
**A Critical Discourse Analysis of the International Community's Statements (August 2019)
on the Abrogation of Article 370 of Kashmir**

Fatima Ahmed ¹, Tabish Munir ²

¹ MS in International Relations from COMSATS University Islamabad.

² Research Scholar at Quaid-e-Azam University in Islamabad. Email:
tabishmunirkhan@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i2.612>

Abstract

On 5th August 2019, India scrapped Article 370 from its constitution, which gave Indian occupied Kashmir semi-autonomous status. This constitutional change brought Kashmir under the Union of India against the wishes of the people of Kashmir. The international community's response to this politically significant move was ambivalent. Previous literature on the international community's response to the changed status of Kashmir is limited. The purpose of the current study is to find out the underlying meaning of the International Community's response on the issue at hand. The study is qualitative in nature, as it aims to explore and describe the underlying meaning of the statements issued by international actors regarding the constitutional amendment on Kashmir. This research employs Norman Fairclough's 3D model as the primary tool for critical discourse analysis in this study. The result will highlight the hidden agenda in the discourse of the International Community regarding the abrogation of Article 370, which changed the status of Kashmir, and the implications of the agenda for the stakeholders involved in the Kashmir issue.

Key words: Critical discourse analysis, International Community, Fairclough's 3D model of CAD, Kashmir, Article 370

Introduction:

The Jammu and Kashmir conflict is a bone of contention between India and Pakistan since their inception as independent states. Both India and Pakistan consider Kashmir an integral part and are not ready to compromise. Their claim is based on allegations rooted in history, culture, and the principles of division of the Indian subcontinent, as well as international resolutions and the principle of self-determination. Discourses around Kashmir legitimise the control of one at the expense of another, to which the international community has responded from time to time. However, the conflict turned on August 15, 2019, when the special status of Kashmir was revoked. The Modi government abrogated Articles 370 and 35-A of the Indian Constitution. This move is a violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1948, which confers the right of self-determination on the people of Jammu and Kashmir. This move shows Indian intentions to bypass bilateral and international agreements to which India is a signatory.

The special status of Jammu and Kashmir, as granted under Articles 370 and 35-A of the Indian Constitution, gave the state a unique status, allowing it to make key decisions independently, such as drafting its own constitution, granting citizenship to its residents, and having its own separate flag. This autonomy ensured that the people of Kashmir could maintain their identity and freedom

of action. The abolition of these articles was an agenda of Narendra Modi's election campaign in 2019. This election manifesto promised to merge Jammu and Kashmir with the Indian state. The repeal of these articles at the constitutional level was followed by large-scale human rights violations in Jammu and Kashmir (Ur Rahman, Khan, and Rahat, 2022, 200).

The human rights violations have never ceased in Jammu and Kashmir since the independence of India and Pakistan in 1947. India has been delaying the rights of self-determination to the people of Kashmir, and with the abolition of articles 370 and 35-A, India has snatched their right to autonomy in different matters within their State. Right after the annulment of articles 370 and 35-A, the Indian government imposed a curfew in Jammu and Kashmir. The number of the Indian army has been increased in the state (Zain Ul Abiden Malik 2020). The curfew had an adverse effect on the daily lives of people. They were unable to continue their children's education and access healthcare facilities. The economy of Jammu and Kashmir also deteriorated, which resulted in hardships for the local population (Siddiqua, Iqbal, 2023, 50).

The right to communication was also put on hold, as internet and telecommunication services were halted for eight months. The people of different walks of life, especially politicians, Hurriyat leaders, lawyers, students and traders, became the target of arbitrary arrest in order to control the reaction to the unconstitutional move of ending the article 370 (Ahmed, Tariq, 2022, 36). The human rights atrocities and the abrogation of Article 370 have triggered a reaction from the International community. The international community's reaction to India's unilateral action of abolishing Article 370 has been apathetic (Alam, Sughra, Bhatti, Nawaz Muhammad, and Awan Muhammad Waris, 2020, p. 16).

The Abrogation of Article 370 garnered global attention, eliciting a range of responses from the International Community. The reaction of the International community has been mixed. Some actors have condemned the act of abrogating Article 370; others have shown neutrality on the matter. International organizations have also voiced their concerns over the issue (Nisar, Tehseen, 2019, 6).

