



STRATEGIC VISION
INSTITUTE

VISION

VISIONARY INSIGHTS INTO THE STRATEGIC INQUESTS OF NATIONS

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 9
SEPTEMBER 2016

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi

Strategic Vision Institute
Islamabad

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 9
SEPTEMBER 2016

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi



Strategic Vision Institute (SVI)

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this edition are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of Strategic Vision Institute.

Strategic Vision Institute (SVI)

Strategic Vision Institute (SVI) is an autonomous, multidisciplinary and non-partisan institution, established in January 2013. It is a non-governmental and non-commercial organization, administered by a Board of Governors (General Body) supervised under a Chairperson and administered by a Management Committee headed by a President/Executive Director.

SVI aims to project strategic foresight on issues of national and international import through dispassionate, impartial and independent research, analyses and studies. The current spotlight of the SVI is on the national security, regional and international peace and stability, strategic studies, nuclear non- proliferation, arms control, and strategic stability, nuclear safety and security and energy studies.

SVI Foresight

SVI Foresight is a monthly electronic journal. It has a multi-disciplinary perspective highlighting on the contemporary strategic and security studies. The Journal is envisioned to be a collection of policy-oriented articles written by its Research Associates, Visiting Faculty and professional experts. The objective is to provide the readership with a concise all-round and real-time policy oriented discourse on contemporary strategic regional and international developments, highlighting their relevance to Pakistan.

Contents

Editor's Note	3
Mapping Conflicts in Syria and Yemen	
Amanullah Khan	4
Doval's Doctrine, Kashmiri Uprising and Uri Incident	
Shahzadi Tooba	7
CTBT At 20: Where Pakistan and India Stand	
Beenish Altaf	10
The Consequences of Deployment of BrahMos Missile in Arunachal Pradesh	
Saima Ali.....	12
The Global Powers Need to Revisit Their Strategy on North Korea's Nuclear Development	
Beenish Altaf	14
Pakistan and NSG: Countering the Cards	
Maimuna Ashraf.....	16
War Clouds in south Asia: Economic Terrorism in South Asia and its Impact on Geo-economics	
Shahzadi Tooba	18
Joint Sea-2016: Sino-Russian Axis Towards a Global Ascendancy	
Saima Ali.....	20
Pyongyang Strategy, Nuclear Diplomacy and International Environment	
Maimuna Ashraf.....	22
CPEC and The Growing Indian Frustration	
S Sadia Kazmi	24
Pak-Russia Joint Military Exercises: Possibility for an Emerging New Alliance?	
S Sadia Kazmi	26
Frustrated Modi Is Isolating India	
Amanullah Khan	28

Editor's Note

The electronic issue of the SVI Foresight for the month of September carries an opinion based analytical commentary on the contemporary issues of strategic importance. A scholastic analysis of CTBT can be found in one of the articles included in this issue. Not only does it give a new and unique overview of the subject but also provides unique recommendations by closely scrutinizing the Indian and Pakistani perspectives. Another article on NSG effectively establishes that a preferential treatment is being given to India and suggests various counter measures that Pakistan could adopt in the face of discriminatory stance adopted by the US. Another relevant debate about the North Korean Nuclear Program can also be found in this issue. There are two separate articles that have raised pertinent concerns about nuclear diplomacy and International policy. It is suggested that North Korea needs to be taken seriously by the international community and the policy needs to be revisited with regards to the North Korean Nuclear development. Recently Indian atrocities in Kashmir and its hostile agenda aimed at Pakistan's isolation have gained a worldwide attention. Two articles in this issue shed light on this dimension of regional politics. Another article carries enlightening analysis on the joint exercises between Russia and Pakistan. An interesting take can be found on the possibility of a new emerging alliance between the two states. Some other articles in this electronic issue provide a detailed analysis of CPEC and growing Indian frustration, the Geo-economic war by India and its implication of the regional stability, and an effective analysis of Yemen and Syrian conflict.

It is hoped that the issue will help readers in staying updated with the current political environment and will find the analyses useful. The SVI Foresight team invites and highly encourages the contributions from the security and strategic community in form of opinion based short commentaries on contemporary political, security and strategic issues. Any suggestions for further improvement are welcome at our [contact address](#). Please see [here](#) the copy of SVI Foresight electronic journal. You can find us on [Face book](#) and can also access the SVI [website](#).

Syedah Sadia Kazmi

Senior Research Associate

Mapping Conflicts in Syria and Yemen

Amanullah Khan

Power politics is continuing to destroy many countries in the Middle East. Hundreds of thousands of people have been killed, millions are living paralyzed lives, and the economic damage is in hundreds of billions of dollars—\$202 billion in Syria alone. Besides, the invisible psychological consequences for the victims are unthinkable.

The conflict in the region presents a complex scenario as it is spreading in all directions. Not only, regional countries have got affected and involved (willing or unwillingly) but the temperature is being felt in other continents also. People having sympathies with militants are coming from other parts of the world, i.e., Australia, Europe, Asia, and America, to join terrorist groups in the region.

The initial interpretation of the unrest was that people are depressed from the monarchy in the Arab world and this is a struggle for freedom and democracy. As the uprising entered in new phases of violence with the emergence of Da'esh (ISIS), it became obvious that power politics is underway by the regional and extra-regional players. The picture got clear when two informal alliances were formed—United States, Saudi Arabia, Turkey as one bloc (supposedly A), and Russia, Iran, and Lebanon, the other (B).

On Syria, national interests of every regional and extra regional actor (both A and B) merge at a point to either support Syrian President Bashar al-Assad or remove him. This convergence of interest in both the cases is the real driving force behind the two informal alliances. However, important to understand is that every state in each group is pursuing different political, economic and strategic agendas vis-à-vis Syria.

From bloc-A, Washington wants to remove Assad as early as possible. It is utilizing every forum at diplomatic level to convince the world that with Assad in power, there cannot be durable peace in Syria. Militarily, US army personnel have been deployed to train rebels, and play advisory role to rebels' commanders. Saudi Arabia also does not accept Assad's government as legitimate and thus helping rebel forces in Syria. Turkey initially wanted an end of Assad's regime; however, its policy towards Syria seems changed after the failed coup in Turkey, followed by many terrorist attacks inside the country, claimed by ISIS and Kurd militants. Turkey's prime objective has now shifted from removal of Assad to curbing ISIS and Kurds militancy.

In case of the bloc-B, Russia and Iran are the frontline states in their mission to rescue Syrian government headed by Assad. Moscow played a significant role at the United Nations Security Council to prevent Washington from launching Iraq and Afghanistan like wars on Syria. Both Russia and Iran are

contributing active part in targeting rebels along with the Syrian government forces. Lebanon's resistance movement, Hezbollah, is assisting Assad's army. China also sides with the Syrian government and Russia. Recently, a senior Chinese military officer visited Syria and offered aid and training to Syrian military.

One can notice that every country in both the blocs is fighting to eliminate one common threat from ISIS, but it is still a force with control of territories in Iraq and Syria. This put a question mark on Israel's role in the regional politics.

