



VISION

VISIONARY INSIGHTS INTO THE STRATEGIC INQUESTS OF NATIONS

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 11
NOVEMBER 2016

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi

Strategic Vision Institute
Islamabad

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 11
NOVEMBER 2016

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	4
The Puzzling Case of Religion and Civil War	
Babar Khan Bozdar	8
Nuclearized Pakistan with More Compulsions and Less Options	
Nauman Hassan	10
Fortifying Relations with Azerbaijan: Future Prospects for Pakistan	
Saima Ali.....	12
Climate Change and Pakistan’s Response	
Shahzadi Tooba	14
Stability Instability Paradox in South Asia and Jingoistic Indian Approach	
Babar Khan Bozdar	16
NSG’s Consultative Group and Need for Evolving New Process	
Beenish Altaf	18
NSG and Strategic Stability in South Asia	
Asma Khalid.....	20
Emergent Geostrategic Trends of Central Asia in Contemporary World Politics	
Nauman Hassan	22
Regional Scenarios: Conspiracies and Choices	
Aqib S. Paracha	24
Maritime Security and Naval Cooperation between China and Pakistan	
Saima Ali.....	26
India-Japan Nuclear Deal: A Setback to International Non-proliferation Efforts	
Asma Khalid.....	28
CPEC: Need to Address Lingering Problems	
S Sadia Kazmi	30
Pakistan, India and Politics of NSG	
Maimuna Ashraf.....	32
India’s No First Use Dilemma	
Beenish Altaf	34

Challenges to Tackle with the New Baton of Command	
Shahzadi Tooba	36
Pakistan, FMCT and Strategic Compulsions	
S Sadia Kazmi	38
Dormant Dimensions of India-Japan Deal	
Maimuna Ashraf.....	40

Editor's Note

SVI Foresight for the month of November brings to its readers a rich compilation of analytically sound opinion based commentaries. The topics covered are contemporary with direct relevance to Pakistan's strategic and security domain. One of the articles included in this month's issue aptly addresses the ongoing issue of NSG membership. The writer maintains that there is a need for evolving a new process and fresh efforts to be adopted by Pakistan since both India and Pakistan are consistently encountering tough resistance in getting the membership of NSG. Many members of the Group seem determined to thwart non-NPT members attempt to join the Group without a criteria-based approach. Nevertheless, New Delhi has robustly been lobbying with the intense support of Washington and its like-minded countries since 2010 to get a 'special treatment' by the NSG members. Simultaneously, even though Islamabad is equally determined to join the NSG but in view of the strong opposition from several countries, it is likely that both India and Pakistan may not be accepted into the NSG in the immediate future. However, if the United States once again coerces the NSG participating governments, as it did in 2008, Pakistan would not have any choice but to review its engagement with the international nonproliferation regime, which is increasingly becoming a tool to serve only the interests of major powers.

Another significant development on the international political scene was the recently inked India-Japan nuclear deal. A unique analysis regarding various aspects and dormant facets of this deal has been highlighted in another article. Largely the deal has been seen as a major setback to the international non-proliferation efforts. It is evident from the history that India most of the time has failed to full fill terms and conditions directly or indirectly attached to IAEA safeguards and previous nuclear deals. Hence most probably India would continue to increase nuclear capabilities as it doesn't feel obligated to stop vertical proliferation. These trends are evidence enough that India's so-called civil nuclear deals serve as a destabilizing factor and biggest challenge to the efforts of non-proliferation. Hence in the future too such deals will severely damage the nuclear nonproliferation agenda and aggravate the tension in the region.

In international anarchic structure, revolutions in military affairs by one state are not without implications. Though, the nuclear politics of South Asia is debatable yet it is understandable that India is responsible for nuclearization of South Asia. The demonstration through nuclear detonation – even if peaceful – created strategic imbalance and destabilized the region. From employment to deployment, New Delhi's aggressive and divergent attitude led Pakistan to react in kind. One of the articles included in this issue highlights this significant are and suggests that in the given circumstances, India must act with caution. India has the option to ratify Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) that will obviously encourage Pakistan and other proliferators to ratify and contribute towards regional as well as global stability and peace. New Delhi's zealous step could be a milestone in global civil-nuclear cooperation

Closely linked to this debate is the fragility of strategic stability in the South Asian region. Territorial disputes, historical events and geostrategic location make it imperative for India-Pakistan to increase their defence spending. The growing defence production gap and India-US nuclear deal has already disturbed the balance of power in the region. The opinion article deliberates on this particular issue and maintains that presently, India and Pakistan aspire to join the NSG to acquire new kind of high-tech nuclear technologies. It is believed by the author that the NSG membership would further increase defense production gap among both nuclear neighbors, and imbalance will trigger the security dilemma in the region. It would severely destabilize the deterrence stability and security situation in South Asia.

Another article maintains that the major contributor to instability in the region is the Indo-Pak hostility. The author very skillfully applies Stability-Instability Paradox to understand the relationship between the conventional and nuclear possibilities of war. It is maintained that the presence of nuclear weapons changes the nature of direct confrontation into the proxy war as was evident during the cold war. Stability-Instability Paradox states that when adversaries have nuclear weapons, the probability of direct war between them greatly decreases but the probability of minor and indirect conflict will increase. This is because rational actors want to avoid war and thus they neither start major conflict nor allow minor

conflict to escalate into major conflict. The writer has established that this paradox exists in South Asia and has enumerated authentic reasons to believe that.

The CPEC continues to be as important as any other strategic issue for Pakistan. The writer maintains in the article that it has to be seen in its exclusivity benefiting the whole country and not just one particular province. Hence the controversies regarding the promised industrial parks, economic zones, provision of electricity, gas and telephone lines, fiber optics, railway lines etc should be chased away on priority basis. CPEC project provides Pakistan with an opportunity to emerge as a major economic hub for global trade and investment. However for it to keep moving towards its ultimate realization there is still need for proper measures to be taken especially in the security domain. At the same time the other domestic impediments also need to be addressed on the immediate basis. This is required because certain internal and external elements aiming at sabotaging the CPEC are also ramping up their evil designs. CPEC surely has a lot to offer but only if it is kept clean from the clutches of undue yet inevitable obstructions and controversies. The leadership and concerned authorities on both sides cannot afford CPEC to be politicized

Pakistan has also made its mark by recently ratifying the Paris Agreement on Climate Change that commits nearly every country to lowering planet warming greenhouse gas emissions to help stave off the most drastic effects of global warming. A very important debate can be found in this issue regarding this particular development. The article highlights firm resolve of the Government of Pakistan to remain fully committed to the implementation of the Paris Agreement. Coupled with this is another major achievement wherein Pakistan has become member of the exclusive club, producing over 1,000 megawatts of electricity through renewable energy sources. The issue of climate change and its probable dire consequences are being faced not just by Pakistan but the whole world and hence the analysis presented in the article is very relevant and helpful for the readers who want to broaden their perspective on the issue.

Pakistan and Azerbaijan have also been forging their relationship into a more significant and productive equation beneficial for both the states. One of the opinions in this issue

suggests that while staying mindful of the international viewpoint and divergent association among states; few significant joint ventures in terms of cooperation at national and international spheres are possible between Pakistan and Azerbaijan. The exchange of ideas on success and disadvantages can help both sides to formulate right options at right times. Multiple non-traditional security measures and traditional security measures hold opportunities; Pakistan and Azerbaijan just need attempts and serious measures for military, political and economic and cultural cooperation. Imperative point to highlight and understand is that political goodwill can serve as a back support

Last but not the least a very pertinent yet less addressed area of religion has also been tackled with in one of the opinions included in this issue. The writer has managed to present a unique view by analyzing the presence of religion in civil wars.

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

Syedah Sadia Kazmi
Senior Research Associate

The Puzzling Case of Religion and Civil War

Babar Khan Bozdar

Religion is directly as well as indirectly involved in civil war. The research is analyzed to check the presence of Religion in civil wars.

Since 1940 to 2000, incumbent government and rebels who identified with Islam were involved in thirty-four percent religious civil wars. Out of forty-two civil wars, Hinduism was involved in seven percent and Christianity was linked with twenty-one percent. When political elite feels an immediate threat, they will work to reframe their issues into religious touch.

The sixty years reveals two findings. First, the number of civil war increases because religion was a central point. Secondly, these religious civil wars were devastating and prolonged in nature.

The example of Sudan is the best fit in this regard and case of Al Qaeda attack on twin tower of the United States and pentagon in September 9/11. Civil wars between Hindus and Buddhist in Sri-Lanka, Hindus and Muslims in India as well as among the Muslims in Iraq. As a result, policymakers have focused greater attention on the subject of religion and organized violence.

“Religion is a very much complex concept, it includes belief in natural and supernatural being Prayer and communication with that being. There is a concept of heaven and paradise and between ritual and sacred objects”.

Judaism, Christianity, Islam and to the lesser extent Hinduism and Buddhism, each faith has its own belief system. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam may have a common interest and there is an element of violence in all these three religions. The logic of violence is simple. Such as the physical self is mortal and hence temporary; the religious self, however, is potentially immortal and eternal. Thus to sacrificing the temporary and mortal life to obtain eternal and permanent life is not only rational but also desirable. Sacrifice is the operational world because there is no way to empirically verify the existence of divine being and physical self-sacrifice is defending one’s faith. One particular respected in Christian and Muslim tradition.

