

## **Deconstruction of Indian Narrative on Kashmir Dispute**

***Muhammad Faisal Aziz***

*PhD Scholar*

*Department of Political Science Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan*

[faisalazizmalik@hotmail.com](mailto:faisalazizmalik@hotmail.com) *Corresponding Author*

***Prof. Dr Syed Shahid Hussain Bukhari***

*Department of political science Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan.*

[Shahidbukhari@bzu.edu.pk](mailto:Shahidbukhari@bzu.edu.pk)

---

### **Abstract**

The changing story of India regarding Kashmir dispute can be analyzed by utilizing the hypothetical system of Jacques Derrida's deconstruction, which questions the twofold structures and progressive resistances seen in writings and talks by Indian diaspora. We look to comprehend the advancement and changing forms of the Indian account at the local, state, and global levels by dissecting the official comments and affirmations of imperative Indian authorities, such as the prime serve, outside serve, and resistance serve. By recommending that all writings contain irregularities and dangers that can be uncovered by means of cautious ponder, Derrida's deconstruction highlights the precariousness of meaning and the smoothness of dialect. Utilizing this hypothesis, we point to investigate the subtleties of the Indian talks on Kashmir and how it has changed over time in reaction to moving social, political, and geopolitical conditions.

***Key words:*** Indian Narrative, Deconstruction, Kashmir, Pakistan

---

## 1. Introduction

This research article has a brief analysis of Indian narrative by renowned Indian leaders and policy makers on Kashmir dispute; analysis has been critically evaluated by Derrida's deconstruction method. Researcher has divided this analysis in different eras, from the independence of both states India and Pakistan, until abrogation of Article 370 and 35A manifested. This Article also include Indian narrative, and analysis of discourse transformation and also has the United Nations records where India has progressively narrowed the place for Kashmiri political agency where they claim their independence from India, even Indian critics has presented their views on this dispute accordingly in multiple eras since independence, because this has been a flash point between Indian and Pakistan and influencing South Asian politics and over decades both states have been in war from 1948 till today (Tirpathi, et al, 2015).

With the help of Derrida's theory, this Article will investigate that how the ambiguity of language has been used purposefully in Indian narrative. The language has been a tool for India to neutralize the conflict internationally and claiming its sovereignty over Kashmir. In the recent world, especially when social media dominates the communication of the world, India needs to present its state view as a follower of human rights and international diplomatic orders. Unfortunately, this approach is inconsistent with its geo-politics in Kashmir. The analysis of discourse clearly reveals the paradox of narrative and military actions which repeatedly question the peace and stability in the region of South Asia mainly between Pakistan and India (Hallegua, 2024).

## 2. Literature Review

This situation of Kashmir issue did not let the Kashmiris solve their identity issue. Indian attitude and offensive approach led to a conventional war between India and Pakistan in

September 6, 1965 which later on put to another ceasefire on Sep 23, 1965. After such an offensive act of war, the issue became more and more internationalized and India was pressurized to settle down the issues said by Ganguly, Smetana, Abdullah & Karmazin (2019). While international pressure was still building on India and Pakistan both to resolve the issue, India started ingression into the East Pakistan which was geographical away from west Pakistan. This leads to hard to control and maintain the law and order which leads to insurgency and turmoil was created in 1971 general elections on the issue of power distribution between the political parties of East and West Pakistan. The state of India took advantage of the situation of the political tension and geographic distance and group Mukti Bahini which was a Bengali separatist movement supported by the India. This was coming into the lime when recently the Indian prime minister has admitted the support for separatist movement against Pakistan in 1971 play a major role in the creation of Bangladesh Pakistan armed forces were fighting on dual forums at that time moreover initial cheat and dishonesty of some government personnel led to their surrender. There could have been massive innocent civilian casualties if Pakistan army would choose to fight. East Pakistan separation was mainly a political defeat for Pakistan because in Kashmir India had witnessed the valor and strength of Pakistan army. Kashmir issue encouraged India to block all the ways of Pakistan's huge military success in 1965.

