



# SVI FORESIGHT

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 9  
SEPTEMBER 2017

Compiled & Edited by:  
S. Sadia Kazmi



STRATEGIC VISION  
INSTITUTE

**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
Commemorating the 52 <sup>nd</sup> Anniversary of Pakistan's Defence Day	
Beenish Altaf .....	2
Rohingya Genocide and the Clash of Civilization	
Naila Farooq .....	4
BRICS Declaration and the Shifting Equations	
Ubaid Ahmed .....	6
India's Naval Expansion Plans: Prospects for Pakistan	
Qura tul Ain Hafeez .....	8
Russia's Position on CPEC	
Asia Maqsood.....	10
Pakistan's TNW Saga: Facts and Fictions	
Asma Khalid.....	12
The Rising Romance between Pakistan and Russia	
Baber Ali Bhatti .....	14
CPEC: Launch Pad for an Alliance Amongst China, Russia and Pakistan	
Asia Maqsood.....	16
Deterrence in US-North Korea Tension	
Maimuna Ashraf.....	18
Nuclear Disarmament or Non-proliferation Regime: Envisages Bleak Future	
Beenish Altaf .....	20
Indian Assertiveness - A Peace Spoiler	
S. Shahid Hussain Bukhari .....	22
Indo-Japan Nexus: Implications for China and the CPEC	
S. Sadia Kazmi .....	24
Boosting India-Japan Strategic Ties and Its Implications	
Maimuna Ashraf.....	26
India-Pakistan and Nuclear Deterrence Equation in Region	
Asma Khalid.....	28

Rohingya Crisis: A Pragmatic Approach for Pakistan	
S. Sadia Kazmi .....	30
US-North Korea Brinkmanship: Anticipating Escalation	
Ubaid Ahmed .....	32
Nuclear Weapons Ban Treaty: Challenges and Prospects	
Qura tul Ain Hafeez .....	34
Pax Indo-America in South Asia	
Baber Ali Bhatti .....	36

## *Editor's Note*

September brings with it another well timed issue of the SVI electronic journal *SVI-Foresight*. Covering various contemporary topics of strategic importance, it offers opinion based short commentaries on a number of issues including: current status of Deterrence in connection with US-North Korea tensions, Indo-Pakistan nuclear deterrence equation in the South Asian region, the growing trend of strategic relations between India and Japan and the regional implications, Problems and prospects of Nuclear Weapons Ban treaty, Rohingya crisis, and a timely analysis of Pakistan's 52<sup>nd</sup> Defence day.

This scholarly journal intends to offer original research articles on a wide range of issues and problems of contemporary relevance in the broad field of international studies. The journal provides insights in international politics and organization, international economics, defence and strategic studies, political geography and international law.

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

## *Commemorating the 52<sup>nd</sup> Anniversary of Pakistan's Defence Day*

### *Beenish Altaf*

The month of September has a unique importance in the history of Pakistan. It is so because of the armed forces of Pakistan who have given befitting reply to the Indian armed forces during the 1965 war and forced them to draw back. Therefore, the defense day of Pakistan is celebrated in commemorating the memories of Pakistani brave soldiers who laid their lives protecting our homeland in the 1965 War against India.

The Chief Minister Punjab said on the 52th anniversary of the defence day that besides continuous monitoring of naval, aerial and physical boundaries, the armed forces have also played unforgettable role against terrorism and the unique solidarity shown by the political and military leadership for the total elimination of terrorism is a bright chapter in the national history. This unique example of national unity has realized the enemies of Pakistan that this nation is fully united to effectively counter any threat to national security and survival.

Basically it was the disputed state of Kashmir that became the flashpoint in 1965, and led to the Indo-Pakistan war later in the same year. Border skirmishes started in April, spiraled into a war as the Indian Forces crossed the international border and advanced towards Lahore. On September 6, 1965, Indian army crossed the international borders of Pakistan without a formal declaration of War. It was a time when the whole nation was cast into the mould of a cohesive unit to defend our home land and defeated the Indian Army and made them retrieve on all fronts.

Indians forces then, crossed the international border of West Pakistan without a formal declaration of war, and launched a three-pronged offensive against Lahore, Sialkot and Rajasthan. There was a fierce tank battle on the plains of Punjab. That was the moment when the domestic India Pakistan conflict transformed into an international conflict and raised called the external power's concerns.

'The seventeen-day war witnessed the largest tank battles since World War II, causing thousands of casualties to both sides, but remained militarily inconclusive. Pakistan withstood the invasion of its territory by an enemy four times its size, and in doing so the whole nation stood up to the challenge with an iron resolve.' Well, the US suspended military supplies to both sides during the Indo-Pak War. Both the Soviet Union and the United States took a united stand to curtail the conflict within the boundaries of the Sub-continent from escalating into a global conflict. China threatened to intervene and offered military support to Pakistan. It was to keep China away from this conflict that both the Soviet Union and the United States pressured the UN to arrange for an immediate ceasefire. The main diplomatic effort to stop the fighting was conducted under the backing of the United Nations and a ceasefire came into effect on September 23, 1965.

However, Pakistan's forces were strategic sound enough and became a concrete wall before the enemy during the confrontation and gave a befitting reply to enemy's aggression. The political as well as the military leadership is fully aware of the conspiracy and tactic of the enemy and the security and

solidarity of the country will be protected at every cost along with ensuring elevation of national honor and prestige.

Pragmatically, Pakistan kept facing new threats and challenges, in the face of terrorism, criminal acts or other strategic threats from outside country, all fueled by other states having stakes in the instability of the country. Even the Kashmir issue remained a constant bone of contention between the two countries. Till the Kashmiri people are granted their inalienable right to self-determination, thereby removing the core cause of conflict, durable peace will continue to elude South Asia.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/09/06/commemorating-52nd-anniversary-pakistans-defence-day/>



## *Rohingya Genocide and the Clash of Civilization*

### *Naila Farooq*

During past few days the most potent images and videos of rivers of blood, beheaded children, dead bodies lying on streets and burning people alive have started a new debate onto the issue of Rohingya Muslims. This is not the first time that Rohingyas have had to face violence and brutality, until now thousands of Muslims have become victims of this 'slow-burning genocide' in Myanmar.

Myanmar — otherwise known as Burma — was one of the 48 states that voted for the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948, which states that “Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status”. Article 5 of the UDHR even states, “No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.”

Unsurprisingly, Human Right Organisations, Amnesty International, western countries and international media outlets like the BBC and CNN are quiet about the violation of Universal Declaration of Human Rights over this genocide that has no parallel in the world today.

Even the response of Aung San Suu Kyi, one of prominent leaders in Myanmar and a champion of Nobel Peace Prize was quoted saying, “I don't think there is ethnic cleaning going on against any ethnic minority. I think ethnic cleansing is too strong an expression to use for what is happening”, which clearly indicates her biases. On a similar note, Human Rights Watch stated that the government of Myanmar has to “stop the offensive” and they should allow ‘humanitarian assistance’ to Rohingya Muslims. Now the question is why these IOs and ROs are only resisted to statements and why are they waiting for permission from the government of Myanmar to help Rohingya. History is full of incidents where Western powers never waited for permission if they had genuine interest in the region.

Back in 2001, on September 26, just after fifteen days of the 9/11 attacks, the US covertly inserted members of the CIA's Special Activities Division led by Gary Schroen as part of team Jawbreaker into Afghanistan, forming the Northern Afghanistan Liaison Team.

Although, history has proof that US took no approval for any kind of ‘assistance’ in Afghanistan. Instead, the rest of world were left to choose between being seen as either for or against the US led war against terrorism and after years of sacrifice states like Pakistan are still asked to ‘do more.’

Hundreds of women folk in Myanmar were gang raped after ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and young boys are burned alive instead of being educated after ratifying the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) on July, 15,1991, but not a single peace keeping mission was send to act against the violation of ratified treaties or human rights.

This whole episode of Rohingya genocide and the silence of so called global peace protectors remind the very well theory of international relations known as 'Clash of Civilisations'. In this theory, Samuel P Huntington argued that world politics is entering a new phase, where divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain to be the most powerful actors in world affairs, but principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations. The clash of civilisations will dominate global politics and the fault lines between civilisations will also be the battle lines of the future.

The case of ethnic killings in Myanmar is the exact example of what Huntington wrote back in 1993. The western agenda-based peace builders are keeping their mouth shut because instead of the perpetrators, the victims of this unending cycle of violence are Muslims. So, the Buddhist nationalists can and will wipe out the Rohingyas and not a single light will light up to save them.

The Rohingya Muslims will suffer and it will be very hard to get international attention as the West that is shouting asking to 'do more' to help them continue their so called war against terrorism will 'do nothing' to save innocent lives in Myanmar because this is a war of civilisations and the victims are Muslims.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/e-paper/2017-09-13/lahore/14065>

## ***BRICS Declaration and the Shifting Equations***

***Ubaid Ahmed***

Notwithstanding the defense against US on the issue of terrorism, China looks as if it has taken an astonishing novel turn on the subject. The declaration espoused at the recent BRICS summit in China's Xiamen has denounced terrorism in its all forms and manifestations and also named three key Pakistan-based terrorist groups – the Haqqani network, Jaish-e-Muhammad and Lashkar-e-Taiba in a larger group of terrorist organizations blamable for violence and insecurity.

