



VISION

VISIONARY INSIGHTS INTO THE STRATEGIC INQUESTS OF NATIONS

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 6

JUNE 2018

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi

Strategic Vision Institute
Islamabad

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 6
JUNE 2018

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi



STRATEGIC VISION
I N S T I T U T E

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	1
China and Pakistan Together for the Fortification of Maritime Security.....	2
S Sadia Kazmi	2
Pakistan and India’s NSG Membership: Challenges and Prospects	4
Uzge A. Saleem.....	4
Pakistan’s Quest for NSG Membership and Role of China	6
Qura tul Ain Hafeez.....	6
Forthcoming Nuclear Suppliers Group Plenary Meeting and India’s Status.....	8
Sonia Naz.....	8
28 th NSG Plenary: National Interests or Non-Proliferation Norms	10
Ahyousha Khan	10
Nuclear Suppliers Group and Non-proliferation Regime.....	12
Beenish Altaf	12
NSG Expansion for Non-NPT States: India and Pakistan’s Case.....	14
Ubaid Ahmed	14
Humanizing the Kashmir Issue Amid Damning UN Report on Kashmir	16
S Sadia Kazmi	16
Nuclear Deterrence and Action Reaction Paradigm in the Indian Ocean.....	18
Ahyousha Khan	18
SCO Ensuring Regional Security and Economic Interests	20
Qura tul Ain Hafeez.....	20
Why is the World Bending Over Backwards for Indo-Centric US Interests?	22
Uzge Amer Saleem	22
Singapore Summit – Challenges and Prospects	24
Beenish Altaf	24
India’s Shifting Nuclear Doctrine: Impact on Strategic Stability	26
Asma Khalid.....	26
Pakistan’s Nuclear Policy: Impact on Strategic Stability in South Asia	28
Sonia Naz.....	30

Editor's Note

June has specifically been an important month with regards to the 28th Plenary of NSG. However, no considerable development about the highly anticipated decision on India and Pakistan's NSG membership was witnessed. Nonetheless, the scholars at the SVI have extensively scrutinized the deliberations of 28th plenary and provided an in-depth analysis of the issue. The readers will find a substantial and informed evaluation of the present status, limitations, and future probability of the membership of non-NPT states in their articles. Major part of this issue deals with this important area.

Other significant topics covered in this issue of electronic journal include Nuclear Deterrence and Indian Ocean Politics, China-Pakistan Maritime Security Cooperation, Environmental Stability and CPEC, Humanizing the Kashmir Issue, and SCO Ensuring Regional and Economic Security among others.

It is hoped that the issue will help readers in staying updated with the current political environment and they 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 improvements 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](#).

Senior Research Associate
Syedah Sadia Kazmi

China and Pakistan Together for the Fortification of Maritime Security

S Sadia Kazmi

Secure and protected sea lanes provide a state with the advantageous position where it can virtually have control over the world, as was rightly proclaimed by Alfred Thayer Mahan “whoever rules the waves, rules the world”. Maritime security has increasingly become an important issue globally as well as especially for Pakistan, more than ever before ever since it has embarked upon the CPEC project with China. Successful operationalization and functioning of Gwadar port largely depends on the secure sea routes in the Indian Ocean Region (IOR). IOR itself has 36 littoral states and it is believed that almost 65 percent of world’s oil and 35 percent world’s gas passes through this region. No wonder these statistics have helped the IOR garnered world attention wherein the US, Russia, China, and India are actively engaged in claiming their economic and military influence.

Security itself is generally defined as freedom from threat or danger. There are a variety of potential threats that the sea lanes are prone to. These include piracy, illegal fishing and exploitation of water resources, smuggling, drug and human trafficking, terrorism, robbery and even the act of contaminating the water or causing marine pollution is part of the many threats. Only once these threats are sufficiently addressed, can a state enjoy leverage over the other countries. While it’s a blessing to be a littoral state, Pakistan is also faced with a number of challenges. It is one of the 36 Indian Ocean Region’s littoral states with a long coast line to defend. However, it becomes quite challenging in view of limited infrastructure and lack of ample security forces. Pakistan needs to employ advanced naval capability to secure its port and the adjacent sea lanes for the economic activity to continue smoothly and unhindered. According to the facts, almost 95 percent of Pakistan’s trade passes through the Indian Ocean Region. Which means it is essentially a life line for Pakistan which must never be broken or blocked. Gwadar port is also closely located to the Strait of Hormuz, which is a significant choke point in the IOR. This geographical location and close proximity to the Strait of Hormuz, makes Gwadar port not only a significant point in the Indian Ocean but also exposes it to the security threats emerging from Strait of Hormuz. Furthermore, India modernization of its navy is another are of genuine concern for Pakistan. Hence, the maritime security assumes the status of national security concern for Pakistan which eventually has its implications for all the sectors especially for the human security. The Indian naval buildup needs to be immediately countered by Pakistan through the development and modernization of its naval power.

In this regard, recently on 1st June 2018, Pakistan Ministry of Defence Production signed a contract with China Shipbuilding Trading Co. Ltd (CSTCL) for two Type 054A frigates for the Pakistan Navy. The main objective behind this development is to acquire the much-needed naval modernization which these frigates will bring to the Pakistan Navy, and also the essential and enhanced maritime security capability for Pakistan. Pakistan and China already signed a contract earlier in 2017 for two frigates. As per the information, Pakistan is set to procure four Type 054A frigates from China by the year 2021. These will also be equipped with weapons and subsystems including the Type 366 over the

horizon (OTH) radar and Type 382 3D air search radar. Other important specifications include, Vertical Launch System (VLS) for Surface to Air Missile (SAM), dual-quad-cell (2x4) anti-ship missiles (AshM), dual-triple (2x3) anti-submarine warfare (ASW) torpedoes, a 76mm main gun, and Type 1130 close-in-weapon-system (CIWS), and a helicopter hangar among many other more significant functions and features. Pakistan also hopes to get eight submarines from China by 2028 equipped with Stirling-cycle Air-independent propulsion (AIP) system which will be able to carry three nuclear warheads each.

All these facts evidently show that both China and Pakistan are committed to enhancing the maritime security of Pakistan and making the Gwadar port an unhindered hub of economic activity. Both are not leaving any stone unturned in addressing all the possible challenges. Not only these practical measures are timely, but will essentially mitigate and counter the Indian naval threat simultaneously enhancing the security of Gwadar port and ensuring the success of the CPEC project. No doubt only a strong and robust naval force can guarantee a state national security interests.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2018/06/09/china-and-pakistan-together-for-the-fortification-of-maritime-security/>

Pakistan and India's NSG Membership: Challenges and Prospects

Uzge A. Saleem

Both the front runners of South Asia have found a new interest in becoming a part of the international non-proliferation regime. This desire was made public when both the states applied for membership in May 2016. So far both have faced disappointment and as the NSG 28th plenary meeting approaches the debate of whether there will be one winner, two winners or no winner at all, rekindles. The decision is crucial for both because they have their own set of concerns riding on this membership. Indian Prime Minister Modi has made the NSG membership the single most important foreign policy agenda for his regime while Pakistan does not want to be blocked out of the trade group by India if it becomes a member.

