



STRATEGIC VISION
INSTITUTE

VISION

VISIONARY INSIGHTS INTO THE STRATEGIC INQUESTS OF NATIONS

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 2
FEBRUARY 2018

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi

Strategic Vision Institute
Islamabad

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 2
FEBRUARY 2018

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi



STRATEGIC VISION
I N S T I T U T E

Strategic Vision Institute (SVI)

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

Strategic Vision Institute (SVI)

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

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

SVI Foresight

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

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Editor’s Note | 1 |
| India’s Unmanned Armed Vehicles (UAV) Capabilities | |
| Ahyousha Khan | 3 |
| India’s Quest for Ballistic Missile Defence Shield | |
| Qura tul ain Hafeez | 5 |
| A Vacuum Russia Finds Hard to Fill | |
| Babar Ali | 7 |
| Trump’s State of the Union Address and Pakistan | |
| Ubaid Ahmed | 9 |
| A Look at Yemen Conflict | |
| Nisar Ahmed..... | 11 |
| Dynamics of Kashmir Conflict | |
| Asma Khalid..... | 13 |
| India’s Nuclear Program and Non-Proliferation Regime | |
| Beenish Altaf | 15 |
| Pakistan and Non-Proliferation Treaty: Concerns and Challenges | |
| Asma Khalid..... | 17 |
| CPEC: Conflict Management | |
| Qura tul ain Hafeez | 19 |
| Nuclear Deterrence and Doctrines in South Asia | |
| Ahyousha Khan | 21 |
| Crisis in Turkey-US Relations | |
| Nisar Ahmed..... | 23 |
| Growing Employment Opportunities under CPEC | |
| Sadia Kazmi | 25 |
| Pakistan: Condemning Indo-US Belligerence | |
| Ubaid Amed | 27 |
| Pak-Russia Defence Ties: A Paradigm Shift in Defence Cooperation | |
| Babar Ali | 29 |

CPEC and National Development

Sadia Kazmi 31

JCPOA and IAEA Verification

Beenish Altaf 33

Editor's Note

SVI Foresight for the month of February touches upon some extremely significant issues. An insightful take on India's nuclear program and its impact on the non-proliferation regime lets the reader know how the Indian nuclear program is taking full advantage of the 2008 Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) decision under the US initiative to exempt New Delhi from the restrictions on the supply of nuclear fuel and equipment to non-NPT countries. In this regard, the Indo-US civil nuclear agreement is an active exemplar that is undermining the global non-proliferation regime. Another article further elaborates on the same debate and looks at the challenges and concerns that Pakistan tends to face in the context of non-proliferation treaty as both Pakistan and India are facing international pressure to join the NPT. The treaty itself is quite discriminatory as it divides the states into NWS and NNWS. The writer in this article raises pertinent questions as to why the reason and motive for the NNWS to defend them are any less significant than those of the NWS. Hence why should the pressure be on the NNWS only? The credibility of the NNWS was being doubted by the very same states who themselves were guilty of lapses in their own security systems as well as nuclear arms buildup; US and USSR Cold War incidents like Cuban missile crisis. How can one be sure that the history would not repeat itself? If the international security could be endangered once it could be brought to that point again. The readers will find the analysis engaging and quite apt. Similarly, the state of nuclear deterrence and doctrines in South Asia has been examined in another article included in this issue. While it is believed that there could be many reasons behind the pursuit of nuclear weapons, but nuclear deterrence vis-à-vis one's enemy is and has always been the main reason motivating enough to build nuclear weapons. The writer convincingly maintains that deterrence enables two nuclear rivals to avoid war due to fear of unacceptable damage to one's vital interests. It relies upon the understanding of the threat from nuclear weapons in case of an attack. The application of this idea is evaluated in the South Asian setting.

The changing international political environment brings forth the emergence of crisis in Turkey-US relations. The same has been commented upon in yet another article. The decades long partnership of the US with one of its major NATO allies, i.e. Turkey, has been under serious

strain for some time now due to growing divergence in policies and collision of interests of the two countries in the conflict ridden geopolitical landscape of the Middle East. The readers will find this article quite informative with strong analysis elaborating on various dimensions of the emerging rift between the two allies. Another article sheds light on the increasingly improved relations between Russia and Pakistan specifically in terms of defence cooperation. While the other commentary included in this issue of the SVI Foresight sketches a detailed overview of growing tensions in Pak-US relations. It is interesting to see that Pakistan is able to condemn the Indo-US belligerence for its national security and sovereignty. Indian atrocities in occupied Kashmir have also been addressed in yet another article. February is the month when Pakistan observes Kashmir day in solidarity with the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The readers will find this article timely and informative. Furthermore, the CPEC is opening new vistas of development within Pakistan hence there is a need to address any hindrance or possible conflicting situations. The same has been suggested in an article where the conflict management related to the CPEC project has been effectively proposed through various possible options. One can stay hopeful that the CPEC will truly be a game changer, positively contributing to all the development sectors of Pakistan and ultimately improving its socio-economic credentials in the region as well as at the global level.

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

India's Unmanned Armed Vehicles (UAV) Capabilities

Ahyousha Khan

Technology has made it possible for humans to inflict wrath, fire, and fury with bullets and firepower without even being physically present. Unmanned Armed Vehicles (UAV) is one such invention that gets the credit for relieving the human generation from facing the direct impact of their doings. However, simultaneously it is humans who should be credited for their invention that saved them the inconvenience of experiencing bullets and firepower.

In the 21st century, war fighting and intelligence gathering techniques have changed a lot. Now many countries are using UAV technology for intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, target acquisition and target destruction. Even in an underdeveloped region like South Asia, UAV or Drone is not some alien word. South Asia became accustomed to this technology due to its use by the US in War on Terrorism. Now both major arms race competitors (India-Pakistan) in South Asia possess this technology. Nonetheless, due to the strict international arms control mechanism, the acquisition of this technology is not an easy path.

However, Indian accession to Arms Control and Non-proliferation regimes in last two years will bring significant changes in the development of UAV technology in South Asia. One fact to reckon here is that UAV is dual-use technology and its export protocol is strictly followed under the guidelines of Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) and Wassenaar Arrangement. If general arms race pattern of South Asia is to be analyzed, it is India that leads and Pakistan follows to avoid security dilemma. With Indian accession into the MTCR and Wassenaar Arrangement now all kind of dual-use technologies will be accessible to it. Both these regimes control technologies including space satellites, sophisticated cameras, and drone technologies. MTCR and Wassenaar Arrangement forbid its members from the spread of dual-use technologies, hence India to gain access to both regimes agreed to utilize these technologies only for its domestic military requirements.

Moreover, India's official Joint Force Military Doctrine's obsession with the Surgical Strikes indicates that India will opt for the means that will facilitate such strikes. As it will be impossible for India to send troops across the working boundary or LOC, so to put practicality into its plan Drones are quite a viable option. The reason behind acceleration in India's UAV capability is the hawkish attitude of the Indian establishment. As Modi-Doval Doctrine wants India to have a hard power that could be used even against sub-conventional threats (cross-border terrorism) when times call for it.

India is not new to UAV technology as for quite some time India is operating Israeli Searcher and Heron Drones for not only command, control and communications but for intelligence, reconnaissance and target acquisition. Previously used drones by India's armed forces didn't have the capability to fire a missile. Thus, to change this predicament, India developed a Medium Altitude, Long Endurance (MALE) drone with the ability to fire a missile, known as Rustom 1. The missile Rustom 1 is integrated with locally developed anti-tank missile HELINA, which depicts the anti-armor capabilities. So far this drone is paired with Indian Navy, and Rustom II is also under development for Indian Naval forces.

In the century of communication network and satellites, every single technology relates to the other. Indian Satellite Based Augmentations (SABS) are not only satellite systems for local communications but they would strengthen UAVs capability to receive refined signals for precision vertical guidance to assist planes in a safe landing. Satellite capabilities are the key to better UAV technologies. Indian SAB systems would enable its UAVs to operate over a larger area and will navigate them to return. Also, Indian Army is launching designated military satellites that are enabling its UAV program.

As for now only Indian Navy possess locally build missile carrier drone, but the stage is all set for Indian land forces to acquire their UCAVs. With its increased power and access to more resources, Indian UCAV will become more stealthy and lethal.

