



VISION

VISIONARY INSIGHTS INTO THE STRATEGIC INQUESTS OF NATIONS

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 6

JUNE 2017

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi

Strategic Vision Institute
Islamabad

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 6

JUNE 2017

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi



STRATEGIC VISION
I N S T I T U T E

Strategic Vision Institute (SVI)

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

Strategic Vision Institute (SVI)

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

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

SVI Foresight

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

Contents

Editor’s Note	1
CPEC: Capacity Building and Employment Generation	
Adil Sivia	3
China-Pakistan-Russia in South Asia’s Geostrategic Fulcrum	
Asia Maqsood.....	5
Missile Proliferation, India, Prithvi II and Deterrence Stability in South Asia	
Asma Khalid.....	8
US-Pakistan-India After Trump	
Asia Maqsood.....	10
India-US LEMOA: Implications for Regional Strategic Environment	
Dr. Shahid Bukhari	12
Nuclear suppliers Group: Need for Objective Criteria	
Beenish Altaf	14
The Politics of MTCR	
Beenish Altaf	16
Upcoming NSG Plenary Meeting	
Maimuna Ashraf.....	18
Implications of India’s Missile Program and Non-Proliferation Regime	
Asma Khalid.....	20
How the Recent NSG Plenary was Significant	
Maimuna Ashraf.....	22
Gulf Crisis and Challenges for Pakistan	
Babar Bozdar	24
CPEC and Special Economic Zones	
Sadia Kazmi	27
Shanghai Cooperation Organization, Belt and Road Initiative and CPEC	
Adil Sivia	29
Unmanned Aerial Vehicles and Escalation Along LoC	
Muhammad Adil Sivia	31

The Gulf Crisis: An Analysis

Sadia Kazmi 33

Maligning Pakistan for Kabul Attack

Babar Bozdar 35

Editor's Note

SVI Foresight for the month of June contains an array of insightful commentaries on the topics of utmost strategic import. The readers will find proficient and well informed analyses on a number of contemporary issues including the plenary meeting on NSG and how it was significant, the politics of MTCR, the Indo-US LEMAO and its regional implications, a debate on Prithivi II and Missile Proliferation, developments regarding CPEC, Gulf crisis and recommendations for Pakistan, the recent Kabul attack, and a couple of articles on South Asian security.

US' tilt towards India is no hidden secret. There have been a series of favors and concessions that the US extended to India from time to time. One such ongoing issue is the membership of NSG. The proposed new criteria for membership, discussed in the June plenary and the December consultative meeting last year are diluting nonproliferation norms and are not agreeable to all members. Furthermore, the proposed country-specific approach weighs heavily in favor of India, leaving an equally-credentialed Pakistan with a number of barriers to entry. In order for the export control group to maintain its integrity and achieve its nonproliferation objectives, a transparent, criteria-based approach to NSG membership is warranted.

Similarly the Indio-US LEMAO that concluded on August 29, 2016 by the outgoing Obama administration is important to be scrutinized in the context of South Asian regional security since it is yet another explicit act of preferential treatment by the United States for India that once again introduced discriminatory actions taken by the US to accommodate India. This is not without incentives for the US who seeks Indian assistance in containing China.

India has also been active on the proliferation front. The launch of Prithvi II is enough evidence towards this claim. India's expanding fissile material production, nuclear capable ballistic missiles including MIRVs and recent test of Prithvi II is a wakeup call for major powers and global non-proliferation regime as it is not only disturbing the deterrence stability in region but also raises the international apprehension of regional states regarding India's growing missile capabilities.

Another equally significant strategic development for Pakistan and China is CPEC. One of the articles explores the contribution and potentials of CPEC for capacity building. It raises a pertinent question as to what possible ways could be explored to better develop and sustain the ownership of CPEC projects than providing jobs to the people of the areas where these projects will be implemented? It suggests that the value addition is of paramount importance not just for enhancing the exports of Pakistan but for job creation as well. Streamlining of the processes involved in value addition chain for converting raw materials into finished goods is required for maximizing the benefits from CPEC.

In the past month, the Gulf Crisis has taken most of the attention of political and security analysts. A well thought out and insightful analysis of the whole crisis can be found in this issue. It also includes in depth observations on the possible policy challenges that Pakistan might have to face being close to both Qatar and KSA.

The geostrategic landscape of South Asia is visibly in a mode of shift ever since the emerging China-Pakistan-Russia nexus. An article discusses in detail the various facets of this new development including China's Belt and Road Initiative, Russia's Eurasian Economic Union and its possible connectivity with BRI, and Pakistan's geostrategic location, all of which are collectively serving as key factors that can define the new trends in the triangular power relations between the three. It is very much required to examine the motivating factors behind the convergence of interests and what would the impact this trio on Asian Order.

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

Senior Research Associate
Syedah Sadia Kazmi

CPEC: Capacity Building and Employment Generation

Adil Sivia

Developing countries often rely on agriculture sector as main driver of their economies. Major chunk of labor force is absorbed by agriculture sector directly or indirectly. Limited technical knowledge base, shortage of capital and inconsistent long term industrial policy framework hampers the prospects of transformation of agrarian society to industrial society. Pakistan has long relied on agriculture sector to grapple with unemployment genie. Banking on one sector for employment generation has failed to meet the expectations. The path to economic development goes through manufacturing and high-end services sector.

China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) provides the opportunity for diversifying and expanding the size of Pakistan's economy. Through Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) inflows under CPEC, chronic shortage of capital for developing infrastructure for launching industrialization drive will be lessened to greater extent. Availability of cost effective and sound communication infrastructure for movement of raw materials and finished goods is one priori for providing establishing competitive industry in globalized world. The Chinese model of economic development is premised on the notion that infrastructure development and economic development reinforce each other.

Job creation for youth bulge of Pakistan that is often termed as asset should be main priority of state before this asset turns into liability due to unemployment. Misplaced priorities of the policy makers of the country are serious concern in this regard. CPEC through employment generation will provide timely and corrective intervention for addressing the grievances of unemployed youth. Chronic electricity shortage has worked to further shrink the meager exiting industrial base of Pakistan. Early harvest energy projects under CPEC will help reduce the electricity shortfall in short run. Affordable and sustained electricity supply is essential for reviving Pakistan's industry and attracting foreign investors to invest in industrial sector of Pakistan. Power generation projects under CPEC will create thousands of jobs directly while supporting millions of jobs indirectly.

The utility of Special Economic Zones (SEZs) for efficient utilization of industry dependent on agriculture, manufacturing industry, employment creation, and expanding exports of a country has been established fact around the world. SEZs are means to the end of industrialization but successful establishment and sustenance of SEZs requires well thought long term consistent investor friendly policies. China has effectively followed the SEZs focused economic development strategy. Nine locations for SEZs have been identified under CPEC, while further consultation is ongoing between China and Pakistan for identifying more locations for SEZs. The problem of capital and capacity deficiency can be ameliorated through Joint Ventures (JVs) between Chinese and Pakistani business community in these SEZs. Developing stakes of local industry and protecting their interest under CPEC is necessary for

developing domestic industrial base. Pakistani industrialists should be offered incentives at par with Chinese investors for investment in these SEZs.

Having skilled labor is essential for moving up the manufacturing chain in industrial sector. Building the capacity of cottage industry through skills is necessary for launching industrial revolution through step by step bottom to top approach. The educational institutions involved in producing technical skilled labor should be connected under CPEC to their counterparts in China. CPEC can be real game changer only if it helps Pakistan to develop indigenous industrial base with assistance from China. Producing Pakistani skilled labor and management for utilization in CPEC related projects is necessary for developing the stakes of local people. What other way can be better for developing and sustaining the ownership of CPEC projects than providing jobs to the people of the areas where these projects will be implemented?

Value addition is of paramount importance not just for enhancing the exports of Pakistan but for job creation as well. Streamlining of the processes involved in value addition chain for converting raw materials into finished goods is required for maximizing the benefits from CPEC. Chinese investors should be encouraged to form JVs with Pakistani industries for completing the value addition process both in agriculture and industrial sector so that finished goods can be exported from Pakistan to China and rest of the world. CPEC Long Term Plan for economic engagement should be structured on developing JVs in SEZs, capacity building of labor and industry, and substantial investment in Research and Development (R&D) by linking technical education institutions and industry of Pakistan. The potential of CPEC being game changer can be realized through making and implementing long term plan for industrial development of Pakistan.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/06/08/cpec-capacity-building-employment-generation/>

China-Pakistan-Russia in South Asia's Geostrategic Fulcrum

Asia Maqsood

The year of 2010 marked the beginning of an age of shifting interest and realignments of power relationships. This new age matrix brought the strategic partnership of three key powers that are central to the resolution of many regional issues and whose collective political decisions can shape the political environment of future. This power relationship is between China, Pakistan and Russia. China with its economic and global influence, Russia with its muscular strength and information warfare, and Pakistan being a frontline state combating terrorism and its geostrategic location. This emerging triangular power relationship has an inherent political potential to pull the string in the emerging regional and global political theater. The contemporary international political order is moving towards multi-polarity which leaning towards the Asian political order, a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural region.