With the waiver India gained from NSG somehow got stuck in an illusion that this special treatment will apply to all the aspects of Indo-NSG understanding. The hope was killed when no decision was made in the 2016 plenary meeting. However India being India, did not register this clear signal. Part of its lobbying tactics was to become a part of MTCR. The agenda here was twofold: a) it wanted the support of the 34 MTCR members in NSG and; b). it wanted to help China become a part of MTCR (which it was previously rejected) so that China softens its stance on India's NSG membership. The latter goal has not been met yet. The real problem is not India's membership into NSG but its vision of itself as the driving force for the region, and as soon as it is able to get NSG membership, this agenda will be on top of its 'to do list' to block Pakistan out. If India was to play on fair lines it wouldn't be as much of a problem. Its desire of blocking Pakistan out is clear by its insistence on a merit based approach through which it assumes Pakistan will be left out for not fulfilling the merit. What it doesn't realize is that even to set a merit there needs to be a certain criteria for that.

Coming towards the second candidate for the membership i.e. Pakistan, it has maintained a principle stance over the membership of the trade group. If Pakistan cannot become a part of the NSG because the state is not party to NPT then the same applies to India as well and any special treatment would be nothing more than discrimination. What the international community needs to be communicated is that they it cannot have a biased approach for the state of Pakistan solely for the US and India's strategic interests. The membership needs to be granted to both the South Asian states otherwise the asymmetry will further increase which will destabilize the peace and security of the South Asian region. Furthermore it needs to be brought into consideration that by granting membership to Pakistan, its nuclear program can be streamlined along with the rest of the recognized nuclear weapon states which will bring it under the rules and regulations of NSG. This is something the international community would want for Pakistan because apparently it has reservations regarding the safety and security of Pakistan's nuclear program so why not bring it at par with the rest of the programs where the skepticism regarding illegal proliferation can be eradicated once and for all?

Considering the case of both the states the only rational solution which China advocates in the NSG openly is that first of all the factor of states being NPT members must not be ignored since it is an

important cornerstone for NSG however if it is to be overlooked then it must be overlooked for all aspirants alike and country specific approach should not be an option. Joining NSG can solve many issues for Pakistan including its problem of energy shortage as well as financial backwardness. Such an opportunity can prove to be beneficial for Pakistan as well as to the other states of NSG because the forum can also be used for confidence building and mutual understanding of each other's circumstances. However India would not like this to happen so easily because that means compromising the leverage it gets by becoming the front runner in South Asian politics.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2018/06/13/pakistan-indias-nsg-membership-challenges-and-prospects/>

Pakistan's Quest for NSG Membership and Role of China

Qura tul Ain Hafeez

Pakistan has been trying to acquire the membership of the 48 member Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) for the past several years. Its quest for the NSG membership is essentially meant to meet the growing energy demands of the state. The international community is now looking forward to the upcoming NSG plenary meeting, expected to be held at Latvia this month. The matter of concern is that Pakistan has been ignored by the global nuclear governance for its membership in the NSG. Although the global nuclear governance is based on the so called principles of equality and non discriminations but among the permanent members of the NSG China is the one who supports unbiased and criteria based approach for the membership of both Pakistan and Indian. China views that non NPT states should be included in the NSG cartel once they became the member of the NPT because as per the rules set by the NSG any state which is a non-signatory of the NPT could not become the member of the NSG until or unless it becomes the party to NPT. Therefore India being a non-signatory to the NPT does not meet the criteria of becoming the member of the NSG. There are other countries that have shunned India's membership into the NSG which include New Zealand, Turkey, Ireland, South Africa, and Austria. Countries like Kazakhstan and Belarus have supported Pakistan's bid for the NSG.

A glance at the NSG background reveals that NSG was formed in response to the first Indian nuclear explosive test in 1974, to prevent nuclear proliferation by controlling the export of materials, equipment and technology that can be used to manufacture nuclear weapons. However India's nuclear test of 1974 demonstrated that nuclear technology transferred for peaceful purposes could be used to build nuclear weapons. Considering India's previous record one can infer that it is not eligible to enjoy the special waiver of the nuclear trade. Nonetheless due to the international lobbying by the US, India has sufficient western supporters for its case. By hook or crook India has been accommodated in the NSG with a special waiver. Therefore it is important for the international community to extend equal treatment to Pakistan as that of India. It is pertinent to mention here that Pakistan has a comprehensive export control system and its national command authority is responsible for control of Pakistan's strategic assets. If the waiver for India were generalized on the basis of criteria, Pakistan could be exempted from the full-scope safeguards requirement and be incorporated into the NSG as a nuclear supplier state.

Under the above circumstances Pakistan would be willing to negotiate the terms of such an exception. But, the question is why the US is concerned that Pakistan should not get the membership of the NSG even if it has been following the full scope safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Director-General Yukiya Amano during his visit in March 2018, to Pakistan's various civilian nuclear facilities and installations was highly impressed by the standards which Pakistan is maintaining for nuclear safety and security. He stated that, "Pakistan is an experienced user of peaceful nuclear technology; everywhere it was clear that Pakistan has the knowledge and the pool of people who are dedicated to do this job". Henceforth despite the IAEA full

scope safeguards why can't Pakistan get a special waiver like India? It should also be allowed to do nuclear trade with China which has been panned prior to China's membership in the NSG in 2004.

Contrary to Pakistan's efforts for the nuclear safeguards and security measures some nuclear experts and critics are of the view that Pakistan's rationale for the participation in the NSG is unreasonable. The legitimacy and nuclear parity are the reasons along with the severe energy crises behind Pakistan's aspirations for NSG membership. So, here is the answer for those who oppose Pakistan's quest for nuclear energy, that in Pakistan summers are welcomed with a gift of 8000MW shortfall while winters embrace a cool and smoggy shortfall of 7000MW. Pakistan ranks at the fourth position among the list of countries that are facing energy deficit according to a United Nations Report, 2013. So, Pakistan is confronted with energy crisis. It is for all the genuine reasons that Pakistan needs the nuclear energy which is the cheaper solution in order to meet its day by day increasing energy demands.

Despite Pakistan's continuous diplomatic efforts regarding the NSG, there is currently no consensus in the NSG about how it should approach the question of future relations with non-NPT parties. However the NSG is required to consider the issue which has significant impact on NSG's future credibility and effectiveness. NSG should encourage and welcome states like Pakistan in the NSG instead of discouraging them because this will otherwise compel the states to acquire other cheaper yet hazardous means of energy such as coal which is cheaper yet contributes to increasing the amount of carbon footprint. Moreover this will disturb the world peace and South Asian strategic stability. Therefore China being the important global player and close neighbor to both Pakistan and India should further promote this criteria based and non discriminatory approach in the global nuclear governance.

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2018/06/13/pakistans-quest-for-nsg-membership-and-role-of-china/>

Forthcoming Nuclear Suppliers Group Plenary Meeting and India's Status

Sonia Naz

Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) is the group of states that prevent the nuclear proliferation by controlling the export materials, technology and equipment that can be used in making of the nuclear weapon. NSG was found in 1974 in response to Indian nuclear tests. India clearly violated the peaceful use of nuclear material with Canadian supplied research spent fuel for making Plutonium. The formation of NSG was the result of Indian violation of peaceful use of nuclear material for military purposes.

India has been granted a special NSG waiver by the US and has been enjoying a special status since 2008, getting preferential treatment for its case and application for the NSG membership due to its strong bond with US. In fact, the US wants strong alliance with India to counter China's growing influence in the South Asian region. While India gained the full support of Obama administration in 2010, but the recent attitude of NSG member states and changing trends of nonproliferation regimes indicate that it would not be so easy for India to get the membership of NSG. One can recall that the US' exceptional behavior towards Indian membership was debated extensively in the international media before the 2016 NSG Plenary meeting. The debate highlighted that special treatment given to one state would undermine the credibility of non-proliferation regimes. Ever since India signed a nuclear deal with the US, few congressmen seem concerned due to Indian noncompliance of nuclear related promises. After this deal Pakistan also warned the US that this coalition would intensify the arms race in South Asia.

