



VISION

VISIONARY INSIGHTS INTO THE STRATEGIC INQUESTS OF NATIONS

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 5, NUMBER 1

JANUARY 2019

Compiled & Edited by:

S. Sadia Kazmi

Strategic Vision Institute
Islamabad

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 5, NUMBER 1
JANUARY 2019

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
Indian Land Warfare – 2018: What it Means for the Region	
Younis Sarwer	2
Induction of Pakistan A-100 MLRS and Deterrence Equation of South Asia	
Syeda Saiqa Bukhari	4
Pakistan Securing its Maritime Interest and CPEC	
Qura tul Ain Hafeez	6
Future of North Korean Nuclear Program	
Beenish Altaf	8
Re-shaping the CPEC Narrative – A Political Perspective	
Waqas Jan	10
Can Cyber Deterrence be Pursued?	
Ahyousha Khan	12
Back to Short Range Ballistic Missile	
Ahyousha Khan	14
Who is to be Blamed for Arms Built-up in Asia Pacific	
Qura tul Ain Hafeez	16
Overviewing India’s Military Modernization: 2019 and Beyond	
Syeda Saiqa Bukhari	18
10-Year Challenge: US Policy Towards the Middle East	
Younis Sarwer	20
China’s Increasing Role in Brokering Peace in Afghanistan	
Waqas Jan	22
Time to Reform the NPT	
Beenish Altaf	24

Editor's Note

With the beginning of year 2019, the *SVI Foresight* successfully enters into its fifth year. While we take the opportunity to wish you all a very happy and prosperous New Year, we are also thankful to our ever increasing readership not only for its keen interest and continued support but also for the invaluable input and feedback. We look forward to having a continued association and productive engagement.

Keeping up with the SVI past practice, the first issue of this year attempts to cover all the contemporary areas of strategic importance to Pakistan and the world at large. Opinion Articles included in this electronic journal will present its audience with the insightful analysis on significant national, regional and global developments. Short commentaries cover following topics: Indian Land Warfare Doctrine-2018: What it Means for the Region, Induction Of Pakistan A-100 MLRS and Deterrence Equation of South Asia, Pakistan Securing its Maritime Interest and CPEC, Future Of North Korean Nuclear Program, Can Cyber Deterrence be Pursued?, Back to Short Range Ballistic Missile, Who is to be Blame for Arms Built-Up in Asia Pacific, Overview of India's Military Modernization: 2019 and Beyond, 10-Year Challenge: US Policy Towards the Middle East, China's Increasing Role in Brokering Peace in Afghanistan, and an important article emphasizing upon the need for reforming the NPT.

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

Indian Land Warfare – 2018: What it Means for the Region

Younis Sarwer

As a supplement to the Joint Doctrine of Indian Armed Forces-2017, Indian army has proclaimed its Land Warfare doctrine (LWD) on 14th December 2018. It outlines broader contours of Indian military strategy and draws on different sets of tactics to accomplish the strategy. The document is essentially important to understand India's perception of the regional and extra-regional environment and how it is likely to affect the political and strategic developments in the region.

The stated doctrine explicitly refers to the Sino-Pak economic cooperation as a collusive threat to the Indian security. The doctrine explicates "collusive threat from adversaries" as one of the major external challenge faced by India. The enunciated assumption follows India's long held resistance to any effort towards regional integration that doesn't allow India to implement its dominating agenda and respects the norm of state sovereignty. The latest iteration is a follow up to the Indian policy of deriding China-Pakistan Economic Corridor. India, obsessed with its strategic alignment with U.S. and its agenda of regional domination, continues to see CPEC with suspicion and is ready to lose the unprecedented opportunity of regional connectivity. Indian attempts to fabricate the military dimension of the project by means of propaganda are in line with the objectives mentioned in LWD.

Given the fact that India has already embarked on its project of military modernization by means of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Robotics, this doctrine further emphasizes the integration of AI and Robotics into war fighting and allocation of resources towards this end. LWD touches upon some of the disruptive technologies that include; Directed Energy weapons, hypersonic weapons, Lethal Autonomous weapons, and Micro satellites. This kind of military modernization unveils India's increasing assertiveness, its bid to achieve "escalation dominance", and to secure advantageous position in terms of Limited conventional warfare. Considering the nature of bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, it would definitely compel Pakistan to take necessary countermeasures. Given the context, Pakistan will be pushed to allocate resources for the acquisition of such disruptive technologies to balance the negative effect of India's actions. Consequently, it would lead to a new facet of arms race in the region at the expense of social and economic welfare of the people of the region. Besides this, the doctrine primarily focuses on the logic of limited conventional warfare against the adversaries. But, it is forgotten that the solution is not limited war between the nuclear weapon states, instead it would lead to catastrophic consequences for peace in the region and beyond.

To the surprise of many, Indian military declaration has explicitly mentioned the centrality of Information and psychological warfare as India's response to adversaries. The referred document says, "Psychological Warfare will be used to promote own objectives and the Indian Army shall graduate to a state where mass media becomes an organic part of future operations". While stating the objective of Indian Army regarding the subject of information warfare, it adds, "Indian Army will develop capabilities to prosecute Information Warfare Operations over the entire spectrum of conflict as well as in 'No War No Peace' scenario, with the aim to achieve full spectrum information dominance over the adversary".

These statements reinforce Pakistan's long standing claim of India as driver of the fifth generation warfare initiated against the country to destabilize it from within and poses a threat to Pakistan's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

India's offensive doctrinal ambitions and its posture, as a disrupter of peace, in a recent past go unnoticed at the comity of nations. International community, despite being committed, in rhetoric, to the goal of promotion of global peace and prosperity, continues to appease India for short term economic benefits, in practice. This policy of appeasement, although seems worth pursuing germane to power politics, but in the longer run, it would have some serious setbacks for regional and global peace.

In sum, the doctrine and stated objectives are counterproductive to the goals of regional integration and promotion of peace in the region. The doctrine reflects the typical mindset in the Indian strategic circles that impedes progress on the regional connectivity and sees such benign ventures through suspicion and doubt. Furthermore, it is expected to engender a relatively new facet of arms race and warfare i.e. psychological and information warfare, in the region. Therefore, to ensure regional stability and to forge peace, unbridled Indian ambitions should be muzzled and rule based order should be made to work indiscriminately.

