



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

A public policy perspective on the domestic factors that led the Modi administration illegally annex Kashmir

Gangadin, Shaiesta

Citation

Gangadin, S. (2022). *A public policy perspective on the domestic factors that led the Modi administration illegally annex Kashmir*.

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master thesis in the Leiden University Student Repository](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3485076>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



**Universiteit
Leiden**

Governance and
Global Affairs

**A public policy perspective on the domestic factors that led the Modi
administration to illegally annex Kashmir**

MSc Public Administration – International and European Governance 2021/2022
Leiden University

Name : Shaiesta Gangadin
Student number : s2989441
Document : MSc Thesis
Supervisor : Dr. Vasilis Karakasis
Second reader :
Date : 5 August 2022
Word count : 18.610

Abstract

The objective of this single-case exploratory study is to investigate the annexation of Kashmir by India in 2019. The research question in this thesis is how domestic factors have played a role in the decision of the Modi administration to annex Kashmir. Kingdon's (1995) Multiple Streams Framework has been applied to the annexation of Kashmir in order to investigate what domestic factors led to the window of opportunity, the annexation of Kashmir. By study of the problem, political and policy stream, an explanation of the course of events leading up to the window of opportunity has been formed. Each stream has been separately analyzed according to Kingdon's (1995) parameters and indicators in order to select the information relevant to this thesis. This thesis recognizes that there might have been limitations regarding other parameters such as e.g. psychological/leadership parameters, which could not have been taken into consideration. However, Kingdon's model (1995) has proven useful to understand the annexation of Kashmir by India through a public policy perspective.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Mr. Karakasis, for his patience, understanding and guidance throughout the thesis writing process. His support is what helped to keep me believing in and focused on the goal. Thank you for your words of motivation and the way you have taken your time to help me.

Secondly, I would like to thank my parents, and in particular my little brother Sharvan, for their support, their faith in me and their patience these past months. The thesis writing process is stressful, thank you for understanding what I needed during this process and for being there for me.

Thirdly, I would like to thank one of my teachers from my BA European Studies degree, Mr. Harris, from The Hague University of Applied Sciences. Your wise words and your advice to keep believing in myself, and to have vegan ice cream when it gets hard, is what I have kept in mind and what has helped me throughout my previous MSc as well as the MSc this thesis has been written for.

Fourthly, I would like to thank my second reader. At the point of submitting this thesis it was not clear yet as to who my second reader would be, but regardless I would like to thank you as well. Thank you for taking your time to grade my thesis and to provide feedback that I will take with me to future projects and reports.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Literature review.....	8
3. Theoretical Framework.....	16
4. Methodology.....	25
5. Analysis.....	29
6. Conclusion.....	46
7. List of references.....	49

1. Introduction

‘Systematic fear in Kashmir’ (Al Jazeera, 2022).

‘India and Pakistan have fought three wars over Kashmir’ (The Conversation, 2021).

‘Shameful: tear gas, batons on march against Kashmiri Pandit’s killing’ (NDTV, 2022).

These are just three headlines about the Kashmir conflict that accurately describe the severity of the case. The ongoing Kashmir conflict marks 75 years in 2022, having commenced in 1947 during the partition of British India. There have been several periods of unrest and several periods of truce in these 75 years. The most recent period of unrest started in 2016, and in 2019 India illegally annexed Kashmir. The annexation of Kashmir is the research topic of this thesis as this thesis will attempt to analyze the process leading up to the annexation through Kingdon’s Multiple Stream Framework, However, in order to understand the research that will be presented in this thesis and to have background information on the topic, the Kashmir conflict will be explained from the following paragraph onwards.

Kashmir has had a special status under Article 370 of the Indian Constitution since 1954 (Schofield, 2021). This special status granted the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir the power to determine the extent to which the Indian constitution would apply to Kashmir. This means that the Assembly could also have chosen to implement the entire Indian constitution, yet because of the Kashmiri desire to be an independent state, the Assembly chose to implement only to a certain extent the Indian constitution (Schofield, 2021). There was also Article 35A, which provided special privileges to the Kashmiri. In August 2019, unrest began again in Kashmir. Thousands of additional Indian troops were deployed, schools and colleges were closed, tourists received orders to leave, all telephone and internet services got disconnected and the Kashmiri political leaders were placed under house arrest (BBC News, 2019). Article 370 allowed Kashmir a certain autonomy, as Kashmir was allowed its own constitution, its own flag and the freedom to create laws. Jammu and Kashmir was able to make its own rules regarding residency, ownership of property and the fundamental rights. This even included that Kashmir could ban Indians from buying property and settling in Kashmir (BBC News, 2019). In August 2019, with the invocation of Articles 350 and 35A, India annexed Kashmir and Kashmir became Indian territory despite of previous agreements dating back to the Instrument of Accession signed by Maharaja Hari Singh (BBC News, 2019).

There have been a number of events since the most recent period of unrest in Kashmir. In April 2016, the first female chief minister of Indian-administered Kashmir, Mehbooba Mufti, became instated (BBC News, 2016). In July 2016, the Indian authorities posed an indefinite curfew in the larger part of Indian-administered Kashmir after the murder of a popular freedom fighter named Burhan Wani (BBC News, 2019). A month after the imposed curfew, most restrictions were lifted except for the imposed shutdown of mobile and internet services. From September 2016 until July 2017, there have been a number of surgical strikes and violent clashes that took place in Indian-administered Kashmir (BBC News, 2019). During one clash, Pakistanis were killed, and during another clash Indians were killed. India and Pakistan have pointed the finger towards each other many times. In order to understand these events, and why the tension is so high in the region, the extensive yet relevant history of the Kashmir conflict will be provided in the empirical framework before the analysis chapter of this thesis.

However, in order to understand why the Modi administration decided to annex Kashmir is not immediately evident. India and Pakistan have been at war over Kashmir for 75 years in 2022, and the annexation of the region is a very serious violation of international law, and is considered an act of aggression under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (BBC News, 2019). The research objective of this thesis is to look into what led India to annex Kashmir. To further specify the research objective, a study has been conducted into Indian domestic events that could have played a role in the decision to annex. Through this study, the findings gathered will hopefully contribute to academic research into illegal annexations and the process leading up to it. Furthermore, this public policy angle through which the Kashmir conflict has been studied will hopefully add to a better understanding and a more concise timeline of the Kashmir conflict. Therefore, this thesis will seek to answer the following research question:

What were the domestic push factors for the Indian government to illegally annex Kashmir?

The theoretical framework selected for this research is the Multiple Streams Framework. Through use of John Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework as a theoretical framework, this question will be answered from a public policy perspective, a perspective that applied to this case has not been much elaborated on in academic literature. Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework will allow the findings to be studied from three different perspectives which will be further elaborated on in the theoretical framework. As three different perspectives will be

used for this study, the expectation is that this method will allow for a more detailed and more concise overview, meaning taking more factors into account due to the three streams, of the domestic events leading up to the window of opportunity – the annexation of Kashmir by India. As Kashmir is not the first case of an annexation, the following chapter concerning the literature review, will provide an elaboration on how academic scholars have explained illegal annexation before. Following the literature review, the theoretical framework will be explained and thereafter the methodology, the analysis and with that the application of Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework. The concluding remarks will be the last chapter of this thesis. After the concluding remarks, one can find the references used to conduct this research.

2. Literature review

2.1 Illegal annexation in the international playfield

Annexations are considered illegal in the international playfield. In order to better understand what an annexation entails, explanations have been derived from different scholars' work. The first is from Hoffman (2013) who elaborates on why annexations are considered illegal by stating the following: "annexation means the forcible acquisition of territory by one state at the expense of another state. It is one of the principal modes of acquiring territory... in contrast to acquisition a) of terra nullius by means of effective occupation accompanied by the intent to appropriate the territory; b) by cession as a result of a treaty concluded between the states concerned (treaties), or an act of adjudication, both followed by the effective peaceful transfer of territory; c) by means of prescription defined as the legitimization of a doubtful title to territory by passage of time and presumed acquiescence of the former sovereign; d) by accretion constituting the physical process by which new land is formed close to, or becomes attached to, existing land. Under present international law, annexation no longer constitutes a legally admissible mode of acquisition of territory as it violates the prohibition of the threat or use of force. Therefore, annexations must not be recognized as legal." Amnesty International (2020), states that an annexation: "is a flagrant violation of international law, illustrates cynical disregard for international law, exacerbates decades of human rights violations, entrenches institutionalized discrimination, amounts to 'war crimes', must be rejected by the international community, is unlawful under international law and is therefore null and void without international legal effect, can have other serious implications regarding residency and mass expropriation, and that it has happened before". What makes an annexation different from a cession is according to Rothwell et al. (2014): "annexation is distinct from cession. Instead of a state seeking to relinquish territory, annexation occurs when the acquiring state asserts that it now holds the territory. Annexation will usually follow a military occupation of a territory, when the occupying power decides to cement its physical control by asserting legal title. The annexation of territory is essentially the administrative action associated with conquest. Mere conquest alone is not enough, but rather the conquering state must assert it is now sovereign over the territory concerned. For example, the defeat of Germany and Japan in 1945 led to their occupation by the Allies for a number of years, but the states themselves were not absorbed by the Allied Powers part of their respective territories. Examples of annexation in contemporary practice are not common, and are generally viewed as illegal."

2.2 Illegal annexations from an international relations perspective: Neorealism on illegal annexations and the pursuit of regional hegemony

International relations scholar John Joseph Mearsheimer has developed the theory of offensive realism in his book *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (2001). Offensive realism is a theory which describes the interaction between great powers as something that is instinctively driven by the desire for regional hegemony in the anarchic international system. In his book, Mearsheimer uses great powers China and the United States as an example as Mearsheimer argues that the continuous growth of China will lead to conflict with the United States (Mearsheimer, 2001). Mearsheimer was greatly influenced by the founder of international relations, also known as neorealism, which was Kenneth Waltz (Brittanica, n.d.). According to Waltz (1990), states seek security and adopt a defensive position towards their rivals when there is an absence of authority (which is the condition of anarchy). These states must seek alliances in order to contain the threat their rivals pose, which comes down to the need of a balance of powers between states in order to maintain international order (Waltz, 1990). As mentioned before, Mearsheimer was greatly influenced by Waltz but he developed his own theory according to his own beliefs. Mearsheimer named his theory 'offensive realism', which entails that the need for security and with that the need for survival, can make states aggressive and seeking to maximize their powers (Mearsheimer, 2001). In offensive realism, states do not seek to cooperate, except during alliances for a noted period of time, and seek to completely diminish their rival's powers and maximize their own. Mearsheimer has five core assumptions: " (1) the international system is anarchic as there is no power above the states that can arbitrate their conflicts, (2) all states have some military capability, however limited, (3) states can never fully ascertain the intentions of other states, (4) states value survival above all else and (5) states are rational actors that seek to promote their own interests" (Mearsheimer, 2001). According to Mearsheimer (2001), these conditions can "create strong incentives for states to behave aggressively towards each other". This incentive can also grow because of the uncertainty the future brings, as one cannot predict the future intentions of a state. Therefore, the one rational thing for states to do is increase military power and adopt an assertive position whenever their fundamental security is at stake (Mearsheimer, 2001). Mearsheimer (2001) believed a superpower should only intervene whenever an actual threat is being presented to a region of strategic importance.

In international relations, regional hegemony entails the predominance (so control or influence) of one independent powerful state over a neighboring region (Mearsheimer, 2001).

Mearsheimer (2001) argues that his offensive realism theory is what leads to the pursuit of regional hegemony. Global hegemony is unattainable, but regional hegemony is possible and will provide the possibility to the regional hegemon to stop the rise of its rivals in other regions (Mearsheimer, 2001). When looking at the concept of illegal annexation, which has been defined in the literature review as “the acquisition of legal sovereignty by one state over the territory of another, usually by occupation or conquest” (Oxford, n.d.), one can find how Mearsheimer’s offensive realism is an applicable theory to understand illegal annexations. To illustrate why, the annexation of Crimea by Russia in 2014 will be used as an example. As elaborated on before in the previous chapter of this thesis, Crimea was annexed by Russia as Russia felt the ‘superpower’ and decided to expand its power and show Ukraine and the neighboring countries its powers. The then sitting Ukrainian president Yanukovich was removed from his position after protests and fled to Russia. His removal created unrest in Ukraine which housed strong pro-Russia sentiments (Grant, 2017). Russia saw this as an opportunity to showcase its power and expand its territory, and protect those supporting Russia. With the recent Russian invasion in (and with that attempt to annex) Ukraine added to the list, it has become obvious that Russia is seeking to become a regional hegemon and the annexation of Crimea has helped them a long way (CSIS, 2022). However, as this research aims to understand the domestic factors that pushed the Indian leaders to annex Kashmir, Mearsheimer’s theory will not be sufficient to cover this.