Yemen situation could be understood quite differently by looking through different lenses. For a lay person, it looks like that there is a civil war in the country, just like it is in Syria, Libya, Iraq, Nigeria, etc. Broadly, there is a sectarian war underway, in which regional powers like Saudi Arabia and Iran are the main actors. However, a big picture shows that beneficiary of the war is neither Iran nor Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia has done a mistake by launching air strikes in Yemen. Time will tell but it seems that Saudi Arabia would not be able to completely eliminate Houthi's resistance. Recent reports have shown that despite heavy bombardments by Saudi jets, Houthis are spreading their control to other areas. Iran seems committed to let not Houthis defeated. If Saudi air strikes continue, it would put economic pressure on the already deteriorating Saudi economy, and could create security problems inside Saudi Arabia as the country has Shia population especially in the oil rich areas. A good number of Saudi soldiers have already been killed in attacks by Houthi tribesmen on the border with Yemen.

Overall, the situation is going worse day by day. The task of all insurgent groups seems to spread anarchy and challenge writ of the unwanted governments in the region and eventually overthrow them. Many have already been overthrown; Assad government is being badly targeted, while some more are in the pipeline. The formula for achieving such set objectives varies from country to country. Whether it is Boko Haram in Nigeria, Al-Shabaab in Somalia, ISIS in Iraq, Free Syrian Army in Syria, or TTP in Pakistan, all such armed groups are proxies, having political and economic agendas and therefore cannot be termed as non-state actors.

It is imperative to underscore that Middle East crisis is carrying dire consequences for the international peace at large. Repercussions of the protracted conflict can even engulf Pakistan, which is already fighting terrorism at home. Since all major Muslim countries (Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Egypt, and Iran) are supporting one or the other party in the Middle East, Pakistan position remains neutral so far. However, if Saudi Arabia becomes unstable due to militancy then Pakistan might not be in a position to remain neutral, due to the holy places in Makkah and Madina.

Chances for peace in the region are fading in the foreseeable future because winning over the other has become a difficult task. Both parties/blocs cannot afford to lose; it has become a matter of life and death for them in every sense. It is now a test case of military muscle and patience for the opponents, in other words. The worrisome aspect of the conflict is that innocent citizens are suffering.

Regional organizations like OIC and GCC are powerless entities and lack capacities to deal effectively with the complex issue. Leadership of the major Muslim countries is ethnically so bitterly divided that total destruction of Syria, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, and Yemen has not awakened them. Western world is pursuing its own agenda and to some experts, continued unrest in the region suits their objectives.

United Nations role for maintaining peace, by and large, is less visible in almost all of the international conflicts. The five permanent members of the Security Council have divided approach to the Middle East crisis. US, UK, and France are on one side, while Russia and China on the other. The organization having the supreme mandate to maintain peace in the world is under strong influence of the big powers. Its role is not very different from the League of Nations, according to some political commentators. If there has been no world war since the formation of the international body, it is not by virtue of any great role played by the international organization but because of deterrence and mutual assured destruction phenomena created by the nuclear weapons.

Lastly, it is baseless to assume that removing Assad from power would bring stability in Syria. There are examples of Libya and Iraq where internal security situations have got worsened after Qaddafi and Saddam.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/09/15/mapping-conflicts-syria-yemen/>

Doval's Doctrine, Kashmiri Uprising and Uri Incident

Shahzadi Tooba

In wake of new phase of uprising in the Indian occupied Kashmir, Since July 8, 2016 against the martyrdom of the young Kashmiri leader Burhan Wani by the Indian security forces in Indian Occupied Kashmir (IOK), pressure on the Indian government led by BJP Narendra Modi has been mounting both domestically and internationally. In continued sieges and prolonged curfew, Indian forces have martyred more than 100 innocent Kashmiri who have been protesting against the martyrdom of Burhan Wani.

In its response, on Sunday September 18, four militants who were carrying guns and grenades stormed a base in Uri, close to the Line of Control (LoC) with Pakistan and killed at least 17 soldiers in the Indian Occupied Kashmir (IOK). BBC reported that the four attackers were killed by the Indian army (who was sleeping at the time when militants entered in the base).

A statement of former chief of India's spy agency RAW, A. S. Dulat, published in the magazine, 'The Wire' on August 27, 2016 concludes it all as "the Kashmiri uprising is 100% indigenous". But as usual like the previous terror attacks, without any investigation, Indian high officials have started accusing Pakistan for the Uri base terror attack. In this regard, a senior Home Ministry official and a spokesman of the Indian army allegedly said, "It is clearly a case of cross-border terror attack...the militants infiltrated across the Line of Control from Pakistan before attacking the base in Uri."

The blame game is not new as Indian top officials and media had been accusing Pakistan-based banned Lashkar-e-Tayba and country's intelligence agency ISI (Inter-Services Intelligence) of these terrorism-related incidents, including Mumbai terror attacks of November 2008, the Indian parliament assault of December 13, 2001 and militants' attack at Indian Air Force Base in Pathankot, which occurred on January 2, 2016.

As a matter of fact, Ajit Doval, the ex-spy master who is now National Security Advisor of Indian Prime Minister Modi is the real author and controller of India's offensive-defensive doctrine. Under this he prepares the scripts of these "dramas". Besides planning various terror attacks in Pakistan as part of Indian offensive-defensive doctrine, Ajit Doval also advised to arrange various subversive acts inside India and to shift the blame game to Pakistan like orchestrated drama of Gurdaspur episode, boat incident etc. to defame Pakistan and its security agencies. In this context, on January 2, 2016, the terror attack at Indian Air Force Base in Pathankot was preplanned under his directions.

Pakistan needs not to even respond against these accusations because it has to exposed by their own officials as happened earlier. On July 19, 2013, the Indian former home ministry's official and ex investigating officer Satish Verma disclosed that terror attacks in Mumbai in November 26, 2008 and

assault on Indian Parliament in January 12, 2001 were carried out by the Indian government to strengthen anti-terrorism laws.

As regards the terror attack at the Indian Air Force Base in Pathankot, Indian media and top civil and military officials started claiming that the attackers had arrived from Pakistani Punjab's Bahawalpur district, and had links with Jaish-e-Mohammad and Pakistan's primary intelligence agency, ISI. But, despite Islamabad's cooperation with India like formation of the Joint Investigation Team (JIT) consisting of professionals to investigate the Pathankot attack, crackdown against the militant group Jaish-i-Mohammad—lodging of a First Information Report (FIR) in relation to the incident, New Delhi failed in providing any proof of Pakistan's involvement in the Pathankot episode.

Pakistan rejected allegations that it was involved in the assault at the Uri base. In this respect, foreign ministry spokesman Nafees Zakaria told Reuters on the same day, "India immediately puts blame on Pakistan without doing any investigation. We reject this." Pakistan denies any role in cross-border terrorism, and has called on the United Nations and the international community to investigate atrocities it alleges have been committed by the security forces in Indian-occupied Kashmir.

More than this some of the other facts are as:

Uri is part of Jammu which has a Hindu majority population and isn't experiencing a Kashmiri freedom struggle, how then an attacker finds it easier to target a military installation in a High Security Zone comparatively safe and secure zone?

Indian has erected a type A fence all along LOC besides installing state of the art laser sensors to detect any cross LOC movement. This arrangement is over and above the routine patrolling of Indian army along with its specially trained dogs. How then a handful of terrorists could sneak across, dodging third largest army of the planet earth with its hi-tech gadgets & their ferocious K9 force?

The place where this incident happened is well guarded position and isn't HQ 12 Indian Brigade as reported by media rather it is rear HQ of 10 Dogra battalion which has majority of Sikh soldiers and also has a petroleum depot as well. There is all the possibility that an accidental or designed out-break of fire is being reported as a terrorist attack to save the unit, brigade and Division commanders and also to save the dented vaccinated pride of Indian Army.

