Line into J&K, disguised as locals, with the aim of sparking a popular uprising in the Valley. The plan rested on an assumption: that Kashmiris were waiting for a signal to rise against India. The assumption failed. Local people reported the infiltrators to the authorities instead of joining them, and Indian forces rounded up most Gibraltar columns within weeks.

Gibraltar's failure is one of the most instructive episodes for UPSC. It shows the gap between external assumptions about Kashmiri sentiment and the on-ground reality of 1965 — barely a decade after the 1953 dismissal, the Valley did not rise. Pakistan's stated aim was to "liberate" Kashmir; India's stated position is that it was an unprovoked infiltration across the CFL. Either way, Gibraltar escalated into full-scale war by September.

Gibraltar did not emerge from a vacuum. In April 1965, India and Pakistan had already clashed in the Rann of Kutch, where Pakistan's performance convinced its military planners that India — still recovering from the 1962 defeat by China — would not fight hard for Kashmir. That misreading shaped Gibraltar's design: a covert push expected to meet a feeble response. The Rann prelude is worth remembering because it shows how one limited clash can embolden planners toward a larger gamble — a pattern UPSC questions on miscalculation and escalation probe regularly.

Why it matters for UPSC: Gibraltar is the textbook case of a covert operation built on a faulty political assumption. **How UPSC tests it:** The date (5 August 1965), the objective (uprising in the Valley), and the outcome (locals reported the infiltrators) are all fair game in Prelims.

19. 1965: Operation Grand Slam and the Great Tank Battles

When Gibraltar stalled, Pakistan launched Operation Grand Slam on 1 September 1965 — a conventional thrust toward Akhnoor in the Chhamb sector, aimed at cutting off J&K's road link with the rest of India. India responded by opening a new front across the international border toward Lahore and Sialkot on 6 September, widening the war beyond Kashmir. Inside J&K, Indian forces captured the strategic Haji Pir Pass, the infiltration route used by Gibraltar columns.

The 1965 war's most famous land battle, Asal Uttar (8–10 September) in Punjab, earned the nickname "graveyard of Pattons" after Indian forces destroyed or captured scores of Pakistani Patton tanks. The war ended in a military stalemate after 22 days of fighting, with a UN-mandated ceasefire on 23 September 1965. For Kashmir specifically, the war's lesson was that the CFL could not be altered by force — a lesson both sides would test again.

Why it matters for UPSC: 1965 fixed the pattern: Kashmir triggers the war, but the war is fought (and settled) on broader fronts. **How UPSC tests it:** Haji Pir's capture and its later return at Tashkent is a classic linked-fact question. Asal Uttar and the Patton nickname appear in military-history Prelims questions.

20. The Tashkent Declaration, 10 January 1966

With the Soviet Union mediating, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri and Pakistan's President Ayub Khan met at Tashkent and signed a declaration on 10 January 1966. Its core term: both sides would withdraw to their pre-war (pre-5 August 1965) positions — which meant India returned the hard-won Haji Pir Pass. The declaration also restored diplomatic and economic relations and renounced the use of force.

Hours after signing, in the early hours of 11 January 1966, Shastri died of a heart attack in Tashkent — a shock that still generates questions about the succession (Gulzarilal Nanda became acting PM, then Indira Gandhi). In India, the Tashkent terms were politically controversial: having

won Haji Pir at cost, returning it felt like a concession. In Pakistan, Ayub Khan faced similar criticism. For Kashmir, Tashkent's importance is that it reaffirmed the CFL's sanctity without resolving the underlying dispute — the template for every later "status quo" agreement.

The declaration pleased almost no one at home. In India, the Jana Sangh and sections of the press attacked the return of Haji Pir as a giveaway; in Pakistan, Foreign Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto broke with Ayub Khan over the settlement, beginning the political rupture that would bring Bhutto himself to power within a few years. Tashkent thus illustrates a recurring truth of India-Pakistan peacemaking: leaders who compromise abroad often pay for it domestically. The "Tashkent spirit" — code for accepting the status quo — survived as diplomatic language long after its signatories were gone.

Why it matters for UPSC: Tashkent is the archetypal "war gains traded at the table" case study.

How UPSC tests it: The dates (10 January declaration, 11 January Shastri's death), the mediator (USSR/Kosygin), and the Haji Pir return are standard facts. Mains asks whether Tashkent was a missed opportunity or a realistic settlement.

21. 21. 1971: Kashmir on the Western Front

The 1971 war is remembered for the eastern front and the birth of Bangladesh, but Kashmir saw serious fighting on the western front from 3 to 16 December 1971. Pakistan attacked in the Chhamb sector again, and India defended Poonch against a sustained siege. Unlike 1965, India held its ground in J&K while winning decisively in the east — the two-front reality meant Kashmir was a holding action, not the main effort.

The war's Kashmir legacy was diplomatic rather than territorial. India's victory — 93,000 Pakistani prisoners of war, the largest surrender since World War II — gave New Delhi overwhelming bargaining power, and the question became what India would demand at the negotiating table. The answer, at Shimla in 1972, was restraint: India returned most captured territory in the west, betting that magnanimity would buy a durable settlement.

One detail often missed: while Pakistan made gains around Chhamb in 1971, India captured significant Pakistani territory in other western sectors, notably in the Shakargarh bulge and in Rajasthan. These captured areas became bargaining counters at Shimla — the concrete meaning of bargaining power in negotiations. India's decision to return nearly all of it, keeping only small strategic adjustments, is what makes Shimla 1972 such a debated settlement: magnanimity that bought goodwill, or bargaining strength surrendered too cheaply? UPSC expects you to know both readings.

Why it matters for UPSC: 1971 shows Kashmir as one theatre among several — a useful corrective to Kashmir-centric histories. **How UPSC tests it:** The Chhamb and Poonch battles, the war's dates (3–16 December 1971), and the 93,000 POW figure are core facts. Mains may ask why India did not press its advantage in the west.

22. 22. The Shimla Agreement, 1972: From CFL to LoC

On 2 July 1972, Indira Gandhi and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto signed the Shimla Agreement. Its Kashmir provisions were transformative: the Cease Fire Line was renamed the Line of Control (LoC), with both sides committing to respect it "without prejudice to the recognized position of either side"; and both countries agreed to settle their differences "by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations" — language India has ever since cited to keep third parties (including the UN) out of Kashmir.

The agreement's ambiguities have fuelled decades of argument. Pakistan's stated position is that Shimla did not cancel the UN resolutions; India's is that the bilateral framework superseded them. What is not disputed is the practical effect: the CFL became the LoC, the dispute became officially bilateral, and every later India-Pakistan dialogue — Lahore, Agra, the composite dialogue — has operated inside Shimla's frame.