2.3 Illegal annexation from an international law and international human rights law perspective

The United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner released a statement on June 20, 2019, on illegal annexations and what it entails for international law and international human rights law. In this statement is included the following: “international law is very clear: annexation and territorial conquest are forbidden by the Charter of the United Nations... there is not an atom of sovereignty in the authority of the occupying power” (UNHR, 2019). This form of battle can be blamed on that it is still a legitimate policy to go to war and conquest despite modern day developments (UNHR, 2019). UN Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territory, Michael Lynk, said the following: “While annexation has not disappeared from the modern world, this strict prohibition in international law has had a considerable dampening effect... the power of prohibition is that annexations in the modern world, when they do happen, are rarely recognized by other nations. International law, when married to international resolve works” (UNHR, 2019). When conducting secondary research,

it became noticeable that many academic literatures regarding illegal annexations and international law and international human rights law use the Israel-Palestine conflict in the West Bank and the annexation of Crimea by Russia as their main examples. International law must be enforced and restated by the international community in cases of illegal annexation in order to avoid (severe) violations of international law and international human rights law. If this does not timely occur, the number of casualties can increase rapidly and any prospect of a peaceful resolution will be postponed to a point where a peaceful resolution seems highly unlikely. An example of such a situation is the annexation of Kashmir by India in 2019 which will be analyzed throughout the following chapters of this thesis using the theoretical framework of Kingdon's Multiple Stream Framework (BBC News, 2021). This framework seems more applicable to the purpose of this research, which is to establish the domestic push factors leading to the annexation of Kashmir.

2.4 Previous cases of illegal annexation and their connection to international relations and international law

In history, there have been a number of cases of illegal annexations. Ever since the foundation of the United Nations, the following territories are amongst those that have been illegally annexed (left aside later international recognitions and example cases with less information available): The West Bank excluding East Jerusalem by Israel, Golan Heights by Israel, Western Sahara by Mauritania, Morocco and Spain and Crimea by Russia. This section will elaborate more on each case of illegal annexation mentioned above in order to provide an overview of how international relations and international law explain these annexations according to different scholars. Furthermore, to how the international leaders responded to the annexations, the build-up to the annexations and media response to the annexations for later comparison to the main case study at hand. The number of cases selected is minimized in order to keep the focus of this chapter parsimonious.

2.4.1 East Jerusalem, the Golan Heights and the West Bank excluding Jerusalem by Israel

In 1967, the Six-Day War was fought between Israel and a coalition of Arab states consisting of Jordan, Syria and Egypt. During this war, Israel was able to capture East Jerusalem, which is part of the West Bank, from Jordan (BBC News, 2020). This present day, the West Bank is still occupied by Israel. The West Bank is a large territory on the west bank of the Jordan River and which is bounded to the north, south and west by Israel, with Jordan on its east (BBC News, 2020). The Six-Day War, also known as the Middle East war, marked the start of the

occupation by Israeli forces of the West Bank region. As mentioned before, the conflict between Israel and Palestine is still unresolved and originated when the land was divided between Israel and Palestine around 1947 (Quest, 2022). In an attempt to create a safe place for the Jewish in the early 1900s, the idea of the formation of Palestine was created. Despite that at some point in history, not many Jewish people were left in the land what is now known as Palestine, it remained the rooting place of the Jewish religion. When the British entered Palestine and promised Palestine that it would become home to the Jewish again but failed to uphold this promise, resistance against the British colonialism increased which led to severe unrest in the region (Quest, 2020). This was until 1947, when the United Nations saw no other solution than to divide the land between what is now known as Israel and Palestine on the basis of the religious majority in each area. So, areas that housed more Jews became Jewish territory, and where there lived more Palestinians became Palestinian territory (Quest, 2020). Despite of the Jewish community being the minority, they obtained a larger part of the territory. Disagreement from the Palestinian side was expressed and the Jews refused to abandon the century-old dream of a homeland for the Jewish. When the British left in 1948, Israel declared itself an independent state which the surrounding Arab countries did not accept and from thereon sought to free Palestine (Quest, 2020).

As mentioned before, neorealism seeks to explain that an inter-state conflict has human behavior as a cause (Waltz, 2008). Selfishness, misdirected aggressiveness and simple stupidity can often be blamed when it comes to conflict. Mearsheimer argues that the strong need for survival is one of the strongest causes of conflict, which is visible in the Israel-Palestine conflict. Palestine was created as a safe place for Jews, to which Israel felt threatened and acted aggressively in order to protect and promote Israeli interests, to guarantee their own survival above all else (Mearsheimer, 2001). In the case of Israel-Palestine, domestic factors played little to no role and the conflict was mostly determined by the five neorealist principles as established by Mearsheimer (2001). The roots of the problem lie within the international system, which has divided Israel and Palestine on the basis of the religious majority without further looking at any economic disadvantages (Journal of Palestine Studies, 2015). To Israel, the economic disadvantage at the time was the loss of land as Israel was struggling to survive between the Arab countries and Palestine (Journal of Palestine Studies, 2015). On the other hand, there is international law. Under international law, Palestine has had an international status under Article 22 of the League of Nations and was granted international recognition to self-determination in 1947 by the UN Special Committee on Palestine (Quigley, 2005). In

1971, the International Court of Justice said that the League of Nations had rejected the legality of the annexation of Palestine (Quigley, 2005). Legally, there are two issues in this conflict. One being the debate on the democratic right to self-determination and the other being the acquisition of territory by war (Quigley, 2005). Pertile (2005) describes the Israeli settlements as illegal as they are in violation with Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, and that they are in violation with several international declarations (Barak-Erez, 2006).

2.4.2 The Western Sahara by Mauritania, Morocco and Spain

The Western Sahara is a desert area rich in phosphates located at the northwest coast of Africa (BBC News, 2021). The sparsely-populated area is a former Spanish colony and was officially annexed by Morocco and Mauritania in 1976. This marked the start of the territorial dispute between Morocco and its indigenous Saharawi people who are led by the Polisario Front (BBC News, 2021). The annexation began on October 30, 1975, when Morocco and Mauritania both occupied the Western Sahara area. On April 14, 1976, the Western Sahara partition agreement was signed and the annexation formalized (BBC News, 2021). This partition agreement also established the borders between Morocco and Mauritania. In the end, Morocco obtained two-thirds of the Western Sahara, the northern parts of the Western Sahara, through the annexation and Mauritania obtained the remaining third through the annexation, which is the southern part of the Western Sahara (BBC News, 2021). On August 14, 1979, Morocco annexed the remaining third of the Western Sahara and with that extended its control over the territory. Regarding media coverage and a global response to the Western Sahara conflict, both have been rather quiet (BBC News, 2021).

When applying neorealism to the annexation of the Western Sahara, different scholars have referred to the aggressive military action by Morocco as an example of a country seeking to become a regional hegemony (Schweller, 1994; Mearsheimer, 2001). Morocco has made more progress than neighboring countries Algeria and Tunisia, which points towards hegemonic ambitions according to Arredondas (2021). This has created competition in the region as Algeria and Tunisia have been trying to expand their regional engagement, instead of having trilateral cooperations (Arredondas, 2021). When applying international law to the annexation of Western Sahara, scholars have established that Western Sahara is not a part of Morocco, and that Morocco has no legal right to claim the territory. Morocco is being considered an occupying power, and should respect the people of Western Sahara accordingly (Sven, 2014).

According to Sven (2014), Western Sahara has the right to self-determination and states that the law of occupation is applicable to this case.

2.4.3. Crimea by the Russian Federation

On March 18, 2014, the Russian Federation annexed the Crimean Peninsula from Ukraine (Grant, 2017). The annexation of Crimea was unprecedented in national terminology, and presented as an attempt to reunite the Russian state into one nation (Teper, 2015). Between 2014-2017, the international governments feared that the Russian annexation would not remain with Crimea, but would extend to Ukraine as Russian troops were increasing around the Ukrainian-Russian borders. This fear has proven correct, as Russia invaded Ukraine on February 24, 2022. This invasion was ongoing in the timeframe of writing this thesis.

Neorealist scholars who have studied the annexation of Crimea have named hegemony and superiority as why Russia committed this crime (Keypour and Hendla, 2019). Ukraine's relations with the West were improving, which was considered a threat to Russia. Why? Because Ukraine had an economic empowerment plan that would be significant on the future European energy market (Keypour and Hendla, 2019). Russia annexing Crimea was a consequence of the uncertainty of intentions, it was unclear as to what Ukraine's next steps would be (Mearsheimer, 2001). Therefore, it can be said that according to neorealism, the annexation of Crimea can be seen as a means to balance out NATO besides the hegemon ambitions (Ghazaryan, 2017). From an international law perspective, Russia has claimed to have a legal basis for its annexation and the right to secession. However, the majority of states reject the claim as no qualification under international law can be found (Marxsen, 2015). Russia used military force to takeover control in Crimea and has forced Ukrainian troops to not intervene and surrender by seizing Ukrainian military equipment. Under international law, this is a violation of Ukraine's territorial integrity (Marxsen, 2015). According to Marxsen (2015), the international law perspective is simple. The annexation of Crimea has been a complete violation of international law.

What becomes evident from these example cases is that the annexations are mostly driven by the ambition to become a hegemon, whether this is for survival or that it is a pursuit of power. Furthermore, that there is little to no legal basis to be found for annexations. Annexing a territory is about seizing an opportunity, an open window under particular circumstances in order to ensure security for the annexing party. Especially during conflict, the desire to survive

can lead to (un)strategic actions, as seen during the Kashmir conflict. The use of the Multiple Streams Framework (Kingdon, 1995) will determine whether the annexation of Kashmir was also due to hegemon ambitions or due to other reasons.

3. Theoretical Framework

In order to answer the research question of this thesis, which was presented in the introductory chapter, multiple factors need to be considered in order to provide an answer that is not based on perspectives that already have been (extensively) covered in current academic literature. This research aims to incorporate the domestic factors playing a role in the annexation by studying the role of the media, the policy-makers and others that can influence policy-making, as well as the public opinion. Through study of the roles the media, policy-makers and the public opinion played during the annexation of Kashmir, the domestic factors that led to the annexation can be detected and elaborated on. There is one theoretical framework that incorporates all three factors, which is John Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework (1984).

3.1 The Multiple Streams Framework

In 1984, *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* was first published. This book, written by John Kingdon, came to be 'a key reference point in the public policy literature' (Cairney and Jones, 2015). Kingdon begins his theory by posing two questions. The first question he poses is 'what factors determine at any given time which items are and are not on the political agenda, i.e. are and are not being considered by policy makers with a view to possible governmental action?' (Kingdon, 1984). The second question Kingdon poses is, 'given that an item is on the political agenda, what factors determine which alternative courses of action the policy makers do and do not take into account as they move towards their final decision?' (Kingdon, 1984). In order to answer these questions, Kingdon used the method of taking two policy areas in the United States, which were health and transportation, and held over 247 interviews in the course of four years with policy-makers in the health and transportation sectors. He conducted these interviews and prepared 23 detailed case studies of policy making in the health and transportation sectors over the past three decades (Kingdon, 1984). As mentioned before, in academic literature, Kingdon's findings are considered to be a key reference point (Cairney and Jones, 2015), because of the following observations. Kingdon observed that if one would look closely at policy making one can distinguish between three streams. These are the 'policy stream', the 'problem stream' and the 'political stream'. According to Kingdon's findings, the policy stream 'consists of ideas which policy makers are working with and thinking about' (Kingdon, 1984). Secondly, there is the problem stream which 'consists of problems that policy makers feel that they must confront, whether or not they have policies or ideas for dealing with them' (Kingdon, 1984). Lastly, there is the political

stream which ‘‘consists of the flow of political events, which moves forward largely independently of policies and problems’’ (Kingdon, 1984). The policy stream, the problem stream and the political stream will be further elaborated on in the upcoming paragraphs. In his book, Kingdon uses the example of Britain’s privatization. Case studies regarding the privatization of Britain all raise the same question, namely that of how privatization became central to the politics of the 1980s, as it was hardly discussed during the 1960s (Kingdon, 1984). When applying Kingdon’s streams to the case of the British privatization, it becomes evident that privatization did not emerge on the political agenda until had entered the policy stream and the political stream. The emergence in the policy stream occurred as a result of ‘‘thinking in the Centre for Policy Studies, the Institute of Economic Affairs and elsewhere’’ (Kingdon, 1984). The emergence in the political stream occurred ‘‘following the Conservatives’ victory at the 1979 general election’’ (Kingdon, 1984). In his book, Kingdon emphasizes the importance of abstract ideas when determining the political agenda (Kingdon, 1984). An example can be found in the British privatization case, as the intent was to use privatization to solve the inefficiency and lack of competitiveness in the public sector, yet some believe that it came forth from a different problem which was the need of the government to raise money in order to maintain the public sector borrowing requirement (Kingdon, 1984). Furthermore, Kingdon emphasized the crucial role that the political ‘mood’ of a certain nation can play in a policy process, for which he uses the example of the United States in the 1970s when there was a public reaction against the ‘big American government’ (Kingdon, 1984). In his book, Kingdon dismisses both the rational-actor model and the incremental model by pointing out that the rational-actor model fails to conform to reality, and that most policy changes are not incremental in character but are rather more similar to quantum leaps (Kingdon, 1984).