Policymakers worried about the combination of religion and violence for at least three reasons.

First and foremost important factor is the indivisibility of religious doctrine and the promise of martyrdom threatens the two pillars of the state system as established in Europe following the end of a thirty-year war. Other two factors are Bargaining and Deterrence.

When religion becomes involved in public affairs it poses a potential threat to both domestic as well as international order. When religion hinders state ability to bargain, the combatant goes on killing each other long after. There is political, economic or social utility in religious traditions. Such as in Islam, Christianity, and Judaism, violent conflict is considered as the manifestation or will of God. Such conflict becomes a test for religious faith.

Religious touched violence tends to fuse temporal and religious authority which produces more form of authoritarian regime. It is obvious that religious fundamentalism is a threat to peace; it may be civil war or interstate conflict. There were Twenty-four religious civil wars data, among them in twenty-five civil wars religion was the central issue. While in seventeen, it was a periphery.

Centrality of religion in violent conflict

More the religion will be central, more will be violent conflict. It will not easily be resolved through peaceful means such as negotiation or arbitration. When religion moves from periphery to center, elites will be the party in escalating a non-violent conflict into violent conflict. If this is true then their outcome will be more decisive and to be more prone to reignite than civil wars fought over other issues.

Those civil wars in which religion is central are four times more deadly to non-combatant than civil wars. The mortality rate of central religious touched civil war is twenty-eight thousand while death rate of Periphery is seven thousand per annum. All civil wars are brutal but religious civil wars are more lethal. Religious civil wars pose increasingly local, regional and interstate problem. Religious outbidding played a key role in this scenario.

Since above timeline the number of Islam centered civil wars increased because of the high utility of religious outbidding for political elites. Western intervention in the Islamic state is also an important factor and it can't be ignored. It is because to secure the access to cheap petroleum. Thus there is hatred among the peoples of the Islamic world against the west and they do such horrible acts which are harmful in nature and are linked to religious wars. Therefore with more people practicing religion the number of religious civil wars are growing.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/04/the-puzzling-case-of-religion-and-civil-war/>

Nuclearized Pakistan with More Compulsions and Less Options

Nauman Hassan

In international anarchic structure, revolutions in military affairs by one state always put consequences on prospective state/states. Certainty about the accusation of nuclear device by Germans led United States to go for nuclear option in 2nd World War era and initiated nuclear arms race. Similarly in South Asia, it was India who pushed Pakistan towards nuclearization despite Pakistan's domestic challenges.

The Smiling Buddha on 18 May 1974 introduced nuclearization in South Asian strategic landscape. Indian authorities catchphrase "Peaceful Nuclear Explosive" proudly but overlooked its aftermaths in regional and global prospective. Still, academic debate seems lacking to accurately elaborate the term but pragmatically India intended to achieve nuclear equilibrium against China.

The demonstration through nuclear detonation – even was peaceful – created strategic imbalance and destabilized the region, particularly. Aside with international criticism by academics and policy makers based in United States, Canada and China: Zulfikar Ali Bhutto stated deliberately, "If India builds the bomb, we will eat grass and leaves for a thousand years, even go hungry, but we will get one of our own". In January 1972 Mr. Bhutto, that time President of Pakistan, expressed the necessity to acquire nuclear device and the emphasis was impelled separate East Pakistan in 1971. Undoubtedly, the president was well-acknowledged about the strategic positioning of his state in international world order and perceived the threat to state's sovereignty. Briefly, it was India nuclear ambition that forced Pakistan to go after nuclear option which ultimately initiated nuclear arms race in South Asia.

After that the overt nuclearization of 1998 in South Asia entirely alter the dynamics of nuclear world order. On 11th and 13th of May 1998, India detonated five devices and widened the sphere of mistrust in already hostile strategic environment of South Asia. The India's test created an indefensible situation on Pakistani side and Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif stated, "We are watching the situation and we will take appropriate action with regard to our security". Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Gohar Ayub Khan said, "We are prepared to match India, we have the capability... We in Pakistan will maintain a balance with India in all fields". After the two day Defence Committee of the Cabinet (DCC) meeting, the chairman of Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission (PEAC) was asked by Prime Minister on 18 May to conduct the explosive and it was 28th of May when Pakistan responded simultaneously to balance Indian strategic superiority in the region.

Interestingly, two years before 2nd test (Pokhran II), India withdrew from negotiations of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1996 which was vigorously supported by Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India, in 1954 as a "standstill agreement" and then in 1963 as Limited Test Ban Treaty. The complex Entry-Into-Force (EIF) provision claimed by Indian authorities as the main issue that forced New Delhi to get aside from CTBT dialogues. By considering relevant factors, it was predictable that Pakistan will follow the suit and despite international pressure and diversified attitude of local administration, it happened. However after nuclearization, both states were declared as nuclear weapon states but faced rigid sanctions by the permanent members of the UN Security Council.

Since the nuclearization of South Asia, both states entered in the era of nuclear politics and academics and policy makers was mulling to figure out their nuclear posture. The doctrinal posture of both states was shrouded with ambiguity and strategic impasse as neither drafted white paper that indicates her nuclear strategy. However later on, Atal Vajpayee in December 1998 and then Pervez Musharraf in May 2000 indicated their strategic framework as Minimum Credible Deterrence and no arms race which they forget subsequently.

The Indian parliament attack of 2001 was blamed on Pakistan as a sponsor and it was analyzed that the nuclear deterrence failed in certain circumstances as sub-conventional warfare materialized. In 2004, New Delhi based policy pundits (strategists) came up with a punitive doctrine. Cold Start Doctrine (CSD) was a military doctrine targeted at conventional attack at Pakistan within limited time of 72 hours to fail Islamabad's nuclear option. The aggressive doctrine was responded in 2011 with the employment of battlefield weapon called Tactical Nuclear Weapon (TNW) through the delivery mean called NASR; a multi-tube, 60 Km range with solid fuel tactical ballistic missile system. Although the Nasr was counter force weapon and with four primary conditions but still failed expensive CSD made India to act irrationally. After all, India declared that if Pakistan will cross nuclear threshold then India will retaliate massively and counter value. The Indian belligerence compelled Pakistan to opt full spectrum deterrence and Pakistan developed Shaheen-III; land-based medium range ballistic missile with range of 2750 Kms to target farthest point in India.

Furthermore, Indian accusation of the ballistic missile defence (BMD) system by the Israel, most advanced S-400 Triumpf of Russia to boost its air defence and development of second strike capability through nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines called Arihant are the crucial steps that are being faced to Pakistan's nuclear establishment. Indian candidacy for the membership of Nuclear Supplier Group as non-NPT member is also smashing into its most respective state.

A state that has suffered about \$110 billion of its economy and more than 33000 recorded casualties in last 14 years, while supporting the global campaign of war against terror, must not be blamed for sponsoring terrorism without evidence. The international cooperation to counter the menace of terrorism within its territory grounds zero and the states machinery still at war with non-states actors. The radicalized extremism is still uncontrollable phenomenon for Pakistani authorities because of large-scale of public support and sentiments.

Though, the nuclear politics of South Asia is a debatable yet it is understandable that India is responsible for nuclearized South Asia. From employment to deployment, New Delhi's aggressive and divergent attitude led Pakistan to react irrationally. In the given circumstances, India must act realistically. India has the option to go for Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) ratification that will obviously encourage Pakistan and other proliferators to ratify and contribute towards regional and then to global stability and peace. New Delhi's zealous step could be a milestone in global civil-nuclear cooperation.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/07/nuclearized-pakistan-compulsions-less-options/>

Fortifying Relations with Azerbaijan: Future Prospects for Pakistan

Saima Ali

Pakistan has a very developed defense industry. We discussed detailed cooperation in this area... So we can work together to establish joint production,” said President Aliyev.

After the successful occurrence of first-ever Russia Pakistan joint military exercise in September, 2016 Azerbaijan has shown its keen interest to follow the footsteps of its predecessor with Pakistan. Above statement was stated by Azeri President during Nawaz first ever visit to Azerbaijan in October, 2016. Pakistan-Azerbaijan has completed 24 years of bilateral relationship. The collaboration between the two states enlarges to every sphere ranging from political, economic, technological, security to cultural ground.

Pakistan has offered Azerbaijan several originally developed defense products, including the JF-17 fighter and Mushshaq trainer jets. Other defense products offered include armoured and unarmoured means of transportations, command and control systems, ammunition, body armour and personnel defense systems, and anti-aircraft defense systems.

On one hand, Pakistan is selling some conventional arms to the United States, United Kingdom, Germany and some Far Eastern countries. Azerbaijan and Pakistan have already built a stable base for wide-ranging cooperation in a number of different areas related to defense, security and trade.

In this context, high level delegation from Azerbaijan will visit and attend next week Defense Expo, which is going to be held in Karachi. Not only will they attend the expo but their visit to defense production facilities is highly expected in order to buy suitable weapons and equipment.