With new world developments such as China's investment in One Belt One Road economic initiative, Russia's Eurasian Economic Union and its connective with OBOR and Pakistan's geostrategic location as key factors that can define the new trends in the triangular power relations between three depending upon the basic queries, it is interesting to examine the motivating factors behind the convergence of interests and what would the impact this trio exert on Asian Order.

China under its dynamic leader Xi Jinping has ambitiously envisioned and pursued the economic strategy to integrate Asia with Europe, Middle East and Africa with its OBOR initiative. Hence, Asia is an integral part and very important key to the success to materialize this OBOR initiative and Pakistan is the first link to this initiative.

However, Pakistan and Russia are two important actors or pillars in the Chinese geostrategic ambition first in the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) and second is the OBOR integration with the Eurasian Economic Union. In this context China, Pakistan and Russia have essential shared objectives in commerce, collective defence and regional security.

From Pakistan's perspective, the Chinese are seeking to accelerate their trade and commerce through CPEC, which is an essential component of Maritime Silk Road enterprise composed of networks of railways, highways and pipelines along with various energy and industrial project subjected to stave off the energy starvation of Pakistan and regional connectivity and pave the way for China's access to Indian Ocean by linking Xinjiang province Pakistan's Gwadar Port.

The geostrategic interests of both countries China and Pakistan converge beyond the geography and also include a substantial role in Afghanistan. As far as China's interests in Afghanistan are concerned these range from the development assistance, investment enterprises and emerging security role to get and preserve its strategic objectives in the country that needs enhanced security environment.

While China and Russia's share interests in the contemporary international environment they are also to counter US hegemony. China and Russia share many multilateral platforms and institutions such as BRICS and SCO to strengthen their strategic partnership depends upon their shared interests, both regionally and globally. Russia with its initiative of the Eurasian Economic Union and China with its OBOR initiative are seeking to revolutionize the world trade and integrate world economics through trans-regional connectivity and mutual cooperation with the shared objective of G-zero World.

An eminent political commentator Pepe Escobar stated that Russia and China not only protecting their core national interests, but advancing their complementarities. Russia's excellence in aerospace, defence technology and heavy industry matches Chinese excellence in agriculture, light industry and information technology. Both these countries are supported by the prestigious institutions such as BRICS, SCO, CSTO and Eurasian Economic Union. Both Russia and China have shared objective regarding peace and stability in Afghanistan, South Asia particularly Pakistan's role as geostrategic fulcrum, Eurasian integration making peace in the violent and fragile middle east.

In South Asia, Russia's recent overture or approach towards Pakistan (previously Cold War rivals) represents a clean break from the Cold War animosity. Russia's security ties with the joint military exercise "Friendship 2016" with Pakistan is a recent example that has more benefits than costs attached. Russia and Pakistan bilateral relations are at embryonic stage with undertaken projects representing the cautious approach.

Here it is pertinent to state that India's traditional rivalry with Pakistan, whom Russia has had a long term strategic partnership dating back from the Cold War era, is uneasy with the growing ties of Russia and Pakistan. Russia is the second largest defence exporter to India and it is expected that their bilateral defence trade is targeted to reach 30 billion dollars by 2025.

On the other hand, Russia and Pakistan both share strategic interests as Russian wants to resolve Afghanistan dilemma because it has fears of the spillover effects of the terrorism to its backyard in Central Asia from Afghanistan particularly the emergence of IS which threatens the stability of Russia itself with reference to Chechnya. It is also has fears of the presence of US forces in Afghanistan.

Pakistan also wants to strengthen its position in the region by engaging second nuclear power. Secondly, Pakistan seeks a peaceful resolution of Afghanistan. Third, Pakistan seeks the prospects of giving Russia access to deep sea port in Gwadar and subsequent incorporation of Russia in OBOR. In a nutshell, in the South Asian context Pakistan's reach to Russia comes out of the need to counterbalance India's growing influence in the region specifically after the Logistics Exchange Memorandum of Agreement (LEMOA) between India and US, which seems to make India a "linchpin" in this region.

India's access to US weapons alongside US support for Indian operations in the sea – Indian Ocean – represents an alarming signal to Pakistan to recalibrate its international relations and increase its outreach to regional powers to counter prospective Indian hegemony in South Asia. Simultaneously Pakistan should maintain its relations with US on an even keel, as Pakistan's shift to strengthen its strategic relations with Russia and China should not be at the cost of Pakistan-US relations — the only objective is to counterbalance India's hegemony in the region.

Missile Proliferation, India, Prithvi II and Deterrence Stability in South Asia

Asma Khalid

India and Pakistan's adversarial relations are locked in a classic military security dilemma that is characterized by the production and development of sophisticated nuclear and conventional technologies, leading towards an arms race. After going overtly nuclear, the development of nuclear and missile capabilities of India and Pakistan has been intensified to ensure their security. However, India's rising missile ambitions has forced Pakistan to build up its nuclear capabilities to maintain credible nuclear deterrence in region.

India started its ballistic missile program in the mid 1980s and pursued it in more systematic manners. Recent trends have revealed that India is developing numerous nuclear delivery systems, trends of missile development includes Shorter and Longer range missiles, MIRVing, and a shift from liquid to solid fuel missiles or ready arsenals. Such advancements and a higher level of readiness by India has challenged the very basics of strategic and deterrence stability in South Asia.

At the end of 2016, India's successful test of sea-based ballistic and cruise missile system, Agni V, with a strike range of 5,500- 5,800 Km, capable of carrying payload of 1,500 kg. India claims that Agni V is to provide deterrence against China. Consequently, after this test India test fired various missiles such as the Agni III and successful test of interceptor missile to develop a two-layered Ballistic Missile Defence system. India's intentions and nuclear capabilities has increased the chances that a bilateral crisis could escalate in a more dangerous way.

Recently, India tested the nuclear capable ballistic missile Prithvi II with a strike range of 350 km, capable of carrying 500 kg to 1,000 kg of warheads. The missile is indigenously developed and undergoing developmental trial and said to capable to hit the major cities of Pakistan from Indian Territory. This factor rejects the Indian claim that its conventional and nuclear programs are China specific as Prithvi II has direct relevance to Pakistan.

India's missile proliferation has forced Pakistan to response India to maintain its security and regional stability. Principle drive for Pakistan's missile program is "security" and it is totally Indian specific. It has been repeatedly mentioned by Pakistan's officials that India's conventional and nuclear capabilities have forced Pakistan to enhance its nuclear competencies to counter the Indian threat. In order to maintain credible deterrence against Indian threat, Pakistan possesses an adequate number of nuclear capable missiles including Abdali (Hatf-2), Ghaznavi (Hatf-3), Shaheen I (Hatf-4), Ghauri (Hatf-5), Shaheen II (Hatf-6) and Nasr (Hatf-9) that have ability to counter-value the targets in India. Most importantly successful test of Ababeel with the introduction of a missile with multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRV) has proved that despite facing defence production gap in conventional forces has successfully maintained technological and deterrent capability by developing effective ballistic missile program.

Hence, the dynamics of ballistic missile development in South Asia present that although India's ballistic missile defense capabilities are at its full pace of development, at the same time the fact cannot be ignored that India is also dictated by a lack of strategic depth and Pakistan's full spectrum credible deterrence is capable to deter all forms of Indian aggression.

Subsequently, talking about regional security landscape, it is imperative to mention that regional security outlook is complex such as; Pakistan's threat perception revolves around India, whereas India's threat perception comes from China. Under this complex security outlook, India's quest for missile program has broad regional and global implications. First, India's expanding missile capabilities marked by improvement in range, payload and accuracy not only indicate that India is heading towards higher level of readiness but also pushing the region towards the destabilizing arms race. Secondly, It has reduces the chances of any bilateral arms control arrangement in South Asia. Third, Pakistan as well as China's centric missile program of India will further complicate the security dilemma in South Asia. Therefore, India's increased level of readiness and destabilizing ballistic missile program is a dangerous combination for deterrence and strategic stability in region.

Therefore, India's expanding fissile material production, nuclear capable ballistic missiles including MIRVs and recent test of Prithvi II is a wakeup calls for major powers and global non-proliferation regime as it is not only disturbing the deterrence stability in region but also raises the international apprehension of regional states regarding India's growing missile capabilities.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/11062017-missile-proliferation-india-prithvi-ii-and-deterrence-stability-in-south-asia-oped/>

US-Pakistan-India After Trump

Asia Maqsood

Since Donald Trump came to power there are less policy clues but from his inauguration speech to anti-globalization, anti-internationalism broadly pointed at its nationalistic stance. In all probabilities, Trump's priorities are inclined towards trade, immigration, terrorism, the Iran nuclear deal and relations with Israel, while the rest of foreign policy including geopolitics or strategic issues are likely to have institutional zest. Now what are the deterministic factors of US-Pakistan relations? It is pertinent to discuss here that Pak-US relations primarily depend upon the Trump's approach towards war on terrorism and towards Afghanistan. The last Obama Administration lost its way dealing with Pakistan while investing too much in India on the basis of legacy and to counter China which is a major factor in Pak-US relations. The other element is that Obama was in urgency in paving the way for stability in Afghanistan which put too much pressure on Pakistan; consequently Pak-US relations remained strained on three sides.