A practical footnote with exam value: the LoC did not appear on maps the day Shimla was signed. Military commanders of the two sides met later in 1972 to delineate the line precisely, sector by sector, converting the 1949 CFL's surveyed portions and the 1971 war's actual positions into one continuous, mapped Line of Control. That delineation is why the LoC has a defined, mutually surveyed alignment (unlike the LAC with China) — and why violations of it carry a particular legal and military weight in India's position.

Why it matters for UPSC: Shimla is the legal foundation of India's "bilateral only" Kashmir doctrine. **How UPSC tests it:** The date (2 July 1972), the CFL-to-LoC renaming, and the "bilateral negotiations" clause are among the most-asked Kashmir facts. Any Mains answer on India-Pakistan relations must reference Shimla.

23. 23. Siachen, 1984: Operation Meghdoot

In April 1984, India launched Operation Meghdoot, airlifting troops to occupy the heights of the Siachen Glacier — the world's highest battlefield, with posts above 20,000 feet. The trigger was intelligence that Pakistan was preparing its own move; the underlying cause was the Karachi Agreement's vague description of the CFL's northern end ("thence north to the glaciers"), which left the area undemarcated. India acted first and has held the glacier's commanding heights ever since.

Siachen matters for Kashmir studies in two ways. Geographically, it sits at the junction of the LoC's northern tip and the Karakoram — the glacier overlooks the Shaksgam Valley (ceded by Pakistan to China in 1963, a fact India does not recognise). Strategically, it is the textbook case of pre-emption: occupying ground to deny it to the adversary. The human cost — more soldiers lost to weather than to enemy fire — also makes it a staple of questions on the limits of military solutions.

Why it matters for UPSC: Siachen links Kashmir to the China-Pakistan axis and to questions on undemarcated borders. **How UPSC tests it:** Operation Meghdoot (April 1984), the "highest

battlefield" description, and the Karachi Agreement's vague northern terminus are standard facts.

4. The Insurgency Years, 1987–1998

24. 24. The 1987 Election Controversy

The March 1987 J&K Assembly election is the most cited turning point in the road to insurgency. The National Conference–Congress alliance won a sweeping majority, but the Muslim United Front (MUF) — a coalition of Islamic parties contesting its first election — alleged massive rigging, particularly in Valley seats it expected to win. MUF candidates and counting agents reported being arrested or beaten; several future militant leaders were MUF polling agents in 1987.

Whether the rigging was as extensive as alleged is debated — the results were lopsided enough to invite suspicion — but the political effect is not disputed: a generation of young Kashmiris concluded that the democratic route was closed. Historians across the spectrum identify 1987 as the moment when alienation turned toward armed militancy. For UPSC, the neutral formulation is: the 1987 election was "widely alleged to have been rigged," and the allegation is "widely cited as a trigger" for what followed.

The human detail that brings 1987 alive: several young men who would become prominent militants — including Yasin Malik of the JKLF — had worked as polling agents for MUF candidates and described being beaten and jailed during the counting. Whether every allegation is verifiable matters less, for exam purposes, than the political consequence: the cohort that tried the ballot box in March 1987 was carrying guns by 1989. That two-year journey from polling booth to militancy is the single most powerful illustration of the "closed democratic space" argument in any Kashmir answer.

Why it matters for UPSC: This is the standard "root cause" of the insurgency in model answers.

How UPSC tests it: Mains questions on the origins of militancy in Kashmir expect 1987 as the starting point, with the mechanism (loss of faith in elections) spelled out.

25. 25. 1989: The Turn to Militancy

By late 1989, armed militancy had erupted in the Valley. The Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF), advocating independence from both India and Pakistan, led the first wave — assassinations of officials, attacks on security forces, and strikes. The Rubaiya Sayeed kidnapping in December 1989 — the daughter of the then Union Home Minister Mufti Mohammad Sayeed was abducted by the JKLF and released in exchange for five jailed militants — announced the insurgency to the nation and is often taken as its symbolic beginning.

Two features of the early militancy matter for UPSC. First, it was initially indigenous and pro-independence (JKLF's platform), only later dominated by pro-Pakistan groups. Second, the state's response — Governor's Rule in January 1990, a massive security crackdown — is widely described

as having deepened the very alienation it aimed to suppress. The cycle of militancy and counter-militancy thus set in.

The early militancy's targets tell their own story. The first wave struck at the instruments of the Indian state in the Valley — police officials, political workers, and alleged informers — alongside dramatic set-pieces like the kidnapping. The state's response combined mass cordon-and-search operations with the new legal architecture of 1990 (Governor's Rule, AFSPA, the Disturbed Areas Act). Each militant strike hardened the security response, and each harsh response widened the pool of recruits — the action-reaction cycle that defines the entire 1990s and that every conflict-resolution answer must describe accurately.

Why it matters for UPSC: 1989 is the other great turning-point date, paired with 1987. **How UPSC tests it:** The Rubaiya Sayeed kidnapping (December 1989) and the JKLF's initial pro-independence stance are precise facts examiners like. Mains asks about the shift from indigenous to externally supported militancy.

26. 26. The Kashmiri Pandit Exodus, 1990

In January 1990, as militancy peaked and targeted killings of minorities began, the Valley's Kashmiri Pandit community fled in large numbers to Jammu, Delhi, and elsewhere. Estimates of those who left are widely cited at around 100,000 — the near-entire community. Pandit organisations describe it as a forced exodus under threat; the fact of the mass departure in early 1990 is not disputed, though its characterisation remains contested between communities.

For UPSC, the exodus matters on two planes. Humanly, it is one of independent India's largest internal displacements, and the community's three-decade life in camps and resettlement colonies is a staple of questions on internally displaced persons. Politically, it ended the Valley's centuries-old composite culture in practice and became a permanent reference point in every debate on Kashmir. Handle it with gravity and neutrality: state the event, the widely cited scale, and the competing characterisations without adopting either community's framing as your own.

Why it matters for UPSC: Internal displacement, minority rights, and rehabilitation policy all converge here. **How UPSC tests it:** The timing (January 1990) and the attributed scale (~100,000) are the factual core. Essay and GS answers use it as the human cost of the conflict.

27. 27. Hizbul Mujahideen and the Pakistan Angle

Founded in 1989, Hizbul Mujahideen quickly eclipsed the JKLF as the Valley's dominant militant group — larger, better armed, and explicitly pro-Pakistan (seeking merger with Pakistan rather than independence). India's stated position, documented in official statements and dossiers, is that Hizbul and similar groups received training, arms, and direction from Pakistan's ISI across the LoC. Pakistan's stated position has been that it provides only moral and diplomatic support to what it calls an indigenous freedom struggle.

The JKLF's eclipse is itself instructive: by the mid-1990s, its pro-independence leaders had been sidelined or had renounced violence (Yasin Malik declared a ceasefire in 1994), while pro-Pakistan groups dominated. For UPSC, the analytical point is the insurgency's transformation — from a

locally rooted uprising to a proxy conflict — which is exactly how India's official narrative frames the post-1990 phase, and exactly what Pakistan's narrative disputes.

