

VOL.2, NO.2 ★★ December 2014

ISSN: 2311-0635

**NATIONAL DEFENCE UNIVERSITY  
PAKISTAN**



**OPINION**

**A JOURNAL OF THE ARMED  
FORCES WAR COLLEGE**

[www.ndu.edu.pk](http://www.ndu.edu.pk)

## EDITORIAL BOARD

<b>Patron</b>
Major General Muhammad Naeem Ashraf
<b>Chief Editor</b>
Midhat Shahzad
<b>Editor</b>
Cdre Muhammad Shuaib
<b>Assistant Editors</b>
Cdre Naveed Anwar Cheema, T.Bt.
Gp Capt Muhammad Afzal, TI(M)
Lt Col Ikram ul Haque
Lt Col Abu Bakar Shahbaz

<b>ADVISORY BOARD</b>	
Dr. Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema	Dean Faculty of Contemporary Studies, NDU Islamabad
Dr. Muhammad Khan	Head of the Department International Relations FCS, NDU Islamabad
Dr Syed Bashir Hussain	Head of the Department Government & Public Policy FCS, NDU Islamabad
Dr. Ishtiaq Ahmed Chaudhry	Head of the Department Peace & Conflict Studies FCS, NDU Islamabad
Dr. Zulfiqar Khan Chaudhry	Head of the Department Strategic Studies FCS, NDU Islamabad
Prof Dr. Ghulam Shabbir Niazi	Head of the Department Leadership & Management Studies FCS, NDU Islamabad

AFWC Journal (OPINION) is sponsored and edited by the Armed Forces War College (AFWC), National Defence University Islamabad, Pakistan. Comments / suggestions may be directed to:

**Chief Editor, OPINION**

Armed Forces War College  
National Defence University  
Sector E-9, Islamabad  
Pakistan  
E-mail: [midhat@ndu.edu.pk](mailto:midhat@ndu.edu.pk)  
[www.ndu.edu.pk](http://www.ndu.edu.pk)

***DISCLAIMER***

*Statements, facts and opinions expressed in the AFWC Journal are solely of the authors and do not imply the official policy of the Institution, editors or publisher.*

## MESSAGE OF PATRON



The evolving global security environment is though complex and challenging also offers opportunities to those who position themselves correctly. Correct strategic positioning is invariably a result of conceptual clarity obtained through objective research and analysis. To this end, Armed Forces War College (AFWC) at the National Defence University promotes knowledge through enhanced research and analysis in the field of national security.

This edition of OPINION e-journal comprises research work undertaken by the course members of National Security and War Course (NSWC) 2013-14. The selected articles are of general interest to a wide range of researchers, scholars and policy makers. We expect the journal to promote scholarly knowledge by inspiring discussions and information sharing with regards to comprehensive national security.

I would like to acknowledge the commitment and hard work of the entire team of OPINION on publication of its 4th edition. I hope the ideas shared would contribute towards creating awareness on the security matters highlighting need to promote peace and stability.

**Major General Muhammad Naeem Ashraf**  
**Commandant, Armed Forces War College**  
**National Defence University, Islamabad**

## **CHIEF EDITOR'S CORNER**

We feel great pleasure in presenting the 4th edition of our AFWC “*Opinion*” e-journal, the first publication of this year’s biannual issue. Deliberate efforts have been made by all concerned to maintain the high standard set forth by the University in bringing the well researched work by the panels of NSWC 2013-14 mainly comprising research work of individuals / panels on key issues.

For our new readers, OPINION journal is a publication of Pakistan’s premier institution National Defence University Islamabad. The magazine is a collection of selected researched work of the panels /individuals. The Journal is broadly divided into four sections i.e. Global / Regional issues, National Security, Military Strategy and views of individual writers on contemporary issues.

I strongly believe that readers will feel a professional analytical approach and find new ideas in this edition as well. This edition will definitely be NDU's another leap for intellectual and professional development.

**Midhat Shahzad**  
**Chief Editor OPINION**  
**AFWC Journal**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Part-I</b>	<b>Global / Regional Issues</b>	<b>Page No</b>
❖	US National Security Strategy-2010 - Interests in South and West Asia	1
❖	Pakistan-Russia Relations and Future Prospects	14
❖	US - India Strategic Alliance and Pakistan's Security Concerns	26
<b>Part-II</b>	<b>National Security</b>	
❖	Pakistan's Energy Security Challenges	39
<b>Part-III</b>	<b>Military Strategy</b>	
❖	Indian Quest for Permanent Membership of UNSC – Implications for Pakistan	57
❖	21 <sup>st</sup> Century Conflict: Fighting in a Meta City	73
<b>Part-IV</b>	<b>Views</b>	
❖	Global Strategic Threats to International Peace & Security Post Cold War Era	85

## **PART – I**

### **Global / Regional Issues**

- **US National Security Strategy-2010 – Interests in South and West Asia**
- **Pakistan – Russia Relations and Future Prospects**
- **US - India Strategic Alliance and Pakistan's Security Concerns**

## US NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY-2010 INTERESTS IN SOUTH AND WEST ASIA

**Air Commodore Muhammad Zahoor Faisal**

### ***Abstract***

*The 9/11 incident altered the complexion of international politics and brought a paradigm shift in the US National Security Strategy. The Obama National Security Strategy of 2010 emphasizes on a multi-facet security plan orchestrated around a democratic world free of tyranny and terror, open market economy, diversified energy resources and defence against WMD. While the new US Security Strategy has impacted the world at large, its dynamics are unfolding in South and West Asia region also. Despite the planned US draw down in 2014, its objectives and motives in this region are less likely to fade away.*

*US security concerns emanate from Al-Qaeda and its associated terrorist components present in Afghanistan, allegedly in Pakistan and from the likely development of nuclear weapon in states like Iran. Ever since US military presence in this region for war on terror, Pakistan has been facing serious internal security challenges. Some consider it as a side-shoot of War on Terror whereas others perceive it as a measured US effort to destabilize Pakistan. Therefore, Pakistan needs to guard its national interests and keep all options open. Pakistan must eliminate terrorism in own interest and also ensure that no terrorist groups operate from its soil.*

### **Introduction**

In today's world, the term 'security' has considerably broader context and applications that embrace economic, social, environmental and global subjects. US NSS-2010 is an all-inclusive security outline that provides important guidelines on various subjects of national security and serves as a 'Communiqué of Intent' to the world. In the prelude to NSS-2010 paper, Obama envisions "a world in which America is stronger, more secure and able to overcome US challenges while appealing to the aspirations of people around the world".