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/342370/indian-land-warfare-doctrine-2018-what-it-means-for-the-region/>

Induction of Pakistan A-100 MLRS and Deterrence Equation of South Asia

Syeda Saiqa Bukhari

Pakistan inducted A-100 rocket in Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) into its arsenals, boosting the strength of Artillery Crop on January 4, 2019. The missile system was indigenously developed by Pakistani scientists and engineers. MLRS which comprise of two main elements: rocket munitions and a self-propelled platform to carry and launch those rockets, designed to disrupt enemy's mobilization. MLRS is unguided rocket against enemy position in artillery minded sense.

Media wing of the armed forces, the Inter Services Public Relations (ISPR) said that this rocket is a highly effective and potent for interdiction that can effectively disrupt enemy's mobilization and assembly. Chief of the Army Staff (COAS) General Qamar Javed Bajwa, presided over the induction ceremony, paid rich tributes to scientists and engineers for indigenously develop A-100 rocket which shall augment the existing conventional fire power capabilities of Pakistan Army.

While addressing at the ceremony, he emphasized Pakistan Army's resolve to strengthen conventional forces to meet challenges of full spectrum threat. Pakistani defence industry had maintained steady progress in the recent times and had contributed to defence of Pakistan. This missile system is another addition in the deterrence equation of South Asian region.

In South Asia context, mutual hostility and unresolved disputes between India and Pakistan create instability and insecurity. The induction of nuclear weapons into the national defense structures of both states in 1998 has brought an era of dynamics of nuclear politics. Nuclearisation brought the concept of deterrence in the region. The deterrence equilibrium in South Asia is viewed as an assurance for peace and stability in the region. The strategic significance of nuclear weapons in the South Asian security equation is undeniable because these weapons reduce the chances of limited conflict between the two hostile states. Pakistan as a responsible nuclear weapon state has never been in competition with India in terms of size, scope and efficiency of its conventional or strategic capabilities. Hence, equilibrium of nuclear deterrence between India and Pakistan is the underpinning of South Asian strategic stability.

Recently, India's doctrinal policy shift and its objectives ultimately forcing an arms race in the region. Pakistan is obliged to rely on the employment of nuclear weapons owing to conventional military asymmetry. India's aggressive limited war 'Cold Start' (CSD) left no choice for Pakistan but to introduce Short Range Ballistic Missile 'Nasr' (TNW). Indian Offensive Military Doctrine which is specifically designed to undermine Pakistan's conventional capability and occupy its small territory which could be used as a significant tool in post conflict negotiation by initiating surprise attack from eight different fronts by the Integrated Battle Groups (IBGs).

Pakistan developed TNWs to deter India's conventional military superiority. It is well known that conventional asymmetry between India and Pakistan is continuously widening with the passage of time.

India also allocated huge budget for its military which defiantly have ramifications for Pakistan. Pakistan cannot afford arms race with India for the purpose of conventional military parity, consequently Pakistan developed such a capabilities (TNWs) which could deter India's conventional military superiority. Pakistan views SRBM as a stabilizing addition to the prevailing deterrence equation. Pakistan considers the nuclear weapons as last resort weapons which are only meant for deterrence and their use can only be contemplated as a last resort.

Recent Indian weapons modernization and force posturing is viewed as a threat to the strategic stability of South Asian region. India's air defence system the latest addition of S-400 system also has the ability to disturb the regional strategic stability. S-400 is a long range surface to air missile system and has the ability to access aerial targets up to 400 km away. It has the potential to counter threats from ballistic missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and aircraft. To counter Indian doctrinal change, military modernization and proactive military strategy of launching limited conflict and capture some territory of Pakistan adopted Minimum Credible Deterrence with Full Spectrum Deterrence. Now this A-100 missile rocket is also made foe conventional deterrence.

Although, initiation of conventional war, for certain extant will remain a conventional conflict but beyond certain level no one can say that it will remain limited conventional war. It can lead to a nuclear holocaust. It will have series of implications. If India is insisting for operationalizing its Cold Start Doctrine against Pakistan than India will also have to pay for the severe implications at conventional as well as strategic level. No one knows the adversary redlines.

Pakistan in recent years has been trying to modernize its forces as per demands of the contemporary security challenges. Induction of A-100 MLRS into Pakistan army will give it the utmost superiority to overcome conventional threats coming from Indian side. It allows Pakistan artillery corps to keep an eye on enemy's mobilization and prepare them for any Indian military adventure. Induction of A-100 system also affects the surprise element of Cold Start Doctrine. This system makes Pakistan capable to meet the needs of deterrence against the conventional and unorthodox threats. Interestingly, MLRS computerized fire control system enables a reduced crew, or even a single soldier to load and unload the launcher. Furthermore, The MLRS offers a devastating physical and psychological effect on the enemy, covered with high explosion, anti-personnel or chemical warheads as needed.

Lastly, sophisticated technology and long-range ballistic missile development has not only made Pakistan more determined to acquire similar capabilities to counter Indian threat but also to ensure credibility of its nuclear deterrence. Long history of military confrontation, the growing asymmetry and disparity in South Asia has accelerated the process of mastering the latest sophisticated conventional and nuclear technologies. Therefore, both South Asian nuclear states have developed enough nuclear capable warheads, bombers and ballistic and cruise missiles. So far Pakistan has been doing great overall three domains, Air, Sea, and land, in terms of meeting the needs of deterrence against the conventional challenges.

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2019/01/18/induction-of-pakistan-a-100-mlrs-and-deterrence-equation-of-south-asia/>

Pakistan Securing its Maritime Interest and CPEC

Qura tul Ain Hafeez

The IOR is a major sea route that unites the Middle East, Africa, and East Asia with Europe and America. The excessive economic growth of littoral states of Indian Ocean obliges them to protect their energy needs and interests in order to endure their purchasing power. This has great security implications for the sea line of communication of the littoral states of IOR like Pakistan. Continuing to Pakistan's interests in IOR the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) has great potential to transmute Pakistan into a central trade platform, which would undeniably gush the enemies, particularly India, to halt it. The development of Gwadar sea-ports as part of BRI in general and that of CPEC in particular has amplified India's concerns' and aimed for more sophisticated and advanced naval build-up.