In 1972 the Shimla Agreement was signed between Pakistan and India to resolve Kashmir issue bilaterally Cohen (2013) finds this was the agreement which basically India wanted to be held in order to keep the issue bilateral. After Shimla Agreement, Kashmir question has been becoming past like again in the dark side of historical tragedy taken placed in east Pakistan and the carnation of Bangladesh 1971 was very big set back for Pakistan. When the Afghan war started again the issue of Kashmir went on back seat for Pakistan did not find its place to go for resolve. 1998 the situation even gets worse when India has tested it

nuclear tests in Pokhran and Pakistan left no choice to go for its tests on Chaghi, after that the Kargil war was about to brought India and Pakistan both on a full nuclear war which stopped by the international involvement. The 1999 Kargil Conflict brought India and Pakistan on the edge of nuclear war which was avoided by the international intervention. The struggle for independence did not stop by Indian military and its occupation and also the use of force on the people of Kashmir especially the youth of Kashmir did not stop here.

The abrogation of article 35A and 370 having five clauses revoked in 2019, 5 august were these; the first clause is about to act according the Indian constitution also has the power to constitute the Indian constitution further. The second clause about the Kashmiri authorities cannot and will not the exercise any constitutional power without making any agreement with the central government of India will decide this. The third clause were about that the Kashmiri will have a temporary agreement with the central government till elected assembly will be formed. The fourth clause were about that the assembly of

Kashmir will not allow to edit or repealed. The fifth and last clause were about that the people of Kashmir are restricted to defense and communication, and the foreign affairs. Ansari, Effendi & Haque (2019) stated about 35A will limit the none Kashmiri like the dual nationality is banned, the education with provision of jobs to residential of Kashmir people to buy or to get land in the territory of Kashmir and also revoke the special status to the people of Kashmir, it also stopped the non-Kashmiris to marring non Kashmiris with women's also

The present ruling party Bhartiya Janata party BJP is also known to break the rules and constitutional laws in context of Kashmir, by not taking any kind of international pressure or any kind of objection, and claiming domestically the a big win about abrogation of article 35A and 370 of constitution of India by calming the emergence of Kashmir in to the its

union territory by a presidential order by ram nath Kovind on 5 Aug 2019 has cancelled the special status with presidential order 1954 Minhas, Ahmad & Khan (2019) has explained that it was decide on time that according the UNO a plebiscite will be offered to the Kashmiris that will determine the right of their self-determination, it was also decided if the elected assembly will move regulation for all this process bout Jammu and Kashmir which is part of past and never ended journey is still going for Kashmiris.

Kapur (2005) predicted it as paradoxically, Indian political elite knew that if the constituent assembly existed, it cannot cancel the special status of Jammu and Kashmir, by doing this it was obvious the government of India want to change the demography and culture of Kashmir using the force in the two nation theory of Muhammad Ali Jinnah has predicted before but now the on 05 AUG 2019 the ruling party of India has proved the fascism and extremism ideology against Muslims and specially for the people of Kashmir. In 2018 the constitutional assembly was removed by India and did not even exist earlier. People, especially the youth of Kashmir, are behind bars with huriayt and special orders were taken to stop the protests against this decision taken by the BJP and the government of India.

### **3. Discussion**

“New Delhi’s “Integral-Part” claim silences alternative accounts of history of Kashmir and its legal status. The thread of narrative works so well that at international level it has created an opinion as a settled dispute. We lack a systematic map of how this narrative is constructed and where it cracks.” And this problem statement leads to the research questions such as; Which textual and visual practices does India use to spin together its Kashmir sovereignty narrative? And how does the deconstruction of the Indian narrative create a space for negotiation? And these questions give rise to the hypothesis that, “Once the performative layers of India’s Kashmir narrative are exposed, its apparent fixity turns

negotiable.” The Qualitative research methods has been applied in a manner that they were beneficial to get to know the perception reference and behavior in the context of Kashmir Dispute. This is an ahistorical with descriptive, evaluative and explanatory research in nature. What people think and perceive is a complex phenomenon to understand but qualitative method of conducting research makes the sense of particular action or phenomenon. The interpretative mode of this research demanded the acceptance of data which is secondary and primary to substantiate and augment different generalizations. The nature of the evidence in the form of data is secondary and primary in nature as the process of investigation is unfolded. The sources which have been Primary in nature are the structured interviews with the experts on Kashmir dispute. The data of secondary nature is accessible at the published sources likewise the books, periodicals, journals, reports, documents and online sources available.