The Multiple Streams Framework is a theoretical framework developed by John Kingdon, and built on the ‘‘garbage can model’’ presented by Cohen et al., (1972). The garbage can model argues the existence of problems, solutions and participants, how they exist separate from each other, and how the evolvement of these streams happens at different paces yet simultaneously (Cohen et al, 1972). Basically, the garbage can model can be seen as a place where ideas and solutions can be ‘dumped’ in a can along the way. Despite the fact that Cohen et al., (1972), argue the separate existence of problems, solutions and participants, the streams can come together at a certain point in the decision-making process. Kingdon argued that the point where these streams come together, or in his words ‘couple’, was at the choice opportunity policy

window (Kingdon, 2003). According to Cohen et al., (1972), this decision-making process will be less rational or organized and rather match an organized anarchy. The multi-dimensional garbage can model approach to policy processes was seen by Kingdon as a process reflecting the general concepts of organized anarchy, as factors such as ambiguity, competition, limited time and imperfect processes are not entirely rational nor linear (Kingdon, 2003). For the Multiple Streams Framework, Kingdon acknowledged the existence of non-state actors, as well as institutions and networks. As this study aims to look into the domestic factors leading to the annexation of Kashmir, this approach is most suitable as it allows the study of multiple actors. The study of multiple actors will allow an analysis of the context and the course of events leading up to the annexation, and context is a factor that Kingdon placed emphasis on in his theory (Kingdon, 1984). The Multiple Streams Framework considers the policymaking process unpredictable, complex and not part of the rationalist theories group (Zahariadis, 2016). The inability to predict the policymaking process and the complexity and irrationality that stem from it can be explained by external factors (Kingdon, 1984). Kingdon argued that external factors such as focus events or changes in the national mood can contribute to decision-making as well as agenda-setting (Kingdon, 1984). External factors can influence the entire idea-shaping of a policy, and as policy ideas are shaped and evolve along the process, external factors can have a large impact on the policymaking process. By use of the Multiple Streams Framework, one can also study why some policy ideas gain more attention than those who have been neglected.

As mentioned before in this section, the Multiple Streams Framework consists of three different streams which are the policy stream, the political stream and the problem stream (Kingdon, 1984). These streams flow independently, and only come together in the window of opportunity. This ‘coupling’ of streams, as Kingdon refers to it, occurs when policy entrepreneurs find the window of opportunity, making the policy entrepreneurs and the window of opportunity crucial in this theoretical framework (Kingdon, 1984). Each stream has different indicators, which will be elaborated on in the next chapter regarding the methodology of this thesis, and when those indicators have been met one can couple the streams and establish a window of opportunity. In order to provide a full theoretical background on the Multiple Streams Framework, the following paragraphs will conceptualize the elements and elaborate on the three streams and the window of opportunity.

3.1 Problem Stream

As mentioned before, the problem stream “consists of problems that policy makers feel that they must confront, whether or not they have policies or ideas for dealing with them” (Kingdon, 1984). So, the problem stream is where the problem and its perceptions are being defined. When defining problems, Howlet et al., (2015), defines it as conditions and issues that are relevant to the general public. Such problems often arise from failure by the government to achieve a certain ideal standard (Kingdon, 1984). For each stream, there are certain parameters that serve to attract the attention of the policymakers. The parameters for the problem stream are focusing events, feedback and indicators (Kingdon, 1984). The first parameter is focusing events, which according to Birkland (1998) is an event that is harmful or potentially harmful, as these events can be harmful to the community or part of a community. Furthermore, these focusing events could also lead to the mobilization of interest groups such as the (affected) public, the media and policy entrepreneurs (Birkland, 1998). These interest groups seek attention for problems and advocate for changes in current policies in order to combat what they consider failed policies. The focusing events are usually unforeseen crises that place pressure on policymakers to act to resolve the issue at hand (Howlet et al., 2015). The second parameter is feedback. Feedback provided on certain issues and conditions to existing policies can aid in detecting other issues and in resolving these issues. The third parameter is indicators. Indicators are being used to highlight a specific problem in a specific area. Therefore, indicators can determine the severity of a problem and the attention directed towards the problem. How significant a problem is, is dependent of how policymakers percept and define these problems (Kingdon, 1984). The perception of a problem is the key factor in the problem stream, as the parameters elaborated on above are prone to perception, but also to ideology. Thus, this makes the parameters not objective (Pralle, 2009). According to Pralle (2009), the focus of the debate should not be placed on the problem, but rather on how the government is responsible to act on this problem and how they will take up this responsibility. As mentioned before, ideology plays a role as well. This is because the involved actors will advocate for a cause according to their own ideology (Pralle, 2009). How a problem is set out determines the course of action for the involved actors. When a problem is framed as an actual problem, the involved actors can increase the attention for the issue and mobilize their interest groups to try convince the policymakers to take action (action as preferred by this interest group). The downside is that one actor could receive more attention, or would be able to divert the attention towards a different issue.

According to Knaggard (2015), the role of the media and the way in which they frame problems is underdeveloped in Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework, as is in her opinion the entire problem stream. A remarkability in Knaggard's (2015) publication is the 'problem broker'. Knaggard argues that a problem broker would be strategic actor in the problem stream, as the problem broker: "framing a condition as a public problem is done with the purpose of making policy makers accept it and, in the end, do something about it" (Knaggard, 2015, p.452). As mentioned before, Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework was first developed in 1984, and since then the media has undergone drastic changes. With the rise of television broadcasting, news channels that air continuously and the use of social media by the media, the media and other interest groups can easily reach a huge crowd and with that incredible attention for the issue at hand (Knaggard, 2015). This aids (or does the opposite depending on the topic) in framing a problem in a certain way. The methods, tools and sources used to conduct the problem stream will be elaborated on in the next chapter of this thesis, the methodology.

3.2 Policy Stream

As mentioned before, Kingdon (1984) summarizes what the policy stream is by stating that it "consists of ideas which policy makers are working with and thinking about" (Kingdon, 1984). In the policy stream, policy communities develop policy alternatives. Policy communities can be described as separates coming together such as interest groups, academics, researchers, civil servants and others who strive to uphold a policy in the public, consultants, experts and so forth (Cairney and Zahariadis, 2016). These policy communities come together to discuss the problems at hand, as well as potential problems, and try to determine what can be done to solve it. In other words, solutions are being sought in this stream. This is why this stream is also being referred to as the 'solutions stream' (Kingdon, 1984). Kingdon (1984) has set out different parameters for this stream as well. These parameters include value acceptability, technical feasibility, financial viability and public acceptance (Kingdon, 1984). Value acceptability entails the way in which actors find an alternative that matches with their values. Technical feasibility entails the feasibility of the implementation of a policy alternative. Financial viability is composed of the financial side of a policy alternative, meaning the establishment of the costs and benefits. Public acceptance is also a parameter, as the policy will experience the results of it. Once all parameters have been established, coupling with the window of opportunity is possible.

According to Pralle (2009), the policymakers and interest groups in the policy stream are too prone to the influence of political actors. The policy experts as mentioned before come across as hegemonic. Kingdon (1995) defines these policy experts as ‘hidden participants’ and stated that the hidden participants are the ones who are mostly responsible for the development of alternatives. This is because, as the name gives it away, they are experts in a certain policy field. So, when these experts advise on policy alternatives, the political system has a credible source for their to be proposed policy alternatives (Kingdon, 1995). The hidden participants can influence and shape the perception of a problem in the eyes of the involved actors, making them likely to be policy entrepreneurs. Policy entrepreneurs could be integrated into the visible and hidden participants such as think tank employees (Kingdon, 1995). The policy entrepreneurs are dedicated to finding solutions to problems and therefore play a pivotal role in both the agenda-setting and decision-making processes (Kingdon, 1995). According to Kingdon (1995), a policy entrepreneur should be persistent, have skills in the field of negotiation, should have established a political network and should be perceived as an expert in his or her field. The policy entrepreneurs are also the ones who will eventually couple the three streams, as they are the ones to recognize the window of opportunity and to detect and display whatever is needed to pursue the policy alternative and make use of that opportunity (Kingdon, 1995).

According to Mintrom and Norman (2009), the reason why persistence should be a key trait is because the coupling of the three streams is a difficult task and might require more than one try. Furthermore, seeking attention for a certain problem is not easy either and will require time and effort to gain this attention and keep the problem at the forefront (Mintrom and Norman, 2009). The reason why a political network is a requirement is because there should be someone with power to propose the policy alternative to and to promote it to. Another important skill should be problem recognition and problem definition (Mintrom and Norman, 2009). This is because the policy entrepreneurs are the ones who will frame and define a problem in a matter, and after propose an alternative that should avert the crisis. Thus, the problem definition, the proposal of the alternative and finding the right political connections is coupled by the policy entrepreneur (Mintrom and Norman, 2009). The policy entrepreneur must also recognize the window of opportunity and take action at the right time. The methods and policy entrepreneurs to study the policy stream will be further elaborated on in the next chapter of this thesis regarding the methodology used for this research.

3.3 Political Stream

Kingdon (1984) defines the problem stream of the stream that “consists of the flow of political events, which moves forward largely independently of policies and problems” (Kingdon, 1984). This stream revolves around the combination of governmental actors active in decision-making, whether elected or appointed, the national mood and the interest groups that are active on all sides (Hoefler, 2022). There comes a point in the process where a defined problem exists, when an opportunity emerges for action to be taken, as well as an acceptable and feasible solution (Hoefler, 2022). This is the point where the political will to do something exists and is referred to as a policy window. At this point, policy entrepreneurs couple a problem with a policy and they push for the majority of the decision-makers to support their problem statement with the votes of these decision-makers (Hoefler, 2022). When this occurs, new laws are being enacted. Unfortunately, it is very frequently the case that policy windows close without any action being taken. So, despite of new laws being enacted, once the policy window has been opened the system will move on to the next phase (Hoefler, 2022). What is important to remember when conducting the political stream and the Multiple Streams Framework in general is that policymaking is not a rational process and cannot be explained as a natural process to which clear goals have been set that can be achieved through customized solutions. The policymaking process is a random one that depends on framing and coupling of problems that have both been identified and defined, and general solutions that will appeal the majority of the decision-makers whenever the moment to take action arrives (Hoefler, 2022).