Pakistan which is mostly a reluctant follower in South Asian arms race needs to focus on the technology that is necessary to run UAVs, which is the satellite system of its own. Pakistan's Buraq and its missile BARQ are extraordinary achievements considering Pakistan's technological and economic restrains. But, in the long run without its military and communication satellite, C4ISR and ISTAR programs cannot enter into the next phase.

<http://southasiajournal.net/indias-unmanned-armed-vehicle-uav-capabilities/>

India's Quest for Ballistic Missile Defence Shield

Qura tul ain Hafeez

A Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD) system is a system that defends any country against possible incoming missile threat. It intercepts targets and destroys enemy missile enroute. A BMD missile flights through three phases: boosts, mid-course and terminal. Usually, the radar of the BMD missile intercepts the missile from the opponent's side, then tracks the target through command and control system and finally fires the interceptor missile from the launcher truck. Other countries that have advanced missile system include the US, Russia, Israel, and China. The leading BMD systems in the world are Patriot Advanced Capability-3, THAAD, S-400 Triumph and S-500. India with its aspirations for regional dominance has been trying to develop an indigenous (BMD) system since the late 90s with the start of Integrated Guided Missile Development Program (IGMDP).

The Indian BMD programme is structured as a two-tiered system with Prithvi Air Defence (PAD) for high altitude interception and Advanced Air Defence (AAD). PAD is a two-stage missile: a solid-fuel motor and liquid fuel propeller. It works with the inertial guidance navigation system with mid-course updates from the Long-Range Tracking Radar (LRTR) and active radar homing in the terminal phase. Moreover, PAD is also capable of tracking 200 targets at a range of 600 km, with a maximum interception altitude of 80 km in exo-thermic-in space range.

In its quest for acquiring the Missile Defence System (MDS), India has developed Ballistic Missile System that could intercept missiles in not only endo-atmosphere, i.e., within the earth's atmosphere, but can also intercept in the exo-atmosphere. However, this advancement of Indian BMD and Air Defence System (ADS) is not merely the fruits of Indian efforts. Countries like Russia, Israel, and the US helped India while providing it with access to sophisticated technology to advance its MDS. Recently India plans to buy 131 surface-to-air missiles from Israel at the cost of US\$70 million (\$\$93 million), as per the Indian Defence Ministry press release issued on 2nd January 2018. The BARAK missiles made by Israel's Rafael Advanced Defence Systems are to be used aboard India's first locally built aircraft carrier, the INS Vikrant, which is under construction. Previously in April 2017 India and Israel signed a deal worth around US\$2 billion which includes medium-range surface-to-air missiles. Israel has become a major defense supplier to India, selling an average of US\$1 billion worth of military equipment each year.

Moreover, not only relying on Israeli missiles, but India also signed an inter-governmental agreement with Russia for the purchase of the S-400s in October 2016. The estimated worth of the contract is US\$ 4.5 billion. The S-400 is technologically one of the most advanced Missile Air Defence System in the world. The S-400 system is armed with the capacity which enables it to engage with the stand-off jammer and Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft including both ballistic and cruise missiles.

India has been briefed about the Patriot III under the long-term strategic partnership with the US. It was also the view of the analyst that India might buy Patriot III from the US. But the matter of the fact is that how many systems India will acquire for its Ballistic Missile Defence Shields (BMDS) because no Ballistic Missile (BM) can guarantee 100 percent interception and destruction of an incoming missile.

Although India is learning about the new technologies for the creation of its BMDS its previous record of building the indigenous weapon system is not very encouraging. The best examples are the failed Arjun Main Battle Tank (MBT), the rejected Indian New Small Arms System (INSAS) rifle, and most recently Indian indigenously built SSBN Arihant which went critical twice. Although Indian BMDS is particularly designed against Pakistan however, alternatively it would not be wrong to say that India might not be able to defend itself from Pakistan's missiles. Petr Topychkanov, a senior researcher at the Carnegie Moscow Centre's Non-Proliferation Programme, says "despite heavy investments in developing anti-ballistic missile systems, India may not be able to fully defend itself in a conflict from strikes by Pakistani missiles." This is true that India has been signing defense deals of millions of US dollars with Israel and it aims to acquire S-400 from Russia as well. It lacks a sophisticated BMD system which could defend it from incoming Ababeel Multiple Independent Reentry Targetable Vehicles (MIRV) of Pakistan.

Subsequently, Indian Ballistic missile system will give a false sense of security. Already according to a rough estimate South Asian region has one-third of the total world's ballistic missile capability. In such a complex and volatile environment, India's quest for BMDS will lead India with a false sense of security and might compel India to go for a nuclear first strike. Hence such a scenario undermines the strategic stability of the whole region.

<http://southasiajournal.net/indias-quest-for-ballistic-missile-defence-shield/>

A Vacuum Russia Finds Hard to Fill

Babar Ali

In the wake of Trump's endless tirade against Pakistan, Russia provided explicit gestures of support in favour of Pakistan. In August 2017, Russian Presidential Envoy to Afghanistan Zamir Kabulov censured Trump's South Asia strategy and insisted that Islamabad is 'a key regional player to negotiate with. Putting pressure (on Pakistan) may seriously destabilise the region-wide security situation and result in negative consequences for Afghanistan'.

The US strategy against Pakistan has created an opportune vacuum for Russia to reshuffle the positions of its strategic allies in its favour. The growing fissures between the US and Pakistan provide Russia with a golden opportunity to strengthen its multifarious ties with Pakistan and thereby to further expand its influence in the region and beyond. History is a testament to the fact that such opportunities become available to states once in a decade or perhaps centuries and those nations which only focus on immediate needs at the cost of geostrategic and long-term objectives miss such opportunities.

In this respect, Pakistan figures as a key regional player that can be detected on Russia's radar for regional alliances. Donald Trump stated that 'The United States has foolishly given Pakistan more than 33 billion dollars in aid over the last 15 years, and they have given us nothing but lies and deceit, thinking of our leaders as fools'. After Trump's unabated anti-Pakistan policy statements, Pakistan axiomatically finds itself in the unquestioning need of alternative and virtually equal powerful ally. The situation potentially brings a series of opportunities for Russia: to enhance its regional influence, to get active engagements in South Asia, to expand and consolidate its alliance and to gain economic benefits by the substantial symbiosis with Pakistan.

While Russia-Pakistan full-scale military cooperation gives the appearance of close and stable relations between the two, on the contrary, it has camouflaged poor economic interdependence and a lack of strategy for bilateral cooperation.

However, there are concerns that these opportunities will only bring short-term gains with no long-term strategic outcomes for both Russia and Pakistan. There are multiple factors which support the fact that both countries will have to put serious efforts for long-term strategic outcomes.

Russia seems unclear and reluctant to fill the vacuum. There could be various reasons. To start with, due to uneasy economic situations in both countries, they have limited resources for mutual investments and joint business projects.

The second reason for concern is Russia's virtually non-transparent and unpredictable moves towards Pakistan. Under the third president Dmitry Medvedev (2008-2012), Russia's policy toward Islamabad was transparent. In 2008, Russia's Foreign Policy Concept declared Pakistan as one of the key regional powers that Russia intended to develop relations with on bilateral and multilateral levels.

Putin's return to the Kremlin in 2012 led to changes in Russia's policy in South Asia. It seemed to be less transparent and predictable. The first indication of this was a short notice cancellation of the Dushanbe Four summit in Islamabad in 2012 due to President Putin's inability to visit Pakistan. Shortly after that, this platform ceased to exist. After that, combined military exercises of Russia and Pakistan in 2016 provided a much-needed spark to the bilateral relations. The helicopter deals and second friendship military exercise in 2017 are significant additions to cooperation. However, these developments do not appear enough to detect the exact or explicit position of Pakistan in Russia's foreign policy framework.

While Russia-Pakistan full-scale military cooperation gives the appearance of close and stable relations between the two, on the contrary, it has camouflaged poor economic interdependence and a lack of strategy for bilateral cooperation. These ambiguous developments and lack of clear policy towards Pakistan indicate that the vacuum is hard to be filled by Russia. There is hardly any mention of the current policy.

Russia and Pakistan should focus on less visible, but more critical fields of partnership to start with, formulating the roadmap for bilateral relations and facilitating trade between them. A trusted partnership with both India and Pakistan is possible only if Russia realizes and articulates their independent value for itself, makes its policy South Asia-oriented, protects its ties with India and Pakistan from the third countries' influence, and avoids U-turns and any unpredictability in its regional strategy.