Significantly, on regional and international issues, Azerbaijan has always supported Pakistan stance on Kashmir. At this time both the countries adopting reciprocate approach as Pakistan always supported Azerbaijan in its conflict with Armenia over Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Moreover Pakistan is the only country in the world which has not yet recognized Armenia.

On the other hand Pakistan was the third country which immediately recognized Azerbaijan in 1991. Azerbaijan and Armenia has more and less same conflict of region named Nagorno-Karabakh as Pakistan and India has on the Kashmir Issue. Since 1991, Pakistan and Azerbaijan enjoy close and cordial relations, characterized by shared perceptions on major global and regional issues.

In return for Pakistan’s support to Azerbaijan on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, Azerbaijan has supported Pakistan’s stance on Kashmir resolution. Specifically, after the resolution passed by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of Pakistan in support of Nagorno-Karabakh, there is an increase in demand in Pakistani public circles for a reciprocal resolution on Kashmir from the platform of

Parliament of Azerbaijan on account of similarities that Kashmir issue holds with Nagorno-Karabakh conflict.

As Kashmir conflict has been on the agenda of the United Nations for more than six decades now, as an unfulfilled duty and Pakistan reiterates its unwavering resolve to stand by Kashmiri brothers and sisters who have continued their courageous struggle to achieve legal right of self-determination. Azerbaijan understands the issue well and has always supported the stance of Pakistan.

Apart from official diplomatic high level visits and meetings that are regularly held among the heads of states, military and parliamentary officials; few prominent among many significant developments that have contributed towards cementing of the ties between the two states are; formation of Joint Ministerial Commission cultural forums like Pakistan-Azerbaijan Friendship Association, existence of Multani Caravanserai in Ichiri Sheher Baku, reconstruction of the High School for Girls donated by the Heydar Aliyev Foundation of Azerbaijan in Azad Jammu and Kashmir.

Keeping in mind the international viewpoint and divergent association among states, few significant joint ventures in terms of cooperation at national and international spheres are possible between Pakistan and Azerbaijan.

The exchange of ideas on success and disadvantages can help both sides formulate right options at right times. Multiple non-traditional security measures and traditional security measures hold opportunities; Pakistan and Azerbaijan just need attempts and serious measures for military, political and economic and cultural cooperation. Imperative point to highlight and understand is that political goodwill can remain in contact as a back support.

The community links between Azerbaijan and Pakistan can be created and strengthened as they are real force that can bring real difference. Pakistan and Azerbaijan face varied regional challenges but both of the countries have immense capacity too, apart from just mentioning what can be done, much can be done in real sense with the will to cooperate.

As in recent visit to Azerbaijan, Premier Nawaz talked about its priority to extend all possible facilities to the business community. He said his government has been in constant contact with the business community to address different issues and Pakistan's exports have risen as a result.

<http://www.voiceofjournalists.com/fortifying-relations-with-azerbaijan-future-prospects-for-pakistan/>

Climate Change and Pakistan's Response

Shahzadi Tooba

Pakistan ratified the Paris Agreement on Climate Change that commits nearly every country to lowering planet warming greenhouse gas emissions to help stave off the most drastic effects of global warming.

Nearly 200 countries agreed Climate change accord in December 2015, which came into force on 4 November 2016. The agreement commits world leaders to keeping global warming below 2C, seen as the threshold for safety by scientists, and pursuing a tougher target of 1.5C. The carbon emission curbs put forward by countries under Paris are not legally-binding but the framework of the accord, which includes a mechanism for periodically cranking those pledges up, is binding. The agreement also has a long-term goal for net zero emissions which would effectively phase out fossil fuels.

At least 55 parties to the UN's climate convention (UNFCCC), responsible for at least 55 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions, had to ratify it for it to take effect. Hundred and eleven countries have ratified the Paris agreement, including 10 of the largest polluters. These countries cover more than 55% of global emissions. The world's top three emitters of carbon dioxide – China (27%), the US (15%) and India (7%) – have ratified the agreement.

Dubbed the Paris Agreement, it is the first-ever deal binding all the world's nations, rich and poor, to a commitment to cap global warming caused mainly by the burning of coal, oil and gas. In its praise it is said that "Humanity will look back on November 4, 2016, as the day those countries of the world shut the door on inevitable climate disaster".

This meant drastically and urgently cutting emissions, which requires political commitment and considerable financial investment. The urgency was brought home by a UN report on Thursday which warned that emissions trends were steering the world towards climate "tragedy".

By 2030, said the UN Environment Program, annual emissions will be 12 to 14 billion tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e) higher than the desired level of 42 billion tons. The 2014 level was about 52.7 billion tons. 2016 is on track to be the hottest year on record, and carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere passed an ominous milestone in 2015.

Pakistan's Permanent Representative to the UN, Ambassador Maleeha Lodhi, deposited the Instrument of Ratification signed by the President of Pakistan at a ceremony held at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

With this ratification Pakistan has become 112th country to ratify the agreement which entered into force earlier this month. Pakistan had signed the agreement on the first day of its opening for signature in New York in April this year.

The conditions for the agreement's entry into force were met on Oct 5 requiring ratification by at least 55 countries that account for 55 percent of all global greenhouse gas emissions. The agreement

obliges member states to keep global warming below 2 centigrade regarded as the threshold for safety by experts and scientists.

Pakistan's ratification is in line with its firm commitment to the purposes and objectives of the Climate Convention. It also highlights the resolve of the Government of Pakistan to remain fully committed to the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

In Pakistan the cabinet has also approved a Climate Change bill. The salient features of the bill, according to the proposals are: a 'Pakistan Climate Change Council' would be established. The body would be a high climate change decision making body which will either be chaired by the prime minister or a person nominated by him. The federal government may appoint federal and provincial ministers, chief ministers, Azad Jammu and Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan chief secretaries as members of the council. Different projects will be prepared under this authority and will be implemented by the provinces.

Another major achievement in this regard is that Pakistan has become member of the exclusive club, producing over 1,000 megawatts of electricity through renewable energy sources. Pakistan had achieved 1135 MWs of installed capacity of electricity on basis of renewable sources of energy. This capacity would be increased to 1185 MWs by next month when first project of renewable energy under China Pakistan Economic Corridor using wind power would be installed at Gharo. Out of these 1135 MWs the country has been producing on basis of renewable sources, the country has been producing 590 MWs on basis of wind power, 400 MWs on basis of solar energy, 145 MWs power produced through bagasse available with sugar mills in Northern Sindh and Southern Punjab.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/21/climate-change-pakistans-response/>

Stability Instability Paradox in South Asia and Jingoistic Indian Approach

Babar Khan Bozdar

The region of South Asia is confused with regards to Indo-Pak hostility. However both nation shares linguistic, cultural geographic and economic links but their relationships have been plagued by hostility and suspicion.

When Pakistan tested its nuclear missile in 1998, an approach to the balance of power occurred in south Asia because India had already tested its nuclear missile in 1974, it was the compulsion of Pakistan and a matter of survival. Therefore the balance of power was crucial for the region.

Stability-Instability Paradox was framed to understand the relationship between the conventional and nuclear level of war. Mostly it changes the nature of direct confrontation into the proxy war as we have seen during the cold war, there was huge tension between NATO and Warsaw Pact states and their allies but neither it starts major conflict nor allows minor conflict to escalate and the same situation is here in south Asia since the nuclear explosions of Pakistan.

After a limited war of Kargil, minor conflicts triggered between India and Pakistan. As a result, both countries came to the brink of war on different occasion. Mumbai attack was one of them and it triggered the conflict but later on it was controlled because there was the probability of nuclear exchange, therefore both states were much aware of Mutual Assured Destruction. The situation becomes worst when Indian politicians alleged Pakistan as the perpetrator and proclaimed for surgical strikes at Mureedke Headquarter of Jamat-Ud-Dawa but later on it shows flexibility when Pakistan offered an assurance of full co-operation.

“Stability-Instability Paradox states that when adversaries have nuclear weapons, the probability of direct war between them greatly decreases but the probability of minor and indirect conflict will increase. This is because rational actors want to avoid war and thus they neither start major conflict nor allow minor conflict to escalate into major conflict.”

Stability-Instability paradox exists in south Asia because of following reasons. First, it triggered the minor conflicts such as Mumbai attack which brought both countries near the brink of war and there was a chance of nuclear exchange because it was a massive attack in its nature. Secondly, minor conflicts were not allowed to cross the threshold as in the case of Mumbai attack. The number of skirmishes happened in 2015 is as under.

On second January 2015, a thirteen year Girl was killed by Indian BSF firing in Pakistani residential areas Zafar Wal. On 14 February 2015, a sixteen year Girl was killed in Indian firing near Rawalakot. On 11 April 2015, A Pakistani drone was claimed by Indian BSF to be spying on Indian Territory along the international border. On July 15, 2015, A BSF Soldier was killed in firing cross-border

firing by Pakistani rangers. On 15 August two Pakistan civilian were killed in cross-border firing along Kotli. On 7th September 2015, An Indian civilian was killed by Punjab ranger's fire along LOC in Poonch Sector. On 26th October 2015, two Pakistani civilians were lost their lives in BSF firing along Shakargarh Sector. On 2nd November, two Indian soldiers were killed in Gurez Sector according to Indian Sources.