Derrida's concept of deconstruction is a powerful expository instrument that uncovers the covered-up control relations in political writings that are as often as possible clouded by the exacting elucidation of dialect. Words like "majority rule government," "opportunity," and "fear mongering" are regularly utilized in political talk and displayed as either all around favorable or negative. Deconstruction, be that as it may, appears that these thoughts are bound with ideological assumptions that development specific motivation. Derrida's approach challenges these assumptions and welcomes us to think approximately how these concepts seem to be utilized to develop a few political motivations at the cost of others (Derrida, 1987). This strategy is particularly valuable for analyzing how the political talk in India on Kashmir has changed since the beginning.

The policies of Indian leadership such as the founder of India Mahatma Gandhi were much flexible and far from being dominant and nationalistic yet led to a vagueness regarding future of Kashmir. That vagueness opened a path for the future leadership who changed the

narrative in the coming years, the Kashmir policy turned into hard core nationalistic approach which focused only on Indian political and strategic gains. By the use of Derrida's deconstruction theory, we can analyse and critically observe the shift of narrative from Gandhi's comments to the recent leadership rhetoric and comprehend the manner in which this narrative has progressed over time. The below statement can be used as a fine example of soft Indian initial stance over Kashmir (khan & Cheema, 2015).

"The People of Kashmir should be asked whether they want to join Pakistan or India. Let them do as they want. The ruler is nothing. People are everything." (Speech at Prayer Meeting July 29, 1947)

When we apply Derrida's theory of deconstruction on this study, we can analyse the opposing meanings in one speech. For example, the use of language from Gandhi's discourse was visibly unstable. Especially his speech on the event of prayer meeting in 1947, completely supported the Kashmiri's right of self-determination and thoroughly defended the idea that people of Kashmir have complete right to choose the leader and their political future as per their own preferences. India raised the issue in the UN on 1 January 1948 by promising a plebiscite under United Nations supervision. And in 1954 with time his narrative shifted and Nehru declared in parliament that "We are no longer bound by UN resolutions". Where different scholars have criticized and argued that Nehru has a weak legality he did not mean for that he will go for a plebiscite under the UN authorities because he had no intention to Honor that in future, because this was considered as a tactical delay in this promise which was never going to be happened in future it was not a fulfillment of moral commitment which Nehru claimed, its unconditional to Kashmiri's he had decided with his cabinet already on 26th October 1954. On this specific turn in narrative renowned scholar Alastair Lamb notes that India used the UN to "buy time until Kashmir's integration was complete". Indian Council of World Affairs (ICWA) funded by government published

monographs (*Kashmir: The Northern Gate*, 1956) that described the state as “India’s geo-strategic helmet.” Alastair Lamb remarks these texts “read more like gazetteers of annexation than academic inquiry.” Nehru’s cabinet note (30 March 1951) a move Pakistani foreign secretary Abdul Sattar later called “a constitutional sleight-of-hand that buried the plebiscite” (Ganguly & Donnell, 2022).