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/199423/vacuum-russia-finds-hard-fill/>

Trump's State of the Union Address and Pakistan

Ubaid Ahmed

There's a stark difference between the Twitter and the teleprompter rendition of Trump's policy. President Trump's persistence in his State of the Union address that Congress pass laws to guarantee that "American foreign-assistance dollars always serve American interests, and only go to America's friends" may not be as artless as it appears.

However, to the extent one recalls, Americans have always offered help and given the premiums to serve American interests only.

Notwithstanding the past couple of months, both Pakistan and the US walked a diplomatic tight rope. As the dust was yet to settle, there came a tweet from Trump at the very onset of the New Year, where he threatened to cut the aid to Pakistan for purportedly deceiving the US and offering little or no help in its chase against the terrorist's 'safe havens'. Trump's Afghanistan policy is distinct from that of Bush and Obama's, for Trump has started seeing Pakistan as a contributor to the elements that keep the US entangled in Afghanistan. In other words, Trump sees Pakistan as part of the problem rather than solution.

In his maiden State of the Union address, the US president asserted that in future 'foreign assistance will go to America's friends only'. Though the president made no mention of Pakistan in his talk yet examined Afghanistan imbroglio in detail saying 'our military is no longer undermined by artificial timelines, and we no longer tell our enemies our plans'.

Trump also asserted the need to keep the nation safe from terrorist activities. He announced that he had formally crossed out Barack Obama's arrangement to close the detention facility at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba. "We must be clear," he said. "Terrorists are not merely criminals. They are unlawful enemy combatants. And when captured overseas, they should be treated like the terrorists they are." He additionally called for Congress to sanction 'all necessary power' for the US to detain "terrorists" caught abroad.

Now the things obvious are, Trump is also changing the gears in Afghanistan as he enters his second year in the office. Thousand more advisers will be sent to help Afghan security forces. A year ago, the Pentagon had already started sending extra 3,000 troops to Afghanistan, raising the US force strength to 14,000 troops. Likewise, the rules of engagement have already been altered, thus allowing greater offensive air strikes against Taliban. Extensive drone strikes inside Pakistan to target terrorist sanctuaries are also on a rise.

Moreover, according to the most recent report by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Construction (SIGAR) to the US congress, the Taliban fighters whom the US led forces have spent billions of dollars trying to defeat, are now openly active in 70 percent of the Afghanistan. This clearly shows the utter failure of Afghan and the coalition forces in the region.

Now the questions that arise here are, if all the above don't represent any shift in the strategy, what does?

Similarly, whence the President avowed that the American future assistance is not meant for enemies was he referring to Pakistan?

Likewise, does Trump's call for authorisation of 'all necessary powers' for the US to detain terrorists who are caught abroad hints a probable unilateral action by the US?

To conclude, these all are the questions that need to be answered well in time, for Trump has already started the year with a bang and is also quite likely that he may end it in a whimper.

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/199849/trumps-state-union-address-pakistan/>

A Look at Yemen Conflict

Nisar Ahmed

In a latest twist in the ongoing Yemen civil war, forces loyal to President Abdrabbuh Mansur Hadi, backed by Saudi-led coalition and Southern separatists backed by United Arab Emirates (UAE) have turned against each other thereby exposing the fragility of the coalition against Houthis and differences between Saudi Arabia and the UAE. This also exposes the ill-informed US approach towards Yemen where it backs the Saudi-led coalition against Houthis. The US obsession with Iran has blinded it to see the complex dynamics of Yemen conflict.

The latest clashes erupted on 28th January after the expiry of a deadline set by the separatist Southern Transitional Council (STC) for a cabinet reshuffle, including the removal of Prime Minister Ahmed bin Daghar. This infighting between the allies demonstrates the futility of the disastrous and costly military approach adopted by the Saudi-led coalition which is backed by the US, UK and France in terms of providing weapons, intelligence sharing etc.

The immediate roots of the current conflict in Yemen can arguably be traced back to 2011, when disillusioned with long-held authoritarian regimes and dictatorships, people resorted to protests and strikes in several states in the Middle East and North Africa Region, which came to be known as Arab Spring or Arab Uprising. Yemen was not exception to the popular uprisings. Protests erupted against the high unemployment, poor economic conditions, and widespread corruption that affected much of the country. The protests soon escalated to demand the removal of President Abdullah Saleh, who had been ruling the country for more than 30 years, first in the North Yemen and then over the entire country after unification in 1990.

However, as the pressure mounted, Saleh had to transfer power to his Vice President, Abdrabbuh Mansur Hadi in November 2011. The National Dialogue Conference envisioned and established as a part of the transition agreement failed to address the grievances of the revolution period and bring together the diverse political, religious, and tribal groups to work together to rebuild the governmental structures due to elitist and non inclusive character of the entire process.

In the time following the NDC, political infighting continued and most Yemenis did not feel that the Hadi had greatly improved their situation. Hadi Government's failure to provide security and basic goods compelled the Houthis, the Southern secessionist movement, and some youth groups to officially reject the GCC-brokered peace deal. Also, they increasingly felt unrepresented in the political process.

As popular political dissatisfaction grew in Sana'a, former President Saleh re-entered the political arena and instituted a pragmatic alliance with the Houthis in the hope of consolidating power to regain political control. When President Hadi proposed a new draft constitution in 2014, Houthis launched anti-government protests and mounted a military takeover of Sana'a backed by Saleh's strategic logistical support, vast patronage networks, and additional fighting forces. They also took control of the presidential palace in January 2015, installed themselves as an interim government, and

placed Hadi under house arrest, where he issued his resignation. About one month later, Hadi escaped and fled to Aden where he rescinded his resignation and denounced the Houthi takeover. As the Houthi movement pushed increasingly southward towards Aden, President Hadi fled to neighboring Saudi Arabia.

From Saudi Arabia, he formed an anti-Houthi coalition with support from Western and GCC allies to counter the Houthi advance. Backed by nine other, mostly Arab states, Saudi Arabia launched a disastrous indiscriminate military campaign after the Houthi capture of a strategic military base north of Aden on March 25, 2015.

This is generally considered the starting point of the current Yemen war. The Saudi-led assault has largely consisted of aerial strikes on indiscriminate or disproportionately civilian targets, naval blockades, and deployment of ground forces to areas of strategic importance, such as airports and seaports. The Houthis, in turn, have engaged in heavy ground fighting, laid extensive land mines, and launched indiscriminate rockets into populated areas as they push to establish de facto control of Yemen's main population centers. Both groups are responsible for extensive human rights violations.

Currently, Hadi's political base is fast fracturing as Southern separatists challenge the legitimacy and viability of his rule and demand the restoration of independent status of South Yemen that existed till 1990. It is noteworthy that Southern leaders had initially exchanged their support against the Houthis for patronage in Hadi's government. Many of these southern militias have also been trained and funded by the United Arab Emirates ostensibly to counter violent extremist organizations. However, they are growing weary of the instability and have renewed calls for southern secession. Massive demonstrations in Aden and renewed calls for southern secession challenge the Houthis and the Hadi government in the wake of continued instability, perceived economic and political marginalization.

The southern separatist movement which has gained momentum recently has critical influence on the conflict dynamics in the south. As more influential parties promulgate in Yemen, it complicates the ability of any political solution to entice all parties and permeate to local communities. It is thus need of the hour that international community and the major stakeholders of the Yemen conflict revisit their respective approaches which are largely characterized by militarism, political expediency, and misinformation of the various tribal, regional and sectarian dynamics of the Yemen conflict.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2018/02/13/look-yemen-conflict/>

Dynamics of Kashmir Conflict

Asma Khalid

Ever since the creation of Pakistan and the ensuing problem of accession of the Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir, the Kashmiri people have been suffering under the unjust Indian occupation. Despite India's military and political manoeuvres in the occupied Kashmir, the majority of the local population has been demanding its right to fair plebiscite and has been firmly disseminating the same demand at every local and international forum.

With the Kashmir issue remaining unsolved on the UN agenda for decades, the insignificant response of the world community, insularity of international organisations and India's consistent evasion of dialogue, the indigenous movement in Kashmir seems to have fallen into a stalemate internationally.