Above facts clearly, express that Stability-Instability Paradox exists in South Asia because there is a continuous rise in such minor incidents. Two other lethal incidents Pathan Kot and URI attack were also happened, which again created tension among the masses and the situation was alarming because Indian officials claimed that ISI is their handler. They were trying to malign ISI but the fact was that these were nonstate actors and they were trying to create hostility between India and Pakistan, while the third party was earning its benefit. Pakistan condemned the attack and assured full co-operation and offered join investigation in this regard but Indian government rejected its offer. Later on National investigation agency investigative the attack and no such involvement of Pakistan were found.

The Jingoistic Indian approach

Since Modi becomes the prime minister of India, there is a Vertical increase in such incidents due to immature policies of BJP led Government. Indian army is brutally killing the Kashmiri's and on another side cross-border firing and violation of LOC is mean to change the narrative of Pakistan regarding Kashmir. It is obvious that India is creating minor conflicts and labeled it to Pakistan that is unjust and unfair.

There is a perception projected by Indian media that Pakistan is exporting terrorism in India, but the fact is that they are freedom fighters who fought for their rights of Self-Determination but Indian army is suppressing their voice. Indian public is totally unaware of Indian foreign policy and Indian army's propaganda against Pakistan. Indian media plays a double role in this regard. No doubt Indian public is interested in politics and plays an active role but they don't know anything about Modi's covert policies. Google lists Modi among the "world's most stupid prime minister and under the list of top ten criminals". Modi's policies may lay down India and time will prove it. The Jingoistic attitude of Indian premier is haunting the peace process between India and Pakistan. It is time to reset the policies and make speedy the peace process.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/22/stability-instability-paradox-south-asia-jingoistic-indian-approach/>

NSG's Consultative Group and Need for Evolving New Process

Beenish Altaf

India's application could not acknowledge a confirmatory response from a few members of the Group, yet it leaves the impression that New Delhi is determined for the full membership of NSG. Like the Seoul plenary meeting of June 23-24, 2016 failed to reach a consensus in 48 members of NSG cartel, the recent consultative group's meeting also could not reach to any consensus with regards to India's bid for NSG.

It is evident that both India and Pakistan are consistently encountering tough resistance in getting the membership of NSG in the near future. Many members of the Group seem determined to thwart non-NPT members attempt to join the Group without a criteria-based approach. Nevertheless, New Delhi has robustly been lobbying with the intense support of Washington and its like-minded countries since 2010 to get a 'special treatment' by the NSG members. Simultaneously, Islamabad is equally determined to join the NSG.

Even though Pakistan wishes to be included in the NSG cartel on the basis of merit, it also wants to draw attention to the issue of discrimination in the group's membership. India is being treated on favorable terms, with laws amended and waivers granted to accommodate it. Despite the fact that India's diversion of nuclear material and equipment for the so-called peaceful explosion of 1974 was the prime reason behind the creation of the NSG. It was created to prevent the diversion of nuclear material from civilian trade to military purposes, with seven suppliers of advanced nuclear technology, i.e. United States, United Kingdom, Canada, France, Japan, West Germany, and Soviet Union, getting together to form a cartel to control nuclear technology supplied for peaceful uses. India violated its obligations with Canada, diverting plutonium from the Canadian-Indian reactor that was being run by U.S. heavy-water, which was provided purely for peaceful purposes.

In view of the strong opposition from several countries, it is likely that both India and Pakistan may not be accepted into the NSG in the immediate future. However, if the United States once again coerces the NSG participating governments, as it did in 2008, Pakistan would not have any choice but to review its engagement with the international nonproliferation regime, which is increasingly becoming a tool to serve only the interests of major powers.

The other option for Pakistan could be to start a diplomatic campaign to convince the NSG members of its needs and capabilities, and simultaneously highlight India's non-adherence of the promises made as part of the nuclear deal with the United States; Pakistan should continue nuclear cooperation with China, while also focusing on economic development to attract other nuclear vendors to explore commercial benefits in the country.

Pakistan has two time-slots that should be capitalized. First is the time slot till the next plenary meeting of NSG; this time should be capitalized in promoting Pakistan's perspective regarding NSG membership through proactive diplomatic and political representation across the 48 NSG nations. The

second window of opportunity comes in the backdrop of slow-pace developments in Indo-US nuclear cooperation, Pakistan has sufficient time to strengthen its politico-economic engagement with the rest of the world in general and with China in particular till the India-US nuclear deal gets materialized.

However, Pakistan needs to adopt a 'Proactive Diplomacy' rather than a 'Reactive Diplomacy'. after the current NSG's consultative Group meeting it is evident that India is not going to make in it even at this time. Because on countries stances, most of the country stances are same, yes Russia will review its stance again. China is standing on the same note. In addition to, 17 countries said further discussions are required on the subject whereas 12 called for immediate membership to India but no consensus yet. But obviously there should be criteria based approach for non-NPT members so that India and Pakistan get same treatment from the international community.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/23112016-nsgs-consultative-group-and-need-for-evolving-new-process-oped/>

NSG and Strategic Stability in South Asia

Asma Khalid

Though the Obama administration is immensely supporting India's membership in the cartel for its own regional and economic interests, because India's inclusion in the group will boost the security and economic ties with the US to counter the China's growing influence. It should not forget that NSG was established in the response of India's nuclear test in 1974. Additionally, India has violated that IAEA safeguards and use IAEA safeguarded nuclear reactor's spent fuel to manufacture the nuclear weapon. Whereas Pakistan takes the safeguards very seriously and its nuclear program is technically advanced, safe and secure. These factors present Pakistan, a valid candidate for the membership of the NSG. With the strong backing of US, still, many countries continuing to insist principle position that entrance of a non-NPT country will be a major setback to the efforts of nuclear arms control. Importantly, it will be a great disappointment for the states like Brazil and South Africa, which have given up their nuclear Program to join the NPT. Above all, it is a fact that Pakistan has taken extraordinary measures regarding the safety and security of its nuclear installations under IAEA umbrella. Being a responsible nuclear weapon state, it is Pakistan's legitimate right to get the membership of supplier group. Moreover, Pakistan instead of demanding for special treatment has maintained the criteria based approach. Importantly, providing any special exemption from NSG principle to India and ignoring Pakistan's bid will not only question the credibility of the cartel but at the same time, it will disturb the strategic balance in South Asia.

Significantly, NSG meeting held in Seoul on June 2016 was very remarkable and left both states positive as instead of eliminating from the race of membership, and NSG is considering to discuss the matter in future. Despite the Seoul development, India has not given up its quest for NSG membership. Such as, on India's request, a meeting of NSG group is being held on 11-12 November 2016 to smooth its entry in the cartel. Remarkably, Japan and India are about to sign a civil nuclear deal to strengthen economic and security ties to counterweight China in the region and international market. This deal will allow Japan to export nuclear-related material and technologies to India.

This deal can be viewed as a way forward for the smooth entry of India in NSG. US backing and Japan-India civil nuclear deal are the factors making the situation worse for Pakistan, as if India got the membership, it will make impossible for Pakistan to join the group because NSG works on consensuses. So Pakistan should take effective diplomatic measures to get recognized by the international community as a legitimate, responsible candidate.

The International community should follow principle approach and treat the nuclear status of India-Pakistan equally. However, India is enjoying the exceptional treatment from various countries of the group, ignoring the fact that granting membership to India and not Pakistan would disturb the strategic stability and inject the never ending nuclear arms race in the region.

NSG membership would increase defense production gap among both nuclear neighbors, and imbalance will trigger the security dilemma in the region. It would severely destabilize the deterrence stability and security situation in South Asia. Hence, knowing India's vigorous efforts, it is necessary for Pakistan to evaluate its effective foreign policy as well as diplomatic efforts to get the NSG membership as a responsible nuclear weapon state to ensure regional stability and security.

<http://pakobserver.net/nsg-strategic-stability-in-s-asia/>

Emergent Geostrategic Trends of Central Asia in Contemporary World Politics

Nauman Hassan

Naturally, the energy resource rich states of Central Asia have transformed interests of regional and global powers from the “Great Game” into the “New Great Game”. Currently, besides regional states itself, U.S, China and Russia are the most active players because of their new transformed interests whereas Pakistan and India are also deliberately active by focusing on strategic objectives like desire for alliance. Additionally, the US’ and NATOs’ eastward expansion and their presence in Afghanistan has led to an emerging bilateral strategic alignment of China and Russia. The foremost objective of this accord is to counter rebalancing strategy of US and its dominance over Asia Pacific.

Despite the democracy, Security and Energy are the core elements that are summarizing U.S strategic interests in Central Asian region. US-Iran issue over Iranian nuclear program has created a geo-strategic impasse and security dilemma in the regional spheres and is adversely affecting the geo-economic potential. In September 2007, Richard Boucher (U.S. Assistant Secretary of State); “One of our goals is to stabilize Afghanistan so it can become a conduit and hub between South and Central Asia so that energy can flow to the south so that the countries of Central Asia are no longer bottled up between the two enormous powers of China and Russia, but rather that they have outlets to the south as well as to the north and the east and the west”. Soon after Soviet Union’s dissolution in 1991, White House started reframing its policies to gain the potentials of Caspian region as U.S. was the most influential stakeholder in the region in post-Soviet era.