Pakistan's Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif has pledged to emphatically highlight violence against the innocent Kashmiris in the IOK in a speech during this week's annual session of General Assembly. The incident is nothing more than staging another drama in Kashmir to trumpet Indian mantra of terrorism and dash Pakistan's diplomatic moves to expose Indian atrocities in UNGA.

After all there can always be an opportunity from an accident especially when India and its hapless leadership US under so much pressure that their PM refuses to go and speak at the UNGA session and more importantly answer about dwindling security situation in Kashmir.

Ahead of Uttar Pradesh polls in order to divert the attention of its failures, Kumari Mayawati, Chief Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) said, Narendra Modi may trigger war with Pakistan. She said it will go to any extent in UP polls and there was fear of Hindu-Muslim riots.

It is due to these reasons that Indian security agencies under Ajit Doval's doctrine arranged terror assault at the Uri base not only to defame Pakistan but to divert the attention of international community from the war of liberation in the Indian controlled Kashmir, as it has, now, been accelerated.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/09/20/dovals-doctrine-kashmiri-uprising-uri-incident/>

CTBT At 20: Where Pakistan and India Stand

Beenish Altaf

When it comes to nuclear testing, the word ‘no’ has been said by many states, many times. But as we approach the 20th anniversary of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)’s entering into signing this week, whether this ‘no’ will convert to ‘never’ remains to be seen. In this regard, the United States’ push for the CTBT through a United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolution, which will “reinforce norms against nuclear testing; underscore the value of the 1996 CTBT and also the international monitoring system to detect clandestine testing,” may be an important step. However, to turn the CTBT into reality, the eight states holding out on the CTBT, especially India and Pakistan would need to reconsider their stance.

History

The CTBT has been signed by 183 states and ratified by 166. However, in order to turn this de facto moratorium into de jure moratorium, the 44 states that is listed under Annex 2—states possessing nuclear technology—need to ratify the Treaty in order to ensure it is entered into force. Though 36 Annex 2 states have ratified the Treaty, the United States, China, Egypt, Iran, and Israel have not, while North Korea, India, and Pakistan have not even signed it.

Perspectives from India

Due to India’s desire for Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) membership to attain a legitimate right over civil nuclear trade, New Delhi is under pressure to ratify the CTBT because most NSG member states are party to it (except the United States). However, India may not sign because:

The CTBT bans all nuclear explosions, in consequence hindering both the initial development of nuclear weapons as well as significant enhancements (h-bomb). But India, ironically, is reportedly engaged in the development of a thermonuclear city (bomb);

India has made its stance on the CTBT very clear in the past, saying India will not sign the treaty, “not now, nor later;”

India has said that it wants to retain its nuclear testing option “if the international situation requires;”

India is already enjoying enough benefits from the Indo-U.S. nuclear deal, such as dual use technology and reactors;

Even though most NSG states have signed the CTBT, Indian analysts have argued that signing the CTBT as a pre requisite for India's membership into the NSG is a "non issue."

Views from Pakistan

While analyzing Pakistan's stance on the CTBT, three factors, as identified by nuclear expert Dr. Zafar Nawaz Jaspal, are important: objective/scope of the CTBT, scientific maturity of Pakistan's nuclear weapons program, and reciprocity in signing of the CTBT. Historically, Pakistan has been in support of the CTBT objective and its formulation process, indicated by its vote for a draft of the treaty presented in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 1996.

However, Pakistan's reluctance on signing the CTBT stems from its concerns over India's growing capabilities such as its missile defense shields, sea-based missiles, ICBM development, and it reportedly developing a uranium enrichment complex in southern India. As Islamabad's stand on CTBT is mainly dependent on India, it has once again offered a mutual nuclear test ban arrangement to New Delhi, which, if accepted, would mean a legally binding bilateral agreement between the regional nuclear rivals. Even though India has rejected a similar proposal from Pakistan in the past, New Delhi should consider it seriously, especially in light of its desire for NSG membership. Realistically, Pakistan might sign the CTBT keeping the ratification by India as a pre-requisite, which would potentially happen after U.S. and Chinese ratification.

There is also the belief that Pakistan must achieve the technical capability to test nuclear weapons at an advanced level through nuclear simulation tests before signing the CTBT.

President Obama's UNSC Resolution

If the treaty enters into force, it would strengthen global strategic stability and disarmament efforts, and would be in the interest of the non-proliferation regime. However, for the future of the treaty, the foremost responsibility lies on the shoulders of two permanent members of the UNGA, the United States and China. Ratifying the CTBT is unmistakably in U.S. national security interest. However, despite the Obama administration identifying the CTBT ratification as a top priority seven years ago, political complexities such as an endorsement from the Senate still plague the initiative. In this regard, President Obama's proposed UNSC resolution has led to a re-opening of the CTBT debate in the United States as well as globally.

Concluding Thoughts

During the ninth round of the Pakistan-US Security, Strategic Stability, and Nonproliferation (SSS&NP) Working Group recently, Pakistan voiced its support of CTBT's objectives and assured that it would not be the first to resume nuclear testing in the region. Additionally, the United States warmly welcomed Pakistan's recent non-testing proposal to India. On the other hand, India has been mum on the CTBT recently, and has not even responded to Pakistan's offer of a bilateral non-testing arrangement. The ball, thus, is in India's court.

The Consequences of Deployment of BrahMos Missile in Arunachal Pradesh

Saima Ali

The deployment of BrahMos missile is bound to increase the competitiveness and rivalry between China–India relations and will have a negative impact on the stability of the region. The BrahMos is a new game piece in India’s tense relationship with China. China claims parts of Arunachal Pradesh as its own and both sides have contesting claims on the Line of Actual Control (LAC), which is the de-facto border between the two countries. China has warned India that increasing troops presence and the move to deploy BrahMos cruise missiles in Arunachal Pradesh can escalate tensions on the border.

Chinese People’s Liberation Army (PLA) has strongly reacted against this move of India. India deploying supersonic missiles on the border has exceeded its own needs for self-defense and poses a serious threat to China’s Tibet and Yunnan provinces. Military buildups along the Sino-Indian border have increased recently as last month India deployed nearly 100 tanks to the Ladakh region. In reaction, Beijing cautioned of possible economic consequences.

The BrahMos cruise missile is stealthy, fast and extremely difficult to shoot down. The BrahMos is a supersonic cruise missile which can be launched from submarines, ships, aircraft or land. It can carry warheads weighing up to 300kg, and strike targets on land and at sea. It has been in service with the army since 2007 and is currently being tested for use by the Air Force’s Sukhoi-30 fighters.

It also has become a point of controversy in a complicated web of overlapping alliances between India, China, Russia and potentially Vietnam. Nevertheless Vietnamese Navy isn’t going to match China’s rapidly expanding fleet any time soon. But small Vietnamese ships with BrahMos missiles could pose a major threat to China’s larger military vessel. Therefore, India may attempt to cultivate an alliance with Vietnam in order to counterbalance China.