The mid-1990s split deserves emphasis because it shaped everything after. In 1994, Yasin Malik's JKLF declared a unilateral ceasefire and renounced violence, pulling the pro-independence faction out of the armed struggle; the same year, pro-Pakistan groups consolidated under the United Jihad Council umbrella. From that point, the Valley's militancy spoke with one dominant voice — merger with Pakistan, not independence. This transformation is why India's official narrative dates the "proxy war" phase to the mid-1990s rather than 1989, a periodisation UPSC questions sometimes probe.

Why it matters for UPSC: The "proxy war" framing is central to India's internal-security doctrine.

How UPSC tests it: Questions ask you to distinguish JKLF (pro-independence, early) from Hizbul (pro-Pakistan, dominant later), and to state each country's declared position on cross-border support.

28. 28. AFSPA Comes to J&K, 1990

In 1990, the Armed Forces (Jammu and Kashmir) Special Powers Act was extended to the state (the state having been declared a "disturbed area"), giving the armed forces powers of arrest, search, and the use of force, with legal immunity for actions taken in good faith. AFSPA had operated in the Northeast since 1958; its arrival in Kashmir placed the Valley under a similar security architecture.

The debate around AFSPA is one of UPSC's perennial themes. The security establishment's stated position is that the Act is an enabling law — without it, the Army cannot operate against entrenched militancy. Critics, including several official committees (the Justice Jeevan Reddy Committee on the Northeast, and later voices within J&K's own political class), have argued that the immunity provisions damage the state's legitimacy and that the law should be revoked or diluted where militancy has declined. Note the precise legal fact: AFSPA applies only where an area is notified as "disturbed," and its continuation is a political decision, not an automatic one.

Why it matters for UPSC: AFSPA questions appear almost every year in some form. **How UPSC tests it:** The 1990 extension to J&K, the "disturbed area" precondition, and the immunity clause are the factual core. Mains expects the balanced debate, not a verdict.

29. 29. Hazratbal 1993 and Charar-e-Sharief 1995

Twice in the 1990s, militants occupied revered shrines, forcing the state into delicate sieges. In October–November 1993, militants took refuge in the Hazratbal shrine; the security forces laid siege for over a month, and the standoff ended with the militants surrendering and the shrine undamaged — an outcome widely seen as a success of restraint. In May 1995, the Charar-e-Sharief shrine, associated with the saint Sheikh Noor-ud-din Noorani, caught fire during a similar siege and was largely destroyed — a cultural catastrophe both sides blamed on each other.

The contrast between the two outcomes is the teaching point. Hazratbal 1993 is cited as the model of how to handle shrine standoffs — patience, negotiation, no storming. Charar-e-Sharief

1995 is cited as the cost of getting it wrong, whatever the fire's actual cause. Together they illustrate the peculiar difficulty of counter-insurgency in a society where shrines are both militant refuges and the people's sacred centres.

Why it matters for UPSC: These episodes are compact case studies in the ethics and tactics of counter-insurgency. **How UPSC tests it:** Dates and the contrasting outcomes (1993: peaceful resolution; 1995: shrine destroyed) are the facts to hold. Useful as examples in GS-III internal security answers.

30. 30. The 1996 Elections and the "Normalcy" Narrative

In 1996, after six years of Governor's/President's Rule, J&K held parliamentary and then Assembly elections. The National Conference, led by Farooq Abdullah, won the Assembly and formed the government. New Delhi presented the polls as the restoration of the democratic process; turnout was modest in the Valley but substantial in Jammu and Ladakh.

The 1996 elections matter for UPSC as the first iteration of a recurring pattern: elections as counter-insurgency strategy. The logic — that elected government restores legitimacy and drains militancy's political oxygen — has been invoked for every subsequent J&K election. Critics note that turnout figures were contested and that militancy continued; supporters note that the democratic space, however imperfect, began to reopen. A balanced answer acknowledges both: the elections were a genuine step and an incomplete one.

The numbers are worth holding: in the September–October 1996 Assembly election, the National Conference won 57 of the 87 seats and Farooq Abdullah returned as Chief Minister, six years after the dismissal of his government had helped trigger the crisis. Parliamentary elections earlier that year had already tested the waters. New Delhi read the results as popular rejection of the boycott calls issued by separatist groups; sceptics noted the heavy security presence and disputed the turnout figures in Valley constituencies. Both readings have persisted through every J&K election since — 2002, 2008, 2014 — making 1996 the template, not just an event.

Why it matters for UPSC: "Elections as conflict management" is a reusable analytical frame. **How UPSC tests it:** The year (1996), the winner (National Conference/Farooq Abdullah), and the preceding Governor's Rule are the facts. Mains may ask you to evaluate elections as a tool of conflict resolution.

31. 31. Kargil's Shadow Over Kashmir, 1999

The Kargil intrusion of 1999 was detected in May, fought through June and early July — Tololing, Tiger Hill (recaptured 4 July 1999), Batalik — and ended with Kargil Vijay Diwas on 26 July 1999. Though fought in Ladakh's Kargil sector, the war cast a long shadow over Kashmir politics: it proved that the LoC could be violated even under the 2003-era... no — even while diplomacy (the Lahore Declaration of February 1999) was underway, and it hardened Indian opinion against trusting Pakistani commitments.

For Kashmir specifically, Kargil had two lasting effects. Militarily, it led to a massive strengthening of LoC surveillance and the fence that now runs along much of the line. Politically, it discredited

the "peace process will restrain the army" argument in New Delhi for years. The Kargil Review Committee under K. Subrahmanyam drew lessons — intelligence reform, a Chief of Defence Staff (created much later, in 2019) — that reshaped India's security architecture.

Why it matters for UPSC: Kargil is the hinge between the insurgency era and the 2000s peace-process era. **How UPSC tests it:** The core dates (May detection, 4 July Tiger Hill, 26 July Vijay Diwas) and the Kargil Review Committee are standard. In Kashmir answers, use it as the event that made LoC sanctity non-negotiable for India.

32. 32. Why 1989–90 Still Appears in UPSC Answers

Notice how often model answers on Kashmir begin "the roots lie in 1987–90." There is a reason: those years contain every ingredient examiners look for — a political trigger (the 1987 election), an external dimension (cross-border support), a governance failure (the crackdown), and a human cost (the Pandit exodus). A single paragraph covering 1987–90 gives your answer its causal foundation, whatever the question's actual focus.