The parameters in this stream are the governmental turnovers, the national mood and political pressure groups (Kingdon, 1995). The national mood illustrates that a large number of people desire to see changes in policy, but as this parameter is abstract it is hard to create (Pralle, 2009). According to Knaggard (2015), national mood can be created by public gatherings, conducting public polls, political and public correspondence, elections and by the way the media depicts policy issues. There is also a downside to this, as a political actor could use a certain media outlet as a resource that only focuses on a single side of the coin, leading to this media outlet being a biased source of information (Zahariadis, 2016). However, political leaders and interest groups use the public opinion and try to shape it according to their own ideology, using fear and emotions. According to Zahariadis (2016): “leaders seek to influence a policy decision not only by taking advantage of the current national mood but also by framing the mood in a politically expedient way” (p.468). The conclusion of this point is that the

national mood does not always depend on a majority stance, but that it can also be driven by other forces. The other parameter are the political pressure groups, and as mentioned before, the political pressure groups can be placed under the concept of visible participants. These political pressure groups come from different policy communities, who are being referred to as hidden participants (Kingdon, 1995). What has been mentioned before as well is that there are usually experts participating among the visible and hidden participants, and as policymakers have limited knowledge of a topic and limited time to provide extensive details on a policy solution, government officials and policymakers delegate this task to civil servants who seek advice from the experts of these political pressure groups (Zahariadis, 2016: Kingdon, 1995). The political pressure groups play an important role in the political streams as they can set apart the preferences of the public and help to better understand what these preferences are (Pralle, 2009). Furthermore, the political pressure groups can push for their own political agenda as they can influence the perception of the policymakers and raise attention over certain policy issues and the selection of alternatives that can shape policymakers and push for what they find to be an acceptable and feasible solution (Pralle, 2009). The remaining parameter is governmental turnovers (Kingdon, 1995). As established before, the political stream is where the visible actors play a role. These visible actors can be political appointees, congressmen, government officials, elected officials and the political parties (Kingdon, 1995). As Kingdon uses the United States political system as an example, the same example will be continued to explain the impact elected officials can have. Elected officials, such as a President, gain public attention. These figures can have a significant impact on policy issues, as they can push for policy issues to get a more prominent place on the agenda and as they can select the alternative solutions (Kingdon, 1995). Pralle (2009), Kingdon (1995) and Zahariadis (2016) agree that administrative turnovers as well as legislative turnovers can have a large impact on policy issues. According to Kingdon (1995), that the slightest change of government or in the legislative department could be sufficient to have a policy change implemented.

Political conditions are often beyond one's control, yet certain situations are more amenable to becoming a policy window (Hoefler, 2022). Policy entrepreneurs and all advocating for policy changes should be skilled advocates, trained in negotiation, problem recognition and definition and in recognizing the most feasible and acceptable solution to the situation and in the eye of the public. When action is not undertaken at the point the policy window opens, there might

not come another policy window (Hoefler, 2022). The methods and sources that will be used to study the political stream will be elaborated on in the methodology chapter.

3.4 Window of Opportunity

In the Multiple Streams Framework, the window of opportunity is described as the moment for policy entrepreneurs (explained in paragraph 3.2) to push their policy alternatives through and to attract attention for different problems (Kingdon, 1995). This window of opportunity is a critical moment, and may not come back when action is not being undertaken (Kingdon, 1995). As mentioned before in the previous paragraph, paragraph 3.3, policy windows can open due to the course of events for any of the three streams. The window of opportunity is there to be used to present the significance of a policy change and the feasibility of alternatives (Kingdon, 1995). The window of opportunity is short, at times predictable and at times unpredictable, depending on the circumstances (Kingdon, 1995). Ambiguity is a key word for problem definition in the Multiple Streams Framework, and as established before, does it prevent the usefulness of rationality (Hoefler, 2022). There are multiple actors involved in the same situation, so goal maximization is off the table at all times. Yet, for the best possible outcome, use of the window of opportunity is vital.

3.5 Theoretical expectations

Kingdon's three streams provide different theoretical expectations which will be elaborated on below. These theoretical expectations, in other words the hypotheses to this thesis, will be analyzed and tested in the results chapter of this thesis (chapter 5). As mentioned before, the operationalization and methods of data collection will be elaborated on in the next chapter regarding the methodology of this research.

Expectation 1: The framing of the most recent period of unrest by the Indian media outlets has contributed to the decision to push the annexation of Kashmir through as they made it come across as justified. The Burhan Wani murder is believed to be the focusing event.

Expectation 2: The shift in the national mood of India after the recent period of unrest caused by the murder of Burhan Wani has contributed to the decision to push the annexation of Kashmir through.

Expectation 3: Politicized science by the Indian government was used that has contributed to the decision to push the annexation of Kashmir through.

4. Methodology

4.2 Justification of a single case study and operationalization

Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework is an adaptable framework, which makes it suitable to use as a tool to analyze a crisis such as the annexation of Kashmir by India. As the conceptualization of Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework has been done in the previous chapter regarding the theoretical framework, it is of essence to operationalize the streams as well. The following three subparagraphs will show this research will operationalize the three streams.

4.2.1 The problem stream

Through the problem stream, the focusing event that led to the annexation of Kashmir in 2019 will be identified. As elaborated on in the introductory chapter, since 2016, there has been much unrest in the area following the murder of soldier Burhan Wani (Behera, 2016). Through use of local Indian media outlets, the focusing event will be identified. As mentioned before in the theoretical framework, the focusing event will be identified by analyzing how the Indian media framed the murder of Burhan Wani and the riots that followed in the aftermath, starting in 2016. The way in which the Indian media such as Hindustan Times, The Economic Times and India Today have framed the annexation is crucial to understand in this study. The justification as to why these three media outlets have been chosen is because these media outlets are Indian and have spoken out about the Kashmir conflict and the circumstances of the Kashmiri before, and frankly, quite often over the years. In addition, BBC News' Indian department has been covering the Kashmir conflict rather extensively over the years and has provided rather unfiltered information regarding the situation.

According to Knaggard (2015), the problem framing in the problem stream has grown to be more important in the agenda-setting phase over the years due to the constantly changing media landscape. When the media uses certain factors that call upon a certain fear or emotion, this can frame the problem in such a manner that it suits a particular actor. When analyzing the selected media outlets, use will be made of indicators to determine what information is relevant and what is not (Toshkov, 2016). These indicators will look at threats (directly and indirectly) made by Indian government officials that point towards the decision to annex, narrative stories on the most recent period of unrest, certain literary indicators, so words, that point towards India's desire to fully have Kashmir as a part of the Republic. In the problem stream analysis,

these indicators will be looked at and evidence will be gathered that will help explain what pushed the Indian government to annex Kashmir from a domestic point of view and what the crisis is that pushed the annexation through.

4.2.2 The political stream

In order to conduct the political stream analysis, the parameters as elaborated on in the theoretical framework will be looked at and analyzed. As elaborated on in the theoretical framework, the parameter that is the national mood is hard to measure and hard to create. Yet, this parameter can be extremely important as it can directly steer policies into a particular direction (Knaggard, 2015). The national mood can be used by political leaders as well as political pressure groups, as elaborated on in the theoretical framework chapter, and can thus be steered into a direction that would benefit a particular actor. This is because ideology plays a significant role, and ideology is a factor dependent of the interests of a particular actor. This makes the national mood a significant factor to analyze, despite of the complexity to measure it (Knaggard, 2015). In order to analyze the national mood, this thesis will analyze official public statements made by Indian politicians regarding the Kashmir conflict and its annexation. The reason as to why statements by Indian politicians have been chosen to investigate the political stream is because the political stream should display the political opposition and political support of a public policy change. By study of the political mood when the annexation was announced, the political stream will allow to help answer what led to Modi's decision to annex Kashmir. Kingdon (1995) states that the slightest change in government could be sufficient enough for a change in policies, but President Modi's administration has been active since before 2016. Therefore, it is crucial to understand why an active administration 'suddenly' decided to withdraw Kashmir's special status and annex the region, especially since the installment of Kashmir's special status was done under the Indian government (Schofield, 2021). Furthermore, possible governmental turnovers will be sought using the same sources to determine if a governmental or administrative turnover has played a role. In doing so, this thesis strives to answer if these factors have played a role in pushing the annexation of Kashmir through.

4.2.3 The policy stream

The policy stream analysis will be conducted through the study of which policymakers are involved in dealing with crisis, what kind of solutions they offered and the ideology of these policymakers. Through study of the official documents drawn up by the United Nations

mission to Kashmir, named the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan, or UNMOGIP for short, that focus on proposed resolutions for the region between 2016 and 2019, and by study of newspaper articles from the same media outlets as mentioned in subparagraph 3.2.1 of this chapter. By study of these sources, this thesis strives to identify the impact of politicization on Kashmir and its annexation. Moreover, this analysis will also aid in identifying the policy entrepreneurs and a possible feasible policy alternative. The identification of the policy entrepreneur will go according to the traits Kingdon (1995) listed, which are: to be able to define, recognize and frame a problem, to be able to provide policy alternatives that are feasible, to be able to show persistency, to be able to make use of a political network and to be able to detect a window of opportunity and know when the right time is for action to be undertaken (Mintrom and Norman, 2009; Zahariadis, 2016).

As elaborated on in the theoretical framework, the problem stream (where the problem is being defined and framed), the policy stream (where an alternative policy can be proposed) and the political stream (where political connections can be made useful) are coupled by the policy entrepreneur (Kingdon, 1995). This coupling should happen at the right time, as the policy entrepreneur should be able to determine the right moment for action to be taken (Kingdon, 1995). Therefore, this thesis will also examine if the United Nations can be considered policy entrepreneurs given their close involvement in the Kashmir conflict since right after the conflict was initiated.

4.3 Methods of data collection

Each stream of Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework (1995) will have different sources to collect the different data required to answer the main research question of this thesis. However, the focus of this thesis lies on understanding the domestic factors that have led to the annexation of Kashmir in order to provide a public policy perspective on what pushes leaders to annex a territory. For this research, use will be made of primary and secondary data sources. Under primary data sources, one can place policy and government documents. Under secondary data sources, one can place media reports, news articles and academic literature.

4.4 Reliability, validity, limitations and threats of the case study

In order to establish the limitations of a case study, and in particular a single case study, information has been obtained from Toshkov's (2016) book on Research Design in Political Science. As a single case study has been selected, it is less plausible to generalize the findings

of this research to other cases of illegal annexation. However, as this thesis looks into the domestic factors that lead to an annexation from a public policy perspective, comparing findings can depend on the circumstances of a case. For this research, the data collection strategy has been made transparent which adds to the reliability of the findings (Toshkov, 2016).

A limitation to this study could be selection bias, as use will be made of several news outlets of which one could believe have been selected as they match the case study. Another limitation could be human bias, as the researcher is human and of Indian origin, which could imply subjectivity. Toshkov (2016) argues that these limitations cannot be entirely removed, but can be minimized. According to Thies (2002), bias could be minimized by providing context to the findings. Therefore, all streams will provide context to the findings and events in order to reduce these biases. A third limitation can be the study of a national mood, which is a concept that is hard to measure (Kingdon, 1995). The researcher of this thesis acknowledges the complexity, yet through use of multiple sources and thus evidence-based information, this limitation will be minimized as well (Thies, 2022). The societal relevance of this case lies in exploring what domestic factors push leaders to annex, as there is not much literature available on this particular perspective, as established in the literature review of this thesis. This thesis has a valid research design as it attempts to minimize bias by following Thies' (2002) arguments regarding the provision of context for each finding and event. By studying a gap in literature, this thesis has a lower external validity but will contribute to future research on annexations from this public policy perspective. Furthermore, the use of Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework to determine the course of events having led to an annexation might contribute as an example case study that could aid future research.

5. Analysis

The aim of this thesis is to provide a public policy perspective on illegal annexations, by studying the domestic factors that led the leaders of the Indian government to push the annexation of Kashmir through. Each subsection will examine one of the three streams according to the theoretical framework by John Kingdon, the Multiple Streams Framework. The first subsection will analyze the problem stream through use of Indian media outlets Hindustan Times, India Today, BBC News India and The Economic Times by paying attention to their narratives. The second subsection will analyze the political stream through use of statements made by the Indian government that can be found in news articles from media outlets as mentioned above. The third subsection will analyze the policy stream and will focus on the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan. The United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan, UNMOGIP for short, has been the United Nations' watchman at the Line of Control in Kashmir since January 1949 (UNMOGIP, 2022). Since 1951, when it was decided that the Military Observer Group should continue to monitor the Line of Control, this task force has been also been monitoring the ceasefire in the region. As the ceasefire was being monitored, the question is how the unrest could begin again. This section will also look into the role a possible policy entrepreneur could have played in the situation leading up to the illegal annexation of Kashmir back in 2019. In the end, the window of opportunity will be identified and elaborated on which concludes this analysis chapter. However, in order to better understand the analysis of the domestic events it is important to have empirical background on the Kashmir conflict. Therefore, this empirical background will be provided before continuing to the actual analysis.