Despite the western and the US; support, India's proposal for the NSG membership has failed to get a favorable response in the Seoul NSG plenary meeting of 2016. Nonetheless, the Premier Narendra Modi is trying to remove obstacles with the help of the US to get the membership of NSG because it would allow New Delhi to trade in nuclear materials with the rest of the world. India claimed that "Indian participation in the NSG would strengthen the international efforts to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons". India looks hopeful about its prospects for the membership of NSG after becoming the member of Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) on 7 June, 2016. After getting MTCR membership India proclaims to extend support China's membership into MTCR where it hopes that in return China will support India in its application for the NSG membership.

Pakistan has also been aspiring to get the NSG membership and has sent an application in this regard coupled with the diplomatic efforts to get maximum support from the international community on its case. Pakistan stands for a non-discriminatory stance towards the non-NPT nuclear weapons states for their entry into the NSG. It will enable them to carry out civil nuclear trade. Pakistan on its part welcomed the nuclear security initiative in 2009 by the US President Barak Obama and took several practical steps for making its nuclear weapons more secure. It also ratified the Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material amendment in 2016 and has been following the UNSC Resolution 1540. The amendment was about the physical protection of nuclear material during the international

transport and storage. Pakistan is making best efforts to ensure its nuclear security by establishing a Centre of Excellence and training and education centers. It is interesting to know that the world community is polarized with regards to the India and Pakistan case for NSG. While the French presidential along with the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Mexico are supporting India, on the other hand China, New Zealand, South Africa are opposing Indian membership. According to them, NSG 48 members are the signatory of the NPT, whereas India is not a signatory of the NPT. Membership of the NPT is a necessary qualification to gain membership of the NSG. India promised in 2008 that it would take certain measures of nonproliferation in exchange of NSG waiver, but it has not separated its civilian and military reactors and neither has it signed the Nuclear Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). Its non-adherent attitude weakened its case for the membership of NSG, resultantly many NSG group members showed reservations over its candidacy for the NSG.

India and Pakistan are capable of producing highly enriched Uranium and Plutonium for civil and military purposes and they can easily assist the developing states in advancing their nuclear infrastructures and technology. Both states are the non-NPT member states which would make it hard for them to get the NSG membership in the upcoming 28th plenary meeting because even in the last plenary meeting the same issue resulted in the stalemate on India and Pakistan's case. Even though the US always favors India, but this time it appears that the US support will not be that helpful to get the NSG membership because ultimately it all boils down to the credibility of the NSG which should not be compromised.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2018/05/14/indias-conventional-force-posture-developments/>

28th NSG Plenary: National Interests or Non-Proliferation Norms

Ahyousha Khan

Another year has elapsed, and future of South Asian non-NPT states aspiring to become a member of Nuclear Suppliers Group is still hanging in the air. Now as 28th NSG plenary is approaching, the time has come to see whether the efforts made by India and Pakistan will be fruitful or not.

But before jumping to the analysis of both countries' individual efforts for securing the NSG membership, a fact to reckon is, currently the NSG is rising as an export control cartel which is serving the vested interests of its member states rather than global non-proliferation norms. It is a group of 48 members initially designed to regulate nuclear export control because of the fear that bilateral agreements and NPT are not enough to stop possible proliferators from diverting civilian nuclear technology for military uses. Furthermore, the concern which resulted in the creation of the NSG (initially named London Suppliers Group) was the byproduct of Indian nuclear test of 1974, commonly known as Smiling Buddha. To conduct this test, India used the fuel from Trombay nuclear plant then reprocessed it at CIRUS plant, which was the violation of Indian-Canadian agreement under which CIRUS was given to India. Thus, it was Indian so-called peaceful nuclear explosion which led to the creation of NSG because of lack of NPT capability to stop nuclear proliferation.

There is no denying the fact that international system is based on states which work towards the acquisition of their national interests and sometimes these interests are acquired at the expense of others. When it comes to the national interests of states, it cannot be expected of them to let go of their national interests because of the more significant benefit of the international system. This brings us to the question of what would be the standing of international regimes and norms in comparison to the national interests of the states. Linked to it is the issue that where would the NSG stand, which claims to be the regime to control nuclear trade to stop its usage for the proliferation of nuclear weapons after its members choose to follow their national interests rather than international norms. Indeed the importance of national interests for the states cannot be denied in the wake of events happening in the non-proliferation world since more than two decades, especially the NSG waiver to India which illustrates that the US under the imperatives of its strategic, economic and political interests is in favor to grant NSG membership to India. India, on the other hand, believes that it qualifies for the NSG membership because of its so-called exemplary non-proliferation record. Thus it should have acceded into the export control cartel by the merit-based approach. Recently, India is also supported by Germany in its quest, where it was said that Indian inclusion in NSG would boost export control regime. Yes, Indian integration into NSG might encourage export control regime because of the market that India will provide to the exporters, but will that inclusion be equally beneficial for non-proliferation norms, is the question that the pundits of nuclear export control cartels must answer.

If states which are not a member of NPT can be included into the NSG then what was the point to make that rule in the first place. It means that rules and norms are nothing but a façade and can be

changed with the change in the interests of the states. Pakistan is also a non-NPT signatory state striving to become a member of NSG; it believes in the criteria based approach if countries which are not a party to the NPT are being given a chance to become part of the NSG. However, a significant aspect of Pakistan's application is that it adheres to IAEA Safeguards, self-sufficiency in nuclear technology and adherence to conventions like CPPNM (Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials and Facilities). Pakistan is not a big market like India for nuclear energy projects, but it is a market with an enormous potential for green energy in the backdrop of its growing energy needs. Thus, it is necessary for the NSG to develop a criterion which should be equally applicable to all the members rather than playing "pick and choose," as it will only increase the states' mistrust in the international regimes. Moreover, it encourages states to resort to other means to fulfill their energy requirements. It is about time that international community must realize that preferential treatment to India will not boost NSG as export control regime. Lastly, developing an approach which could entail changing dynamics of international system would boost the NSG as export control system rather than preferential treatments given to one actor. As national interests are also not static, there may come a time when they change. So, to keep the integrity of these international systems intact, the 28th NSG plenary must take actions based on the goals and objectives of the group and equal chances must be given to all potential members.

<http://southasiajournal.net/28th-nsg-plenary-national-interests-or-non-proliferation-norms/>

Nuclear Suppliers Group and Non-proliferation Regime

Beenish Altaf

There are nine nuclear weapon states, and of the nine, four have not signed the NPT; Pakistan, Israel, India, and North Korea withdrew from the treaty. These four states are referred to as non-NPT nuclear weapon states. Pakistan, one of these nine states worldwide to possess nuclear weapons, aspires to be a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), an association of 48 nations that oversees the international trade of atomic and atomic-related materials and technologies with a shared commitment to global nonproliferation.

Although not a signatory of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) or the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), the country's experience in civil nuclear program warrants attention of the NSG. Lt Gen Mazhar Jamil, former director general of the Strategic Plans Division (SPD), said that there is a concern that the non-proliferation regime is becoming increasingly politicised and discriminatory. Despite these abnormalities in the nuclear order, Pakistan remains positively engaged.

Reportedly, India is not considering any proposal to sign the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty (NPT) as a precondition for joining the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG). However, the US is spearheading India's campaign for inclusion in the group and contends that after attaining membership of other multilateral export control regimes like Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), Australia Group, and Wassenaar Agreement, India's case is ripe for membership.