This research will shed light on the varying stances of different countries within the international community regarding the altered status quo of Jammu and Kashmir and their approach to India. By conducting a 3-dimensional analysis of the statements made by selected actors in the international community regarding the abrogation of Article 370, this study aims to provide a meticulous understanding of the Kashmir conflict. Fairclough's 3-dimensional model will highlight how inequality and injustice are reproduced and resisted through text in social and political contexts about the Kashmir conflict in the world (Salma, Nurul Fathia, 2018, p. 7). The findings will expand the knowledge of the international community's response and approach towards the Kashmir conflict. The people will find out how many countries view the Kashmir issue in general and particularly after its changed status quo.

Literature Review:

To support this study, research in this field is cited. The relevant Journal articles of last four years have been reviewed. Kinza Tariq (2020) has analyzed Imran Khan's speech at UNGA held on 28th September, 2019, using the Fairclough model under CDA. They have critically examined the speech using the three dimensions developed by Fairclough to gain a deeper understanding of the language used by the former Prime Minister of Pakistan. The model revealed the dichotomy of "us" vs "them" in each issue he has presented. This study is significant as it took place a month after the abrogation of Article 370 in Kashmir by India, and Imran Khan's speech also referenced the Kashmir issue. This study has given deeper insights into Imran Khan's speech and helped the public to understand their leader in a better way.

Nadaf, A. H. (2023) has used the socio-cognitive model under Critical discourse analysis in order to compare the headlines of two online newspapers post-abrogation of Article 370. This study found out how the Indian government shaped the discourse about the abrogation of Article 370 by solidifying domestic legitimacy through aggressive nationalism.

Siddiqua Ayesha (2023) conducted a Critical discourse analysis of the Pakistani newspaper “The Dawn” to investigate how the Kashmir conflict is presented after the revocation of Article 370. CDA focuses on the lexical choices, as the pattern of language unravels the discourse. The author’s findings indicated that the newspaper has employed a negative portrayal of the BJP and a positive portrayal of the people of Kashmir. The media narrative has also highlighted the voice of Kashmiris and their right of self-determination.

I.U. Khan (2022) has conducted a critical discourse analysis of editorials in Indian and Pakistani Newspapers on Article 370 of Kashmir, as implemented by India. The lexical choices were analyzed and the ideological square model under CDA was used. The research found out that the Pakistani newspapers have used “US” towards the people of Kashmir while India has termed the Kashmiri people as “them”.

The literature review has highlighted that various approaches under critical discourse analysis have been employed to analyze speeches of leaders, newspaper editorials, and online news forums regarding the abrogation of Article 370 in Kashmir. It has been observed that the Critical discourse analysis on the response of the international community towards the abolition of the article 370 is limited. This has created a gap in knowledge, as the interdisciplinary approach has been employed in this study using Fairclough's 3D model under Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyze statements made by Turkey, Malaysia, Pakistan, China, the United States, and international organizations such as the UN, immediately following the abolition of Article 370. This is a unique research idea and will be a valuable interdisciplinary contribution to the existing body of literature on the Kashmir conflict.

Methodology:

To understand discourse analysis, it is essential to explain discourse in simple terms. Discourse is a word in linguistics that refers to any informal or formal information that has the ability to be investigated in a structured manner. Thus, discourse analysis is a process of examination that probes how different parts of language convey complete meaning to the audience. In order to expand the process of discourse analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis has been proposed. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has wider application as it covers not only language studies but also media discourse, public discourse, organizational and political discourse. Scholars have developed various frameworks and theories to carry out CDA. One such framework is developed by Fairclough's 3-dimensional model for carrying out CDA. Fairclough considers language as a social practice. This model provides an interdisciplinary approach to analyze and examine the interaction of text and conversation and how this interaction yields the social and political discourse. (Tariq, Kinza , Nawaz , Muhammad Shawal , Farid , Dr. Aisha, 2020, 34-35)

Norman Fairclough is a CDA scholar. He presented his 3-Dimensional model in 1989 which was revised in 1995(Tahir, Momina, Nawaz Sana and Naveed Yousaf, 2022, 675). The Fairclough model comprises three stages of analysis. The first stage is called textual analysis. At this stage, the language of a discourse is analyzed to identify its elements of cohesion, semantics, and morphology. The second stage is called Process analysis. In this stage, the text is analyzed to understand how it is generated, circulated and used by the society (Dr. Hassan Waseem et al., 2019, 33). The third stage is called social analysis. In this stage the discourse is placed in the context of social and cultural reality (Tariq, Kinza , Nawaz , Muhammad Shawal, Farid, Dr. Aisha, 2020, 34-35).