The history of Kashmir is rich, and among the most well-known histories of the broader Indian subcontinent (Schofield, 2021). When translating the word Kashmir, it results in the meaning of "land desiccated from water". It is believed that Kashmir used to be an enormous lake, drained by the great saint of ancient India, Kashyap (Government of J&K, n.d.), which to some explains the great natural resources and natural beauty of the region (Schofield, 2021). Why this explanation is significant to this research will appear towards the end of this chapter. Records of the Kashmiri history date back until the era BC, but in order to keep this research parsimonious, Kashmiri history from the Dogra Rule onwards will be elaborated on as the roots of the Kashmir conflict can be found during that period. However, it is significant to note that in the early 1300s, Kashmir was an important center to Hinduism as well as Buddhism.

Between the 7th-14th centuries, Kashmir has seen a series of Hindu dynasties. It was in 1339 when Kashmir got its first Muslim Ruler, making the region part of the Mughal Empire from 1586 until 1751, and from 1751 until 1820 from the Afghan Durrani Empire (Schofield, 2021). There was a ruler in Kashmir many years ago who was known under the name of Ashoka Maurya, who was credited with the establishment of the city of Srinagar, a significantly larger city in the Kashmir region. Kashmir was included into his empire around 250 BC and Buddhism began to flourish, yet Hinduism remained the largest religion in the region. In 1339, the then Hindu ruler of Kashmir passed away and Muslim rule was established under Sultan Shamasuddin, whose dynasty ruled the Kashmir Valley for over 222 years (Government of J&K, n.d.). In 1819, Kashmir came under the rule of the Sikhs, as Punjabi Ranjit Singh's armies conquered Kashmir. This conquering was at first generally not labeled as negative, as the Kashmiri had suffered under the Afghan Durrani rule and were hopeful for a new era (Pradeep, 2019). Unfortunately, the Sikh rule was considered oppressive as the Sikh governors turned out to be harsh and strict so there was little to no improvement for the Kashmiri (Pradeep, 2019). Under the Sikh rule, Kashmir started to attract more tourists from Europe who noticed the harsh conditions the Kashmiri were subjected to. The poverty under the Muslim farmers was increasing and the tax rate imposed by the Sikh rulers was exorbitantly high. This caused farmers to divert to different areas such as Punjab to avoid the high taxes. Kashmir is divided into regions, of which one of the most well-known is the region Jammu and Kashmir. This is now union territory of India (Schofield, 2021).

The state of Jammu was ruled by the Sikh empire from 1770 onwards, and in 1808, the region was conquered in its entirety by Maharaja Ranjit Singh (Schofield, 2021). Maharaja is the Hindi word for ruler/prince/king (Personal Communication). In the house of the Sikh rulers, there was a man named Gulab Singh who worked his way up to becoming the Raja (prince) of Jammu in 1822 (Government of J&K, n.d.). Raja Gulab Singh and his general Zorawar Singh Kahluria conquered and subdued the regions of Rajouri and Kishtwar in 1821, the Suru Valley and Kargil in 1835, Ladakh between 1834-1840 and Baltistan in 1840 (Government of J&K, n.d.). By the (geo)strategic conquering of these regions, Raja Gulab Singh surrounded the entire Kashmir Valley. It was in 1845 when the first Anglo-Sikh War broke out and not long after followed the second Anglo-Sikh War. In 1848, the second Anglo-Sikh War took place after Maharaja Gulab Singh confronted the British. Contrary to what the British expected, Maharaja Gulab Singh did not turn against his new lords. In fact, the Treaty of Amritsar, which was established around the time of the first Anglo-Sikh War, allowed the British to demand

military support from the Sikhs, which the British did (Schofield, 2021). The Kashmir Valley became a possession of the Dogras, and the Kashmiri were unsatisfied with their rulers and criticized the British for it. This is because the British sold Kashmir and the Kashmiri felt overlooked (Schofield, 2021). An exert (translated from Hindi to English) from Indian newspaper The Imperial Gazetteer of India stated the following: ‘Two treaties were concluded. By the first the State of Lahore (i.e. West Punjab) handed over to the British, as equivalent for one crore indemnity, the hill countries between the rivers Beas and Indus; by the second the British made over to Gulab Singh for 75 lakhs all the hilly or mountainous country situated to the east of the Indus and the west of the Ravi i.e. the Vale of Kashmir’ (Imperial Gazetteer of India, 1908).

Between 1820 and 1858, the Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir (in that period named the Princely State of Kashmir and Jammu) was constituted after having been drafted by a treaty, and combined religions as well as regions and culture (Government of J&K, n.d.). In the east of the region one can find Ladakh, a region in which Buddhism was the largest religion and where a large number of Tibetans were housed. In the south of the region one can find Jammu, a region who had a rather mixed population of Hindus and Muslims, as well as Sikhs. The Kashmir Valley is the center of the region, largely populated and had the Islam as the largest religion although there was an influential Hindu minority (including the Kashmiri pandits, whose history will be elaborated on later in this chapter). The Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir also includes the Baltistan region, a region with a small population to the northeast, which had a similar population as that of Ladakh. Lastly, there was the Gilgit region which housed different streams of Muslims (Government of J&K, n.d.). After the First Indian War of Independence in 1857, Jammu and Kashmir came under the rule of the British Crown (Schofield, 2021). From this moment forward, Kashmir was ruled by the Maharajas of the Dogra dynasty. Kashmir was now a Dogra Maharaja ruled princely state under the British Crown (Behera, 2016). The British handled all sorts of administrative affairs such as defense, external affairs and communications. Around 1941, nearly 80% of the Kashmiri population was Muslim, 20% was Hindu and the remaining few percentages were divided over Sikhs and Buddhists (Behera, 2016). The Muslim majority was the largest religion in the region, yet it was the Hindus who dominated the area. The Muslims suffered under it by having to pay high taxes and by not getting the same opportunities as those of other religions (Schofield, 2021).

The British Crown ruled the Indian subcontinent until mid-1947. The British Crown had obtained around 562 princely states, of which Kashmir was the largest one of the most desirable due to its resources and geostrategic location (Schofield, 2021). On August 15, 1947, the two independent states who are now known as the Republic of India and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, were created as a result of the partition of British India (Behera, 2016). The Indian Independence Act of 1947 outlined the partition and the structure of the partition, which was according to the religious majority of a state, being either Hindu or Muslim. This entailed that e.g. when a region housed more Muslims than Hindus, the region would be labeled as Muslim and would be part of Pakistan. But, there was a third option which was to remain independent (Schofield, 2021). So, states could either accede to India or Pakistan on the basis of the religious majority in their state, or they could choose to remain independent. What was remarkable was that the division of the states according to the religious majority led to the dissolution of the Indian Crown (Schofield, 2021). The princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, ruled by Hindu Maharaja Hari Singh, had a larger Muslim population (Behera, 2016). Maharaja Hari Singh feared that the Muslims would not be happy with a decision to accede to India, and he also feared that Hindus, Sikhs and Buddhists would become targets if he decided to join Pakistan. Therefore, Maharaja Hari Singh decided to remain independent. However, neither India nor Pakistan could come to terms with that decision. On August 11, 1947, Maharaja Hari Singh dismissed his prime minister, Ram Chandra Kak, because he was an active advocate for Kashmiri independence (Behera, 2016). This action was considered as a move towards acceding to India and Pakistan decided that Kashmir could not become Indian territory and decided to use force if deemed necessary (Schofield, 2021).

In July 1947, Pakistan attempted in various ways to persuade Maharaja Hari Singh to let Kashmir join Pakistan and Pakistan promised various benefits in exchange. Still, Maharaja Hari Singh was leaning more towards acceding to India as he realized that remaining independent would become difficult (Schofield, 2021). India and Pakistan had both claimed the entirety of Jammu and Kashmir. After the partition, Kashmir was attacked by Pakistani tribesmen. This was done to persuade Maharaja Hari Singh to accept Pakistan's offers and join the Islamic Republic. However, India came with a counter offer, which was unlimited backup from Indian military forces if Maharaja Hari Singh would accede to India (Behera, 2016). Maharaja Hari Singh had signed the Instrument of Accession, in which was noted that Kashmir could not be forced to adhere to a constitution, not back then and not in the future (Behera, 2016). From 1947 until 1949, India and Pakistan fought the First War of Kashmir which ended

with a ceasefire instigated by the United Nations. This ceasefire was later named the Line of Control, which was formally finalized by the Shimla Agreement. The Shimla Agreement served as a peace treaty between India and Pakistan and laid down that Pakistan would govern the Pakistani controlled parts of the region, and so would India (Behera, 2016).

Until the annexation in 2019, India controlled around 55% of the area which included Jammu, the Kashmir Valley, the larger part of Ladakh and 70% of the Siachen Glacier (Behera, 2016). Pakistan controlled around 30% of the area which included Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan. What remains is around 15% of the area which covers the uninhabited Trans-Karakoram Tract and a part of the Demchok Sector, which are controlled by China (Behera, 2016). China has accepted its share and does not seek to control more. Therefore, the role of China in this conflict will not be further discussed in order to keep this research parsimonious. Kashmir has had several periods of unrest and ceasefire over the years. In the periods of unrest in the region, there have been many violations of human rights and humanitarian rights (Schofield, 2021).

Kashmir has had a special status under Article 370 of the Indian Constitution since 1954 (Schofield, 2021). This special status granted the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir the power to determine the extent to which the Indian constitution would apply to Kashmir. This means that the Assembly could also have chosen to implement the entire Indian constitution, yet because of the Kashmiri desire to be an independent state, the Assembly chose to implement only to a certain extent the Indian constitution (Schofield, 2021). There was also Article 35A, which provided special privileges to the Kashmiri. In August 2019, unrest began again in Kashmir. Thousands of additional Indian troops were deployed, schools and colleges were closed, tourists received orders to leave, all telephone and internet services got disconnected and the Kashmiri political leaders were placed under house arrest (BBC News, 2019). Article 370 allowed Kashmir a certain autonomy, as Kashmir was allowed its own constitution, its own flag and the freedom to create laws. Jammu and Kashmir was able to make its own rules regarding residency, ownership of property and the fundamental rights. This even included that Kashmir could ban Indians from buying property and settling in Kashmir (BBC News, 2019). In August 2019, with the invocation of Articles 350 and 35A, India annexed Kashmir and Kashmir became Indian territory despite of previous agreements dating back to the Instrument of Accession signed by Maharaja Hari Singh (BBC News, 2019).

5.1 The problem stream

The problem stream analysis will attempt to confirm or unconfirm *theoretical expectation 1* as outlined in the theoretical framework chapter. This theoretical expectation concerns the analysis of the suspected focus event, which is the murder of Burhan Wani in 2016 (Schofield, 2021). The timeframe of the problem stream lies between 2016 and 2019, after the annexation of Kashmir. 2016 is the year in which unrest began again after quite a period of rest, so by examining the events relating to the Kashmir conflict from year forward, the focusing event can be identified. The annexation itself occurred in August 2019, so by study of news articles of before and after August 2019, the expectation is that there will be a better understanding of the motivations (crisis) behind the annexation. Moreover, in this manner context will be provided and the reactions of the media outlets after the annexation will be explored. First, the events since 2016 as depicted in the media will be chronologically listed in order to identify the focusing event. Then, how the media depicts the annexation will be analyzed. In doing so, this analysis will test *theoretical expectation 1* and allow room to determine whether or not *theoretical expectation 1* can be confirmed.

5.1.1 The uprising of Kashmiri independence – a timeline of the unrest

The headline of BBC News India read ‘Kashmir clashes over militant Burhan Wani leave 30 dead’ on July 11, 2016. In this news article, the Indian BBC described one account of a violent clash between Kashmiri freedom fighters and Indian security forces in India-administered Kashmir that has led to the death of 30 civilians (BBC News, 2019). The BBC News (2019) article states that the violence in this period is ‘‘the worst violence seen in the region for years’’. At the time, around 800 extra troops were sent by India to help restore the order in the region. The BBC News article states that the situation has been considered a state of emergency with the uprising of armed Kashmiri Muslim forces fighting for independence or for a merger with Pakistan (BBC News, 2019). A BBC News article (2019) has provided the following timeline: in July 2016, the unrest began after the murder of Burhan Wani followed by riots which resulted in a curfew in most parts of India-administered Kashmir in August of 2016. From September 2016 until July 2017, the violent protests and outbursts continue over the murder of Burhan Wani and because of a fire exchange between India and Pakistan along the Line of Control in November 2016 (BBC News, 2019). In July 2017, Muslim militants attacked Hindu pilgrims which resulted in seven deaths and 16 injured. This was considered the worst attack against Hindus since 2000. The last event on the timeline is August 2019, when the Indian government

decided to invoke the special status of Jammu and Kashmir that gave the region special autonomy.