Furthermore, India perceives the Gwadar port (that is considered as crown jewel of CPEC) as a hazard to its contesting interests in Central Asia States. The reason being, India can access Afghanistan, Iran and Central Asian Republics (CARs) only through Chabahar by passing Pakistan and Gwadar a deep water sea port that is easily accessible to these land locked states than Chabahar. A couple of days back on 24th December 2018 India has formally overtook the operational control of Iran's Chabahar Port. India's aspirations to become blue water navy in the IOR raise serious concerns among Pakistan's maritime security. CPEC would lead toward increased maritime politics and contestations not only between Pakistan and India but would also involve China and the US.

In such turbulent circumstances Pakistan is required to prepare its sea-based defence to secure its sea lines. Islamabad needs to carefully evaluate its options and develop its strategic response accordingly, involving but not limited to continuous development of its naval capability and an even closer maritime cooperation with China. In view of the prevailing power dynamics in the Indian Ocean, Pakistan Navy in order to secure its interest in IOR inked a contract with China's State Shipbuilding Corporation (CSSC) in June 2018 for two, Type 054AP frigates. The agreement is an extension of a previously signed agreement in 2017. Recently on December 19, 2018 steel-cutting ceremony for the second Type 054A frigate for the Pakistan Navy was held at the Hudong-Zhonghua shipyard in Shanghai. The type 054 AP warship frigates will be equipped with modern detection-state of art sensor and Guided Missiles weapon systems; capable of anti-ship, anti-submarine and air-defence operations. According to the report of China Daily report added that the "Type 054A is the best frigate in service with the PLAN".

It is pertinent to mention here that maritime security is linked with the economic security and vice versa. Gwadar port is one of the most important projects of the CPEC where Pakistan and China are very hopeful that in future this shipping port will generate the revenue for Pakistan's economy. There is a big chunk of fishery industry through which Pakistan can earn a lot. It will stimulate business and trade activities at state level and across the region. The 054 AP frigates ""Will be one of the largest and most technologically advanced platforms of the Pakistani Navy and strengthen the country's capability to respond to future challenges, maintain peace and stability and the balance of power in the Indian Ocean region" a report on 2nd January 2019 released by Chinese state owned media said.

In some, to deal with all these existing defies Pakistan Navy (PN) has espoused to a multi divided line of action for safeguarding the port in a more effective manner. It conducts security patrolling and coastal exercises from time to time. Furthermore, previously in 2013 it has inaugurated its Joint Maritime Information Coordination Centre (JMICC) in Karachi to provide with an effective mechanism of Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA). After receiving these 054 AP frigates warship Pakistan will definitely in far more better position to counter India's vested interests in the Indian Ocean region. It will also help secure the Gwadar port which is the chief component of Pakistan maritime trade activities. China has always been an all-weather strategic partner of Pakistan. Although India always tries to propagate that CPEC is military agreement instead of an economic one however, securing the economic interests with an advanced mechanism does not mean at all that it's planning something militarily. Pakistan has always adopted a defensive policy and it is the right of every sovereign state to secure its interests even if they are economic as there is no morality in international politics, still CPEC is an economic project which welcomes every state of the region for economic cooperation even if it is India as well.

<https://pakobserver.net/pakistan-securing-its-maritime-interest-and-cpec/>

Future of North Korean Nuclear Program

Beenish Altaf

North Korea's leader, Kim Jong-un, recently showed his willingness to have a second summit meeting with the United States President Trump. However he conditioned the offer that he will only cooperate if the US will remove international sanctions against his country, otherwise the North Korea will be left with no choice then to return to the nuclear option.

The North Korean leader in his New Year Day's speech said that "he is willing to meet the United States president at any time for the betterment of our international community. However, if the United States does not keep its promise in our international community and misinterprets our patience and intention and continues with the sanctions, then we have no choice for the sake of our national interest and peace of the Korean Peninsula but to come up with new initiatives and new measures."

Previously, the same country that was once annoyed strongly against a state, cause of its nuclear buildup, was impressed from its diplomatic twist to the extent that it decided to change its decisions favoring it. At that time point in time, President Donald Trump reversed its decision of military exercises with South Korea by calling it as "waste of money". That happened in the backdrop of a Summit held-in between the US and North Korea on June 12, 2018 in Singapore. Since the Prime Minister of Singapore Lee Hsien Loong welcomed the meeting open-heartedly, the role of the country, was fairly vital in carrying out parlays among both the leaders, North Korean Kim Jong-un and the US Donald Trump. Critically it was believed to be the first remarkable deal in many years among both the countries. Regarding its agenda, largely denuclearization was on the top most priority list in the summit.

Despite the fact, that some were anticipating the results of the deal quite positive as a step building good relationship between the US and North Korea, likewise others were apprehensive of it. Paradoxically, the country habitual of military solutions, is evidently foreseeing a "good feeling" for North Korea this time; with reference to the June's summit.

The Rodong Sinmun of Pyongyang on the other hand said that "broad and in-depth opinions would be exchange to establish a permanent and peaceful regime in the Korean Peninsula and to solve problems that are of common concern, including issues to realize the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula."

Formerly relationship of the US and North Korea has remained on the edge and tensed to the extent of transferring harsh and threatening statements to each other at the state level. It was followed by several missile tests from North Korean side, who up till now conducted six nuclear tests too (the latest of which was in September 2017). North Korea offered a frightening and alarming demonstration over the precedent months of its capability to deliver warheads, using missiles that could easily strike South Korea, Japan and the United States territory. It was actually exasperated by 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 Korean 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 look with the lens of a victory, several conclusions could be drawn including: a durable peace is anticipated as the best outcome as North Korea is now trying to develop good ties with South Korea. The top leader, Kim met President Moon Jae-In and discussed areas of mutual interests. Besides, the next summit could be a step-up for international community's disarmament goal that is the denuclearization 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. However, till present there is nothing substantial outcome as the US is stick to its military presence in and around Korea likewise the North Korea is also stuck to its condition of removal or lifting of sanctions first before any solid step towards dismantling its nukes.