This research is exploratory and uses qualitative methods to conduct the study at hand. In this research method, the data is interpreted, and findings are jotted down in the form of paragraphs. This study employs Fairclough 3D model under the CDA for analyzing purposely selected statements made by the important actors of the international community which includes United States of America, Pakistan, Turkey, Malaysia, China and UN on the abrogation of the articles 370 by India.

Analysis, Observation and Discussion:

China's Statement:

"China is always opposed to India's inclusion of the Chinese territory in the western sector of the China-India boundary into its administrative jurisdiction."

"Recently India has continued to undermine China's territorial sovereignty by unilaterally changing its domestic law, India's action is unacceptable and would not have any legal effect." "China's position on the Kashmir issue is clear and consistent. It is also an international consensus that the Kashmir issue is an issue left from the past between India and Pakistan." "The relevant sides need to exercise restraint and act prudently. They should refrain from taking actions that will unilaterally change the status quo and escalate tensions." (Reuters 2019).

Textual Analysis:

This statement was made by the Chinese Foreign Ministry's spokeswoman Hua Chuying on 5th August, 2019 in the wake of the abolition of article 370 of Kashmir by Indian government. In Textual analysis, the elements of cohesion, semantics and morphology of a text are studied. The statement consists of 108 words. The statement consists of two parts. The first part concerns China's concerns about its border, while the second part relates to the changed status of IOK and the resulting relationship between Pakistan and India. Simple sentence structure is used. The statement is cohesive, and it only uses commas to punctuate the sentence. Pronouns are not used in the statement. It is an official and diplomatic statement.

Process Analysis:

In this step, it will be seen how the statement is generated, circulated and used in the social set-up. This statement is the official stance of China on India's abolition of Article 370 and is intended for India and Pakistan in particular, as well as for the world in general. The official statement has two parts; the first part reflects China's stance on its border with India, which is directly affected by the revocation of Article 370. The words "oppose" and "unacceptable" shows that China is condemning India's act. The word "always" indicated that China had a border issue with India in the past, also. The phrase "no legal effect" reflects China's firm territorial stance.

The second part of the statement addresses the Kashmir conflict. Here, China takes a neutral position by saying that the Kashmir issue is between Pakistan and India. China asks India and Pakistan to refrain from escalating tensions in the region. There is no mention of human rights violations in the IOK following the abolition of Article 370.

Social Analysis:

At this stage, the relationship between the discourse and social reality is established and analyzed. Chinese statement holds importance in the international community as it is an economic power in the global community and a regional power in South Asia. China has been an all-weather friend with Pakistan and has had troubled relations with India since 1947. The statement shows China's dual position on the revocation of Article 370. Firstly, China criticises the act as it affected its

western borders. It has prioritised its national sovereignty. Secondly, it takes a neutral position and urges Pakistan and India to refrain from taking steps that would increase the tension in the region. In the light of Pak-China friendship, the statement did not show upright support for Pakistan on the issue of Jammu and Kashmir.

American Statement:

“We are closely following the events in the state of Jammu and Kashmir. We take note of India’s announcement revising the constitutional status of Jammu and Kashmir and India’s plan to split the state into two union territories. We note that the Indian government has described these actions as strictly an internal matter. We are concerned about reports of detentions and urge respect for individual rights and discussion with those in affected communities. We call on all parties to maintain peace and stability along the Line of Control.”(Iqbal 2019)

Textual Analysis:

This statement is issued by the spokesperson Morgan Ortagus of the American State Department on 5th August, 2019, in response to the revocation of Article 370 of IOK by India. The Textual analysis of the statement reveals that it contains 88 words. It is a cohesive official statement. The language is formal. It has used “We” –the first-person plural pronoun- to refer to the higher authorities of American government officials. Compound sentence structure is used along with simple sentences.