Ironically, the keepers of international nuclear non-proliferation regime are persisting to embrace a non-NPT nuclear weapon state for nuclear commerce acting discriminatory towards the other South Asian non-NPT but a nuclear weapon state (Pakistan) obtaining same status. However, a small notwithstanding depleted group is holding out preventing consensus on new admissions.

The credibility of international nuclear non-proliferation regime faces a big question mark. The materialisation of Indo-US nuclear deal posed stern questions for the non-proliferation regime and nuclear trade worldwide. It managed the NSG waiver without accepting NPT, in addition the deal also excluded eight Indian nuclear reactors from IAEA safeguards that are well suited for 1,250 kilograms of plutonium upgrading for weapon purposes "which has the ability to produce 240 nuclear weapons a year". Consequently, amplifies regional instability and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. The US cannot in any terms call the step an advantage to global non-proliferation regime.

Paradoxically speaking the creators of non-proliferation regime and its cartels have created rooms for nuclear mishandling within the group itself. Countries namely United States, United Kingdom, Canada, France, Japan, West Germany and Soviet Union got together to form the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), in response to Indian diversion from Canadian based reactor (diverted Plutonium from the Canadian-Indian Reactor) that was given for peaceful use. Pragmatically recounting NSG's objective or purpose was to regulate nuclear commerce so further diversions as that of India could not take place

again since India used it for military purposes that resulted in Indian Peaceful Nuclear Explosion (PNE) in 1974.

Although, the group is not a formal organisation and its guidelines are non-binding, but still, its members are expected to incorporate the guidelines into their national export control laws. Ironically, it does not mean that any country specific diversion or waiver would become legal under the guidelines of NSG. Indubitably, in order to step forward and improve the global non-proliferation goals, putting in new members in NSG would be an encouraging and constructive option. Along with that it would be equally vital to uphold the efficacy and effectiveness of NSG. Therefore, the expansion should be carried out on non-discriminatory bases - by taking a criteria based approach.

However, the key decisions at NSG, like admission of new members, are undoubtedly politicized. The decisions instead of following an equitable and non-discriminatory approach are motivated by geopolitical considerations. Admittedly, Pakistan does what it can; the non-proliferation regime should also do what it must, to become equitable and rule-based. Nevertheless, stalemate on the issue of admission of non-NPT countries persisted at the last meeting of the consultative group of the 48 members' cartel, controlling the international nuclear trade.

<https://nation.com.pk/14-Jun-2018/nuclear-suppliers-group-and-non-proliferation-regime>

NSG Expansion for Non-NPT States: India and Pakistan's Case

Ubaid Ahmed

The ascent of the NSG as one of the critical and influential cartel groups promoting the cause of non-proliferation intends to urge India to become part of it by passing the chronicled reality that the NSG was created against the Indian nuclear weapons tests. The Great Powers possessing nuclear weapons have already given certain exemptions to India in terms of trading in the field of nuclear technology transfer. However, these special exemptions by the NSG members are not consistent with the purported arrangements of the NSG that does not permit a state unless it is party to the NPT.

Albeit Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) was made against the Indian atomic test, it is astonishing to note that even the NSG's revised guidelines of June 2013 did not name India specifically, whose nuclear weapon test wound up in the creation of NSG.

NSG works on the consensus by following the two prominent sets of its normative posture. Firstly, it is responsible to strictly follow the guidelines for nuclear exports. Secondly, it also relates to nuclear related exports. It is imperative to note that the first set of NSG's guidelines deals with elements such as a) nuclear materials, b) nuclear reactors and equipments, c) non- nuclear materials for reactors, d) plants and equipments for the reprocessing, enrichment and conversion of nuclear material and, e) nuclear technology for each of the above nuclear export elements. Whilst, the second set of NSG guidelines largely deals with nuclear export related materials such as fuel cycle and nuclear explosive for industrial purposes only. Both of these two sets of NSG guidelines are consistent with the provisions of internationally binding treaties in the field of nuclear non-proliferation such as the NPT and many other.

Since the NSG rises up as one of the important cartel groups in the field of non-proliferation, it is not free from the critical issues it confronts. For instance, the Indo-US nuclear deal and the NSG's nuclear exemptions to India has become a critical issue for the NSG in terms of sustaining its credibility. This indicates that NSG may drift away from the provisions it sets and undermine its own set of guidelines.

However, there can be certain plausible options that the NSG may undertake to restore and enhance further its normative posture and credibility as one of the rising cartels in the field of international non-proliferation like the NPT would recognize both India and Pakistan as nuclear weapons states before they think of joining the NSG. Presumably, as India and Pakistan enhance their nuclear maturity, the NPT and NSG could eventually recognize these nuclear weapons states with the ultimate motive to strengthen the non-proliferation regime

It is also encouraging that the NSG could expand its membership by inducting more states that may include those states which are either Party to the NPT or those who have not yet joined the NPT. If in case India is embraced before Pakistan, it could have critical consequences for regional arms race and increased over reliance on nuclear weapons in the South Asia. Alternatively, the NSG could relax its provisions unanimously agreeing that it could eventually pave the way for both India and Pakistan to

join the NSG. However, both would remain legitimate and responsible nuclear weapons states by following the essential parameters of the international non-proliferation regime including that of the additional protocol of the IAEA. Furthermore, the NSG might adopt to strictly stand by its provisions without showing any flexibility by not allowing both India and Pakistan to become part of the NSG unless they fully satisfy the guidelines of the NSG particularly joining of the NPT.

In a nutshell, this may not be favorable to the NSG as this would show NSG too rigid, discriminatory, and limited by not increasing its membership. Plausibly, expanding its membership and promoting the cause of non-proliferation, the NSG could enhance its credibility in the field of non-proliferation by making both India and Pakistan obligatory to the essential parameters of the non-proliferation.

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2018/06/14/nsg-expansion-for-non-npt-states-india-and-pakistans-case/>

Humanizing the Kashmir Issue Amid Damning UN Report on Kashmir

S Sadia Kazmi

It is a fact that in a conflict situation, the contending parties aim at extracting maximum benefit mostly at the expense of the opponent. In doing so however, a pure realistic logic comes into play where exercising maximum power to achieve maximum gain is the rule of law. No compromise, no compassion, and nothing less than a complete victory over the other is acceptable.

While it is known that conflict is ubiquitous in nature and follows a certain life cycle short of either exploding into a full-blown war or ending into a stalemate, it also has a probability to get resolved, managed or be transformed if proper techniques are employed coupled with the necessary will. Not only does that allow for the space to address a conflicting situation but also raises hopes for minimum material and human casualties.

One relevant option in such cases is to “humanize” the conflict through conflict transformation mechanism so as to associate the human dimension to the dispute and making it more humane. This helps re-frame the ways in which peace building initiatives could be discussed and pursued. It is important to note that “empathy” is essential to peace building.

Same is the treatment that is needed to be extended to the Kashmir issue, the most bitter territorial dispute between India and Pakistan. The two nuclear states have fought their first war in 1948 on this very issue and have been engaged in continuous skirmishes along the LoC from time to time, so much so that today it is seen as a nuclear flashpoint between Pakistan and India.

It is important to identify that the stakeholders in this case are not just the state of Kashmir, Pakistan or India, but the real stakeholders are the people of Jammu and Kashmir who have been suffering for more than six decades at the hands of Indian brutality and savage atrocities. It is ironic that despite the decades long miseries of innocent Kashmiri people, the international political community is mum on the subject in terms of taking any practical action against the aggressor or to even acknowledge the human suffering in this case.