<https://www.eurasiareview.com/16012019-future-of-north-korean-nuclear-program-oped/>

Re-shaping the CPEC Narrative – A Political Perspective

Waqas Jan

Since Imran Khan's government came to power nearly 6 months ago, there has been a concerted effort from this new government to bring the China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) in line with its own development objectives. Outlined somewhat vaguely as part of its pre-election narrative, recent statements emanating from the Prime Minister's Office, as well as key Ministries such as the Ministry of Finance and the Planning and Development Commission, all appear to be aimed at linking CPEC with the ambitious development goals set by none other than the new Prime Minister himself. These include the somewhat generalized goals of poverty eradication, increased employment and greater austerity as all part of a broader agenda for enhanced socio-economic development.

The emerging narrative being used to frame CPEC thus appears at first sight, as a move away from the more jingoistic pomp of the previous government. Rather than the incessant flag-waving and the marked emphasis on nation-building through massive infrastructural development, Imran Khan's government appears to have taken a more measured and pragmatic approach to CPEC's contribution to national development. While, the Nawaz Sharif government thrived on perceptions of largesse and massive government spending (primarily through Chinese funding), Imran Khan's approach has been to highlight the country's development constraints in light of its ballooning fiscal and current account deficits.

This difference is evident in the Minister of Planning and Development's most recent statements following the 8th Joint Cooperation Committee (JCC) meeting held in Beijing last month. He pointed out that his government had widened the scope of CPEC by laying greater emphasis on developing the country's agricultural, fisheries and light industrial sectors to help boost exports. All while scrapping other expensive projects such as the planned 1,320 MW Rahim Yar Khan Power project that was instead deemed as being more politically motivated than anything else.

These developments thus mark a clear difference in the narratives being espoused by the incumbent and previous governments with regard to CPEC. While the previous government had focused incessantly on pushing for large transport and energy infrastructure projects as part of its policy agenda, the present government has vehemently questioned the usefulness of this approach. These differences characterize not only the varying development objectives of both these governments but also the very politics that influence and shape these objectives. They represent, if anything, the healthy impact of a thriving democracy on CPEC. .

However, moving beyond the political undertones currently defining (and re-defining) CPEC, it is also worth noting that the entire initiative is gearing towards its second phase of development. Whereas, the preceding phase was characterized largely by massive state-led infrastructure projects, the following phase is more geared towards setting up the right conditions for building a long-term industrial base on the back of key private-public partnerships. The development of designated Special Economic Zones, as well as improving the ease of doing business for foreign investors mark some of the

most important challenges that currently require the government's attention. These in turn require a renewed political will beyond the constituent politics of localized development. This holds especially true if these initiatives are to translate to actual export revenues and greater Foreign Direct Investment for the Nation as a whole.

What's more, these challenges are such that even if overcome successfully, they lack the kind of visibility and immediacy that is otherwise associated with large infrastructure projects. The benefits of greater exports and foreign investments are likely to be realized over the long-run, even after putting in place a series of hard-fought measures and reforms. These stand in direct contrast to the immediate benefits to the population from for instance, a new highway or bus service, or from a marked decrease in power cuts as popularized by the previous government.

Hence, while the present government continues to espouse its narrative of a people-centric development agenda even with respect to CPEC, one wonders whether it holds enough political capital to carry out the more difficult task of restructuring entire sectors within the Pakistani economy. This holds particular importance considering the fact that it has considerably distanced itself from the preceding government's approach to not only CPEC but the country's entire development agenda. In emphasizing this more people-centric approach, it remains to be seen whether the people themselves buy into this narrative of such ambitious yet well-intentioned socio-economic development over the long-run. Because at the present, all this government has to show for regarding CPEC is an ambitious, populist narrative, bought from with its own fast dwindling reserves of political capital.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2019/01/22/re-shaping-the-cpec-narrative-a-political-perspective/>

Can Cyber Deterrence be Pursued?

Ahyousha Khan

South Asian security structure is marred with hostility between two major powers of the region. Owing to this hostility both states are involved in constant arms build up to secure their own security vis-à-vis each other, which is resulting in to security dilemma. Addition of new technologies and struggle to achieve them in name of national security is turning every new sphere for development and cooperation in to war zone. One such example is cyber space.

Cyber space or information technology is the technological revolution of 21st century which facilitated the notions like globalization by making communication fast, easy and accessible. Today almost every state and it's ever important institution have their virtual existence on the cyber space. Moreover, due to difficulty in managing manual data, states are also shifting its important data in to digital form. Thus, information technology has eased many difficulties but every coin has flipside, so does the information technology. But, if one must ponder on the reason behind the flipside, is it the technology itself to be blamed or intentions and ambitions which changes the course that how certain technology should be perceived. Unfortunately, one of the greatest technological revolutions of not only 21st century but of human history after becoming the victim of humans and states intentions cannot be credited as boon.

Though South Asia is a developing region and both nuclear powers in the region are engulfed in many socio-economic issues but unresolved disputes, mistrust and hegemonic ambitions are motivating both states for action-reaction due to prevailing security dilemma. Recently, India's Chief of Army Staff has made statements twice on different occasions to use artificial intelligence, new technologies and in military affairs to be able to fight modern wars. India is also in final stages of setting-up its Defence Cyber Agency under the Integrated Defence Staff to deal with emerging, important and new threats in cyber space. It was also mentioned by Indian military authorities that the units of cyber agency will be spread across the country where there will be dedicated officers, units and cells at every headquarter to deal with the aspect of cyber security. From these past two years after announcing its Joint Armed Forces Doctrine of 2017 which guides India armed forces to use cyber space as medium to apply military power, vigorous attempts have been made to utilized cyber space for maximum military advantage.