Process Analysis:

This analysis reveals that the statement is attributed to the US State Department, which is widely regarded as the most powerful institution in the world. It is an official statement that is broadcast soon after the abrogation of Article 370 of IOK by the Indian government. It aims to present the US perspective on the matter and is directed towards India. The language of the statement is formal and uses the word “note” twice, indicating that America has acknowledged the Indian government’s action of changing the constitution of IOK and also that this action is an internal matter of India. However, the terms “closely following” at the beginning of the statement show America has not ignored this significant change made by India and will continue to monitor the situation. Similarly, the word “concerned” is used, which reveals America’s unease on the human rights situation in IOK. The use of the term “affected communities” acknowledges the people of Jammu and Kashmir who are affected by the revocation of Article 370. In the last line of the statement, the term “all parties” refers indirectly to Pakistan, and the word “call” indicates that both India and Pakistan are urged to maintain peace and stability along the Line of Control.

Social Analysis:

The US statement reflects the view of the world's superpower, which has strong diplomatic and economic ties with India. The US have used cautious language, which is not entirely neutral. Initially, the US has acknowledged not only India’s abolition of Article 370 but also its plan to further divide the union territories. It has also acknowledged the action as India’s internal matter, which is not only against the UNSC resolutions but also against the Simla agreement between Pakistan and India. So, the US has not criticised India’s actions, but has accepted them. However, to keep up with the western values of upholding respect of human rights, the statement presents apprehension about the detentions in IOK and a need for the involvement of these people in the discussion on the matter. The statement concludes with the US demand that the parties to the conflict maintain peace on both sides of the Line of Control. Parties to the conflict include India and Pakistan. Pakistan has not been directly addressed in the statement, but it is indirectly

addressed at the end, and it is asked to ensure peace along the Line of Control. This shows that Pakistan has not signed the Simla pact between Pakistan and India

Turkey's statement:

“We are concerned that the annulment of Article 370 of the Constitution of India on 5 August 2019 which accords a special status to Jammu-Kashmir could further increase existing tensions. We sincerely hope for the resolution of the problem through dialogue and within the framework of the relevant UN resolutions by observing the legitimate interests of all people of Jammu-Kashmir as well as Pakistan and India.”(Andolu2019).

Textual Analysis:

This statement is given by the Turkish Foreign Ministry on 5th August 2019, in response to the revocation of article 370 of IOK by India. The word count is 66 for the statement. Complex sentence structure has been used. The pronoun “We” is used to represent the higher government officials of Turkey. It is a cohesive and formal official statement that presents the Turkish view on the revocation of Article 370 by India.

Process Analysis:

The process analysis of the Turkish official statement shows that the statement made by Turkey, which is an extended neighbor of India. Turkey is a predominantly Muslim country and is regarded as a significant actor due to its unique location at the crossroads of Europe and Asia. The language of the statement is carefully crafted to appear objective and neutral. The word “concerned” in the opening line shows Turkey’s anxiety about the outcome of the abrogation of Article 370 in the already tense region. The word “hope” suggests that Turkey remains neutral in the situation and anticipates an outcome favorable to all parties involved in the conflict. The words “dialogue” and “UN framework” reveal Turkey's desire for peace and its commitment to upholding UN resolutions in the matter. In the closing line, Turkey has acknowledged the interests of the people of IOK, Pakistan and India.

Social Analysis:

The official stance of Turkey on the abrogation of Article 370 indicates that it has not taken a side in the matter. Despite the common religious bond of Turkey with Pakistan and IOK, the statement does not condemn the Indian action of merging IOK with the Indian Union and the human rights atrocities that followed. The human rights violation has not been mentioned in the statement. However, the legitimate rights of the parties to the conflict are mentioned. Turkey has also upheld the UN resolutions on IOK and has noted that conflict resolution should be achieved under the umbrella of UN resolutions.

Malaysian Statement:

“Malaysia is monitoring the situation in Jammu and Kashmir. Malaysia has close and friendly relations with both India and Pakistan. Malaysia encourages the two close neighbors to re-engage in dialogue and negotiations with a view to de-escalate the on-going situation and finding an amicable solution.” (Staff2019).

