

## Kashmir Conflict: A French Perspective

Dr. Humaira Masood<sup>1</sup> Muhammad Muzaffar<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

*This France's prominent role in solving the global conflicts represents an interesting case study because in spite of its size (only 1% of the population of the world), it maintains the largest diplomatic network (152 embassies worldwide). With this diplomatic network France plays more significant role than its size in global affairs. Its representation in United Nations Peace Keeping Missions is ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> among the EU members and UNSC permanent members. This network also helps France to achieve its international ambitions means to play the role of a mediator among conflicting parties or show its existence as counter force in the global conflicts and issues. In Asia, an issue - Kashmir conflict - which poisoned South Asian politics almost last 70 years and very much compatible with all French global ambitions felt to be totally ignored by French policy makers. Although since the beginning, France acknowledged Kashmir as conflicting region between Pakistan and India yet it never expressed its independent opinion on the issue like it did on certain global conflicts i.e. Iraq/Syrian war, Bosnia-Serbia conflict or some issues linked to African regions. It supported all the UN efforts to solve the Kashmir conflict yet its support heavily influenced by Anglo-American opinion and its own regional financial interests. So, France, a representative of politics of grandeur, existing soul of European Union and decisive factor in global affairs never transformed French moral support to the right of Kashmiri people into a practical help in the form of mediation for the solution of the conflict. The research has been conducted to find out why, France, in spite of being a champion of human rights, self-determination and non-proliferation is so indifferent and unconcerned to the Kashmir conflict, the oldest unresolved issue of the modern age. The research concludes that French policy makers through the years could not make Kashmir conflict as a priority because they considers it asan Asian issue where Anglo-American interests lies and which non-solution could not damage French strategic or economic interests in the region.*

**Keywords:** Kashmir, Human Rights, Self-Determination, Non-Proliferation, Conflict

### French Global Role

The foreign policy was considered as the first line of defence for France. Hubert Vedrine, French foreign minister (1997-2002) was right to claim that the foreign policy was not a luxury for France but a necessity (Hubert & Bouabdallah, 2008). and that “necessity” is named among policy

---

<sup>1</sup> Chairperson, Department of Political Science GC Women University Sialkot

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science GC Women University Sialkot

makers 'the policy of grandeur' France plays a prominent role in solving the global conflicts and to get that objective, in spite of its size that is only 1% of the population of the world, it maintains the largest diplomatic network in the world (152 embassies worldwide) (Rosa, 2016). With this diplomatic network France plays more significant role than its size in global affairs. Its representation in United Nations Peace Keeping Missions is ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> among the EU members and UNSC permanent members (Delattre, 2017). This network also helps France to achieve its international ambitions means to play the role of a mediator among conflicting parties or show its existence as counter force in the global conflicts and issues (Nünlist, 2010).

French governments has to follow certain set principles while formulating its foreign policy, which are linked to the historical traditions, century's experiences and political thoughts of the philosophers. That's why French foreign policy is generally described as – state policy – preoccupied with the economic interests.<sup>3</sup>

French policy makers formulate their global strategy, keeping these constraints in mind and consequently, sometimes world witnessed them to act unusually against global trends like if they raised strong opposition of American policies in Vietnam during 1960s, they are also the torchbearer of anti-American policies in Iraq in 2003 in spite of having strong alliance commitment with them. Yet this French independence of opinion in foreign policy does not appear regarding its policies towards south Asian conflicts generally and Kashmir conflict particularly. Although this issue has poisoned South Asian politics almost last 70 years and very much compatible with all French global ambitions of mediating role between conflicting parties or supporting of human rights yet French policy makers ignored it one way or the other.

### **Kashmir Conflict**

British India administratively divided into two parts, Federal Units and Princely States. According to 3<sup>rd</sup> June plan, which was the symbol of end of British empire in India, these princely states which were either 568 or 572<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> State policy means, the ideas of state overrule the interest and ideas of private groups. Sur, Serge, "The Foreign Policy Makers in France: Elaboration and Public Debate," in *Pakistan and France: Security Perspectives and Worldviews* (Islamabad: Institute of Strategic Studies, 2008), 7.

