



STRATEGIC VISION
INSTITUTE

VISION

VISIONARY INSIGHTS INTO THE STRATEGIC INQUESTS OF NATIONS

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 6
JUNE 2016

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi

Strategic Vision Institute
Islamabad

SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 6

JUNE 2016

Compiled & Edited by:
S. Sadia Kazmi



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
Nuclear Suppliers Group: Pakistan's Options	
Beenish Altaf	3
India Bid for NSG Membership	
Sidra Khan	6
The Port Politics: Gwadar and Chabahar	
Saima Ali	8
Tenor of Indo-US Relations and Options for Pakistan: Pakistan Left in Limbo	
S Sadia Kazmi	10
India's Civil Nuclear Cooperation with China	
Shahzadi Tooba	13
Pakistan Looking for a Criteria Based Approach in NSG Membership	
Sidra Khan	15
Naval Nuclear Competition in South Asia	
Maimuna Ashraf	17
Withdrawal of Britain from EU and Implications for its Integration	
Shahzadi Tooba	19
Time to Review Our Afghan Foreign Policy	
Saima Ali	21
CPEC: The Real Game Changer for Central Asia	

Nasurullah Brohi	23
Missile Defence and Deterrence Equation in South Asia	
Maimuna Ashraf	25
The Dire Internal Security of Pakistan	
S Sadia Kazmi.....	27
India is Top Arms Importer	
Beenish Altaf	29
Pakistan’s Permanent Membership in the SCO: The Dreams of Prosperity	
Nasurullah Brohi	31

Editor's Note

Month of June brings with it another electronic issue of opinion based short commentaries on the contemporary topics pertaining to security landscape of Pakistan. Major subject matter in the succeeding articles centers around the most talked about theme of Indian NSG membership. The scholars have weighed out all pros and cons in case India was given the membership. The arguments are supported by convincing rationale which suggests that such a move could have been detrimental not just for Pakistan's security and sovereignty but would have immense regional repercussions too. It is only legitimate to believe that a preferential treatment to India by the US and West has caused a deeper rift and distrust among the official circle of Pakistan towards US' regional policies. In these grim circumstances China has been the only ray of hope that Pakistan could rely upon. For China it is more a matter of legitimacy and legality.

All of these aspects have been debated and scrutinized at length in the articles included in this issue. The readers can also find a pertinent analysis of the options available to Pakistan if India is brought into the NSG and Pakistan is left out. It is rightly debated that such a situation would be a direct act of discrimination based on short-sighted commercial and strategic interests since India has not yet fulfilled its major commitments given to the United States as part of the 2005 civil nuclear deal such as working for the conclusion of the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) and separating its military and civilian reactors. The scholar suggests that Pakistan should continue to take measures to ensure that the strategic stability is maintained, without getting into an arms race. At the same time Pakistan should pay attention to the diplomatic campaign to convince the NSG members of its needs and capabilities, and simultaneously highlight India's non-adherence of the promises made as part of the nuclear deal with the United States; Pakistan should continue nuclear cooperation with China, while also focusing on economic development to attract other nuclear vendors to explore commercial benefits in the country. The signing of Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) cannot be seen as a possibility unless it is assured that Pakistan's strategic interest and regional security will be taken care of. Pakistan should not give in to Western "double standards", and keep calling for an unbiased criteria-based approach for inclusion into the NSG group. Another article predicts that if India is not given the membership, it may linger on and then the matter of membership will have to be taken up with the new elected government of the US and if the new leadership is as willing to grant the membership to India as the present one. Now that the membership has been refused, Pakistan should

not sit idle instead should try to pace up its diplomatic efforts more extensively aiming at convincing the international community to pay heed to Pakistan's genuine concerns.

India's naval nuclear ambitions and its civil nuclear deal with China are other indicators which are becoming a source of serious threat for Pakistan. Pakistan needs to realize that it also has to come up with an inclusive security policy which should counter India at all the fronts while also strengthen Pakistan's position as a regional balancer to India.

In connection with the same debate, another article exclusively looks at the present trend on Indo-US relations and how Pakistan has been intentionally left in the limbo. It suggests various options where the US and Pakistan both need to put in concerted efforts to revive the connection, as it is impossible to completely forego the relationship for good.

Another article looks at a very significant issue of port politics, drawing comparisons between the port of Chabahar and Gwadar. An interesting contrast shows how the geopolitical concerns are still very relevant in today's time and era and how they are increasingly driving state's policies.

Other topics touched upon in this issue deal with the internal security situation of Pakistan, the Afghan policy and the need for its revival, and the prospects of much awaited prosperity hinged with the membership of SCO.

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

Syedeh Sadia Kazmi
Senior Research Associate

Nuclear Suppliers Group: Pakistan's Options

Beenish Altaf

With the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) plenary meeting next week, debate on the possible inclusion of non-NPT states is gaining momentum, with some opposing the membership, while others suggesting criteria to accommodate non-NPT signatories into the NSG fold. India and Pakistan have formally applied, while Israel is still contemplating, mindful of being left outside the mainstream nonproliferation regime while other states with similar credentials are brought in. If India alone is allowed to become a member of the NSG while Pakistan remains outside, this would not only undermine global nonproliferation norms but cause countries like Pakistan to question the value of engaging with the nonproliferation regime.

Though Pakistan's ongoing political and diplomatic efforts are intended to create space for itself in the NSG, it does qualify for civil nuclear trade in legal terms. While submitting its application for NSG membership, Pakistan outlined its credentials such as harmonization of its export control lists with those of the international export control regimes, its efforts to ensure nuclear security and safety, and its adherence to NSG guidelines. Thus, the induction of Pakistan would be a step towards strengthening the global nonproliferation regime.

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

If India is included in the NSG

If India is brought into the NSG and Pakistan is left out, it would be another act of discrimination based on short-sighted commercial and strategic interests. India has not fulfilled its major commitments given to the United States as part of the 2005 civil nuclear deal such as working for the conclusion of the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) and separating its military and civilian reactors. Yet, it is again being considered for exceptional treatment. Contrary to its promise that it will work towards the conclusion of FMCT, India has not even considered unilateral moratorium to freeze its fissile material production. According to a recent report by the Belfer Center, India seems to have done the opposite, and expanded its fissile material production capacity. Instead of discouraging India, the United

States and other major suppliers that have entered into nuclear cooperation agreements with it are pleading India's case for NSG membership.

Options for Pakistan

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

As a responsible nuclear state and a country in dire need of nuclear technology to meet its growing energy needs, Pakistan wants to remain constructively engaged with the global nonproliferation regime, so that along with China, it qualifies for civil trade with other states also. Nevertheless, this relationship cannot be based on unilateral commitments and obligations;

After the India-specific NSG exemption in 2008, India reportedly began an expansion of its nuclear program. It is believed that since civilian facilities were supplied with foreign fuel, India had the option of using its indigenous stockpiles for military purposes. This seems to have helped India's bomb-making potential, and has disturbed regional balance. Pakistan should continue to take measures to ensure that strategic stability is maintained, without getting into an arms race;

The other option for Pakistan could be to start a diplomatic campaign to convince the NSG members of its needs and capabilities, and simultaneously highlight India's non-adherence of the promises made as part of the nuclear deal with the United States;

Pakistan should continue nuclear cooperation with China, while also focusing on economic development to attract other nuclear vendors to explore commercial benefits in the country;

Pakistan too should not sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) unless it is assured that its strategic interest and regional security will be taken care of;

Pakistan should not give in to Western "double standards", and keep calling for an unbiased criteria-based approach for inclusion into the NSG group;

Last but not the least, Pakistan can wait for a more appropriate time to secure membership, while it continues to pursue a normative approach to international nonproliferation efforts.