Commencing with the sheer criticism against the savagery on 'innocent Afghan nationals', the avowal went on to firmly backing the Afghan national government as well as the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces. Alongside the Pakistani terrorist groups, the declaration enumerated Taliban, Islamic State, the Al Qaeda and its partners like the East Turkestan Islamic Movement, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, the Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan and the Hizb-ut-Tahrir.

The BRICS, made out of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa, is as yet an untested unit of examination. . This is restricted in terms of communicated want or eagerness to lead, their capacity or ability to lead and the cogency to be a pioneer for followership or acknowledgment. However, the themes used to capture leadership of the BRICS are generally defined to copiously cover security and economic dimensions.

Nevertheless, there is an equal message for both India and Pakistan in the aforesaid declaration, and it would really be foolish calling it a diplomatic win for India reason being the realpolitik considerations are always there. Such declarations are principally consent based documents and China being the host has steered its drafting in its very own way. The language on Pakistan-based terrorist groups would have been kept out by China. Moreover, this avowal might well be viewed as a refreshment stand to India but in fact in a broader horizon it's a well-considered shift in China's policy with larger aims in the foresight.

Undoubtedly the decision by the host China to downrightly name terror groups has significant ramifications. To start with, the conspicuous reference to Afghanistan and the activities of the Taliban and the Haqqani amass seem, by all accounts, to be a riposte to the reported latest US arrangement on Afghanistan. Likewise in naming the Haqqani network and turning out in solid support to the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF), the Chinese are putting the press on Islamabad and making space for embeddings themselves into the Afghan equation.

Equally, it is not that China is cutting Pakistan free. Without a doubt, the inverse could be the situation. Beijing could well be moving Islamabad into a nearer grasp. In the wake of putting down cash through the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), China is looking to advance peace and solidness in the region both as a methods for getting return on its investments, and in addition dislodging the US

as the main performing artist in the region China considers its fringe and a vital one as a result of its Belt Road initiatives.

Afghanistan is an inexorably profitable connection in the engineering of China's Belt Road Initiative (BRI) particularly in South and Central Asia. Henceforth, China simply cannot let go the political instability and insecurity in the region for it keep on posing real snags to the extending Chinese cash and faculty in the region. On the other hand India for its part has explicitly rejected the BRI in its backyard even going so far as to boycott Beijing's prized road and belt forum in May 2017. So by naming Pakistan based terror groups China has played its part in addressing one of the grievances of India and to bring it to the chequered board of BRI in consort to the regional significance that India possess.

Pakistan however is committed to fighting the dread especially against the groups mentioned in the pronouncement. Hitherto, with the foreign media guns blasting towards Pakistan, clearly Islamabad is exhibiting a frail instance of its counter terrorism endeavors to its regional and global allies. Pakistan must not wrongly dismiss motion from developing world economies. BRICS revelation recommends a global pattern Pakistan can't stand to overlook. Pakistan also needs to make its domestic fight against terrorism more purposeful. Be that as it may, summing it up there is a bigger message in the more outspoken way to deal with terrorism noticeable in Xiamen announcement; for BRICS has a unique basis of economic growth and development which must be accomplished by inculcating peace in the region.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/09/14/brics-declaration-shifting-equations/>

## *India's Naval Expansion Plans: Prospects for Pakistan*

### *Qura tul Ain Hafeez*

India is industrializing her naval potency at rapid pace to accomplish the position of a “Blue Water Navy”. Nearly 90 percent of the Indian trade is carried out via sea route, which requires India to expand her resilient marine power in the Indian Ocean, securing maritime objectives and correspondingly establishing her hegemony in regional constituency and beyond.

The Indian Navy recently took delivery of the first domestically assembled long-range surface-to-air missile system (LRSAM). The Barak-8 (first LRSAM) is indigenously produced by Indian missile maker Baharat Dynamic with the assistance of Indian MoD, Defence Research and Development Organization (DRDO) in collaboration with a production line setup by Israeli defence contractors IAI and its subsidiary Rafael in India. LRSAM is designed to deal with incoming airborne threats with a range of 90-150 kilometres and is equipped with advanced phased-array radar, command and control, mobile launchers and missiles with progressive radio frequency (RF) searchers.

However, India's urge to advance blue water proficiencies is perceived as an intimidation by others in the neighbourhood. It has particularly amplified Pakistan's concerns, whose foremost security hazards hail from India. Moreover materializing the nuclear trio ambitions would provide India with a second-strike capability. Consequently the nuclear deterrence equation flanked by the hostile competitors will be disrupting.

According to an estimate as per data of 2016 the Indian naval assets include 79,023 personnel and a large fleet comprising of 2 aircraft carriers, 1GAH amphibious transport dock, 9 landing ship tanks, 14 frigates, 10 destroyers, 1 nuclear powered submarine and 14 conventionally powered submarines, 25 corvettes, 7 minesweeping vessels, 47 patrol vessels, 4 fleet tankers, numerous auxiliary vessels, 8 maritime reconnaissance and anti-submarine aircraft purchased from Boeing Co for \$ 2.1 billion in 2009 and approved an order for 4 more aircraft.

India is repetitively refining and accumulating naval competence, her navel budget for the upcoming decade is worth \$61 billion in order to increase size of navy by half. Indigenously India not only lifted her vessels building capacity, but she has done fair enough collaboration as well. India plans to build a 160 plus-ship navy, three aircraft carrier battle groups, 40 warships and submarines including stealth destroyers, anti-submarine corvettes and stealth frigates, INS Vikrant due to be inducted by 2018-19, induction of MiG-29K multirole aircraft and Kamov-28 and 31 helicopters to position from its aircraft carriers as per 2022 plan. These acquisitions would immensely improve Indian reconnaissance capabilities and would provide the Indian Navy strategic outreach in the Indian Ocean. According to the 2009 updated Indian Maritime Doctrine Indian Navy will put under her control all the choke points, significant islands, and trade routes, the Indian Ocean, Arabian Sea and in the Bay of Bengal. This vision is put forward for the Indian Navy by 2025. India aims to operationalize its naval force

in combination with the United States. Taking benefit from US's existence in the region India is trying to counter Chinese naval influence and advancing its own naval ambitions as well.

The more important point to ponder is that India is set to nuclearize the Indian Ocean. This will deter other states of the region more especially Pakistan. Pakistan intendeds to sustain an effective nuclear deterrent against India, the outline of the latter's nuclear triplet is a hostile growth, intensifying the security dilemma between India and Pakistan. Indian naval nuclear advancement will qualitatively modify the strategic equilibrium amid India and Pakistan. It might provoke Pakistan to enhance naval nuclear capability of her own for rebalancing the deterrence equation between the two. Subsequently this will hamper the strategic stability and geopolitical situation of the South Asian region thus leading to arms buildup and an arms race would start.

It is necessarily recommended for Pakistan to keep an eye on Indian naval transformation by expanding her own indigenous defence manufacturing to meet the contemporary needs of the Pakistan Navy; because her flimsy economic sources do not let her to purchase new weapon systems from industrialized countries. Pakistan must boost her joint ventures with countries like China, Germany and France to grow her nautical strength and overwhelmed her feebleness. Pakistan navy should also improve her exploration and reconnaissance proficiencies. Pakistan Navy should invite countries and participate in joint navel exercises with other countries to enlarge her operative war fighting ability at sea to overwhelmed upcoming intimidations and encounters to her national security.

<http://pakobserver.net/indias-navel-expansion-plans-prospects-pakistan/>

## *Russia's Position on CPEC*

### *Asia Maqsood*

2010 marked the beginning of an age of shifting interest and realignments in power relationships. This matrix of the new age brought the strategic partnership of three key powers, which are central to the resolution of many regional issues and whose collective political decisions can shape the political environment of future.

This power relationship is between China, Pakistan and Russia. China with its economic and global influence, Russia with its muscular strength, information warfare and Pakistan being a frontline state combating terrorism and its geo-strategic location this emerging triangular power relations have inherent political potential to pull the string in the emerging regional and global political theater. The contemporary international political order is moving towards multi-polarity which is leaning towards the Asian political order, a multiethnic and multi cultural region.

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

China under its dynamic leader Xi Jinping ambitiously envisioned and pursued the economic strategy to integrate Asia with Europe, Middle East and Africa with its OBOR initiative. Hence Asia is an integral part and very important key to success to materialize this OBOR initiative and Pakistan is the first link to this initiative. However, Pakistan and Russia are two important actors or pillars in Chinese geo-strategic ambition, first in the China -Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) and second is the OBOR integration with the Eurasian Economic Union. In this context China, Pakistan and Russia have essential shared objective in commerce, collective defense and regional security.

From Pakistan's perspective, the Chinese seek to accelerate their trade and commerce through CPEC, which is an essential component of Maritime Silk Road enterprise composed of networks of railways, highways and pipelines along with various energy and industrial project subjected to stave off the energy starvation of Pakistan and regional connectivity and pave the way for China's access to Indian Ocean by linking Xinjiang province with Pakistan's Gwadar Port. The geo-strategic interests of both countries China and Pakistan converge beyond the geography and also include a substantial role in Afghanistan. As far as China's interests in Afghanistan are concerned ranges from the development assistance, investment enterprises and emerging security role to get and preserve its strategic objectives in the country which need enhanced security environment.