Joint armed forces doctrine also says that these actions taken by India were made in an attempt to "gain the advantage over adversary and denying him the same" in cyber space. But, question arises here is that is it completely possible to gain advantage over the enemy in cyber space and denying him the same. Cyber technology was developed in a way that it facilitates interconnectivity and open accessibility thus it is nearly impossible to denying the enemy chances of attacking one's cyber space. Many scholars believed in the notions of cyber deterrence which is defined as an ability to contain threat of punishment if attacked and promise to withhold attack if threat is not of extreme situation. But, the question is should South Asia experience one more type of deterrence after nuclear one to avoid war? The answer to this question couldn't simply be yes or no considering the complexity in the

situation. Nuclear deterrence in South Asia is working or so far has worked between all the nuclear states because the adversaries are known, their technological developments are known. Thus, it is easy to deny enemy the option to attack due to fear of massive retaliation. In cyber space enemies can be non-state actor relying on spoofing to launch an attack on state actor. In such scenario retaliation could be highly difficult. Both India and Pakistan are already entwined in a complex security and threat matrix which cannot afford the retaliation of any cyber-attack because of the existing ambiguity in locating the source of attack. If technological advanced states like US-China can realize that there are certain boundaries in cyber sphere which should not be crossed in peace time and have reached the agreement, so does the India and Pakistan.

It would be very idealistic to say that cyber space should not be converted into war zone by South Asian rivals but at least both parties can reach to the certain understanding where cyber security issues must not ignite conventional or nuclear war.

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2019/01/26/can-cyber-deterrence-be-pursued/>

Back to Short Range Ballistic Missile

Ahyousha Khan

Year 2018 was significant from the point of view of nuclear arms build-up and non-proliferation efforts globally. On one side Washington and Pyongyang went for negotiations after decades of direct confrontations; on the other hand side US withdraw from Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) with Iran and Inter-mediate Nuclear Force Treaty (INF) with Russia. Furthermore, in its nuclear force posture review of 2018, US went back to low yield nuclear weapons, which are also known as “tactical nuclear weapons”. The emphasis of NPR 2018 was especially on availability of low yield nuclear weapons in sea launched ballistic missiles. The reason given by the US for acquisition of tactical nuclear weapons was adversaries should not perceive that out of fear of collateral damage US would not consider the option of nuclear weapon. Hence, US did not want its enemy to exploit lower levels of threshold in any conflict.

Few years earlier Pakistan faced heavy international pressure and criticism when it decided to induct short range ballistic missile “Nasr” to counter rising Indian threats at lower levels of conflict due to adoption of Cold Start Doctrine (CSD) by India. CSD is a limited offensive military war fighting strategy designed to capture Pakistan’s territory and wage war below nuclear threshold. However, development of short range ballistic missile with low yield by Pakistan counters CSD effectively and helped Pakistan to extend deterrence at tactical, operational and strategic level. According to Pakistan’s strategic community “Nasr” provided Pakistan with “flexible deterrent option” “in response to concerns that India’s larger military could still wage a conventional war against the country, thinking Pakistan would not risk retaliation with a bigger nuclear weapon.”

The move to go for tactical nuclear weapons by Pakistan was heavily criticized by the international community on the account that although the usage of TNWs was effective in Cold War but in South Asian setting it would escalate the conflict to full scale nuclear weapon because India would respond with massive retaliation under the predicament of its nuclear doctrine. However, now today when US is under threat of North Korean ICBM’s it is giving the same logic which it previously waived-off when Pakistan gave it.

Moreover, in recent years India also went for tactical nuclear weapons, and recently successfully tested its indigenously developed surface to surface short range ballistic missile “Parahaar”. The missile is developed by India’s Defence Research and Development Organization and has a range of 200 km. According to different sources “Parahaar” is “quick reaction, all weather, all terrain, highly accurate battlefield support tactical weapon system”. Moreover, India is also planning to test it’s another short range ballistic missile name “Pralay”, which has the 350-500 km depending on the payload and it is also cannisterized weapon.

All these developments by US, India and Pakistan are done under their security imperative. In this realist and pragmatic world states does not uphold non-proliferation norm on the price of their own interests and security. So, if short range ballistic missiles are requirement of one’s defense and security,

they will be built. Moreover, if they have the capability to affect strategic stability their buildup should be criticized non-discriminately rather than turning the blind eyes towards development by one side and bashing the other side.

<http://southasiajournal.net/back-to-short-range-ballistic-missiles%EF%BB%BF/>

Who is to be Blamed for Arms Built-up in Asia Pacific

Qura tul Ain Hafeez

Maritime disputes have appeared as one of the absolute security concern in the Asia-Pacific region. They act as a driving factor for the major power of the region, while formulating their strategic policies towards their neighbors. Over the past several decades the maritime security disputes touched an irrepressible point which cannot be ignored. The regional balance is also being affected by these skirmishes and the probability of an ensuing armed conflict among the littoral states cannot be denied easily. The geographical proximity of South China Sea and its potential of resources of oil and natural gas make it a hot spot and pivot of maritime clashes in the Indo-Pacific region. The urge to control the resources is one of the driving forces behind these disputes among the littoral states of SCS. Many isles and reefs of the South China Sea belong to China, Philippines, Vietnam, Taiwan, and Malaysia. China repeatedly claims her sovereignty upon these entire island (Paracel, Spratly and Scarborough Shoal), topographies lying within the dash line and “sovereign rights in the waters and sea bed” within the dash-line limit. Moreover, many of the non-claimant states have noteworthy maritime security interests of, freedom of navigation and over flight, acceptance of international laws of sea and acquisition of regional peace and safety, in the SCS. Also the United States Pivot Asia Strategy in the SCS appears to jeopardize any probability of making an end to the Conflicts.

Recently on Jan. 8, 2019, China has sent it's a DF- 26 Ballistic Missile in the northwest region i.e. far western Gobi Desert and Tibetan Plateau regions. The DF-26 an anti-ship ballistic missile (ABM) is a long range BM capable to carry a nuclear or conventional warhead and can target medium and long range ships at sea up to 4,000km (2,500 miles). There are views that China's attempt to launch the missile seems to protect itself in response from the U.S. Naval missiles. The Arleigh Burke-class destroyer USS McCampbell was supposedly conducting a self-proclaimed Freedom of Navigation Patrol (FONOP) near the Parcel Islands on 7th Of January 2019.