Pakistan desires NSG membership, but standing up to discrimination is equally important. It could well have applied for membership later, but Pakistan will be kept out of the NSG once India gets in, and Indian entry into the "London Club" would be destabilizing for South Asian security, having a negative fallout on the nonproliferation regime at the international level as well. As Adil Sultan argues: "The responsibility for the eventual demise of the remaining non-proliferation norms will lie with the NSG and the major powers that are supporting India's entry into the NSG." Though, despite the eagerness of the United States, there are still some states opposing India's NSG induction, and the group

takes decisions by consensus. Hence, the status quo may well be maintained. It is time for member states to restore the NSG's credibility by adopting a criteria-based approach for adding states instead of giving country-specific waivers, as this will only weaken the global nonproliferation regime. The NSG should not walk away from its founding principles.

<http://southasianvoices.org/nuclear-suppliers-group-pakistans-options/>

India Bid for NSG Membership

Sidra Khan

The editorial in the New York Times titled “No Exceptions for a Nuclear India” has expressed concerns over the bid for an Indian membership in the Nuclear Supplier Group. The NSG is a nuclear club of 48 nations determined to hold back nuclear proliferation by taking extreme measures at export and re-transferring of fissile material, which can be utilized in making of nuclear weapons.

As the New York Times editorial has discussed, India does not come up to the merit of being part of the Nuclear Supplier Group, since all other 48 nations of the NSG are signatories of Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which India has vehemently refused to be a part of. Not being part of NPT places no compulsions on India for stopping the production of fissile material for making nuclear weapons.

For the past decades, the world has witnessed the USA bending rules for its relationship with India as India is vital to USA’s interests in countering China in the Asia-Pacific. US President Obama has been putting huge efforts for India to gain membership of the NSG, whose status is to be decided on June 9, 2016, and June 23, 2016. As part of the deal in 2008, the major clause stated that India is to uphold the responsibilities of a nuclear state similar to all other developed and advanced nuclear nations. India has disqualified itself by continuous production of fissile material and proliferating vertically. The NSG states are hoping not to repeat the mistake of 2008 by exempting India from any considerable and binding commitment. The countries which are supporting India are serving their trade and other interests by putting the issue of proliferation on the back burner.

The role of China becomes one of utmost importance, not only to Pakistan but also to the NSG as a whole. It is rumored that China is stacked against India and will not allow India to become a member of the NSG. The Chinese take on this issue is, if India can be exempted so can Pakistan; Pakistan’s past record is cleaner than India’s, having a ratio of 3:1 missile testing, Pakistan should be part of the NSG. Pakistan has also applied to become a member of the NSG and is supported by China in getting the membership since China has helped Pakistan in building up of Chashma nuclear power plant. In this regard, Pakistan has fared quite well this time. The breaking point here is that although China has been backing Pakistan’s membership in the NSG, the member states would not want Pakistan to become a part of the NSG and this would become even more difficult if India gains its entry in the NSG.

However, it is not in Chinese interest that India becomes a NSG member and be treated equally to other nuclear member states. The NSG club has now turned into a strategic battleground. Back in 2008, China hadn’t yet cast a negative vote for India; the strategic implication of this gesture was to project that China is not anti-India and also to use a carrot-and-stick policy against India. China didn’t want India to get closer to the US than it already was. Daniel Markey, a South Asia expert, is of the view that China was then trying to show that they are not against India but this time, the Chinese are bold enough to make overt maneuvers against India’s entry in the NSG.

India is of the view that she meets the necessary criteria needed to be a part of the NSG. India has also resolved the rising international concerns of the member states. There are also reports that India is ready to make few nuclear reactors which will give India's domestic market a boost and that India is ready to trade and open up to international business.

Over the course of years, India has put massive diplomatic efforts to project itself as a responsible state, which is qualified to be a member of the NSG. The last nail in the coffin was PM Modi's visit to Switzerland and Mexico. However, the final outcome of the NSG meeting cannot be predicted. Whether India will gain membership in the NSG is still uncertain as the club works on the basis of consensus; India will need a majority of yes votes for its membership. There are speculations that China, who in 2008 backed down from casting a negative vote, might do the same this Thursday (9 June 2016). China is also aware of the possibility that once India gains its entry into the NSG, Pakistan will never be given a chance to become its member too.

Some plausible questions arise here: if India manages to gain its membership in the NSG, would she stop the production of fissile material? Owing to India's past record of refusing to even uphold the essence of NPT, the chances are minimal. The member states of the NSG are signatories of CTBT. Will India sign the CTBT or FMCT, providing India has nuclear facilities kept outside safeguards, with the latest reports of building a hydrogen bomb? The member states were quite enthusiastic to have trade with India but such questions are quite worrisome for them. The NSG works on general consensus, and if India gains its membership in the NSG, this gives rise to an even bigger question. Will the nuclear club be able to set up future guidelines if India continues testing missiles?

Moreover, if India gets into the NSG club it will have some serious consequences for the entire region. Pakistan and India are strategic contenders and if India will get into the NSG club it will definitely disturb the deterrence equilibrium. A disturbance of the deterrence equilibrium means disturbing the balance of power which will make the region vulnerable. The US should not surpass the precedence of Pakistan as they did in past vis-a-vis US-India Nuclear Deal. The fate of India will be decided on 9th June in Vienna but indicators are showing that India will not qualify the membership for this year as India hasn't met yet all the criteria of the membership. Pakistan is another big issue if India will be entertained it would weaken the rules for other non-recognized nuclear weapons states to join.

Analyzing the facts if India won't get the membership this year it will be the cruel twist of fate as the US presidential elections are coming at the end of this year. The enigmatic future of Indian membership of NSG would be dependent on the new Leadership of the US. The factor of the victory to the Republicans or the Democrats as well as the usage of an anti China policy by the new president makes the future scenario of Indian membership in NSG very uncertain.

<http://cscr.pk/analysis-and-opinions/indian-bid-nsg-membership/>

The Port Politics: Gwadar and Chabahar

Saima Ali

Both Gwadar and Chabahar ports have a unique geostrategic and geopolitical significance. Economically and strategically both are vital choke-points which provide unrestricted access to the Indian Ocean where about 100,000 ships and around 70 percent of the world's petroleum trade passes each year. The strategic significance of these ports is visibly clear from the fact that these sea trade centers are located at the crossroads of international sea shipping and oil trade routes while linking three regions that are: South Asia, Central Asia and the Middle East.

For India, Chabahar is the adjoining port to the Indian Ocean providing direct entrance to the Middle East and Central Asia. Chabahar will provide India with an entry to Afghanistan. Recently Iran, Afghanistan and India reached an agreement to give Indian supplies, heading for Central Asia and Afghanistan, special treatment and decreased tariff at Chabahar.

For China, Gwadar with a considerable head start over Chabahar, could be a finishing point for pipelines in its oil and gas supply chain from the Middle East and the Africa, allowing it to find a way around the crowded nip point that is the passage of Hormuz. Gwadar also opens up the projection for a pipeline corridor bringing oil and gas to China from the Middle East as an exchange route to transport oil around the Indian Subcontinent and through the progressively more disputed territorial waters of the South China Sea. The path will be economical, less risky and give Beijing greater freedom of action to chase its control over the South China Sea.

Declaration of CPEC brought India yet again in an open conflict with Pakistan. In November 2013, Pakistan handed over the Gwadar Port to Chinese Overseas Ports Holding Company Ltd. (COPHCL) for further expansion. This progress worried India and it started asking Iranian officials to resume the construction of the Chabahar port. Chabahar is located at approximately 150 kilometers west from the Pakistani deep-sea port, Gwadar. In a way, Chabahar development by India was a result of strategic rivalry of Gwadar. Many in Pakistan view Chabahar as India's answer to Pakistan's development of the Gwadar port, associating with China, which is something India should invest in by all means. India has many strategic and political reasons to have partnership with Iran. India wants to counteract China and the place it chose in Iran (Chabahar) is just 106 miles away from Gwadar. No doubt it is a strong effort to reduce the economic weight of Gwadar.