By applying the theory of deconstruction on Nehru’s discourse and analyzing it through the lense of Derrida, we analyse that his subsequent actions showed juxta positioning of his statements. He repeatedly acknowledged that referendum in Kashmir would shape its future according to the choices of its native people. Democracy was the only target which was considered to be point of focus of showing the progress of a country. This pledge from Nehru’s speeches, aided as the foundation the people who were involved, both in India and away. But unfortunately, again, this upper layer of Nehru’s discourse has an under lying interpretation as per the deconstruction theory of Derrida. This pledge from Nehru was steadily deteriorated by the upcoming actions and political policies from Indian government. Derrida’s theory suggests that meanings of discourses are always conditioned and adjourned. On one hand, Nehru’s emphasize on the referendum in Kashmir was the focus of his statements but it was postponed to the extent that political environment changed in the region. These statements were quite far from the real military and political actions of Indian government (, B. A & Kanth, 2021). After the creation of Bangladesh in December 1971, India’s narrative on Kashmir dispute shifted decisively from multilateralism to bilateralism from forums of UN to bilateral bargaining tables. Right after the fall of Dhaka, India rejected any UN debate on Kashmir dispute making this agreement as its core policy. In response Pakistan’s foreign minister Abdul Sattar named 1971 victory to “impose a victor’s peace”. Alastair Lamb coined a term “diplomatic coup” in context of Kashmir dispute. India buried the UN dimension in dispute resolution most notably after



the 1972 Simla Agreement in which Indira Gandhi's linear claim "Kashmir will now be discussed only across the table with us" and the same victory that buried UN resolutions also exposed coercion by Indian military power, not consent. Bilateralism functioned as Derridean *pharmakon* healing India's image as magnanimous victor yet poisoning any residual space for Kashmiri self-determination. Since the bilateral table had only one chair, and every post-1971 "atoot ang" rally carried the trace of the never held referendum. It proved that the linear "*bilateral finality*" was always already haunted by the undated signature of 1947 (Hussain, 2021). After discourse transformation in Indian narrative critical author Arundhati Roy coined the term "reduced Kashmir to a domestic dispute" and this voice was from within India.

By utilizing Derrida's deconstruction hypothesis to Vajpayee's articulation, the control elements and fundamental inconsistencies in India's Kashmir story are uncovered. By surrounding the Kargil struggle as a resistance of "regional keenness," the cite legitimizes India's activities as a counterattack to animosity. Deconstruction uncovered, in any case, how this dialect diminishes the complexity of the Kashmir debate to a parallel restriction of assailant versus protector. The accentuation put by Vajpayee on "each inch of our domain" recommends a settled, verifiable sway that overlooks the debated status of the region and the goals of the Kashmiri individuals. The affirmation maintains India's hegemonic pose by emphasizing sway and obstructing animosity, smothering restricting perspectives and supporting a story of control and mastery (Jaswal, 2024).

By utilizing Jacques Derrida's deconstruction hypothesis, we may look at the fundamental presuppositions, irregularities, and control structures in Modi's discourse. Agreeing to Derrida's hypothesis, deconstruction involves looking at the progressive structures and double resistances display in writings and talks to give light on the generation, delay, and conceivable flimsiness of implications (Derrida, 1976). In his discourse, Modi draws a

sharp qualification between the "modern" framework that supplanted Article 370 and the "ancient" framework that existed some time recently it was revoked. The previous is related with "separatism, psychological warfare, favoritism, and large-scale debasement," agreeing to him, but the last mentioned is seen as a sign of "advancement and thriving." A conventional deconstructive objective is reflected in this development: a twofold that diminishes complicated reality to a basic good or bad choice.

According to Derrida's hypothesis of difference which holds that meaning is continuously delayed and that the presence of one idea suggests the nonappearance of another Modi's discourse as it were gives the "modern framework" meaning since it restricts the "ancient" framework (Derrida, 1982). The discourse overlooks Kashmir's changed political, social, and financial circumstances as well as the verifiable avocations for the sanctioning of Article 370. Or maybe, it makes a division that partners the disavowal of Article 370 with progression and its conservation with relapse. The nuances of Kashmiri personality and independence are ignored in this misrepresentation, which moreover downplays any advantageous impacts or objectives of Article 370, such as the defense of territorial political and social rights.