The UNSC resolutions have recognised the right of the people of the state of Jammu and Kashmir to decide their own future through a process of self-determination which allows them to exercise their will through transparent and free plebiscite held under the supervision of the United Nation's observers. India's government officials and representatives in the UN agreed to hold plebiscite for final solution. Later, India followed the delaying tactics with regards to holding the plebiscite and now India has stepped back from its initial commitment that it gave to the people of Jammu and Kashmir and to the international community at the United Nations.

India is pursuing the policy of violence and brutal suppression of Kashmiri people by using massive scale violence as a tool to force people to accept India's illegal occupation of the state. According to various reports, five Kashmiri youth were killed by Indian security forces in Ganawpora area of Shopian District on February 2, 2018. . The basic right to live a prosperous life is being challenged by India; therefore killing of innocent Kashmiri people underscores the ongoing genocide in Kashmir.

Indian Defence Minister George Fernandes openly threatened Pakistan regarding AJK and GB, claiming these areas as integral part of India along with IOK. Unfortunately, the distrust further increased after high profile ceasefire violations were reported comprising massive exchange of fire at the LOC between India and Pakistan. Frequent border clashes between India-Pakistan have further collapsed the peace talks between the two while several troops and civilians of both states have been killed during the heavy exchange of fire.

Notwithstanding, currently there is a sheer stalemate between India and Pakistan in terms of negotiations and the whole international community is maintaining the silence thus allowing the status quo to prevail. The criminal silence of the United Nations and international community towards the human rights violations and sufferings of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is humanity matter of shame for the whole world. Though, Indian brutal repression and tragic silence of international community has been counterproductive and the whole Kashmir has been united under the call for right of self-determination. It is noteworthy that Kashmiris don't have a sovereign window but Pakistan.

Pakistanis are much successful in the context of Kashmir for they really didn't allow the issue to fade through diplomatic and political strategy.

Kashmir issue acquires a growing significance when in the backdrop of nuclearisation of South Asia, a handful of Indian lobbyists overemphasize the issue by terming it as a possible “nuclear flashpoint” in South Asia. It is important to note that the elements of strategic stability are gaining strength in South Asian region. Though in the light of atomic weapons, the perils of an armed conflict are more serious and alarming, but strategic stability and deterrence equilibrium have played a key role in reducing the chances of an armed conflict during the times of heightened tensions e.g. parliamentary attacks of 2001-2002, Mumbai terrorist attacks of 2008, violations of cease fire agreement and Indian fabricated claims of the surgical strikes.

Another dimension of the issue is that India is following the policy of presenting Kashmiri people as terrorists and Pakistan as a terrorist country. Nonetheless, the right of self-determination must not be coupled with terrorism. Pakistan should not withdraw from its principle stance of the right of Kashmiris for self-determination. So question arises that in the renewed circumstances what should be Pakistan's course of action about Indian Occupied Jammu and Kashmir in the light of new developments?

First, the strategy to resolve the Kashmir issue is through 'self-determination'. Second, Pakistan should revisit its strategy as the world does not run on fair play. Third, it is imperative for Pakistan to support the Kashmir cause on all forums as Kashmiris require more support from Pakistan. Fourth, international community should break its silence and must avoid its selective condemnation. Fifth, along with the political dimension to the Kashmir conflict there is a strong need to work on the economic dimension of the issue for the development and prosperity of Kashmiri people.

To conclude, there is no denying of the fact that although a number of threats and challenges are attached with the Kashmir conflict, but the goal of security and stability in the region largely depends upon the resolution of Kashmir dispute in accordance with the wishes of the Kashmiri people.

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/202007/dynamics-kashmir-conflict/>

India's Nuclear Program and Non-Proliferation Regime

Beenish Altaf

The Indian nuclear programme is taking full advantage of the 2008 Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) decision under the US initiative to exempt New Delhi from the restrictions on the supply of nuclear fuel and equipment to non-NPT countries. The Indo-US civil nuclear agreement is an active exemplar in this regard that undermines the global non-proliferation regime.

In this regard, India has claimed that it has a clean non-proliferation record and that it should be included in nuclear mainstream countries by making it part of the NSG. However, it is evident that India's non-proliferation record does not meet the international standards for it to qualify.

It has been said a lot in the past nuclear suppliers groups' debates that India's first nuclear test was actually a device derived from Canadian and US' exports, designated purely for peaceful purposes. That test stimulated the US and several other countries to create the NSG and to restrict global nuclear trade more severely.

It is a well-known fact that India's nuclear programme is plutonium-based mainly. Its uranium reserves are apparently shown to be low for civil nuclear usage and are actually low for military usage. The trend of nuclear deals with India, set-in mainly by the US, though for its own interest, has and will further overwhelm India with uranium reserves. India's civil nuclear programme will not only benefit out of it but will also keep extensive amounts of uranium for its growing nuclear weapons programme.

Although it is true that even the smallest nuclear arsenal requires a great deal of confidentiality and ambiguity, the absence of information about India's nuclear programme has opened space for considerable speculation by observers, including in academic circles, both in India and abroad.

Some of that speculation is informed, while much is extrapolated from scant statements made by current and former Indian officials. Some of the recent commentaries on India's changing nuclear strategy must be seen in this context. Gen Bipin Rawat, Indian army Commander-in-Chief, in an interview acknowledged that the Cold Start doctrine exists for conventional military operations. He is the first senior Indian official, military or civilian, to do so as all former Indian chiefs have avoided using the term Cold Start and preferred calling it as a 'proactive strategy'.

However, it is essential to bring to light what we know about India's nuclear strategy or intentions. In this regard, a special study has been carried out at the Belfer Centre by John Carlson titled India's Nuclear Safeguards: Not Fit for Purpose. It accounts that currently, the Nuclear Suppliers Group is considering India's application for membership.

In this context, the NSG members are reportedly discussing membership criteria for states not a party to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, including a requirement for clear and strict separation of current and future civilian nuclear facilities from non-civilian nuclear facilities.

In this write-up, the author examines India's Separation Plan and safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and shows that they do not meet this standard. The current arrangements create an unverified grey zone between military and civilian material and are not sufficient to verify that India is not using the safeguarded material to benefit military purposes. In light of these deficiencies, it seems unlikely that there will be a consensus within the NSG to admit India unless the separation plan and the agreement are amended.

There are three major problems in the India-IAEA agreement. Firstly, the safeguarded plutonium can be substituted with unsafeguarded plutonium of lower isotopic quality; secondly, the safeguarded nuclear material can be used in facilities in the unsafeguarded programme; and thirdly, the safeguarded material can be used with unsafeguarded material. Today, it is clear that several provisions in this agreement can no longer be considered appropriate. This could also be the case for INFCIRC/66-type agreements applying in other non-NPT states.

The above would likewise have implications for Pakistan, which has raised concern about the strategic threat posed by India's unsafeguarded materials and facilities and is also seeking to join the NSG. It needs to create a transparent and verifiable separation between the civilian and military nuclear materials and activities in India and to protect the integrity of IAEA safeguards.

<https://dailytimes.com.pk/203369/indias-nuclear-programme-non-proliferation-regime/>

Pakistan and Non-Proliferation Treaty: Concerns and Challenges

Asma Khalid

In the contemporary security environment one of the predominant challenges to the world peace and security is the spread of nuclear weapons. The Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), since its inception, is considered as universal arms control agreement, which has been adhered to by all states except India, North Korea, Pakistan, Israel and North Sudan.

Nuclear non-proliferation regime today faces various threats from the rising security dilemmas in the global arena. Thus in the light of such challenges, international norms have been established to fight the rising threats. NPT being the penumbra of the NPR has enrooted itself in the international law and is working towards gaining universality.

Numerous obstacles have been faced by the treaty along its course of existence despite which it has managed to strengthen the international security environment bring a global order. The validity of nuclear non-proliferation treaty is being challenged by continued defiance of the states; due to the states own national interests in anarchical international security environment. Additionally, discriminatory approach by major powers in the implementation of the standards of the Non-Proliferation Regime i.e. as Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), Nuclear Supplier Group and Wassaner Arrangements (WA) are employed as an instrument to fulfill the strategic objectives of great-power. The proliferation record in the last few decades has raised questions about the sincerity behind its creation and subsequent application. Such as, since the first nuclear explosion, eight states have detonated the nuclear bomb. This factor shows that nuclear proliferation mechanisms are relatively inadequate to handle prevailing challenges as the suspected cases of nuclear proliferation.