The imprisonment of Indian naval officer Kulbushan Yadev, along with a huge spy network carrying out rebellious activities in Baluchistan and Karachi, specified some Indo-Iranian nexus. Later, arrest of some Afghan spies in Baluchistan further uncovered Indo-Afghan alliance. Also, droning of Mullah Mansur further brought such facts into the attention, which strengthened assumption regarding Indo-Afghan-Iran nexus. In fact, this strategic competition represents the intensity of Indian panic because of Pakistan China economic corridor. Certainly, Chabahar can affect the timelines of CPEC, prohibiting reaping full benefits of the expected game changer.

Despite the strategic importance of Chabahar for India, there has been very little progress observed for several reasons. First is Iran's unresponsive support for the project. Although the idea was first mooted in 2003, it was only in 2012 on the sidelines of the 16th Non-Aligned Movement Summit in Tehran that Iran — then wobbled under sanctions for its nuclear activities — approved to set up a joint working group to function the port project as part of the trilateral agreement between Afghanistan, India and Iran on investment cooperation, business and transportation. A chief factor behind Iran's unwillingness to allow an Indian presence at Chabahar was the opposition by the Army of the Guardians of the Islamic Revolution, which reportedly uses the port to ship arms to Yemen and militant groups in the region.

Furthermore, given the existence of Gwadar next door, where China has pledged to invest \$46 billion for CPEC, it is unclear whether the Chabahar route will produce enough trade to justify the investment. In fact Iran, which has been playing hardball with India and demanding greater Indian investment in Chabahar, itself plans to invest \$4 billion to build a plant in Gwadar to process 400,000 barrels of oil per day. Clearly, resolving the Chabahar challenge is vital to securing India's interests in Iran and beyond. Nevertheless, given the challenges noticeable in this project, India is unlikely to succeed on its own.

Additionally, Gulf region is in a state of strategic instability and it is difficult to forecast viability of Iran's strategic route, including its relationship with India. Competitors such as China and Pakistan could obstruct or otherwise trump India's involvement in the project. Expectantly the development of Gwadar will attract Kabul and Central Asian Republics more.

India wants to get back Karzai type government in Afghanistan which is only possible if Islamabad's control is reduced by upsetting the newly formed cooperative relationship between the two Muslim countries. With the Torkham border tension between Afghanistan and Pakistan, it seems its designs are somewhat succeeding. However, the Durand Line conflict between Afghanistan and Pakistan is not new. The greater economic benefits that Afghanistan can reap from Chabahar, it's only a matter of time before Kabul will soften its stance on the issue.

In order to be triumphant, Pakistan should exercise effective leadership by employing its administration, military and diplomacy to maximize the Gwadar port's potential. If Pakistan succeeds in this regional game, the Gwadar Port will guarantee connectivity to the world as well as speedy movement of its workforce, goods and services. And, the CPEC will result in qualitative improvement of Pakistan's land connectivity related infrastructure.

Failing to achieve this goal will allow India and Iran to collect all the benefits. Pakistan must ask China, to sign and announce high-status cooperation agreements and openly announce a strategic military coalition to help each other achieve common interests, and also to help each other in case of any violence. CPEC is the game changer and it's destined to be successful.

<http://www.voiceofjournalists.com/the-port-politics-gwadar-and-chabahar/>

Tenor of Indo-US Relations and Options for Pakistan: Pakistan Left in Limbo

S Sadia Kazmi

The Indo-US embrace of each other is getting tighter and tighter. A number of positive developments clearly point to the US resolute where it is determined to pursue a policy to ensure the rise of India not only as a regional power but as an important global player as well. This affection towards India is not just to empower it in the international political arena, driven by some benevolent disposition, but underlies an obvious game of self interests on both sides. While India stands immensely benefitted by the concession, waivers, leverages and cooperative arrangements, in the economic and military terms, the US on the other hand seeks to find in India an important contestant against China within the Asia Pacific region. With US having great interests and security concerns lying in Asia Pacific, it wants to ascertain that India should not prove to be an easy competitor for China. Distracting China from its economic pursuits and causing disruptions to the OBOR initiative, while getting it engaged and preoccupied in its own backyard, and ultimately disabling China's rise as an economic and military opponent on the world stage, is the ultimate objective both India and the US are aiming at. No wonder the US has been investing a lot in India for this purpose and at the same time is quite vocal in exalting India's status by terming it as its strategic partner and an instrumental "pivot" in its Asia Pacific Policy.

Hence in the light of above mentioned realities in the world of Realpolitik, it appears justified on the part of the US to exhibit a "discriminatory" attitude towards Pakistan and extend a "preferential" treatment to India. Governed by the Idea that each state is eventually striving for its own survival and self interest and may go to any extent to make that possible, the "Realist" driven international politics doesn't hold anyone accountable on their seemingly unjust or biased overtures. It's a fact that the shifting regional and global realities have caused waning of US interest in Pakistan. Nonetheless, in order to divert world attention from its prejudiced policies, the Western propaganda machinery is fast churning out lies against Pakistan. It is bent upon proving Pakistan's alleged fraudulence in fighting off terrorism and extremism. Even though Pakistan had long been serving as a front line non-NATO ally to the US to fight a war, which is not even its own. Pakistan is also being accused of having links with the Haqqani network, against which it is not doing "enough". Since Pakistan is an important player in China's flagship OBOR project, the idea is to pressurise Pakistan and cripple it economically, leaving it highly vulnerable for any potential investors. Hence Pakistan's economic, military, political and diplomatic isolation is the "not-so-hidden" agenda, mutually being pursued by the US and India. It is for the same reason that the sale of F-16 to Pakistan has been withheld, in the opposition of which, the US lawmakers have been quite instrumental.

The same US lawmakers however, have recently allowed amendments to the US defence bill last Thursday. As per the amendments, India is being proposed to be considered on par with the NATO allies. This means that India will be as eligible as any other NATO ally for the sale of defence equipment and technology transfer. Now what makes India deserving of this favour by the US, while it is clearly aware

that such a step is going to be detrimental for the regional stability, specifically causing a big blow to Pakistan's position in the region, exposing it to even greater security threats, can hardly be justified on any ground. Not only the US has shamelessly gone back on its commitment to provide the F-16s, it has also immediately blocked the \$ 450 million in aid to Pakistan. The US lawmakers are constantly insisting on strict restrictions on Pakistan unless it meets out the suggested conditions.

While Pakistan has been intentionally left in the limbo to deal with the security mess created by the outsiders, a constant stream of accusations is being hurled at it, making it appear as a country that cannot be trusted anymore as a responsible state. The recent killing of Mullah Mansur on Pakistani soil is yet another assault on Pakistan's commitment towards exterminating terrorism. His presence in Pakistan helps prove the Western suspicion that Pakistan is providing shelter to the terrorists. Even though the authenticity of such allegations and even the claim of Mullah Mansur's presence in Pakistan, are still contested, but the Indian and Western propaganda is actively engaged in tarnishing Pakistan's credibility and world image.