The supersonic BrahMos cruise missile has dive attack capabilities, and fits in the Sino-Indian border where it’s mostly mountain landscape. BrahMos with “steep div” capabilities suited to mountain warfare. BrahMos began in the 1990s as a joint project between Russia and India to develop an Indian version of the P-800 Oniks cruise missile. The missile’s name is a portmanteau of the rivers Brahmaputra and Moskva in India and Russia, respectively. Technically speaking, the BrahMos is actually

slightly faster at Mach 2.8 than the P-800. It also weighs twice as much as a Tomahawk, at six thousand pounds.

The BrahMos isn't just an antishipping weapon it also can hit ground-based targets, and is ideal for exactitude attacks against fixed installations such as radars, command centers, airbases and enemy missile batteries. It can also potentially carry a 660-pound nuclear warhead, though that doesn't appear to be its primary projected use.

Cruise missiles are designed to be fired at extended ranges from their targets so as not to expose the launching platform to enemy retaliation. During the Cold War, Russia developed unusual style of cruise missile designed to take out American aircraft carriers. These flew over the speed of sound to better evade the carrier's defenses, which include air-to-air missiles fired by fighters, surface-to-air missiles and Gatling-cannon Close-in weapon systems, or CIWS. They were also larger to increase the likelihood of achieving a kill in one hit.

The missile's "penetration capabilities" poses a threat to China's border regions and therefore can't hit any of China's major cities on its east coast while Chinese missiles can certainly strike places like New Delhi with relative ease. Disputes over lightly populated Himalaya mountains shouldn't constitute a truly substantive conflict of interest between the two countries.

Therefore, India must focus on promoting peace "rather than the opposite," China has said about Delhi's decision to put advanced cruise missiles along the border in Arunachal Pradesh. Chinese Defense Ministry spokesman Wu Qian said "We hope that the Indian side can do more to benefit peace and stability along the border and in the region, rather than the opposite."

<http://www.voiceofjournalists.com/the-consequences-of-brahmos-deployment-in-arunachal-pradesh/>

The Global Powers Need to Revisit Their Strategy on North Korea's Nuclear Development

Beenish Altaf

North Korea is continually building up its nuclear and missile program that is causing apprehensions worldwide. Its most latest nuclear test triggered the fear of nuclear terror among the US and other relevant states. The contemporary test counted as the fifth and the largest one that has been detonated is estimated at 10 kilotons. It is also worth mentioning here that it came on the 68th anniversary of the regime's founding. It triggered a flurry of phone calls among the worried leaders of the US, South Korea and Japan.

Officially it is stated by the Pyongyang's Nuclear Weapons Institute that "the detonation is a nuclear warhead explosion test for a device able to be mounted on strategic ballistic rockets." The statement also claimed that North Korea's standardization of this warhead design "will allow production, at will, of smaller, lighter and diversified nuclear warheads of higher strike power."

North Korea presented an unnerving and frightening demonstration over the past few months of its ability to deliver such warheads, using missiles that could strike Japan, South Korea and even US territory. It is actually the plan of the US to install anti-missile defence system in the South that further elevated and evoked concerns in the North.

The test has ignited global resentment with the UN Security Council agreeing to begin drawing up new sanctions against the North and several western capitals threatening the country of dire consequences. Nevertheless, nuclear missile program of DPRK has become reality as despite all the sanctions and the warnings they have been developing their nuclear program. Ironically, nothing has work so far, either the UN sanctions or unilateral steps taken by the US, Japan or South Korea. . Even the entire focus of the US has been on tightening sanctions against the impoverished country, which is already under five sets of UN sanctions.

The international community along with the other peace loving countries is exasperated on North Korea's growing nuclear aspirations. Likewise Pakistan has condemned it too expressing it as against the objective of a nuclear weapons free Korean Peninsula. More precisely, all that Pakistan wants is peace in the Korean Peninsula. It is desired that all the countries in the region including North

and South Korea, Japan, China and the US, manage the situation diplomatically with utmost responsibility.

There were plenty of opportunities in the past when North Korean leadership expressed its willingness to talk to the world on its nuclear program subject to lifting of sanctions and provision of necessary economic assistance. The collaborative approach would have been effective but regrettably the United States preferred to hurl threats on North Korea aggravating the situation further.

But now North Korea aspires to become the giant of the region by enhancing its nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles. On the other hand, analysts are of the view that to carry out nuclear attack, North Korea would need to miniaturize its warheads so that they can be fitted on a missile for delivery and there are reasonable doubts about claims of the Pyongyang regarding its ability to miniaturize nuclear weapons.

There is a prevailing view from the U.S. analysts believing that India has been covertly helping North Korea develop its nuclear and missile programs despite UN sanctions since 2006. According to international reports and the U.S. experts, India is reportedly involved in training dozens of North Koreans who later took key positions in its sensitive missile programs. Moreover, North Koreans have been receiving training related to missile and space programs in India for the past two decades. Since 2006, the UN has issued five major sanctions against North Korea.

Alarmingly, Pyongyang's nuclear advancements pose a serious challenge to the global non-proliferation regime and isolating North Korea has proved to be counter-productive. It is taken as a step further towards miniaturization of its nuclear warheads. However, the ideal solution would be to resolve the issues with a balanced approach having sanctions and diplomatic engagement simultaneously.

While South Korea and Japan might have legitimate concerns over nuclear movements in the neighborhood, there is also urgent need to resolve the problem through constructive engagement with the North aimed at addressing its concerns as well.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/27-Sep-16/pyongyangs-growing-nuclear-aspirations>

Pakistan and NSG: Countering the Cards

Maimuna Ashraf

Notwithstanding the proactive lobbying, assertive US backing and overwhelming support in favor of India's bid for the membership, India is still struggling hard for the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) membership while the plenary meeting of NSG also concluded with sharp setback for India. The chances for a favorable outcome were already bleak for India's inclusion but two quick progressions dropped the vociferous voices. First, China opposed India's membership in defense of the principles that does not allow a non-NPT state to be part of NSG club. Second, Pakistan formally applied for club's membership. Albeit floor was in favor of India with prominent positive interventions, yet the absence of consensus - with New Zealand, Ireland and Austria supported for merits of NPT, Turkey and China flagged Pakistan right of membership and Brazil's stance for criterion based process - led to showdown vis-a-vis India's induct as member.

Evidently, two players are exchanging tough messages to drive respective pressure points, China as 'non-proliferation hardliner' and US as 'strategic supporter'. The prudent positions by both states are niche aligned to their geostrategic interests yet playing a subtle and significant role in determining which way the vote will sway. Notwithstanding Indian diplomatic efforts and US pressure, China did not fall for any influence and is still sticking to its official stance which in result stonewalled Indian efforts and supported Pakistan's candidature. Pakistan sees this Chinese treatment as testament of all-weather friendship and close ally.

The China's criteria based approach advocates for same treatment of all non-NPT states. This called the 48 members of group to reach consensus on what the 'criteria' should be. It would mean that neither India nor Pakistan could gain entry till the NSG draw up its criteria. Consequently, this was a smart delaying tactic by China aimed at New Delhi. Conversely, India opposed any criteria-based approach and asked for a merit based approach. By 'merit' India probably desires to look at the previous record of a country and their nuclear non-proliferation credentials, which could benefit India and trouble Pakistan. However, India's application does not guarantee merit, since it was India whose 1974 nuclear test led to the creation of the NSG. The basic purpose of the NSG is to provide a mechanism through which the non-proliferation goal could be achieved, but in the present scenario the group members are unanimously supporting a proliferator (India) to be part of the group. This questions India's non-proliferation credentials and merit-based approach. Yet, this requires consensus on the measures to evaluate 'merit'.