While China and Russia's shared interests in the contemporary international environment are to counter US hegemony. China and Russia shared many multilateral platforms and institutions such as BRICS and SCO to strengthen their strategic partnership depends upon their shared interests both

regionally and globally. Russia with its initiative of Eurasian Economic Union and China with its OBOR initiative are seeking to revolutionize the world trade and integrate world economics through trans-regional connectivity and mutual cooperation with the shared objective of G-zero World.

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

In South Asia, Russia's recent overture or approach towards Pakistan (previously cold war rival) represents a clean break from the cold war animosity. Russia's security tie with the joint military exercise "Friendship 2016" with Pakistan is the recent example, which has more benefits than costs attached. Russia and Pakistan bilateral relations are at embryonic stage with undertaken projects represent the cautious approach. Here it is pertinent to state that India's traditional rivalry with Pakistan, whom Russia has long-term strategic partnership commence from the cold war era, is uneasy with the growing ties of Russia and Pakistan. Russia is the second largest defence exporter to India and it is expected that their bilateral defence trade is targeted to reach 30 billion dollars by 2025. On the other hand, Russia and Pakistan both share strategic interests as Russian wants to resolve Afghanistan dilemma because it has fears of the spill-over effects of the terrorism to its backyard in Central Asia from Afghanistan particularly the emergence of IS which threatens the stability of Russia itself with reference to Chechnya. It also has fears of the presence of US forces in Afghanistan.

Whereas Pakistan's interests are starting from first, it wants to strengthen its position in the region by engaging with second nuclear power; Second, Pakistan seeks to peaceful resolution of Afghanistan; Third, Pakistan seeks the prospects of giving Russia access to deep-sea port in Gwadar and subsequent incorporation of Russia in OBOR. In a nutshell, in the South Asian context Pakistan's reach to Russia come out of the need to counterbalance India's growing influence in the region specifically after the Logistics Exchange Memorandum of Agreement (LEMOA) between India and the US which seems to make India "linchpin" in this region. As Indian access to US weapons alongside US support for Indian operations in the sea – Indian Ocean — represents an alarming signal to Pakistan to recalibrate its international relations and increase its outreach to regional powers to counter prospective Indian hegemony in South Asia. Simultaneously Pakistan should maintain its relations with US on even keels because Pakistan's shift to strengthen its strategic relations with Russia and China are not at the cost of Pakistan-US relations- the only objective is to counterbalance India's hegemony in the region.

<http://www.eurasiareview.com/17092017-russias-position-on-cpec-oped/>



## *Pakistan's TNW Saga: Facts and Fictions*

*Asma Khalid*

The existence of an action-reaction spiral between South Asian nuclear rivals has increased the fragility of regional strategic stability. India's military modernization drive comprised of military stockpiling and war-prone military strategies such as Cold Start Doctrine (CSD) is considered alarming for deterrence stability in the region. The worrisome reality about India's military modernization based on the huge militarization thrust has the potential to disturb the balance of power and the deterrence stability in region.

In 2004, India introduced a new military doctrine known as Cold Start as a part of its grand strategy to ensure training, procurement, services and national policies to achieve an edge in future military operations under the nuclear overhang against Pakistan. It is based on the pre-emptive strike with reduced the mobilization period of integrated battle groups for limited war. The aim of the doctrine is to launch a retaliatory punitive conventional strike to inflict maximum damage by using conventional arms at the time of crisis and use it as a bargaining chip. The Cold Start Doctrine not only ensured the forwarded dumping of ammunition and placing of troops in forwarded cantonments but also brought change in their war strategy by immediately employing their forward deployed troops in an offensive role as part of their "Pro-active strategy" to achieve limited aim offensive.

The Indian aim of Cold Start Doctrine (CSD) or Pro-active strategy is to engage Pakistan in a limited war; a war which brings financial and economic restraints for Pakistan. Therefore, the Indian shift from a traditional defensive posture to more offensive posture against Pakistan through the Cold Start Doctrine, forces Pakistan to formulate strategic solutions to maintain the Balance of Power. So the question arises about what are the options for Pakistan to shape its defence policy in response to India's pro-active strategy against Pakistan?

In response to the real threat of Cold Start of aggressive insight, Pakistan adopted the counter measure strategy and developed the short range, low-yield, battle field nuclear weapons. NASR (Hatf-IX) is the most significant short range missile that aims to prepare against Indian aggression through punitive retaliation. NASR was introduced in 2011, it is dual-capable missile with a range of 60km and it is characterized as "quick response system". NASR is a dual-capable battlefield weapon and it can carry both nuclear and conventional warheads to defeat external aggression. Additionally, it is significant to note that, NASR is not only a cost effective apparatus against Indian aggression it has also enhanced Pakistan's deterrent force value. According to the ISPR, NASR has capability to contribute to "full spectrum deterrence" against perceived evolving threats and it has successfully defeated the Indian aim of exploring the means for conventional conflict. Due to these factors, Pakistan's strategic planners view NASR as a viable solution to the Indian cold start doctrine and maintain that NASR has put Cold Water on Cold Start because it has reduced the probability of any kind of aggression or limited war against Pakistan and brought down the evolving threat of war on strategic level.

Global strategic reservations exist on Pakistan's low yield, battlefield, strategic nuclear missile "NASR". The global debate on Pakistan's "NASR missiles" revolves around propaganda of Western and Indian analysts and strategic thinkers. Debate about the TNWs in South Asian context started in 2011 after the flight testing of NASR by Pakistan. Pakistan also has Abdali (180 km) and Hatf-IA (100 km) missiles that confer tactical capability. Whereas India also possess TNWs including Indian made short range Ballistic missile 'Prahaar' (150 km) and tactical surface-to-surface missile 'Pragati' (60-170 km) ; 'Pragati' is based on the Prahaar missile. India is also working on Pinaka Guided (60 km) that will be a tactical asset. Such weapons provide better reaction time to India than liquid fuelled Prithvi-I. It is imperative to identify that India tested Prahaar after few months of Pakistan's test of NASR and now India is developing more tactical Nuclear Weapons. However dilemma of global strategic argument regarding TNWs is that debate remains muted about India's tactical nukes. Moreover, it is significant to note that low-yield short range weapons should be called as "battlefield weapons or strategic weapons" instead of Tactical Nuclear Weapons.

Yet, significance of low-yield ballistic missiles in South Asia cannot be undermined by global propaganda against Pakistan's NASR because it is a defensive weapon that aims to uphold strategic and deterrence balance in the region which is expected to be affected in the future due to India's military modernization plans and growing conventional asymmetry. By developing NASR, Pakistan gave a viable solution or calculated mechanism to counter India's Cold Start Doctrine without undermining the deterrence stability of the region.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/23-Sep-17/pakistans-tnw-saga-facts-and-fiction>

## *The Rising Romance between Pakistan and Russia*

*Baber Ali Bhatti*

The relationship with Russia began developing in the post 9/11 period when Pakistan became the front-line state in the "war on terror". In 2002, a major working group called the 'Pakistan-Russia Consultative Group on Strategic Stability' was established which aimed to tackle the probable threats to regional stability which paved the way for further strengthening mutual ties. On and off exchange of visits by delegates of both countries kept supplementing ties. In 2011, Russian president, Vladimir Putin, publicly supported Pakistan when it was struggling to gain full membership of Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). It was a kind of break-through in the developing relations of Pakistan and Russia. Various economic agreements were signed and a number of offers were made by Russia for further assistance including technical assistance for the Guddu and Muzaffargarh power plants. Thereafter, a fruitful addition in bilateral ties was made by the President Asif Ali Zardari by his visit in 2011.

In the post 9/11 scenario, Pakistan made a positive and major shift in its foreign policy towards Russia which has resulted in a various joint-ventures benefiting Pakistan tremendously. A major breakthrough was the joint military exercise between Russia and Pakistan which marked a great change in this relationship while opening up the several doors for bond-enhancement on different fronts. Pakistan is following this path more enthusiastically. For instance, Pakistan wants to create the impression that it is ready to forget the legacy of its bitter past in the Soviet-Afghanwar memories. Moreover, it yearns to forge new relations for mutual benefit to the people and the region. What exactly is luring Pakistan towards Russia and Russia towards Pakistan should be analyzed comprehensively including the mutual and exclusive benefits that both countries gain from each other.

Russia is regaining the lost position of the post-Soviet-Afghan war and becoming an international player in the world politics. As far as South Asia is concerned, Russia is aware of the fact that in the wake of the complete withdrawal of US troops from Afghanistan, Pakistan will only be the crucial player in Afghanistan due to weak governance structures and the resurrection of the Afghan Taliban. Despite the reality that India has been infiltrated in Afghanistan, the existence of the Taliban on a larger scale cannot be over-looked. For the strategic stability of the region and the orientation of influence, Pakistan can play a key role. This is what led Russia to increase the advancement of military and economic ties with Pakistan.