These realities once again point to an important factor where unfortunately Pakistani leadership has always been lacking and that is the incapability of acquiring a sufficient clout within the international community of nations. Our diplomatic front either doesn't recognise the gravity of situation or have already given up in the face of consistent turmoil. The Foreign Affairs Adviser Sartaj Aziz and the Special Assistant to the PM on Foreign Affairs Tariq Fatemi have not been able to cultivate any favourable conditions for Pakistan, despite having the diplomatic acumen. They need to realise that putting all eggs in one basket, China in our case, is not a tactful strategy. At the same time the US cannot be kicked out for good. Also Pakistan should brace itself for the possible turbulent times where the anti-US sentiments might prop up the religious extremist factions in the aftermath of Mullah Mansur's killing, creating further instability and hotbed likely to invite more violation of Pakistan's sovereignty by its detractors. Pakistan's diplomatic machinery should devise a timely mechanism to deal with this two pronged strategy. The US should be made to realise that the only way regional stability can be guaranteed is by adopting a joint equitable strategy for both Pakistan and India without discriminating between the two.

At the same time, India is watchful of the US designs. The retrospective evaluation of the US' policy trends reveal that it tends to "exploit" states for its own personal gains and once those are achieved, the partnership is usually disbanded. This happened with Iraq, which the US strengthened against Iran, but later invaded it reducing it to shambles. Similarly Pakistan has been used time and again to protect US interests against Russia in Afghanistan and later to fight off terrorists in Afghanistan and elsewhere, only to be eventually left alone to deal with the repercussions in the form of insurgency, and extremism within the country. Hence India should not rule out the possibility that the same could very well happen to it too. Even though the volume of arms export to India from the US has surpassed the one from Russia, but ultimately this is feeding the American Military Industrial Complex, hence again serving US interests. Additionally, the US' motives to strengthen India against China to secure its own interests in the region can be translated into India being taken as a mercenary. It is believed that India is not oblivious to these realities, and may try to cut some slack independent of the US. After securing maximum influence in the international community it may pursue its own independent course, which later on might even come in clash with that of the US. Hence the possibility of distrust, skepticism

and suspicion in the Indo-US relations cannot be completely ruled out. Pakistan should try to exploit this slight obstruction between the two by highlighting the cons repeatedly and at all international forums, and by putting in more consolidated diplomatic efforts to manipulate the situation in its own favour.

<http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2016/06/22/comment/tenor-of-indo-us-relations-and-options-for-pakistan/>

India's Civil Nuclear Cooperation with China

Shahzadi Tooba

China and India are among the top five of the world in highest CO2 emission. Both China and India are advanced nuclear energy countries and are expanding their respective civil nuclear energy sectors. The two neighbors have well-established nuclear fuel cycles and reactor designs. However, they vary considerably on the scale and size of their respective civil nuclear energy programs. The Chinese civilian program is growing at a far faster pace with 22 reactors under operation and 27 reactors under construction, while India has 22 reactors under operation and six reactors under construction.

Nuclear power, which currently accounts for just 3 percent of India's output, is key to future energy plans in India, where a quarter of the 1.2 billion population has little or no access to electricity. India operates 20 mostly small reactors at six sites with a capacity of 4,780 MW, according to the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Limited. The government hopes to increase its nuclear capacity to 63,000 MW by 2032 by adding nearly 30 reactors at an estimated cost of \$85 billion.

One of the hindrances to get foreign players up and running in India's nuclear power sector has been largely elusive due to disagreements over pricing and a liability law that suppliers worry leaves them overexposed in the event of an accident.

So in promoting the use of clean energy Modi and Xi had declared, "India and China believe that expansion of civil nuclear energy program is an essential component of their national energy plans to ensure energy security".

India has in mind the Chinese assistance to Pakistan's nuclear weapon program in the past, its harsh reaction to India's atomic tests in 1998, opposition to the India-US nuclear deal of 2005, and the more recent deployment of Chinese nuclear submarines in the Indian Ocean. India has also in mind the Chinese help in 1995 when it was struggling to ensure the supply of enriched uranium to the US built Tarapur reactors and China supplied 30 tons of Low Enriched Uranium (LEU) for the two safeguarded Tarapur reactors.

For China the main reason to have this civil nuclear energy cooperation is its eagerness to export its nuclear power reactors. Besides its plans to build new reactors in Pakistan, China has been exploring export opportunities in Argentina, Britain and Romania. Another reason of exploring the options means his country may now be competing with the United States, France, Russia and several others. The US-India Civil Nuclear deal, as a matter of fact is also a reason because Beijing took it as an attempt by Washington to counteract Beijing's growing influence in the region.

Even having all the friendly ties, China is said to have 'belligerently' led opposition to India's membership of NSG. India has been seeking membership of NSG to enable it to trade in and export

nuclear technology. While USA is trying hard to let India be a part of the NSG to counter China's power in this region. Question of interest for Pakistan is: how this cooperation will be helpful for India except being member of NSG? And if these kind of cooperation exist what is the need to be a part of NSG?

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/06/23/indias-civil-nuclear-cooperation-china/>

Pakistan Looking for a Criteria Based Approach in NSG Membership

Sidra Khan

India applied for Nuclear Suppliers Group's membership on 12th May, in response to that Pakistan also put up to join NSG by 18th May. Since then, India has been lobbying around internationally gathering sympathies and collaborating with like-minded nations to support membership of India in NSG. Indian Foreign Affairs Minister Sushma Swaraj, while in a press conference has admitted having spoken to 23 nations to help India acquiring NSG membership. Pakistan, on the other hand, has only relied on maintaining a telephonic conversation with Vladimir Makei, Foreign Minister of Belarus and Yerzhan Ashikbayev, Deputy Foreign Minister of Kazakhstan. Pakistan is opposing Indian inclusion in the NSG at national level whereas efforts should have been made diplomatically at international level.

However, Pakistan still can amend its mistakes by acknowledging the diplomatic efforts of China, Turkey-Kazakhstan, and Belarus. Pakistan needs to make substantial diplomatic efforts for securing NSG membership by increasing visits to allied countries. Pakistan also needs to help its all weather friend China; reducing international pressure and supporting Chinese stance globally on NSG. Pakistan should initiate diplomatic lobbying at international level with the state like Ireland, South Africa and New Zealand to support Pakistan's efforts.

Pakistan does not oppose India's membership in NSG as it should follow criteria based approach. India officially cannot make declaratory statements regarding Pakistan's membership in NSG as India itself is waiting for its membership to be approved.

Experts all around the world are giving their views which call for strong standards for NSG membership which will, in turn, strengthen the global disarmament and the nonproliferation regime.

Nuclear experts have openly criticized both India and Pakistan's application in NSG as according to them they do not meet the required criteria. However in this regard, India is strongly criticized as experts have rejected the diplomatic efforts of USA supporting India's bid in NSG.

India has an added privilege as it has exemption granted by NSG from India's long-standing safeguard standard for nuclear trade signed in 2008. However, India has not been able to meet the possible non-proliferation commitment it pledged it would adhere to. India's civil nuclear separation is still ambiguous; additionally, the IAEA additional protocol is quite weak compared to the other developed nuclear-armed state.

Nuclear experts are of the view that NSG's would be further discredited by having country-specific exemptions from the NSG guidelines. These exemptions would damage the acute strategic balance and exacerbate the nuclear threats in the South Asian region.

Dr. Huma Baqai Associate Professor, Director Public Affairs and Communication and former Chairperson, Department of Social Sciences endorses Pakistan's membership in NSG group rightly as Pakistan's nuclear command and Control is safe and well protected. Although US-Indo economic cooperation is at its summit, however, USA also needs Pakistan for its interests in South Asia. Similarly, Pakistan's Foreign Office spokesman Nafees Zakaria vehemently has said as Pakistan has opposed the country specific exemption for NSG membership, Pakistan since the beginning has aimed at the policy of criteria based approach treating both India and Pakistan as free and sovereign states in a nondiscriminatory way. India alone cannot be considered for NSG membership the two candidates are needed to be considered on equal footings.