Terms like "fear mongering" and "separatism" that Modi utilized in his address grant the Kashmiri struggle a particular setting that fits with a bigger account of national security. Modi sets up a causal affiliation between Article 370 and these hindering events that are both generally and politically reductive whereas remaining influential in discourse. Agreeing to Derrida, this talk is based on logocentrism, in which certain terms are benefits ("improvement," "success"), whereas other expressions are marginalized or demonized ("separatism," "terrorism").

The center of Modi's contention for revoking Article 370 is the vow of "improvement and success". Deconstructive investigation uncovers that these expressions are loaded with ideological suspicions and are hence not unbiased. We are provoked to consider the definitions of "improvement" and "thriving" as well as the individuals who donate them by perusing Derrida's hypothesis. Advancement in war zones has truly habitually been utilized as a implies of setting up specialist and consolidating regions into the winning political and financial framework (Mangiarotti, 2023).

Modi proposes that thriving and advance were outlandish beneath Article 370, suggesting that the past independence was a boundary to self-determined development or maybe than a prerequisite. This position takes after what Derrida alludes to as "supernatural closure," in which one elucidation is fixed off from other conceivable translations. Hence, or maybe than being based on a pluralistic understanding of the needs and aspirations of the locale, the "modern time" that Modi talks of is predicated on a special vision of development that is in line with the objectives of the Indian state. The narrative's move from independence to advancement is portion of a bigger arrange to marginalize neighborhood histories and voices in favor of a centralized control structure (Bhatnagar & Chacko, 2020).

A basic deconstructive elucidation must take into account the voices of the Kashmiri individuals themselves, which are obviously missing from Modi's discourse. This is where Derrida's concept of quiet as a possibly significant space comes in convenient. The discourse depicts a single, perpetual story as the as it were reality by disregarding the Kashmiri perspective on Article 370 and its abrogation. This exclusion fits the definition of phallogocentrism, which Derrida might utilize to portray the magnification of a overwhelming voice at the cost of others' voices. The narrative's shortage of representation for Kashmiris is characteristic of a bigger propensity in Indian legislative issues, as the region's personality and aspirations are typified interior a patriot system. The numerous

Kashmiri characters and the reasonable political objectives that have verifiably impacted the region's relationship with India are basically eradicated by this prohibition (Hussain, & Kanjwal, 2024).

#### **4. Recommendations**

This study recommends a more inclusive and critical examination of Kashmir dispute by incorporating diverse historical, political and Kashmiri representatives. Future research should further analyze how state narratives are constructed through media, political speeches and visual discourse. Greater attention should also be given to alternative narratives to create space for dialogue, negotiation and peaceful conflict resolution.

#### **5. Conclusion**

With the passage of time, there has been a drastic change in the narrative of Kashmir dispute. This change of narrative has been occurred regionally and globally moreover in India and on global level as well. The focal point of these changes in the discourse dimensions of rhetoric and narrative revolves around some underlying changes in discourse which are due to the instabilities on the governmental levels and also strategical and political shifts of both the states (India and Pakistan. This study helps critically analyzing the Kashmir conflict by using Derrida's theory of deconstruction.

After the partition in 1947, India used to practice democracy or at least used to present its face of self-determination in front of the world. It used to use the rhetoric in which it was the focus that democracy if the cornerstone of their policy. In 1947, prime minister Nehru guaranteed the referendum to attain the idea of the will of the people of Kashmir. The purpose of the elections was to reach to a peaceful agreement according to the choice of Kashmiri people after it got separated from India in 1947. The purpose of doing so was to

achieve a global image of India in which it could be demonstrated that India is a country that always support international laws and orders even in its domestic issues. This is the same narrative that India has been vocal about several times in the UN. The interesting fact was that the conclusion of the referendum was not considered unchangeable, it was dependent on some geo-political and social factors.

