



Advance Social Science Archives Journal

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>

Vol.2 No.4, Oct-Dec, 2024. Page No. 796-808

Print ISSN: [3006-2497](#) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](#)

Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)



ROOTS OF KASHMIR STRIFE AND THE SAGA OF GILGIT BALTISTAN (GB)

Haji Muhammad Anwar	Ph.D Scholar, Department of Pakistan Studies, Government College University, Faisalabad Email: hmanwerskd14@gmail.com
Dr. Abdul Qadir Mushtaq	Chairman, Department of Pakistan Studies, Government College University, Faisalabad
Muhammad Hasnain	Lecturer, Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Management and Technology, Main Campus Lahore

ABSTRACT

Kashmir debacle is a faulty demarcation of the partition plan between India and Pakistan. The conflict of Kashmir was not only a political dispute between India and Pakistan but an ethnic, religious and territorial dispute as well. In this conflict, the perceptions of Pakistan and India about the GB are entirely different. Pakistan assimilated the GB with Kashmir strife and considered it an unfair partition of the British rulers who ignored the self-determination right of the local masses. Quite to the contrary, India regarded it as a territorial issue and said that Jammu and Kashmir including the GB is a vital part of India. The Indian territory has occupied illegally by Pakistan. But the aspiration of the masses of the GB and historical background are vice versa. In this paper, an effort has been made to disclose the point that how the GB became the part of Kashmir discard in accordance with the proposition of India and Pakistan and what are the historical facts of the GB which remained oblivion in the political debates? The crux of the paper is that the GB is quite extraordinary case and has stuck in the whirl of Kashmir discard due to the strategic lapses of indigenous policies. It is such a region in the country of Pakistan that emancipated its region by fighting of its own and vanquished their enemies and by their freewill acceded to Pakistan. But the region has not become a full-fledged constitutional part of Pakistan yet and waiting for a pragmatic resolution to this longstanding issue between Pakistan and India.

Key Words: Kashmir Strife, Gilgit Baltistan, India's view about the GB, Pakistan's narrative about the GB

Introduction

Since the inception of error-full partition of Britain, Kashmir became an intricate dispute and the root cause of rivalry between Pakistan and India (Qasim et al., 2024). In the division of territories, India occupies Kashmir valley, Jammu, Kargil and Ladakh whereas Azad Kashmir and the GB fall in Pakistan's territory (Ali, 2022). Among these territories, the GB remained oblivion in the history. Despite having many ambiguities, the fascinating land never lost its geostrategic importance (Yasin & Qasim, 2020). The geographical location of the GB has made it a sensitive region. Since China and Pakistan have launched CPEC project to expedite their economic relations through a project of China's initiative of 'One Belt One Road', the position of the GB has been further raised up because it is the only rout to connect Pakistan and China through

Khunjerab Pass. In this way, China wants to get access to the international market with the cheapest routes (Ullah & Anwar, 2020).

Besides that, the political history of the region shows a complex picture (Siddiq, 2017). It was under the British Rule but side by side it was under the Dogras of Kashmir where it was also directly governed by the local monarchs (Shafique & Iftikhar, 2017). This confusing history has led to a challenging problem of whether it was a part of Kashmir or a province or something else. Since 1st November, 1947 Pakistan has been governing the GB as a part of Kashmir conflict (Saqib et al., 2019). The GB has multidimensional issues and one of them is its political status. The GB is neither considered a province nor considered a state; a status of semi province has been installed through presidential order since 2009 (Zain, 2010). Such a constitutionally unclear and dividing line has kept the land away from their proper constitutional rights (Qasim et al., 2024).

The main reason behind the selection of this topic is to determine the historical conditions of the GB through the various stakeholders of Kashmir strife. It has also glanced over the root causes of becoming the GB a part of Kashmir issue. The viewpoints of the local people have been incorporated to assess their stances in order to draw a solid conclusion and to suggest possible ways to address this longstanding enigma.

Research Design

The scheme of plan is to attain answers to research questions validly, objectively and accurately through theoretical as well as descriptive analytical studies. This research work focuses on qualitative data. As far as data collection is concerned, both primary as well as secondary data are used. The primary data has been incorporated by structured face to face interview of the prominent figures that have a command over the political or constitutional history of the GB. Primary data has been collected through interviews. Besides that, effort has been made to find out concrete ways to give the constitutional rights of the GB without harming Kashmir cause. On the other hand, the secondary data has been gathered by all means of reliable sources i.e. books, research articles, newspapers, reports and internet data from governmental and non-governmental organizations.