The practical tip: memorise a five-line version. "The widely alleged rigging of the 1987 election closed the democratic route for a generation of Kashmiris. Militancy erupted in late 1989 under the JKLF; the Rubaiya Sayeed kidnapping (December 1989) marked its arrival. The state's response — Governor's Rule (January 1990), AFSPA, mass crackdowns — deepened alienation. The Kashmiri Pandit exodus (January 1990, ~100,000 widely cited) ended the Valley's composite culture in practice. By the mid-1990s the uprising had become a proxy conflict dominated by pro-Pakistan groups." That paragraph fits almost any Kashmir question's introduction.

Why it matters for UPSC: This is answer-writing craft, not just history. **How UPSC tests it:** Not directly — but the ability to compress 1987–90 into a crisp causal paragraph is what separates average answers from high-scoring ones.

5. Kargil, Peace Processes and the 2000s

33. 33. The Lahore Declaration, February 1999

In February 1999, Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee rode a bus to Lahore and signed the Lahore Declaration with Pakistan's Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. The declaration committed both countries to intensify their dialogue, including on Kashmir, and — crucially — the accompanying Memorandum of Understanding committed them to nuclear confidence-building measures, coming just months after both countries' 1998 nuclear tests. For a brief moment, a Kashmir settlement through dialogue looked plausible.

The Declaration's importance for UPSC is as the "before" picture to Kargil's "after." The same Pakistani establishment that signed at Lahore was, within months, executing the Kargil intrusion — a duality that Indian analysts cite as proof that Pakistan's civilian government did not control its army's Kashmir policy. Whether Nawaz Sharif knew of the Kargil plan in advance remains disputed; what is not disputed is that Lahore's promise collapsed within months.

Why it matters for UPSC: Lahore is the high point of the bilateral peace process and the baseline against which Kargil is judged. **How UPSC tests it:** The month and year (February 1999), the bus diplomacy image, and the nuclear CBMs in the MoU are the facts. Mains asks why Lahore failed — the standard answer points to the civil-military divide in Pakistan.

34. 34. Kargil 1999: The Kashmir Connection

The Kargil intrusion — Pakistani soldiers and irregulars occupying heights on India's side of the LoC in the Kargil sector, detected in May 1999 — was, in strategic terms, a Kashmir operation: its aim, as later analyses suggest, was to cut the Srinagar-Leh highway and internationalise the Kashmir issue by creating a crisis. India responded with Operation Vijay on land and Operation Safed Sagar in the air, with the explicit political constraint that aircraft would not cross the LoC — a self-imposed limit that drew global appreciation and denied Pakistan the wider war it may have wanted.

The war ended with Pakistan's withdrawal under US pressure (the Clinton-Sharif meeting of 4 July 1999) and India's recapture of the heights, marked by Kargil Vijay Diwas on 26 July 1999. For Kashmir, the lasting consequence was the LoC fence and a surveillance grid that sharply reduced infiltration in the following decade. The Kargil Review Committee's report also pushed intelligence reforms whose effects reached Kashmir's counter-infiltration posture.

Why it matters for UPSC: Kargil is where Kashmir, the LoC, nuclear deterrence, and US diplomacy intersect — a perfect GS-II/GS-III crossover. **How UPSC tests it:** The "aircraft will not cross the LoC" decision, the July dates, and the Review Committee are favourites. A dedicated book on the war sits in this Library; cross-refer it rather than repeating detail.

35. 35. The Agra Summit, July 2001

In July 2001, Pakistan's President Pervez Musharraf came to Agra for a summit with Vajpayee. Expectations were high; the summit collapsed without a joint statement. Attributed accounts of the failure differ — Indian accounts emphasise Musharraf's insistence on making Kashmir the "core issue" and central to any declaration, while Pakistani accounts emphasise Indian rigidity — but the outcome is undisputed: no agreement, and the peace process stalled.

Agra's teaching value is in negotiation theory, a quiet UPSC favourite. It illustrates the "single-issue veto": when one party insists that nothing is agreed until its core issue is settled, summits collapse. Months later, the 13 December 2001 Parliament attack buried the process entirely. For answers, Agra 2001 pairs naturally with Lahore 1999 as the rise and fall of the Vajpayee-era peace process.

Agra's collapse is often told as a single missed handshake, but the structural obstacles were formidable. Musharraf arrived as the architect of Kargil — a fact India's strategic community could not forget — yet also as the only Pakistani leader with the army's backing to deliver a deal, the classic "only Nixon could go to China" paradox. The summit's most famous footnote, Musharraf's off-the-record breakfast with Indian editors, showed a leader comfortable with public

diplomacy but unable to close with his counterpart. For UPSC, Agra demonstrates that summits fail less from poor chemistry than from irreconcilable core demands.

Why it matters for UPSC: It is the classic "failed summit" case study for India-Pakistan questions.

How UPSC tests it: The month/year (July 2001) and the "no joint statement" outcome are the facts. Mains may ask you to diagnose the failure — keep to attributed accounts, not certainties.

36. 36. Parliament Attack and Operation Parakram, 2001–02

On 13 December 2001, five armed militants attacked the Indian Parliament complex; nine security personnel and staff were killed before the attackers were shot dead. India blamed the Pakistan-based Jaish-e-Mohammed and Lashkar-e-Taiba — a charge Pakistan denied — and launched Operation Parakram, a ten-month military mobilisation that brought nearly a million troops face to face across the border. War was widely feared; it did not come.

Parakram's Kashmir relevance is direct: the standoff was triggered by Kashmir-linked militancy striking at the heart of Indian democracy, and its de-escalation (completed by late 2002) came through US mediation and a Pakistani pledge against cross-border terrorism. The episode also demonstrated the nuclear overhang: both sides' 1998 tests meant full-scale war carried catastrophic risk, pushing India toward the doctrine of limited, calibrated responses that would mature in 2016 and 2019.

Parakram's most dangerous moment came not in December 2001 but in May 2002, when the Kaluchak attack — militants killed soldiers' families at an army camp near Jammu — brought the two armies to the brink again, with the world openly discussing nuclear risk. De-escalation followed through sustained US engagement and Pakistan's January 2002 pledge against terrorism emanating from its soil. Remarkably, J&K held Assembly elections in September–October 2002 in the middle of the standoff, producing a PDP–Congress coalition under Mufti Mohammad Sayeed — a reminder that the democratic track and the military track ran simultaneously.

Why it matters for UPSC: Parakram is the textbook case of coercive diplomacy under the nuclear shadow. **How UPSC tests it:** The date (13 December 2001), the ten-month mobilisation, and the nuclear-deterrence lesson are core. Links to GS-III (internal security) and GS-II (crisis diplomacy).

37. 37. The LoC Ceasefire of November 2003

In November 2003, after back-channel contacts, India and Pakistan agreed to a ceasefire along the LoC and the international border — the first sustained quiet the line had known in years. The ceasefire held broadly for over a decade and enabled the most productive phase of the peace process: the 2004–2007 composite dialogue, the Srinagar–Muzaffarabad bus service launched in April 2005 (letting divided families meet for the first time in decades), and cross-LoC trade from 2008.