Contemporary international political scenario, Trump has no such political baggage and will be assisted by a Secretary of Defence who seems to be a thoughtful and well-aware military leader having history of wars and conflicts. Here question arises that will a continuation of Obama's policy work? In my understanding it will not be easy for US to think up a new good policy in immediate future because its engagement in the region revolving around two categorized ideas- China and war on terrorism in which Afghanistan is crucial part. For first idea US needs India and for the second it needs Pakistan. With the new developments of China and Pakistan on China-Pakistan Economic Corridor and other different joint ventures, both India and US are on the same ground to oppose these developments in the region containing China.

Pakistan's priority for joint ventures with China and cooperative strategic partnership in particular, are, to counterbalance India, not against US. So US may not undermine or demoralize Pakistan in prioritising its bilateral relations with India at the cost of China-Pak relations at strategic level. This makes its Pak-US relations very complex and needed to be reconciled. Along these China-Pakistan relations, the unresolved conflict in Afghanistan, continued militancy in Pakistan and Afghanistan, revolutionary Iran and resurging Russia Pakistan is factor in all this needed to be dealt fairly not discriminately. Media reports quoting US officials said that the potential of Trump Administration responses being discussed include expanding US drone attacks, redirecting or withholding some aid to Pakistan eventually may downgrade Pakistan's status as major non-NATO ally.

Some US officials and experts on the region scoff at the title "Pakistan is not an ally- it's not North Korea or Iran. But it's not an ally", said Bruce Riedel, a Pakistan expert at the Brookings Institute. By this title would be seen to Pakistan as a major blow. Lisa Curtis, senior Director for South and Central Asia at the National Security Council co-authored a report with Hussain Haqqani, Pakistan's former ambassador to Washington in which they recommended the Trump Administration warn Pakistan, the status could be evoked in six months, according to the February report "Thinking of Pakistan as an ally

will continue to create problems for the next administration as it did for the last one". But it is unclear how seriously the current administration was considering the proposal.

Since the Indo-US nuclear deal in 2008, Indo-US strategic partnership is growing. Ahead of PM Narendra Modi's visit to US on June 26, 2017 is yet to be seen as how US current administration takes PM Modi's concerns against Pakistan as According to times of India that Modi would raise terrorism emanating from Pakistan and US aid to Islamabad. This will be their first meeting, though they have spoken at least three times on Phone starting with the morning after Trump's stunning election victory in November 2016. It is reported that top issues for both sides are likely to be discussed counter terrorism, followed by H-1B visa system for India and trade for the US. The ongoing US review of its policy on Afghanistan is expected to figure out prominently and India will be keen know if the American are staying there, and for how long?

The current scenario which is witnessing the successes of the development projects such as CPEC bringing the prosperity and peace in Pakistan is not favouring both India and US and they are collectively expressing their opposition. The strategic partnership of both US and India plays a very infertile role in the whole stability and peace in South Asia's geostrategic fulcrum. Pakistan compelled to seek other strategic partners such as China and Russia but not at the cost of Pak-US relations whereas to counter India's ambitious regional role with the assistance of US. Critically analysing one can said that India-US relations will be flourishing during Trump whereas Pak-US relations may remain strained to certain extent yet to be seen.

<http://pakobserver.net/us-pakistan-india-trump/>

India-US LEMOA: Implications for Regional Strategic Environment

Dr. Shahid Bukhari

According to a report in *New York Times*, The American Secretary of States, Rex Tillerson had vowed to deny access to China over her artificially built islands in South China Sea. Keeping in view such state of mind by the United States' Secretary of State, if one evaluates the India-United States' Logistic Exchange Memorandum of Agreement (LEMOA), a lot of strategic implications come into mind for regional strategic environment. LEMOA, concluded on August 29, 2016 by the outgoing Obama administration, is another preferential treatment by the United States for India that once again introduced discriminatory actions taken by the US to accommodate India. This is not without incentives for the US who seeks Indian assistance in containing China.

LEMOA is a logistic support agreement between India and United States that enables the US to cater a lot of facilities from the Indian ports to police the Indian Ocean region. Although claimed by the Indian Defence Minister, Manohar Parrikar that the agreement does not provided bases on Indian land for the US troops; this agreement is an indication of Indian intentions to play against China at the US disposal, which may further culminate into the use of Indian land for the purpose of military operations against China.

For the US and India, this agreement simply facilitates the two allies to use each other's logistic infrastructure, but for China and Pakistan, it shall have geostrategic implications. As the events are unfolding in the US-India bilateral relationship, both countries have renewed their framework for defence relationship for next 10 years as well as the US has designated India as the 'Major Defence Partner' while negotiations for co-production of F-16 aircraft in India are also underway, one cannot remain naïve of the strategic intentions of the LEMOA pact.

As reported, LEMOA has apparently nothing to do with the establishment of the US bases in India and it will serve the purpose of refuelling and replenishment including supplies and services relating food, water, clothing, transportation, oil, lubricants, communication, medical, training, spare parts, repair, maintenance, and ports usages. Question here arises that what anymore else is required to conduct military operations except provision of Arms and Ammunitions?

Would the US require arms, ammunition, or sophisticated technology from India to conduct any military operation in the region then? The answer is definitely a 'No'. Another apparently innocent gesture has been shown by outlining the four primary areas of cooperation under the agreement; i.e. Port Calls, Joint Exercises, Training, and Humanitarian Assistance while other requirements have been left on bilateral negotiations on case-by-case basis.

Although, this provision pretend to be peace-time cooperation arrangement but it keeps room for extension of this logistic cooperation for strategic operations. It does not rule-out logistic support to

each other in the occurrence of armed conflict in the region. As claimed by the Indian Defence Minister, Manohar Parrikar “It (LEMOA) doesn’t have anything to do with the setting up of a base... It’s basically logistics support to each other’s fleet... So, it will basically ensure that both navies can be supportive of each other in the joint venture operations we do, exercises we do”.

The US Defence Secretary, Ashton Carter echoed with Parrikar and stated that “It (LEMOA) is fully mutual... It’s not a basing agreement of any kind, but it does make the logistics of joint operations so much easier and so much more efficient”. Keeping in view the regional competition, this can be understood that supporting each other’s navies, for making joint operations much easier and efficient, shall have ultimate strategic objectives. These strategic objectives are definitely aiming at to counter China if and when needed. Keeping in view the US Asia-Pacific policy and the China-US competition in South China Sea, the US has adequate resources available around the Asia-Pacific region but it lacked adequate military presence in the Indian Ocean.

Since the US has adequate technological resources available at her disposal, it lacked logistic support in the region that is being arranged through LEMOA pact. It should not be ignored that ‘Logistic Support’ is vital part of conducting war operations anywhere in the world. Therefore, LEMOA is an indication of preparation for any possible military confrontation in the Indian Ocean lead by the United States and assisted by India, placing India at the US disposal by her own choice. It may therefore be concluded that LEMOA shall contribute to strategic instability in the already fragile regional strategic environment.

In her pursuit to contain China, the US is providing utmost support to India without taking into account its implications for the regional strategic stability. Just like other areas of cooperation under the India-US Strategic Partnership, LEMOA shall also significantly contribute to Indian military modernisation and operational capacity, which shall be perilous for Pakistan’s security, especially when there is complete absence of bilateral dialogues and confidence building measures.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/world/16-Jun-2017/india-us-lemoa-implications-for-regional-strategic-environment>

Nuclear suppliers Group: Need for Objective Criteria

Beenish Altaf

The Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) is losing credibility. The proposed new criteria for membership, discussed in the June plenary and the December consultative meeting last year, are diluting nonproliferation norms and are not agreeable to all members. Further, the proposed country-specific approach weighs heavily in favor of India, leaving an equally-credentialed Pakistan with a number of barriers to entry. In order for the export control group to maintain its integrity and achieve its nonproliferation objectives, a transparent, criteria-based approach to NSG membership is warranted.

June 2016 Plenary and December Meeting: The Grossi-Song Formula

The June 2016 plenary discussed the technical, legal, and political aspects of the participation of states that are not party to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), but failed to lay down criteria for NSG membership, remaining fixated on the question of the NPT. China took a principled position that there should be a criteria-based approach for all membership aspirants, which would apply to all non-NPT applicants, accompanied by consultations and discussions specific to the country. It is believed that at least 12 NSG members support China's appeal for a criteria-based approach.

At the June plenary, then-NSG Chair Ambassador Rafael Mariano Grossi of Argentina was tasked with coming up with a transparent consultation process with all the members to agree on an impartial membership criterion. The outcome was a revised version of a draft 'Exchange of Notes' for Non-NPT applicants, outlined by Grossi and the current NSG Chair, Ambassador Song Young-wan of South Korea. It is a sequential approach, which paves the way for Indian membership and harms Pakistan's case for admission. As Zamir Akram points out, it includes actions that India already took to receive an NSG waiver exempting it from full-scope safeguards, which was needed for the Indo-U.S. nuclear deal. It further advocates that Pakistan seek a waiver to be eligible to receive civil nuclear technology, even after being granted NSG membership. It is believed that the revised version, also known as the Grossi-Song formula, did not consult China and saw opposition from other members including Turkey, New Zealand, Brazil, Ireland, Austria, Belarus, Italy, and Switzerland. Even Russia called for more consultations among the members and greater transparency in the procedure.