Textual Analysis:

The official statement issued by the foreign ministry of Malaysia comprises 45 words as a reaction to the abrogation of Article 370 of IOK by India. The language is formal. Complex sentence

structure is employed to convey Malaysia's official stance. Pronouns are not used; instead, the country's name is used.

Process Analysis:

Malaysia is an extended neighbor of India, and its stance on the abrogation of Article 370 is for Pakistan and India in particular and for the international community in general. The statement has used the word “monitoring” in relation to the changed constitutional status of IOK, indicating that Malaysia will be following up on the post-370 scenario. The words “close” and “friendly” have been used to describe Malaysia's relations with both India and Pakistan. The words “encourage”, “dialogue”, “de-escalate”, and “re-engage” have been used to convey Malaysia's intention and focus on peace in the region.

Social Analysis:

Malaysia's official statement on the revocation of Article 370 is neutral. It clearly states that Malaysia maintains friendly relations with both India and Pakistan. However, the nature of the ties varies between the two countries. Malaysia and Pakistan share similar religious values; on the other hand, Malaysia has an economic bond with India. Considering the spiritual affinity of Malaysia with Pakistan and even IOK, the statement is objective with no trace of criticism on the annulment of Article 370. The statement closes by motivating India and Pakistan to resolve the tension of the changed status quo with the help of discussion

United Nation's statement:

<p>“The secretary general has been following the situation in Jammu and Kashmir with concern and makes an appeal for maximum restraint. The position of the United Nations on this region is governed by the Charter of the United Nations and applicable Security Council resolutions. The secretary general also recalls the 1972 Agreement on bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, also known as the Simla Agreement, which states that the final status of Jammu and Kashmir is to be settled by peaceful means, in accordance with the Charter of the UN.”(AFP2019)</p>

Textual Analysis:

This statement has been made by the spokesperson on behalf of the UN secretary general in the wake of the abolition of article 370 by India on 5th August, 2019. According to textual analysis, the statement comprises 90 words. The sentence structure, compound-complex, has been used to convey the message. The statement is cohesive. No pronouns are used.

Process Analysis:

The statement is given on behalf of the UN secretary general, who is the head of the United Nations. The United Nations was established at the end of World War II to promote peace and preserve human rights worldwide. The statement employs diplomatic language and is directed at India, Pakistan, and the IOK. The statement has used the terms like “UN charter”, “security council resolutions”, “Simla Agreement of 1972” which points towards the fact that UN wants the IOK issue to be resolved under the ambit of Simla agreement under the UNSC resolutions. However, the word “bilateral” has been mentioned to remind the parties that there will no third party involved to solve the IOK issue. The term “maximum restraint” is used which implies that India and Pakistan should control their actions which can aggravate the IOK issue.

Social Analysis:

According to the role and objectives laid out by the UN, the UN statement had to be the most significant statement regarding the revocation of Article 370 by India. However, the statement fails to condemn India's unilateral action on the IOK, in the face of the Simla Agreement and UNSC resolutions. UN has used a neutral tone regarding the issue, and there is no mention of the curfew in IOK that followed in the post annulment of article 370. The UN does not highlight human rights violations.

Pakistan's statement:

No unilateral step by the Government of India can change this disputed status, as enshrined in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolutions," read the statement. "The decision will never be acceptable to the people of IOK and Pakistan." "As the party to this international dispute, Pakistan will exercise all possible options to counter the illegal steps,"

Pakistan reaffirms its abiding commitment to the Kashmir cause and its political, diplomatic and moral support to the people of Occupied Jammu and Kashmir for the realisation of their inalienable right to self-determination." (Siddique2019)

Textual Analysis:

This statement is given by the spokesperson of the Foreign Ministry of Pakistan on the revocation of Article 370 by India. According to the textual analysis, the statement contains 89 words. The sentence structure used is compound complex. The language is cohesive.