<sup>4</sup> Ramusack reports that the *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, published in 1909, listed 693, including Nepal and the Shan states in Burma, but that the Report of the Indian States Committee of 1929 gave a total of 562. Of the latter, 327 were described as estates, *jagirs* (a type of estate) and 'others'. Estates numbering 108 rated inclusion in the imperial advisory body, the Chamber of Princes. Barbara Ramusack, "The Indian Princes

in number, were given three options for their future, among them only first two were considered to be viable,

- (a), join Indian state,
- (b), join Pakistani state,
- (c), remained independent.

Most of these princely states were geographically, surrounded by India so they had to adopt only first option, which they did – and more than 500 states joined India before 13 August 1947<sup>5</sup>(Sadasivan, 2005).

Unfortunately, those states that wished to join Pakistan, due to their geographical position, had to face Indian wrath – among them, Junagadh, Manawder, Hyderabad and Kashmir can be listed. Each state had to face different complication after their decision like Junagadh had Hindu population with Muslim ruler while Kashmir vice versa, Muslim population with Hindu ruler (Dogra Raja) (Ernst, 2007).

India managed to control all the pro-Pakistan states within a year through coercion<sup>6</sup> and invasion<sup>7</sup> except Kashmir which is still a bleeding wound for the region and symbol of international community's so-called

---

and Their States,” Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 2003, 2, <http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/434>.

<sup>5</sup>S. N. Sadasivan, *Political and Administrative Integration of Princely States* (Mittal Publications, 2005); Ian Copland, “The Princely States, the Muslim League, and the Partition of India in 1947,” *The International History Review* 13, no. 1 (1991): 38–69.

<sup>6</sup>The state of Junagadh declared on 15 August 1947 to accede with Pakistan. After cautious consideration and keeping, the careful balancing of all factors in mind Pakistani government – due to geographical restraint – hesitant to accept. However, after one-month delay, it accepted this accession proposal.<sup>6</sup> Indian government could not digest this ‘independent’ decision of the state and in November 1947 through a ‘military action’, India occupied Junagadh. Pakistan could not do anything to protect that newly joined area because any reaction against – this Indian aggression might be open a Pakistan India war. According to Lord Mountbatten, that war “might have been ended of Pakistan altogether. V.P. Menon, *The Story of the Integration of the Indian States*, Orient Longman (Calcutta, 1956), 130.

<sup>7</sup>Next Indian target was Hyderabad, the Nizam of Hyderabad wished to remain independent like India and Pakistan; British government also had given him the hope. Indian government declared that, ‘independent Hyderabad was a threat to Indian security. Therefore, to eliminate that – threat – first they created internal chaos in the state against the Nizam. Under the pretext of that chaos and *right of population to decide its future*, first Indian government interfered in state affairs and then on 13 September 1948, Indian army entered and occupied the state after four and a half days fighting. Sir Anthony Eden declared this Indian action as ‘an act of aggression’ in House of Commons on 15 September 1948 but practically nothing has done to undo it. “Dawn,” January 4, 1977.

justice and equality. First, Nizam of Hyderabad who wished to remain independent due to being economically strong enough and having access to sea faced Indian aggression at his decision; to not to join India submissively. The result was Indian military interference in Hyderabad with the plea that Hindu population wished to join India (Beverley, 2015) but when Muslim population of Kashmir wished to be the part of Pakistan, and then the prince right for accession was justifiable and acceptable. Unprepared and unequipped Pakistani army could not save those states from Indian 'forced' actions.

Situation in Kashmir was totally opposite to Junagadh and Hyderabad – here more than 80 percent population was Muslim while its ruler was Hindu. Now Indian government focused the '*rulers' right to decide the future of the state*. In Junagadh and Hyderabad, they pleaded the right of masses, which were Hindu, but in Kashmir, they stressed the right of ruler who was Hindu (Bose, 2005). On this argument, they deprived the unlucky state of Kashmir to decide its future until now.