Even though, the UN resolution of 1948 suggests fair, free and independent plebiscite, the resolution was never implemented because of India. Instead, swift genocide of Kashmiri Muslims is being carried out by Indian state sponsored elements in Kashmir to make it a Hindu majority land, which needs to be stopped.

Pakistan’s permanent representative to the UN, Amb. Maleeha Lodhi rightly stated that “nothing undermines the credibility of UNSC more than the selective implementation of its resolutions”. Nonetheless, Pakistan on its part has been raising the issue of indigenous struggle of people of Kashmir at all the regional and international platforms on purely human grounds.

There is more than ever an immediate need to put an end to the Indian brutalities that have even crossed the last limits of barbarism through pallet gun attacks on unarmed civilian population and by unabashedly using the innocent people as human shield tied in front of their vehicles.

An excerpt from the book “The Collaborator” written by a Kashmiri writer Mirza Waheed depicts the horrific picture of violence by India in Indian occupied Kashmir mentioning that “there were people dying everywhere getting massacred in every town and village; there were people being picked up and thrown into dark jails in unknown parts; there were dungeons in the city where hundreds of young men were kept in heavy chains and from where they never emerged alive; there were thousands who had disappeared leaving behind women with photographs and perennial waiting; there were multitudes of dead bodies on the roads, in hospital beds, in fresh martyr’s graveyards and scattered casually on the snow mindless borders”.

This is only a glimpse of what is actually going on there. No less than a breakthrough, on June 15, 2018, finally the first ever UN report on Kashmir recognizes the human rights violation and carnage against the local Kashmiri population by the authorities in the Indian Occupied Kashmir. It is indeed a first positive step that would not only coax the international community and Human rights watchdogs to be more objective towards the Kashmir issue but will also evoke the much required empathy needed to make positive progress for the basic rights of the Kashmiri people.

Although it took the UN seventy long years but it comes as a sigh of relief that the report explicitly mentions that in IOK, people have been subjected to lack of justice and impunity, extrajudicial killings, administrative detentions, torture, enforced disappearance, and sexual violence. It identifies the Indian authorities being ruthless with the unarmed civil population and employing the most brutal acts to inflict human anguish.

This report could actually serve two major purposes: one, the international community should now be able to see in black and white the aggressor and the victim, and the real stakeholder i.e. the people of Kashmir; second, seeing the conflict from the human lens can help to limit escalation and violence. The international community should not allow India to de-humanize the issue anymore, which so far has only led to the gross human rights violation and genocide by India.

There is a high hope that evaluating the Kashmir issue on purely human grounds will dispel the misleading Indian generated propaganda against the indigenous freedom struggle of innocent Kashmiris. It will help better educate the world community on the issue and employ relevant humanizing strategies to effectively transform this never ending conflict.

<https://www.voj.news/humanizing-the-kashmir-issue-amid-damning-un-report-on-kashmir/>

Nuclear Deterrence and Action Reaction Paradigm in the Indian Ocean

Ahyousha Khan

South Asian security architecture is complex and comprises of traditional and non-traditional threats. However, traditional security threats which are of strategic nature hold the center stage within the overall regional security and threat matrix.

Destructive power of nuclear weapons gives them the psychological edge over the enemy and if these weapons are possessed by both sides, the mutual vulnerability keeps enemies at bay due to the fear of unacceptable damages/ loss. Deterrence is not the use of nuclear weapon rather it is the ability and capability to use the weapon if one's vital interests are threatened. However, deterrence pessimist believes that as it is an established fact that the deterrence is psychological, it is greatly dependent on validation of deterrence capability from time to time through finite actions. Hence, states either needs to develop new technologies or show their resolve to use nuclear weapons to keep up the credibility of nuclear weapons.

However, one aspect to make nuclear deterrence work effectively is the realization of the fact that once nuclear weapons are acquired, the states mostly try to maintain the deterrence acquired either by hook or crook. Thus, it is futile effort if one party or parties in the conflict try to overcome it. Pakistan is an example that is maintaining nuclear deterrence with its limited resources to counter the enemy which is larger, stronger and is greatly accepted by international community. Reason behind Pakistan's strong resolve is its fear that without nuclear weapons its core national interests and survival would be at stake. Thus, international pressure is of no importance because nuclear deterrence is ensuring the existence of a state. Darker side of nuclear deterrence is that in order to keep its credibility against one's rival, states invest in weaponization, which leads to the arms race that stimulates security dilemma between nuclear rivals.

In the South Asian context, India, by the virtue of its larger economy and geography wants to have stronger position in the region, which is constantly challenged by Pakistan. However, to curb Pakistan and prove its worth, India develops new technologies and explores new horizons in arms race. One such horizon in this regard is the Indian Ocean which is becoming the new victim of this decade's old South Asian rivalry. Recently India made its second SSBN and also operationalized its submarine launch K-15 missile. Moreover, Indian navy is building indigenously built SSBNs, SSNs and ship launch cruise/ballistic missiles to have maximum control over Indian Ocean, which is falsely believed by India as its backyard.

These actions by India gave it quite credible second-strike capability which negated the established deterrence equation between both South Asian nuclear neighbors. Resultantly, to maintain nuclear deterrence through minimum but credible efforts, Pakistan resorts to developing its own second-strike capability. At the moment Pakistan has successfully tested its sea launched cruise missile

Babur-3 from submerged platform, moreover it is also up-grading its Augusta 90 B series submarine with air propulsion. Moreover, Pakistan is also buying conventional submarines and frigates from China to counter Indian SSN and SSBN fleets. In addition to this Pakistan recently tested its ship launch cruise missile Harba, which is quite a significant development because cruise missile capable of carrying nuclear weapon is already tested and with successful test of Harba capability to fire cruise missile from ship is also acquired. Thus, to counter growing offense by full spectrum deterrence, option of converting ship launch cruise missile into ship launch nuclear cruise missile can be acquired by Pakistan.

Thus, disrespect of strategic deterrence by India is catalyzing arms race in the region. Saddening aspect in this regard is when rest of the world is using oceans for regional integration, the South Asia nuclear neighbors are converting their economic opportunity into war zone. Thus, militarizing and nuclearizing the common goods such as ocean. On top of all this, major powers are also using Indian Ocean to display their power either through actual presence of naval powers through the support of their respective allies. Fact to reckon here is that the deterrence acquired in South Asia is here to stay. Nuclearizing new arenas will not make either party more secure rather it will give birth to security dilemma, which will result in more and more arms build-up. So, to stop arms race and action-reaction chain, it is necessary that fear of unacceptable loss/damage must be respected.

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2018/06/25/nuclear-deterrence-and-action-reaction-paradigm-in-the-indian-ocean/>

SCO Ensuring Regional Security and Economic Interests

Qura tul Ain Hafeez

Asia is the region which perhaps shares the most dynamic volatile and complex geostrategic environment. The Asian countries by and far have tried to sort out the emerging issues through different channels and platforms. However, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) is most successful among them up till now. SCO is primarily the result of joint efforts by Russia and China to maintain peace, security, and stability in the region. Since its beginning in 1990, the organization is successfully promoting regional peace and connectivity for almost past two decades. Being an international organization, the SCO now successfully brags eight permanent members including Kazakhstan, China, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, India and Pakistan. It has four observer states including Mongolia, Afghanistan, Belarus and Iran while Azerbaijan, Armenia, Cambodia, Nepal, Turkey, and Sri Lanka are the dialogue partners.