For UPSC, the 2003 ceasefire illustrates a structural point: the LoC's temperature is a policy variable, not a law of nature. When both capitals want quiet, the line goes quiet; when relations collapse, it heats up. The bus service and trade are also useful examples of "soft borders" —

confidence-building measures that change lives without changing maps, a concept examiners appreciate in answers on conflict resolution.

Why it matters for UPSC: CBMs are a recurring Mains theme, and 2003–2008 is the golden age of India-Pakistan CBMs. **How UPSC tests it:** The November 2003 date, the 2005 bus service, and cross-LoC trade (2008) are the facts. Use them as positive examples in answers on dialogue and diplomacy.

38. 38. Musharraf's Four-Point Formula, 2006

Around 2006, Pakistan's President Musharraf publicly outlined a four-point formula for Kashmir: demilitarisation of the region, self-governance (without independence), no redrawing of borders, and a joint management mechanism for both Kashmiris. Back-channel negotiators on both sides later confirmed that the two governments had come closer to a framework settlement than at any time before or since — reportedly nearing agreement on demilitarisation and self-governance formulas.

The formula's failure is as instructive as its content. Musharraf's domestic position weakened in 2007 (the lawyers' movement, the Lal Masjid siege), and the 2008 Mumbai attacks destroyed what remained of the process. For UPSC, the four-point formula is the closest the subcontinent has come to a negotiated Kashmir settlement — the "what might have been" that every India-Pakistan answer can reference. Present it as attributed history (negotiators' accounts), not as established treaty text.

What made the back channel of 2004–2007 different was its seriousness: seasoned negotiators on both sides — India's Satinder Lambah among them — later confirmed that drafts were exchanged and that the two sides had converged further than ever before on demilitarisation sequencing and self-governance frameworks. The window closed from both ends — Musharraf's authority crumbled in 2007 amid the lawyers' movement and the Lal Masjid siege, while in India the UPA government, entering election mode, lost the appetite for bold concessions. The lesson for UPSC: settlements need both a formula and a political window, and 2007 had the first but lost the second.

Why it matters for UPSC: It is the most advanced settlement proposal in the dispute's history. **How UPSC tests it:** Mains questions on "is a Kashmir settlement possible?" expect the four-point formula as the reference case. Know its four elements and why it collapsed (2007–2008).

39. 39. The Amarnath Land Row, 2008

In mid-2008, the J&K government's decision to transfer forest land to the Amarnath Shrine Board — for facilities for Hindu pilgrims — triggered massive protests in the Valley, where the move was seen as a demographic and political intrusion. The government revoked the transfer; then Jammu erupted in counter-protests and an economic blockade of the Valley. The coalition government fell, and the state went under Governor's Rule before fresh elections later that year.

The land row matters because it revealed a hardened communal-regional divide — Valley versus Jammu — that would shape every later agitation. It also marked the return of mass street politics

after the relative quiet of the mid-2000s. For UPSC answers, 2008 is the moment when Kashmir's conflict acquired its modern street-protest character, setting the template for 2010 and 2016. Describe it factually: a land-transfer order, Valley protests, revocation, Jammu counter-agitation, government collapse.

The row's electoral sequel is instructive. After the coalition's fall and a spell of Governor's Rule, fresh Assembly elections were held in November–December 2008 — and despite separatist boycott calls, turnout was strikingly high, including in Valley constituencies. The National Conference–Congress coalition under the young Omar Abdullah took office in January 2009, and New Delhi presented the turnout as the Valley's vote for the democratic process. Whether high turnout equalled endorsement of the Indian state or simply a vote for local governance remains debated — but the 2008 election, like 1996 before it, became evidence in the "ballot versus bullet" argument.

Why it matters for UPSC: It is the bridge between the dialogue era and the unrest era. **How UPSC tests it:** The year (2008), the trigger (land transfer to the Shrine Board), and the Valley-Jammu polarisation are the points. Useful in answers on regional divides within J&K.

40. 40. The 2010 Unrest: Kashmir's Stone-Pelting Summer

The summer of 2010 saw months of street protests in the Valley, triggered by the Machil fake encounter (in which three civilians were killed and passed off as militants) and fuelled by a cycle of protester deaths at the hands of security forces. Stone-pelting by young crowds became the unrest's signature — a form of protest that was leaderless, youthful, and difficult for the state to manage without causing further casualties. Over a hundred civilians died over the summer, a widely cited figure.

New Delhi's response included an all-party delegation and the appointment of three interlocutors, whose 2012 report recommended political engagement — recommendations that were never implemented. For UPSC, 2010 is the case study in the limits of a purely security-led approach: the interlocutors' report exists, its recommendations are on record, and the gap between report and action is itself an examinable point on governance.

New Delhi's political response to 2010 went beyond the interlocutors. In September 2010 the Centre announced an eight-point initiative: appointing interlocutors, reviewing the deployment of security forces, releasing students detained for stone-pelting, and a package of economic and employment measures for the state's youth. The interlocutors' 2012 report then recommended sustained political engagement, including a review of central laws extended to the state. That neither the eight points nor the report translated into lasting policy is itself a data point — one that UPSC answers on "why unrest recurs" can cite as the gap between announcement and implementation.

Why it matters for UPSC: The interlocutors' report is a citable official document for answers on political engagement. **How UPSC tests it:** The Machil trigger, the stone-pelting character, and the interlocutors (2010–2012) are the facts. Mains may ask why political initiatives stall after unrest.

41. 41. The AFSPA Debate of the 2010s

As militancy declined in the early 2010s, J&K's elected government — Chief Minister Omar Abdullah in particular — pressed for partial revocation of AFSPA from areas where the Army was no longer actively operating. The Army's stated position was that the law was an enabler without which counter-insurgency operations could not function, and that dilution would be premature. The Centre sided with the security establishment; AFSPA stayed.

The debate is a perfect UPSC specimen because both sides' arguments are on the public record and both have merit within their frames: democratic normalisation versus operational necessity. It also connects to the Northeast, where similar demands have partially succeeded (AFSPA's footprint there has shrunk over the years). A strong Mains answer compares the two theatres and asks what conditions would make revocation feasible — reduced violence, police capacity, political consensus.

The debate acquired a formal political platform in 2015, when the PDP-BJP coalition's Agenda of Alliance — the common minimum programme of two ideologically opposed parties — explicitly mentioned reviewing AFSPA and the Disturbed Areas Act. The Army's leadership, meanwhile, maintained publicly that the Act was a functional necessity wherever the force operated against militancy. The review never happened; AFSPA remained in force across J&K through the decade. For answers, this episode shows the debate's structure clearly: elected governments demand review, the security establishment resists, and the Centre arbitrates — usually in favour of the status quo.