Literature Review

For only a century, GB region remained under Kashmir state. The trade between these two regions was very little in the past. Therefore, they did not have people to people interaction and also their language and cultures were different. The spoken languages in the region which is used by majority of the people are; Balti, Shina, Wakhi, Burushaski, and Khowar while the people in the parts of Jammu and Kashmir mainly uses Kashmiri, Pahari, Hindko, and Gojri. The British forcibly made the region its part and later the Dogra ruler, Gulab Singh bought in 1846. So, this book helps to understand the core issue of Kashmir and highlights the integration of the GB with the Kashmir strife (Naseem, 2017).

The inhabitants who lived earliest in the region of GB are dated back to millennium 5th BC on the basis of archeological evidences. The main domain of this book revolves

around the circle of historical facts and figures. Though, it covers the vast area of the GB in terms of historical geography, geographical makeup of the GB and multi-ethnic social composition as a source of history. Yet, it does not describe the Kashmir issue. The book is a value addition to get compact idea about the historical background of GB and its inhabitants. It does not give a luminous idea in respect of Kashmir discard which the current paper focuses on (Dani, 2017).

"Pakistan Occupied Kashmir: Politics, Parties and Personalities" a collective efforts of the three prominent authors of India, Surinder Kumar Sharma, Yaqoobui Hassan and Ashok Behuria, provide the genesis of political parties and the political background of the GB and Azad Jammu and Kashmir through a myopic lenses and have declared the GB a Pakistan's occupied territory. The title of the book itself disclosed the fact that it is fully biased and partially described the historical background of the GB. But, this book has been used as a helping tool to assess the Indian narrative about Kashmir conflict.

Historiography of Kashmir Debacle

Kashmir is touched towards Northeast by Sinkiang province, Tibet on the east, Pakistan's provinces of KPK on the west and Punjab, on the south by Himachal Pradesh the Indian state and Punjab and northwest by the GB (Baig et al., 2018). When the British decided to hand over power to the local administrators through the subcontinent Partition Plan, the British asked significant Indian states to consent towards Pakistan or India in accordance with the aspirations of the masses (Bansal, 2008). Three Princely States (Hyderabad, Junagarh and Kashmir) made no choice till 15 August 1947. The Junagarh's Muslim rulers despite having the high population of Hindus decided to agreed to Pakistan in 1947 (Howe & Hunzai, 2019). With the support of the major Hindus' population, Indian army resisted and arranged a plebiscite in Indian favor (Bercha, 2002). The Muslim leaders who were ruler in Hyderabad, conveyed to maintain independent status while the Hindus were in majority so Indian Army entered Hyderabad on 13 September 1948 and annexed its territory. On the other hand, the Kashmir case was completely against to the above mentioned cases (Haverluk et al., 2014).

Hari Singh (Kashmir's Maharaja) wished to be independent and put forwarded an agreement to both the new states but India did not agree. Maharaja Hari Singh played a dual role and executed standstill agreement with Pakistan not to negotiate with any other country but secretly he took several steps to facilitate India (Hunzai, 2013). Muslims were in majority in Jammu and Kashmir and revolted against the Maharaja Hari Singh. The Maharaja began to commit atrocities again the Kashmiri Muslims by the force of Maharaja a 200000 Muslims were brutally killed in Jammu alone (Bouzas, 2017). Due to this catastrophic condition, the tribesmen in hundreds from the then NWFP and now KPK province of Pakistan crossed the threshold towards Kashmir to assist the Muslim brethren. Consequently, it guided both the countries towards war situation in 1947-48 (Anwar & Qasim, 2024). However, the GB which was under the rule of Dogras along with the British during the time of partition was ceded through the mechanism of agreement by the Maharaja with India in the October month of

1947. The gentry of the GB got angry and rebelled against the Dogra forces. They vanquished the Dogra army completely from their land and willingly joined Pakistan because it had got independence because of the Islamic ideology (Bouzas, 2012). The Kashmir case was sent to the United- Nations-Organization (UNO) which declared the territories under the control of India and Pakistan through a cease-fire agreement in July 1949. The UN Security Council declared by saying that the clear as well as final status of GB and J&K both will be decided through a plebiscite which will be held under the UN's supervision. However, the matter is still pending and waiting for its lasting solution (Hussainabadi, 2003).