Process Analysis:

The statement issued by Pakistan is the most important as Pakistan has been a party to the Jammu and Kashmir conflict since 1947. Strong words are used by Pakistan to express its disappointment and displeasure with India's unilateral action of merging the IOK into the Indian Union by abolishing Article 370. The statement starts with Pakistan refuting India's unilateral decision, and the word "unacceptable" has been used to convey that Pakistan and the people of IOK do not accept the changed constitutional status. The word "reaffirms" demonstrates Pakistan's commitment to resolving the issue of IOK. The word "illegal" has been used to refer to the abolition of article 370 by India. The statement also explicitly states "inalienable" rights of self-determination of the people of IOK.

Social Analysis:

The response of Pakistan holds importance as it is the party to the IOK conflict since 1947. Pakistan and the people of IOK share the same religion and cultural values. The people of IOK identify with Pakistan more in comparison to India. Pakistan has refused to accept the changed status of IOK under the Indian Union; it has vowed to counter any further illegal steps taken by India. Moreover, Pakistan has reaffirmed its commitment to providing all types of support to the people of IOK, enabling them to exercise their right to self-determination. Pakistan has referred to the UNSC resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir (IOK). It shows Pakistan wants the resolution of the IOK conflict according to the international rules and regulations laid in the UNSC resolutions. Moreover, it unravels Pakistan's resolve that it is not going to back out by this changed status of Jammu and Kashmir.

Conclusion:

In the aftermath of the abolition of Article 370 of IOK by India on 5th August, 2019, not only changed the constitutional status of Kashmir but also increased the human rights violations. The international community issued statements regarding India's annulment of Article 370. The selected statements of some countries have been evaluated using Norman Fairclough's 3-Dimensional model under Critical Discourse Analysis. The analysis has revealed that, except for Pakistan and China, Turkey, Malaysia, and the USA have adopted a neutral stance on the abolition of Article 370. The statements issued by the spokespersons of the foreign ministries of these countries right after the revocation of Article 370 have used a diplomatic tone. Only Turkey and Pakistan have mentioned the UNSC resolutions on the Kashmir issue. Malaysia has explicitly mentioned its good terms with both Pakistan and India. All the statements have urged Pakistan and India to refrain from any steps that could escalate tensions in the region.

Turkey and Malaysia didn't condemn the Indian action even though these countries share common religious values with Pakistan and IOK. Only Pakistan explicitly condemned India for revoking Article 370 unilaterally, as it violated both the UNSC and the Simla agreement between Pakistan and India. The UN's statement also didn't criticize India's action of abolishing Article 370. The UN failed to uphold its values of ensuring the implementation of UNSC resolutions on Kashmir and maintaining peace.

China has condemned India's action, as revoking Article 370 directly affects the border between India and China. However, considering the strong bond of friendship between China and Pakistan, China did not take Pakistan's side on this matter; rather, it stated that the Kashmir issue is a bilateral issue between Pakistan and India.

Norman Fairclough's 3-dimensional analysis of the statements reveals that the international community has shown an apathetic response to the revocation of Article 370 by India due to their own political and economic interests with India.

Reference:

- Rahman, Ibad Ur, Arif Khan, and Laraib Rahat. "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Discursive Ideologies in Pakistani and Indian Print Media about the Abolition of Article 370 and 35A in Kashmir." *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT)* 3, no. 10: 199-205. [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gdpmr.2022\(V-I\).19](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gdpmr.2022(V-I).19).
- Siddiqua, Ayesha, and Muhammad Zubair Iqbal. "Media Discourse on the Kashmir Conflict after Abrogation of Article 370." *Strategic Studies* 43, no. 2 (2023): 45-58. https://www.issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Ayesha_Siddiqua_and_Muhammad_Zubair_Iqbal_SS_No_2_2023.pdf
- Ahmed Tariq. "Human Rights Violations In Jammu And Kashmir And Post Abrogation of Article 370". *Legal Research Development*, 6, no.3 (2022): 35-41: DOI: 10.53724/LRD/V6N3.12. (<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/527255955.pdf>)
- Nawaz, Muhammad & Alam, Sughra & Waris, Muhammad. (2020). Abrogation of Articles 370 & 35A of the Indian Constitution: Implications for Peace in South Asia." *International Review of Social Science.* 8, no. 8 (2020): 9-20 : https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Muhammad-Nawaz-77/publication/343792502_Abrogation_of_Articles_370_35A_of_the_Indian_Constitution_Implications_for_Peace_in_South_Asia_SUGHRA_ALAM/links/5f51d03c458515e96d2b44cb/Abrogation-of-Articles-370-35A-of-the-Indian-Constitution-Implications-for-Peace-in-South-Asia-SUGHRA-ALAM.pdf