Implications

The Grossi-Song formula did not break the logjam in the NSG membership process, as it had nothing new to compel India to take any additional non-proliferation commitments. Likewise, nuclear experts have warned that "any further country-specific exemption from NSG guidelines for trade and/or membership without compensating steps to strengthen non-proliferation and disarmament would increase nuclear dangers in South Asia, and weaken the NSG and the broader nuclear non-proliferation regime." In other words, South Asia's strategic stability will be challenged if any country-specific decision is taken at the NSG, further elevating the jeopardy of confrontation between both nuclear powers.

The Indo-U.S. civil nuclear deal and the 2008 NSG waiver to India have already tainted the NSG. Due to double standards and the inability to reach a consensus on the India-Pakistan candidacy issue, the NSG's credibility, and even that of the nonproliferation regime, is being compromised.

Way Forward

Pakistan's credentials for membership are equivalent to those of India's. While submitting its application for NSG membership, Pakistan outlined credentials such as the harmonization of its export control lists with those of the international export control regimes, efforts to ensure nuclear security and safety, and adherence to NSG guidelines. Likewise, Pakistan's Ambassador at Vienna said, "seeking participation in the export control reflects Pakistan's strong support for international efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery." If the new draft criteria are presented with transparency, Pakistan would probably not have any apprehensions in signing an additional protocol on its civilian facilities. Similarly, Pakistan could accept a separation of its military and civilian program, which is technically already operating separately. The only additional step would be to bring these measures under formal International Atomic Energy Agency(IAEA) considerations. These steps would further strengthen Pakistan's case.

The backlash to the Grossi-Song formula has created space for Pakistan to achieve tactical success by working with like-minded states, eventually halting another preferential waiver for India. Pakistan will welcome effective draft criteria if developed with transparent and comprehensive consultations among all the participating governments, as should India.

Last but not least, to sustain the norms and credibility of the multilateral export groups, the nonproliferation regime needs to promote the ideals of strategic restraint and avoidance of nuclear war. It is through the realization of these normative postures that regimes such as the NSG will have any chance of survival. The upcoming plenary next week could be an opportunity for the group to revive its declining image.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/05/19/forthcoming-nsg-plenary-meeting-prospects-pakistan-india-candidacy/>

The Politics of MTCR

Beenish Altaf

As India became the 35th member of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), it is considered by India itself that the membership would be mutually beneficial in the furtherance of international non-proliferation objectives. Sardonicly, this is not correct! India, immediately decided to benefit from its entry into the group by deciding on to the enhancement of the range of its supersonic cruise missile beyond its previously known limit.

India gained the membership on June 9, 2016 that was before the formal plenary held in Busan (South Korea) from 17-21 October 2016. A big assistance of Russia was behind the successful accession to the regime. Given that India is heading towards advancement of its missiles after joining the 34 nation group where, MTCR actually work to restrict the proliferation of missiles, complete rocket systems, unmanned air vehicles, and related technology for those systems capable of carrying a 500 kilogram payload at least 300 kilometres, as well as systems intended for the delivery of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

The missile India and Russia have agreed to extend the range is their Brahmos supersonic cruise missiles beyond the current 300 km. The land-attack version of BrahMos supersonic cruise missile with an extended range increased from 290 km to 450 km was successfully test fired. Brahmos, is a joint venture between the Russian Federation's NPO Mashinostroeyenia and India's Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) who have together formed BrahMos Aerospace. The name BrahMos is a portmanteau formed from the names of two rivers, the Brahmaputra of India and the Moskva of Russia. It is a short-range ramjet supersonic cruise missile that can be launched from submarines, ships, aircraft or land.

It needs to be taken into account that Russia has welcomed Indian entry into the 35 nation (now 35 states after Indian entry) group very bluntly. Russia itself believes that it is a key anti-proliferating member of the group. The membership to India has definitely ease space and missile collaboration with Russia, which could not supply cryogenic engines and other dual use technology missiles to India, because it was bound by MTCR norms. This is because of the fact that the MTCR guidelines prohibit its members from transfer, sale or joint production of missiles beyond 300-km range to countries outside the group however India is in now therefore, the first thing both the countries got is, the license to increase the range of its missile.

This joint step by India – Russia is taken far offensive and pointing towards Pakistan because Brahmos with 300 km range was very difficult to target inside Pakistan but after enhancing the range the missile can hit anywhere inside Pakistan. So it is having regional implications at large in this regard. It would be worrisome not only for Pakistan but for China too. An Indian military official stated at some point of discussion, that “our threat perceptions and security concerns are our own, and how we address these by deploying assets on our territory should be no one else's concern.” The statement

depicts the aggressive and offensive mode of Indian mind making. So, a greater range for Brahmos would imply that India's power to strike would get an unprecedented fillip.

Ironically, since 2004 the MTCR membership was stagnant to 34 countries. India's application got accepted because of the political influence. Pakistan's missile program is mature so joining the MTCR can be beneficial for Pakistan. Pakistan officially supports four multilateral export control regimes including MTCR. Nonetheless, it's the political influence behind it that there is not much emphasis for MTCR around the world.

Analytically, it could be assessed from the above that India is doing this after the MTCR membership just within days, what India will do if its dream comes true of getting NSG membership. It would, for sure, lead the way for enhancing its uranium reserves for military usage. Analytically, China stonewalled India's entry into the NSG at the recent June Plenary as it has an impact being the active member of the group but could not stall India's membership to the MTCR seeing that it is not a member. Nevertheless, India is undoubtedly spending day by day and more and more in developing its tremendous firepower and strike capabilities. This is alarming for the world in general and the region in particular.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/world/19-Jun-2017/the-politics-of-mtcr>

Upcoming NSG Plenary Meeting

Maimuna Ashraf

Currently, major challenges that may fall within the critical issues of the NSG that it confronts in nuclear politics of 21st century is the induction of more members especially the states that are not party to the NPT. The most important and controversial is membership of India and Pakistan in the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG). Although NSG was created against the Indian nuclear test of 1974; it is surprising to observe that even the NSG's revised guidelines of June 2013 do not mention India directly; the country whose nuclear weapon test became responsible for the creation of NSG in the first place. Three dimensions to the whole issue are significant, First dimension is Commercial lobby; it is presumed that US. Commercial purpose was main idea behind Indo-US nuclear deal in 2005 and later in 2008 when waiver was granted to India. Second is the politics of norms. If norms are main factor behind nuclear politics then Indo-US nuclear deal and NSG waiver should strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. The third is the "geopolitical" perspective with strategic undertones. The ground realities illustrate that India's politics and its membership of NSG has less to do with the economic or norms dimension and more influenced with geopolitics.

The Indo-US deal on space technology existed since 2004 long before the Indo-US nuclear deal. Now it is believed that India will be able to enhance sophistication of its missiles. Things further gained pace in 2010 and the idea was floated that India should be the member of all the four multilateral export control cartels such as Australia Group, MTCR, NSG and Wassenaar Arrangement. By then the NSG waiver had already been granted to India and recently India became member of MTCR. India now is strategic partner of the US and enjoys more autonomy than other allies of the US. At the last Plenary Meeting in 2016, the Indian bid to seek the NSG membership was blocked by more than 10 Participating Groups (PGs), including China, and Pakistan's application also yielded no positive response due to their non-NPT status. Afterwards, the US and India increased their diplomatic efforts to convince NSG PGs including China, to accommodate India into the Group. However, the stalemate continued during the extraordinary meeting of the NSG PGs at Vienna in November 2016. At least 12 NSG members at the meeting called for a criteria-based approach. These included China, Turkey, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Italy, Ireland, Austria, New Zealand, Belgium, Brazil and Russia.

At that meeting China also maintained that any formula worked out should be non-discriminatory and applicable to all non-NPT states. Although, most of the NSG major powers possessing nuclear weapons have shown commendable amount of leniency to India including the recent Grossi Formula paving the way for India to secure a smooth entry into the NSG. Creating exceptions in most of the cases for India whilst ignoring set criteria by lowering the restriction bar undermine credibility of the NSG and the international non-proliferation regime.

The next, 27th plenary meeting of the NSG is likely to be held in Swiss capital Bern this month on June 22-23, but the chances of any breakthrough on India's entry into the elite group still look slim. The Swiss Spokesperson on the agenda of forthcoming plenary session said, "In this role, Switzerland will

take into account the views of all participating governments and seek to guide the Group towards reaching consensus on the question of how to integrate non-NPT states.” Switzerland’s own position to support India’s membership remains the same as when the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi visited the country last year.

Since the revised NSG’s provisions talk about the criteria-based principles based on the unanimous consensus between the members, in the upcoming meeting, it would be challenging how the NSG could induct non-NPT states particularly possessing nuclear weapons into the NSG. There are certain criteria that could be followed, for instance, the NSG could follow its principles and allow only non-NPT states to become part of the NPT as non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS) before they join the NSG respectively. However, this strict criterion may not be acceptable to India and/or Pakistan which are nuclear weapons states. They have never joined the NPT rather these states would like to be recognized; obtaining a formal nuclear legitimacy like the P-5 major nuclear weapons states before they could become part of the NPT.