India's Stance over Gilgit Baltistan

According to the Indian government, on the eve of leaving of the British colonial presence from India, princely states were left to join either Pakistan or India. Maharaja Hari Singh who was ruling Jammu, Kashmir, Ladakh and the GB agreed to the Instrument of Accession with the then Governor General, Lord Mountbatten in October 1947 (Qasim et al., 2024). Since then the government of India considers it a legal document to prove the GB as a part of India. According to the Indians, Pakistan feared that the Maharaja would accede to India that is why Pakistan Army with the assistance of tribesmen had invaded the state causing the 1st war on Kashmir between both the countries (Jalal, 1995). India sent its troops to Kashmir for defending its land. The hostile attitude and the involvement of the Pakistani Army took an invasion on Indian Territory. Since then, the Indian perspective is that Pakistan has illegally occupied Kashmir. On the other hand, the GB was being governed by Hari Singh at the time of partition who wanted to join India through the Instrument of Accession (Khalid, 2010). India considered Kashmir and the GB as a vital place in terms of strategic, economic and defense perspectives. The GB can become a valuable point for India to contact Afghanistan and the Central Asian Republic. The GB can also disconnect the direct routes of China and Pakistan if it falls under Indian control (Hussain & Javaid, 2018). For India, the GB and Kashmir are the core issues because no Indian government is willing to allow any part of its territory to be separated from India on the basis of religion, language and politics (Khan, 2017). According to Indian social analysts, India is a secular pluralist State having all religions advocating Indian nationalism. In past Congress reared the notion of United India while the Muslim League raised two nation theories. Since the partition of India and Pakistan as two nations, India is facing violent separatist movements (Khan, 2015). Now, India is reluctant to address the Kashmir issue because it will accelerate the nationalist activities within the Northeast of India. Tamil Nadu and Punjab might renew the demands for parting the Indian Union. Therefore, India has deployed a large number of security forces in order to maintain state power and laws and also to manipulate the freedom movement in Kashmir (Nashad, 2013).

The Indian Constitution treats the GB as well as Azad Kashmir as division of the Indian Union. Following this India has reserved 25 seats in Kashmir Assembly for Azad Kashmir and GB according to 1941-51 censuses (Nigar, 2017). The main part of the GB such as Kargil/Ladakh is governed as Kashmir's part by India. Both the regions; Ladakh and

Kargil can take part in election to be part of the Kashmir Assembly in India and the Ministers are also selected from there (Lambah, 2016).

The J&K state observed many political and constitutional changes following the 1947 independence. This state also witnessed armed based conflicts between the two partitioned countries. The interruption of UN through a resolution stopped the armed conflict in 1949, and both the countries agreed to cease fire. Approximately one third of the territorial area handed under the Pakistan's control which is known as Azad Kashmir, while GB as a region was not included in Azad Kashmir (Kruetzmann, 2008). The territory of GB was named as Northern Areas. Since its independence, the region witnessed many bloody encounters between both the neighboring countries; the conflicts of 1948, 1965 war, war of 1971 and lastly in 1999. The very last conflict, the Kargil-war gained worldwide attention due to sensitivity and brutality. The nuclear capabilities of both the countries were an accepted fact (Nasiruddin, 2018).

At the Siachen glacier, which is the world's highest and costly border area of India and Pakistan, a reasonable number of soldiers without any armed based war lost the lives on both Indian and Pakistani side because of harsh and severe climatic condition (Qasim & Rahman, 2022). India also encountered armed based conflict with the neighboring state China in 1962. The area of Ladakh (Aksaichin, 37555 sq. km) came under the control of Chinese army because of this and the conflict still exists. Pakistan also agreed to hand over the Shambhala area in Gilgit region (5180 sq. km) to China. The actual area of J&K which was (2,22,236 sq. km) abridged by (43735 sq. km) in northern region after this and original territorial area bought by Maharaja now squeezed and China also became authoritative state in the some part of J&K. Under the administrative authority of India currently there are (101,437 sq. km) of the territory (Qasim et al., 2023).



(Source www.Geography.com)

Pakistan's Narrative of the GB

The territorial dispute over the attainment of the huge State of Kashmir and the GB is usually known as Kashmir dispute and both the authoritative states have different stance. The sub-continent was segregated on the designed standard that adjoining majority of Muslim population areas was to be detached from the non-Muslim majority areas for establishing two autonomous states of Pakistan and India. There were about 562 princely states under the British Crown. By 15, August 1947, the greater part of the newly joined states joined India on account of their geographical contiguity while only ten states joined Pakistan (Safdar, 2014).