One of the prime objectives of the SCO is to deal with the three evils of extremism, separatism and terrorism, which are prevalent in the Central Asian countries, and primarily inside Afghanistan. However, with the new emerging strategic trends now Russia is focusing on prevailing security issues and energy potentials. Simultaneously, China on the other hand emphasizes more on regional bonding and economic integration. China, the actual driving force behind the SCO is absorbed with the vision of encouraging regional trade and investment through economic collaborations, and through trade ventures like (BRI, BRICS). This will empower China as an influential and prominent actor in the international politics. There cent 2018 Summit of the SCO on June 9-10, 2018 at Qingdao not only marked the 18th annual anniversary of the SCO but showed the SCO progress with accession of Pakistan and India. Including them as full members to the SCO has widened the SCO's expansion space. It will stretch it as a broader platform so that it can play its part effectively and in a more influential manner. Keeping always in mind its original aspirations i.e. the "Shanghai Spirit", the SCO is moving ahead productively.

One of the prominent features of the SCO which binds the members' states together is the factor of countering the Western influence. The recent G7 summit and president Trump's lashing tweets against Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau clearly show that the Western directive is breaching and an Eastern order is consolidating now. Still there is a need to do allots currently the Asian region is confronting multiple challenges. One of them is the clash of interests as India, Pakistan, China and Russia claim their varying interests in Afghanistan. Moreover, there are certain territorial disputes which lingered on since long and are waiting for attention. These need to be resolved. Owing to its special focus on Afghanistan, the SCO being a multilateral platform (comprehensively deals with the radicalization challenges) is a good option to raise voices. However, due to the presence of NATO and US led coalition forces, there is a little opportunity for the SCO to deal with these transformational changes. Yet in its own capacity, the SCO has an Afghan Action Plan for the SCO members and Afghan government to emphasize upon the joint military exercises, cooperation among the members to combat drug trafficking, terrorism, and organized crimes.

Substantively being the next door neighbor to Afghanistan and sharing the border, Pakistan is very much prone to these challenges. However at the same time placing itself at the crossroad of east and central Asia, it can provide many advantages to the landlocked states of Central Asia and Afghanistan. Utilizing Pakistan's geostrategic significance, China-Pakistan Economic Corridor, and the Gwadar port, Pakistan can become a source of energy provision and trade hub for the SCO members. In the recent SCO Summit 2018, President Mamnoon Husain stated that "there is a need for building trust for the achievement of durable peace and regional stability in the 'Shanghai spirit of shared development and prosperity'. Moreover, he stressed upon the economic activities to be carried out to enhance the trade. All these efforts show that the SCO is ensuring regional security and economic interests of the Asian region.

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2018/06/25/sco-ensuring-regional-security-and-economic-interests/>

Why is the World Bending Over Backwards for Indo-Centric US Interests?

Uzge Amer Saleem

There are no permanent friends nor permanent enemies in the international order there is only time confined strategic partners or allies which change with the ever-changing interests and concerns of a state. This pattern has both, a positive and a negative side to it. The state being favored at some particular time must always keep its guards up or prepare for a fallback cushion because the only sure thing about international relations is that they are unpredictable. Pakistan once was the most favored NATO ally, and now it is on the verge of being Grey listed by FATF. This can prove to be a case study for the state's next door neighbor. This downward spiral did not come upon Pakistan because it went rogue or started negating the US agendas. If anything, the state hosted the war on terror on its soil. However, the simple reason for this breakup was a shift in the US' interests with shifting international dynamics. The reason why it is important to mention this shift of interests is that what happened to Pakistan then can very well happen to India at any point of time.

However, the current situation is that the international community is all in support of America's new focal state. Exceptions are being made, and relations are being built. Why else would the NSG which was formulated after the Indian nuclear test grant waivers to the very same state? India has not committed to non-proliferation of its assets nor has it joined the NPT to streamline its program. Furthermore, its nuclear sites do not even come under the safeguards of IAEA. So what is the reason that India seems to be enjoying this special "responsible state" status? It is all because of American support. All of these blessings on India are because America chose for it to be blessed. The state has been admitted to MTCR, Wassenaar Arrangement, and Australia group. One might question as to why it is that these admissions were not made in the previous years and are readily being made now. The answer once again is that the American hand was not behind India ambitions in the earlier years.

Now that it is established that the US support bags special status for India from the international community we can analyze why that is so. The answer again lies in Geopolitics and maintaining the hegemonic status of the US. The US has always had an interest in the South Asian region. The motives, however, have been different every time. During the Cold War era, the purpose was to contain Russia through Afghanistan. During the War on Terror, it was to contain the terrorists in Afghanistan. The common ground here is that for both this motives Pakistan was a state of interest because it was the only state generous enough to cater to these demands and needs at that time where India was conveniently non-aligned. However, now the motive has become twofold. The US wants to target Pakistan through India and also contain the Chinese influence from spreading. The primary reason Pakistan has been put on the hit list is that of the state's cordial relations with China and also because it has now stopped dancing on the American music. India fits into this situation because of the age-old concept that the enemy of an enemy is a friend and since India seems to be hostile towards both China and Pakistan historically, it fits in perfectly for the role.

The international community needs to realize that the US agenda will keep on shifting and so will its interests in the states but the international community can do better than just following the US in whatever it chooses to do in the international politics. NSG can prove to be a platform for showcasing a firm stand. Membership should not be granted to India just because the US desires so. The global community needs to realize that if the US has no regard for the treaties that include other states, like the US-Iran nuclear deal, then there needs to be no catering of the US interests. It is about time that the international world order comes out of the US shadow and makes an identity for itself because the US behavior is becoming unpredictable by the day. Followed by the withdrawal from Iranian Nuclear deal was withdrawal from the UNHRC simply because it did not comply with its interests in Israel. If the US can act according to what suits it right then so should the rest of the global community. If realism seems to be the popular trend, then it should be supported by all alike.

<http://southasiajournal.net/why-is-the-world-bending-over-backward-for-indo-centric-us-interests/>

Singapore Summit – Challenges and Prospects

Beenish Altaf

A country that was once strongly frowned upon, that was reason for the heightened global concern for nuclear buildup, is now being appreciated for its diplomatic panache to the extent that the US decided to change its decisions favouring that state. President Donald Trump, just a day ago, reversed its decision of military exercises with South Korea by calling it a “waste of money”.

This is in the backdrop of a Summit held on June 12, 2018 between the US and North Korea in Singapore. Since the Prime Minister of Singapore Lee Hsien Loong welcomed the meeting open-heartedly, the role of the country, is fairly vital in carrying out parlays among both the leaders, that is, Kim Jong-un and Donald Trump. It is believed to be the first remarkable deal in many years among both the countries. Regarding its agenda, largely denuclearisation has been on the top most priority list in the summit; however, its outcomes could not be assessed before time. Some are anticipating the hopeful outcome seeing it as a good step for building favorable relationship between the US and North Korea, while others are apprehensive of it. Paradoxically, the country habitual of military solutions i.e. the US, is evidently foreseeing a “good feeling” for North Korea this time; with reference to the June’s summit.

The daily newspaper “Rodong Sinmun” of Pyongyang on the other hand claims that this summit will establish a permanent and peaceful regime in the Korean Peninsula and to solve problems that are of common concern, including issues to realize the denuclearisation of the Korean Peninsula.