The other option is that NSG could relax the conditions through mutual consensus that are acceptable for both India and Pakistan as the non-NPT members allowing both India and Pakistan simultaneously into the NSG, enjoying the similar rights for peaceful uses of nuclear technology under the IAEA’s comprehensive safeguards without compromising on their nuclear weapons status. Conversely, creating exceptions for one state against the interest of another could jeopardise the credibility of the NSG in general and affect the strategic stability of South Asia in particular.

<http://pakobserver.net/upcoming-nsg-plenary-meeting/>

Implications of India's Missile Program and Non-Proliferation Regime

Asma Khalid

India is believed to have fastest growing missile program of the world. It is estimated that India possess enough fissile material to produce 90 to 110 nuclear warheads and its fissile material production is increasing rapidly. India's exiting missiles that have direct implications for Pakistan are Prithvi I and Prithvi II with the range of 150/350 km, whereas second family of ballistic missile Agni- series has also direct implications for Pakistan, and on the other hand it is designed to reach china as well. So Indian missile program has not only triggered the Pakistan's concerns but the other regional states like china that considers the Agni-V as a threat to their security and regional stability. Currently India possesses ballistic missiles, nuclear-capable aircraft and longer-range ballistic missiles. Though, India claims that it has kept its warheads separate from launchers but higher level of readiness is matter of great concern of regional powers.

India's Missile defence system has potential to upset the strategic stability of region. India aims to acquire sophisticated Missile capabilities and Ballistic missile defence system to achieve two main objectives: First, to deter regional powers, China and Pakistan; Second, to emerge as regional power to establish its hegemony in region. To achieve these objectives India is building the huge stockpiles of fissile material. Such factors are posing more drastic security challenges to the South Asia.

India has large number of operational missiles in its inventory. India's expanding missile capabilities with the significant improvement in range, accuracy, Payload and reliability, is not only forcing the regional states to enhance their capabilities to ensure their security, but also have the potential to instigate the arms race in region. India initiated its missile program in 1980s (much earlier than Pakistan) and brought greater insecurity, instability and tension and forced the regional states, such as traditional rival Pakistan to build up its nuclear capabilities to ensure its security and maintain stability in region.

Indian missile developments have serious implications on regional as well as global level. On regional level, it has enforced the traditional rival Pakistan to enhance it missile as well as nuclear capabilities. Secondly, various kinds of missiles increase with large inventory has enhanced the tension in region and increased the chances of escalation between Pakistan and India on one side, and between India and China on other side. Whereas at global level, the sophisticated missile developments with improved ranges and payload have serious implications on the non-proliferation regime, as it is encouraging the other regional states to pursue their nuclear and missile programs to counter Indian offense.

Consequently, the recent developments in the Indian Missile program are a matter of great concern for the competing regional states, especially for Pakistan. Developments in its missile as well as Ballistic Missile Defence System (BMD) and upcoming collaboration of India with US, Russia and Israel

has added new dimensions to the regional stability and security equation. Especially, introduction of BMD system have posed negative implications on both Pakistan and China and possess the ability to give rise to arms race in region due to existence of action-reaction spiral between China, India and Pakistan.

Here question arises that what are the options for regional states especially Pakistan? In response to Indian missile program, Pakistan has also developed its missile program since early 1980s. Pakistan has several types of nuclear capable ballistic missiles with shorter and longer ranges including nuclear capable aircraft, ballistic missiles and cruise missiles. In 2017, Pakistan test-fired Babur III and surface-to-surface ballistic missile Ababeel, these latest developments are considered as landmark contributions in the defence arrangements of Pakistan. These developments will not facilitate Pakistan to sustain the credibility of its deterrence strategy against the Indian missile program but also allow the Pakistan to neutralize the Indian BMD system.

India's Missile development has challenge the security and strategic stability of the region, influenced the nuclear postures of regional states Pakistan and China, and posed the negative implications to non-proliferation efforts. Trends have revealed that combination of India's massive capabilities: especially test of Agni V, Submarine Launch ballistic Missile (SLBM), motives to acquire Theater Missile Defence (TMD) and membership of Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) is worrisome. Through membership of the missile club, India has got access to sophisticated missile technology and under the umbrella of MTCR India will be able to export its space and missile technology to countries that adhere to the principles of missile group.

To conclude, if these trends of Indian missile program are not handled carefully, they could endanger the security of region and enhance the lethal arms race as well as will be a setback to global non-proliferation arrangements.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/06/24/implications-indias-missile-program-non-proliferation-regime/>

How the Recent NSG Plenary was Significant

Maimuna Ashraf

The twenty-seventh Plenary Meeting of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), an elite nuclear cartel to control nuclear commerce, which was held in Switzerland this month on 22 and 23 June 2017 ended inconclusively on the issue of non-NPT state's membership. India was struggling to whittle away the resistance for paving the way into the group. However, the country's print media headlines concluded the entry status as 'stalled and awaited.' The outcome of this plenary session on the enlargement of cartel's memberships does not come as a surprise because no breakthrough for India's accession to NSG was expected for foreseeable future, viewing no change in China's position and blatant slant among the members of cartel over the criteria for accepting new or Non-NPT countries into its fold. The stringent division was observed on Grossi Proposal as well, which was presented last year and showed apparent inclination in India's favor as against Pakistan. Reportedly, more than twenty states are defying US pressure currently and insisting on adopting an objective and universal criteria for inclusion of non-NPT states in the cartel. The view from Pakistan maintains that persuasive diplomatic outreach by Pakistan spread the realization on an international level about the possible repercussions of further exceptions for India. Conversely, the resilience from Indian side for NSG candidature was also manifested. However, notwithstanding U.S. efforts for India's exceptional and unconditional entry, the stalemate persists on offering an exclusive treatment to India.

So what was discussed in the recent plenary meeting and how it was significant? Other than highlighting the central role of NSG and its contribution to the international nuclear non-proliferation architecture with NPT at its center, the member states of group reassessed stock of developments since last plenary meeting. While NSG discussed the 'technical, legal and political aspects of the participation of the non-NPT states of the NSG,' eight significant issues were focused in the discussion. At first, diverse views were exchanged on the technical issues imperative for the implementation of the control lists and various proposals were considered to update the NSG control list. On next, the discussion took place to upgrade the NSG guidelines to keep pace with evolving global security landscape. Moreover, the policies regarding transparency were debated, and information was exchanged for best practices on licensing and enforcement. Also, the Participating Governments welcomed the growing number of states that have harmonized their national export control systems with the NSG guidelines and oversight lists. Lastly and more significantly, NSG relationship with India was discussed, and all aspects of the implementation of the 2008 Statement on Civil Nuclear Cooperation with India were considered. India was granted a special waiver from its rules governing civilian nuclear trade that paved the way for India-US nuclear deal. Critics argue the problem with this exceptionalism is that a lot of fissile material that is being imported extensively for India's civilian nuclear program is going into its civilian safeguarded stream and could be using for its weapon program. Consequently, there exists a big hole in India's separation plan that keeps one guessing. This is a critical issue that has also been highlighted in the recent literature, and some countries are also aware of this concern. It is also clear from the recent Belfer Center report by Mansoor Ahmed, titled "India's Nuclear

Exceptionalism” that the ability for India to import its fissile material for the civilian purpose has enabled it to use its indigenous stock of fissile material exclusively for weapon purpose. So India’s ability to increase the inventory of nuclear weapons has gone up tremendously. Akin apprehensions were raised in King’s College report titled “India’s Strategic Nuclear and Missile Programs.” This depicts that negative narrative about Pakistan as the fastest growing nuclear program is a deception and debatable. The fact of the matter is that the number of nuclear facilities and fissile material stocks in Pakistan is much lesser as compared to India’s, especially after it was given the waiver in 2008. Hence it is impossible for Pakistan to have a nuclear program that is growing faster than that of India. Consequently, the debate about India’s growing nuclear program and exceptional treatment rekindled lately and probably the issue will be discussed again in next meeting as NSG members decided to meet again to discuss the issue of non-NPT state’s candidature in November.

This is yet to see that what consensus Participating Governments will reach on the admission of new states into its fold, however, Pakistan feels encouraged by the increasing number of states supporting neutral formula and realizing Pakistan’s concerns about India’s exceptional treatment. It is hoped that NSG members would adopt impartial criteria for all non-NPT countries in future. Otherwise, another exemption for India would accelerate an arms race in the South Asian region by infuriating Pakistan to expand its nuclear capabilities and will also question international efforts to curb proliferation. To conclude, criteria-based NSG membership is a mutually beneficial proposition because it will benefit the strategic restraint, the stability in South Asia, the Non-proliferation regime, NPT, and NSG.

<http://southasiajournal.net/how-the-recent-nsg-plenary-was-significant/>

Gulf Crisis and Challenges for Pakistan

Babar Bozdar

The Gulf States including Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Yemen and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Egypt have severed its ties with the small, but oil-rich Arab state, Qatar, by accusing the later of supporting Saudi arch rival Iran and proliferating terrorism and extremism in the region. This diplomatic deadlock in Arabian Peninsula leaves hard choices for the only Muslim *de facto* nuclear state and Pakistan's neighboring country, Iran. Pakistan's rule is important in this crisis and how it will impact Pak-Qatar, Pak-Saudi and Pak-Iran relations.