However, disputes started due to three princely states, namely Hyderabad, Junagadh, and Jammu and Kashmir. In Junagadh, and Hyderabad, the Hindus were in majority while the Muslims rulers were ruling there. Both the rulers of these two states planned to affiliate with Pakistan due to Islamic ideology but Lord Mountbatten, the Governor-General at that time informed Jinnah about Pakistan's approval of the attainment of Junagadh would be a complete contravention of the standards on which both the Muslims and Hindus agreed (Agnew, 2013). So, Pakistan accepted the directives of Lord Mountbatten and ceded the states of Hyderabad and Junagadh to India. However, Jammu, Kashmir and the GB were being ruled by Dogras under the supervision of the British rulers. The Maharaja acceded to India in October 1947 against the spirit of the partition plan in which the wishes of localities were entirely ignored. Consequently, a strong resistance came out from the GB over this decision of the Maharaja. Gilgit Scouts, a Dogra force consisting of the local gentry of Gilgit rebelled against the Dogra army and liberated their land from Dogra's clutches and joined up to Pakistan with their free will (Ali, 2010).

Lord Mountbatten, the last viceroy of India, during his special meeting with Chamber of Princes in New Delhi on 25 July 1947, said that all princely states are at liberty to join either India or Pakistan (Nayar, 2007). He illuminated that two preconditions have to be kept in consideration while acceding to any dominion. These prerequisites contained the geographical contiguity of the princely states and wishes of the masses of these states. So, both factors were favoring Pakistan. This notion was violated by Lord Mountbatten himself while supporting Indian rulers and Maharaja Hari Singh (Benz, 2016). This was certainly the first violation of the Indian Independence Act on behalf of the Viceroy himself. Therefore, it is usually asserted by Pakistan that Kashmir is an unfinished agenda of Indian partition which is yet to be decided according to the free will of people of the disputed territories which is rightly called the right of self-determination (Bodla, 2014; Parveen et al., 2023).

According to Pakistan's constitution, the GB is not a fully integral part of Pakistan, and its inhabitants do not have any representation in Pakistan's parliament. Like Azad Jammu and Kashmir, the GB is considered a disputed territory. It is also given as a justification that the UN recognized the Line of cease fire in 1949 at Kashmir. After that, it was named, (LoC) Line of Control following the Shimla Agreement of 1972. In GB, there is also a line of Cease-fire and the UN Observers were deputed in Ladakh and the GB borders (Qasim et al., 2023).

After the successful resolution of Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and the neighboring country, India, the states of Pakistan and China will also re-negotiate for borders matter according to article 6 of an agreement signed in 1963 between Sino-Pak (Feyyaz, 2019).

India showed reservations on the agreement between Pakistan and China on northern borders and forwarded a letter with concerns as part of legal protest to UN Security Council in 1963, March 16th. India considered this agreement against the Security Council resolutions between India and Pakistan. The stance of state of Pakistan was different in this matter and declared the protest of India useless and baseless. As the GB region is part of J&K dispute so a final decision about the territories under control of both the countries are to be decided in future according to the UN resolutions, therefore temporary agreements are not the permanent solution of the disputes according to Pakistan. The Boundary agreement of Sino-Pak therefore wouldn't affect the disputed territorial status of J&K. Pakistan avoids any legal and constitutional development in the region to ensure the applicability of UN resolutions (Bown, 1987). Pakistan is optimistic that the Security Council has not acknowledged the Indian proposition that the state acceded to India in October 1947. In its resolution 122 (1957), the Security Council turned down the judgment of the self-styled 'Constituent Assembly' of Occupied Kashmir on attainment to India and hopes that the ultimate decision of the GB and Kashmir will be made according to the wishes of the masses stated through the democratic process of a fair and transparent plebiscite which will be carried under the umbrella of the UN (Iftikhar, 2020).

In a nutshell, Pakistan has constantly reiterated that the GB is a disputed territory. The main stumbling block to make the GB a province is yet to be ascertained through a plebiscite under the UN Security Council Commission. Moreover, Kashmiri leaders are also strictly opposing the merger of the GB into Pakistan thinking that it will weaken the Kashmir cause. Therefore, the status of GB is not well defined and waiting for its long-lasting solution (Kalis, 2013).