International critics perceived the launch of DF-26 by China as a response to US Freedom of navigation near the Parcel Island. However, fact to reckon here is that DF-26 is not the first ABM sent to Parcel Island rather China has already deployed ABMs to both the Parcel and Spratly Islands. Moreover, in recent activity China was conducting training exercise, which was organized by China's rocket force in order to strengthen its existing missile force.

In a recent chain of events China might be testing its ABM because of the rising threat after the US unilateral withdrawal from the INF treaty. Moreover, in Missile Defense Review 2019, US reiterated reliance on ground based interceptors (GBI) to counter ICBM's in US is planning for space based interceptors, which is “existential threat” to China and Russia's strategic deterrent. Thus, it can be said that after US withdrawal from INF, launch of its controversial NPR 2018 and MDR 2019 arms race in not only South China Sea but in world will increase. The pursuit of individual interests by states rather than multilateral arms control and non-proliferation efforts will increase tensions and affect the stability of

the world. Moreover, in this biased and interest driven system major powers only rely on notions like arm control and non-proliferation when it is convenient to them or when they want to stop other states to pursue their national interests. So, instead of finding a solution to the problem of arms build-up and bringing the other states like Iran, China under the umbrella of non-proliferation treaties US itself terminated the treaty. If these states join the treaty there will be arms control instead of arms build.

<http://southasiajournal.net/%EF%BB%BFwho-is-to-be-blame-for-the-arms-build-up-in-asia-pacific/>

Overviewing India's Military Modernization: 2019 and Beyond

Syeda Saiqa Bukhari

On 10th of January, Indian Army Chief General Bipin Rawat gave the statement that the military is launching war games next month to test 'structures geared towards sudden and swift offensives into enemy territory by Integrated Battle Groups (IBGs)'. These new structures will be "validated" in military exercises on the ground in May, 2019'. He further highlighted the three key objectives of these exercises: to be prepared for future warfare by strengthening Indian military capabilities, become more efficient and better manage its defence budget which shows that India is trying to prepare itself for military conflict against Pakistan.

Integrated Battle Groups (IBGs) are self-contained fighting units, comprising of major elements of military with close support of the air force and if need arises expanded to include naval forces. He further said that 'after military exercises they will go to the government and take their sanction to restructure traditional divisions into permanent IBGs'.

South Asian region witnesses complex and hostile relations between India and Pakistan due to a number of historical and political events. Indeed, both hostile states have over 100 nuclear warheads; have gone to war four times since independence, in addition to several other standoffs, skirmishes and crises that nearly escalated into conflict. This new statement from Indian side provides the latest reminder of hostility between two India and Pakistan.

General Rawat's statement somehow raises concerns in Pakistan because the proposed Integrated Battle Groups are the foundation of Indian offensive military doctrine, which involves initiating rapid military offence from multiple fronts by exploiting the element of surprise and leaving Pakistan with neither the time to respond nor the defensive resources to stop those multiple attacks. Indian intention to operationalize IBG is a way of parlaying Pakistan's nuclear gamesmanship through proactive war.

The timing of General Bipin statement is very noteworthy as in January 2017; General Rawat appeared to acknowledge the existence of Cold Start. Before that, the Indian political and military establishments have not officially sanctioned the doctrine. General Bipin said that CSD exists for conventional military operations. His more recent statement about IBGs exercises seem to solidify further that Indian is in its path towards implementation of its offensive military strategy.

Indian military doctrine Cold Start is to fight short duration of conventional war with Pakistan under the nuclear shadow. Cold Start Doctrine involves restructuring of its defensive formations of army stationed near to the international borders, expansion of its offensive capability with higher mobility, make preliminary gains by exploiting the element of surprise and more focus on combined operations of air-land forces. Military offensive power of India is consisted of three strike corps, an armored division each with mechanized infantry and extensive artillery support. Holding corps operate as defensive corps stationed closed to the international border and primarily meant for enemy penetrations. Indian Cold

Start Doctrine would require reorganization of the Indian military offensive power into eight small sized battle groups called IBGs that combine mechanized infantry, artillery, and armor.

Indian Army Chief General Bipin Rawat official confirmation about the existence and validity of offensive military doctrine Cold Start a year before, justified Pakistan's development of Short Range Ballistic Missiles "Nasr". Pakistan tactical nuclear weapons have a definite capability to deter India's aggressive military action.

As seen that after Modi Government, India is more assertive towards Pakistan. They have claimed to conduct surgical strikes inside Pakistan which is yet doubtful. If India continues its assertive behavior towards Pakistan, Islamabad can expect any kind of Indian conventional military attack. Again the Indian general election is going to happen in April/May this year, Pakistan is undoubtedly a subject of relevance in the India's 2019 general elections.

During the BJP government, anti-Pakistan sentiments have flared in New Delhi on multiple occasions, prompting many of the members from the BJP to perpetuate such sentiments overtly. Pakistan's Prime Minister Imran Khan has made several offers for talks but India repeatedly rebuffed such attempts. Because a step towards normalizing the relationship with Islamabad could be used against the government by the opposition parties, and deteriorating the vote bank of BJP government. General Bipin statement in this scenario is very significant because this is the one way to do stirring up nationalistic sentiments among the people.

Hence, India has made noticeable strides towards operationalising the Cold Start Doctrine which includes weapon and equipment procurements, forward leaning posture by constructing cantonment near the international border and shifting of logistical units, depots to forward locations and recent announcement to restructuring of traditional armed forces to IBGs. This implies that India is fast moving towards fully operationalizing the Cold Start Doctrine by meeting all the requirements to successfully implement such a strategy. However, to what extent it can dent the Pakistani defenses or to what extend it can achieve its stated objectives remains a different proposition which remains a subject of debate and is difficult to predict with certainty.