Why it matters for UPSC: It keeps the AFSPA debate current beyond the 1990 origin story. **How UPSC tests it:** The Omar Abdullah demand (early 2010s), the Army's counter-position, and the Northeast comparison are the analytical points. Expect this in GS-III internal security questions.

42. 42. 2016: The Killing of Burhan Wani and Its Aftermath

On 8 July 2016, security forces killed Burhan Wani, a young Hizbul Mujahideen commander who had become famous — and to many Valley youth, iconic — through social media. The Valley exploded in protests that lasted months: a curfew ran for over fifty days, thousands were injured, and the security forces' use of pellet guns, which blinded many protesters, drew national and international criticism. The unrest marked the arrival of a new, social-media-driven militancy and a new generation of protesters with no memory of the 1990s.

For UPSC, 2016 illustrates three modern themes: the role of social media in conflict (Wani's online persona was central to his appeal), the ethics of crowd-control weaponry (the pellet-gun debate produced official reviews of non-lethal options), and the changing sociology of militancy (local, young, educated recruits rather than foreign infiltrators). The unrest also ended the PDP-BJP coalition's honeymoon and set the political stage for the turmoil of 2018–19.

Why it matters for UPSC: Social media, non-lethal weapons, and youth radicalisation — three contemporary syllabus themes in one episode. **How UPSC tests it:** The date (8 July 2016), the

pellet-gun controversy, and the social-media dimension are the points. Handle sensitively: describe, don't glorify or demonise.

6. Abrogation and After

43. 43. The Road to August 2019

The abrogation did not come from nowhere. The immediate backdrop: the Pulwama attack of 14 February 2019 and the Balakot airstrike of 26 February 2019 had hardened the national mood; the BJP's 2019 election manifesto explicitly promised the abrogation of Article 370; and the coalition government in J&K had collapsed in 2018, leaving the state under Governor's and then President's Rule — which, crucially, meant Parliament could exercise the state legislature's powers. In early August 2019, a massive security build-up and the curtailment of the Amarnath Yatra signalled that something major was coming.

The President's Rule detail is the constitutional key examiners look for. Article 370's Clause (3) required the "recommendation" of the state's Constituent Assembly — long dissolved. With the Assembly dissolved and President's Rule in force, the government would argue that Parliament, exercising the legislature's powers, could supply the needed concurrence. Whether that reasoning was sound became the central legal question of the next four years.

Why it matters for UPSC: The "how" of August 2019 is as examinable as the "what." **How UPSC tests it:** Prelims asks the sequence (Pulwama → Balakot → mandate → President's Rule → August orders). Mains asks about the constitutional mechanism — the President's Rule link is the detail that earns marks.

44. 44. 5 August 2019: How Article 370 Was Read Down

On 5 August 2019, the President issued Constitution Order 272. Its mechanism was ingenious and controversial in equal measure: it amended Article 367 (the interpretation clause) to say that references to the "Constituent Assembly of the State" in Article 370(3) would be read as references to the "Legislative Assembly of the State." Then, with Parliament exercising the Assembly's powers during President's Rule, a second order declared Article 370 itself inoperative — except for Clause (1), which was used to extend the entire Indian Constitution to J&K. In plain terms: the provision was not repealed by amendment; it was switched off using its own machinery.

On the same day, the government announced the state's reorganisation. The legal audacity of C.O. 272 — reinterpreting a dead Assembly reference to manufacture the required recommendation — is precisely what the Supreme Court was asked to judge. For UPSC, the two-step mechanism (367 reinterpretation, then 370 rendered inoperative) is the technical core; most aspirants know only that "370 was removed," which is not quite what happened legally.

Why it matters for UPSC: This is constitutional procedure at its most creative — exactly what GS-II examiners love. **How UPSC tests it:** The date (5 August 2019), the order number (C.O. 272), and

the Article 367 route are precise Prelims-grade facts. Mains asks you to evaluate the mechanism's validity.

45. 45. 6 August 2019: The J&K Reorganisation Act

On 6 August 2019, Parliament passed the Jammu and Kashmir Reorganisation Act, 2019, bifurcating the state into two Union Territories: J&K (with a legislature) and Ladakh (without one). The appointed day was 31 October 2019 — the birth anniversary of Sardar Patel, the integrator of princely states, a symbolism no examiner will miss. Ladakh's separation fulfilled a decades-old demand of its Buddhist-majority population, which had long complained of neglect by Srinagar.

The reorganisation's constitutional basis was Parliament's power under Article 3 to form new states and UTs — but Article 3 normally requires the views of the affected state's legislature, and here Parliament supplied those views itself during President's Rule. That circularity was the second great legal question after the 370 mechanism. For UPSC, note the UT-with-legislature model: J&K joined Delhi and Puducherry as a UT with an elected assembly, a first for a former full state.

Why it matters for UPSC: Article 3's procedure and the UT-with-legislature model are core GS-II material. **How UPSC tests it:** The Act's date (6 August 2019), the appointed day (31 October 2019), and the two-UT structure are standard facts. Mains asks about the Article 3 procedure question.

46. 46. What Actually Changed After Abrogation

Beyond the constitutional drama, the practical changes were extensive. The J&K Constitution ceased to exist; the Ranbir Penal Code was replaced by the Indian Penal Code (now the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita); the state's separate flag went; central laws — from the Right to Education to reservation provisions — applied in full. The permanent-resident regime under Article 35A ended: new domicile rules defined who could claim residency rights for jobs and land, and land ownership was opened to non-residents, a change supporters called integration and critics called demographic engineering — present both characterisations as attributed positions.

On the political plane, the established regional parties (National Conference, PDP) — whose leaders were detained in August 2019 — called the move a betrayal of the accession bargain, while the BJP and its supporters called it the completion of national integration. Panchayat and municipal institutions were given a larger role in the new administrative design. For UPSC answers, the concrete list (penal code, flag, domicile, land, central laws) matters more than the rhetoric.

Why it matters for UPSC: "What changed" questions test whether you know effects, not just events. **How UPSC tests it:** Prelims may ask which of the listed changes followed abrogation; Mains expects the concrete inventory plus the two competing characterisations, neutrally stated.

47. 47. Detentions, the Clampdown and the Courts

August 2019 brought sweeping preventive detentions — including former Chief Ministers — and a communications clampdown: mobile internet was cut for months, the longest such shutdown in a democracy at the time, as widely reported. The government's stated position was that the restrictions prevented violence and saved lives; critics, including opposition parties and press bodies, called them disproportionate. In January 2020, the Supreme Court's Anuradha Bhasin judgment held that indefinite internet shutdowns were unconstitutional and that restrictions must satisfy tests of proportionality — a landmark ruling on digital rights that UPSC now cites in internet-freedom questions.