Aspirations of the locals of Gilgit-Baltistan

Before the British invasion, the present GB was ruled by local emperors and monarchs. During 1890-1935 period, the British administration formed Gilgit an Agency with a single administrative set up and separated the region into four sub-units; Gilgit, Skardu Ladakh, and Kargil. The British controlled the external affairs while the internal management was largely left to the Dogra Rulers. During independence, the State of Jammu and Kashmir along with the GB comprised five districts Jammu, Kashmir, Paunch, Ladakh, Baltistan and Gilgit. The total area was 84471 square miles which were separated into three major regions; Jammu Province (12,378 sq. m), Kashmir Province (8,539 sq. m) and Ladakh and GB (63,554 sq. m) (Murphy, 2010)

When the partition movement accelerated in the subcontinent, the people of the GB also mutinied and revolted against the Dogras in order to liberate their land. Gilgit Scouts, a Dogra force in which local people were inducted, led a successful rebellion against the Dogras and liberated their land from the Maharaja of Kashmir. The 29,814 square miles of the GB came under the administrative control of Pakistan. This area

was named as the Northern Areas while the rest of the 33740 sq. miles of Ladakh remained under the control of India. The people of GB unconditionally acceded to Pakistan because the newly established state of Pakistan became the beacon of hope for the GB along with the Muslim of the Subcontinent. However, their hopes shattered when instead of integrating the area within Pakistan, the government decided haphazardly and linked it to the fate of the Kashmir issue (Mahmud, 2008).

The other significant event was Karachi Agreement of 28th April 1949, between Azad Jammu And Kashmir government and State of Pakistan. It also affirmed that GB is part of Jammu and Kashmir. Through this accord, Gilgit and Baltistan administration was temporarily handed over to the Federal Government of Pakistan. Here, the point to ponder is that the conformity was signed by the Government of Azad Jammu and Kashmir which does not have any connection with the GB and also there was no representation of the GB in it. So, this heinous agreement pushed the GB region in political mire (Mustafa, 2015).

The establishment of Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Northern Areas (KANA) was initiated under the Federal government and affairs of Gilgit Agency were transferred to KANA Division. The post of Political Agent was upgraded and the post of "Resident of Northern Areas" was created in 1952. The administration and governing authority was shifted from the then NWFP to Ministry of KANA can also be called a reason that made the GB a controversial region, because there is no direct agreement with the people of the GB (Sloan, 1999).

"The status of GB has been declared disputed both from Pakistan and Indian perspectives. Pakistan is hoping to get a vote of the people of the GB whenever a plebiscite is carried out by the UN Commission. But historically, the GB has never been a part of Kashmir. It was annexed and integrated into Kashmir during Dogra Rule. The people got freedom by defeating Dogras and eagerly joined Pakistan. So, the solution of the issue is that the people of GB must be given representation in Pakistan's parliament and senate provisionally until the implementation of the UN resolution" (R. J. Maqpoon, Former Governor GB, personal interview, July, 2020).

"GB has not been a part Kashmir because both the GB and Kashmir were under the Dogra Raj before their partition, but the GB got independence just like India and Pakistan. If the GB is considered a part of Kashmir then Pakistan and India should be Part of Britain because they used to be a part of it before their partitions. So, this logic is entirely baseless. He further said, 'if Azad Kashmir claims the GB as its part then why the GB is not having any seat in the Azad Kashmir Assembly? What are they giving to develop this region for the last seven decades?' If Indian Occupied Kashmir claims the GB as her part then there is no sound proof because the GB has its own distinctive languages, unique culture, unparalleled customs, Supreme tradition and well-reformed norms which are poles apart from that of the Kashmiris" (T. Raabbani, Professor, personal interview, August, 2020)

"Dogras forcefully succumbed Baltistan through its militancy. And there is no legal basis of Amritsar Pact 1846 by which Dogras occupied Gilgit and its suburbs. Pakistan has treated the GB separately from Azad Jammu and Kashmir both politically and

administratively". The locals of GB wish to become the 5th province of Pakistan. He further said "The people of GB have Pakistani National Identity Cards and passports. They are internationally recognized as Pakistanis. If the GB is provisionally given full constitutional rights through the amendments in the constitution then it will fairly strengthen the Pakistani stance over the GB on Kashmir issue" (I. Sanai, Former Minister Education, GB, personal interview, July, 2020).