Indian ministers, on the other hand, are busy convincing the Chinese government to support Indian bid for NSG , Subramanian Jaishankar Indian Foreign Secretary has recently visited China unannounced. However, China in response has not only opposed Indians but also have criticized major powers like the US to end their support for India as such states only want to gain access to sensitive and advanced nuclear technology

Analyzing Chinese narrative it becomes quite clear that China will not allow India to gain its entry in NSG, however, US State department had stressed Pakistan to present its NSG application in front of the group.

There is also speculation regarding the meeting of Indian PM Modi with Chinese President Xi in the coming Shanghai Cooperation Organization SCO summit planned to be held in Tashkent in the next coming days.

Pakistan with its continuous efforts has been trying to maintain balance in South Asia and to initiate a culture of peaceful nuclear technology in the region, Pakistan urges all the NSG members to adhere the criteria and merit-based approach for inclusion of new members and stresses India to strengthen its nuclear safety and security standards. Since decades, Pakistan has proved itself to be a responsible nuclear state adhering to international nuclear norms of nonproliferation. Pakistan should be treated fairly and on criteria based approach for the NSG membership. Pakistan has a four-decade long experience of the safe and secure operation of nuclear power plants. The group was formed to prevent proliferation as a response when India tested thus the members of NSG should adhere the norms of the group.

<http://thepashtuntimes.com/pakistan-looking-for-criteria-based-approach-in-nsg-membership/>

Naval Nuclear Competition in South Asia

Maimuna Ashraf

Among many other prevailing challenges, South Asian regional security has been newly challenged by the recent secret test of India's submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) K-4. The test has boosted Indian deterrence capabilities, but disturbed strategic balance in the already murky regional landscape by creating a security dilemma for Pakistan. The academic world has been buzzing with criticism since reports emerged that India's first nuclear-powered submarine, INS Arihant, is ready to be commissioned into operational service after completing weapons trials and deep-sea diving drills. This addition creates two immediate consequences: first, it is likely to provide India a seaborne nuclear deterrent, despite certain attributes of Arihant that are believed to limit its operational role, and skepticism about the success rate of missiles tested from this submarine. Second, it will elevate India's rivalry with China and Pakistan in the maritime domain.

The ocean has thus become the hub of competition between the key regional powers. As U.S. Rear Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan said presciently at the turn of the 20th century: "Whoever controls the Indian Ocean will dominate Asia... This ocean is the key to the seven seas in the twenty-first century, the destiny of the world will be decided in these waters." Oceans now have a more significant role in South Asian strategy than ever before. The security challenges in the Indian Ocean Region (IOR) have magnified in the wake of economic sea trade routes that connect Europe and the Americas to Africa, the Middle East, and the Asian continent, significant strategic chokepoints through which more than half of the world's sea-based oil trade moves, and a rising rivalry between India and China. Around 85 percent of China's oil imports pass through the Strait of Malacca. Whereas India, with its hegemonic ambitions in the region, wants to keep its traditional influence in this ocean. Meanwhile, the United States already has a naval presence there.

Nuclear weapons are the most recent aspect of this strategic contest, thus the strategic significance is not confined to economic worth or conventional military influence. In the current milieu, four nuclear states have strategic interests in the region, and the waters of the Indian Ocean are witnessing three separate contests for regional influence: between the United States and China, China and India, and India and Pakistan. These rivalries are making the existing environment in the region highly unstable. The United States-India nuclear deal and their growing strategic partnership is largely viewed as an alliance to counter China and Pakistan. Conversely, India is skeptical about the Chinese claim that the "string of pearls" strategy aims to provide alternative sea trade routes, and New Delhi suspects that it is an effort to militarize or even nuclearize the region. The launch of India's INS Arihant should not worry China, even if it indicates New Delhi's aspiration to nuclearize its navy, because China already has advanced nuclear capabilities. Nonetheless, it disturbs the deterrence equation in an already unstable South Asia.

In the same vein, technically, Pakistan should not react if an Indian nuclear submarine is aimed at deterring China. However, this sea-based nuclear deterrent raises fears of Pakistan's destruction by a

state possessing superior capabilities. Just as India is compelled to respond to Chinese sea-based nuclear developments, so is Pakistan to India's.

Nuclear optimists believe that a diversified nuclear force structure, covering each leg of the nuclear triad, assures credible second-strike capability, thus decreasing susceptibility to a nuclear attack and stabilizing a nuclear relationship. Notwithstanding the aforesaid optimistic rationale about sea-based deterrence, nuclear rivalry in the maritime realm can create greater instability and many critics are skeptical about the notion that sea-based nuclear arsenals can act as a stabilizer in the region. In the next few years, most of the sea-based nuclear weapons in the region, primarily Indian and Chinese, may move from the design and testing phase to active deployment. As Rory Medcalf notes: "The implications of new sea-based nuclear weapons for deterrence, stability or instability will not be determined by those weapons systems alone. Investment in other capabilities like ballistic missile defenses, anti-submarine warfare (including nuclear-powered attack submarines) and hypersonic missiles could complicate the picture." Anti-submarine warfare capability is something the United States might assist India with. Such sea-based nuclear cooperation will fuel Pakistan's naval nuclear ambitions. Pakistan may look to neutralize developments in India by deploying submarine-launched variants of cruise missiles on a conventional submarine. The ambiguous combination of conventional and nuclear capabilities at sea would result in an additional challenge.

India and Pakistan should abide by the agreement on pre-notification of flight testing of ballistic missile, reached between the two states in 2005, which the K-4 test violated. Such infringements and negligence can cause many regional security risks, including nuclear accidents and miscalculations. Ideally, the security of the Indian Ocean should be a matter of concern for all states sharing economic and strategic interests in the region, including the United States and other actors not within the region. While states in the Indo-Pacific region are developing their nuclear submarine programs, vital matters regarding command and control, future posture, and notification of missile tests should be addressed through bilateral and multilateral channels to avoid mistrust, miscommunication, and misconception.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/06/27/naval-nuclear-competition-south-asia/>

Withdrawal of Britain from EU and Implications for its Integration

Shahzadi Tooba

Britain is the second-largest economy after Germany in the European Union, a nuclear power with a seat on the United Nations Security Council, an advocate of free-market economics and a close ally of the United States.

Britain will become the first country to leave the 28-member bloc, which has been increasingly weighed down by its failures to deal fully with a succession of crises, from the financial collapse of 2008 to a resurgent Russia and the huge influx of migrants last year. The withdrawal process is expected to be complex and contentious, though under the bloc's governing treaty it is effectively limited to two years.

Migration is the main issue among other issues. With net migration to Britain of 330,000 people in 2015, more than half of them from the European Union and Mr. Cameron was totally unable to deal with the effective response to how he could limit the influx. And there was no question that while the immigrants contributed more to the economy and to tax receipts than they cost, parts of Britain felt that its national identity was under assault and that the influx was putting substantial pressure on schools, health care and housing.

Scholars are skeptical towards UK in their views, as Thierry de Montbrial, founder and executive chairman of the French Institute of International Relations said that "the main impact will be massive disorder in the E.U. system for the next two years". Further he said that "there will be huge political transition costs, on how to solve the British exit, and the risk of a domino effect or bank run from other countries that think of leaving." European Parliament President Martin Schulz in an interview told German public broadcaster ZDF that, "the United Kingdom has decided to go its own way. I think the economic data show that it will be a very difficult way". European Council President Donald Tusk warned that Britain leaving the European Union could seriously threaten "Western political civilization." Britain will have to strike new trade deals with Europe and amend its laws that were based on E.U. legislation. It will take a long time to sort all of that out.

Predictions that the E.U. could break apart might be a bit far-fetched, but there certainly are other countries where demands for similar referendums could gain momentum. But many suspect that the European Union may try to "punish" Britain and deter other countries from making their own exit with a lousy deal. However, if the economic fallout is as bad as some have predicted, it's also possible that European leaders may seek to calm markets with a quick and easy deal.