Pakistan relations with Qatar

Qatar got independence from the United Kingdom on September 3, 1971. Arab states were among the first to recognize Qatar, and the country gained admittance to the United Nations and the Arab League in the same year. Soon after independence Pakistan and Qatar developed bilateral relations. Pakistan has an embassy in Doha; Qatar maintains an embassy in Islamabad and a consulate-general in Karachi. Relations between the two are shaped by Pakistan's generally close relations with the Arab world. Like other nearby Gulf States, there is a large Pakistani community in Qatar which numbers over 50,000. They work in diverse fields and send remittances each year. During the 2010 Pakistan floods, Qatar provided timely assistance to the country.

The relations between Pakistan and Qatar were deep rooted further when Pakistan signed a 15-year gas supply agreement with Qatar. Islamabad would import 3.75 million tons of liquefied natural gas (LNG) annually and add 2,000 megawatts of power to the national grid. Not only was the agreement with Qatar gas-2 – the largest LNG producer globally – going to singlehandedly almost halve the country's electricity shortfall and amount for over 85 percent of Pakistan's LNG import capacity, it also diversifies Pakistan's energy mix time-tested and the leadership and people of both brotherly Muslim countries have immense love and respect with each other as Qatar Government has played key role in providing timely assistance and rehabilitation to flood victims. People of Pakistan and Qatar are associated with each other in diversified fields, religion and both countries are enjoying cordial relations.

The deal, Pakistan's biggest, will help the country add about 2,000 megawatts of gas-fired power-generating capacity and improve production from fertilizer plants now hobbled by a lack of gas, a government official said.

Pak-Saudi Relations

Saudi Arabia and Pakistan have sought to develop extensive commercial, cultural, religious, political, and strategic relations since the establishment of Pakistan in 1947. Pakistan affirms its relationship with Saudi Arabia as their most "important and bilateral partnership" in the current foreign policy of Pakistan, by developing closer bilateral ties with Saudi Arabia, the largest country on the

Arabian peninsula and host to the two holiest cities of Islam i-e Makkah and Madina, the destinations of Muslim pilgrims.

Additionally, Pakistan maintains close military ties with Saudi Arabia, providing extensive support, arms and training for the Saudi Arabian military. Fighter Pilots of the Pakistan Air Force flew aircraft of the Royal Saudi Air Force to repel an incursion from South Yemen in 1969. In the 1970s and 1980s, approximately 15,000 Pakistani soldiers served in KSA. Saudi Arabia has negotiated the purchase of Pakistani ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads. It is also speculated that Saudi Arabia had secretly funded Pakistan's atomic bomb program and seeks to purchase atomic weapons from Pakistan to avoid possible threats posed by its regional rival Iran, Iraq and Israel. Both nations have received high-level delegations of scientists, government and Saudi military experts of seeking to study the development of a Saudi nuclear program.

Policy challenges for Pakistan

This diplomatic deadlock in Arabian Peninsula leaved hard choices for Pakistan foreign policy makers either to join KSA or satisfy Iran. The policy makers of Pakistan are pondering on hard available options.

Firstly, available options for Pakistan is to bandwagon itself with Arab states in the leadership of Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) against Qatar and invite the wrath of Iran.

Secondly, the blatant support of Arab isolated Qatar and showing soft approach for Iran can be more problematic for heterogeneous Pakistan, as its massive Sunni population and plethora of pro Saudi Wahabi leaders potentially create an internal instability by giving it the sectarian colour in the already terrorism victim country. So these horrifying consequences will not allow Pakistani policy makers to even think about on this option. Pakistan enjoys friendly relations with both Saudi Arabia and Qatar, however the diplomatic stalemate in the Gulf countries, has leaved only the hard choices for Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's present government to back either Riyadh and Doha.

The intellectuals and civil society of the country rightly demand from pro Saudi Sharif to stay practically nonaligned with Riyadh in the escalating Gulf crisis, as his unconditional support to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia could probably intensify the Sunni-Shiite conflict in already sectarian fragile South Asian nation.

Pakistan's neighbor Iran is also unhappy with Islamabad's active role in Saudi led Islamic Military Alliance (IMA) of 41 Muslim nations, in which former Chief of Pakistan army assigned a leading role. Furthermore, Tehran's Ambassador to Pakistan conveyed their grievance to Sharif government. Finally, Pakistan's civilian government and the military establishment, which enjoys a significant share of Saudi funding, Islamabad is more inclined towards Saudi Arabia. As it is noticeable that Islamabad is hardly doing anything that would be taken as support for Doha.

In short, the fresh diplomatic crisis between Riyadh and Doha may not effect Pakistan adversely soon, but Islamabad's blatant announcement of alignment with any of conflicting party will be

interpreted against by another opponent. The recently adopted neutral, unbiased approach of Pakistan can save it for time being, but the apparent fears of prolong tensions in Gulf would bring adverse consequence for Islamabad. Rationally, the fruitful diplomacy between the conflicting parties is the most viable and demanding solution of Saudi-Qatar severed relations, which Pakistan can facilitate by taking Tehran and Riyadh into confidence.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/28062017-gulf-crisis-and-challenges-for-pakistan-oped/>

CPEC and Special Economic Zones

Sadia Kazmi

Special Economic Zones or SEZs are considered significant specifically for the industrial development of a country. Industrial development provides the firm standing on which any country can hope to reap long term economic benefits. At the same time it is important that the SEZs are based on the export oriented business/trade development. SEZs are the specific regions identified and demarcated with the sole aim of bolstering economic activity. The aim is achieved through offering various incentives to the foreign investors such as tax and duty exemptions. This idea is now being practiced all across the globe in various countries and is contributing greatly to their respective economic growth.

Pakistan today, under CPEC, has entered the Industrialization phase. Even though in the past also Pakistan was mindful of establishing these zones and tried to establish the SEZs but the attempts were not particularly successful back then. Nonetheless Pakistan does already have some successful industrial clusters and estates in Sialkot: surgical goods Cluster; Gujarat: ceramic/pottery industrial cluster; Faisalabad: readymade garments manufacturing cluster; Khyber PakhtunKhwa (KPK): marble Cluster; Hattar Industrial Estate (KPK): food and beverage, textile, crockery, chemical industry; and Gujranwala: tannery/leather industrial cluster.

However this time along with the renewed conviction, Pakistan can rely on the vast personal and successful experience of China in the establishment of SEZs under the ambit of CPEC. China's own SEZs which number almost around 1800, speaks volume of its sound success in this domain. Since 1980's it has garnered enough skill, practice and knowledge of the requirements for setting up of these economic zones. Pakistan can also and must utilize this experience of China in ensuring the success of its prospective economic zones.

So far nine SEZs have been identified to be established soon. One each in Punjab, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Baluchistan and Islamabad, two in Sindh and one each in FATA, Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan. Governing structure for these zones is provided in the SEZ Act 2012 and the Board of Investment (BoI) has established "CPEC-SEZ" Cell for facilitating stakeholders on the matters relating to CPEC and Special Economic Zones. Not only can Pakistan learn greatly from China but should also focus on cultivating domestic capacity in the areas of vocational education, agriculture, water management, automobile technology, electrical appliances, and disaster management etc.

Pakistan is eventually set to embrace around 37 SEZs under CPEC. Four SEZ sites were identified in Punjab. Punjab-China Economic Zone and Quaid-i-Azam Apparel Park SEZ are in Sheikhpura while M-3 Industrial City and Value Addition City are in Faisalabad. In Balochistan, nine places were identified for SEZs: Bostan Industrial Zone, Dasht Industrial Zone, Turbat Industrial Zone, Industrial Zone at the Junction of Qilla Saifullah, Zhoband Loralai, Gwadar Industrial Estate, Lasbela Industrial Estate, Dera Murad Jamali Industrial and Trading Estate and Winder Industrial and Trading Estate.

In Sindh, four sites were identified for SEZs. These are China Special Economic Zone at Dhabeji in Thatta, China Industrial Zone near Karachi, Textile City and Marble City. Two of these projects were considered in Thatta: China Special Economic Zone, Dhabeji (priority) and Keti Bandar. The Khyber Pakhtunkhwa government requested the establishment of SEZs in 17 places under the CPEC. These include economic zone at Karak, Nowshera, Bannu, Jalozai, Rashakai, Risalpur, Chitral, Buner, Swat, Batagram, Jahangir, Mansehra and Gadoon Amazai. Others include Hattar Phase VII Industrial Zone, Ghazi Economic Zone and Gomal Economic Zone in Dera Ismail Khan. Moqpondass SEZ will be established in Gilgit-Baltistan. In Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Bhimber Industrial Zone will be the priority project while Muzaffarabad SEZ will be the alternative. In Fata, the only SEZ will be Mohmand Marble City. ICT Model Industrial Zone will be established in Islamabad while an industrial park will be developed on Pakistan Steel Mills' land in Port Qasim near Karachi.

It's a fact that at the moment Pakistan doesn't have a manpower proficient enough to operate Chinese technological tools and machineries. Also there is not yet much information available about the nature of labor that will be employed in this project. It is expected that China can provide rigorous training to the local Pakistani workforce and make them skilled enough to use the advanced technology. Not only will it generate domestic employment opportunities but will directly contribute to the sustainable development of Pakistan, which of course is one of the eventual goals of the CPEC.