Formerly relationship between the US and North Korea has remained on the edge and tensed to the extent of exchanging harsh and threatening statements to each other at the state level. It was followed by several missile tests from North Korean side, which up till now conducted six nuclear tests too (the latest was in September 2017). North Korea offered a frightening and alarming demonstration in the preceding months of acquiring the capability to deliver warheads, using missiles that could easily strike South Korea, Japan and the United States territory. It was actually to exasperate the US plan of installing anti-missile defence system in the South, which resulted in further evoked concerns in the North Korean.

Pakistan always condemned North Korean nuclear ambitions because it damages the global objective of making Korea a nuclear weapons free peninsula. More precisely, all that Pakistan wants is peace in Korean Peninsula. It was always 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.

However, if looked at with the lens of a victory, several conclusions could be drawn including: a durable peace is anticipated as the best outcome in terms of this summit as North Korea is now trying to develop good ties with South Korea. Kim met President Moon Jae-In and discussed areas of mutual interests. Besides, the summit could be a step-up for international community’s disarmament goal that is the denuclearisation of Korean Peninsula, ironically, the time frame of which cannot be measured at

this point of time. Another gain for North Korea could be the removal of sanctions from the American side that will be a further aid in the development of good bilateral relations.

Despite mutual optimism, analysts on both sides are of the view that it is too early to call it a win-win summit. A big concern is the method or details about how to verify the North Korean compliance. An agreement toward no more nuclear or missile testing or rockets flying is needed. The summit gives North Korean leader a status of a credible leader to which President Trump justifies as a part of its long-term strategy that will eventually lower the level of tensions with North Korea. He said, "I went there, I gave him credibility....I think it is great to give him credibility." At large it could be summed up in the hope that Washington wants to achieve a major disarmament goal by North Korea within the next two and a half years, within Trump's current presidential term, which ends on January 20, 2021.

<https://nation.com.pk/26-Jun-2018/singapore-summit-challenges-and-prospects>

India's Shifting Nuclear Doctrine: Impact on Strategic Stability

Asma Khalid

Strategic Stability is considered crucial for preventing war and conflict between nuclear adversaries. It is comprised of two essential factors: deterrence equilibrium and crisis stability. India and Pakistan's military buildup and technological advancements are considered satisfactory to maintain the Balance of Power (BOP) and nuclear deterrence equilibrium. While on the military side, nuclear capability has played a vital role to ensure the strategic balance as no major war has taken place between India and Pakistan in post 1998 era. Therefore, it is pertinent to establish that the nuclear capability has restored strategic balance and maintained crisis stability in the region. Deterrence equilibrium is arduously maintained in the region but has played a vital role in maintaining peace between two nuclear neighbors. Nonetheless, according to nuclear analysts the strategic stability in South Asia is fragile as just the nuclear deterrence alone is not sufficient to maintain durable peace and stability in the region. Challenges to strategic stability between India and Pakistan include domestic politics, cross border tension, risk of terrorism, induction of sophisticated technologies, India's evolving nuclear doctrine and India-US strategic partnership. These challenges have enhanced the fragility of strategic stability and complexity of nuclear deterrence in South Asia.

Growing challenges in the South Asian landscape has forced the security strategists to analyze the potential threats of India's 'shifting strategic logics'. A recent debate on strategic landscape of South Asia revolves around India's shifting nuclear policy and doctrine which can be studied under the twin pillars of 'strategic ambiguity' and 'pre-emptive nuclear strike'. Nuclear doctrine of India is based on the principle of "Credible Minimum Deterrence" and Nuclear First Use. Statements by Indian scholars, former military officials and extensive military buildup of its forces are expression of emerging trends in India's nuclear doctrine. On the bases of recent developments, it is anticipated that India is shifting its nuclear posture to Nuclear First Use (NFU). Secondly, it is moving from "Counter Value targets" to "Counterforce targets". Another recent development is that India is deviating from Credible Minimum Deterrence and opting for credible deterrence. However, Indian disguise was revealed internationally when Vipin Narang at Carnegie International Conference in March 2017 hinted towards potential change in India's nuclear doctrine. For reference Vipin Narang used excerpts from the book of former Indian National Security Advisor Shivshankar Menon. One might wonder if the shift in India's No First Use policy or other nuclear policy developments should come as a surprise for Pakistan. The answer would be that these discoveries by International Community didn't come out as a surprise to Pakistan for India's stance on use of nuclear capability against the biological and chemical nuclear weapon has already questioned the status of "Nuclear First Use" posture.

It is also important to note that India's history is full of contradictory remarks. Such as the fact that initially India denied the existence of Cold Start Doctrine (CSD) but in 2017 Indian Chief of Army Staff Bipin Rawat accepted that India is working to operationalize its CSD. More importantly, in article 2.3 of India's Draft Nuclear Doctrine (DND) adherence to the principle of Credible Minimum Deterrence is claimed but Indian military build-up and technological developments e.g. Missile development and

Proliferation (Prithvi, Agni, Brahmos, Nirbhay), Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMD), Space capabilities (its Cartosat-2 Series for Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance) , Fleets of SSBN and SSN (Arihant class and Akula Class respectively) clearly negate the article 2.3 of its DND. India's shifting logics and technological advancements demonstrate that India is constantly trying to achieve escalation-dominance in the region.

The above mentioned scenario demands to explore the impact of India's shifting nuclear doctrine on the strategic stability of region. If India is to opt for counter force strategy instead of counter value strategy then it will have to achieve considerable quantitative and qualitative arms superiority over Pakistan. This would increase the defense production gap between nuclear rivals and instigate the arms race in the region. Secondly, nuclear CBMs and proposal of establishing Strategic Restraint Regime will face a serious blow if any such move of shifting nuclear strategy by India is to be made. Lastly, if India is to go for a nuclear shift then it will have serious implications for the strategic stability within the South Asian region as it would lead the region towards crisis instability.

However, the ambiguous nuclear posture and claims from the Indian side regarding the shift in the nuclear doctrine need to be clarified to avoid the risk of miscalculation. Given the circumstances it is inevitable for Pakistan to take following security measures to ensure its security: First, developing and maintaining a second strike capability; second, acquiring Ballistic Missile System; third, development of offensive as well as defensive cyber- warfare capabilities. Most importantly, South Asia demands a practical approach to prevent conflict escalation through initiating dialogue process and establishing Arms Control Regime. To conclude, it is vital that nuclear doctrines should not be based on ambiguous principles in order to avoid the risk of miscalculations. Thus, the pragmatic approach in South Asian strategic landscape would be the establishment of nuclear risk reduction measures.

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2018/06/26/indias-shifting-nuclear-doctrine-impact-on-strategic-stability/>

Bringing Environmental Stability to the Fore-front of the CPEC

Agenda

Waqas Jan

For all the hopes and excitement being generated by the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), it is easy to lose sight of why and what exactly CPEC means for the country in its present socioeconomic context. For years, Pakistan's economic stagnation has been directly linked to its inability to surmount key developmental challenges. Its decades old infrastructure and increasing stress from a fast rising population, has given way to a vicious cycle of underdevelopment, severely limiting its ability to progress in the 21st century. China's \$62 billion injection of developing key infrastructure under CPEC is poised to directly address this gap, offering nothing short of an economic life-line to Pakistan.

Especially considering the long continuing financial and energy crises, CPEC's targeted focus on boosting Pakistan's transport and energy infrastructure is being touted as a much needed panacea to the myriad socioeconomic developmental challenges limiting the country's progress. The purported benefits to the country's exports, with stronger foundations for its agricultural and manufacturing sectors come out as the most obvious benefits.