So far India is not ready for any limited, quick and swift warfare operations. India lack adequate offensive elements in their overall military. Most of the Indian offensive military capabilities are under process. It could be assumed that by 2025, New Delhi would be able to fulfill its deficiencies in its army and air force capabilities and would be able to launch joint military and air force operation with the support of political leadership capabilities. Presently, India need more time to fill the operational gaps to bring into practice its CSD. It can be said that India changed its military doctrine only to threaten Pakistan not for initiation of limited conflict against Pakistan. Lastly, Nasr (TNW) holds peculiar position as far as Indian military's Cold start doctrine is concerned. The induction and deployment of Tactical nuclear weapons would checkmate CSD and prevent India from any misadventure.

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2019/01/26/overiewing-indias-military-modernization-2019-and-beyond/>

10-Year Challenge: US Policy Towards the Middle East

Younis Sarwer

The hashtag #10YearChallenge has got us thinking how the world of politics has changed in the last 10 years. From Obama's vision of 'Smart Diplomacy' of upholding American ideals, of resuscitating Multilateralism, to Trumpism that is grounded in 'Impulsive diplomacy', railing against American tradition and mooring impetuous suspicion of International bodies, the last decade has seen stark changes in the global political arena. Amongst the wide array of issues where the US foreign policy has undergone a transformation, Obama's view of Middle East was latest to be censured.

On the heels of uncertainty that surrounded Trumps' decision to withdraw US troops from Syria, Mike Pompeo sought to draw a vision for America's foreign policy towards the Middle East. The speech was delivered in Cairo, the same city where Obama spoke 10 years ago. The blistering rebuke of Obama's Middle East policy inspired a mix of delight and fear- a delight for them who threaten peace and fear among those who seek stability. It also unravels a discrepancy that scholars believe exists between administration's rhetoric to reassert lost American influence in the region and its willingness to commit resources to pursue a strategic shift.

In his address, Obama attempted to reconcile Islamic values with Western democracy. He defied the logic- situated in hatred and exclusion that drove American foreign policy since 9/11. Obama's bid to atone for the past troubles, US policies have inflicted upon Middle Eastern region, sent a positive message to the Muslims across the world. He said that Islam and American polity are not in a competition and acknowledged how both remain in close connections since the birth of American polity. Obama warned of the consequences if differences were not bridged. He said, "So long as our relationship is defined by our differences, we will empower those who sow hatred rather than peace, and who promote conflict rather than the cooperation". Following this, the Obama administration embarked on seeking peace and stability in the region by means of cooperation. For this, he embraced multilateral diplomacy to mend ties with Iran and made significant overtures on this front – offers of unconditional talks and writing letter to Iranian Supreme leader are cases in point.

Furthermore, Obama's speech addressed the question of the Palestinian struggle and the project of promotion of democracy in the region. He noted that "Israelis must acknowledge that just as Israel's right to exist cannot be denied, neither can Palestine's. The United States does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements. This construction violates previous agreements and undermines efforts to achieve peace. It is time for these settlements to stop". It clearly demonstrated the then administration's commitment to the two-state solution and to oppose unbridled Israeli advancements to withhold provision of fundamental rights of the Palestinian population. Besides this, while averting direct criticism over Middle Eastern autocracies, Obama carefully managed to raise the question of inalienable rights of citizens, with particular mention of women's rights. In sum, Obama's vision to redress America's relations with the Middle East was based on the notion of co-existence, pluralism and multilateralism.

Contrary to this, Pompeo exhibits a new facet of American foreign policy towards the region that draws its logic from the precedents that bred turmoil in the region. Excessive American intervention in the region has never done any good to the region. In the past, efforts to bring regime change through external support befell misery and turbulence. Be it Mosaddeq's regime in Iran, or Saddam Hussain's government in Iraq attempts to disrupt the natural course of events has hurt peace and security of the region. While berating Obama's decision to withdraw from Iraq, one must not forget Bush's policy of conquering the Middle East to reshape its larger political context that engendered chaos and weakened the political order. Undermining whatever progressed Obama administration has made to retrieve American image as the protector of rule-based order, Pompeo outlined the US strategy which envisaged squeezing Iran from within and supporting Israel and other autocratic regimes at the expense of American tradition. The Palestinian question, central to the region's security, and Khashoggi's killing, pivotal to American comportment abroad, could not receive the attention of US secretary of the State.

In practice, Obama's foreign policy agenda offered a delicate balance between gestures of idealism and carefully veiled realist face of the policy. Amidst this struggle, he was keen to revive the multilateral essence of global order. He adamantly rejected the language of hatred, abuse, threat and coercion. All this radically differs how trump views the Middle East. Chastising Ayatollahs of Iran, reversing Obama's bid to reshape American perception of the Muslim world and eroding the foundations of a two-state solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict reflect how Trump has changed US Middle East policy.

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/348559/10-year-challenge-us-policy-towards-the-middle-east/>

China's Increasing Role in Brokering Peace in Afghanistan

Waqas Jan

As China continues to embrace its role as a major regional power, its increasing willingness to engage with the Afghan peace process offers an interesting indication to the emerging dynamics of the wider Central Asian region. Having already established considerable influence across large parts of Asia, the Persian Gulf, Africa and even Europe; China with the help of its Belt and Road Initiative has continued to leverage its widespread trade and economic relations for increased diplomatic goodwill, across a diverse range of countries. This has allowed China's diplomatic relations with these countries to help shape what many have termed as a New World Order, which is directly in contention with the US's unilateral supremacy. This is perhaps most apparent in China's increasingly prominent role in Afghanistan, which serves as perhaps the most challenging yet most indicative example of China's stated objectives of enhanced regional integration and shared prosperity.

The key challenge posed by Afghanistan comes to a large extent from the rampant insecurity and instability that has for decades characterized its relations with its neighbors. The impacts of the US led War on Terror (now in its 18th year) has for instance overshadowed many attempts by its neighbors to meaningfully engage in major trade, investment and/or development related activities. Recent statements from the US president regarding the impending withdrawal of US forces have cast even further uncertainty over these issues, specifically due to the lack of a coherent exit strategy from the US.