The disastrous incident of September 11 has compromised Russian regional standing as US and China stepped towards emerging influence and rebalancing strategy. Though Russia is still enjoying dominance in the region over other stakeholders of the “Neo Great Game”, Putin’s concepts regarding developed structure of “Eurasian Bloc” and “Near Abroad” are the basic Foreign policy derivatives of Russia that targeted at regaining its lost stature. On addition, using the platform of The Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), Russia played an important rule for the closer ties of Central Asian states that manifested Russian influence in the region.

Moscow pursues a two dimensional policy that focuses on geopolitical struggles in the region to counter western influence particularly the US. It remains very cautious in the matter of extra-regional powers dominance through potential alignment for defense and cooperation. Moreover, as far as the roles of Iran and Turkey, Russia has serious concerns as these are also the major stakeholders in Caspian Basin. Russia also wants to enhance its cooperation with Iran to transport energy resources. Along a side to analyze the stress in political issues and resolution, Russia is also developing its ties with Turkey bilaterally.

Being major active player in the “Neo Great Game”, China’s also growing its strategic relationship with Central Asian states. Currently, China is focusing to expand its own economy through

uniting the region economically through a gateway to access European and Middle Eastern markets. Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) is formed to achieve economic interests from this region and also as an indicator of Chinese objective to comprise US influence.

Chinese President Xi Jinping visited region in September 2013 targeting abundant energy reserves and construct transit routes to transport its products towards European markets. President Xi Jinping signed about US \$ 48 billion investment primarily focusing energy, trade and infrastructure. Chinese trade initiative with Tajikistan surpassed Russian bilateral trade of US \$ 3.7 billion. Nonetheless, the Chinese cooperation is economy based and China will not challenge Russia's political primacy without provisions of political integration.

Indian policies are particularly focusing to become a regional hegemon. To achieve this objective, New Delhi is trying to establish good strategic relations with CARs aspires as to cement a major influence in this region. Strategically, India wants to pursue positive engagement with Central Asia and Iran to develop an intra-regional transportation infrastructure and fostering bilateral economic ties despite its irrational attitude towards Islamabad. India also wants to further bolster strategic nuclear ties with Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan for import of uranium and they have signed the agreement for nuclear cooperation in 2009. Moreover, Iran is referred as a key for India's to establish emergent relations with Central Asia and Middle East through the North-South Corridor and developing Chabahar Port. These efforts are also centered to establish a gateway for landlocked Afghanistan.

Likewise other countries, Pakistan is also viewing the Caspian region as immensely significant in strategic dynamics. Pakistan's immediate response towards the independence of regional states was an offer to link Central Asian states with South Asia and the Arabian Sea like "Silk Route". The unrest in Afghanistan was laying between Pakistan, and Central Asia and Pakistan's efforts of Taliban regime was to moderate the Taliban's attitude in order to push trans-Afghanistan gas pipelines from Turkmenistan. Beside this the Pakistan and Afghanistan could be a suitable route for Central Asian states to export energy reserves to China, Japan, South East Asia and even South Asia.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/23/emergent-geostrategic-trends-central-asia-contemporary-world-politics/>

Regional Scenarios: Conspiracies and Choices

Aqib S. Paracha

The sub continent is anticipating some phenomenon very unusual nowadays. What initiated this atmosphere horrific is the Uri attack whose suspects are till anonymous. The ongoing provocation of Indian forces at LoC is also maintaining the situation bewildering. This all settling has once again brought both the traditional competitors on the apex of conflict. Aside from the traditional rivals, United States and China are scrutinizing the unfolding thoughtfully. Their close observation is a clear indication of the fact that how important this regional unfolding would be.

United States and India, the two heart- throbs are exploring every possibility for enhancing their bilateral relations in parallel to containing the regional development agenda put forwarded by China. Certainly, their long term agenda is the containment of China which naturally would be troublesome for Pakistan. The alignment of Afghanistan into the Indo-United States nexuses is a part of this master plan. Alongside this, China and Pakistan are partners in the Economic Corridor project that further obligates China and Pakistan to extend diplomatic support for each other on regional and global platforms. Contemporarily, these associations are undergoing important phases where any small immature act would risk the stability of the entire region. Undoubtedly, Pakistan and India are the stakeholders whom should act rigidly mature for the stability of this region. Otherwise these same would have to bear the loss as their partners are geographically aside.

At the global level PM Modi's propaganda is not up to that mark but regionally he is giving a tough time to Islamabad. His swaggering visits to Iran and his ongoing handshakes with President Ghani are part of the same plan. The India- Iran-Afghanistan Chabahar Initiative could said to be a regional integration initiative but characterizing Chabahar as a counter weight to Gawadar is not the illustration of bitterness then what? Issues between Pakistan and India are still there as they were decades ago. New Delhi must be aware of the fact that including Kashmir, issues pertaining to water, Siachen and Indian's involvement in Balochistan has tide that could flow up to that level which is definitely too dangerous. Conventionally strong India should comprehend fact that India's attitude will result into regional insecurity.

Circumstances now a day's are to the level that is not admirable and to continue with these circumstances is delicate for these two states. The Indo-US partnership is if more than making India economically strong then it's not commendable. Likewise to disguise his failed efforts to eradicate terrorism from its soil, India must avoid blaming Pakistan upon terrorism. The global community admires the fact that Pakistan is battling the world's largest campaign "Zarb-i-Azb" against terrorism. Pakistan has also mentioned in front of the global community that this is the fight of Pakistan's survival. Subsequently, after the apprehension of Kulbhushan Yadav India's involvement in Balochistan is evident. India's inclusion to the Security Council and other platforms would be admirable when India will end violating the international laws. In Pakistan there exists a consensus among civil military leadership that

constructive engagement with India on issues of Kashmir, LoC, and Siachen etc will not be just profitable for both countries but for the entire region. India must therefore needs to stop portraying the wrong stories because Pakistan's prevailing economic and military status is more than enough to give a tough time to India.

<http://pakobserver.net/regional-scenario-conspiracies-choices/>

Maritime Security and Naval Cooperation between China and Pakistan

Saima Ali

As we know that security of maritime components of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor is a top priority of the Pakistan. That's why Pakistan Navy and PLA Navy are amplifying their existing maritime cooperation, keeping in mind the changing regional international circumstances. Military cooperation between the two countries is widespread and it covers equipment, personnel exchanges and joint exercises. Pakistan strongly sustains PLA Navy's improved role in the international arena. In October 2015, Pakistan had announced its decision to acquire eight Type 41 Yuan-class diesel-electric submarines, half of which may be built in Pakistan while the other half would be made in China and transferred.

With focus on the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), the Navies of both sides recently engaged in a joint exercise aimed at promoting maritime security and stability in the region. The fourth joint exercise, which began on Thursday, concluded on November 21, 2016.

China and Pakistan are situated in an area that has great geographical importance and hosts almost half of the world's population. Along with the human resources, the area is also rich in natural material resources. This speaks volumes about the importance of stability in the region and of amiable relations between the countries situated here. The fact that three of the seven declared nuclear states of the world are situated here, and another, Russia, has its own interests in the region because of Central Asian states' being contiguous to the region, further add to the importance of this region.

The lingering issue of Kashmir along with the extremist trends and rivalry or competition between two or more states in the region states with hegemonic designs exploits the situation by maintaining the status quo or even exacerbating the problems. In this context Pakistan China naval collaboration is another throne in the eyes of Indian naval strategists. India has been closely monitoring the activities of Pakistan navies in its own territorial waters. The recent incident of Indian submarine entering in Pakistan territorial waters on November 14, 2016 is a solid proof. As a reaction India is quickly upgrading its naval arsenal to counter the peril posed by joint Pakistan – China Navies in the Indian Ocean and the Arabian Sea.

As security of maritime components of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor is a top priority of the Pakistan Navy. Subsequent to formal inauguration of the Gwadar Port on Sunday, the cargo shipments were set off from the world's largest deep-sea port under the protection of the PN ships. The first mega pilot project of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) successfully kicked off when the first ever cargo containers arrived from Kashgar to Gwadar. The cargo containers were subsequently exported to Middle East and African countries. Pakistan Navy, being aware of its responsibility to make the maritime component of CPEC and Gwadar Port safe, deployed its ships and aircraft to provide

security cover so as to ensure safe and secure trade transit in international waters, the statement added.

With the operationalization of the Gwadar Port, the maritime traffic to and from Pakistani ports is expected to increase manifold; therefore, the Pakistan Navy has adopted a multi-divided approach to deal with the existing disputes such as increasing up security at the Gwadar Port, conducting security patrols and coastal exercises, enhancing maritime domain awareness and engaging law enforcement agencies. Pakistan Navy is considering buying super-fast ships from China and Turkey for its special squadron to be deployed at the Gwadar Seaport for the security purpose. A ship-building project is being deliberated at the Port Qasim in Karachi and Gwadar. The two advanced shipyards would design and develop ships and other security equipment for Pakistan Navy. “A squadron may have four to six warships,” an official of Pakistan Navy told The Express Tribune on the sidelines of the on-going defence exhibition, IDEAS 2016, at the Karachi Expo Centre.