The courts' broader role remains the live edge of the story. Petitions challenging the abrogation's constitutionality worked their way through the Supreme Court for four years — the legal questions being exactly the 367 mechanism and the Article 3 procedure described above. For UPSC, the sequence (detentions → clampdown → Anuradha Bhasin → pending constitutional challenge) is the governance-and-rights narrative to hold.

Why it matters for UPSC: Anuradha Bhasin is now a standard citation in GS-II answers on internet shutdowns and proportionality. **How UPSC tests it:** The judgment's core holding (no indefinite shutdowns; proportionality test) is the takeaway. Present the detentions factually with both stated positions.

48. 48. How the World Reacted

Pakistan's reaction was the sharpest: it downgraded diplomatic relations, suspended trade, and took the issue to the UN Security Council, which held closed consultations on Kashmir in August 2019 — the first such Council discussion of the issue in decades, though it produced no resolution or statement. Pakistan's stated position was that the abrogation violated the UN resolutions and the Shimla Agreement; India's stated position was that the move was an internal constitutional matter and that Shimla's bilateral framework remained the only legitimate forum.

Other reactions were measured. The United States called for restraint and dialogue; China, which controls Aksai Chin and was ceded the Shaksgam Valley by Pakistan, objected particularly to Ladakh becoming a UT, calling it an attempt to undermine its territorial sovereignty — a statement India rejected. The OIC issued statements critical of the move. For UPSC, the analytical point is the world's broad acceptance of the "internal matter" framing: no country imposed costs on India, and the issue did not return to the Council's formal agenda.

Why it matters for UPSC: International reactions test the "bilateral vs multilateral" theme from the Shimla topic. **How UPSC tests it:** The August 2019 closed UNSC consultations (no outcome) and China's Ladakh-specific objection are the precise facts. Mains asks why the world largely treated it as internal.

49. 49. The Constitutional Debate: Federalism and "Temporary" Provisions

Strip away the politics and the abrogation poses a pure constitutional question, beloved of GS-II examiners: can the Union reorganise a full state into Union Territories, and switch off its special status, without the consent of any elected body of that state? The government's case rested on the letter of the law — Article 370's own machinery, Article 3's text, Parliament's plenary power during President's Rule. The challengers' case rested on the Constitution's federal spirit — that statehood is part of the basic structure's federal promise and cannot be extinguished by executive manoeuvre.

Related debates continue in classrooms and courtrooms: whether "temporary" in Article 370's heading imposed a duty to remove it or a bar on removing it unilaterally; whether the basic-structure doctrine constrains Article 3 reorganisations; and what precedent the episode sets for other states. A top-scoring Mains answer does not resolve these debates — it stages them fairly, giving each side its strongest argument in a paragraph.

Why it matters for UPSC: This is the federalism question of the decade. **How UPSC tests it:** Expect it framed as "critically examine" or "discuss" — the examiner wants both sides staged, then your reasoned assessment. The basic-structure angle is the advanced point.

50. 50. Writing on Kashmir in UPSC Answers Today

You now have the full chain. Here is how to convert it into marks. First, structure: every Kashmir answer benefits from a three-part spine — history (accession and the UN phase), the constitutional story (370/35A and their erosion), and the current position (post-2019 reorganisation). Second, tone: factual, neutral, and institutional — cite agreements, dates, and court rulings, never slogans. Third, balance: state India's position and Pakistan's position where they differ, and mark disputed figures as disputed.

Fourth, diagrams: a small map sketch showing the LoC, the CFL's origin, Siachen, and Aksai Chin earns disproportionate credit in GS answers. Fifth, contemporary hooks: link Kashmir to the syllabus theme of the question — federalism (GS-II), internal security (GS-III), or India-Pakistan relations (GS-II). The examiner is not testing your opinion on Kashmir. The examiner is testing whether you can organise a complex, sensitive subject into a clear, sourced, balanced argument. This book has given you the material; the arrangement is now yours.

Why it matters for UPSC: This is the payoff topic — technique, not content. **How UPSC tests it:** Indirectly, in every Kashmir question you ever face. Re-read this topic the night before the Mains GS papers.

Quick-Revision Tables

Table 1: Kashmir Timeline — The Dates That Matter

Date	Event
------	-------

22 Oct 1947	Tribal invasion begins; Muzaffarabad falls 24 Oct
26 Oct 1947	Instrument of Accession signed by Hari Singh
27 Oct 1947	Indian troops airlifted to Srinagar
1 Jan 1948	India takes Kashmir to the UN Security Council
21 Apr 1948	UNSC Resolution 47 (plebiscite after demilitarisation)
1 Jan 1949	Ceasefire; Karachi Agreement creates the CFL
17 Oct 1949	Article 370 adopted
Jul 1952	Delhi Agreement (Nehru–Abdullah)
8–9 Aug 1953	Sheikh Abdullah dismissed and arrested
14 May 1954	Presidential Order inserts Article 35A
5 Aug 1965	Operation Gibraltar begins
23 Sep 1965	Ceasefire ends the 1965 war
10 Jan 1966	Tashkent Declaration; Shastri dies 11 Jan
2 Jul 1972	Shimla Agreement; CFL becomes the LoC
Feb 1975	Indira–Sheikh Accord
Apr 1984	Operation Meghdoot; India occupies Siachen heights
Mar 1987	Assembly election; rigging widely alleged
Dec 1989	Rubaiya Sayeed kidnapping; militancy erupts
Jan 1990	Kashmiri Pandit exodus; AFSPA extended to J&K
Feb 1999	Lahore Declaration
May–Jul 1999	Kargil war; Vijay Diwas 26 Jul
Jul 2001	Agra Summit fails
13 Dec 2001	Parliament attack; Operation Parakram follows
Nov 2003	LoC ceasefire agreement
8 Jul 2016	Burhan Wani killed; Valley unrest follows
5 Aug 2019	C.O. 272; Article 370 read down
6 Aug 2019	J&K Reorganisation Act passed

31 Oct 2019	Two UTs (J&K, Ladakh) come into being
-------------	---------------------------------------

Table 2: Key Personalities

Person	Role in the Kashmir Story
Maharaja Hari Singh	Last Dogra ruler; signed the Instrument of Accession, 26 Oct 1947
Sheikh Abdullah	National Conference leader; backed 1947 accession; dismissed 1953; CM again after 1975 accord
V.P. Menon	States Ministry Secretary; flew to Jammu for the accession signature
Lord Mountbatten	Accepted accession 27 Oct 1947 with the plebiscite remark
Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad	Installed as PM after Abdullah's 1953 dismissal
Lal Bahadur Shastri	PM during 1965 war; signed Tashkent Declaration; died 11 Jan 1966
Indira Gandhi	Signed Shimla Agreement 1972 and the 1975 accord with Abdullah
Zulfikar Ali Bhutto	Pakistan's signatory at Shimla, 2 Jul 1972
Farooq Abdullah	NC leader; CM after 1996 elections; earlier CM in the 1980s
Atal Bihari Vajpayee	Bus to Lahore (1999); Agra Summit host (2001); 2003 ceasefire
Pervez Musharraf	Agra Summit (2001); four-point formula (~2006)
Omar Abdullah	CM who pressed for partial AFSPA revocation in the early 2010s