However, Pakistan may gain benefits from this relationship more than Russia. In the wake of several geostrategic and geo-political changes that are taking place near Pakistan, Pakistan has taken the initiative to develop strategic ties with all regional players in which Russia is significantly important. The long-lasting and sustainable political and security developments in Afghanistan will be beneficial to Pakistan as well. Pakistan is right next to Afghanistan, and is adversely affected by its internal conflicts. In the Afghan-scenario, both countries are expected to get mutual strategic benefits in the strengthening ties. Russia is currently a regional and world power, a former superpower and permanent

member of United Nations Security Council. In the regional context, it is a leading member of SCO. Keeping in view these substantial credentials, Pakistan needs to build stronger ties with Russia especially when the US supports India playing a major role in the region. The US seems more inclined towards India despite the fact that Pakistan provided US with huge assistance being the front-line ally against war on terror and bearing the loss of armed forces and civilians. Having amicable relations with China on one hand, developing relations with Russia on the other hand, Pakistan can adjust itself to the changing dynamics of international relations.

Geographically, both countries seem to be ineluctable for each other providing the greater margin of economic and strategic partnership. Therefore, Pakistan must take this relationship as much as it can to heights aiming to achieve the strategic goals in the region. In the changing dynamics of world politics, Russia might prove to be a beneficial friend of Pakistan and can support Pakistan in the international community.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/23-Sep-17/the-rising-romance-between-pakistan-and-russia>

## *CPEC: Launch Pad for an Alliance Amongst China, Russia and Pakistan*

### *Asia Maqsood*

The addition of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor(CPEC) in the One Belt One Road (OBOR) initiative is a good example of how a leader, in this case Xi Jinping can turn an idea into reality. OBOR and Pakistan's membership of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) also makes the upcoming regional changes relevant to Russia. CPEC isn't just a trade route. It is also about the construction of major projects. The scheme has given impetus to China and Pakistan to cooperate in many fields of infrastructure, energy, agriculture and communication. There are several reports which suggest that the corridor will be host to an oil pipeline that will carry one million barrels of oil to China per day. This will be a welcome change for China, which currently imports about eight million barrels per day. Out of the eight million barrels, six million come in through sea routes.

It is still important to discuss whether CPEC can actually bring some measure of financial stability to Pakistan and how the Chinese will want to be repaid for it if it does. Some argue that the benefits CPEC will bring to China will be so great that the Chinese will happily take a number of financial losses involved in the development of CPEC. However, Pakistan should still be wary as it is unlikely to be able to pay for a number of costly CPEC projects.

It is predicted that the project, which costs over 50 billion dollars will not only be a game changer for Pakistan but Asia as a whole. There is also apprehension that India would start a military confrontation over CPEC. But that greatly depends on how many countries stand to benefit from CPEC. At the moment, the probability that India would be so reckless is very low.

As far as Russia is concerned, it is important to remember the relationship that country has with India. It has been a key weapon supplier to India for decades. Would it join an alliance with two of India's biggest rivals? There are some indicators that it might actually leave India behind to enter an alliance with China and Pakistan in order to benefit from CPEC. Russian Intelligence Chief Alexander Bogdanov has already made a visit to Gwadar and reportedly, he showed great interest in Russia becoming a part of CPEC. Intelligence officials from both countries have also expressed interest in strengthening defence and military ties. This shouldn't come as a surprise to anyone. After all, Russia has long desired to have access to a warm water port. And it seems Gwadar suits them just fine.

Russia and Pakistan weren't exactly the best of friends during the cold war. But the two nations have made great amends in their bilateral relations in the last two years. Russia is also well aware of Pakistan-India dynamic in the region, and their leadership is quite aware that a closer relationship between Moscow and Islamabad will probably upset India. But it seems like the CPEC offer just might be too tempting for them to refuse.

Russia and Pakistan also share strategic interests in Afghanistan. The so-called Islamic State (IS) in Afghanistan can easily spill over into Chechnya. Russia, like Pakistan is also against the presence of United States forces in Afghanistan. These shared interests give Pakistan the opportunity to strengthen its position by forging an alliance with another nuclear power and to counterbalance India's growing influence in the region, specifically after the Logistics Exchange Memorandum of Agreement (LEMOA) between India and the US, which seems to have made India the US's linchpin in Asia and the Indian Ocean.

Indian access to US weapons and support for Indian naval operations is an alarming development for Pakistan. This isn't to say Pakistan shouldn't maintain its relations with the US. Pakistan's shift to strengthen its alliances with China and Russia shouldn't come at the cost of Pakistan-US relations. The objective is simply to counterbalance India's hegemony in the region.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/23-Sep-17/cpec-launch-pad-for-an-alliance-amongst-china-russia-and-pakistan>

## *Deterrence in US-North Korea Tension*

*Maimuna Ashraf*

In the pre-nuclear age, the question of credibility in executing the threat was not a vital problem because the mighty side having the military means could carry out threat or launch an offensive while the weaker side was not allowed to take an aggressive action. Thus, the military means and the willingness were two foremost factors requisite to fulfilling the threat whereas after nuclear revolution, the deterrence theory speaks predominantly about the credibility. In literary sense, 'deterrence means to prevent people from doing something by frightening them, particularly through threats of severe consequences.'

Later, the concept of nuclear retaliation further consolidated the threat by permitting vigorous punishment without allowing realistic defence, because after the introduction of nuclear or strategic weapons, the cost of nuclear weapons is no more restricted to the battlefield or front line and the nation's infrastructure, population and industries cannot remain intact in modern conflict.

The general realisation is that in a nuclear conflict, either side would lose more than it gains. Thomas Schelling argues that in nuclear coercion, actors can credibly threaten or take steps on the route that may eventually result in the situation getting out of control.

The destruction done by nuclear weapons was first witnessed by the world in the Second World War when Hiroshima and Nagasaki were hit by the atomic bomb. The general perception is that since the advent of the nuclear weapons, the sense about major world war has grown. The potential impact and efficacy of nuclear weapons spurred a debate between proliferation optimists, the more the better, and pessimist, more will be worse.

On the notion of deterrence, optimist argues that the nuclear proliferation decreases the likelihood of war. Kenneth Waltz opined that nuclear weapons can increase stability among states because due to deterrent factor and nuclear retaliation, the states will tend to avoid war; both conventional and nuclear. Whereas, the nuclear pessimists argue that states possessing nuclear weapons may not necessarily come in mutually deterring pairs or stable relationships which would increase the risk of accidental nuclear war. Pessimist also contend about the possibility of preemptive strike between two hostile states possessing nuclear weapons and sharing common borders although deterrence till now worked in such cases, for instance between US-USSR, Soviet Union-China, India-China and Pakistan-India.

The cold war model is the most recounted to explain this phenomenon as the hostility between United States and Soviet Union did not escalate into direct military conflict despite the height of tensions.

On the contrary, with reference to ongoing US-North Korea tensions, the US President's national security adviser HR McMaster, in an interview, disagreed with the perception that "US and its allies will

tolerate nuclear weapons in North Korea and rely on traditional deterrence to prevent the North from using them, just as they had deterred the Soviet Union from using its much more massive nuclear arsenal during the Cold War”.

However, there are other Trump advisers who think that deterrence can work with North Korea. On the other hand, Pyongyang claim to complete the miniaturisation of hydrogen bomb capable of being fitted to an intercontinental ballistic missile is also important component of the North Korea’s deterrent strategy.

The country is showcasing its capabilities to demonstrate that it can cause significant damage to adversary. Thus, the derivatives of deterrence are certainly functional in current tensions. Yet a noticeable fact or limitation is that even if deterrence can stop a state to launch an aggressive action, it cannot prevent a country to further develop nuclear weapons.

Nonetheless, if North Korea is not deterred, then it will go on and make nuclear weapons which can be one of the most dangerous weapons in the world. Robert Gallucci, a former Clinton administration official, rightly questioned that “what makes deterrence unreliable in North Koreans case as it is certainly not the quality or quantity of North Korea’s nuclear weapons because Soviet Union had about thousands of weapons at height of Cold War while North Korea have less than 20”. The United States have so far deterred governments in past from using nuclear weapons that include Joseph Stalin in the Soviet Union and Mao Zedong in China. However, whether North Korea would be deterred by destruction or change its calculus on the development of nuclear weapons by the incentives, disincentives or sanctions is yet to be seen but the cost of failed deterrence is unimaginable.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/26-Sep-17/deterrence-in-us-north-korea-tension>



# ***Nuclear Disarmament or Non-proliferation Regime: Envisages Bleak Future***

***Beenish Altaf***

The failure of the Non-Proliferation Treaty's (NPT) Review Conference to produce a document with a substantive consensus has convinced many Pakistani experts that the country's leadership has made correct decisions on nuclear issues in the past. The NPT Review Conference has been held after every five years since the treaty went into force in 1970. This year's conference held at the UN headquarters in New York from April 27 to May 22 looked into the implementation of the Treaty's provisions since 2010. Review conferences on four previous occasions: 1980, 1990, 1995, and 2005 – had failed to deliver a final declaration.

The failure to produce a consensus document at the 2015 conference has led to disappointment across the world. It was widely expected that steps to be taken for advancing the 64 point Action Plan, agreed at the 2010 conference, for promoting nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy would be agreed upon. The opposition of the United States towards a plan for convening a conference on the establishment of the Middle East Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone and strong differences between nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear weapon states on the divisive issue of disarmament prevented the participating countries from agreeing on a final document.