The right of self –determination and Kashmir issue was popular subject for international community in 1950s and 1960s because India after failing to capture it forcefully took the issue to the United Nations in 1948 (Schofield, 2003). The issue has many aspects, political, religious, social, regional and international which complicate the solution with the passage of time.

- According to partition plan, Muslim majority areas geographically linked to emerging state of Pakistan should be the part of that state but Indian political intention with military actions kept the people of Kashmir in an indecisive and uncertain position even after more than seventy years has been passed.
- This indecisive and uncertain position of Kashmir poisoned the whole south Asian region and played an important role to strengthen the defence mechanism of the states and forced them to adopt security oriented policies. The defence expenditure of Pakistan and India and the wars, nuclear/missile race are the significant outcomes of that conflict.
- This unsettled issue of Kashmir is remained alive as a boundary conflict among the three neighbouring states (Pakistan, India, and China) which off and on poison their bilateral relation.
- The unjust attitude of the international community created a calamitous scenario for Kashmiris from last 70 years. Consequently the general mass

vs security forces scenes can be seen easily which resulted in the human right violations at large scale.

The crux of the Kashmir conflict is the demand of right of self – determination and its refusal which divided into many phases on historical bases; initial phase, Pakistani efforts, Kashmir stands for itself.

The indecisive Dogra Raja of Kashmir considered to be playing in Indian hands in 1947, in result against the Majority Muslim population wishes, he asked Indian government to help him to control internal chaos which was created due to his cruel and anti-Muslim policies. Indian involvement in the Kashmir issue caused first clash between India and Pakistan which forced Indian to use United Nations to strengthening its control in the valley for that they succeeded (Hussain, 2016). Next 15 years UN did nothing practically accept passing the resolutions and sending its commissions and presenting proposal which India always rejected?

In 1960s, Pakistan tried to take its support for Kashmiris at next level and wars between India and Pakistan was indirect efforts to solve the Kashmir issue which proved to be failing like UN efforts rather Pakistan has to lose its eastern wing during 1970 clash.

After the failure of UN and practical Pakistani effort, the people of Kashmir decided to raise the issue themselves, so a violent resistant movement has been started in the valley in 1990s which is still continued (Tucker, 2015).

### **French Official Stance on Kashmir**

The inclusion of Indian sub-continent into British Empire in 18<sup>th</sup> century turned this region an unattractive place for French policy makers in coming centuries. This attitude continued even after the emergence of two independent states and withdrawal of British in 1947.

This emergence of new states had given birth many unresolved conflicts: - political, economic and territorial, among them Kashmir conflict is still undecided and turned into nuclear flashpoint after 1998 (Wirsing, 2003) The involvement of United Nation in the Kashmir conflict and presence of France in UNSC as permanent member played an important role for concerned states to have favorable French opinion on the Kashmir conflict. The significance of Kashmir region forced the two states to view their friendships and enmities in the prism of this conflict. Consequently, any states' pro-Pakistan attitude regarding Kashmir conflict put it into anti-India or vice versa. France has to face the same attitude in its south Asian relations,

it has shown -a pro-Pakistan attitude in 20<sup>th</sup> century and pro- Indian attitude in 21<sup>st</sup> century regarding Kashmir conflict.

France, since the beginning, acknowledged Kashmir as conflicting region between Pakistan and India yet it never expressed its independent opinion on the issue, like it did on certain global conflicts i.e. Iraq war (2003), Bosnia-Serbia conflict (1995) or some African regional issues. It supported all the UN efforts to solve the Kashmir conflict through negotiations since the beginning yet its support heavily influenced by Anglo-American opinion and its own regional financial interests. The most important thing is it is strictly limited to the moral support.