The present scenario regarding the effectiveness of the non-proliferation treaty and its validity today is yet another issue which is being debated on. Whether it should be altered or continue to be as it is? It came into force in 1970 and the world is a more complex place with even more impeding issues than before. In order to enhance its influence and bring under its umbrella those countries that have refused to sign it or have gone against it as NPT has to be amended to some extent in order to fully address their security dilemmas.

Apart from that the discriminatory nature of the treaty by dividing the sates into NWS and NNWS stirs up question like why are other states being deprived of the right to protect themselves for the same reasons that the NWS were doing so. The credibility of the NNWS was being doubted by the very same states who themselves were guilty of lapses in their own security systems as well as nuclear arms buildup; US and USSR Cold War incidents like Cuban missile crisis. Who was to say that history would not repeat itself? If the international security had been endangered once it could be brought to that point again.

In South Asia, Pakistan and India are facing international pressure to join the NPT. Nuclear weapon capabilities and developments are the matter of global concern due to their catastrophic

implications. Primarily, technical assistance of the US to India and Indo-US nuclear deal are considered a violation of article I and II of the NPT. Because acceptance of the obligation set a legal limit on future nuclear weapon cooperation with the .S and Non-NPT state as it undermines the vital purpose of NPT to prevent the nuclear proliferation. Furthermore, India-specific exemption to NSG guidelines and its potential inclusion in Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), and membership of Missile Technology Control Regime is disturbing the regional nuclear deterrence equilibrium. As well as forcing Pakistan to indulge in a nuclear arms and missile race to ensure credible deterrence, it is posing serious challenges to the non-proliferation regime. Similarly, country-specific safeguards demonstrate a discriminatory institutional mechanism of the non-proliferation regime and undermine the non-proliferation objectives. Additionally, the Indo-US nuclear deal may encourage the NPT signatory to defy the treaty under the Article X of the NPT, in order to pursue their national interests.

Thus in the light of the trends and challenges faced by the non-proliferation regime it cannot be concluded whether NPR is a failed regime or not. But the future of NPT is dependent on the series of events such as US-North Korea negotiations, India's membership to the NSG, the Indo-US deal and US-Iran deal. Due to these challenges, NPT and Non-Proliferation regimes are extensively seen in distress and Pakistan has repeatedly refused to sign the treaty. The prevailing security landscape and National Security issues demand a non-discriminatory, viable and effective mechanism to resolve the challenges to nuclear non-proliferation efforts.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2018/02/26/pakistan-non-proliferation-treaty-concerns-challenges/>

CPEC: Conflict Management

Qura tul ain Hafeez

CPEC is a great opportunity to enhance Pakistan's economy. The new commercial and economic businesses nevertheless encompass certain security issues pertaining to the development and implementation of the new projects under the Long-Term Projects (LTP – 2018 to 2030). These challenges and threats are internal as well as external. As far as the internal security issues are concerned, Pakistan is facing the brunt of the extremism and terrorism. Baluchistan is considered as the most sensitive province in this regard. It is the largest province of Pakistan according to its area and the smallest in terms of population. When measured against socio economic standings of other provinces, Baluchistan is the least developed. Its society is still plagued with tribal structures. Although the province is rich in resources, but insufficiency of capital and absence of skilled population is hindrance in utilizing those resources to the maximum. CPEC is an opportunity for improving the economic and security situation of Baluchistan province. It not only connects China's north-western region of Xinjiang to Gwadar port but will bring trade through Europe, Africa, Oceania, and the Middle East.

Baluchistan's political stability and security is pivotal to the success of Gwadar port and infrastructural projects of CPEC. The inhabitant Baloch tribes consider CPEC injustice to the people of Baluchistan and deprivation to the local Baloch. However, in order to overcome any kind of unpleasant activities Pakistan government has established a separate Security division of 2,000-strong force, devoted to protect national and Chinese interests in Pakistan. There is also news prevailing in the international media that "China is holding secret talks with the Baloch tribes for the security of CPEC related infrastructural projects". The officials from Pakistan acknowledge such efforts on part of China. Being a large province of Pakistan, it is important to resolve the grievances of Baloch. The international media is portraying this news as if China is doing something wrong but settlement of interprovincial disputes is very much important for CPEC.

The prosperity of Baloch people lies in the peace of Balochistan and the economic corridor is very unlikely to be successful unless there is peace in Gwadar. But there are some anti-nationalistic elements that want the underdeveloped provinces of Pakistan to remain in darkness. In such circumstances it's important to resolve the conflict, and mitigate it rather than escalating. There is a need for the proper mechanism of conflict management while minimizing the negative outcomes and maximizing the positive ones. According to Thomas Killman the five steps of conflict management includes accommodating, avoiding, collaborating, compromising and competing. These strategies are applicable depending upon the nature of the conflict. Considering the CPEC and the provincial grievances, all these strategies are not applicable. However accommodating the conflict is possible with collaboration. The CPEC-LTP envisages broad parameters for the development of Provinces in order to accommodate the conflict. The LTP emphasizes that the province's priorities would be honored at first. Special economic zones have been prioritized in all the provinces of Pakistan with industrial Parks, energy security, and infrastructural developments.

The CPEC conflict accommodation essentially entails offering the Baloch what they want. The use of accommodation often occurs when one of the parties wishes to keep the peace. Therefore, negotiations between Baloch tribes and the Chinese official will be good for the implementation of the CPEC Projects. After accommodation of the conflict, next step is collaboration. Collaboration with Baloch tribes and Chinese investors will bring ideas of mutual interests to find a creative solution acceptable to everyone. In an interview with the BBC Urdu on 2nd February, 2018, Chinese ambassador to Pakistan Mr. Yao Jing said that “militants in Baluchistan were no longer a threat to the economic corridor”. While the tribes’ statement reveals that they will not oppose the CPEC projects as long as their financial benefits will be taken into account. A provincial tribal leader stated ““Today, young men are not getting attracted to join the insurgents and many people see prosperity as a result of the CPEC”. This shows if there are discussions between the two parties then they are beneficial for the CPEC security. And if the above strategies of conflict management will be adapted then the challenges to the CPEC will be overcome sufficiently.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2018/02/26/cpec-conflict-management/>

Nuclear Deterrence and Doctrines in South Asia

Ahyousha Khan

Even after witnessing the harrowing devastation of nuclear bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki during WW2 many states still wanted to have nuclear bombs in their arsenals. States knew the potential of nuclear weapons to inflict unacceptable damage yet they chose to develop these arsenals. The reason behind the pursuit of nuclear weapons could be many, but nuclear deterrence vis-à-vis one's enemy has been the main reason motivating enough to build nuclear weapons. Deterrence enables two nuclear rivals to avoid war due to fear of unacceptable damage to one's vital interests. It relies upon the understanding of the threat from nuclear weapons in case of an attack.

So, states acquire nuclear weapons against their adversaries to validate nuclear deterrence that enables them to achieve national security because of the threat of nuclear retaliation. As nuclear deterrence is not the actual utilization of nuclear weapons but the threat of use of these weapons if national security of the state is in question. However, to make nuclear deterrence work as a credible threat, it is necessary to have nuclear weapon delivery capability as well as the credibility of in question capability and the ability to communicate that capability and credibility. To explain the operationalization of its nuclear assets doctrines is drafted.

South Asian nuclearization brought about the idea of nuclear deterrence that led to the strategic stability in the region. After their overt nuclearization, policies of minimum credible deterrence and credible minimum deterrence were chosen by Pakistan and India respectively for amassing nuclear capabilities. In its Draft Nuclear Doctrine (DND) India adhered to the credible minimum deterrence regarding its nuclear arsenals and relied upon a policy of "no first use" and rationale of "punitive retaliation" to implement nuclear deterrence. On the other hand, Pakistan, to implement nuclear deterrence against India relied upon the minimum credible deterrence and first use even if conventionally attacked by India. Pakistan developed its nuclear capability specifically against India. However, Indian nuclear assets are not only against Pakistan but China as well.

Nonetheless, if India's objectives are closely analyzed, it considered itself a nation destined to play a great role, so its nuclear capabilities are designed to go hand in hand with its national policy objectives. Although doctrines are important in determining the destination of states future endeavors and they give insight into the command and control structures but they mostly are more obscuring than revealing. In murky South Asian landscape, doctrines and postures are changing with the improvement in technology and states ambitiousness.