The incident that changed the dynamics of this issue was the 1965 war of Pakistan and India. After this war, the narrative of India about the issue of Kashmir, shifted from that of self-determination to the integral and most important part of India. It was this time when the narrative of Kashmir was not just a small territorial disputed. It escalated to a vital part of India which could not be compromised and state security was dependent on it. The fire of sense of possession ignited more after the 1971 war and Shimla agreement afterwards. More pressure on rhetoric about Kashmir being an issue of national security and unity began to come out especially from the Indian leadership like Indira Gandhi. Such a change of narrative was the example of explosivity and flexibility of discourse from the view of deconstruction.

The changes in the narrative of Kashmir kept happening with time in the history of Pakistan and India. Another shift occurred after the Kargil War of 1999. This time is also important to mention as it was the time when India and Pakistan declared themselves as nuclear powers. Now the focus was on India's strategic expertise and hardcore nationalism. Moreover, the stance of the leadership of that time prime minister Vajpayee was also on the showcasing of the importance of Kashmir for India as an ultimate matter of the national identity. The prominence of such a narrative moved to territorial independence but side by side to the denial of attack, which was becoming highly militarily. In the deconstruction theory of Derrida, this point will be thoroughly discussed where vulnerability and strength face each other and construct the basis of forced nationalistic narrative.

Through these times, Kashmir's dispute was used by India as its symbol of hegemony and strength in the region. The purpose was to showcase its military strength and resilience to protect it from perceived international threats. India's response over the issue of Kashmir is altered during the time same as its narrative. It has been observed that India has perceived Kashmir as a pivotal point for its national security and tried to retreat this claim over and over again due to an underlying fear. As it can be seen that soon after announcing itself as a nuclear power, India has been in a performative stage militarily and strategically to ensure itself saved from external threats. China also share a hostile border with India, and in this way by protecting its claim over the Kashmir, India is sending a dual message to both of its hostile neighbors.

Another very important and recent change which occurred in India's policy about Kashmir was the removal of the composition of article 370 from its constitution. This was the only constitutional law that provided an autonomous status to Kashmir. The Indian leadership's claim was to attain economic, governmental and social benefits from this move. The focus of Indian leadership was on the progress and incorporation of the land of Kashmir with India. Prime minister Modi asserted that this move will help Kashmir to integrate and become advanced with the cooperation of Indian population merging in the land of Kashmir.

On the other hand. This narrative is completely one-sided. There seems to be loops in the story as per a deconstructive point of view. This change of policy from Indian leadership has been presented in the Lense of only positivity and progress in the region which thoroughly dismisses the idea of any kind of political unrest. The use of Derrida's deconstruction theory reveals that the use of specific terms such as development and modernization of Kashmir is mono-sided agenda which serves only India's political goals. Such a use of language confuses cultural, political and multi-layered historical identities in

Kashmir. This manufactured storyline completely avoids the scenarios of unrest and call for independence in Kashmir. It also suppressed the opposition which showed India's centralized propensities and so-called democracy.

India's internal politics and its narrative over Kashmir are completely different when it comes to the call for action. A policy narrative that has caused a significant rift between India and Pakistan is Indian presentation of the matter of Kashmir as 'domestic matter' on global forums. The reason for doing so is to halt any international intervention in the region. On the other hand, whenever it goes in favour of India, it uses international agreements for any internal settlement. This dual approach from Indian leadership shows that the story is fabricated and adopted as per their own strategic benefits.

## References

- [1] Ali, N. (2022). Kashmir under Modi's new India. *Taylan Kenar*, 313.
- [2] Balcerowicz, P., & Kuszewska, A. (2022). *Kashmir in India and Pakistan policies*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351063746>
- [3] Bhatnagar, S., & Chacko, P. (2020). Peacebuilding think tanks, Indian foreign policy and the Kashmir conflict. In *Rising powers and state transformation* (pp. 100–119). Routledge.
- [4] Bouzas, M. (2017). The Line of Control in Kashmir.
- [5] Bukhari, M., Muzammal, T., & Latif, M. I. (2021). Modi and Kashmir: Future prospects. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 74–82.
- [6] Constantin, S., & Carlà, A. (2025). The vicious circle of securitization processes in the former Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir. *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 10(1), ogae034. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jogss/ogae034>
- [7] Culler, J., & Derrida, J. (1987). What is deconstruction?
- [8] Derrida, J. (1976). The supplement of copula: Philosophy before linguistics. *The Georgia Review*, 30(3), 527–564.
- [9] Derrida, J. (1981). Semiology and grammatology.
- [10] Derrida, J. (2004). *Dissemination*. A&C Black.