One of the Pakistani nuclear strategists pointed out that Pakistan's nuclear deterrent should be both "credible and symmetric" with its conventional and strategic capabilities and that "refinement of the nuclear capabilities should continue." Ambassador Tariq Osman Hyder, who until recently was a member of the Oversight Board for Strategic Export Controls, said the collapse of the NPT Review Conference was a setback to the developed countries, which had projected this flawed and discriminatory treaty as the linchpin of the non-proliferation regime.

Likewise, the future of disarmament is bleak. This has been said upon many forums in or the other way. The disarmament talks are no more something to believe. Besides many optimistic statements on the future of disarmament has been given on and off by the Western powers especially the US. Ironically, when the country who is itself into changing laws and norms of the rules being a custodian itself, one should not consider its intentions of achieving disarmament more than a bluff. Pakistan very rightly took the decision in not joining the NPT and then conducting nuclear tests in 1998. Regarding the disarmament issue, narrating about Pakistan's position in the Conference on Disarmament (CD), it was not Pakistan, but the major western powers which were obstructing progress on nuclear disarmament.

Talking about the disarmament initiative, the contemporary situation of Russia and the US initiatives was assessed. The point of concern is Russia's apprehensions on the reduction of nuclear warheads from their countries to 1000 warheads apiece. Since it is the strategic stability in between

both countries, a precondition to reduce or cut down the number of nuclear warheads, Russia apprehends that the US is violating or undermining it by developing prompt global-strike systems, expanding its ballistic missile defense and opposing the draft treaty banning weapons in outer space. So, for initiating the disarmament talks again whether bilateral or multilateral, one needs to deal with it through new inter-governmental dynamics or by use of a creative diplomacy; this would positively add on from the non-proliferation perspective too.

Certainly, the biggest challenge to the future of the non-proliferation regime was from the failure to progress on disarmament. 'The international non-proliferation regime could "collapse" due to the "short sightedness" of the nuclear weapon states, which are unwilling to give up their hegemony.'

There should be a combined and holistic approach by both nuclear and non-nuclear weapon states for making the non-proliferation regime "non-discriminatory, flawless, effective, and universal".

The international non-proliferation regime has not only remained inadequate while dealing with instances of proliferation, but has also undermined the objectives of the Article IV of the NPT on transfer of nuclear technology for exclusively peaceful purposes. The major example of which is the Indo-US nuclear deal. This was back in 2008 when the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) decision to lift the ban on nuclear trade with India was taken out. This step constituted a lofty blow to an already beleaguered Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) and global non-proliferation regime. The deal is also cause of promoting nuclear power, a prohibited and problematic technology; the emphasis on nuclear power is likely to deflect from the adoption of more ecologically sustainable sources of electricity generation.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/09/29/nuclear-disarmament-non-proliferation-regime-envisage-bleak-future/>

## *Indian Assertiveness - A Peace Spoiler*

*S. Shahid Hussain Bukhari*

India stands at the second position in world in terms of highest number of population. It is known as the world's largest democracy with a secular outlook. Moreover, it has one of the emerging economies of the world in 21st century, and owes a large number of armed forces while aspiring to be recognised as a great power. Although India is known to have a potential to get the status of a Great Power for which the United States has also pledged to help it, it is yet awaited. Indian nation has been dreaming since long to achieve such a prestigious position but has been unable to understand the reasons for failure in fulfillment of their long awaited dream.

To be known as a Great Power, a state does not only need to acquire a military capacity and economic superiority or having a democratic system, it requires to have a capacity to deal with international affairs in a sensible and mature behaviour in conduct of their relationship. But unfortunately, Indian leaders perhaps consider 'assertiveness' as the major ingredient for becoming a major power. Therefore, Indian leadership has always pursued assertive policies in conduct of their relations with other nations. They are unable to understand that 'assertiveness' does not work everywhere.

In its search for a long-awaited status of Great Power with an 'assertive' mindset, India is now looking towards the United States to help achieve greater military strength and influence around the world while adopting assertive attitude towards other states in the South Asian region including Pakistan. Confronting with the immediate neighbours with a hope of support from outsiders like the United States in the region is manifestation of folly attitude on part of India which will never work.

It is well known that India is pursuing many projects for advanced defence acquisitions and military procurements. It is looking for advanced fighter jets, drones, missile systems, missile defence, and nuclear cooperation around the world and has become the largest importer of arms according to the SIPRI Year Book for 2017.

India's fast ventures for military modernisation with the US support are not only contributing to its hard power, but also adversely affecting the country's strategic thinking where a 'false sense of superiority' is overwhelmingly determining Indian attitude towards its conduct of international relations. Starting from immediate neighbours to regional and international spheres, Indian leaders are assuming themselves to be supernatural entities that deserve to rule the world.

This false sense of superiority has created a sort of superiority complex in the minds of Indian leadership as well as Indian people, which is dangerous not only for the regional peace but will also prove to be self-annihilating for the Indian state itself. This is an era of respect for sovereignty of every state in the world irrespective of states' size and capacity. One cannot dominate merely by acquiring military capacity or coercive attitude. Inter-state relationships are established on the basis of sovereign

equality and respect for each other. In their lust for Great Power Status, Indian leadership has forgotten this principal requirement in conduct of international affairs.

Without taking into account the consequences of unnecessary diplomatic ridicule, Indian leadership has introduced a culture of disrespecting the diplomatic lingua. In their policy to isolate Pakistan in international arena, Indian diplomatic community has gone to the extent of using bizarre language which is more damaging for India itself and less for Pakistan. The most recent manifestation of such an attitude was the address of Indian representative in the UN Eenam Gambhir, who called Pakistan as 'Terroristan'. Indian Foreign Minister Sushma Swaraj praised the theme of the UNGA event 'Focusing on people:

Striving for peace and a decent life on a sustainable planet', but was unable not only to notice the indecent attitude of Ms Gambhir but she herself showed indecency by targeting Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan. This indicates the abusive strategic thinking of Indian leadership who, in surge for defaming Pakistan, has gone to the extent of setting aside the diplomatic manners. Disrespecting your counterpart's name and founding fathers will result in worsening the already fragile strategic environment in the region. It cannot, in any way, show a serious intension for peaceful dialogue process. It is manifestation of just an assertive attitude towards other nation which will never work rather acts as a 'peace spoiler'.

If Indian leadership really wants peace and prosperity in the region, they will have to amend their attitude towards other nations in general and towards Pakistan in particular. Indian leadership is required to recognise and accept the reality of Pakistan's strength and strategic importance in the region and will have to come out of Pakistan phobia.

They will have to learn to talk to Pakistan on equal footing while setting aside their hegemonic attitude. Efforts to isolate or malign Pakistan shall prove to be counter-productive. India shall have to settle regional issues with Pakistan for a peaceful rise. Attitudinal fault lines based on perceived support from outside world need to be addressed through respect for other's sovereignty and with a positive commitment towards peace and tranquility. Last but not least, diplomatic manners need to be adhered strictly in the whole process.

[http://dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/29-Sep-17/indian-assertiveness-a-peace-spoiler?tm\\_campaign=shareaholic&utm\\_medium=facebook&utm\\_source=socialnetwork](http://dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/29-Sep-17/indian-assertiveness-a-peace-spoiler?tm_campaign=shareaholic&utm_medium=facebook&utm_source=socialnetwork)

## *Indo-Japan Nexus: Implications for China and the CPEC*

*S. Sadia Kazmi*

India and Japan have given impetus to their bilateral relations after reviewing and revisiting their policies towards each other as well as towards the region in general. Ever since the World War II, the gradual warming up of relations has been taking place. Now it is almost over two decades of economic ties which are visibly turning into strategic cooperation. One common factor that has been instrumental in bringing the two closer to each other is China. The exponential economic rise of China as well as its Asia Pacific policies including its growing stronghold in South China Sea, has raised worries for both Japan and India. China's massive investment in Pakistan's infrastructural and developmental projects is another major area of concern for India. Infact both India and Japan have suggested an alternative to CPEC in the form of Asia-Africa Growth Corridor (AAGC). In the backdrop of 12th Indo-Japan annual Summit meeting the Indo-Japan nexus gains a renewed significance within the context of Asia Pacific and specifically its implications for South Asia.

The meeting between Japanese and Indian Prime Ministers Shinzo Abe and Narindra Modi took place during the former's two day visit to India on 13-14 September 2017. The timings of this meeting is quite significant as India recently disentangled itself from a "could have been" violent conflict with China over Doklam. The post Dokalm overtures of India towards the US and Japan, show an intentional effort on its part to reduce its dependence over China and to establish more robust and reliable alternatives. Even though the analysts are expecting a possibility of positive ties between China and India especially after the BRICS Xiamen declaration where China for the first time condemned Pakistan based terror outfits Lashkar e Taiba and Jesh e Muhammad for committing terrorist acts. Nonetheless it is being considered more of a diplomatic victory of India and it is yet to be seen whether China and India can get back on the cordial terms so soon after the Doklam crisis. India has already been showing resistance against CPEC alleging it to be a threat to its sovereignty and territorial integrity. It is for the same reason India has not only consistently refused to join the CPEC but by doing so it has denied China a 1.3 billion market of consumers. In the same vein, the visit of Prime Minister Abe pronounces the objective of embarking upon a geo-economic vision as a counter to China's "Belt and Road Initiative". The leaders of the two states were vocal in expressing disappointment with China's BRI and especially the CPEC. It is unfortunate that Japan blindly tows the line of India and believes that CPEC is somehow violating India's territorial integrity.