In South Asia, Pakistan happens to be a defensive player which mostly retaliates to Indian aggressive stances. Right from the start of its nuclear posture, Pakistan was certain that nuclear weapons should enable both countries to not launch any kind of attack against each other. Yet India's Cold Start Doctrine (CSD) and its joint military force doctrine enables ideas of limited conflict below the

nuclear threshold, which are not well-reasoned ideas for a volatile region like South Asia. So, to counter Indian proactive aggressive strategies that nullify the nuclear deterrence, Pakistan resorted to developing nuclear deterrence at all spectrums of threat. Thus, the policy of Full Spectrum Deterrence (FSD) is developed by Pakistan, which will follow the broader spectrum of minimum credible deterrence.

To maintain deterrence equilibrium, it is necessary that both countries avoid an arms race in the region. Pakistan's national policy regarding its nuclear and conventional arsenals calls for avoidance of arms race. If Pakistan's recent technological innovations are assessed carefully, they clearly depict Pakistan's resolve to validate nuclear deterrence and strategic equilibrium in the region. For instance, to maintain the credibility of its nuclear deterrence Pakistan has developed Multiple Independently Reentry Target Vehicle (Ababeel) and is also developing second strike capability in response to Indian naval nuclear fleets. On the other hand, India's nuclear doctrine or its policy statements never show any validation in arms control in the region rather Indian nuclear doctrine fascinates nuclear triad for credible minimal deterrence. Many international scholars and former Indian National Security Advisor believe that India's nuclear doctrine is much more flexible and should be given more credit. Moreover, recent Indian military developments suggest that in case of attack India might not allow Pakistan to go first and would use the first decisive blow.

But these all speculations about India's nuclear doctrine are not new for Pakistan. As it is understood in policy making institutions of Pakistan that nuclear doctrines are just the declarations and not verifications. It is impossible to elaborate beforehand that state will only rely upon punitive retaliation in case of conflict. But there are a few additions in the operationalization of India's nuclear doctrine that must not be neglected as they deny no first use policy. India regarding the operationalization of its nuclear doctrine in 2003 states that India reserve the right to use a nuclear weapon in response to an attack (can be CBW attack) on its forces even outside its territory. These windows in India's nuclear doctrine indicate that India wanted to keep its options open if required to use a nuclear weapon in the crisis situation. But, the point to ponder here is why Indian forces will be attacked outside its territory. This indicates that under the guidelines of CSD and surgical strikes, India's military forces might be launching an attack somewhere and to ensure their survivability nuclear threat is jotted down in the official doctrine. However, the question that arises here is; for how long South Asian neighbors will indulge in this arms race that is draining economic resources of both countries. Moreover, for how long false declarations in the name of nuclear doctrines will be used by the states to gather international support. Maybe till the time India becomes the member of Nuclear Suppliers Group.

<http://southasiajournal.net/nuclear-deterrence-and-doctrines-in-south-asia/>

Crisis in Turkey-US Relations

Nisar Ahmed

The decades long partnership of the US with one of its major NATO allies, i.e. Turkey, has been under serious strain for some time now due to growing divergence in policies and collision of interests of the two countries in the conflict ridden geopolitical landscape of the Middle East.

Given the mounting mutual distrust, suspicion and absence of any serious efforts to iron the recurring differences, as indicated in several cases including the US refusal to extradite the US-based cleric Fethullah Gulen who is accused by Turkey of masterminding the coup in July 15, 2016, a direct military confrontation between the US-led troops and Turkish armed forces in Syria is not so inconceivable.

Lately the strained relations reached a “crisis point” in the aftermath of the revelations that the US-led coalition in Syria intends to create a border security force of 30,000 personnel comprising mainly of Kurdish militia in Syria named People’s Protection Units (YPG) over the next several years. The BSF will be tasked with securing the long sections of Syria’s northern border with Turkey and eastern border with Iraq, as well as parts of the Euphrates river valley. However, this proposal did not sit well with Turkey for the obvious reason that it has since long considered the YPG as a Syrian offshoot of the Kurdistan Workers’ Party or PKK of Turkey which is coincidentally designated as a terrorist group by both Turkey and the US.

Decrying the US plans, Turkey’s president Recep Tayyip Erdoğan accused the US of forming a “terror army.” “A country we call an ally is insisting on forming a terror army on our borders,” Erdoğan said in a speech in Ankara. “What can that terror army target but Turkey? Our mission is to strangle it before it’s even born.” It is worth mentioning here that Turkey’s frustration with the US support to and heavy reliance on Kurdish militia in a fight against the Islamic State is not a recent phenomenon. In fact Turkey’s approach to Syrian conflict, apart from fighting the menace of IS, has largely been shaped by its sensitivity to the issue of Kurdish separatism.

Turkey sent troops into Syria in 2016 to prevent Syrian Kurdish fighters from forming a contiguous entity along its border. It has also supported rival Syrian rebels and independently fought to drive IS from parts of Syria. Moreover, Turkey was one of the leading countries along with Iran, Iraq and Syrian government in denouncing the referendum held by Iraqi Kurds for an independent Kurdish state last year in September 2017. The referendum had raised serious concerns in Iraq, Turkey, Iran and Syria that it could encourage their Kurdish minorities to break away.

Thus, given the fact that Turkey is home to the largest Kurdish population at an estimated 14 million, makes a long term US military and political support to the Kurds a serious threat to the territorial integrity and security of Turkey. The US policy on Syria now more than ever dashes Turkey’s hopes that after the defeat of the IS, the US would sever its ties with the Syrian Kurds. Thus, dismayed

with the US, on Jan. 20, Turkey launched Operation Olive Branch in northwestern Syria's Afrin to clear the region from the PYD/YPG 'terrorists' as well as remaining Daesh elements.

Notwithstanding the high level diplomatic visits to Turkey from the US in a bid to prevent escalation of hostilities in the ties, the situation on the ground bellies any farce of consensus and unity as far as their respective stance on the dynamics of Syrian conflict is concerned.

On the contrary, the situation on the ground suggests that the two countries are probably in for a major direct military confrontation as ominously indicated by Turkey's decision to enhance the sphere of its military operation into Manbij, where, unlike in Afrin, the U.S. has military presence. However, it is never too late and there is always a light at the end of the tunnel, sincere efforts for peace and appreciation of each other's concerns instead of prioritizing narrow geopolitical interests can salvage the ties from a major crisis.

To this end, the leadership of the two countries needs to avoid exchange of harsh words. Thus one hopes that ultimately sanity will prevail as both the countries can get nothing out of confrontation except further bloodshed and instability already reining the Middle East.

<https://www.eurasiareview.com/27022018-crisis-in-turkey-us-relations-oped/>

Growing Employment Opportunities under CPEC

Sadia Kazmi

It is a common fact that any new businesses or a mega project, when being established, needs to hire employees. They create jobs and these economic opportunities uplift and support communities through increasing the quality of life and overall standard of living. CPEC brings the same to the people of Pakistan. Economic growth is a fundamental requirement for the development of a country. For companies to invest and an economy to grow, stable environments, efficient institutions, functioning markets and access to sustainable financial services are all required. CPEC has the vision and realisation that economic growth is created by people. Hence, it offers viable vocational training in order to enhance the right competences for dynamic economic development, tailored to needs and with strong practical relevance. Integrating as many population groups as possible into the economy is the only way to ensure that growth has a broad effect and is sustainable. A well-qualified workforce is a prerequisite for economic growth. Training and education ensure that suitable staff can be recruited for job vacancies. New businesses need to hire employees. They create jobs and these economic opportunities uplift and support communities through increasing the quality of life and overall standard of living. Only the projects under CPEC include Vocational training centres but it also provides advice on increasing the performance and market relevance of vocational education systems.

Unemployment affects more than 202 million people worldwide and is thus a global problem. Sustainable employment prospects are conditional upon adequate income, social security, occupational health and safety, labour rights as well as the right to organise. Time and again it has been assured by the leadership of both China and Pakistan that the two countries are placing special focus on increasing and improving employment opportunities and achieving income levels that secure livelihoods. It is believed that the new era of development and prosperity would emerge and new job opportunities will appear in the country through the CPEC Project.

According to the international labour organisation, CPEC would bring 400000 jobs to the country while the Applied Economic Research Centre has estimated that the mega initiative would provide around 700000 direct jobs between 2015 and 2030. The Planning Commission's data shows even more promising results, with CPEC generating around 800000 jobs in the next 15 years. Pakistan is about to gain a lot from these opportunities as there would also be a noteworthy increase in the annual economic growth of the country.