The role of maritime forces has increased in Pakistan since the country has made the Gwadar Seaport operational and speeded up economic activities under the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC).The Pakistan Navy also vowed to remain fully committed and geared up to provide a conducive environment to uninterrupted flow of the maritime trade in the exclusive economic zone. One thing is quite obvious that the success of the CPEC and the Gwadar Port project is linked to safe and secure maritime environment in the Indian Ocean region in general and in the Arabian Sea in particular.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/25/maritime-security-naval-cooperation-china-pakistan/>

India-Japan Nuclear Deal: A Setback to International Non-proliferation Efforts

Asma Khalid

The international community today is faced with the dilemma of nuclear proliferation. It has proved to be the gravest challenge for mankind for its catastrophic nature has the tendency to send mankind back to Stone Age. In order to fight of this challenge many arrangements such as global peace treaties, regimes and agreements have been established. But these arrangements have a lot of flaw which have been manipulated by the member states to serve their purpose and in turn challenge the efforts of arms control. Recently, Japan and India hit a civil nuclear deal for peaceful use of nuclear energy. This arrangement will permit Japan to supply nuclear-related technology, fuel, and equipment to India. The nuclear deal will directly increase the ability of India to generate nuclear power both quantitatively and qualitatively. Economic, political and strategic interests are considered as an essential foundation for India's civil nuclear deals.

India-Japan nuclear deal is an exception for many reasons. First, in the past in reaction to the Pokhran test (1998), Japan had raised many concerns regarding India's nuclear program and imposed numerous economic sanctions on India. Second, despite being critical of India's nuclear program and victim of the nuclear attack, now Japan has signed a nuclear agreement with known violator of IAEA Safeguards and Non-NPT state. Additionally, since its inception, India-Japan nuclear deal is considered as a destabilizing arrangement for nonproliferation efforts and regional stability.

The latest Japan-India nuclear deal comes in the wake of following developments: Boosting economy, military purpose, strategic cooperation and regional politics. First, India-Japan nuclear agreement is an extraordinary step to increase India's economic development and growth. Bilateral trade and economic relations establish a unique segment of bilateral cooperation. Prime Minister Modi is pursuing the 'Make in India policy,' this strategy aims to design, manufacture and produce military arms to achieve self-reliance. To reduced dependence on imports and achieved greater self-sufficiency in the area of defence equipment India desires to achieve double-digit growth rate. Modi government believes that 'Make in India objective' can reach through Japan-India cooperation as the partnership with Japan will provide quality infrastructure making Indian markets attractive to foreign investors. This development means that nuclear agreement will potentially contribute to a conventional and nuclear arms race in Asia. Secondly, keeping regional security challenges in mind, civil nuclear deal remain of strategic significance for India. The traditional rivalry with Pakistan, China's rising influence and growing naval presence in the South China Sea and China-Pakistan cooperation (CPEC) are the factors due to which India is desperately cooperating with other regional countries to respond security and geopolitical challenges. Japan-India nuclear cooperation has significant strategic implications for the Indo-Pacific region. Bilateral ties are considered a vital instrument by India and Japan to counter china's expansion and keep it's economic, military and political influence inbound.

The bilateral nuclear agreement is limited to commercial use but International community especially anti-nuclear group has expressed grave concerns regarding India-Japan nuclear agreement. Because pact permits India to enrich uranium and reprocess fuel and this highly enriched uranium can be used to enhance nuclear capabilities. However, both states have insisted that agreement is limited to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. To ensure this objective a termination clause has been added by Japan that if India conducted a nuclear test then deal will be terminated. But termination clause is not much remarkable because if once India launches any nuclear test then it would be practically impossible for Japan to take back the reactors and technology it has already supplied. Technological similarities for peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the production of nuclear weapons has complicated the India-Japan Nuclear deal and posed serious repercussions to the task of preventing nuclear arms proliferation.

Provided, if India remains committed to terms of the nuclear agreement and cease nuclear testing, then trends of co-operative relationship and regional stability can be witnessed, but past events present that India will not stop its vertical proliferation. Furthermore the indo-pacific politics and triangle of Pakistan, China and India has added a lot more new variables to make the regional security equation more complicated. In this context two prospects are prevailing: First, India aims to upgrade its outdated army through military modernization. Secondly, India is trying to cover the gap with China. To achieve these objectives, India introduced a new military doctrine in 2004 as a part of its grand strategy to ensure training, procurement, services and national policies to achieve edge in future military operations under the nuclear umbrella. Under this scenario, India is determined to get Nuclear Supplier Group's membership and enhancing nuclear cooperation to increase nuclear capabilities. These dynamics indicate that recent India-Japan civil nuclear deal will have an adverse effect on the global nonproliferation efforts as nuclear technology and equipment acquired from Japan will fuel the India's nuclear program directly or indirectly.

It is imperative to note that India would continue to increase nuclear capabilities as it is not committed to stop vertical proliferation. Another alarming situation is that in past India is failed to full fill terms and conditions directly or indirectly attached to IAEA safeguards and previous nuclear deals. These trends present that India's so-called civil nuclear deals are viewed as a destabilizing factor and biggest challenge to efforts of non-proliferation. It is perceived that such deals will severely damage the nuclear nonproliferation agenda and aggravated the tension in the region. Furthermore, Japan being a proponent of global nuclear zero ignoring the India's intentions and calmness of the players of Nuclear Non-proliferation reveal that nuclear powers have always adhered to a state-centric approach in addressing proliferation challenges. This approach of players of Non-proliferation has led to the major setback to global efforts of arms control and nuclear non-proliferation

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/28/india-japan-nuclear-deal-setback-international-non-proliferation-efforts/>

CPEC: Need to Address Lingering Problems

S Sadia Kazmi

CPEC project provides Pakistan with an opportunity to emerge as a major economic hub for global trade and investment. Pakistan is located at the cross-section of three engines of growth in Asia which the CPEC aims to integrate into an economically interdependent network of profits and revenues. With the recent formal inauguration of the Gwadar port, this dream already has taken a shape of reality. Also the arrival and docking of first Chinese ship on the port, has been a major milestone achieved collectively by both the states despite all the skepticism attached with the probable success of this project.

However for it to keep moving towards its ultimate realization there is still need for proper measures to be taken especially in the security domain. At the same time the other domestic impediments also need to be addressed on the immediate basis. This is required because certain internal and external elements aiming at sabotaging the CPEC are also ramping up their evil designs. CPEC surely has a lot to offer but only if it is kept clean from the clutches of undue yet inevitable obstructions and controversies. The leadership and concerned authorities on both sides cannot afford CPEC to be politicized.

There are certain interest groups that are exclusively working to create misconceptions and mislead the general understanding about the CPEC. However it is also a fact that there is no smoke without fire. There are particular issues which unfortunately still need to be addressed despite all the progress so far made on the project. These could prove to be huge impediments in the long run if not being given due consideration. Some of these problems are related to route map, priority route, transparency about the basic agenda and framework of the CPEC, structure and deadline of the Western route, facilities along both the routes and the methodology to be adopted for construction of economic zones etc.

The heart of CPEC i.e. Gwadar port has become functional and much more progress and development is being anticipated on it in the near future. Some of it includes developmental projects to be held at Gwadar in order to embolden the economic corridor, such as Free Trade Zone, Business Complex of Gwadar Port Authority, Pak-China Government Primary School at Faqir Colony, Sawar and Shadikor dams and Gwadar University. And for all this to become a reality, the politico-socio stability in Pakistan and especially in the Balochistan region is very important. At this point in time, more than ever before the political instability is not an option. It cannot be afforded by Pakistan, nor is it in the interest of China.

The need of the hour is to dispel the controversies and ensure security measures. Pakistan must also foil India's conspiracy of imposing war and ignore its deliberate provocations by adopting a wise strategy so as to maintain peace in the region. China on its part acknowledges the political tension in the sub-continent and the possibility of India cornering and sequestering Pakistan. However the good thing is that China has time and again showed confidence in Pakistan and ensured that China will work more on the economic corridor if necessary. China will not leave Pakistan stranded in the hour of need.

Simultaneously one cannot just ignore the factor of popular support when it comes to the success of any venture. There is a need to realize that these developmental projects be seen in the positive light by the locals, and or that some confidence building between the Government and common people also needs to be done. In this regard some partial information about the plans and framework of the CPEC can be made public so it could cultivate more trust and awareness among the general public too. Only recently the KP Assembly Speaker Asad Qaiser moved an application with Peshawar High Court seeking multiple directives from the federal government regarding development of the CPEC's Western route. This shows that the problems related to the routes are still lingering and should not be allowed to develop into long lasting grievances.

Several positive developments are in the offing which should not be mired by such irritants. Only recently a trade convoy covered three thousand kilometers journey from Kashgar to Gwadar after passing through Gilgit-Baltistan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Punjab and Sindh. According to the facts some 873 kilometers of highways in Baluchistan have been constructed in two years.