Table 3: The Legal-Constitutional Landmarks

Instrument / Provision	What It Did
Instrument of Accession, 26 Oct 1947	Hari Singh acceded on defence, foreign affairs, communications
UNSC Resolution 47, 21 Apr 1948	Three-step sequence: Pakistani withdrawal → Indian reduction → plebiscite
Karachi Agreement, 1949	Formalised the Cease Fire Line (CFL)
Article 370 (17 Oct 1949)	"Temporary" provision limiting Parliament's legislative reach in J&K
Delhi Agreement, Jul 1952	Nehru-Abdullah bargain: own constitution, flag, residuary powers with the state
Presidential Order, 14 May 1954	Inserted Article 35A (permanent residents' special rights)

Tashkent Declaration, 10 Jan 1966	Return to pre-war positions; no force
Shimla Agreement, 2 Jul 1972	CFL renamed LoC; disputes to be settled bilaterally
C.O. 272, 5 Aug 2019	Read "Constituent Assembly" as "Legislative Assembly" via Art. 367; 370 rendered inoperative
J&K Reorganisation Act, 6 Aug 2019	Two UTs from 31 Oct 2019: J&K (with legislature), Ladakh (without)

Table 4: Wars and Operations Touching Kashmir

Conflict	Dates	Kashmir Significance
First Kashmir War	Oct 1947 – 1 Jan 1949	Accession; airlift; CFL created
1965 War	5 Aug – 23 Sep 1965	Gibraltar fails; Haji Pir captured, returned at Tashkent
1971 War	3 – 16 Dec 1971	Chhamb, Poonch on western front; set up Shimla
Siachen / Meghdoot	Apr 1984	India seizes the glacier heights; "highest battlefield"
Kargil War	May – 26 Jul 1999	LoC violated; Tiger Hill 4 Jul; LoC fence follows
Parakram mobilisation	Dec 2001 – late 2002	Coercive diplomacy under the nuclear shadow

5 Exam Tips

1. **Build a 30-date spine and revise it weekly.** Kashmir questions are date-heavy. If you can place 26 Oct 1947, 1 Jan 1949, 1954, 2 Jul 1972, Jan 1990, 26 Jul 1999, and 5–6 Aug 2019 without hesitation, half the Prelims battle is won.
2. **Never confuse the CFL with the LoC.** The CFL is the 1949 Karachi Agreement line; the LoC is its 1972 Shimla successor. Examiners set this trap deliberately — in Prelims statements and in Mains answers that misuse the terms.
3. **Learn the legal mechanism, not just the headline.** "Article 370 was removed" is a weak sentence. "C.O. 272 of 5 August 2019 reinterpreted Article 370(3) through Article 367, and the Reorganisation Act of 6 August 2019 created two UTs from 31 October 2019" is a strong one.
4. **Attribute, don't assert, on disputed points.** Write "Pakistan's stated position is..." and "India's stated position is..." rather than declaring who is right. UPSC rewards this discipline explicitly in its evaluation of sensitive topics.
5. **Keep one 150-word Kashmir paragraph ready for any paper.** A compressed 1947–2019 narrative that you can drop into GS-II (federalism, IR), GS-III (security), or the Essay paper saves precious thinking time in the hall.

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What is the Instrument of Accession, and when was it signed for J&K?

The Instrument of Accession was the standard legal document by which princely states joined India or Pakistan, acceding on three subjects: defence, foreign affairs, and communications. For Jammu and Kashmir, Maharaja Hari Singh signed it on 26 October 1947, after the tribal invasion began on 22 October. Lord Mountbatten accepted it on 27 October, adding a personal remark that the state's final status should be settled by a reference to the people once order was restored.

2. What did Article 370 actually say?

Adopted on 17 October 1949 under the "Temporary, Transitional and Special Provisions" heading, Article 370 limited Parliament's power to legislate for J&K. Beyond the three accession subjects, Parliament could act only on matters the President specified with the state government's concurrence, and other constitutional provisions applied to the state only through Presidential Orders. Clause (3) allowed the President to declare the article inoperative on the recommendation of the state's Constituent Assembly.

3. What was Article 35A?

Article 35A was inserted not by constitutional amendment but by the Presidential Order of 14 May 1954, issued under Article 370. It empowered the J&K legislature to define "permanent residents" and reserve for them special rights in state employment, land ownership, settlement, and scholarships. It was the legal basis of the state's distinct domicile and land regime until August 2019.

4. What exactly happened on 5–6 August 2019?

On 5 August 2019, Presidential Order C.O. 272 amended the interpretation of Article 370(3) (via Article 367) so that the "Constituent Assembly" reference would be read as the "Legislative Assembly" — whose powers Parliament was exercising during President's Rule — and Article 370 was then declared inoperative. On 6 August 2019, Parliament passed the J&K Reorganisation Act, splitting the state into two Union Territories — J&K (with a legislature) and Ladakh (without one) — effective 31 October 2019.

5. What is the difference between the CFL, the LoC, and the International Border?

The Cease Fire Line (CFL) was the 1949 Karachi Agreement line marking where the guns stopped in the first Kashmir war. The Line of Control (LoC) is its successor: the Shimla Agreement of 2 July 1972 renamed the CFL as the LoC, with both sides committed to respect it. The International Border is the recognised, demarcated boundary elsewhere between India and Pakistan (for example, in Punjab and Rajasthan) — distinct from both the CFL and the LoC, which run through the former princely state.

6. Why is Kashmir so important for the UPSC exam?

Because it connects nearly every GS theme: post-independence history (accession, wars), the Constitution and federalism (Articles 370/35A, Article 3 reorganisation), international relations (UN resolutions, Shimla, bilateralism), and internal security (insurgency, AFSPA, counter-

infiltration). A single well-prepared Kashmir narrative can be deployed across GS-I, GS-II, GS-III, and the Essay paper — which is why toppers treat it as high-return preparation.

Continue Reading

- [Indian History: 50 Most Important Topics](#) — the Partition and accession context, and the full 1947–48 war narrative
- [Indian Polity: 50 Most Important Articles](#) — Articles 370, 35A, and Article 3 placed in the full constitutional scheme
- [International Relations: 50 Most Important Topics](#) — India–Pakistan relations, the UN dimension, and the Shimla framework
- [Internal Security: 50 Most Important Topics](#) — insurgency, AFSPA, and counter-infiltration doctrine
- [Indian Geography: 50 Most Important Topics](#) — the LoC, Siachen, Aksai Chin, and map work for the region