If India succeeds in joining the NSG club, it will give India greater excess to nuclear commerce, legitimacy of nuclear armed state outside NPT and equivalent status to other members of NSG. However criteria-based consensus is important to address the differences because treating India as an exemption would set precedent for future membership.

Pakistan is not ready to accept any assurance that India would refrain from blocking Pakistan's subsequent bid. It believes that criteria-based approach will preserve its future prospects for NSG membership. The basic criterion established according to the NSG's procedural arrangement is that applicant should be signatory of the NPT. Neither Pakistan nor India is signatory of the NPT, thus pragmatically neither state can join NSG. This makes Pakistan's argument questionable. If NSG establishes criteria by linking membership with NPT, it will diminish Pakistan's chances to join NSG because Pakistan has no plan to sign NPT in future. The discriminatory nature of the NPT convinced Pakistan not to sign NPT and when India carried out tests in 1974, Pakistan's reservations were further validated. Reportedly, Pakistan exercised intensified lobbying with a delegation led by Foreign Secretary Aizaz Chaudhry in the annual NSG plenary meeting held in Seoul and interacted with representatives from 25 countries on the sidelines of the session to oppose 'exclusive membership' for India. Recently, Kazakhstan and Belarus supported Pakistan's bid to NSG which should be seen as more recognition for Pakistan's credentials. As things stand, Pakistan's diplomatic overtures have fructified with some NSG members in quest of detailed discussions within NSG to decide upon criteria for admittance of non-NPT countries to the group with a perspective to preserve the non-proliferation norms. But Pakistan needs to diversify its foreign policy objectives and lobbying approaches if it seeks NSG membership in the future.

There are expectations that a special meeting of NSG will be held in approaching months. Consequently, associating Indian membership with NPT might delay Indian inclusion but in the long term the approach is short-sighted for Pakistan. Lately, US is working with the UN Security Council on a resolution to persuade India and Pakistan to limit their arms race and ultimately both states will be pushed into CTBT. However, Pakistan should not accept any pressure to sign Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) for NSG inclusion unilaterally.

<http://nation.com.pk/blogs/27-Sep-2016/pakistan-and-nsg-countering-the-cards>

War Clouds in south Asia: Economic Terrorism in South Asia and its Impact on Geo-economics

Shahzadi Tooba

“Geo-economics is the use of economic instrument for geo-political purposes”. These kinds of activities are specifically carried out by foreign countries in order to sabotage the economic activities of a country, and make the state dysfunctional. This economic terrorism is far worse than direct invasion of a country. Emerging economies are the most affected.

Coming towards the practicality of the term “economic terrorism” after creating Uri attack drama, India is going ahead with all the other plannings. The main focus of India is to sabotage the CPEC Project, as exposed through Kulbhushan Yadav, a spy working for Indian research and Analysis Wing (RAW) who was caught by Pak army in March 2016. Gen Bajwa explained that the primary task given to Yadav (as he accepted) was to revive the dying Balochistan insurgency and sabotage China-Pakistan Economic Corridor. India has made no secret of its strong opposition to the CPEC project, and it is believed to be making covert efforts to sabotage it. Indian Foreign Minister Sushma Swaraj has said last year that Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi “very strongly” raised the issue regarding China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) during his visit to Beijing, and called the project “unacceptable”.

Another episode of the series is the abrogation of Indus Water Treaty. The treaty consisted of 11 articles, detailing different provisions and rules for both parties. The 8 appendixes present in the treaty listed the detailed conditions and technical information that was to be followed by both parties.

Under the conditions set in the Indus Water treaty, out of the six rivers that flow into Pakistan, the three western rivers (as highlighted in the picture above) were allocated to Pakistan. According to the Indus Water Treaty, Pakistan has unrestricted access to the three rivers, i.e. Jhelum, Chenab and the Indus. For its part, India was allocated unrestricted access to the three eastern rivers, i.e. Ravi, Sutlej and Beas.

Despite having control over the upstream of the three western rivers, India isn’t allowed to store any water or modify the natural drainage of the river flow. However, the treaty does allow India to use the water for domestic, agricultural, power generation and any other non-consumptive purposes.

The same applies for Pakistan with respect to the three Indian rivers up until the rivers reach Pakistan. Following that, Pakistan had nearly unrestricted access to the rivers. Pakistan isn’t allowed to alter the three Indian rivers in any way which could cause damage to India.

As mentioned before, Pakistan has unrestricted access to its own rivers and is allowed to manage the water as it sees fit. However, Pakistan was also asked to develop the capacity to make the best possible use of its water resources.

To aggravate the already tense situation, Prime Minister Narendra Modi told officials on Monday that India should use more of the rivers' resources. Further he said that India will accelerate its building of new hydro-power plants along three rivers that flow into Pakistan and "we want to see that all these (hydropower) projects are put on a really fast-track basis".

India has long accused Pakistan of backing militant groups operating in the Himalayan state of Jammu and Kashmir, through which several of the countries' shared rivers flow. Pakistan denies the allegations and says India has not provided adequate proof to support its claims.

The Indus Waters Treaty was signed in 1960 in a bid to resolve disputes, but India's ambitious irrigation plans and construction of thousands of upstream dams has continued to annoy Pakistan, which depends on snow-fed Himalayan rivers for everything from drinking water to agriculture.

As per the agreement, however, India is allowed to build dams only to consume the water, which they are currently not doing. As a review is in the process whether to restart construction of the Tulbul navigation project, which was suspended several years ago. The project proposes diverting water from one of the shared rivers to a city in India-held Kashmir that could impact flows downstream.

Which means that only option left for India is to build dams and restrain or slow-down the flow of waters. In such a scenario, it will take India at least 12-15 years to build the required number of dams to put Pakistan in trouble.

Adviser to the Prime Minister on Foreign Affairs Sartaj Aziz on Tuesday told the Senate that revocation of the Indus Waters Treaty by India "can be taken as an act of war" against Pakistan.

"If India tries to interrupt water flow into Pakistan, it will not only violate the Indus Water Treaty, but also set a regional state practice under which international law can be serve as a precedent. It will provide China, for example, a justification to consider of suspension of waters of the Brahmaputra river. He further told that "Pakistan will 'react befittingly' if India attempts to violate the Indus Waters Treaty.

For immediate blockade, it will have to violate the treaty. In this case, the matter can also escalate and may lead to a full-blown war between both the countries.

The most important thing is that if Pakistan has to gain international support and deal with the issue permanently, we need to conserve our water resources as much as we can. Pakistan requires more dams, to store water, and barrages, to control water flow in case India releases water from its dams or block the water.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/09/28/war-clouds-south-asia-economic-terrorism-india-impact-geo-economics/>

Joint Sea-2016: Sino-Russian Axis Towards a Global Ascendancy

Saima Ali

In the contemporary international arena, regional alliance is significant; and for great powers like China and Russia to have regional popularity and cordial relations with all the regional countries is in their fundamental interests. Last week, China and Russia commenced an eight-day joint naval exercise in the South China Sea off the coast of China's Guangdong province, in a sign of growing cooperation between their armed forces against the backdrop of regional territorial disputes.