The CPEC has to be seen in its exclusivity benefiting the whole country and not just one particular province. Hence the controversies regarding the promised industrial parks, economic zones, provision of electricity, gas and telephone lines, fiber optics, railway lines etc should be chased away on priority basis.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/29/cpec-need-address-lingering-problems/>

Pakistan, India and Politics of NSG

Maimuna Ashraf

The last Vienna Plenary meeting of NSG ended without reaching any consensus on the issue of NSG candidature for non-NPT states. India was lately giving the impression that it has won the support of majority of the states including Mexico, Switzerland, Brazil, Russia and New Zealand. But the fact is that New Zealand doesn't stand a chance against the US pressure. Similarly the countries in Latin American have different interests.

However three major countries Ireland, China and Austria have not shown any change in their stance against the Indian membership. However, India wants to send the message out that NSG issue is still alive and India is diligently working for its membership. It's almost a decade that membership of NSG has become much contested, especially because of India and Pakistan interest into NSG. Most of the countries were given the impression by the US and India that Pakistan has been brought in by China as a reaction to Indian membership application to spoil the Indian case. Contrary to this, Pakistan had its Export Control Act in 2004. Since then it has been updating its NSG list. Islamabad announced its NSG compliance list in 2005 followed by two subsequent reviews in 2007 and 2012 that ensures the working on this issue long before India had applied for NSG membership.

Hence when India applied, Pakistan had already done its homework and was ready to apply which it did instantly. Also it wouldn't have been possible for Pakistan to apply within 6 days of Indian application. Pakistani side gave a detailed dossier spanning over 300 pages within 6 days which shows that preparations were already there. So Pakistan has to tackle this impression as well. The right time to insist on a stringent criterion for non-NPT states was in 2008. At that time NSG countries missed an opportunity where they could have asked both Pakistan and India to simultaneously adhere to strong non-proliferation commitment. This could have injected nuclear restraints in South Asia. But now India has access to all kinds of nuclear technology and has the capability to live without the membership of NSG. For India it is a matter of prestige. For now, it will not be easy for India to meet any new criteria as it can live without it. Earlier this year, Pakistan's foreign affairs advisor indicated that Pakistan is willing to enter into a bilateral non-testing agreement with India.

Back in 1998 as well, Pakistan proposed simultaneous adherence to CTBT by both Pakistan and India. Later India refused by making it clear that it is not going to join CTBT. Now Pakistan has found a middle ground i.e. the bilateral agreement which is still better than unilateral moratoriums because unilateral moratoriums are voluntary however India is not willing for such a bilateral agreement as well because it does not comply with its interest.

India is of the view that NSG membership is very significant for their prestige and for this purpose India went openly for an alliance with US. Even after the meeting scheduled on 11-12 November 2016, the trends are not in favor of India. However Pakistan also needs to maintain its

resilience in its policy regarding the issue of NSG membership. Viewing the increasing number of countries supporting universal criteria for non-NPT states, it can be accessed that Indian membership in NSG doesn't seem forthcoming which is ultimately good for Pakistan. However, if Pakistan could not win the membership simultaneously with India, it should still not give up on its ambitions as it needs recognition in the long run. Pakistan can gradually and eventually get there by constant efforts but it should not rush and must keep the pace of responsible nuclear weapon state.

<http://pakobserver.net/pakistan-india-and-politics-of-nsg/>

India's No First Use Dilemma

Beenish Altaf

No-first-use policy of the India nuclear Doctrine is, to a certain extent uncertain as the India Defence Minister, Manohar Parrikar is contravening this 'no first use policy' bit by bit. Parrikar very recently expressed personal doubts about India's nuclear no-first-use policy rhetoric "why should I bind myself? I should say I am a responsible nuclear power and I will not use it irresponsibly." The statement became a hot debate among the global nuclear cognoscenti especially in south Asia. Evidently when it comes to India and Pakistan each and every bit of such intentional or unintentional rhetoric plays a major role in shaping the future relevant moves.

The No-first-use (NFU) actually refers to a pledge or a policy by a nuclear power not to use nuclear weapons as a means of warfare unless first attacked by an adversary using nuclear weapons. It clearly depicts the preemptive mindset of Indian conscientious nuclear weapons managers/ regulators.

It would be more pertinent to mention here that this is not the first time of Indian Defence Minister giving such a treacherous thought, rather it is a series followed by something new after a span of time. In May 2015 also Parrikar blurted in New Delhi that "we have to neutralise terrorists through terrorists only. Why can't we do it? We should do it. You remove a thorn with the help of a thorn." This was the time when Pakistan's military and civilian leaders were united in raising their voice in a public against Indian covert operations in Balochistan.

The Defence Minister also opined about the rethink of Indian submarine building program that it should look for greater numbers than the existing plan of constructing 24 such vessels. This was in referring to the existing 30-year submarine building plan that envisages construction of 24 submarines, including both nuclear and conventional, he suggested India need a longer term plan till 2050 as the existing plan ends in 2030.

Similarly, India is heading day by day into the continuous modernization of its military built-up, aspiring to become the giant arms trader of South Asian region. It outdoes China as the world's largest importer of weapons systems, indicating the country's intent of modernizing its military abilities and demonstrating capabilities beyond south Asia. It is feared that the whole Asian security is fueling arms trade now as the region has accounted for 46 percent of global imports over the past five years. As according to a report by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), six of the world's ten largest arms importers are in Asia and Oceania.

The above mentioned facts and these statements in point of fact, reflect a common sense approach to challenge a state that is certainly Pakistan, just to exercise and reiterate its colossal nuclear ambitions in South Asia. George Perkovich, a Vice President for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, observes that it is threatening to mount responses against Pakistan could augment deterrence of such acts and could add options for India to respond if deterrence fails and more terrorism occurs. Consequently, Parrikar's observations and suggestions were far from crazy.

As India is considered in its media-age democracies, the defence minister or the ministry as a whole should not act so asinine. Such probabilities time in and time out, actually, provides an opportunity to believe on the security lapses along with a serious rethink about the dilemmas in the making of a sound national security policy of that country.

It needs to be explained in Parrikar's next rhetoric that could there be any responsible use of nuclear weapons too? The spot on is, he is a responsible nuclear power and he will not use it irresponsibly, something irrational or just an attention-grabbing technique.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/30/indias-no-first-use-dilemma/>

Challenges to Tackle with the New Baton of Command

Shahzadi Tooba

Gen Qamar Javed Bajwa assumes charge as Pakistan's sixteenth army chief and Gen Zubair Mehmood Hayat is now the 17th Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee.

The succession may not immediately bring about a major change in policies, but it could still have important implications at regional level, for ties with India and Afghanistan, and on domestic level for the civil-military equation and the ongoing fight against terrorism.

The foremost priority would be fight against terrorism, and consolidation of the gains made in this fight. Terrorist attacks in Mohmand Agency and Gwadar on the day Gen Bajwa was named were in themselves reminder that the fight was still not over. It is believed that Gen Bajwa, as his colleagues say, is a firm opponent of extremism and terrorism. He may prove even more forceful in the fight against terrorism than his predecessor, who is credited with launching Operation Zarb-i-Azb, which helped lower the frequency of terrorist attacks.

Another immediate issue requiring the new army chief's attention would be the situation on the LoC, where the violence has escalated over the past two months, even though the relationship has generally been tense ever since Narendra Modi came to power in India. The army chief is credited with having spent a considerable part of his military service in the Rawalpindi-based 10 Corps, which is responsible for guarding the Line of Control (LoC). The X Corps is an active military administrative corps of Pakistan Army, currently assigned in Rawalpindi, Punjab Province of Pakistan. As an ode to Lt. General Aftab Ahmad Khan (pioneer of the X Corp), the insignia of the X Corps features a Rising Sun with 10 rays extruding from it. However, his time at the 10 Corps was a period of relative quiet following the 2003 ceasefire accord. This experience could prove invaluable as he takes command amidst serious escalation on the LoC, which saw some of the intense skirmishes since 2003.

He would then have to take stock of the situation in Balochistan and the Karachi operation. Additionally, he'd be required to take position on the awaited Punjab operation, which could not be launched during his predecessor's period, despite pressure exerted by the military.

The later, Gen Zubair Mehmood Hayat, a three-star general, served as director general of the Strategic Plans Division (SPD), which is the secretariat of the NCA, and Bahawalpur corps commander. This made him an ideal choice for the post of CJCSC, which has an almost exclusive jurisdiction over Pakistan's nuclear forces and assets.

Theoretically, the CJCSC has to be the senior-most four-star officer from any of the three services — army, navy and air force. However, since the establishment of the NCA, the army has staked a claim to its leadership, because it controls the key areas of nuclear command and strategic assets. The CJCSC is also the deputy chairman of NCA's deployment committee, which is headed by the prime minister.