- Nisar, Tehseen, Kashmir and the abrogation of Article 370: “Can peace be possible, or stalemate continue to hamper India and Pakistan relations in future?” South Asia Democratic Forum 45, (2019): 2-11: <https://fid4sa-repository.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/4510/>
- Salma, Nurul. “Exploring Van Dijk: Critical Discourse Analysis’s Aims.” Centre for open sciences. (2018) 1-9: <https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/mwrnq>
V 1 Issue 4 2020
- Tariq, Kinza , Nawaz , Muhammad Shawal, Farid, Dr. Aisha “Imran Khan’s Speech at UNGA: A Reflection on Us vs. Them Divide Using Fairclough’s 3D Model in CDA.” Research Journal of Social Sciences & Economics Review (RJSSER) 1, no.4 (2020) 33-44: <https://doi.org/10.36902/rjsser-vol1-iss4-2020> (34-44)
- Siddiqua, Ayesha, and Muhammad Zubair Iqbal. "Media Discourse on the Kashmir Conflict after Abrogation of Article 370." Strategic Studies 43, no. 2 (2023): 45-58. [https://www.issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Ayesha Siddiqua and Muhammad Zubair Iqbal SS No 2 2023.pdf](https://www.issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Ayesha_Siddiqua_and_Muhammad_Zubair_Iqbal_SS_No_2_2023.pdf)
- Nadaf, Hussain Arif, “Discursive representation of the Article 370 abrogation: A comparative CDA of the headlines of two major Indian online news publications.” Journalism, 24, no. 6 Arif Hussain Nadaf <https://orcid.org/0000-0000-0000-0000> Volume 24, Issue 6 (2021) 1342-1361: <https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849211056843>
- Rahman, Ibad Ur, Arif Khan, and Laraib Rahat. "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Discursive Ideologies in Pakistani and Indian Print Media about the Abolition of Article 370 and 35A in Kashmir." International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT) 3, no. 10: 199-205.: [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gdpmr.2022\(V-I\).19](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gdpmr.2022(V-I).19).
- Tahir, Momina, Nawaz Sana and Naveed Yousaf, “Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan’s Address at the 74th Session of the General Assembly of the UN.” Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review 6, no.2 (2022): 673-686. [http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022\(6-II\)58](http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022(6-II)58)
- Dr. Hassan Waseem, Rehman ur Abaid, Zafar Asad, Masood Samyya, “An Application of Fairclough’s Three Dimensional CDA Approach to Fraser Anning’s Speech in Australian Senate.” 1, no. 1 (2019) 32-35: <http://doi.org/10.53057/linfo/2019.1.1.5>
- Reuters. 2019, “China says India move on Kashmir violates its territorial sovereignty,” Dawn, August 6, 2019. <https://www.dawn.com/news/1498428>.
- Iqbal. Anwar. 2019, “India calls actions in Kashmir internal matter: US.” Dawn, August 6, 2019. <https://www.dawn.com/news/1498261>
- Agency. Anadolu. 2019, “Turkish, Pakistani leaders discuss India’s Kashmir move.” Hurriyet, August 6, 2019. <https://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkey-expresses-concern-over-indias-kashmir-move-145539>
- Staff. Sawarajya . 2019. “Different Countries And Organizations Respond To Article 370 Abrogation.” Sawarajyamag, Augsut 8, 2019. <https://swarajyamag.com/news-brief/live-different-countries-and-organisations-respond-to-article-370-abrogation>

Siddique. Naveed. "Pakistan says it will exercise all possible options to counter 'illegal steps' taken by India in IOK". Dawn, August 6, 2019. <https://www.dawn.com/news/1498236>

AFP. 2019"UN chief calls for 'maximum restraint' in occupied Kashmir." Dawn, August 8, 2019. <https://www.dawn.com/news/1498796>