France's consistence neutral stance on Kashmir conflict explained through the following points:- (Andra, 2011)

- "France supports the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan in its mission *to maintain the Line of Control*.
- France calls upon India and Pakistan *to increase regional cooperation* by complying with the Shimla Agreement while pursuing *a bilateral solution* to the conflict in Kashmir and participating in confidence-building measures such as prior warning of missile tests in order to prevent nuclear incidents.
- France urges calm over Kashmir, so it *favors dialogue between India and Pakistan*.
- France endorse the Nicholson Report adopted by the European Union Parliament and *advise Pakistan to initiate democratic reform, work to end the Kashmir conflict and address the humanitarian situation in Kashmir* (Choudhry , 2006)
- France remains committed to the Cooperation Agreement on Partnership and Development between the EU and Pakistan and affirms *its commitment to the development of the Pakistani economy through infrastructure building and technical support*."
- France, with Germany and Spain want *to remain neutral on the Kashmir conflict, interested to continue prosperous economic relationships with India and Pakistan*.
- On the other hand, France with the US, UK believes, Kashmir issue needs to be resolved for durable peace and stability in South Asia. While tending to be neutral, *France, US and UK acknowledge India as the regional superpower and a strategic market*.

This French approach explains clearly the priorities which France has regarding Kashmir conflict – UNO, EU, US cooperation, bilateral talks between the conflicting parties. The most important among them is that this

conflict would not hinder its regional economic relations either with Pakistan or India. Question arises, why France has adopted that strict neutrality and indifference to Kashmir conflict. The answer linked to French personal experiences regarding nationalist feeling of a lost territory and right of self-determination.

Through the years, France judged Kashmir issue in two different aspects of French history - Alcee Lorrain<sup>8</sup>, and Corsica<sup>9</sup> – first one influenced French opinion positively and second one negatively. Keeping their nationalistic struggle for the Alcee Lorrain region in mind, France always showed a sympathetic attitude towards Kashmiri's struggle and supported Pakistan's stance on issue till the beginning of 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Corsica, one of the 13 regions of France, has a gradual struggle for more autonomy if not independent, is another factor which plays although not significant role in French reluctance in involving the Kashmir conflict. France, also viewed Kashmir conflict through the right of self-determination, their own decolonization experience in early 20<sup>th</sup> century and limited struggle for autonomy in Corsican region in late 20<sup>th</sup> century. These internal issues coupled with economic interest forced France to restrict its practical participation and focus only to the moral support to the Kashmiri's.

### **French Presidents and Kashmir Conflict**

France showed a sympathetic and realistic approach towards Kashmir conflict in the early phase of the issue particularly when it was discussed in United Nations in early 1950s. Their approach based on the earlier French diplomatic observations from their ambassadors in Pakistan and India and cold war constraint. French diplomat in Pakistan informed its Government in May 1948 that with the passage of time Kashmir issue would become “a

---

<sup>8</sup> In 19<sup>th</sup> century, the region of Alsace Lorain<sup>8</sup> between Germany and France was as crucial as Kashmir between Pakistan and India in 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century. In 1870, when German armies first time broke the power hierarchy of France in European continent and defeated them to have their unity and full independence, they also occupied the region Alsace Lorain. This defeat and occupation raised anti-germen feelings with in France camouflaged in French nationalistic slogan. In the coming years, this regional conflict caused three wars in the short span of 65 years. Killing of millions taught both the states “wars do not solve the issue”. After the WWII, return of the Alsace Lorain region to France, division of Germany and making of the European Union solve this conflict between the two neighboring states.

<sup>9</sup> Corsica is a part of France from 1763 and famous French general Napoleon Bonaparte was a Corsican. Most of the French colonial administration belonged to Corsica. Klaas van Walraven, *The Yearning for Relief: A History of the Sawaba Movement in Niger* (BRILL, 2013), 259.

decisive factor, on the orientation of Pakistan foreign policy” (Pierre, 1951). It was further reported in 1950s that the separation of East Bengal which population had a different culture from the western part of country was more easily acceptable than the partition of Kashmir. (Pigeonneau , 1950). French ambassador in India in 1955 accused the Indian Prime Minister Jawaher lal Nehru (1947-1964) for declining any international solution with the hope that the worsening of political and economic situation in Pakistan transformed his actions in Kashmir *a fait accompli* because he had no illusion that the physical constitution of Kashmir and majority Muslim population and its natural communication links made it a part of northern region of Pakistan.<sup>10</sup>

These diplomatic observations helped French policy makers to formulate their policy towards Kashmir conflict. Consequently, the world had witnessed that the France which had a severe reluctant attitude for the right of self-determination to its colonies, was showing a sympathetic attitude towards Kashmir conflict in United Nation during that era.