The basis of the decision to appoint a senior military officer as Chairman JCSC was firstly because of numerical strength of the Army which makes almost 80 percent of three services and it's logical to give this post to a military officer. Secondly, Pakistan's war strategy is land-based thus it felt essential to appoint a military office to this position; thirdly, controlling and supervising Pakistan's strategic assets by Pakistan Army and as such it was felt that the military officer should be appointed Chairman JCSC. Lastly, the Pakistan Army deals at international level with leaders of top powers besides sending its troops for UN peacekeeping force and as such it was felt essential that the office of Chairman JCSC must be occupied by a senior military officer at all times.

So the office of Chairman JCSC has become very important and it would be a big challenge for highly able General Zubair Hayat, who had served as DG SPD and thus has full knowledge of Pakistan's strategic assets, to meet future requirements of the country and maintain high level military acumen in that context besides dealing with affairs of the three services. While the office of CJCSC is technically the more senior position — as he serves as the principal military adviser to the prime minister and the National Command Authority (NCA) — the office of army chief is the most prized and arguably the most powerful position in the country and both have regarding their experience a lot to tackle with in the near future.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/11/29/challenges-tackle-new-baton-command/>

Pakistan, FMCT and Strategic Compulsions

S Sadia Kazmi

Pakistan has been facing a serious asymmetry vis a vis India when it comes to the fissile material stocks and growth in conventional arms and capabilities. This is further augmented by India's provocative "Cold Start" doctrinal gestures. There is no ambiguity about this doctrine which aims at ultimately capturing Pakistani territory. The added arms sophistication achieved by India in terms of nuclear triad, the ABMs, and other destructive weapons, has given it a natural edge over Pakistan.

Although the major powers have stressed upon having peaceful relations between India and Pakistan, their own biases and inclination towards India, serve as source of threat for Pakistan. It is a known fact that the US, Israel and Russia are the biggest arm suppliers and security providers to India.

In this very complex situation where the proponents of peace have their clear biases in favor of India, Pakistan constantly feels the need to make its case and resort to taking security measures aimed at safeguarding and ensuring its own security and regional strategic equilibrium with India.

At the same time one should keep in mind that this fact has been globally acknowledged that Pakistan is a responsible nuclear state. Nonetheless it still needs to keep reiterating its own position as a confident and responsible state which is fully committed to the basic aims and objectives of nonproliferation. On the other hand India has most of reactors outside the IAEA and there is also no adherence to previously agreed upon objective of separating civilian and strategic nuclear facilities.

Pakistan in this regard adheres to the basic principle of nonproliferation and likes the major powers to abide by this principle of non discrimination and equal dealing extended out to all the states. The exemptions and preferential treatment meted out to India is a clear violation of this nonproliferation principle and also raises genuine concern about the credibility of the regime and its autonomous status.

Pakistan has maintained its position of supporting and contributing to the nuclear safety and security at most of the global forums. This has been achieved in concrete form by introducing extensive national measures. It rightfully believes that all states have equal rights to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy but through transparent and fool proof mechanism.

Pakistan also holds some genuine concerns with regards to Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT). By staying fully committed to the ideals of nonproliferation and disarmament, Pakistan maintains that the FMCT should include the existing stock of fissile material instead of just aiming to cut off the future production. Not only would this be an incomplete and ineffective effort towards disarmament rather it would also not contribute in maintaining the strategic equilibrium between the two nuclear states India and Pakistan, as has already been mentioned that there is a huge imbalance in the existing capabilities of the two.

To avoid such a lopsided equation between India and Pakistan, which obviously only increases Pakistan's security concerns, there is a need that the treaty looks at this particular dimension too. Such a measure will essentially prevent the vertical and horizontal spread of nuclear weapons technology and inclusion of past production of the material along with the existing stockpiles will contribute to nuclear disarmament as well.

Hence there are obvious strategic compulsions which explain Pakistan's position on FMCT. Pakistan stands for the treaty that takes into account the existing asymmetries and equal security for all the states. This should be taken up and discussed in parallel with the other core issues of Negative Security Assurances, and Prevention of Arms Race in the Outer Space (PAROS).

A comprehensive and a balanced approach is what Pakistan believes in and rightfully expects. Pakistan has never negated the idea of negotiations in this context. Dealing with the issue through talks and developing a mutual understanding is the best way out for all. An even-handed approach would demand that the NSG exceptions and probable membership are made possible for Pakistan as well just as it was allowed for India too. If weighed objectively, one would find that Pakistan holds all the required credentials better than India on the basis of which India is being given exemptions.

Pakistan's nuclear program remains to be the essential element in determining its national security. Hence the security and safety of its nuclear program is its major concern, much crucial to Pakistan itself than any other state.

For this reason it has the most sophisticated Command, Control and Security mechanism in place. All of its facilities are subject to internal monitoring, improvement and effective maintenance. The relevant authorities have ensured strong strategic export controls and strict measures to keep the assets safe and secure from all the possible internal and external threats.

Hence it is only logical that Pakistan be given same exemptions that are being offered to India or otherwise India should be made to follow the same standards rules as the ones set for the other states. India should be made to put its unsafeguarded power reactors and breeder programs under the safeguards. In fact this should have been made the prerequisite for any favor or exemption given to India. But this was deliberately over looked while keeping the focus on building India's strategic and commercial capabilities. This once again makes the case for Pakistan to not yield unless its genuine security concerns are duly addressed and satisfied.

Until then Pakistan has no alternative but to maintain the fissile material production capability to meet any foreseeable challenges.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/30112016-pakistan-fmct-and-strategic-compulsions-oped/>

Dormant Dimensions of India-Japan Deal

Maimuna Ashraf

Japan is expanding its strategic landscape by improving relations with India. India has been repeatedly reported to have often shown reservations in welcoming the Japanese delegation to the annual Malabar naval exercise between India and the US, notwithstanding pressure from the latter. India's reluctance was seemingly intended to avoid Chinese provocation. At that time, Japan's inclination towards India was not seen as a union against China but a move to reinforce Japan's own presence in the Indian Ocean. Japan's naval posture has been focused on protecting home islands and its skimpy fleet of vessels, which are capable of resupplying ships with fuel and munitions, and its recent developments seem to focus on this policy. The country has been relying on the US for the security of its supply lines for years. However, with its recent military advancements, it can now be presumed that Japan is fast developing its ability to independently secure its supply lines. Both Japan and China are greatly dependent on the Strait of Malacca and Indian Ocean for trade. Undoubtedly, Japan's presence in these critical waterways is enhancing its capability to secure its supply lines while improving its strategic position alongside increasing tension with China in the South China Sea. Besides improving its military relations with India, Japan was also seen bolstering its economic relations with countries in the Indian Ocean basin. In 2013, Japan concluded first bilateral naval exercise with India in the Bay of Bengal and also affirmed that similar exercises would also be held in future. After that, India and Japan are continually getting closer in order to pursue their respective interests.

Compared to the past, Japan and India are now more closely cooperating on a number of issues. The perfect example for this proximity is the civil nuclear cooperation between the two states. At a bilateral summit held in New Delhi last December, Japanese Prime Minister, Shinzo Abe, signed a memorandum of agreement on civil nuclear cooperation with Indian Prime Minister, Narendra Modi. And on August 14, 2016, both prime ministers reportedly agreed to finalise a full-fledged nuclear cooperation agreement in November 2016. Lately, on November 11, 2016, Japan and India signed an accord for peaceful usage of nuclear energy.

After this treaty, India would be able to import nuclear power plants, nuclear fuel and technology from Japan. India is the world's third largest importer of crude oil and now realises that nuclear energy is a more reasonable way to meet the country's energy demands without emitting carbon on a large-scale. Although India already has civil nuclear cooperation with other countries, it still needed to sign a nuclear agreement to import large forged components from Japan. From an economic point of view, the transfer of nuclear technology is not only significant for India's growing economy but also an attractive reason for Japan to invest. Japan seeks to build nuclear power plants to revive its nuclear market after the Fukushima nuclear disaster. Apart from the economic standpoint, India's potential to compete with China and its strategic cooperation with the US further adds weight to this civil nuclear cooperation. The deal will also have security implications in the South Asian region. Pakistan has expressed concerns over the controversial nuclear deal while urging Japan "to objectively assess the consequences of discriminatory approaches to our region."

It is presumed that this deal would further develop India's credibility as a responsible nuclear weapon state. However many argue that being victims of a nuclear bomb, Japanese should not have entered into an agreement with a non-NPT state. The deal also has a separate nullification clause that would cancel the pact if India were to conduct a nuclear test, even for peaceful purposes, because there cannot be any assurance that the technology provided by Japan has not been used for military purposes. The intensity of Japan's concern over this can be understood from the December 2015 Japan-India joint statement when Prime Minister Abe stated "the importance of early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) which should lead to nuclear disarmament."

There was also a political resistance seen to the deal in Japan. Therefore, the deal can become unstable if India is developing a thermonuclear weapon, as has been reported by different sources. However, if India will be allowed to receive this nuclear technology without banning its future nuclear tests, it would further reduce the chances of states signing CTBT because many states already have reservations over India's preferential treatment, as was seen in the last Vienna plenary meeting. In the aforesaid scenario, this will be another deal having an adverse impact on the non-proliferation regime.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/30-Nov-16/dormant-dimensions-of-india-japan-deal>