- [11] Derrida, J. (2009). Unconditionality or sovereignty: The university at the frontiers of Europe. *Oxford Literary Review*, 31(2), 115–131.
- [12] Diakoulakis, C. (2012). *Jacques Derrida and the necessity of chance* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Sussex.
- [13] Ganguly, S., & O'Donnell, F. (Eds.). (2022). *Routledge handbook of the international relations of South Asia*. Routledge.
- [14] Hallegua, M. Z. (2024). *100 Desi stories series: Great Indian leaders: Inspiring stories from the lives of legendary leaders*. Jaico Publishing House.
- [15] Hussain, S. (2021). *Kashmir in the aftermath of partition*. Cambridge University Press.
- [16] Hussain, S., & Kanjwal, H. (2024). Integrating Kashmir: Modernity, development and sedimented narratives. *American Journal of Islam and Society*, 41(3–4), 85.
- [17] Jacob, H. (2011). Contours of the contemporary Kashmir conflict: Geopolitics, soft borders and India-Pakistan relations. *Eurasia Border Review*, 2(1), 17–34.
- [18] Jaswal, A. (2024). *The changing image of insurgency in Kashmir* (Doctoral dissertation). Staffordshire University.
- [19] Khan, K., & Cheema, P. I. (2017). Modi's Kashmir policy. *Strategic Studies*, 37(3), 1–21.
- [20] Kuszewska, A. (2022). The India-Pakistan conflict in Kashmir and human rights in the context of post-2019 political dynamics. *Asian Affairs*, 53(1), 198–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2022.2041288>
- [21] Landau, I. (1992). Early and later deconstruction in the writings of Jacques Derrida. *Cardozo Law Review*, 14, 1895.
- [22] Mangiarotti, E. (2023). Kashmir as frontier in Narendra Modi's ethno-nationalist idea of India. In *India's foreign policy and economic challenges: Friends, enemies and controversies* (pp. 135–148). Springer International Publishing.
- [23] Mangrio, N. (2012). A historical and political perspective of Kashmir issue. *The Dialogue*, 7(3), 255–264.
- [24] McLoughlin, S. (2023). *Kashmir through the lens of a feminist human security approach: A case study of half-widows* (Master's thesis).
- [25] Mir, B. A. (2025). Kashmiri Pandits: Socio-political dynamics, displacement, and pathways to return. *India Review*, 24(2), 131–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14736489.2025.2484911>



- [26] Pandow, B. A., & Kanth, I. (2021). Press freedom in an “open prison” called Kashmir. *Media Asia*, 48(4), 295–303.
- [27] Rauf, S., & Asif, M. H. (2021). Modi and Imran regime: Foreign policy on Kashmir dispute. *Human Nature Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(1), 12–22.
- [28] Shahid, A. B., & Sunawar, L. (2021). Indian politico-religious extremism and Kashmir: A study of Modi’s India. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs*, 4(2).
- [29] Sharma, M. R. (2023). Locating contemporary Indian federalism: Contextualising the trends of centralisation with changing dynamics. *South Asian Survey*, 30(1), 45–71.
- [30] Snedden, C. (2015). *Understanding Kashmir and Kashmiris*. Oxford University Press.
- [31] Tripathi, S., Prabhakar, G. P., & Liddle, J. (2015). Leadership insights from the top: Exploring leadership through the narratives of CEOs in India. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 11(3–4), 126–146.
- [32] Waqas, M., & Rehman, K. (2023). The Kashmir dispute: A strategic analysis. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 11(3), 17–23.