In 1948, during the UNSC’ proceeding, French UN Representative Mr. Guy de la Tournelle proposed, the withdrawal of foreign troops from the state of Kashmir, the return of the inhabitants, irrespective of their race either Hindu or Muslim to their places of origin in the state, The establishment of a free administration, which would not exert pressure on the population and would absolute guarantee of a free vote (Hasan , 1960) This pro-Pakistan, French attitude towards Kashmir conflict was continued and later, during the 241<sup>st</sup> meeting of the UNSC, its representative supported plebiscite and asked for an interim authority composed of the major stake holders in Kashmir (chief of the National Conference and of the Muslim Conference). According to French approach, a satisfactory plebiscite could be held only then, when there was an authority and force to ensure it (UNO, 1947).

This early sympathetic approach of France affected due to Pakistan’s warm support to those independent movements and warm welcome to their leaders in Pakistan who were struggling for their independence against French colonial rule on the Mediterranean belt (Algeria, Morocco, and Tunis). The official support of Pakistan to these movements was created a wave of uneasiness in French embassy in Karachi and French government had adopted a reactive policy. It linked the presence of Kashmir issue in the UN with Algerian support and conveyed its concerns to Pakistan and asked to be “considerate about Paris sensitivities” (Boquérat, n.d.) France also reminded Pakistan about its responsibilities as a SEATO ally, its economic

---

<sup>10</sup> Dispatch from the ambassador of France in India, Stanislas Ostrorog, to the MFA, 6 July 1955. NUOI, S 50-2-A-14, vol.239. Dr. Gilles Boquérat, “France-Pakistan Relations through the Quai D’ Orsay Archives,” 43.

requirements and diplomatic need for the Kashmir issue. According to French ambassador, Pakistani government should first think about Kashmir rather than supporting the Algeria (freedom fighters).<sup>11</sup> That's the crux of the French policy towards Kashmir conflict.

Kashmir remained to be regional issue - a legacy of the British colonial and post-colonial past for France. So France put that conflict there on its foreign policy priority list where French moral support for Kashmir issue was linked to its bilateral relations with the conflicting parties' means India and Pakistan. France always propped up Anglo-American resolution which supported the plebiscite<sup>12</sup> because it believed that lack of solution of the conflict created an arm race in the region which not only effect the weak economies of both the states but they also become the pawns in the hands of major military powers of the times.<sup>13</sup> Later, time proved this French assumption.

After 1950s heated debates in UN on Kashmir issue when more important geopolitical issues between cold war powers (US, USSR) took the floor of UN, Kashmir issue was left only to show concern to get either Indian favour or Pakistani support. For France it was linked to the Gaullism or grandeur policy of General Charles de Gaul, these are the most popular terms which commonly used to explain French foreign policy during 1960s. The end of colonial wars and presence of Charles de Gaulle as president in France reinvigorated French foreign policy style. Kashmir issue for France now linked to regional financial interest so when French Prime Minister George Pompidou visited South Asia to check the possibilities of French arms sale in the region, it found Pakistan more important as arms buyer than India which was already linked to the soviet bloc for arms. Keeping south Asian political complexities and French business interest in mind French prime minister expressed French stance regarding Kashmir issue. In Pakistan, he told reporters that Kashmir dispute was endangering the peace and security of the region, and an "appropriate and equitable solution" of dispute must be found (Sayyid,, 1998). He also asserted that France supported the right of self-

---

<sup>11</sup> Telegram from Bernard Dufournier, to MFA, 15 December 1959, Duroselle, Vaïsse, *Documents Diplomatiques Français*, 729. in Foreign ministry under the, series Asie 1956-1967, sous-series Pakistan, E.27-23-4, vol.1131, Dr. Gilles Boquérat, "France-Pakistan Relations Through the Quai D' Orsay Archives," 41.