Ultimately deepening and reinforcement of their footprints in the Indo-Pacific region is the intended part of the plan. Similarly, US Secretary of Defence Jim Mattis' visit to New Delhi on 25th September, further highlights the increased efforts by India to strengthen the relations. Although the prime reason for the Defence Secretary visit is in connection with Trump's South Asia policy and possible US-India cooperation in Afghanistan, it is believed that China factor is quite relevant. As is also evident from Pentagon's statement which outlines Mattis' agenda, stating "the secretary will emphasize that the United States views India as a valued and influential partner, with broad mutual interests extending well beyond South Asia". Similarly, PM Abe's visit comes in the wake of North Korea's nuclear and ballistic

missile tests, as he condemns the tests and announces that “strengthened Japan-India ties are the basis to underpin the regional order”. The two states also hailed the civil nuclear cooperation agreement that was agreed upon in July, allowing Japan to export its nuclear power technology to India. With regards to this development, the critics have raised their concern that it would instead disturb the regional peace. Their objection is indeed quite valid that technology export to India, which conducted nuclear tests in the past without joining the Nuclear No-Proliferation Treaty, could be diverted to military use.

Nonetheless Japan along with India assumes for itself a role of torchbearer for peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region and the world. While specifically in an attempt to minimize China’s role in the Asia-Pacific region, Japan and India agreed to promote defence and maritime security cooperation between their countries. The two states have vowed to expand their area of cooperation and the 12th Indo-Japan annual Summit was followed by signing of 15 MoUs in sectors like engineering, automobile and infrastructure, IT and skill development, aerospace, defence manufacturing, pharmaceuticals, electronic and housing etc. The visit also saw the launch of Mumbai-Ahmedabad bullet train project. For this, a training institute has also been set up that will help develop human resources with high level knowledge for the operation of High Speed Railway. For this Japan has committed loan of 10.45 billion Yen (about INRs 606 crore). Further to improve the connectivity in North Eastern Region of India, Japan will provide a loan of 38.66 billion yen (about INRs 2,242 crore) to improve roads and bridges. This project consists of the construction work of NH-40 (in Meghalaya) and NH-54 (bypasses in Mizoram). For up-gradation of existing ship recycling yard at Alang, Gujarat INRs 494 crore loan agreement was signed. All these developments clearly hint at the intentional effort to have less economic reliance on China and to have parallel developmental and infrastructural projects implemented in India as counter to China’s developmental venture in Pakistan i.e. CPEC. Furthermore, in order to counter China, Japan will massively keep pouring in money into the Indian market with an aim to seek enhanced influence in the South Asian region.

Not just that, but the maritime security has also been an important area of concern during the annual Summit. Both countries unanimously highlighted the significance for the freedom of navigation at sea, overflight and unobstructed trade based on international law. This could very well be alluding to China’s growing influence and stronghold in the South China Sea.

Nonetheless, one can predict that since China’s economic presence on the world stage is only going to further grow with the passage of time, so will the cooperation between India and Japan. And if this cooperation actually helps in sustaining peace in the region, then this cooperation should be embraced wholeheartedly. But that is not the case. It is essentially to enhance India’s influence within the region and beyond and to collectively contain China with the help of Japan and the US. Even though it is quite daunting for Japan and India to match up with China’s growing economic clout, they will strive to keep playing their important role in the geostrategic environment of South Asia.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/09/29/indo-japan-nexus-implications-china-cpec/>

## ***Boosting India-Japan Strategic Ties and Its Implications***

***Maimuna Ashraf***

Over the past few years, India made significant efforts to access larger nuclear sources and signed several strategic deals with states from elite nuclear club and other developing states. In this ambit, recently the significant India-Japan civil nuclear agreement in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy came into force on July 20, 2017. The deal can be traced back to the bilateral summit of December 2015 in New Delhi, when Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi signed a memorandum of agreement on civil nuclear cooperation. And on August 14, 2016, it was reported that both prime ministers will finalize a full-fledged nuclear cooperation agreement in November 2016. On November 11, 2016, Japan and India signed the accord for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The official statement said that “this Agreement is a reflection of the strategic partnership between India and Japan and will pave the way for enhanced cooperation in energy security and clean energy. It seeks to promote full cooperation between the two countries in the development and uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes on a stable, reliable and predictable basis.” As compared to past, Japan and India are having more close cooperation on number of issues in recent times. The perfect example for this proximity is the civil nuclear cooperation between the two states. Almost two years after operationalization of India-Japan deal, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe visited India this month which adds a further prominent dimension to bilateral ties of both states. The deal is also been seen as significant attempt to influence India’s efforts for admission into the elite cartel of Nuclear Suppliers Group.

Japan is expanding its strategic landscape by improving relations with India. It was reported in previous couple of years that India often showed reservations to welcome Japanese participation in the annual Malabar naval exercise between India and US, notwithstanding pressure from the later. The Indian decline seemingly intended to avoid Chinese provocation. At that time, Japan’s inclination towards India was not seen as a union against China but a move to reinforce Japan’s own presence in the Indian Ocean. Japan naval posture has been focused to protect home islands and its skimpy fleet of vessels capable of resupplying ships with fuel, munitions and other supplies and its recent developments seems to focus on this policy. The country has been relying on the United States for the security of its supply lines however with recent military advancements it can be presumed that Japan is developing an ability to independently secure its supply lines. Both Japan and China are greatly dependent on Strait of Malacca and Indian Ocean for trade routes. Undoubtedly, Japan’s presence in these critical waterways is enhancing its capability to secure its supply lines and improving its strategic position but also increasing tension with China in the South China Sea. Besides, improving its military relations with India, Japan was also bolstering its economic relations with countries in the Indian Ocean basin. In 2013, Japan concluded first bilateral naval exercise with Indian in Bay of Bengal and at that time it was affirmed that more such exercises will be held in future. After that India and Japan are getting closer in pursuing their interests.

After this treaty, India would be able to import nuclear power plants, nuclear fuel and technology from Japan. India is the world’s third largest importer of crude oil and to nuclear energy is

the most reasonable way to meet country's demands without emitting large scale carbon. Although India is having civil nuclear cooperation with other countries as well but to import large forged components from Japan it was required to sign nuclear agreement. From an economic point of view, the transfer of nuclear technology not only significant for India's growing economy but thereof is also attractive reason for Japan to invest as Japan seeks to build nuclear power plants to revive its nuclear energy market after Fukushima nuclear disaster. Apart from the economic standpoint, India's potential to compete with China and its strategic cooperation with US further adds to the reasons for this civil nuclear cooperation. The deal will also have security implications in the South Asian region. Pakistan expressed concerns over the controversial nuclear deal and urged Japan "to objectively assess the consequences of discriminatory approaches to our region."

It is presumed that this deal would further develop India's credibility as responsible nuclear weapon state however many argue that Japanese being the victim of nuclear bomb should not have entered into an agreement with non-NPT state. The deal also has a separate nullification clause that would cancel the pact if India were to conduct a nuclear test, even for peaceful purposes because there cannot be any assurance that technology provided by Japan had not been used for the military purposes. The intensity of Japan's concern over this can be understood from the December 2015 Japan-India joint statement when Prime Minister Abe stated that "the importance of early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) which should lead to nuclear disarmament." There was also political resistance to the deal in Japan. Therefore the deal can become unstable if India is developing thermonuclear weapon and test it in future as reported in different sources. However if India will be allowed to receive this nuclear technology without banning its future nuclear tests it will further bleak the chances of states signing CTBT because many states are having reservation over India's preferential treatment and they asked for universal criteria in the last Vienna plenary meeting. In the aforesaid scenario, this will be another deal having adverse impact on non-proliferation regime.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/09/30/boosting-india-japan-strategic-ties-implications/>



## *India-Pakistan and Nuclear Deterrence Equation in Region*

*Asma Khalid*

Introduction of Nuclear weapon has transformed the global politics as well as the military power in an expensive way. The primary purpose of acquiring a nuclear weapon is to prevent wars among nuclear-capable adversaries through maintaining deterrence stability. The concept which has dominated the global politics is that war is not a rational mean to achieve political objectives while the strategy of nuclear deterrence is considered as a dominant aspect of nuclear strategy.

Nuclear deterrence in south Asia is significant as it has played a vital role to prevent nuclear and conventional war. Nuclear deterrence in South Asia revolves around two historical adversaries: India and Pakistan. India's nuclear strategy is based on three objectives: first to counter Pakistan and China; second to maximize power; Third, it aims to acquire the status of great power so that it could influence regional and global political and security order. While, the focus of Pakistan's deterrence policy is to ensure national security and counter the threat from a nuclear neighbor, without any intention of influencing the regional and global politics.