5.1.2 Identifying a focusing event

This section will identify a focusing event as according to Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework. As mentioned several times before, the most recent period of unrest started in 2016 after the murder of Burhan Wani (BBC News, 2019). Therefore, the most obvious focusing event would be his murder. On July 8, 2016, Commander Burhan Wani was murdered at the age of 21 during an insurgency operation in the south of Jammu and Kashmir (BBC News, 2019). Burhan Wani was a commander of the Islamic military organization Hizbul Mujahideen, which had been labeled as a terrorist group by the Indian government (BBC News, 2019). Burhan Wani was a well-known figure in Kashmir, as he was seen in the area in viral videos of which the content was related to promoting the Islam in Kashmir, but also to romanticizing the idea of militant groups. In doing so, Burhan Wani attracted many youngsters for the cause of Hizbul Mujahideen. Hizbul Mujahideen is described in the media as an Islamist militant group with the goal to separate Kashmir from India and have it merge with Pakistan (The Economic Times, 2019). However, the narrative quickly changed from 'simple' nationalism to radical jihadism. An example of how radical jihadism is Burhan Wani's idea to storm the Red Fort in Delhi under the flag of the Islam and mandate destruction, as he believed that India was incapable of housing a Muslim population (The Economic Times, 2019). In August 2015, the state government of Kashmir imposed a bounty of 1 million Indian rupees on Burhan Wani, which according to the exchange rate at the moment of conducting this thesis is 12.029,40 euros (Wise, n.d.). Around the same time, a video post showed up on social media in which Burhan Wani and other militants were seen with military arms urging people to arm themselves and fight against the state. The reason behind this message was that he was driven by his desire to destroy the Indian hand in Kashmir (The Economic Times, 2019). Burhan Wani was also suspected of having masterminded several attacks in 2016, including an attack on the resettlement colonies of the Kashmiri Pandits and an attack on the Indian security forces (The Economic Times, 2019). So, on July 8, 2016, Burhan Wani was killed, along with two other militants, during an insurgency operation in the south of Jammu and Kashmir by a special operations group sent by India. India claimed that Burhan Wani and the other militants came to the village of Kokernag to procure weapons. On July 30, 2019, The Economic Times released a news article with the headline 'J&K police to procure 4,000 weapon safety systems to curb gun-snatching incidents.' In this article by The Economic Times (2019) is described

how weapon-snatching has become of great concern to the Jammu and Kashmir police and how the state police had had lost as many as 1400 weapons and magazines to weapon-snatching incidents after Burhan Wani's death in 2016 (The Economic Times, 2019).

As Burhan Wani was considered a fighter for the independence of Kashmir, unrest erupted in the Kashmir Valley after his murder. Violent protests and riots broke out, killing around 100 civilians and injuring 15,000 civilians. These protests broke out between the Indian security forces that were present in the region and between the Kashmiri who were 'calling for independence' (The Economic Times, 2019). A five-months curfew was imposed at the time. However, in a news article dated August 9, 2019, The Economic Times has written that it was no longer a call for independence, thus separation from India and a merger with Pakistan, that was going through the Kashmir Valley (The Economic Times, 2019). Instead, it was "a call for a caliphate" (The Economic Times, 2019) as Pakistani administered Azad Kashmir was overwhelmed by jihadis. The Indian media depicts the 'anti-Modi' demonstrations as an act of ungratefulness for the opportunities the Kashmiri Muslims have gotten over the years in India (The Economic Times, 2019). Kashmiri Muslims were free to travel, study, work and further integrate into the Indian mainland and they benefited from it. The Economic Times (2019) describes this opinion as 'the popular opinion of India'. As a result of the Kashmiri uprising, Indians became impatient with Kashmiri politicians, protests, workers and other Kashmir-related terrorism as never before. The Economic Times (2019) literally stated the following: "It has not been sufficiently appreciated that Kashmir (and, by extension, Pakistan) as a conflict zone is now an all-India fixation". Frustration with the status quo in Kashmir had only grown since the killing of Burhan Wani (The Economic Times, 2019; BBC News, 2019). A news article by The Economic Times, dated August 8, 2019, reads the following: "An obvious upshot was -and is- a frustration with the status quo in Kashmir, and a fatigue with what is seen as the familiar cycle of victimhood and violence, blackmail and bluster. Politically, the ground was fertile for a break from the past and for a new initiative, however audacious. Perceptive to this mood, Prime Minister Modi and Home Minister Amit Shah saw their chance". At the bottom of the article one can find one significant line as to the just quoted exert from the news article, which is "the writer is former press secretary to the President of India" (The Economic Times, 2019).

The first identified trends when analyzing the possible focusing event are that the articles on The Economic Times largely reject the search terms 'Burhan Wani' and opinions on the curfew

and injuries that followed from the violent protests. Rather, The Economic Times' articles attempt to explain the positive sides to the Burhan Wani murder and the events following in its aftermath. As one of the news articles by The Economic Times literally stated that Prime Minister Modi was ready for a new initiative, no matter how audacious, and that this article was written by the former press secretary to the Indian president raises question marks. This means that the depiction of the Burhan Wani murder in India is just an action to keep the situation in Kashmir from escalating and to contain any form of Kashmiri independence or Pakistani nationalism in the region, as Kashmir was already 'part of India' (India Today, 2019: BBC News, 2019). The depiction is considered to be an exaggerated phenomenon of the justification of Indian nationalism, and when taking into account the last sentence of the The Economic Times article (2019), a justification for the annexation of Kashmir. Furthermore, another trend that has been detected is the more neutral stand from BBC News India as their news articles do not seem to have been filtered too much. What is noticeable when reading and comparing the BBC News news article to e.g. The Economic Times news article is that BBC News provides the stance of the involved parties, not just the Indian side. Moreover, the Indian news outlets depict the uprising as solely the fault of Kashmiri Muslims who are ungrateful to what India has offered the Kashmiri. After comparison of the articles used, it is believed that some actions have been dramatized or on the contrary, made more neutral.

As to *theoretical expectation 1*: The framing of the most recent period of unrest by the Indian media outlets has contributed to the decision to push the annexation of Kashmir through as they made it come across as justified. The Burhan Wani murder is believed to be the focusing event.

The expectation is most likely to be confirmed when looking at the analysis above of the depiction of the most recent period of unrest in the region. The Indian media outlets turned the attacks by Kashmiri Muslims into a justification to annex the region by using metaphors such as 'the need for political change' in the area in order to maintain the order (The Economic Times, 2019). It could be argued that this comes down to India wanting to be the superpower in the region, seeing Pakistan as its rival, according to Mearsheimer's offensive realism (Mearsheimer, 2001). By annexing Kashmir, India makes a powerful move in the battle against Pakistan. The changing media landscape has contributed to the acceptance of the annexation under Hindus, as it the events since 2016 have been depicted as acts of jihadism. So, a powerful counter-response that showcases Indian strength would only be right in the eyes of India.

5.2 The political stream

In order to identify a swift in the national mood, relevant exerts according to the indicators described in the methodology chapter will be analyzed. The selection of this source is based on the fact that statements made by Indian politicians depict the then actual status of a country as well as their future plans, from which you can derive the political status of an issue. Exerts from (Indian) news outlets that regard statements made by Indian politicians on the announcement of the annexation will be used. On August 5, 2019, the Indian Parliament voted in favor of the resolution that would revoke the special status of Kashmir (BBC News, 2019). This resolution was tabled by the Indian Home Minister Amit Shah and supported by a number of larger political parties, such as Prime Minister Modi's Bharatiya Janata Party (BBC News, 2019). The political stream raises the question of what the political mood was leading up to the policy change, the revocation of Article 370. Indian reactions, from politicians and otherwise, varied. First, those in favor will be discussed and thereafter those in opposition.

As mentioned before, Article 370 was established as a temporary provision when it was made definitive in October 1949. However, in April 2018, the Supreme Court of India decided that Article 370 had attained permanency as the state constituent assembly no longer existed. This sparked pro-separatist movements even more than before and fighting along the Line of Control continued, and could be seen as the moment the national mood swifed. The Indian government justified the annexation plans by saying that it would help Kashmir integrate better as integration was hindered due to Kashmir's autonomy. The Prime Minister's ruling party, Bharatiya Janata Party, had been pushing for an end to Kashmir's special status (EuroNews, 2019). Furthermore, the Indian government stated that the annexation would help end the violence and militancy in the region, referring to the most recent period of unrest that started in 2016 after the killing of Burhan Wani (BBC News, 2019). Former Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh stated that the revocation of Article 370 in itself was right. One of the leaders of the Indian National Congress, Deepender Singh, stated that the revocation of Article 370 is in the best interest of national integrity (The Hindu, 2019). The plan to annex Kashmir received support from the Chief Minister of Haryana, Congress politician Janardan Dwivedi, the Bahujan Samaj Party, the Chief Minister of Delhi and several Telugu parties. Peace preservation, right to education and right to information were put forward as reasons as to why the revocation would prove beneficial. This is because India's state programmes would apply to Kashmir as well, allowing Kashmiri's the access to it.

The other side of the story is that of the opposition. The comment of Nobel laureate Amartya Sen on the plan to annex was that he was not proud of it as an Indian, and that he considered the annexation and the arrest of the Kashmiri political leaders a classic colonial excuse, only put in place so the Indian government would not face any backlash from that side (NDTV, 2019). That the plan to annex Kashmir was considered a colonial and regressive act was agreed upon by others opposing it. Chief Minister of Rajasthan, Ashok Gehlot, condemned the arrest of Kashmiri political leaders Mehbooba Mufti and Omar Abdullah (Dawn, 2019). The Chief Minister of Punjab, Amarinder Singh, expressed that the annexation would set a dangerous precedent, as it shows that any state in the country can be reorganized like that by simply doing what the President wants (The Asian Age, 2019). Chief Minister Singh also placed a ban on any celebrations or protests relating to the annexation, and placed over 8000 Kashmiri students who were studying in Punjab under extra security (The Asian Age, 2019). Rahul Gandhi, member of the Indian Parliament, referred to the arrest as undemocratic and unconstitutional (The Asian Age, 2019). In New Delhi, hundreds of people protested against the Indian government and called the decision ‘the death of Indian democracy’ (Al Jazeera, 2019). They requested the Indian government to reconsider the decision. Days after the resolution was passed through, a delegation of opposition leaders made an attempt to travel to Jammu and Kashmir to witness the consequences of the resolution and to what extent these consequences went. Rahul Gandhi was one of the 12 members of the team that traveled to the region, but they were sent back when they reached Srinagar which is in the center of the Kashmir Valley (The Wire, 2019).

India’s main opposition party were the leaders of the Indian National Congress. The Indian National Congress filed two petitions under the label ‘urgent’ in the Supreme Court, one challenging the annexation itself, and one challenging the curfew and the complete blackout of all communications in the region. The Supreme Court did not consider the matter to be urgent and has placed the petitions under ‘normal proceedings’ (Daily News and Analysis, 2019). Two of the leaders of the Indian National Congress are Ghulam Nabi Azad and P Chidambaram, who spoke out against the revocation plans in the media. Azad said the following: ‘Jammu and Kashmir’s accession happened with India. There was a history behind it. To maintain that relationship between India and Kashmir, a lot of people have sacrificed their lives... civilians, leaders, workers. Many Indian Army personnel lost their lives. Mainstream political parties and Kashmiri population also dealt with terrorist attacks in the Valley. And now in one go, power-hungry BJP-led NDA government, to appease the vote-

banks, a state which is a border state, which is culturally, geographically, historically and politically different from us... They don't realize the gravity of the situation. We share a border with China. Kargil is also at stake. Pakistan shares its border with Jammu. We have a border with Pakistan Occupied Kashmir too. To then play with people, their lives, the state's unity and integrity and democracy is a betrayal to this country'' (The Quint, 2019). P Chidambaram expressed his disappointment in the Indian media by naming the decision to annex Kashmir a ''black day in the constitutional history of India'' (The Quint, 2019). He added that ''what the government has done was unprecedented. We anticipated that they will embark upon an adventure but even in our wildest dreams, we did not think that they will take such a catastrophic step. They have not simply gotten rid of Article 370, they have dismembered the state of Jammu and Kashmir by mischievously misinterpreting both Article 3 and 370... what they have done is a constitutional monstrosity. People of India must wake up and realize the danger of the example set by this government today'' (The Quint, 2019). Amongst the opposition are multiple left parties, such as Trinamool Congress and the Nationalist Congress Party who walked out of the conference room during the announcement (India Today, 2019).