Both China and Pakistan need to work towards bringing more transparency and clarity in this regard. The final framework should be based on equivalent and balanced opportunities for all the stakeholders.

Last but not the least, for these SEZs to deliver successfully it is important to have a secure foreign investment. For that purpose not only certain economic incentives are to be offered but the provision of basic utilities such as gas, water, electricity are to be ensured too. In this regard the federal governments have already agreed to supply these amenities to the economic zones. Additionally the workable environment should be made available where the security concerns should be at the minimum. The success of economic zones also depends on the socio-economic conditions of adjacent areas. In case of Pakistan, the local employment opportunities and capacity building should be the main focus that should be achieved with the mutual consultation and understanding between both China and Pakistan.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/30062017-cpec-and-special-economic-zones-sezs-oped/>

Shanghai Cooperation Organization, Belt and Road Initiative and CPEC

Adil Sivia

Pakistan's newspaper Dawn reported a detailed report of Long Term Plan on CPEC concluded in the recent OBOR Summit held in Beijing which has raised many concerns about the project. It is said, this plan is not the project document, but it delineates the aspirations of both sides. In short, it laid out associated projects which would have long-run impacts on Pakistan's surveillance, agriculture, tourism, transportation, and finance and security situations. The LTP of CPEC has following salient dimensions;

First, thousands of acres of agricultural land would be leased out to Chinese companies to set up demonstration projects ranges from irrigation technology to seed varieties.

Second, there would be a surveillance system crossing cities across the country with 24-hour video recording on roads and in market places and data will be sent to the command center.

Third, national fiber-optic would be laid for the internet traffic as well as the terrestrial distribution of broadcast television. Chinese media would cooperate with Pakistani broadcasters in the broadcasting the Chinese culture in the country.

Fourth, there would be industrial parks or special economic zones hosting Chinese firms operating in textiles and garments, cement and building materials, fertilizers and agricultural technologies.

Fifth, there would be a coastal tourism industry in the south includes cruise ports, nightlife, water sports though more work is needed to be done. Free and low-interest loans issued to Pakistan to be given out as the project gets under way.

Lastly, the plan asks for the visa-free tourism possible with China to provide more convenient policy support for Chinese tourists to Pakistan without any reciprocal arrangement for Pakistanis.

At first glance, it is little to appease Pakistan. Many see this is the China's colonialism approach towards Pakistan. Let it be clear that it is not colonialism that China cannot take over the country as stable Pakistan is very much important for China in Belt and Road Initiative. Nations cooperate with each other to pursue their national interests in this anarchical international environment so Pakistan must be aware of protecting its sovereignty and its national interests. This is an economic project started commonly with the infrastructure, energy, industry.

In the long-term the plan would be implemented as it is without devising policies by Pakistan will significantly diminish Pakistan's authority over its land and resources and would allow Chinese nearly unrestrained access to our ports and other assets. In short run, this would be an awesome concoction of capital into Pakistan but in the long term if this plan as it is implemented without

discussing in the parliament of Pakistan may be paying back more money than China is bringing into Pakistan.

Initially, this program was not talking about the agriculture, but now in this LTP report, the major portion has been discussed the agricultural field. Though everything is connected with each other as the development of infrastructure bring revolution in the agricultural technology. Many studies have been done in this regard as Woelcke's study reveals that investment in the road infrastructure reduces the cost of transportation. The improvement in the quality of the roads leads to the increment of 20 Or 35 percent in the purchasing power of the farmers according to the season. Likewise, poor infrastructure has adverse impacts on the export of agriculture output because farmers usually have low access to credit in almost all developing countries which could be a hurdle in purchasing the inputs used in farms. It is also observed that markets located at a distance are the main hurdle to use fertilizers and to sell the agricultural products. Various types of infrastructure and agricultural output growth are directly proportional. If the irrigation infrastructure is developed, the revolutionary changes in agricultural output are inevitable by enhancing the land use intensity and provide incentives to farmers to use productivity increasing inputs. Rural electrification increases the irrigated area and also irrigation facilities. Resultantly the output of crops cultivated through underground irrigation system which is always higher than those under canal or tank irrigation. Hence one could be optimistic about the CPEC project that the development of infrastructure brings revolution in agriculture technology.

So the CPEC has a direct impact on the agriculture sector also like the long term plan more talks about the agrarian economy. Mr. Ahsan Iqbal, the Project Director of CPEC, claimed on last Monday, "It is a live document, and both sides [China and Pakistan] have the understanding to modify it as per the need besides reviewing it periodically," he further mentioned that the long-term plan could not have been disclosed by Pakistani government without consulting the Chinese, he called the Dawn story "half cooked" in a race to break the news first".

Pakistan has signed some new deals of \$500 million ahead of Beijing' international forum (OBOR Summit) which has been attended by leaders from at least 29 countries to promote Xi Jinping's vision of expanding trade links.

Discussing the plan's layout to make the visa-free tourism possible with China to provide more convenient policy support for Chinese tourists to Pakistan without any reciprocal arrangement for Pakistani nationals to visit China, I must say Pakistan cannot take this enormous step as it is most affected country from terrorism, there could be more chances of infiltration of terrorist including Uyghur militants to Pakistan. Pakistan should not only rely on the foreign direct investment China but with the better security environment, it should cooperate with other countries for the direct investment like Bangladesh, etc. There is some optimism regarding the CPEC long term plan if Pakistan devises some policies if any default occurs.

<http://southasiajournal.net/there-is-no-such-thing-as-free-lunch-chinas-long-term-plan-for-pakistan/>

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles and Escalation Along LoC

Muhammad Adil Sivia

During the 17th Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) summit held in Astana, Kazakhstan on June 9, 2017, Pakistan along with India became full members of SCO. Created on 15 June 2001 in Shanghai, the main focus of the organization is countering three evils of terrorism, separatism, and extremism. The members of the group are sharing intelligence and military expertise for tackling drug trafficking and cross-border crimes in the globalized world. The presence of emerging China and resurgent Russia makes SCO a significant organization in the world politics. The expansion of SCO with the inclusion of Pakistan and India has expanded the outreach of this organization to South Asia. Full membership of SCO necessarily makes Pakistan part of the security architecture of Central Asia. Inter-regional Interaction at SCO platform will enhance the role of regional powers in creating productive ways for engagement for mutual benefit in economic and security realm.

In a globalized world and increasingly connected regions, the peaceful neighborhood is directly linked with the economic rise of countries of the region. For smooth inflow of raw materials to China and outflow of finished goods to the world, peace in its neighborhood is paramount for continued economic development in China. The real dividends of economic development can only be reaped in a peaceful environment. The SCO will provide both Pakistan and India regional cooperation platforms for economic development. The expectation from Pakistan and India by other SCO members is that both these countries will use the SCO as a platform for interaction and keep their rivalry out.

With economic rise, China is demanding a role in international politics reflective of current economic realities. Vladimir Putin has long been working for the creation of multi-polar world where Russia again becomes a significant power of the world. The convergence of interest between Russia and China is reflected in beneficial partnership in which Russia is taking the lead in engaging with countries through military industry while China is forging long-term economic partnerships. Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, while addressing the 53rd Munich Security Conference, on February 18, 2017, stated the need for developing more equitable and democratic world order. While he rejected the allegations of those who accuse Russia and the new centers of the global influence of attempting to undermine the so-called 'liberal world order,' he identified the flaws of this system which was designed as an instrument for ensuring the growth of an elite club of countries and its domination over everyone else. Russia along with rising powers in Asia has long been trying for "building a democratic and fair world order, a post-West world order, in which each country develops its sovereignty within the framework of international law, and will strive to balance their national interests with those of their partners, with respect for each country's cultural, historical and civilizational identity". He mainly tried to deliver a message to leaders from the West that power transition with the economic rise of China was inevitable in not so distant future. While China is economically developing, it's establishing long-term engagement with partner countries for mutual benefit by win-win strategy.

Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) by Chinese President Xi Jinping is strategic economic statesmanship for reordering international order through the power of economy. The Chinese vision of rising together holds great promise for developing countries facing the problems of capital shortage. The connectivity through BRI will knit the developing countries in Asia, Africa with China being the pivotal state for driving the world economy in future. The rise of China will be the rise of East. China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) has become the main corridor under BRI. Rapid completion of energy and communication projects under CPEC is promising for establishing Pakistan as state facilitating the regional trade and connectivity.

India despite Pakistan and China's offer to become part of CPEC has stayed away from China led regional connectivity initiative because CPEC violates India's sovereignty in Jammu and Kashmir. Indian stubbornness is irrational and against the United Nations Security Council resolution that accepts state of Jammu and Kashmir as disputed territory between Pakistan and India. As CPEC does not change the status of the state of Jammu and Kashmir, Indian opposition and subversive activities against the mega economic project are immensely destabilizing for economic rise of South Asia. Russia is supporting the BRI which essentially means endorsing CPEC for regional connectivity. After becoming a member of SCO, there are expectations from India that it will stop the irrational policy of opposition to CPEC and engage with China and Russia for regional connectivity through Pakistan.