Though nuclear deterrence has prevented the war strategic stability has remained fragile due to India's Military Modernization plan and the expanded defense budget. India is pursuing the long-term program of a huge scale modernization of land, sea, air forces including the rapid modernization of Nuclear, outer space and Cyberspace. The Recent technological acquisition shows that India is primarily supported by United States, Russia, and other European states. Indian ambitions comprised of expansion of long-range missiles, ICBMs, MIRVs, SLBMs, acquisition of BMD system and Cold Start doctrine with the introduction of Nukes has left Pakistan with the only rational choice to shift to full spectrum deterrence.

India's offensive strategies, renewed defense settlements, increased defense budget and the conventional military build-up forces the Pakistan to take countermeasures to ensure deterrence stability and maintain the strategic equilibrium at the same time. India's BMD system and Cold Start Doctrine (CSD) are seen destabilizing for regional-centric deterrence in the future by analysts. Therefore Pakistan has developed the viable countermeasures for BMD and Indian proactive strategy of CSD. Such as the recent developments in Indian Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD) system are the matter of great concern for the Pakistan because endo-atmospheric missile, Advance Area Defence (AAD) has added new dimensions to the regional security equation and pose the serious threat to deterrence stability. In response, Pakistan's surface to surface ballistic missile, Ababeel is a significant contribution in the defense arrangements of Pakistan. Ababeel is capable of delivering multiple warheads using Multiple Independently target Re-entry Vehicle (MIRV) technology. It is a valuable addition to the Pakistan's defense, and it (MIRV) will facilitate Pakistan to sustain the credibility of its deterrence strategy and neutralize the Indian BMD system due to its ability to deliver multiple warheads. Secondly, offensive CSD with the nuclear element has made the dynamics of regional deterrence even more intense. So the most significant development in response to CSD is the introduction of short-range, low yield, battlefield

weapon named as “NASR.” By developing NASR, Pakistan gave a viable solution or calculated mechanism to counter India’s Cold Start Doctrine without undermining the deterrence stability of the region (Khalid, 2017).

Another, Dilemma of the South Asia is that India’s military modernization facilitated by global powers is often viewed as destabilizing for regional-centric deterrence. Trends and recent developments show that India’s conventional and nuclear ambitions are largely being facilitated by a diverse group of supplier states including Russia, United States, France and other European countries. On the other side, China and Pakistan are making strong partnership in economic, military and nuclear fields. China can play the crucial role to maintain the balance of power and deterrence in the region by assisting Pakistan in military and nuclear fields. Therefore, in response to Indo-US-European state’s strategic partnership, Strategic co-operation among China-Pakistan has evolved the unique kind of equilibrium in the South Asia. However, India’s military modernization plane, missile program, Indo-U.S civil nuclear deal and discriminatory approach of U.S towards Pakistan have directly challenged the regional strategy and deterrence balance. In this regard, the absence of crisis stability and deterrence stability mechanism is increasing the fragility of South Asian strategic stability.

To sum up, the concept of deterrence is considered as a remarkable tool to maintain peace. Additionally, nuclear deterrence is continuing in South Asia, despite the fact that conventional and nuclear programs of India and Pakistan demonstrate different trends. Role of external powers cannot be undermined in triggering the nuclear arms race in the region. Therefore, to maintain the deterrence stability, it is imperative to develop a framework comprised of force balance; arms control regime and conflict resolution through dialogue and confidence-building measures in the nuclear and conventional forces.

<http://southasiajournal.net/india-pakistan-and-nuclear-deterrence-equation-in-region/>

## *Rohingya Crisis: A Pragmatic Approach for Pakistan*

*S. Sadia Kazmi*

The killing of Rohingya Muslims through systemic ethnic cleansing by the state of Myanmar is the most horrific genocide in the history of mankind. In the garb of security operation against the Rohingya militants/insurgents in Rakhine state, the government of Myanmar has carried out the most brutal and disproportionate act of slaughter ever. More than half a million Rohingya Muslims have fled the army campaign since August 25 and have escaped to Bangladesh. Despite the recurrent news flash on TV channels and social media handles, the very existence of this humanitarian crisis has been denied by Myanmar's Security Advisor U Thaung Tun who while addressing the UN Security council stated that "there is no ethnic cleansing and no genocide of Rohingya Muslims". Even though the UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres termed it as the "the world's fastest developing refugee emergency and a humanitarian and human rights nightmare". However, Myanmar views them as mere allegation and maintains that if at all there is a mass exodus, the reasons behind it are not the crackdown by Myanmar army but the act of terrorism. The security operation as is claimed by Myanmar government, has led to 400 deaths, which are mostly terrorists, belonging to Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army (ARSA).

However, this doesn't really explain the satellite images of civilians being viciously murdered. Nor does it change the fact that unarmed civilians are being killed even if it is at the hands of terrorists and the government is not only unable to control the situation but apparently is largely unaware of the whole fiasco. The state Counsellor of Myanmar Aung San Suu Kyi has been widely criticized for not being able to address the issue adequately. However, at the same time, China extends its support to Myanmar government and expresses the need for strict action against the elements causing unrest for the state. This makes the situation a bit complicated as while on one hand there is a growing international pressure on Myanmar as the United Nations rights chief Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein stated that this is a typical example of "textbook ethnic cleansing", on the other hand China expresses appreciation and encouragement to Counsellor Kyi. China's foreign ministry spokesman Geng Shuang supported the state effort to "uphold peace and stability" in Rakhine. A possible reason as to why China has adopted this stance is because Myanmar serves as an important pillar in China's energy, trade and infrastructure strategy in the Southeast Asian region. Aung Suu Kyi maintains that the army was only doing its "legitimate duty to restore stability" and that the troops were under the orders by the state to "exercise all due restraint and to take full measure to avoid collateral damage".

While China supports Myanmar government, another country that has been condemning these heinous acts since the beginning is Turkey. President Recep Tayyip Erdogan accused the security forces in Myanmar of waging a "Buddhist terror" against the Rohingya Muslim minority and also lamented the failure of international community to lay sanctions against Myanmar. In a recent speech, he lambasted the international community for its biased approach where the "Islamist terror" is quickly denounced unlike the "Christian terror", "Jewish terror" or the "Buddhist terror". He also urged Bangladesh to open its borders for the incoming Rohingya refugee and not be worried about the economic burden, as the expenses would be covered by the government of Turkey. With this official stance, Turkey is being

hailed as the Human rights hero as well as hero of the Islamic world. In Pakistan, also similar sentiments are being witnessed. Not only rallies and processions have been carried out in solidarity with the Rohingya Muslims, but the federal Cabinet passed a resolution against Myanmar for Rohingya genocide. Government of Pakistan officially condemns the cold-blooded and callous genocide of innocent Rohingya Muslims, including women, children and infants, under the direct patronage of state institutions of Myanmar. Indeed, it is the right approach adopted by the government of Pakistan. The resolution echoes the widespread feelings of the whole nation and calls upon the Nobel laureate Aung San Suu Kyi to take immediate steps to stop the atrocities being committed in Myanmar. Just like Turkey, Pakistan demands the world community to put pressure on Myanmar and also urges the United Nations to take the lead in stopping this genocide.

Some voices inside Pakistan also suggest allowing Rohingya refugees to come into Pakistan. However before actually undertaking this option, this will have to be pragmatically thought out without any emotional traces in the decision. Moreover, for now this hasn't been officially taken up by the government. Nonetheless this could be considered by keeping certain facts in mind. First, there is no denying the fact that the plight of the refugees is real, not because they are Muslims but most of all because they are humans. Second, Pakistan should first see if it can take more burden on its economy when it is already providing shelter to a large number of Rohingya and Afghan refugees, despite its dwindling economic conditions. Third, if in case more are allowed inside, what strategy should Pakistan adopt to ensure that the downtrodden refugees will not be allowed to be the soft target for the hostile anti-state elements. Pakistan might have to adopt strict measure and set up a camp for the refugees and database with fingerprints for better accountability. Last but not the least, Pakistan should also take into account the propaganda from the Indian side where the attempts are being made to link Pakistan with the chaos in Myanmar.

Indian media and blogs are harping upon serious negative information about ARSA group and its alleged training in Pakistan and Afghanistan. It has also been reported in Indian media that Lashker e Tayyaba / Jamat ud Dawa from Pakistan have been operating since several years in Myanmar and are instigating the local Muslim population against the majority Buddhist. Pakistan should not ignore these allegations and give a fitting response. Not just for the sake of counter India's attempt at maligning Pakistan's image internationally, but also for the sake of letting the world know the real facts. Pakistan should also learn from the past experience where it has always rushed to provide shelter to the Muslim brothers and sisters in need whenever required. Apart from the human factor, this has largely proven counterproductive, by increasing the state's economic burden. Hence it is important that Pakistan adopts a rational approach in sync with its potentialities.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/09/29/indo-japan-nexus-implications-china-pec/>

## ***US-North Korea Brinkmanship: Anticipating Escalation***

***Ubaid Ahmed***

The escalation in the war of words between the United States and North Korea reached a new pinnacle this past week. The most recent addition in the verbal hostilities came from North Korean Foreign Minister (FM) Ri Yong Ho, who stated that it was inevitable that North Korea would launch a missile at US mainland. The statement was issued at a speech at the UN general assembly, a platform which was used days earlier by US President Donald Trump. Trump had threatened North Korea with total destruction if it didn't cease its defiance of the United States and its allies.