The "Joint Sea-2016" included ships, submarines, ship-borne helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft, along with marines and amphibious armored vehicles which carried out live-firing exercises. The Naval exercises concluded on September 19. Interestingly this exercise is the first major drill of its kind involving China and a regional power Russia in the South China Sea. So Beijing and Moscow held the first-ever South China Sea iteration of their Joint Sea exercises. The Chinese and Russian navies appointed in a range of activities, including search and rescue drills, anti-submarine warfare, and "joint-island seizing missions." The later appears to be a new addition to the Joint Sea drills in 2016.

Wang Hai, Chinese chief director of the exercise and deputy commander of the Chinese Navy, said the joint drill is "a strategic measure" and a concrete action to promote the China-Russia wide-ranging strategic partnership and will deepen exchanges and cooperation between the two militaries, especially the two naval forces. The drills emphasized combat, digitization and standardization to promote naval cooperation. The drills gave the two countries an opportunity to show each other their combat effectiveness, and the performance data of their military vessels, planes, radar and sonar. Joint Chinese-Russian drills have grown increasingly common in recent years and Joint Sea-2016 is fifth between the two navies since 2012 – with the countries joined in their mutual suspicion of the US and its allies. Russia has been the only major country to speak out on China's behalf in its demand that the US and other countries stay out of such arguments.

From Russian perspective, the partnership with China has always been a much easier task as both have many commonalities such as their lack of stronger relations to many of the European nations and both the countries also experience distrust against the United States which naturally binds these two countries in a close partnership for collaboration despite of having many varied interests. This relation is mutually dependent as Russia needs China for its economic and military interests and China needs Russian support to become a partner in Eurasia and these both have a common interest to become able to maintain an effective counterweight against the US and its allies

Moscow has refrained from criticizing Beijing's position on the South China Sea, where it claims almost 90 percent of the waters under its ambiguous nine-dash line. Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi and Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov reached what Beijing described as an "important consensus" on the South China Sea. "Lavrov expressed that Russia holds that the South China Sea issue should be resolved through political and diplomatic means such as direct dialogues and negotiations by parties

concerned.”The statement added that “Forces outside the region should not intervene,” ostensibly referencing the United States and India.

The Sino-Russian relations in the shape of expanding SCO is an alarming message for many states that these can build a power bloc which has a prominent role in the international affairs to have their diverse policy than the West as they don’t believe that power is hidden in the secrets of interference in other’s internal affairs and dominating world through rouge means. Consequently China and Russia while not formal allies have steadily increased their military-to-military collaboration. In addition to naval exercise, the two countries cooperate on counterterrorism, holding the Peace Mission exercises annually. “Russia and China stick to points of view which are very close to each other or are almost the same in the international arena,” Russian President Vladimir Putin said in June, during a visit to China.

China has declared to continue developing man-made islands in the disputed Spratly island group and is eager to conduct regular aerial patrols over the strategically vital sea through which passes an estimated \$5 trillion in trade each year. At the same time as China says the drills do not envision specific enemies or target any third parties, their location in the South China Sea has drawn criticism.

The Sino-Russia axis and its expanding power beyond the region and is sometimes also termed as a steady move towards the global and military ascendancy as both regional powers are already in alliances and the purpose of their alliance formation is not primarily confined counter the expansion of NATO in the region, but actually these states sought to split some common benefits and strategic affiliation to avoid any bilateral conflict that would cover the way to invite any external player to dominate their sphere of influence and put their interests on stake.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/09/28/joint-sea-2016-sino-russian-axis-towards-global-ascendancy/>

Pyongyang Strategy, Nuclear Diplomacy and International Environment

Maimuna Ashraf

International environment has witnessed fundamental transformation since the ratification of NPT in 1970s, because in the transformed multipolar global dynamic, with different nuclear stand offs, varying alliances and extended nuclear assurances, the application of the NPT is challenged by relevance and obsolescence. The discriminatory approach by NPT signatory states, in pursuit of their geostrategic/economic agendas is undermining the moral and legal authority of the NPT. Non Proliferation Regime (NPR) has to be reformed in order to cope with the current realities and enhanced challenges. The efficacy and success of the NPT as a centerpiece of the international nuclear order had been raging for a decade, the clandestine development of nuclear weapons and enrichment program by NPT signatory states i.e. North Korea, Libya, Iran and the dilemma created by North Korean withdrawal from the treaty, posed a serious challenge to the non-proliferation regime. Whereas, almost 40 countries are now believed to have the capability to make nuclear weapons or have mastered the nuclear fuel cycle.

Since the start of 2016 the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has been working towards further advancement of its nuclear and missile programs. The significant developments include DPRK's claims to have successfully conducted the fifth largest nuclear weapon test, a Hydrogen bomb test, a successful satellite launch, formation of a new military unit KN-08 brigade to deploy ICMBs, and test-firing of a new anti-tank guided weapon. The international community has widely condemned all these developments. However, Pyongyang seems determined to keep enhancing its nuclear and missile programs. Pyongyang's nuclear technological advancements have remained a source of concern at the international and regional level. After DPRK tested its fourth nuclear device on January 6, 2016, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) imposed the toughest resolution UNSCR 2270 against the DPRK to date, in order to curb the advancement in its nuclear and missile domain.

North Korea plans to carry out more tests as it passes through a developing phase of its nuclear weapons development program, not much is known about North Korea's nuclear strategy and its implications. The ambiguity rules and plays an important role in its nuclear weapons program. In the absence of North Korea's policy document and institutionalization of its nuclear policy, it is not obvious what nuclear strategy North Korea would choose and why. Therefore, one can assume provisional interpretations about the embryonic nuclear strategy of North Korea.

If North Korea maintain the modest number, confines the nuclear weapons tests, appears defensive and restrains from using its deterrent forces, then this could have some positive implications on deterrence stability in the Korean Peninsula. Conversely, if North Korea, increases its deterrent forces, miniaturizes nuclear weapons, develops sophisticated delivery systems, acquires an assured second-strike capability and acts more offensive, then this may have greater security implications for the

region. Apparently North Korea might move from the necessary constraints of minimum deterrence, which in turn would have awful security implications for the Korean Peninsula. This would put strategic pressures on South Korea and Japan regarding their legitimate security interests in the region.

DPRK says that it decided to withdraw from NPT in 1993 as it was facing issues regarding country's defense and its sovereignty. However, US rather than addressing North Korea's concerns, responded by imposing UN resolutions that called for full economic sanctions. Later, the talks were held between Kim Il-Sung and Jimmy Carter without reaching any agreeable decision and both remained stuck to their respective stance. DPRK was dealing with US and IAEA, but policies towards DPRK remained unchanged which only moved from bad to worse. The North Korean perspective is that it had no option but to quit from NPT. The main substance of Six Party Talks is the denuclearization of Korean Peninsula. North Korea was wholeheartedly participating in it since long but finally it came to the conclusion that the main proposal of Six Party Talks is not really aimed at the denuclearization of Korean Peninsula or to maintain peace and security in this peninsula, instead it was aimed at disarming DPRK only. Pyongyang states that for as long US refuses to withdraw its army from South Korea, disapproves of converting Armistice Agreement into Peace Agreement, continues to provide nuclear protection umbrella to South Korea, does not give up its hostile policies that include the policy to topple the DPRK government and does not change its mind, DPRK will continue developing its nuclear program. North Korea asserts, it is developing all missiles under its nuclear program, it is for deterrence purposes only and North Korea will continue to develop these capabilities until it balances the security structure in the Korean peninsula.