<sup>12</sup> Resolution was adopted at the 593th meeting by 8 vote, 3 absentees (India, USSR, and Yugoslavia) Resolution 91 (1951), "India-Pakistan question: Document No. S/2017/Rev. 1," March 30, 1951. *Yearbook of the United Nations 1951* (New York, Etats-Unis: United Nations, Department of Public Information, 1952), 343.

<sup>13</sup> "Resolution 122 (1957) 765th Meeting [S3779]," January 24, 1957, <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/131/29/IMG/NR013129.pdf?OpenElement>.

determination of Kashmiri people through referendum or otherwise.<sup>14</sup> Even in joint communiqué issued at the conclusion of his visit of Pakistan, both the states recognized the importance of the Kashmir issue, “as a cause of tension in the region and expressed hope for an equitable solution” (Sayyid, 1998). During his stay in India, he talked about the “peaceful and fair solution” with the direct negotiation between the two states, India and Pakistan. This verbal support further strengthen when during the visit of Pakistani Presidents Ayub Khan, French President, Charles De Gaulle (1958-1969) reiterated that his country would actively support Pakistan’s efforts to solve peacefully “*the grave affairs of Kashmir*”, and would help the countries of the region to end the South Asian conflict that was *going on due to the intervention from abroad*. He also assured Pakistani’s President Ayub Khan that France’s aims in this troubled world were equilibrium in progress and peace. His country would extend to Pakistan friendly help in its effort to remain alive and intact in the region” (Charles & François 1973).

France reasserted its support for the peaceful settlement of Kashmir issue. The French President announced, “*we see your country in practising externally a policy responding to essentials ... while waiting until the Kashmir problem posed between Islamabad and New Delhi, can be the object of a peaceful agreement one day, the hostilities stopped on this land, confirming with agreement you subscribed to at Tashkent*”.<sup>15</sup>

This French spirit of peaceful solution was again asserted on 20th October 1967 at the end of the visit, when in a joint communiqué both the Presidents (Ayub and de Gaulle), noted, “...the settlement of the Kashmir issue has not made any headway since the Tashkent Agreement. Consequently, they believe that efforts should continue to make a peaceful and equitable solution of the dispute. The two leaders had stressed earlier in the communiqué “... peace could not be ensured except by respecting the right of peoples to self-determination, respect for international commitments and independence of states and non-intervention in their internal affairs (Sayyid, 1998).

This French interest for the solution of Kashmir conflict through bilateral negotiations continued in coming decades in theory yet it never materialized in practical shape like offer of mediation between the two states or used its presence as UNSC permanent member. It always supported and shown its interest a bilateral solution at regional level.

---

<sup>14</sup> In New Delhi, he talked about the « peaceful and fair solution » with the direct negotiation between the two states, India and Pakistan.

<sup>15</sup>“Le Marechal Ayub Khan Termine S Visite A Paris,” *Le Monde*, Décembre 1, 1966.

The end of the cold war shuffled global positions and states needed to redraw their policies. France focused south Asia again to grab the benefits from the emerging economic powers (India and China), so its president, Francois Mitterrand visited the region in 1990. The resistant movement in Kashmir valley was at full bloom against the Indian atrocities at that time. Ignoring the fiery situation in Kashmir, French president Francois Mitterrand reiterated old French stance and emphasized the need for a peaceful solution of Kashmir problem and promotion of mutual cooperation between the two conflicting parties, when he was in Pakistan yet the issue was not even mentioned during Indian visit. In February 1990, the French President, Francois Mitterrand, categorically said that “his country fully supports the Kashmir’s” (Hussain 2016).