5.2.1 Identifying a governmental turnover

A news article by media outlet BBC News India from 2016 reported that from April 4, 2016, onwards, Mehbooba Mufti would serve as the first female Chief Minister of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Mehbooba Mufti was a member of the Indian parliament before being sworn in as Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir (BBC News, 2019). When Mehbooba Mufti became Chief Minister, she pledged to discontinue the agenda of alliance as long as Delhi would not showcase actual efforts to peacebuilding (Jammu and Kashmir, 2016). Mehbooba Mufti promised to fight for Kashmiri independence, which was the promise that got her elected as first female Chief Minister according to Hindustan Times (Jammu and Kashmir, 2016). As a former member of Indian parliament who publicly expressed her goal to achieve independence for Kashmir, things could not go right for a long time when she was considered 'the strongest voice in Kashmir' (Hindustan Times, 2020). Her installment and political agenda were not appreciated by the Indian government who continued to attack Mehbooba Mufti through the Indian media outlets. Several headlines read the following: 'Mehbooba Mufti should go to Pakistan with family' (Business Standard, 2020), 'Mehbooba Mufti's DNA is defective' (Hindustan Times, 2021), 'Centre disempowering people of Kashmir: Mehbooba Mufti targets Modi govt' (India Today, 2021). On August 5, 2019, when India annexed Kashmir, Mehbooba Mufti was detained together with other former Chief Ministers Farooq Abdullah and Omar

Abdullah, as well as other regional leaders of Kashmir (Hindustan Times, 2020). Mehbooba Mufti was released after 14 months in detention in October 2020 (Hindustan Times, 2020). Due to the annexation, Mehbooba Mufti was the last Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir.

The installment and removal of Mehbooba Mufti were major governmental turnovers that added to the fire between India and the Kashmiri freedom fighters due to the fact that someone from the Indian parliament decided to stand up for those who desired either independence or a merger with Pakistan. One must not forget the centuries old conflict between Hindus and Muslims in the Kashmir region, and the changing religious background of the leaders in the area. Mehbooba Mufti's strong voice in the area posed a threat to the Modi government (Hindustan Times, 2020). The analysis of the political stream strived to explore whether a governmental turnover was applicable, and if yes, how it contributed to the annexation of Kashmir. As Mehbooba Mufti was considered a threat towards India's claim on Kashmir, the annexation and detainment of the former Chief Minister were considered the 'political changes the area needed in order to restore balance' (The Economic Times, 2019). A conclusion can be drawn that Mehbooba Mufti was considered a threat to India's claim on Kashmir, an issue that could only disappear when India would prove its power and fully takeover (thus, annex) Kashmir.

The political actors continued the same narrative as was depicted in the problem stream. The attitude of the Kashmiri towards India and the other way around, as well as that of India towards Pakistan and the other way around, is harmful to peacebuilding, human rights, and conflict resolution. The narrative of India remains the same over the four years, which is that Pakistan is to blame for the uprising of the Kashmiri since 2016, and that considerable efforts have been made by India to try and resolve the situations. These were efforts that were left unanswered by Pakistan, according to India (India Today, 2019). *Theoretical expectation 2* was formed as follows: The shift in the national mood of India after the recent period of unrest caused by the murder of Burhan Wani has contributed to the decision to push the annexation of Kashmir through. After analysis of the various news articles regarding the opinions of Indian politicians on the annexation plans, a careful conclusion can be drawn that India was announcing that they would undertake action 'to restore peace and order' in Kashmir and that it would be to benefit India's transformation plan (India Today, 2019).

5.3 The policy stream

The policy stream analysis will look into the policy alternatives that have been developed in policy communities. Any feasible and possible alternatives will be explored, as well as if politicized science had anything to do with the annexation of Kashmir. By study of the policy proposals drafted by the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan and the relation between these proposals and India's public statements regarding the situation, it could be determined if the United Nations could form a policy entrepreneur to the Kashmir conflict. This expectation stems from the following statement made by Minister Swaraj during the United Nations General Assembly speech of 2018: "I began by highlighting the unique and positive role of the UN: but I must add that step by slow step, the importance, influence, respect and value of this institution is beginning to ebb. It is time to wonder if we are wandering towards the fate of the League of Nations ... The League went into meltdown because it was unwilling to accept the need for reform. We must not make that mistake. The United Nations must accept that it needs fundamental reform ... reform must begin today; tomorrow could be too late. If the UN is ineffective, the whole concept of multilateralism will collapse" (Times of India, 2018). As the United Nations as was intensely involved in the Kashmir conflict from its start and has implemented policies before (UNMOGIP, 2022), the role of the United Nations as a policy entrepreneur will be analyzed through use of the recent findings by the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan. This policy stream analysis seeks to explore whether *theoretical expectation 3* can be confirmed.

5.3.1 The United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan

On July 5, 2017, The Observer report over 2016 was published. In this report, the UNMOGIP expresses its gratitude towards both India and Pakistan for their continued support to UNMOGIP, and emphasize the crucial role they play in carrying out the organization's mission (UNMOGIP, 2017). Furthermore, this same report states that it is just a part of the United Nations overseeing the Line of Control in Kashmir and has greatly contributed to peacekeeping in the region over the years. The policymakers involved are thus the Indian government, the Pakistani government and the United Nations through UNMOGIP. What the UNMOGIP does is observing the Line of Control in order to minimize cross-LoC incidents and reports back to the United Nations (UNMOGIP, 2017). Following the annexation of Kashmir by India in 2019, UNMOGIP released a statement that the Secretary-General of the United Nations proposes maximum restraint, calling upon the Shimla Agreement as a legal foundation (UNMOGIP, 2019). In the Shimla Agreement, it was noted that the final status of Jammu and Kashmir has

to be settled by peaceful means and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, the Secretary-General had called upon all parties to refrain from taking further actions that could affect the status of Jammu and Kashmir (UNMOGIP, 2019). Nevertheless, Kashmir's special status has still not been reinstated at the point of writing this thesis. Unfortunately, this is as much as the UNMOGIP under the United Nations has made public so far. No clarification of a peaceful conflict resolution, re-installment of Article 370 or the future of Kashmir at all, or a strategy by the United Nations to intervene in this conflict can be found. What is remarkable, is that not much action is being undertaken by the United Nations, which has been pointed out by both India and Pakistan in their General Assembly speeches as seen by India in 2018. In 2019, Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan added to this concern by ending his speech with the warning to the international world that if no changes are being made soon, another war between two nuclear armed nations would be inevitable (UNGA, 2019). Both nations have called out to the United Nations for help, but no clear peaceful resolution can be established, which is the reason why the conflict is still ongoing after 75 years and why India annexed Kashmir. It is one strategic move after another.

5.3.2 Politicized science in policy alternatives

The analysis of the UNMOGIP and the policymakers and their proposed alternatives involved has shown no signs of politicized science in policy alternatives, as no clear policy alternative has been established in the Kashmir conflict itself (Pralle, 2009). The conflict is yet again at a height where the risk of a war between two nuclear powers is very real, and involvement of the United Nations apart from observing is far to be found (Schofield, 2021). This does not confirm *theoretical expectation 3*, which is: Politicized science by the Indian government was used that has contributed to the decision to push the annexation of Kashmir through.

5.3.3 The Indian National Congress as policy entrepreneur

Political entrepreneurs could bring solutions to certain issues as they have the ability and power to make political changes (Kingdon, 1995). Kingdon (1995) described having a political network, being field experts, being able to recognize a window of opportunity and display the skills to make use of this window of opportunity and persistence as qualities a policy entrepreneur should possess. The Indian National Congress has, as one of the larger Indian political parties, the qualities of a policy entrepreneur. The Indian National Congress strives for progression, and has with its size a significant political network of field experts. Due to their ambition to make India progressive, the party has the ability and skills to insert public

(policy) changes. An example of this is the one used before, when the Indian National Congress filed two petitions at the Indian Supreme Court against the annexation of Kashmir on the basis of its illegality and regressive character (The Quint, 2019). This displays their persistence and that they are willing to bring about change for a cause.

5.4. Concluding remarks and the window of opportunity

This thesis started from the window of opportunity, which is the annexation of Kashmir by India in 2019, and worked its way back through the three streams of Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework to determine the domestic push factors that led the Indian government under Prime Minister Modi to annex the region. Kingdon's (1995) acknowledgement of context has proven to be effective, as each separate event can be understood better with the right context. This helps in establishing the relationship between the three streams and the window of opportunity. Based on the findings of this thesis, it can be concluded that the roots of the annexation of Kashmir lie in July 2016, when Burhan Wani was murdered. Every stream revolves back to 2016, as nationalism arose on both sides which caused continuous conflict between India, Pakistan and Kashmir (The Economic Times, 2019). The murder of Burhan Wani marked the start of a new phase of unrest which resulted in a historical peak when it comes to violence and unrest in the region. Radicalism took over, and the Indian media depicted the annexation as a justified response to Muslim radicalism. This radicalism is what created the window of opportunity for India to annex Kashmir: its annexation could be justified as a counter argument towards radicalism and an attempt to establish peace in the region. However, the annexation of Kashmir is illegal under international law, no matter any historical claim on the region. The findings of this research point out that the annexation was another strategical move in the Kashmir conflict, for which a peaceful resolution is not to be found in the near future (Schofield, 2021). A careful conclusion is that India feared that Muslim radicalism would limit India's power of the region, and India had to reply by eliminating this risk. Furthermore, the annexation of Kashmir only benefits the Indian economy as the Indians are now free to move and build a life in Kashmir. Prime Minister Modi saw his window of opportunity after the many attacks and protests, and the further consequences for India are still to be determined after nearly three years post-annexation.

The analysis of the problem stream has shown that the killing of Burhan Wani in 2016 was the focusing event that led to the long period of unrest that followed (BBC News, 2019). The increase in violence and the pro-separatist movements was named as a reason for the Indian

government to revoke Article 370 (BBC News, 2019). The attacks by Kashmiri Muslims were considered to be enough fuel to push the annexation through under ‘the need for a political change’ in order to maintain peace and stability in the region, as well as the 2018 Supreme Court ruling that Article 370 would become permanent (The Economic Times, 2019). According to the opposition as discussed in the political stream, also to maintain Indian superiority in the region. The analysis of the political stream has shown that the Modi administration has made use of the unrest in the region to ‘fully’ take over Kashmir, something India and Pakistan have been trying for 75 years. By using the need for political change, peace, stability and integration, Modi has made India into a hegemon and an international outlaw and ruled over the opposition under these ‘reasons’. The analysis of the policy stream has shown that Kashmir’s special status should have been reinstated according to the UNMOGIP’s 2019 report as the UN Secretary-General had called upon all involved parties to refrain from any actions that would further affect the status of Jammu and Kashmir (UNMOGIP, 2019). Instead of uniting Kashmir, India has caused an even greater division between India, Kashmir and Pakistan who stands by Kashmir’s autonomy in this matter. Given the fact that India and Pakistan are both nuclear powers and the annexation has only added fuel to the fire, a peaceful resolution for the Kashmir conflict is far from in sight.

Kingdon’s Multiple Streams Framework (1995) was useful in explaining the annexation, as it allows an elaborate study. By studying the three streams, three perspectives are being brought upon the issue which makes the explanation leading to the window of opportunity more accurate and more detailed. By studying the problem stream and identifying the focus event, a clear starting point for the research what led to the window of opportunity can be determined. In the case of Kashmir, the focusing event marked the beginning of yet another downwards spiral in the Kashmir conflict. By studying the political stream, the motivations behind the push-through of the annexation can be determined, and by studying the policy stream one can determine how other policymakers view the annexation and the reasoning behind it. The use of the Multiple Streams Framework has allowed for a thorough study of the domestic factors leading to the annexation of Kashmir.