Arguably, the contemporary international non-proliferation regime is in disorder, not due to North Korea, neither due to pre-Joint Comprehensive Action Plan Iran, but because of its inherent structural contradictions and operational flaws. There is a need for bold course of action; otherwise future of non-proliferation is likely to remain bleak. The promises enshrined in the NPT for NNWS have often been flouted by NWS. It is indeed trying to impose a technical solution to political problems. This approach of exclusives is rendering the NPT as a relic. North Korean nuclear advancements pose a serious challenge to the global non-proliferation regime and isolating North Korea has proved to be counter-productive. However ideal solution would be to resolve the issues with a balanced approach having sanctions and diplomatic engagement simultaneously.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/09/28/pyongyangs-strategy-nuclear-diplomacy-international-environment/>

CPEC and The Growing Indian Frustration

S Sadia Kazmi

By now it is widely known that the CPEC is a collection of projects. It primarily aims at achieving strong trade links between China and Pakistan. This 46 billion dollars project will allow Pak-China relations to enter a new phase with added economic and strategic dimensions to it. All this development is closely monitored in Delhi with great unease. They have made no effort to conceal their unease and have openly voiced their displeasure by condemning the CPEC project.

However, both China and Pakistan are fully dedicated to turn CPEC into reality against all odds. This is naturally an alarming situation for India which is finding it hard to curb its frustration anymore. As is evident from Prime Minister Narendra Modi's speech at a conference, in which he resolutely disapproved the initiative of China-Pakistan economic corridor. In very vivid terms he warned that China should stop developing the China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) or be prepared to face dire consequences in Baluchistan.

The same rhetoric could be heard coming from Sushma Swaraj where she vehemently expressed that India would not allow the route of economic corridor to be passed through Gilgit-Baltistan, implying that the region is part of India and Pakistan first needs to seek India's permission to carry out any activity there.

Both these statements coming from high profile and in service political leadership, raises concern for both Pakistan and China. The hurdles and challenges are bound to be there. But it will not be an exaggeration to say that the biggest challenge does come from India. The statements by Indian leadership do not leave any ambiguity that India is against the CPEC. Not only this but it is employing different ways and means to pressurize Pakistan to behave on Delhi's terms.

India is bent upon disallowing the passage of CPEC through Azad Kashmir. India considers Azad Kashmir as "Pakistan Occupied Kashmir", and it assumes that it has the natural right of jurisdiction over whole of Kashmir. On the other hand, constructing the corridor through Azad Kashmir means China considers it a part of Pakistan which comes in direct clash with India's stance on Kashmir.

At the same time India feels growingly alarmed at the possibility of China's presence so close to India. Once Gwadar port is functional, China not only gets three times reduction in the total distance that would need to be covered by the Chinese trading ships but China will also get an easy access into Indian Ocean, thereby undermining India's supremacy and influence in the region. Chinese expected naval edge over India is naturally causing unrest among the Indian military and civil circles.

Not just that but one of the former ambassadors of India openly expressed that the CPEC is having a sole nefarious agenda of containment of India. Hence is seen as a valid threat to Indian security

and sovereignty where both and China are seen to be working towards weakening India's position in the region.

Prime Minister Modi also expressed in his Independence Day speech that people in Baluchistan have thanked him, implying that he is more closely integrated with people in Baluchistan. At the same time his threat about "facing consequences" in Baluchistan, has made it clear that India is involved in instigating the anti-state sentiments in the province. Furthermore, recently Brahmdagh Bugti have been reported to seek asylum in India, to which he has received positive response from the Indian government.

Baluchistan is the main site which holds the major concentration of the CPEC project. Hence Baluchistan has been the prime target for Indian aggressive interventionist policy. The Indian Spy Kalbuhsan Yadav was captured from Baluchistan, further reinforcing the validity of this argument.

However it is a fact that Indian frustration against CPEC, China and Pakistan is only going to grow further, along with the pressure from India against Pakistan. This will for sure add to the tension in the region for which Pakistan needs to be well prepared all the time and be in a position to counter it too.

Eventually India will have to realize that the CPEC is not just bringing dividends for Pakistan but is integral for the socio-economic uplift of the whole region and beyond. Hence staying out of the CPEC is not going to serve India any good and is not even advisable. The stronger economic ties will be guaranteeing regional security and stability and ultimately benefit all the states in the region. This is because of the pattern of interdependence that is created when countries get engaged in the economic activity with each other such as trade. This also reduces the chances of clash or war.

Hence instead of being frustrated by this mega project, India needs to see it from a much bigger perspective where this may actually compliment India's aspirations of becoming an economic giant and ultimately emerge as a major power.

<http://www.voiceofjournalists.com/cpec-and-the-growing-indian-frustration-an-analysis/>

Pak-Russia Joint Military Exercises: Possibility for an Emerging New Alliance?

S Sadia Kazmi

Since the landscape of International politics is always changing, where the alliances and partnerships are also shifting with much frequency, a new emerging cooperation between Pakistan and Russia gains a huge attention as well as importance. Not only is this a significant development in itself where these two estranged states, since the Cold War, have now agreed to joined hands in military domain, but the timing of the military exercises is also quite noteworthy. It is the time when India, a long time trusted ally of Russia, is bent upon isolating Pakistan in the international community. Hence Russian tilt towards Pakistan despite India's motives and concerns, carry immense implications for the states as well as for the regional political and strategic dynamics. At the same time India has always banked upon Russia's unconditional support in almost all the regional and global matters vis a vis Pakistan and other states. Hence the prevalent concern in the official circles of New Delhi about losing out on a traditional partner i.e. Russia, is a very genuine concern. There even have been speculations that India has expressed these concerns to Russian counterparts too, demanding the exercises should be aborted. Whether these reports are true or not, one thing is confirmed that India's long term and trusted traditional partner has opened avenues of cooperation and partnership with India's arch rival Pakistan.

In these interesting turn of events, the Russian stance is clear yet open to debate. Russia maintains that its partnership with Pakistan is independent of its relations with India. It stresses upon the fact that India never showed concern or even stopped Russia from pursuing independent relations with any other states and that the trust between the two is still very much intact. These could be seen as true since another supporting argument is that the Pak-Russian relations are still at a burgeoning stage and will take time to evolve "if at all" to reach to the level of equation that has existed and is still present between Russia and India.

Simultaneously one can bring in the case of China in order to get better understanding of the emerging regional dynamics. China has been since long pursuing the equal handed policy vis a vis Pakistan and India, despite being the closest ally of Pakistan. Even though India and China remained alienated for long after 1962 and have divergence of opinion and clash of interest over several political issues, but they have pushed their differences to the back burner for the sake of bigger interests that serves the both positively. This can be seen as diplomatic maturity that is the need of the time. Pakistan hasn't lost trust in China, while China has openly claimed verbally as well as through concrete actions that its relations with India will never supersede its relations with Pakistan. This has been proven true time and again as is evident from China's dedicated efforts for the socio-economic uplifting of Pakistan through the CPEC, as well as China's stern statement regarding Indian hostile ambitions against Pakistan, in case of which China would voluntarily get involved, giving all out support to Pakistan. Similarly one can expect that Indo-Russia relations to not be effected by the initiation of military exercises between Pakistan and Russia.