For EU the loss of Britain is an enormous blow to the credibility of a bloc. Exclusion of UK from the European Union will create many logistical problems even at present EU is already under pressure from slow growth, high unemployment, the migrant crisis, Greece's debt woes and the conflict in

Ukraine. The vote will definitely shake the grand European vision. It will certainly provide fuel for anti-E.U. politicians all over the continent. Recent polls have shown that countries such as France and Italy want their own votes on E.U. membership, and populists such as the French National Front's Marine Le Pen have found Euro skepticism to be a powerful message to voters.

For one thing, it's still unclear exactly what sort of relationship Britain will be able to strike with the European Union. For the time being there are essentially two models ranging from what Norway or Iceland has – in which Britain would be a member of the European Economic Area and essentially keep access to the European common market – to simply no deal at all, falling back on its membership of the World Trade Organization to set terms of trading.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/06/28/withdrawal-britain-eu-impact-integration/>

Time to Review Our Afghan Foreign Policy

Saima Ali

According to famous American writer Sydney Sheldon, “To be successful you need friends and to be very successful you need enemies.” But what if these enemies are your immediate or next door neighbors? Obviously one cannot flourish or prosper peacefully if your neighbor sees you as your enemy or vice versa. In other words one can only make his/her life miserable by having stinging relations with neighbors.

A well built foreign policy is extremely significant in case of our neighboring countries. In international politics all nations have their own national interests, and there are no permanent enemies and friendships. Neighboring states can be a benefit or a nuisance, depending on the capability to identify one’s long-term interests for long lasting peace on its borders. This is how foreign, strategic and diplomatic policies are framed.

At present Pakistan has stressed and hard relations with all its neighbors except China which is our all weather friend but it is never wise to put all eggs in one basket. Our neighboring countries are no doubt now more antagonistic than allies. Pakistan has had very coarse relations with Afghanistan whereas India has always benefited from very pleasant relations with Afghanistan. The week-long clash between Pakistan and Afghanistan at Torkham border brought to the fore entrenched issues that persist to curse relations between the two South Asian neighbors.

Is this Indian well built foreign policy to cut off Pakistan regionally and globally or its America which is backing India in South Asian region to protect its own national interest and at the same time limiting mighty China influence? Or it is flimsy Pakistan’s strategic and foreign policies?

Certainly, vigorous Indian policy to cut off Pakistan in the region seems tough and secure. After 9/11 Afghanistan became valued friend to India, which directed it to run 24 consulates in Afghanistan, maintaining their indirect rivalry towards its hostile country Pakistan. India has been backing and sustaining Afghanistan in the fields of road and rail network, education, energy and the military since a decade. So Afghanistan will not allow any possible threats to India’s interests within its territory. The indo-US alliance and closeness of India and Afghanistan are complicating Pakistan’s quarrelsome western border areas.

Pakistan’s foreign policy appears powerless of developing its relations with Iran and Afghanistan to minimize any possible threat to CPEC as well as CASA1000. The nexus between Afghanistan, India and Iran is a threat not in political as well as strategic perspective. Pakistan fragile economy was rejoicing on its mega projects like CPEC, TAPI and CASA1000. Their joint support to Afghanistan to safeguard India’s trade route to Central Asia posed a clear and unrelenting threat to CPEC. Islamabad’s decision to fit a gate at the Torkham against the will of the Afghan government could bring about major harmful cost.

Then what are Pakistan's future policy plans for TAPI and CASA1000 from Central Asia via Afghanistan's region?

At the same time we cannot leave Afghanistan's slip-ups in this regard. We cannot blame Pakistan entirely. Pakistan along China carried on their efforts in conveying Taliban for the negotiations but Afghanistan never has shown serious concern in being a collaborator for peace for strengthening security and counter-terrorism cooperation with Pakistan. As stated by Inter Services Public Relations (ISPR) DG Lt Gen Asim Saleem Bajwa in an interview with German broadcaster Deutsche Welle Urdu "The world abandoned Pakistan to handle, manage and face the terrorists in the region all by itself and the narrative that Pakistan has not done enough against terror as quite an injustice to Pakistan. I take it as discrimination against Pakistan."

Pakistan is hosting three million Afghan refugees including 1.5 million undocumented ones. Now many of these Afghans are being used by CIA, RAW and Afghan Intelligence and are responsible for all the terrorist attacks inside Pakistan. Pakistan's foreign policy needs a noticeable strategic shift for domestic and regional peace. Pakistan should be successful to utilize the shared cultural, linguistic, economic, religious and ethnic realities of its western borders, but at the same time a stabilized and firm policy should be adhered. It is about time to control the border and restrict these drug trafficking and terrorist movements. Because of poor policies, different terrorist networks have thrived in Pakistan. Voluntary and dignified return of Afghan refugees by creating pull factors inside Afghanistan. Also there is a need to answer with secure strategic guidelines to secure Pakistan's situation in the region and accomplish the above mentioned mega projects. Any imprudent steps in the region will push Pakistan back into a state of deterioration and isolation.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/06/28/time-review-afghan-foreign-policy/>

CPEC: The Real Game Changer for Central Asia

Nasurullah Brohi

An exceptional geographical location makes Pakistan a real gateway between South Asia and East Asia, and the actual hub of business activities in the region. The fact that this position is not merely confined with the CPEC, but already exists, together with the current Corridor project will further facilitate the smooth connectivity between South and East Asia. This geographical situation gives Pakistan a central position in terms of increased regional connectivity.

Economic development in modern times is mainly dependent on better infrastructural conditions essential for the trade and transport activities. China's active investment in agri-business and telecommunication, natural resource extractions including oil, gas, and uranium, gold and copper enhance the exports greatly help the boost of the Central Asia economy. However, such immense natural richness of resources will hardly contribute to the national development and the enhancement of the living standards if Central Asian states obstruct and face limitations in terms of their trade and export activities.

China has been a major player for the infrastructural and economic development by building roads, tunnels, railway tracks, power lines and oil refineries in Central Asian states. China has also been instrumental in development of the two most important Central Asian road connections of Osh-Sarytash-Irkeshtam and Bishkek-Naryn-Torugart in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan respectively. The Irkeshtam Pass crosses through the Osh–Sary Tash of Kyrgyzstan to the Kashgar in China. Whereas, the Bishkek-Naryn-Torugart road is the other most significant transportation link route connecting the Kyrgyzstan with parts of Europe–East Asia and the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation (CAREC) Transport Corridor and serves as key regional economic hub by connecting the landlocked CAREC countries with the Eurasian and global markets. The road essentially links three administrative regions of the former Soviet Union, i.e. Chui, Naryn and Issyk-Kul and connect the territories of Kyrgyzstan and China across the Tian Shan mountain ranges of Torugart Pass and the northern settlements of Kordai. Ultimately, this important transit traffic route between Kyrgyzstan and China connects with the Karakorum highway of Pakistan providing access to Russia and Kazakhstan to access the ports of Indian Ocean.

The CPEC is situated at the crossroads of the Silk Road Economic Belt and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road. The planned road and railway networks of CPEC link China's Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region with the Southwest Pakistan's deepwater port of Gwadar. The CPEC is also an important part of the Belt and Road Initiative holding huge economic potential and business opportunities for the whole region. Realizing the importance of CPEC for Central Asian region, the President of Turkmenistan Gurbanguly Berdimuhamedov visited Pakistan in March focusing on strengthened bilateral relationship with Pakistan covering broad areas of cooperation ranging from trade, energy sharing, and tourism. To explore the viable economic options it was decided to speed up the linking Dushanbe through the China

Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) and establishing air, road and railway links between both countries having exceptional geostrategic and geo-economic significance in the region.