The decade between post-cold war and war on terror was having a complex global situation, the rising power of non-state actors; terrorism and nuclear proliferation were pressure points of western powers to impose their will on other states. Unfortunately, Kashmir conflict linked to all these three in the last decade of 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Indian Government tried to brand the resistant movement in Kashmir as terrorism to cover its human right violations in this disputed territory. While the nuclear blast of Pakistan and India in 1998 turned the Kashmir a nuclear conflict. Later the Kargil conflict<sup>16</sup> between India and Pakistan on Kashmir awakened the world leaders about the severity of the issue. Consequently, American president Clinton guaranteed for the solution

---

<sup>16</sup>Unresolved issue of Kashmir again caused a proxy war between Pakistan and India, this time the field was Kargil. According to Pakistani claim, the intruders were the *Kashmiri mujahidin* who seized the high ground of Kargil-Dras sector. India accused Pakistan for aggression and violation of Simla agreement. Indian attitude was “no-negotiation” and “demanding”<sup>16</sup> of withdrawal before the negotiation. The fear of general war which could turn into nuclear war between the old rivals raised concern at international level. Western and American approach was quite negative towards Pakistan and they gave admittance to Indian version of the story and pressurized Pakistan to withdraw its forces. G8, without naming Pakistan announced, any military action to change the status of LOC was irresponsible. They demanded the immediate withdrawal and restoration of LOC. French representative Liake Henekien supported the G8 demand and asked Pakistan to take back armed resistance from Kargil and to respect Simla Agreement.<sup>16</sup>Only OIC backed Pakistan and asked to solve the issue with dialogue. For detail of Kargil issue see, Hassan Abbas, *Pakistan’s Drift Into Extremism: Allah, The Army, And America’s War On Terror* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2005), 170–75. Abdul Sattar, *Pakistan’s Foreign Policy: A Concise History*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 256–59. For an American perspective of the view see Ashley J. Tellis et al., *Limited Conflicts Under the Nuclear Umbrella: Indian and Pakistani Lessons from the Kargil Crisis* (Rand Corporation, 2001). For a firsthand knowledge read Foreign Minister of that time description in Sartaz Aziz, *Between Dreams and Realities: Some Milestones in Pakistan’s History* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2010), 274–84.

through his personal involvement, yet practically done nothing. India blamed French government for having a pro-Pakistan attitude during Kargal issues due to the provision of Mirage III aircraft which was later delayed due to Indian and French newspapers protest yet French foreign ministry insisted, France was not imposing embargo against Pakistan or against neighbouring India, with which it is at odds in the crisis (Arpi, 2005).

Indecisive attitude of international community and the continuity of the issue Kashmir is begun to bleeding and bleeding violently. France which claimed to be the torch bearer of human right whose president François Hollande, announce in UNGA session *"France wants to set an example, not to teach others a lesson but because it's our history, our message. Setting an example in promoting fundamental freedoms is our battle and a matter of honour for us."*<sup>17</sup>

Ignored the violation of human rights in Kashmir region when Indian military forces even began to use pallet guns to keep the people silence.

### Conclusion

French approach towards the different global issues depends upon their historical traditions and national cum financial interest linked to that region. To be the second colonial power of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, France mainly linked to East Asia and African region which considered their sphere of influence particularly Africa during and after the cold war. The French involvement in Darfur affair<sup>18</sup> is the significant example of it. France has always tried to keep itself in the pro- Muslim and anti-American camp whenever it has to make a decision regarding Middle East either it is the issue of American invasion on Iraq or the nuclear deal with Iran. So French attitude to the issues and conflict of those region is far different than the other

<sup>17</sup>“25 September 2012 - 67th United Nations General Assembly - Speech by Mr François Hollande, President of the French Republic,” France ONU, accessed July 2, 2019, <https://onu.delegfrance.org/25-September-2012-67th-United>.