When a question was raised to, *(H. Hasrat, prominent scholar and writer, personal interview, July 2020)* that is there any viable option to grant the GB as a full provincial set up without harming the Kashmir discard? The scholar proficiently replied, *"If India is reluctant to hold plebiscite under the UN and pretending time and again while switching her stance and calling it as a bilateral issue, Pakistan can hold election under the supervision of the UN in its territory by convincing the UN law enforcers. If the UN is also reluctant to take a decisive action, Pakistan should enforce its law by making the GB as the fifth province of Pakistan by following the international human right charter. The inclusion of the GB's narrative can further strengthen the credibility of Pakistan's proposition and the level of trust amongst the people of the GB will be raised. So, it is quite justified that Pakistan can move forward towards sustainable outcome by including the GB as a constitutional province of Pakistan without harming Kashmir issue."*

About the right of self-determination, *(B. A. Ghazi, Advocate Supreme Appellate Court GB and social activist, personal interview, August, 2020)* said, *"the right of self-determination is fundamental human right according to the UN charter and the International law. Everybody is born free and has the right to express his will and freely choose his political and social position. The right of self-determination is not determined by the government or the state, it is an individual's right which cannot be suppressed through corporal atrocities, mental tortures and political harassments. Modi's government is dreaming of varying the demographical condition of Kashmir through various political techniques; and the annulment of article 370 on 5th August 2019 is one of them. Now, time has come to bring the GB's status on streamline through proper constitutional reforms and not through presidential orders."*

The Way Forward

It is not an easy to find out an immediate solution to this long-drawn-out enigma of Kashmir issue, mainly having divergent positions since the time of partitions. However, hope sustains life; both the countries can better manage and adopt cautious approach to defuse the tensions through promoting trade and business with each other. By this way, a soft image can be created among the people and their attitude will be shifted towards policy shifting and the conflict zone can turn out to be a junction point of the economic zone (Naseem, 2007).

After the partition, there is no people to people interaction in this war front zone due to their harsh policies. It has created a long rift amongst their relationships. If we glimpse over the ground reality, it will show a vivid image that they have blood relationship and their kith and kin are on both sides. They are anxiously waiting for meeting with each other. A quick solution doesn't seem possible, so the negotiation

should not be interrupted come what may. It is true that people to people contact can create conducive environment to mitigate the grudges between the two countries. It can further lead towards pragmatic approach and may be a stepping stone to address this unaddressed issue (Khan, 1991).

India and Pakistan both assert that Kashmir is an occupied state. India considered that Pakistan has illegally Occupied Kashmir by force; on the other hand, Pakistan's narrative is poles apart and visualized that India has hypocritically Occupied Kashmir. So, the situation doesn't seem to be addressed through direct negotiation. A mediator is badly needed to appease the matter. Either the UN should play its role through the indigenous people of Kashmir to decide their final aspiration by conducting plebiscite or the world powers should come forward to meliorate the situation as arbitrators. Through the past experience, it has been proved that bilateral negotiations were not result oriented owing to offensive strategy of the both side (Anwar & Qasim, 2024).

Conclusion

Kashmir is the longstanding conflict zone between India and Pakistan due to their rigid policies. Both opted offensive strategies towards each other on this issue. One calls it an inseparable part and the second call it its jugular vein. Owing to their aggressive and stern attitude, they have combated with each other in the war of 1948, 1965, 1971 and Kargil war in 1999 and bore nothing except disharmony and hatred. Even now both stick to their propositions. Now the nuclear arms race is depicting the drastic picture in the eyes of many analysts due to increased border tensions, constant violation of line of control, internal disharmony, advancement in technology and the involvement of the non-state actors. Now, both should opt for pragmatic approach and be resilient either to implement the UN resolution on the settlement of the disagreement or raise people to people interaction to make them closer with each other as a way forward to address this unending enigma.

The case of the GB is quite exceptional and stuck in a whirl. It is such a region in the country of Pakistan that emancipated its region by fighting of its own and vanquished their enemies and by their freewill acceded to Pakistan. But the region has not become a full-fledged constitutional part of Pakistan yet. Due to this longstanding issue, the sense of deprivation among the people is accelerating day by day. The youth of the GB is raising slogan in every forum for their due rights. The looming thread is that the continuous negligence of the region and the rising distress among the youth may create another chaos and anarchy in the country. Therefore, the high-ups should rethink its conventional policies to mitigate the emerging constitutional issue of the GB lest a heavy price should be paid for it.