The Silk Road Economic Belt network brings together China with Central Asia, Russia and Europe through an overland link with the regions of Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean Sea. The Central and West Asian region connects with the South East Asia, South Asia and the Indian Ocean. Whereas, the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road links China's coast with the Europe through South China Sea with Indian Ocean and the South Pacific and serves as an international trade route. The Gwadar, Bin Qasim and Karachi ports of Pakistan are the only intersection of the both Silk Road Economic Belt and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road.

Moreover, after fully functioning of the Gwadar Port, it will become a central point of connection for the landlocked countries of Afghanistan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan and exceptionally facilitate their cargo transportation destinations towards Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Iran, and Iraq. The CPEC will eventually boost up regional economies and impact the lives of over three billion people of Asia through immense trade and businesses opportunities.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/28062016-cpec-the-real-game-changer-for-central-asia-oped/>

Missile Defence and Deterrence Equation in South Asia

Maimuna Ashraf

The strategic stability of South Asian landscape revolves around the corollary of nuclear deterrence. The stable or unstable deterrence influence the security dilemma, nuclear threshold, regional asymmetry, nuclear employment and peace accordingly. Pakistan and India experienced the effectiveness of nuclear factor and strategic equation in the region since 1998. However, few recent developments in the region has put the nuclear optimist assessment about the nuclear weapon's impressive contribution and impression of deterrence equilibrium in constructing strategic stability, under stress.

In nuclear factor, not the number of nuclear weapons but their credibility and survivability matter unless influenced by other features having direct relevance with deterrence like transition in military doctrines, Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system, Multiple Independently Targeted Reentry Vehicles (MIRVs) and assured second strike capability. Thus status quo remains stable if strategic equilibrium is in play; the concept of mutual destruction functions and the nuclear opponents has reciprocal annulment of options for war at any level. This piece aims to specifically analyze the recent Indian test of supersonic interceptor missile in pursuit of full-fledged and multi-layered BMD system in a strategic environment which is greatly complex, unstable and unpredictable.

The BMD system consists of sensors to detect and track the missile/warhead and a guided missile, called interceptor, to intercept and destroy the incoming enemy ballistic missiles by using the "hit-to-kill," direct impact technologies—i.e., by "hitting a bullet with a bullet."

The argument, "BMD enhances non-proliferation"; by discouraging adversary to coerce with ballistic missiles that cannot succeed and ultimately convincing aggressor that militarily the ballistic missiles are not worthy investment; cannot be replicated in South Asian context. This assertion works when both states enjoy homogeneity and political stability. On the contrary, in South Asia, Indian BMD annihilates the concept of mutually assured destruction and hands over the responsibility to maintain strategic equilibrium solely in the hands of the Pakistan having economic constraint.

Indian pursuit of BMD will affect Pakistan, not theoretically but practically it will disturb Pakistan's deterrence posture by rendering the concept of minimum credible nuclear deterrence, reduce India's vulnerability to Pakistani ballistic missiles strike, undercuts Pakistan's offensive posture yet strengthen India's defensive capabilities. Strong offense is better in the South Asian context than a strong defense.

Missile defence is not completely foolproof and does not provide a complete protection cover. However, this new system added in the military arsenal has the potential to trigger a conflict due to the false sense of security. The false sense of security is critical because it can be a cause of war between states. It is the false sense of security can trigger a conflict despite a functional balance of power or a balance of terror based on equilibrium. So, false sense of security is a dilemma. Now, if they sell the idea that we have acquired ABM system to check Pakistan's tactical and strategic nuclear weapons and in the

event of a crisis this false sense of security will transform rational actor-model into irrational-actor-model resulting in a major catastrophe.

Pakistan should consider options to counter the instability introduced by Indian BMD. Pakistan can acquire BMD from US, Russia and China, with US being the least available option; however the option to produce its own ballistic defence is not feasible for Pakistan due to economic constraints. There can be several policy options, first is to choose for a mix of qualitative and quantitative improvements to its nuclear force in order to overcome and defeat the Indian defences. Consequently, Pakistan can develop large number of nuclear warheads, ballistic and cruise missiles. Another effective option would be to produce Multiple Independently Targetable Re-entry Vehicles (MIRVs). Pakistan should also work on the sea based nuclear deterrent to ensure the survivability of its nuclear forces, and to have an assured second-strike capability.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/29062016-missile-defense-and-deterrence-equation-in-south-asia-oped/>

The Dire Internal Security of Pakistan

S Sadia Kazmi

The National Action Plan, drafted in the aftermath of tragic Peshawar school carnage, surely was the right move in the right direction. It promised to bring not just an end to the widespread terrorism and terrorist outfits but also aimed at providing the concerned institutions with a mechanism to deal with this menace. The 20 points document was widely accepted and appreciated by one and all across the state. It was also the first time that the civil and military leadership were unanimously agreeing on a plan of action to rid the state and society of extremism. However today, three years onward, the objectives laid out in the document seem to have remained unattainable while the perils of terrorism in various forms appear to have engulfed the society even further. This is not to undermine the efforts like Zarb-e-Azb, military operation in Karachi and the endeavors being carried out in Balochistan, which definitely restored the faith of a common man back into the sincerity of security forces and institutes, but in the face of recurring suicide blasts, target killings, and ever deteriorating law and order situation in Karachi, one is made to question the status and reasons for the declining internal security situation of the state.

The problem may not necessarily lie in the document itself, even if at times those who drafted it tend to argue that it was conceived in haste and hence may have lot of loopholes. But the fact is that the document is more of a “to-do” list, outlining what exactly needs to be done on immediate basis if one wants avoid Peshawar like terrorist attacks in the future. The document clearly points out “what” needed to be done but doesn’t tell “how” to go about it. Being a “Plan” it is expected that it would also contain some line of action or effective policy options for the smooth implementation of the plan. The fact that it was made in a hurry doesn’t hold much justification today after three years, which is ample enough time for any strategy to be evolved, reviewed, revised and improved intermittently.

At the same time, the operation sweep out against terrorist outfits and large scale hangings of the convicts by the military courts did prove to be an effective deterrent for the time being but could not completely snuff out the nuisance of extremism and terrorism. The need is to delve deeper at the micro level and root out the pro extremism factions from the society, who are found alarmingly in abundance among the so called moderate and liberal stratum of general public. This could only be achieved if the mindset is targeted and overhauled into believing that the security of the state and its people is what matters the most and stands supreme in the face of any ethnic or sectarian based division of the society. Indeed such an approach will take time and the results should not be expected to be achieved over night, but so far one doesn’t see any efforts or mechanism being devised to deal with the psychological aspect of this problem. One possibility could be to establish rehabilitation centers for those people, especially the youth who readily becomes an easy target at the hands of extremist elements. Policies at providing employment opportunities could positively supplement the military operations. Crackdown against the institutions/madrasah found to be involved in spreading and hatred would have been strictly dealt with, without any concessions. Unfortunately in a recent turn of events, the PTI leadership has donated a huge amount of RS. 300 million to madrasah Darul-Uloom Haqqania, which is not only running privately, but has also been notorious for having close links with Afghan

Taliban. Key Taliban leaders Mullah Omer, Mullah Mansour and Jalaluddin Haqqani graduated from Darul Uloom Haqqania and so did Asim Umar, the head of al-Qaeda's South Asia chapter. Its graduates were also allegedly involved in Benazir's killing.

Such an action causes a direct damage to the very spirit National Action Plan, which clearly disallows the funding of any terrorist and terrorist outfit, and rather seeks for the freezing of all their assets. The sad part is that when criticized for this action, the opposition leader not only justified his motives but also tried to slap convincing arguments that it was done only in the best interest of the state, where it is being aimed at integrating such elements into the mainstream of the society. One fails to understand how can the evil of terrorism be eradicated when its supporters are sitting among the higher echelons of the state directly involved in the policy making process. It also highlights the fact that as long as the sympathizers are allowed to provide for such organizations, there will be no hope for clean society free from such elements. Such organizations will continue to inculcate extremism among the youth. The money will only be used as a bait to attract more fragile minds which can be easily radicalized too.