As a result, Afghanistan's relations with its neighbors such as Iran, Pakistan and China are still weighed down heavily by security related issues. These include issues such as cross-border terrorism, the smuggling of illicit goods and services and the ensuing threats to the safety of foreign citizens residing in and travelling to Afghanistan. The need to address these issues has further come to serve as a major pre-condition to the eventual success of the fast developing China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) as well as the overarching Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). Especially considering how a key priority of the BRI is to socioeconomically develop the Xinjiang Autonomous region in Western China, there is a definite threat of the myriad security challenges plaguing Afghanistan to spill-over across its border into these areas.

China's increasing willingness to play a greater role in the Afghan peace process, can thus be understood as emanating to a large extent from its increased stake in the wider region as part of the BRI. Based on this framework, China can be seen leveraging its increasingly close ties with Pakistan, as well as the Central Asian Republics to address the prevailing insecurity within Afghanistan at a more regional level. The recently held meetings between the foreign ministers of China, Pakistan and Afghanistan are indicative of this desire, as China continues to promote dialogue between the two neighbors. Furthermore, according to recent statements made by the Chinese ambassador in Pakistan, China is also working to promote ongoing talks between the Afghan government and the Taliban for which the Chinese government has appointed a special envoy to coordinate with the Taliban's political office in Doha.

In addition to these diplomatic efforts, China is also reported to have ramped up its military cooperation with Afghanistan, providing millions of dollars in aid to the Afghan military. It has sought closer cooperation and military exchanges particularly with respect to counter-terrorism operations. This has even given rise to rumors that China is mulling over setting up a military base in Afghanistan's Badakshan province, close to the Wakhan Corridor which borders the Xinjiang region. While the Chinese government has officially denied such reports; such a base would purportedly be China's second overseas military base, further bolstering its capability in projecting power beyond its own borders.

Hence, while China's interests in fostering closer cooperation with Afghanistan are self-proclaimed to be promoting peace and regional stability, these measures have continued to irk the United States adding further tension to already fraught US-China relations. These include the long-standing effects of the ongoing US-China trade war, the increasing militarization of the South China Sea, as well as China's fast increasing influence across the surrounding region. All of these factors arguably point towards the US's own unsuccessful attempts at containing the rise of China, which exacerbated by China's growing role in Afghanistan leads to the growing possibility of China eventually supplanting the US as the dominant power within Central Asia.

However, considering the vast array of challenges still facing Afghanistan, and the US's tenuous hold over the region built over decades of war, the prevailing politico-economic dynamics of the region still remain as complex as ever. Thus, even though China's increasing focus on Afghanistan is likely to benefit the region as a whole, its most recent efforts are likely to bear fruit only over the long-run. That is also only if China and its surrounding countries remain committed to the overall vision of regional peace and prosperity that is enshrined within the Belt and Road Initiative.

<https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2019/01/29/chinas-increasing-role-in-brokering-peace-in-afghanistan/>

Time to Reform the NPT

Beenish Altaf

International politics has never been the same since the advent of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons changed the entire perspective of the international political system and since then a new era of politics has just begun termed as Realpolitik. Books in Hundred were written by prominent scholars, intellectuals, policy makers, academicians, experts around the world to understand ramifications, implications and importance of nuclear weapons possessed by the states. The dominant realist perspective illustrate that state behavior has imprints of human behavior.

However, since the advent of nuclear weapons, the primary goal of international community was to obstruct the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) was one of the major outcomes of these efforts towards nonproliferation in this regard. NPT recognizes five legitimate states are nuclear weapons states (P5) with all the means to have these absolute weapons in their arsenal and became *de jure* States.

Besides NPT, other international regimes/treaties were also came into being to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, but, the efforts seems to be adequately dealt with states aspirations to acquire nuclear weapons. In fact, states like Pakistan, India, Israel and nascent nuclear weapons state North Korea, due to their inherited security compulsion/dilemmas did acquire nuclear weapons to deal with the contrasts of insecurities from their adversaries and became the *de facto* Nuclear Weapons states.

The inclusion of *de facto* Nuclear weapons states and other aspirant states like Iran has forced researcher, policy makers and expertise to reevaluate/rethink the paradigms of nonproliferation. Nonproliferation efforts need to strengthen in order to prevent the further influx of nuclear weapons to other states, which are the aspirants of these deadly weapons. In fact, the Grand Bargain Clause VI of NPT, which was the essence of the nuclear nonproliferation, still lacks solid footholds, since the aim of nuclear disarmament is yet to achieve. The “more may be better” notion is the ghost which has bitterly followed many other states around the world. The Realpolitik of the *de jure* and *de facto* nuclear states is not letting them to create any type of comfort towards even selective disarmament.

The anticipated withdrawal of the US from the US-Soviet Union Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty of 1987, progress of Russian nuclear-capable hypersonic weapons and underwater drones, indefinite extension of the New START treaty, the progress of Tactical Nuclear Weapons (TNWs) in South Asia and in the US (as stated in the 2018 US nuclear Posture Review) along with the swift modernization of nuclear arsenals and up-gradation of new and sensitive technologies by all states possessing nuclear weapon — are some of the latest developments having potential threat to heighten tensions among these states.

In conclusion, the flowers of nonproliferation regimes and treaties are still need to be blossomed. The discriminatory treatments in the nonproliferation regime, segregating states between

haves and have not, coupled with aims of nuclear disarmament, need global efforts to reexamine and rethink about foundation of nonproliferation in order to make it ever strong to deal with future challenges towards nonproliferation. In doing so, researchers in this particular area can play a crucial role to understand the existing challenges and to find the solutions towards nonproliferation both at regional as well as global level.

Ironically, “Institutions that do not evolve to reflect realities of the time end up losing their relevance.” Notwithstanding to the fact that reformation of such legacy institutions is not an easy task to carry out perhaps, it will take a long time to agree to sit on a negotiation table. “If implemented, amendment of the NPT would represent a monumental modification in the nonproliferation structure that has governed the world for the last 50 years. Extensive, constructive and proactive deliberations will allow a reformed NPT to take shape, inspire confidence, build credibility and mature into a strengthened version of its previous self.”

<https://nation.com.pk/30-Jan-2019/time-to-reform-the-npt>