<sup>18</sup>France has the most extensive interests in the region. In Sudan, France has business interests as the publicly-listed companies Alcatel-Lucent and Total operate in the country. However, France is mostly concerned about the implications the conflict in Darfur has on regional stability. Darfur directly borders France's old colonies Chad and the Central African Republic (CAR). Chad and the CAR are strategically important to France because of their geographical location in the centre of the continent and because of large reserves of resources. Moreover, France uses some of its old African colonies as a military training ground. France has traditionally tried to guarantee these interests through bilateral ties, military cooperation and an economic network. “France and the Darfur Crisis,” accessed June 27, 2019, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/france-and-the-darfur-crisis/>.

regional issue either they are in Asia or Latin America. Policies regarding them are formulated the national cum financial interest in mind. With that mind set, they supported the right of self-determination of Kashmiris yet never offered their practical help for the solution of the issue. Anglo-American influence, Pakistani support for Indo-china colonial struggle and a lesson for new Indian government was the reasons which formulated French approach towards Kashmir conflict in early decades yet in last decade of 20th century that verbal support is camouflaged under their financial benefits towards rising Indians economic power and Pakistan's involvement in nuclear phenomenon.

**References**

- Andra, S. (2011). A Case Study of Diplomacy in Practice - Kashmir Conflict during a United Nations Security Council Simulation, *BFP Magazine*.
- Arpi, C. (2005). *India and Her Neighbourhood: A French Observer's Views* (Har-Anand Publications).
- Beverley, E. L. (2015). *Hyderabad, British India, and the World* (Cambridge University Press).
- Boquérat, G. (n.d). *France-Pakistan Relations, Through the Quai D' Orsay Archives*, 40.
- Bose, Sumantra (2005). *Kashmir: Roots of Conflict, Paths to Peace*, Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Charles de Gaulle & François Goguel, (1973). *Discours et Messages V: janvier 1966-avril 1969* (Paris: Plon Club français des bibliophiles).
- Choudhry, Dr Shabir . (2006, December, 14). Emma Nicholson and EU Kashmir Report, *Asian Tribune*
- Delattre, F. (2017). *UN Peacekeeping Saves Lives and Fulfills a Unique Role*, accessed June, 26, 2018, <http://www.franceonu.org/Peacekeeping>.
- Ernst, Waltraud & Pati., B. (2007). *India's Princely States: People, Princes and Colonialism*, Routledge.
- Hasan, K. S. (1960). *Pakistan and the United Nations* (New York: Manhattan Publishing Company).
- Hubert V., Adrien A., & Bouabdallah, M. (2008). *Continuer l'histoire*, 1 vols. Paris: Flammarion.
- Hussain, Nasir (2016, November, 30). *Kashmir Conflicts 1947-2016*, Global Affairs (blog), <http://www.globalaffairs.com.pk/kashmir-conflicts-1947-2016/>.
- Nünlist, Christian, Locher A. & Martin, G. (2010). *Globalizing De Gaulle: International Perspectives on French Foreign Policies, 1958-1969*, Lexington Books.

- Pierre Augé, (1951). *Telegram of the Ambassador of France in Pakistan*, NUOI, Vol. 238.
- Pigeonneau, (1950, March 31). Telegram of the Ambassador of France in Pakistan, NUOI, S 50-2-A 14, vol.239.
- Rosa, B., Caterina, C. & Kristi, R. (2016). *The European External Action Service and National Foreign Ministries: Convergence or Divergence?*, Routledge, 2016),
- Sadasivan, S. N. (2005). *Political and Administrative Integration of Princely States* (Mittal Publications, Ian Copland, The Princely States, the Muslim League, and the Partition of India in 1947, *The International History Review* 13, no. 1 (1991): 38–69.
- Sayyid, R. A. (1998). *Joint Communiques: 1947-1976* (Islamabad: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Pakistan.
- Schofield, V. (2003). *Kashmir in Conflict: India, Pakistan and the Unending War*, I.B.Tauris, 2003.
- Tucker, Spencer C. (2013). *Encyclopedia of Insurgency and Counterinsurgency: A New Era of Modern Warfare: A New Era of Modern Warfare*, ABC-CLIO.
- UNO, (1947). *Yearbook of the United Nations 1947-1948* (New York: United Nations, Department of Public Information.
- Wirsing, R. (2003). *Kashmir in the Shadow of War: Regional Rivalries in a Nuclear Age*, M.E. Sharpe.