How can then one even hopes to curb external security detractors who are always on a look out. The recent statement by COAS General Raheel shows a firm resolve where he whemently conveys that proxies will not be allowed on the Pakistani soil. However one is left to wonder how one can possibly disallow proxies in a society which is riddled with radicalized mindset that can be taken advantage of and may be used any time against one's own state and citizens.

Another important area which is constantly being neglected is that there is a tendency of denial and procrastination towards the harsh reality unfolding in front of eyes. The state leadership has time and again denying the presence of ISIS in Pakistan. However they tend to forget that there is a substantial number of people who sympathies and support ISIS agenda and ideology. Only recently it was reported that 3 Daesh members were held in Lahore. Also LeJ was reportedly seeking to build affiliation with ISIS, before the chief Malik Ishaq was killed last July. However the Pakistani officials have generally denied that Islamic State has gained a foothold in the country, though there are occasional reports of arrests or killing of people affiliated with the group.

The need of the time is that more dedicated and concerted efforts should be invested not just at the state level but at the personal level too if one needs to get rid of the widespread extremism and radical elements in the society. More than anything the NAP needs to be updated to include long term objectives such as devising rehabilitation program that may help in bringing long lasting and durable stability to the internal security landscape of the state.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/06/29/dire-internal-security-pakistan/>

India is Top Arms Importer

Beenish Altaf

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

The international trade volume of major weapons has grown continuously over the past decade, rising by 14 percent between the five-year periods 2006-10 and 2011-15. India falls on the top of the list, accounting for 14 percent of global arms imports, followed by China (4.7 percent), Australia (3.6 percent), Pakistan (3.3 percent), Vietnam (2.9 percent) and South Korea (2.6 percent). South Asia alone accounted for 44 percent of the regional total. The main reason for this is India, which has been the world's largest importer of major arms over the past five years. Asia's second-most populous country buys three times as many weapons as either China or Pakistan, its regional rivals. India and Vietnam, for instance, are two of the world's largest importers of naval equipment, especially submarines. One of the main reasons for this high level of imports is identified by SIPRI that India's arms industry has thus far largely failed to produce competitive indigenously designed weapons. Therefore, since 2011, Russia has supplied 70 percent of India's arms imports, followed by the US who supplied 14 percent and also Israel by 4.5 percent. Likewise, with the support of the US President Barack Obama recently, India managed to enter into the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), a 34-nation wherein the officials and concerned personals are now drawing up plans to make use of this new status. With access into the MTCR, India would now be able to import and export ballistic and cruise missiles. This effectively means that India would now be able to import American drone and predators and enhance its offensive capability which would seriously undermine regional strategic stability. As a consequence, regional deterrence will also be severely damaged.

India joining the group will also pave the way for the purchase of unmanned combat aerial vehicles (UCAV), like the Predator from the United States. In addition, membership would facilitate the export of the Indo-Russian BrahMos supersonic cruise missile to Vietnam in a bid to check China, and also enable India to obtain technologies from overseas to complete development of its homemade UCAV. Owing to the fact that India remains one of the largest and an active importer of weapons system or weapons trade with an 11 % trek in its 2015-16 defence budget, which has increased to 40 billion dollars over the time. Similarly in 2012, India tested its intermediate range Agni-V ballistic missile with a range of 5000 km.

Likewise, India plans to buy Sukhoi-30 MKI fighter aircraft from Russia, multi-role Rafale fighter jets to a naval vessel recently commissioned in Mauritius, reconnaissance assets and satellites and is

also building a two-tiered Ballistic Missile Defence shield in close collaboration with Israel. Paradoxically, if India is accepted in the NSG, though the chances are very bleak, then by achieving its new diplomatic status, it will fuel up its un-ending appetite for arms trade, nuclear weapons, delivery systems, cruise and ballistic missile and much more. In this context India will be further enabled to utilize its freed up domestic resources for arms stockpiling, improving the quality and quantity of its nuclear arms, which will jeopardize strategic stability of the region.

Ironically, India is seeking to boost arms exports 20-fold in a decade to \$3 billion, a push that if successful, would transform one of the world's biggest importers into a major seller of defence equipment. Nevertheless, this largest spending on arms trade could be taken as a strong indication provoking a full-scale regional arms race in the region. Thus the driver of this drastic arms race is a classic security dilemma. That is, "the attempt by one country to increase its own security by increasing its military strength has the effect of creating insecurity in neighbouring states."

<http://pakobserver.net/2016/06/30/india-is-top-arms-importer/>

Pakistan's Permanent Membership in the SCO: The Dreams of Prosperity

Nasurullah Brohi

With the permanent membership in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), Pakistan has successfully become to achieve a platform of benign partnership with developed and immensely rich co-member states that exceptionally will help in addressing its economic, security and social issues. With the firm support by China for the permanent membership of Pakistan into the SCO, the efforts have finally paved the way for the successful entry of Pakistan for becoming full member of Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). The full membership of the SCO prospectively improves international stature of Pakistan with exclusive political, economic and economic opportunities.

The SCO is an ideal sketch of all the things those were actually real-time requirement for Pakistan. The multi dimensional participation makes the organization a unique set of collections and characteristics with diverse cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity. It also greatly supports Pakistan to accentuate its interest in regional peace, stability and development. The efforts for regional cooperation against the terrorism, separatism and extremism will be further strengthened. The SCO members firmly and collectively strive for the complete eradication and protecting the region from the threat of terrorism, separatism and the threat of external interference. Moreover, the SCO provides Pakistan with opportunity to get into closer interaction and relationship with Russia, China and other Central Asian states therefore; it will prove for Pakistan a highly valuable option to seek variety of options to overcome its long-lasting security, energy and other social problems. In addition, Pakistan will get the benefits through greater economic linkages and cooperation with Central Asian countries in the areas of energy and transport. It gets the benign opportunity to explore the SCO's socio-economic prospects under the SCO Development Bank.

Since the core charter of the SCO emphasizes its members' obligation for developing an environment of mutual trust, respect and non-interference therefore, it is much likely that both Pakistan and India would seriously seek the options to refrain from confronting each other. Consequently, a peaceful region would encourage all the members particularly the South Asian members i.e. India and Pakistan to reallocate their resources towards constructive purposes rather than indulging in unending and expensive arms races. The two countries will eventually become able to experience new trends of bilateral relationship in the days coming ahead. The permanent membership of SCO will also bring an economic boom for the two countries since the immense natural and industrial strength of the SCO members particularly focus on sharing the technological and infrastructural development of the member states. If both India and Pakistan rightfully followed the core principles of the SCO, they would become able to bring up any enduring solution to their core issues and bone of contention such as the Kashmir issue. Besides the Kashmir, the issues of water distribution would also be resolved since the issues related to the water distribution was thought to be an security alarm for possible outbreak of war between Pakistan and India in the future.

The SCO also focuses and advocates new trends in the prevailing international political arena. The SCO demand for a new world order and non-dominance of any single state on international affairs is also one of the great roles of the Organization in regional and international affairs. The strategic cooperation and the close ties as leading powers of the SCO enable China and Russia further strengthen their strategic and political bound and increase their sphere of influence beyond the region. This influence particularly expands in many diverse fields, the SCO members having tremendous geographic possession and the human resources have exceptional economic edge and any economic sanction in the future would hardly affect any SCO member's economic sustainability.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2016/06/29/pakistans-permanent-membership-sco-dreams-prosperity/>