However, while these long-standing infrastructural gaps in the country's development agenda have been repeatedly highlighted, little to any attention has been given to the glaring threat of climate change and its increasingly adverse impacts on the country's development potential. The fast worsening water crisis, diminishing air quality, erratic crop yields and rampant deforestation are all just a few of the grave threats being posed for which there seems to be little to any impetus at the policy level. Similarly, the effects of extreme weather events such as prolonged droughts, flash floods, heat waves and erratic monsoon patterns continue to threaten the country's water, food and energy security, greatly limiting the impact of ongoing developmental efforts.

In his keynote speech at the Belt and Road Forum held last year in Beijing, President Xi Jinping declared that the Belt and Road Initiative would be 'green, low-carbon, circular and sustainable.' Considering that CPEC as part of the overall Belt and Road Initiative is an attempt to internationalize the Chinese Development model, this emphasis on promoting environmental stability along with massive state led infrastructure roll-outs present a unique yet highly welcome direction for future developmental efforts.

As Francis Fukuyama has rightly pointed out, this emphasis on building massive infrastructure projects based on enhancing roads, sea ports, railways, airports and energy production has characterized the Chinese development model for over the last few decades. When considering how development models themselves have been internationalized, the Chinese model stands in stark contrast to more recent US and European International Development efforts, that tend to focus more on investing in public health care, women's empowerment, support for civil society, and anti-corruption measures.

It is no surprise why the Chinese impetus on investing in massive infrastructure projects as part of the BRI has been welcomed across the world, particularly by developing nations. Yet, it is up to these developing nations to ensure that these projects are also used to address their unique developmental challenges in an environmentally sustainable manner.

The political and financial will from the Chinese side is clear in this regard. Over the last few years, China has taken clear concerted steps in remedying the environmental and ecological impacts of its rapid economic development. It has invested billions into renewable energy, while prioritizing water, air and soil conservation. It has employed state of the art technology coupled with stringent regulations and enforcement. It has called for institutional reform and drafted clear guidelines and targets for what it wants to achieve as part of its overarching vision of building an 'Ecological Civilization'.

Extending this vision to the BRI and consequently CPEC, policy makers on our side of the border too need to arm themselves with the necessary policy tools and information when taking into account environmental and ecological concerns. Moving beyond rudimentary Environmental Assessment Impacts (EIAs), there is a severe dearth of political will and financing when it comes to employing pragmatic solutions to improving water and food security. While fulfilling the Energy gap has been a highlighting feature of the entire CPEC initiative, the potential for improving water conservation both within the country's urban areas and agricultural and farming complexes for instance, has received little to any attention other than on paper.

Countless lessons can be gleaned from China's own experience of transitioning from environmentally unsustainable progress to greener initiatives. Its recent Sponge city initiative for example presents a ready-made model for combating excessive flooding and water scarcity in urban areas. Through a combination of smart engineering and stringent enforcement the initiative aims to absorb and reuse rainwater to help replenish depleting ground water reserves, while reducing flood risks.

Other initiatives have involved putting forth strict guidelines and penalties for soil and air pollution, where clear and enforceable laws have allowed the government to penalize polluters and set targets for what it considers as environmentally sustainable levels.

All of these and other similar initiatives can be easily deployed within the CPEC framework. Recent steps taken to address the growing water shortage in Gwadar for instance are definitely taking this initiative in the right direction. However, there is still a lot more that can and should be done at the provincial, federal and regional levels. Building on the steadily increasing momentum within Pak-China relations, the idea of promoting an environmentally sustainable and green development agenda fits in perfectly with the win-win dynamics of President Xi Jinping's vision for the Belt and Road Initiative. After all what good is robust economic growth to future generations if it comes at the expense of the basic food and water security passed on to us from our founders and forefathers. This valuable opportunity to prioritize environmental sustainability as part of Pakistan's development agenda should not be squandered.

<https://www.voj.news/bringing-environmental-sustainability-to-the-fore-front-of-the-cpec-agenda/>

Pakistan's Nuclear Policy: Impact on Strategic Stability in South Asia

Sonia Naz

After India's nuclear tests on May 18, 1974, Pakistan obtained the nuclear technology, expertise and pursued a nuclear program to counter India which has more conventional force than Pakistan.

Pakistan is not interested in an arms race in the region, but supports peace and stability. The main purpose to pursue a nuclear program for Pakistan was to secure its borders and deter Indian aggression.

It is not a signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and Comprehensive Test-Ban-Treaty (CTBT) and Pakistan has not signed NPT and CTBT because India has not signed it.

Since acquiring the nuclear weapons, it has rejected to declare No First Use (NFU) in case of war to counter India's conventional supremacy. The basic purpose of its nuclear weapons is to deter any aggression against its territorial integrity. Riffat Hussain, while discussing Pakistan's nuclear doctrine, argues that it cannot disobey the policy of NFU due to Indian superiority in conventional force and it makes India enable to fight conventional war with full impunity.

Pakistan's nuclear posture is based on minimum credible nuclear deterrence which means that its nuclear weapons have no other role except to counter the aggression from its adversary. It is evident that Pakistan's nuclear program is India centric.

In November 1999, Pakistan's Foreign Minister Abdul Sattar stated that 'more is unnecessary while little is enough'. The National Command Authority (NCA), comprising the Employment Control Committee, Development Control Committee and Strategic Plans Division, is the center point of all decision-making regarding the nuclear issue. According to the security experts, first use option involves many serious challenges because it needs robust military intelligence and very effective early warning system.

However, Pakistan's nuclear establishment is concerned about nuclear security of weapons for which it has laid out stringent security system. Pakistan made a rational decision by conducting five nuclear tests in 1998 to restore the strategic stability in South Asia, otherwise it would not have been able to counter the threat of India's superior conventional force.

The NCA of Pakistan (nuclear program policy making body) announced on September 9, 2015 the nation's resolve to maintain a full spectrum deterrence capability in line with the dictates of 'credible minimum deterrence' to deter all forms of aggression, adhering to the policy of avoiding an arms race.

Pakistan wants to maintain strategic stability in the region and it seeks conflict resolution and peace, but India's hawkish policies towards Pakistan force it to take more steps to secure its border.

Pakistan's nuclear establishment is very vigorously implementing rational countermeasures to respond to India's aggression by transforming its nuclear doctrine.

For example, it has developed tactical nuclear weapons (short range nuclear missiles) that can be used in the battle field. Former PM Nawaz Sharif said in 2013 that Pakistan would continue to obey the policy of minimum credible nuclear deterrence to avoid the arms race in the region. However, it would not remain unaware of the changing security situation in the region and would maintain the capability of full spectrum nuclear deterrence to counter any aggression in the region.

Dr. Zafar Jaspal argues in his research that full credible deterrence does not imply as it is a quantitative change in Pakistan's minimum credible nuclear deterrence, but it is a qualitative response to emerging challenges posed in the region. This proves that Islamabad is not interested in the arms race in the region, but India's constant military buildup forces Pakistan to convert its nuclear doctrine from minimum to full credible nuclear deterrence.

India's offensive policies alarm the strategic stability of the region and international community considers that Pakistan's transformation in nuclear policies would be risky for international security. They have recommended a few suggestions to Pakistan's nuclear policy making body, but the NCA rejected those mainly because Pakistan is confronting dangerous threats from India and its offensive policies such as the cold start doctrine.

Hence, no suggestion conflicting with this purpose is acceptable to Pakistan. This is to be made clear at all national, regional and international platforms that Pakistan is striving hard to maintain strategic stability while India is only contributing toward instigating the regional arms race.

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/258936/pakistans-nuclear-policy-impact-on-strategic-stability-in-south-asia/>