References

- Agnew, J. (2013). *Geopolitics: Re-Visioning World Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Ali, N. (2010). Sectarian imaginaries: The micro-politics of sectarianism and state-making in Northern Pakistan. *Current Sociology*, 58(5), 738–754.
- Ali, S. (2022). Gilgit Baltistan: identity crisis and a constitutional limbo. *International Journal of Human Rights and Constitutional Studies*, 9(3), 294-306.

- Anwar, H. M., and Qasim, M. (2024). Geopolitical Incarnation of Gilgit Baltistan on Political Horizon of Pakistan. *Uswa Journal of Research*, 4(1), 1-16.
- Anwar, S. (2017). Impact of Karakoram Highway on the Socio-Economic Development of Gilgit-Baltistan, Pakistan. Doctor of Philosophy Doctor of Philosophy, University of Peshawar, Pakistan. HEC E-Library database.
- Baig, S., Ahmad, M., & Alam, J. (2018). A Strategic Interaction Game of Political Rights: A Case Study of Gilgit-Baltistan, Pakistan. *Global Political Review*, III(II), 10-17.
- Bansal, A. (2008). Gilgit–Baltistan: The Roots of Political Alienation. *Strategic Analysis*, 32(1), 81-101.
- Benz, A., (2016). Framing modernization interventions: Reassessing the role of migration and translocality in sustainable mountain development in Gilgit-Baltistan, Pakistan. *Mountain Research and Development*, 36(2), pp.141-152.
- Bercha, S. A. K.(2002). Gilgit 1947 Say Pehlay. Hani Sara Publishing Gilgit:17-19.
- Bodla, S. (2014). Making a nation in high mountains: Balawars and Balawaristan nationalism in Ghizer district of Gilgit Baltistan. *EthnoScripts: Zeitschrift für aktuelle ethnologische Studien*, 16(1), 125-139.
- Bouzas, A. M. (2012). Mixed Legacies in Contested Borderlands: Skardu and the Kashmir Dispute. *Geopolitics* 17(4), 867-886.
- Bouzas, A. M. (2017). Territorialization, ambivalence, and representational spaces in Gilgit-Baltistan. *The Journal of Trans Cultural Studies*, 8(1), 197-223.
- Brown, W. A. (1987). *The Gilgit Rebellion 1947*. Pen and Sword Books Ltd London: 14-23.
- Butz, D., & Cook, N. (2016). Political ecology of human-environment change in Gojal, Gilgit Baltistan, Pakistan. *Mapping Transition in the Pamirs: Changing Human-Environmental Landscapes*, 197-214.
- Dani, A. H. (2007). *History of Northern Areas of Pakistan Upto 2000 AD*. Sang-e-Meel Publications Lahore
- Feyyaz, M. (2019). Geopolitics, statehood, violence and space compression in Gilgit Baltistan. *South Asian History and Culture*, 10(1), 28-45.
- Haverluk, T. W., Kevin M. B., & Brandon A. M. (2014). 'The Three Critical flaws of Critical Geopolitics: Towards Neo-Classical Geopolitics, 'Geopolitics Berlin 19(1),19-39.
- Howe, K., & Hunzai, I. (2019). The politics of exclusion. *South Asian History and Culture*, 10(1), 14-27.
- Hunzai, I. (2013). *Conflict Dynamics in Gilgit-Baltistan*. Retrieved November, 1, 2023, from <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/resources/SR321.pdf>
- Hussain, Z. & Javaid U. (2018). Situating Gilgit-Baltistan in Growing China Pakistan Interdependence: Post 9/11 Scenario. *Journal of Political Studies* 25 (2), 291-310.
- Hussainabadi, Y. (2003). *Tareekh-e-Baltistan*. Skardu Baltistan: Baltistan Book Depot.
- Iftikhar, G. A. (2020). Gilgit Baltistan: History, Constitutional Status and Genesis of Electoral Politics 1947-2015. *Journal of Languages, Culture and Civilization*,2(1),21-35.
- Jalal, A. (1995). *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia: A Comparative and Historical Perspective*: Cambridge University Press.