<http://southasiajournal.net/shanghai-cooperation-organization-belt-and-road-initiative-and-china-pakistan-economic-corridor/>

The Gulf Crisis: An Analysis

Sadia Kazmi

The escalation of crisis in the Gulf is not a sudden development but sure is quite rapid. The cold relations between Qatar and the other three Arab states namely UAE, Saudi Arabia and Bahrain became obvious almost four years ago. Back then the world witnessed a nine month long standoff of these states against Qatar. Even though the situation apparently got normalized but the tension was building up ever since then. It is now after three years that the situation has gotten worse and has erupted into a catastrophe almost short of a war. Tensions between Qatar and Saudi Arabia began in 2016 when Qatar was the last country to condemn the Iranian attack on Saudi embassy in Iran by the protestors that took place after Saudi Arabia executed a Shia Saudi cleric. Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Egypt launched a number of attempts to prevent Qatar's cooperation with Iran. One June 4, 2017, when the attempts failed, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Bahrain announced cutting all diplomatic ties with Qatar. They even imposed sanctions on Qatar banning Qatar jets from entering the airspace or ports of Saudi Arabia and its allies. Furthermore, Saudi Arabia said that Qatar has to cut its diplomatic ties with Iran and to stop supporting the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas movement and Hezbollah. However Qatar refuses to fulfill these demands. Qatari Foreign Minister Mohamad Bin Adbu Allah Al-Thani announced that Doha refuses any intervention in its foreign affairs and ensured that Qatar can hold on forever facing the sanctions on imposed on it. Presently there have been list of demands by the Arab states to Qatar along with the deadline after which, as per their claim, the possibility of a war cannot be ruled out.

If the situation escalates any further, the obvious ramifications would be that it will not stay constrained to these major states. The intra-regional politics will invoke the external intervention. The adjacent countries will not be able to escape the inevitable politico-economic fallout. Turkey has been quite active since the very beginning of the conflict and has adopted an explicit position. It is reaching out to Qatar amidst the diplomatic isolation and providing the necessary political, diplomatic and economical aid. Iran also enjoys close relations with Qatar and has condemned the violent tones against the Arab state. Iran has cautiously stood with Qatar so far. Iran's all out support to Qatar in face of the sanctions imposed on Qatar is evident of the fact that it wants to draw Qatar in its diplomatic folds. One strong ally in the Middle East would definitely matter to Iran. Major Powers like the US and Russia have almost already been grabbed into the conflict. As far as Russia is concerned, it has adopted a neutral approach officially. But at the same time it does appear sympathetic towards Qatar. It has also managed to forge closer ties with Turkey and Iran recently. Qatar is also being demanded by the other Arab states to banish its support for Iran. At the same time Russia, Qatar and Iran contain the biggest Oil reserves of the world. Hence all these factors naturally make Russia mindful of the fact that Qatar not be diplomatically or otherwise be trampled by the regional states. Nonetheless its energy interests in the region with the other GCC states are equally important, for which Russia is trading carefully and has avoided intervening.

China has shown concerns too since most of its energy needs are met in the Middle East. Not only is it one of the biggest consumers of Doha's gas energy, but it has equally close ties with the other

GCC states too. Also it might not augur too well for China's Belt and Road Initiative. Middle East is one of the prime focuses of this plan where China has already discussed the options for Free Trade Zones. But the crisis in the region might not let the idea materialize into anything concrete. Governed strictly by its strong non interventionist ideals, China would also not physically jump into this conflict but has already conveyed its concerns towards ongoing isolation of Qatar and the possible future escalation. Role of the US is not hidden and is embroiled in a lot of controversy. Despite the presence of dormant conflict within the Middle East, the present chaotic escalation is largely being attributed to the US President Trump's visit to KSA. Not only the US openly hailed the diplomatic isolation of Qatar but in a strange turn of events it also sealed a \$12bn deal to supply F-15 fighter jets to Qatar. This bizarre dichotomy in its stance is beyond the logical reasoning. It looks like an intentional act to pit the two sides against each other. One cannot rule out the fact that the US is trying to bring the Arab Spring that began in 2010, now to its logical conclusion.

Last but not the least, a disintegrated and disheveled Middle East will impact all and carries global implications. War and bullying is no option and the major powers must play their responsible role to bring the two sides to the negotiation table and find a diplomatic solution of this situation. Staying distant and letting the Middle Eastern countries deal with the crisis on their own might not be a very wise course of action.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/06/30/gulf-crisis-analysis/>

Maligning Pakistan for Kabul Attack

Babar Bozdar

THE massive attack in diplomatic quarter of Kabul killed more than 150 people and several wounded. It raises questions on the performance of law enforcement agencies. The attack was deadliest in Afghan capital since last summer when an IS bomber killed 100 peoples in protest and one of the largest to hit Kabul since 2001 intervention. It is strange that, neither Taliban nor ISIS claimed the responsibility of terrorist attack; while it is hypothetically believed that behind this terror attack, Pakistan backed Taliban faction is responsible. This was alleged by Afghanistan's intelligence service, the directorate of national security in a press conference.

Though, Afghan intelligence agency, despite accepting their failure, labeling attack with Pakistan is against the reality. It is a fact that Pak-Afghan relations are not good. Whatever happened in Afghanistan It was blamed on Pakistan immediately without any evidences and is the common practice of Afghan officials. To prove these allegations false, I am presenting some justified arguments. The main argument is that Afghan army as well as Spy agency is incompetent. Similarly, NDS is interlinked with many terrorist groups. If they were known that, Pakistan backed terrorist groups are going to explode in the fortified area where there are numerous security check posts , then why not they were caught on these check post? Why Afghan officials didn't inform Pakistan to take stringent measures against these outfits? How the terrorist reached in such fortified area by crossing all the check post? In this regard, their silence is questionable? Pakistan rejected the baseless statement of Afghan government and hoped that Afghanistan will avoid maligning Pakistan.

The deadliest attack in Afghanistan shattered the walls of Kabul. Peoples from different walks of life condemned this heinous crime against humanity and demanded that the culprits should be behind the bars. Similarly, accusation of Pakistan is also condemned. Today Afghanistan is a staging ground and all the agencies of world are operating there. Afghanistan becomes the hub of all terrorist organizations and Pakistan is the only victim of these outfits because of negligence and ignorant behavior of current and past Afghan governments. More than 50 thousand civilians and security personals lost their lives in war against terrorism because Afghanistan exports terrorism in Pakistan.

Today, Pakistan is a front-line state in war against terrorism. As Afghanistan is victim of terrorism similarly, Pakistan has faced its spillover effects. Hence, hiding their weaknesses and accusing a responsible state is not a rational approach and continually, adopting same behavior will undermine the efforts of Pakistan in combating terrorism. As a student of strategic studies, I think that, behind this terrorist attack, the enemy of Afghanistan and Pakistan is same and is within Afghanistan. Due to bitter relations, Enemy is trying to take maximum benefit and use Afghanistan against Pakistan which is not in the favor of peace, prosperity and instability of Pakistan in general and Afghanistan in Particular. Peace in Afghanistan is a distant dream. There are many reasons behind this. Since Soviet invasion, Afghanistan always remained in state of war. The divide of political parties on the basis of stronghold and role of warlords added fuel to the flames. Moreover, Afghan administration didn't stepped back and

always expressed venom against their neighbours and well-wishers. Today peace in Afghanistan is AT stack due to their double policies. The 40 percent area of Afghanistan is still controlled by Taliban and there is Civil war like situation which has adversely affected Pakistan. Meanwhile, Pakistan is not behind any unpleasant incident happening in Afghanistan, perhaps it is their failure. Moreover labeling allegations against other countries only “signifies a tendency to externalize the internal challenges faced by Afghanistan.” The anti-Pakistan sentiments in Afghanistan are not new phenomenon but it is very old. It is very sad to say that, both Afghanistan and Pakistan governments failed in resolving their basic bilateral issues which are the cause of all problems.

An international conference was held on June 6, 2017 to sort out the political solution of lingering conflict in Afghanistan which was attended by Delegates from around two dozen countries, including the United States, Pakistan, India, China, Russia, Iran and central Asian and European countries, to discuss the current Afghan situation. A Foreign Office official said Pakistan was attending the conference as part of its consistent approach that a solution to the Afghan problem could be found through Afghan owned and Afghan led peace process. He further stated that, this accusatory approach was instigated by those who had no interest in peace and stability in Afghanistan and their malicious agenda is to damage Afghanistan-Pakistan relations and the cooperation initiatives recently gaining momentum.

Who is more benefited from the recent attack? Analysts believed that RAW is behind the Kabul attack. India is trying to kill two birds with one stone. Pakistan and Afghanistan were nearly resuming dialogue process and suddenly Kabul was attacked. As a result, once again deadlock occurs in Pak-Afghan relations. India is trying to isolate Pakistan therefore; it is using all these tactics. The enemy of Peace has succeeded in its mission but Afghanistan should think out of box and stand with Pakistan shoulder to shoulder as peace and stability could be maintained. In a nutshell, the Enemy of Pakistan and Afghanistan is same and in same shape and dress. Now it is a question that whether Afghanistan will recognize its enemy or still it will wear a mask and fire in the air without pinpointing the target?

<http://pakobserver.net/maligning-pakistan-kabul-attack/>