However that is just one perspective. Another dimension to this whole scenario requires one to consider some other facts too. One cannot ignore the reality that for past some time there has been an ever increasing propinquity between the US and India. The US has been investing massively in India in lieu of its Asia Pacific policy, in which India is seen as acquiring the pivotal position. Furthermore the recent figures have reportedly revealed that US has taken over the title from Russia of being the biggest arm seller/provider to India. The Logistic Support Agreement is another major development that has further strengthened the strategic cooperation between the US and India. All of these have not gone unnoticed by Russia. It is true that India and Russia have not lost the trust in each other but equally alarming is the growing coziness between India and the US, which Russia can't knowingly ignore. Hence it would not be very wrong to speculate that India's tight embrace of the US has led to Russia's opening its channels to Pakistan. The world politics is essentially driven by the realist school of thought. The states have been found to realigning their equations and shifting their priorities as per their ever changing national interests. It is an established fact that the states are rational actors that strive for their survivability and growth. The same can be applied to this scenario.

Concurrently Chinese massive investment inside Pakistan through the CPEC, has made Pakistan emerge in a very new light. It is now increasingly being seen as a lucrative investment destination for the international community. Most of the nations are showing their interest in joining and be part of the CPEC project. Russia might too eventually like to seek some long lasting partnership with Pakistan and may become in some way become part of the CPEC. This leads one to visualize another possible realignment of relations and emergence of Russia-Pakistan-China Nexus. Such a possibility may look too good to be true but surely cannot be ruled out.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/09/30/pak-russia-joint-military-exercises-possibility-emerging-new-alliance/>

Frustrated Modi Is Isolating India

Amanullah Khan

Narendra Modi led India is trying to reshape regional security environment in South Asia in many ways. Overall, India's foreign policy (Modi Doctrine) vis-à-vis South Asia suggests a dominant posture. Apart from Pakistan, almost all South Asian countries are somewhat under Indian influence. Pakistan's resistance to Indian hegemonic policies has put Modi's government in a state of frustration, resulting into stressed relations between the two countries.

India blames Pakistan for uprising in the Indian occupied Kashmir, while Pakistan is unhappy over the strong Indian influence in Afghanistan, especially its security and intelligence apparatus in the country. Pakistan regards Afghanistan central to its peace and security, therefore, wants to see a stable, sovereign and independent Afghanistan. Indian factor in Afghanistan is not contributing positively towards achieving the objective of a peaceful Afghanistan. It is using Afghan territory to destabilize Pakistan through mercenary groups. Modi has openly talked about Balochistan, Gilgit Baltistan and Azad Kashmir, which reflects his extremist mindset of Akhand Bharat, a dream by Chanakya. Pakistan has suffered in the past from the same mindset in 1971, where Mukti Bahini, a terrorist organization, was launched by RAW in East Pakistan, followed by Indian military invasion, resulted into the creation of Bangladesh. Modi and his high ups in the government are using the same tactics in Balochistan now, by supporting BLA and other insurgent elements.

Indian government of Modi is also working on a policy to isolate Pakistan in the international community. Modi himself and many of his top ministers have expressed about this on many occasions. For the purpose, he has been visiting many countries around the world to present its case of isolating Pakistan. To some extent, he has been successful in this regard, by effectively engaging Iran, Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan, Bangladesh and United States.

India signed an agreement with Iran to build Chabahar port for Iran that would link India to Afghanistan and Central Asian republics. Islamabad has not officially expressed concerns over the project but it is carefully watching to ensure that Iran's soil is not used against Pakistan. Arrest of an Indian naval commander, Kulbhushan Yadav, by Pakistani security forces on Pak-Iran border has reinforced such apprehensions.

Pakistan's relations with Bangladesh are also at lowest ebb, primarily because of Sheikh Hasina's anti-Pakistan position under the Indian pressure. She has gone beyond humanity level in her rage. Her government is executing senior Jamaat-e-Islami leaders after more than four decades on baseless allegations and through unfair trials.

Delhi and Washington have also come much closer, particularly in the defence sector. Their defence cooperation has increased enormously over the last few years. Containing China seems the main driving force for the close cooperation. India has been given a special status as far as US military

technology is concerned. According to a report, India has access to 99 percent of US defence technologies. Washington has also supported Indian bid for Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) membership.

India has also been able to boost cordial relationship with Saudi Arabia, a close friend of Pakistan. Besides many agreements with India, Saudi Arabia, Bangladesh, and Afghanistan conferred Modi with highest civilian awards. These developments are recent and all due to one man, Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi. World community would once call him an extremist who butchered thousands of Muslims in Gujrat province of India, and Washington and London had denied granting him visas. However, he has changed the entire course of Indian diplomacy in order to isolate Pakistan and further Indian national interests.

India is continuing its efforts to isolate Pakistan in the world community. Pakistan has somehow suffered by virtue of policies of the present Indian government, especially in cases of Bangladesh, Afghanistan and America. However, the question is whether India can completely isolate Pakistan? In simple terms, Modi's policy would prove unproductive. Pakistan carries significance for the world and it cannot be left isolated for a longer time. The current developments are having short-term implications and the dust would settle soon. Except from Afghanistan and Bangladesh, neither Iran can afford enmity with Pakistan at the cost of friendship with India, nor Saudi Arabia would like to ignore Pakistan. Unlike Afghanistan and Bangladesh, Iranian government is independent and more sovereign. It would not like to be dictated about its foreign policy by a third state. Recent update is that Iran and Turkey have expressed great interest to become part of the CPEC project. There is also Iran-Pakistan gas pipeline project underway, and Iran Navy warships have reached Karachi for joint exercises with Pakistan Navy. Iran considers Pakistan's security as its own security. Perhaps Iran's border with Pakistan is the most secure border. Likewise, Washington would not like disengagement with Pakistan being a significant player in the Afghan peace process. This is evident from the fact that US refrained from blaming Pakistan for the Uri attack despite huge hue and cry by the Indian government.

The major upsetting thing for India is China's open support for Pakistan in every internal and external issue. Modi's government knows that Pakistan and China cannot be subjugated and bullied like Afghanistan and Bangladesh. China has always been the frontline supporter of Pakistan. CPEC project, Pakistan endeavor for NSG membership, defence cooperation, and political support to Pakistan's position on Kashmir are some of the examples reflecting strong ties between the two countries.

Russia, one of the close friends of India, has even shown interest to boost cooperation with Pakistan in military sector. There are talks underway for possible purchase of defence hardware from Russia. Moreover, Russian troops are carrying out joint military exercises with Pakistan Army.

In a nutshell, Modi can use its big economic leverage to turn some regional countries in its favor but in the longer run, its aggressive policies will prove negative for India (both internally and externally). Signs are now visible in this regard. Among so many internal social issues, there is unrest in the Occupied Kashmir valley from the last three months, Khalistan and other separatist movements have got momentum again.

History shows that India is bereft of a political logic, it only understand the logic of power. China let them understand the power logic in 1962 and ever since, it did not dare to take any direct provocative measure against China. After Uri attack, Modi's government officials threatened Pakistan with surgical strikes that proved a bluff. Modi then talked of isolating Pakistan which also looks a fantasy. Next, Modi decided to block Pakistan's share of water, by violating Indus Water Treaty. This strategy is also not going to work. India need to come out of a superiority complex as it cannot bully Pakistan under the nuclear umbrella. Let the world aside, for many reasons, India itself cannot ignore Pakistan. It is almost impossible to isolate a country completely in the anarchic world.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/09/30/frustrated-modi-isolating-india/>