6. Conclusion

The objective of this thesis was to explore the domestic factors that pushed the Indian government to annex Jammu and Kashmir, a princely state with great natural resources and a geostrategic location for trade routes given that it lies between Asia's two major economies: China and India (Behera, 2016). The research question of this thesis was: *What were the domestic push factors for the Indian government to illegally annex Kashmir?*

The goal of this thesis was to provide a public policy perspective on a recent annexation by creating a theoretical framework that would help to answer this research question. The theoretical framework for this thesis was based on John Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework. Kingdon (1995) uses three streams in his framework, which are the problem stream, the political stream and the policy stream. The policy stream also identified and analyzed a possible policy entrepreneur. Each stream was based on the following questions:

- What crisis pushed the Modi government to annex Kashmir?
- Why are domestic factors relevant in determining the window of opportunity?
- How was the annexation presented by the local media?
- Which policymakers were involved in dealing with the crisis?
- What kind of solutions to the annexation did these policymakers offer?
- How do these policymakers believe the situation should be resolved?
- What is the public opinion on the situation?
- Was there a swift in the national mood?

The goal of this research was to create a framework that would answer these questions and provide a better understanding of the domestic factors that led the Modi administration to annex Kashmir. This led to three theoretical expectations which this thesis confirmed or denied in the analysis chapter. The research design of this thesis was based on analysis of content provided by several media outlets as well as through documentation by the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan. Each stream used different sources, which have contributed to understanding the domestic push factors that led the Indian government to annex Kashmir in 2019.

The problem stream aimed to explore what the focusing event was and what the national mood was of India according to the different parameters as established by Kingdon (1995), and

through several indicators in order to select the most relevant content for the analyses. This applies for all three streams. For the problem stream, a number of India's largest media outlets were used to identify the focusing event and if there was a narrative by the Indian media that contributed to the annexation. In the political stream, a swift in national mood was analyzed, as well as a governmental turnover that could have contributed to the annexation. In the policy stream, policy alternatives were analyzed as well as a possible policy entrepreneur.

The focusing event turned out to be the murder of Commander Burhan Wani, who died in 2016 at the age of 21, by the hand of Indian armed security forces after he publicly stated his wish to destroy the Indian hand in Kashmir and radically promote the Islam which was supported by Pakistan (Schofield, 2021). His death marked the start of the most recent period of unrest in Kashmir, which resulted in continuous violent encounters and eventually in the need for the Indian government to prove its strength and limit the risk of Kashmir being taken away from the country. So, the decision to annex Kashmir and limit the risk of India's rival Pakistan taking full control of the region was made after the unrest did not end and reached a historical peak. The narratives provided by the media was that the annexation was a simple reply to jihadism as well as an attempt to maintain order and balance in the region. However, given the violence in the region since 2016 and the fact that India violated the terms set in the Instrument of Accession, as well as in the Shimla Agreement make this annexation unacceptable (Schofield, 2021). The Indian National Congress was considered as a policy entrepreneur, one that could propose an alternative policy to the Kashmir conflict, as that is the main conflict at hand, followed by the annexation. The Indian National Congress meets Kingdon's (1995) criteria of a policy entrepreneur, yet due to its current mandate it looks impossible for the United Nations to intervene in a direct manner other than just taking up an advisory/observatory role. This is despite of the fact that the Indian National Congress has been intensively involved in the Kashmir conflict from almost the beginning onwards. The United Nations Military Observatory Group (UNMOGIP) has been monitoring the Line of Control, which was also set by the United Nations, since 1949 under different names. However, their mandate has remained the same over the years which appoint them as an actor that could provide a solution. India and Pakistan do not seem to be able to find a peaceful resolution in the near future, and given the fact that both countries are nuclear powers and the tensions are running high in the area, an actual threat of a nuclear war in South Asia is present.

The limitations and opportunities of this case study have been elaborated on in the theoretical framework chapter of this thesis. To build upon that, recommendations will now be provided for future research into this topic. As the Kashmir conflict is one of the longest and most complex international disputes, finding policy alternatives and solutions is a difficult task.

In conclusion, the domestic factors that have contributed to the annexation of Kashmir by India under Prime Minister Modi, based on the findings of this thesis from the timeframe 2016-2019, are the murder of Burhan Wani, the rise of violent encounters between Indian security forces and Kashmiri civilians and freedom fighters, the rise in Muslim radicalism, the Kashmiri state leaders supporting the independence of Kashmir from India, and the risk of Pakistan attaining more power than India in Kashmir due to the rise in Muslims supporting independence from India (Schofield, 2021). The Kashmir conflict has its roots centuries ago, when the battle was between Hindus and Muslims. The partition of British India marked the start of the territorial dispute in academic literature and is still ongoing after 75 years. India and Pakistan have both expressed their claim on Kashmir and their goal to fully administer the region, and the still unresolved annexation is a strong sign that a peaceful resolution is nowhere to be found in the near future.

7. List of references

Al Jazeera (January 26, 2022). *'Systematic fear': How India battered freedom in Kashmir*. Retrieved from: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/1/26/india-kashmir-press-clud-journalism-sajad-gul-media>

Amnesty International (July 2, 2020). *Israel/OPT: 10 things you need to know about annexation*. Retrieved from: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/07/israelopt-10-things-you-need-to-know-about-annexation/>

BBC News (August 6, 2019). *Kashmir profile – timeline*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-south-asia-16069078>

BBC News (September 7, 2021). *Western Sahara profile*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-14115273>

BBC News (June 25, 2020). *Explainer: Israel, annexation and the West Bank*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-52756427>

Britannica (n.d.). *John Mearsheimer*. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Mearsheimer>

Cohen, M., March, J. & Olsen, J. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1–25.

Dawn (August 5, 2019). *Indian Punjab's CM slams revocation of Article 370 as totally unconstitutional*. Retrieved from: <https://www.dawn.com/news/1498246>

EuroNews (August 5, 2019). *Pakistan calls India's decision to scrap Kashmir's special status 'illegal'*. Retrieved from: <https://www.euronews.com/2019/08/05/india-s-kashmir-in-lockdown-as-region-fears-abolition-of-autonomous-status>

European Parliament (June 25, 2016). *Occupation/Annexation of a Territory: Respect for International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Consistent EU Policy*. Retrieved from: [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document/EXPO_STU\(2015\)534995](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document/EXPO_STU(2015)534995)

Global Policy Forum (n.d.). *Ethiopia and Eritrea*. Retrieved from: <https://archive.globalpolicy.org/security-council/index-of-countries-on-the-security-council-agenda/ethiopia-and-eritrea.html>

Gomm and Hammersly (2000). *Case Study Method*. Retrieved from: https://books.google.nl/books?hl=nl&lr=&id=zeXZSLHZAM0C&oi=fnd&pg=PA45&dq=single+case+study&ots=OcFQa36cet&sig=tJSbP4W9v2EHe-msfo-VUT3eDdY&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=single%20case%20study&f=false

Government of Jammu and Kashmir (n.d.). *History*. Retrieved from: <http://jkplanning.gov.in/history.html>

Imperial Gazetteer of India, volume 15 (1908). *Kashmir: History*. pp. 94–95

India Today (August 5, 2019). *Jammu and Kashmir Article 370 revoked: which political parties supported the bill, which opposed*. Retrieved from: <https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/jammu-and-kashmir-article-370-revoked-political-parties-support-oppose-1577561-2019-08-05>

Jammu and Kashmir (April 5, 2016). *Media reactions on J&K's new chief minister*. Retrieved from: <http://www.jammu-kashmir.com/insights/insight20160405.html>

Kingdon, J.W. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives and public policies*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

NDTV (August 19, 2019). *J&K Detentions: A Classical Colonial Excuse: Amartya Sen*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ndtv.com/video/news/left-right-centre/j-k-detentions-a-classic-colonial-excuse-amartya-sen-524819?rdr=1>

NDTV (May 13, 2022). *'Shameful: Tear Gas, Batons on March against Kashmiri Pandit's Killing'*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/overnight-protests-in-j-k-after-kashmiri-pandits-killing-2971540>

Policy Commons (n.d.). Occupation/Annexation of a Territory: Respect for International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights and Consistent EU Policy. Retrieved from: <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1336155/occupationannexation-of-a-territory/1943116/>

ReliefWeb (August 23, 2015). *Breaking the Media Blackout in Western Sahara*. Retrieved from: <https://reliefweb.int/report/western-sahara/breaking-media-blackout-western-sahara>

Rothwell, Donald; Kaye, Stuart; Akhtarkhavari, Afshin; Davis, Ruth (2014). *"6.6 Cession and Annexation"*. International Law: Cases and Materials with Australian Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. [ISBN 978-1-107-69119-3](#).

Simon, Sven (2014). *"Western Sahara". Self-Determination and Secession in International Law*. OUP Oxford. p. 262. [ISBN 978-0-19-100691-3](#).

Schweller, Randall L. (1994). "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In." *International Security* 19 (1): 72–107.

Teper, Y. (2016). *Official Russian identity discourse in light of the annexation of Crimea: national or imperial?*, *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 32:4, 378-396, DOI: [10.1080/1060586X.2015.1076959](https://doi.org/10.1080/1060586X.2015.1076959)

The Conversation (August 24, 2021). *India and Pakistan fought 3 wars over Kashmir: here's why international law falls short to solve this territorial dispute*. Retrieved from: <https://theconversation.com/india-and-pakistan-fought-3-wars-over-kashmir-heres-why-international-law-falls-short-to-solve-this-territorial-dispute-164672>

The Asian Age (August 5, 2019). *Article 370: Punjab bans any kind of celebrations or protests.*

Retrieved from:

<https://www.asianage.com/india/politics/050819/article-370-punjab-bans-any-kind-of-celebrations-or-protests.html>

The E-IR (May 29, 2020). *The Case of UN involvement in Jammu and Kashmir.* Retrieved from:

<https://www.e-ir.info/2020/05/29/the-case-of-un-involvement-in-jammu-and-kashmir/>

The Economic Times (July 30, 2019). *J&K police to procure 4000 weapon safety systems to curb gun-snatching incidents.* Retrieved from:

<https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/jk-police-to-procure-4000-weapon-safety-systems-to-curb-gun-snatching-incidents/articleshow/70450509.cms>

The Economic Times (September 23, 2017). *PM Narendra Modi hails Sushma Swaraj for her UN General Assembly speech.* Retrieved from:

<https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/pm-narendra-modi-hails-sushma-swaraj-for-her-un-general-assembly-speech/articleshow/60810807.cms?from=mdr>

The Quint (August 5, 2019). *Constitutional Monstrosity: Cong Against Article 370 Revocation.* Retrieved from:

<https://www.thequint.com/news/india/article-370-revoked-congress-leaders-react-jammu-and-kashmir#read-more>

Times of India (September 29, 2018). *Full text of Sushma Swaraj's speech at UN General Assembly.* Retrieved from:

<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/full-text-of-sushma-swarajs-statement-at-un-general-assembly/articleshow/66009354.cms>

United Nations (June 20, 2019). *Annexation is a flagrant violation of international law, says UN human rights expert.* Retrieved from:

<https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2019/06/annexation-flagrant-violation-international-law-says-un-human-rights-expert>

United Nations News (June 29, 2020). *Israel's illegal annexation plans for Palestine, 'disastrous' for wider Middle East – Bachelet*. Retrieved from: <https://news.un.org/en/story/2020/06/1067392>

United Nations (n.d.). *MINURSO fact sheet*. Retrieved from: <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/mission/minurso>

United Nations (n.d.) *United Nations Charter (full text)*. Retrieved from: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>

UNMOGIP (August 23, 2019). *Secretary-General calls for maximum restraint by parties in Jammu and Kashmir, citing Shimla Agreement*. Retrieved from: <https://unmogip.unmissions.org/secretary-general-calls-maximum-restraint-parties-jammu-and-kashmir-citing-simla-agreement-region's>

Waltz, K. N. (1990). Realist thought and neorealist theory.. *Journal of International Affairs*, 44(1), 21–37. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24357222>

Wise (n.d.). *Currency Converter*. Retrieved from: <https://wise.com/nl/currency-converter/inr-to-eur-rate>