The US is the primary 'boogeyman' in North Korean propaganda. Totalitarian regimes need an arch-enemy to fit their nationalistic narrative around and against which the population can be united. Kim Jong-un needs the US to act like its enemy, so it is quite likely that the ongoing bellicose rhetoric will escalate even further. Trump has already sent US bombers to fly in international waters along the North Korean coast in a provocative display of American military power. Undeterred, the North Korean regime threatened to shoot down the bombers even if they didn't enter American airspace. Trump has also belittled Kim Jong-un as a 'Rocket Man', to which Kim responded by referring to Trump as a 'dotard'. As of now, there seem to be more insults than bombs involved.

Kim also knows that as long as he is being backed by China, he can keep upping the ante. Both China and Russia haven't displayed any sign of worry regarding the nuclear threats, with Japan on the other end on the spectrum. Russia has even spoken against unilateral US action, insisting that dialogue is the only way forward. Additionally, Putin has refused to cease Russia's oil exports to North Korea. Beijing is more open to using sanctions to reign in North Korea. The Japanese are planning remilitarization, and its defence ministry is intent on acquiring land-based Aegis Ashore defence systems.

According to experts, the roots of this current standoff can be found in the 'stability-instability paradox', according to which nuclear weapons deter war, as was witnessed during the Cold War. At the same time, threats of war and other provocative behaviour go up. This is why Kim thinks he can get away with threatening history's greatest military juggernaut with nuclear annihilation. Kim is too stubborn to put a stop to the ongoing brinkmanship, and may incite the US to take pre-emptive action. If this happens, the ensuing destruction would be, in Trump's words 'unimaginable'.

The major players need to play their role to prevent that situation from arising. Neither very hard, nor very soft approaches will work here. There is a need to be prudent and pragmatic. The Chinese have suggested that the US cease joint military exercises with South Korea, in exchange for North Korea agreeing to not carry out more missile tests.

It has also been standard practice to ignore the North Korean regime's repression and cruelty towards its citizens. This has been ongoing since long before nuclear weapons and ICBM's from North

Korea became a believable threat. This is ironic since North Korean's are suffering under one of the most repressive regimes in the world, which alone justifies isolating or forcing change in the country. It is ironic that those who claim to be champions of human rights remained quiet regarding the barbarities in North Korea right until it became capable of threatening their strategic interests.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/30-Sep-17/us-north-korea-brinkmanship-anticipating-escalation>

## *Nuclear Weapons Ban Treaty: Challenges and Prospects*

### *Qura tul Ain Hafeez*

The nuclear pessimist have introduced a new treaty in the “Forum shop” of nuclear disarmament In March 2017 the treaty was negotiated in United Nations on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and sustained from 15 June to 7 July 2017. The treaty opened for signature from 20th of September 2017. The treat proposed in the good faith against the humanitarian consequences of the nuclear weapons use with the purpose of a step towards their total eliminations. The treaty prohibits States Parties from developing, testing, producing, manufacturing, acquiring, possessing, stockpiling, transferring or receiving, using or threatening to use nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Lastly, States Parties cannot allow the stationing, installation, or deployment of nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices in their territory. In addition to the Treaty’s prohibitions, States Parties are obligated to provide victim assistance and help with environmental remediation efforts.

It is not possible to purify the world from the nukes completely. Up till now various agreements have been carried out including the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and nuclear-weapon-free-zone agreements, as well as the “right” of states-parties to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. While the assessment shows that there is a deadlock on the complete disarmament.

Moreover, two important elements of the nonproliferation regime have never come into effect, largely because of resistance by the United States and other nuclear weapon states. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) which has been signed by 183 countries but cannot enter into force until all forty-four states with significant military or civilian nuclear capacity ratifies it. China, India, Israel, Pakistan, and the United States have not yet done so. Efforts to conclude a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT) to ban the production of weapons-grade material have also stalled. The United States has been criticized for blocking progress on both issues. International instruments combating proliferation were successful before the end of the cold war but still the states like Pakistan, India and Israel have acquired the nuclear technology. North Koreas nuclear test and her claim of possessing hydrogen bomb is a serious blow for the non proliferation regime, NPT and disarmament efforts.

North Korea’s nuclearization is encouraging the states like Iran keep on to pursuing her nuclear capabilities. Moreover it will provide space for Iran now to continue to advance her nuclear program; even after crosscutting economic sanctions have been imposed on her and near universal global condemnation is still spreading. According to NPT the nuclear weapon states (NWS) agreed to not support other states in acquiring nuclear technology, but they should make them move toward eventual disarmament, but still a special wavier has been given to India which is defector nuclear weapon states and non signatory of NPT like Israel, Pakistan and North Korea.

None of the nuclear weapon state including many of the NATO members has signed the nuclear ban treaty. While the proponents of the treaty claim that the treaty was accepted by the overwhelming

majority. Three of the P5 states the United States, France, and the United Kingdom issued a joint statement following the vote: “We do not intend to sign, ratify or ever become party to it. Therefore, there will be no change in the legal obligations on our countries with respect to nuclear weapons”. They said the treaty do not address and contribute to international law.

This treaty could have unseen implications for Pakistan particularly with regard to its position on Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT). Pakistan needs to be cautious about it as new trend is being set up. If the UN is negotiating the nuclear ban treaty then FMCT can also be taken to the UN as well. Talks on the FMCT have been on hold from past several years thus putting Pakistan at a continuous disadvantage compromising her interests. This treaty will divert the attention of the international community from other Disarmament and non proliferation treaties.

Ideas about eliminating the bomb are as old as the bomb itself. Can nuclear weapons be completely eliminated? . Logic might seem to say of course not. Nuclear weapon can be dismantled to some extent but they cannot be uninvented. For instance if a state dismantle some of her weapons, by and far she can make them again whenever she has the will to do so. Those nuclear weapons may not, in fact, make the world more dangerous but the bomb may actually make us safer. In this era of rogue states and transnational terrorists, that idea sounds so obviously wrongheaded that few politicians or policymakers are willing to entertain it. But that’s a mistake. Knowing the truth about nukes would have a profound impact on government policy. Primarily progress can be made toward arms control, such as actions to reduce the risks of nuclear theft, accident, and terrorism. But the complete elimination may not be the solution nor does it guarantee a complete peace.

There is the need to address the previous treaties first like NPT, FMCT and CTBT who are facing challenges and talks are on hold. NWS and NWS States should start the negotiation for solving the issues of nuclear acquisition on table instead of such treaties because a country acquiring the nuclear weapon will not completely eliminate the arms this will have serious implications for the security of a state.

<http://foreignpolicynews.org/2017/09/30/nuclear-forum-shop-nuclear-ban-treaty-challenges-prospects/>



## *Pax Indo-America in South Asia*

### *Baber Ali Bhatti*

The announcement of Trump's new policies in Afghanistan and South Asia has generated a new debate among opinion makers. Holding Pakistan responsible for the failures of his predecessors, Trump accused Pakistan of providing 'safe havens' to America's enemies in Afghanistan. Perhaps this latest change is the result of the US partnering with India in Afghanistan.

To an extent, the hidden agenda behind keeping American troops in Afghanistan has already been revealed. America's lack of interest in a political solution in Afghanistan can be seen easily. The Americans have demanded unconditional surrender from the Afghan Taliban and demanded that Pakistan wage war against them as well. Offers by Pakistan to bring the Afghan Taliban to the table for peace talks have been rejected.

A trend towards these policies could be seen before hand as well. Back when Pakistan was still looking for a political solution to its own terrorism problem, various talks were sabotaged by American drone strikes. One example of this is the drone strike which killed Mullah Mansour. Acts such as these also slowed down the regions stabilization process and justified American presence in Afghanistan, which in turn serves other American interests. Turbulence in Afghanistan also means that Pakistan will be more likely to accept the current status quo in Kashmir, since it will have to use it's resources securing it's western border. In turn, this will solidify American partnership with India. A more solidified partnership with India, will also give the US license to speak or act against Pakistan's nuclear arsenal. Something which Trump has already shared his opinion on many times. This is the essence of Pax Indo-America.

Furthermore, rising Chinese and Russian influence in the region is something that America is not comfortable with. These changes pose a threat to many of the American's interests in the region. American presence in Afghanistan can act as a counter to their rival's goals in the region. It can certainly impede China's One Belt One Road (OBOR) of which the China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) is a part.

Following Trump's announcement, Pakistan is set on building regional consensus against America. Pakistan has never focused on regional diplomacy as much as it is now ever before. It's relations with China are already positive, so currently it has its diplomatic targets set on Russia. The country's diplomatic strategy seems to be effective. Pakistan has also initiated its plan to fence the Durand line which will also impede American ambitions in the area.

Pakistan's current position doesn't allow it to entertain American demands anymore. Its nuclear defence projects remain ongoing and it is well aware of American military cooperation with India. Pakistan has made all the calculations to ensure the viability of the it's strategic as well as economic interests vis-à-vis China and Afghanistan.

The pre-Trump era has already provided Pakistan with comprehensive insight regarding US foreign policy which will also assist it regarding the strategic picture in South Asia. Keeping in view the strategic moves and diplomatic initiatives, one can be realistically optimistic that Pakistan has orchestrated its policies to manage the Pax Indo-Americana strategy in South Asia.

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/e-paper/2017-09-27/lahore/14369/108886>