Another reassuring development on the CPEC front with regards to opportunities for the local people comes in the form of jointly developed 1.32 megawatt Sahiwal Coal Power Plant by SEPCO and Shandong Ruyi Technology Group Co., that started production in May last year. It is the first major energy project which uses the latest, environment-friendly, supercritical technology under the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC). It is completed and started full operations in a record time for Pakistan. Apart from powering thousands of houses, the Sahiwal power plant has also provided direct

jobs to over 3,000 locals in different fields, including engineers, technicians, supervisors and labourers, during its construction period.

Last year, China Communications Construction Company Chairman Liu Qitao stated that development at Gwadar has created as many as 20,000 direct and indirect jobs for the locals. Planning and Development Ministry's Spokesperson Asim Khan said that over 30,000 people have so far been employed in different projects under the CPEC which will bring more and more tangible benefits to local workers in the coming days. Chinese Deputy Head of Mission Zhao Lijian, told Xinhua that around 60,000 Pakistanis are working on different Chinese projects in Pakistan, including those under the CPEC. Fawad Khalid Khan, a senior engineer working with the China National Electric Engineering Company as a deputy commercial manager in Pakistan, believes that at least 100,000 jobs will be created over the next few years under the power and infrastructure projects of CPEC alone.

Hence these facts and figures mitigate the myths and misinformation about the CPEC to a large extent. One can stay hopeful that the CPEC will truly be a game changer, positively contributing to all the development sectors of Pakistan and ultimately improving its socio-economic credentials in the region as well as at the global level.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2018/02/28/growing-employment-opportunities-cpec/>

Pakistan: Condemning Indo-US Belligerence

Ubaid Amed

Pakistan is surviving tough times, for it goes up against synchronous bellicosity from India and the US.

The Trump administration has chosen to press Pakistan with its 'do more' mantra to eliminate the alleged 'safe havens' for the 'agents of chaos' in Pakistan. Whilst puffed up by the US support of its aspirations to be a regional hegemon, taking advantage of the strained Pak-US ties and unable to suppress the recent popular and local revolt in the Indian occupied Kashmir, India has also deepened its political and military weight on Pakistan.

Given these circumstances, Pakistan indeed at the moment is devoid of a foreign policy to face the twin external challenge.

The most ideal approach to maintain a strategic distance in this regard from a showdown with the US is for Pakistan to influence the Afghan Taliban to join the peace talks.

Notwithstanding Trump's avowals, US authorities purportedly have guaranteed that they want peace and for that matter talks with the Taliban. Undoubtedly, by partaking in such talks, the Taliban could secure a political status that would be legitimate, i.e. not as an insurgent but a negotiating partner. Additionally, such talks could be sought after in different directions and for that matter other regional and trans-regional powers be incorporated into the 'process'.

Likewise, an aggressive Pakistan centric Indian doctrine under a 'belligerent regime' prompting possible strategic miscalculation will genuinely affect the strategic stability in the South Asian region. However, the only thing containing them to a halt is Pakistan's credible nuclear deterrence. Thenceforth, they are continuously targeting Pakistan through sub conventional means, chiefly by sponsoring terrorism at the state level.

Pakistan at this point in time should seek for viable concerted campaigns in the UN Security Council, the General Assembly and likewise at all the other forums to denounce Indian belligerence and its brutal repression of the innocent Kashmiris. Thousands of Kashmiris have been reported to be killed by Indian security forces in custody, extrajudicial executions and enforced disappearances and these human right violations are said to be carried out by Indian security forces under total impunity. Sadly, the height of incongruity is that all those aforementioned forums and the international civil society have turned deaf and blind over the issue; resultantly, Pakistan despite its spirited efforts remained at the defensive.

The relations between Pakistan and the US have been uneasy since Trump avowed its new Afghan strategy last year in August. Now the Trump administration is again changing the gears in Afghanistan. Additionally, it is now much more obvious that the robust Indian role as desired by Trump will only serve the US policy objectives in the region.

Moreover, in words of Plato 'I am trying to think, don't confuse me with facts'.

To conclude, Pakistan should clearly pass on to India that any military adventure will result in a misadventure with disastrous outcomes. Pakistan ought to likewise prompt the Security Council and every single significant 'Power' of the dangers innate to the permanent Indian ceasefire violations and the threats. It could also propose the improved presence of UN Observers on the two sides of the LoC. Lastly; in particular the US should also be cautioned against encouraging Delhi's bellicosity against Islamabad.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2018/02/28/pakistan-condemning-indo-us-belligerence/>

Pak-Russia Defence Ties: A Paradigm Shift in Defence Cooperation

Babar Ali

The increasing defense co-operation between Pakistan and Russia imply that arrangement is essentially a paradigm shift in the defense policy framework of both countries. Former army Chief General Raheel Sharif visited Moscow in the year 2015. The visit was significant because Indo-Pak tensions were particularly high at that time. India and Pakistan were engaged in intermittent border skirmishes on control line. The visit proved fruitful and resulted in the first ever mutual military venture between Pakistan and Russia.

The first military exercise, Druzhba-216 (Friendship-2016), was held between Pakistan and Russia in 2016. This military exercise lasted for two weeks that not only strengthen the Pakistan-Russia military ties but also provided a conducive environment for trust building. The defense landscape has multiple avenues to be explored and work on mutually. Therefore, increasing defense cooperation expected to be focusing on other defense avenues along with joint military drills. Former army Chief General Ashfaq Pervez Kiyani also visited Russia before Gen. Raheel's visit. Consequently, Russia and Pakistan signed a landmark defense agreement and Russia lifted an arm embargo on weapons exports to Pakistan in 2015. Gen. Kiyani's initiative to visit Russia has further cemented the military relations between the two countries.

In military to military cooperation, a recent deal is considerable to be discussed. Pakistan and Russia agreed to the \$153 million helicopter deal during former army Chief General Raheel Sharif's visit to Russia in June 2016. A preliminary contract was concluded at the Pakistan Army General Headquarters in Rawalpindi in August 2015. The Pakistan Army Aviation Corps (PAAC) took delivery of four Russian-made Mi-35M attack helicopters which was confirmed by Pakistan's Defense Export Promotion Organization (DEPO) in a statement issued at International Military-Technical Forum (Army 2017), which took place in Moscow from 22 to 27 August, 2017.

The point is noteworthy that to acquire Russian equipment, Pakistan used to pass through China which is not yet known for manufacturing heavy aircraft engines. After dropping out China as a middle man, Pakistan made the first deal of helicopters with Russia. Russia's manufacturing in military equipment is considered best in world.

Besides, Russia has shown concerns about the emergence of the Islamic State (IS) in Afghanistan. Undoubtedly, IS in Afghanistan has major consequences for Central Asia and Russian territories with Muslim populations. In this regard, the Pakistan military has extensively been exposed to and gained experience in counter-terrorism. Pakistan army's experience in countering guerrilla warfare in Pakistan's mountainous areas adjacent to Afghanistan has enough importance to be shared with Russia.

Terrorism has become imminent threat for Russia. To counter the scourge of terrorism, mutual defense cooperation and mutual efforts are crucial. Pakistan army has widely operated against terrorism and can provide primary assistance and training to Russia. Keeping in view the geographical status and Russian counter-terrorism concerns, a counter-terrorism alliance may also be one of the points of focus in defence cooperation. It is also noteworthy that the Russian Deputy Chief of General Staff visited Waziristan a few months ago with his military delegation and observed Pakistan's counter-terrorism efforts.

In the regional-scenario, both countries are expected to get mutual strategic benefits in the strengthening of ties. Russia is currently a regional and world power, a former superpower and permanent member of United Nations Security Council. These substantial credentials acutely demand that Pakistan needs to build stronger ties with Russia especially when the US supports Indian major roles in the region. The US appears to be more inclined towards India regardless of the fact that Pakistan has been its front line ally in the so called "war on terror" and suffered the loss of armed forces and civilians. Therefore, a paradigm shift in defense policy framework and defense cooperation of Pakistan is the need of time.

In the predictable future, Pakistan and Russia may find various grounds to carry out joint ventures. Recently, the US has surpassed Russia as the largest arms exporter to India. Surprisingly, Pakistan is still an untapped market for Russian arms and military equipment. Russia can utilize Pakistan's markets for economic gains as Pakistan bought the helicopters worth millions of dollars. Keeping in view these points, defense cooperation between Russia and Pakistan seems imperative especially when the regional arrangements and security order support cooperation.