- Jalal, A. (1995). *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia: A Comparative and Historical Perspective*: Cambridge University Press.
- Khalid, N. A. (2010). *Pakistan: A Study of Geographical Environment, Economy and Human Resources*. Azeem Academy Lahore: 12 -16.
- Khalid, N. A. (2010). *Pakistan: A Study of Geographical Environment, Economy and Human Resources*. Azeem Academy Lahore: 12 -16.
- Khan, E. M. (2017). Constitutional Status of Gilgit Baltistan: An issue of human security. *Margalla Papers*, 21(1), 85-103.
- Khan, I. S. (2015). *The flow of History of governance in Gilgit Baltistan*. Master of Philosophy, Habib University Karachi Pakistan.
- Kreutzmann, H. (2008). Kashmir and the Northern Areas of Pakistan: Boundary-Making along Contested Frontiers. *Erdkunde*, 62(3), 201-219.
- Lambah, S. K. (2016). The Tragic History of Gilgit-Baltistan since 1947. *Indian Foreign Affairs Journal*, 11(3), 227-237.
- Mahmud, E. (2008). "The Gilgit-Baltistan Reforms Package 2007: Background, Phases and Analysis." *Policy Perspectives* 5(1), 28-40.
- Murphy, E., and A. Tamana. (2010) "State Terrorism and the Military in Pakistan." In *Coentemporary State Terrorism: Theory*, edited by E. Murphy, R. Jackson, and S. Poynting, 48–67. London: Routledge.
- Mustafa, D. (2015). "Terrorism and Public Space." Paper presented at the Understanding terrorism and counter-terrorism course, Lahore, Mustafa, D., and E. K. Brown. "The Taliban, Public Space, and Terror in Pakistan." *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 51, no. 4 (2010): 496–512.
- Naseem, M. Q. (2007). *Gilgit-Baltistan aur Mas'alah Kashmir*. Sang-e-Meel Publisher Lahore.
- Nashad, F. M. (2013). Siachen Press Clipping. Soday Books Skardu
- Nasiruddin, M. R. (2018). Roots of Sectarian Identity: A Pesteering Factor in Gilgit - Baltistan. *PUTAJ – Humanities and Social Sciences*, 25(1), 157-170
- Nayar, B. R. (2007). *The Geopolitics of Globalization: The Consequences for Development*. India: Oxford Paper backs, 22.
- Nigar, N. (2017). *Diامر-Bhasha Dam Gets a New Revival*. Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad.
- Parveen, T., Qasim, M., Aziz, F., and Farooq, M. U. (2023). Status of Minorities of Pakistan and India:A Legal and Constitutional Comparison. *Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 4(3), 712-724.
- Qasim, M., Ali, N., and Aqeel, M. (2023). Trends and Patterns of Temporal Urban PopulationGrowth in Pakistan. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 7(3), 551-564.
- Qasim, M., Ali, S., and Aqeel, M. (2024). Geographic Diversity and Landscape in Transition:Analyzing the Physical Features of Gilgit Baltistan Region. *Journal of Social Sciences Development*, 3(2), 154-169.
- Qasim, M., and Rahman, A. (2022). Trends and Patterns of Temporal Tourism Growth in GilgitBaltistan Region, Pakistan. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 524-537.

- Qasim, M., Hussain, S., and Ali, K. (2024). Political Evolution in Gilgit Baltistan: A Historical Analysis of Governance Structures and Regional Dynamics. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 13(1), 341-349.
- Qasim, M., Rahman, A., Ahmed, Z., Hashim, M. and Farooq, M. U. (2023). Perception of tourists towards Sustainable Tourism and Green Hospitality Management in Gilgit Baltistan. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 7(2), 1074-1092.
- Safdar, S. (2014). The China-Pakistan Economic Corridor: An Assessment of Potential Threats and Constraints, *Conflict and Peace Studies* 6(2), 24-34.
- Saqib, N. U., Yaqub, A., Amin, G., Khan, I., Faridullah, F., Ajab, H. Ahmad, D. (2019). The impact of tourism on local communities and their environment in Gilgit Baltistan, Pakistan: a local community perspective. *Environmental & Socio-economic Studies* 7(3), 24-37.
- Shafique, M., & Iftikhar, G. A. (2017). Regional Dynamics of China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC): The Case of Gilgit Baltistan. *Journal of Historical Studies*, 3(2), 15-29.
- Siddiq, A. (2017). Reforms in Gilgit-Baltistan, *Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad* 37 (1), 108-123.
- Ullah, A., & Anwar, M. (2020). China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC): A Paradigm Shift in Power Politics. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 28(2), 179-196.
- Yasin, A., and Qasim, M. (2020). China Pakistan Economic Corridor and the Significance of GilgitBaltistan Constitutional Status. *PUTAJ Humanities and Social Science*, 27(2), 79-93.
- Zain, O. F. (2010). A Socio-Political Study of Gilgit Baltistan Province. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 30(1), 181-190.