

## Hypotheses One

### **The weakness of democratic institutions resulted in the creation of social categories for the distribution of patronage.**

The patronage was disbursed according to the convenience of the state on ethnic, religious and regional lines. The constant tensions between centralised nationalism and indigenous nationalism resulted in the imposition of formal nationalism through juridical and legal structures. The officially constituted legitimate sphere of politics was the only channel to express grievances, and only groups ready to engage with the official political processes were given leverage. The other assertions were confronted with violence and coercion to impose a nomological definition of nationalism. The refusal to acknowledge such claims is based on a specific understanding of non-legitimacy to any opposition to formal nationalism and non-acknowledgement of value-specific identity. This led to a situation where indigenous nationalism did not recognise the controlling institutions. The outcome of the clash between the two forces of nationalism was that no mutually acceptable framework emerged for a dialogue. In short, the state nationalism and the Kashmiri nationalism reflected irreconcilable political discourse, one having institutional characteristics and the other based on values of autonomy. The absence of a reconciliation between the two leads to a status where coercion became the only way for the ruling elite. The adoption of coercion accelerated the Kashmiri nationalistic mobilisation. The autonomous nationalist agency also became a reserve for local trust, given its political positioning and subjectivity. As the Kashmiri nationalist agency was confronted with state coercion, the possibility for violent militancy grew with support. The mode of political mobilisation also altered, introducing differing agendas of the various groups who took up militancy. The dominant militant began to enforce the ascendancy of their respective political agendas within the nationalist movement.

Among other things, what comes out is that the roots of Kashmiri nationalism are more complex than the simple thesis of institutional decay and lack of economic structures. Kashmiri nationalism exerted itself

through subaltern processes, creating autonomous ways of political participation and opposing the mainstream ways of involvement. The alternative forms of political participation and mobilisation can be observed in the politics of the All-Jammu and Kashmir National Conference from the 1930s to 1953, the Plebiscite Front and the 1987 Muslim United Front.

One could also understand that the support for Kashmiri nationalism majorly evolved through the collective awareness of the community and a deep urge to exercise their political agency. The repetitive failure of non-violent political mobilisation paved the way for the eventual rise of militancy. In other words, the militant nationalism introduced new ideas which were not always sharing their objectives with Kashmiri nationalism and undermined Kashmiri nationalism over time. This thesis tried to understand how the structural inconsistencies within state nationalism paved the way for further augmentation of Kashmiri nationalism. It thus justified the hypotheses that the weakness of democratic institutions has created social categories for the distribution of patronage, resulting in chasms based on ethnicity, religion, and region.

## Hypotheses Two

### **Kashmiri nationalism is essentially a contestation of self and the other.**

The second hypothesis of the tie study stated that Kashmiri nationalism is essentially a contestation of self and the other. 'Self' and 'Other' denote identity and differences about specific political actors. Rumaëlili (2007:22) notes that simultaneously, the self and the other emerged as perspectival and interchangeable concepts, where the self and the other changed constantly. The collective identities were constituted about the differences; hence, the formation of collective identity entailed differences with those outside of the collectivity. This resulted in the relative difference between the collective self and others.

Nationalism forms identities when socialisation enables individuals to see themselves and how others perceive them. Thus, individuals become self by encompassing other individuals' attitudes, as Mead