<http://russiancouncil.ru/en/blogs/baber-ali-bhatti/pakrussia-defense-ties-a-paradigm-shift-in-defense-cooperation/>

CPEC and National Development

Sadia Kazmi

CPEC is no wonder a multidimensional project which not only focuses on the economic prosperity but lays an equal emphasis on the social development and nation building. This claim is not far from reality especially in the wake of recent announcement about the establishment of the education city in Gwadar, Baluchistan. This development points to the fact that the CPEC aims to bring development at the grass root level and empowering the common public through education. A society that is shaped up through such enlightened policies is no doubt a productive workforce not just for that country but a responsible and a refined member of international community with high morals. The same thought process is involved behind the plan of building the education city as the importance of education in nation building can never be undermined. It is a fact that education is a vital investment for human and economic development.

We are living in an inquiring and innovation-oriented society. The demand of twenty first century is novelty, creativity, and integration of knowledge at global level, research, critical and analytical thoughts. Rapid social changes are creating uncertainty and complexity in the society. To prepare the youth to cope with the present situation, there is a need to develop analytical and critical thinking, skill and attitude that would make them more flexible and innovative to deal with uncertainty and crises at national and global level. It was the realization of the same that has compelled the policy makers to focus on the development and easy access to education for all especially in the less developed and economically deprived areas of Pakistan. In this regard, earlier this month, the Higher Education Commission (HEC) unit of China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) held a special consultative meeting to review the ongoing government university and educational city projects in Gwadar. Members of Technical Review Committee included BUIITEMS Vice Chancellor Dr Ahmed Farooq Bazai, University of Turbat Vice Chancellor Professor Dr Abdul Razaq Sabir, Quaid-e-Azam University Professor Dr Zafar Nawaz, Balochistan Higher Education Secretary Abdula Jan. While senior professors of universities and other government officials were also present on the occasion. In the meeting, comprehensive consultation was conducted for construction and establishment of world class Government University in Gwadar and launch of certain educational and technical training programmes and courses. The consultation process included heads of many government departments, universities, and other institutions of Baluchistan so that the people of Baluchistan could benefit from the completion of CPEC. The committee discussed employment opportunities which would be provided after completion of the CPEC projects. Special focus was made on provision of technical training to the youth of Gwadar. HEC head Lt Gen (retd) Mohammad Asghar at the Baluchistan University of Information Technology Engineering and Management Sciences (BUIITEM) said; "Establishment of Government University Gwadar in due time and duration is an important target for all of us".

He also emphasized on the need for hiring the best and highly qualified teachers. "Best teachers and faculty will be appointed on merit only," the HEC head said. It is important because one needs to realize that in the world of knowledge the emphasis should not just be on the gaining of knowledge but

on the acquisitions of capacity to think and analyze facts logically and make informed conclusions and ideas. This is where the role of a teacher is highly important. Teachers, through their teaching methodology equip the students with the skill to discard old ideas and replace them with modified ideas and new knowledge. As Toffler once said “learn how to learn”. The perceived education city needs to be designed not only for “learning” but for “thinking”. Only such schools and colleges will be able to produce men and women who can think, who can make new scientific discoveries, who can find more adequate solutions to impelling world problems, who cannot be brainwashed, men and women who can adapt to change and maintain sanity in this age of acceleration. Only such a society will be the most tolerant and accommodative of others views and values hence better equipped for crisis or conflicting situation.

Last but not the least education is a factor of change in one’s life. The youth especially is blessed with immense potentials that can only be positively tapped by giving them education. BUISTEM vice chancellor said, “Youth and students of Baluchistan are not lesser than any of us. We have to equip Baloch youth technically in order to promote economic rehabilitation of the local people.” Education for the youth is the medium with the help of which they can quench their thirst for realizing their potentialities. The youth should be equipped with the best possible education and facilitated with favorable conditions to, through the attainment of their skills, be an asset to the community and that way contribute actively to the development of the community, as they are essential elements of the society. In this globalised and knowledge-based world, COEC is no doubt recognizing this need of the hour and is adamant at providing every young person with the opportunity to contribute to the society while fulfilling their potentials.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2018/02/28/cpec-national-development/>

JCPOA and IAEA Verification

Beenish Altaf

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) between Iran and the US has materialized despite all the odds, and since January 2016, the IAEA has been monitoring and verifying the nuclear related commitments made by Iran under this agreement. IAEA believes that the JCPOA is a significant tool for verification and has issued the statement that the nuclear-related commitments made by Iran under the JCPOA are being implemented satisfactorily. Similarly, during the course of demonstrating Iran's abidance of the JCPOA, all aspects of Iran's nuclear program, the enriched Uranium reserves, heavy water factory, and deviation from the agreement, have been reviewed and found to be in compliance with the agreement.

Alaeddin Boroujerdi, Chairman of Iran's Parliament National Security and Foreign Policy Commission made public the recent proclamation by the DG of IAEA, "Despite the US comments against Iran and repetitive violations of the nuclear agreement by Americans which seriously damaged US international reputation as a signatory state of the agreement, the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Yukiya Amano approved Iran's compliance with the agreement for the tenth time." His remarks came after the IAEA once again confirmed that Iran is fulfilling its commitments under the 2015 multilateral nuclear agreement. The UN nuclear watchdog said that it continued to verify and monitor the implementation by Iran of its nuclear related commitments under the 2015 deal between Iran and six world powers.

The new quarterly report analyzing Iran's commitments under the nuclear agreement, is released recently. This testimony is to be examined during the upcoming meeting of IAEA Board of Governors from March 5-9, 2018. On January 12, the IAEA report comes around the same time when the US President Donald Trump gave a four-month notice to Congress and the Europeans to overhaul the nuclear agreement or he would unilaterally withdraw the US from it. The next deadline from him on this matter is May 12, 2018. Earlier the deadline was December 12, 2017 under the US law, which he issued to Congress for taking a swift action. Since, Trump had declared that the agreement does not serve the US national security interests and he already propelled it to Congress so the lawmakers could "fix" sections he considers not advantageous to the United States.

Under the nuclear agreement that went into force in January 2016, endorsed by the United National Security Council, Iran is obliged to put limits on its nuclear activities in exchange for termination of economic and financial sanctions. In this regard the recent report reads that Iran's enriched Uranium reserves stood at 109.5 kilograms until February 12. It said Iran did not exceed its 300 kilogram cap on enriched Uranium during its reporting period. Likewise, it identifies that Iran has continued to inform the IAEA of reserves of heavy water and allowed it to monitor the reserves on regular basis.

Contrarily, despite the IAEA's confidence and optimism with reference to the deal, there are analysts who have reservations on it too. For instance, Mark Dubowitz, Head of Foundation for Defence of Democracies and a strong critic of the agreement, said the basic flaw is that the accord does not

guarantee that Iran will not eventually be capable of developing nuclear weapons. “The problem with the nuclear deal is not whether Iran is complying or cheating.” It is the dangerous reality that the very structure of the deal gives Iran patient pathways to nuclear weapons and (intercontinental ballistic missiles) simply by following the deal and waiting patiently for key restrictions to sunset.”

On the other hand, geo-strategic security architecture of the Middle Eastern region is in a transitional phase. Iran considers its legitimate right to go nuclear, claiming Israel’s nuke as a major threat to its security. This obstructs the idea of nuclear weapons free zone in the Middle East. Hitherto, Iran continues to be in the center of the storm for its proliferation related activities. If Iran legitimately feels it is getting nothing positive out of the NPT and in addition, the US is actually misusing the NPT against it, this may increase calls among Iranian polity for NPT withdrawal. It must be noted here that according to Article X, each party has the right to withdraw from the Treaty. Although it is unlikely that Iran would actually leave the NPT especially after JCPOA yet, if it does, it may not go alone, taking many sympathetic nations with it. Previously, the 120 nations of the Non-aligned Movement—the real “world community”— actually agree with Iran in its dispute with the IAEA and the US. Therefore, the JCPOA could be taken and is proving to be a good initiative to accommodate a country like Iran into the mainstream non-proliferation regime. Rationally, a similar kind of arrangement could be made with the North Korea too, in order to hold down its disturbing nuclear ambitions.

<https://nation.com.pk/28-Feb-2018/jcpoa-and-iaea-verifications>