In the NSS, US attaches lot of importance to South and West Asia where it has several known interests and challenges. Issues such as WOT in Afghanistan, extremism and terrorism in Pakistan, nuclear stand-off with Iran, the chess game involving the Central Asian resources and rising influence of China and Russia have direct connotations for US security.

The US presence in the region for WOT has also brought chaos and anarchy to Pakistan. Few see this as an offshoot of WOT while few others see it as a deliberate US attempt to destabilize Pakistan. There are inferences to suggest that US, even after drawdown in 2014, may be interested to use Afghanistan as a forward base to continue to check Islamic extremism and terrorism in Afghanistan and Pakistan keep the Pakistani and Iranian nuclear program under close surveillance and exert influence in the Central Asian states for energy security as well as containment of Russia and China. US presence or influence in South and West Asia could have multiple objectives and motives. While few of these objectives could be in pursuit of

addressing genuine security concerns, there could be few others that are purely aimed at furthering the hegemonic agenda of US. To study the core concepts of US National Security Strategy-2010 and analyse broad US interests related to important states of South and West Asia with special emphasis on Pakistan.

## **Background to US Security Strategy**

In 1950, President Harry Truman institutionalised the presentation of national security objectives to the US Congress and this tradition continued afterwards. These doctrines principally branded the US foreign policy. The Truman Doctrine was based on deterrence for containment of USSR expansion which was then continued by most US Presidents as a way of guarding American interests. The Eisenhower Doctrine of 1957, Kennedy Doctrine of 1961 and President Nixon Policy of 1969, all directed deterrence through partnerships against communism. The Carter Doctrine of 1980 prepared in the backdrop of Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, committed use of force in defence of US interests in Persian (Arabian) Gulf. The 9/11 changed the nature of global politics and obliged a fundamental review of the previous security policies which were more focused on deterrence. The new security strategy called 'Bush Doctrine' was documented for the first time in 2002<sup>1</sup>, consequently re-examined in 2006<sup>2</sup> and it saw ending policy of deterrence in favour of pre-emption.

## **Overview of National Security Strategy (NSS)-2010**

The Obama government released its first 'NSS' on 27 May, 2010, which reveals the strategic policy and primacies for the Obama Administration. While it is a vital document reflecting the government security priorities and direction, it is "not a blueprint for action but means to convey the President's principles and priorities".<sup>3</sup> The document is spread over fifty two pages with four sections, mainly covers, overview of National Security Strategy, Strategic Approach, Advancing our Interests and finally Conclusion. It inaugurates with defining ends i.e. achieving US enduring interests of security, prosperity, tenets and international order. It then explains methods and actions the US government will employ to achieve those ends. The chores identified in NSS-2010 for the US government are:-

- Promoting just and viable World Order.
- Dislocate, disassemble' eliminate Al-Qaeda and violent extremists.
- Reverse the spread of Nuclear and Biological Weapons and secure nuclear materials.
- Capitalize on the capacity of strong and capable allies.
- Attain balanced and maintainable growth.
- Sponsor Human Rights and democracy abroad.
- Safeguard durable coalitions.
- Building Cooperation with other 21<sup>st</sup> Century Centres of Influence.



## **Promoting a Just and Sustainable World Order**

The document while eluding use of debated word 'New World Order' emphasises on revamping the international institutes and strengthening their authority against non-compliant states. It mentions use of sanctions, isolation and even force to generate results. The 'world order' seems to suggest political changes at the global canvass. Iraq and Afghanistan during Bush and Libya under Obama point at the contours of this perceived 'Order'. Similar opinion can possibly be assumed about war in Syria except that Russian reaction and firmness became an obstruction. There is no issue in solidification of international organizations as long as these do not overstep national sovereignty.

## **Promote Democracy and Human Rights Abroad**

The document says that US "supports the expansion of democracy and human rights abroad because government that respect these values are more just, peaceful, and legitimate." While backing for democracy from a leading power is understandable but then why so open opposition to the democratically elected governments of Palestine and Egypt and if democracy is such an emphasising factor then why so warm support to the kingdoms in Middle East and all the authoritarian regimes of Pakistan? Could it be for "free market" and "democracy" concept go side by side? Therefore, there are reasons to believe that US national interests supersede its urge for democracy and that US could use this argument to interfere in countries having difficulties / issues to align with the US interests.

## **Disrupt, Dismantle, Defeat Al-Qaeda and Violent Extremists**

The National Security Strategy- 2010 reveals firm resolve to defend US against threat from Al-Qaeda. It states, "The United States is waging a global campaign against Al-Qaeda and its terrorist affiliates." Afghanistan and Pakistan are mentioned to be the epicentre of Al-Qaeda in the NSS document. In order to weaken Taliban and deny space to Al-Qaeda, a three prong approach has been proposed i.e. targeting the insurgents, securing key population areas and training Afghan forces; Second, improving governance and third, to strengthen relations with Pakistan improving its capacity to overcome terror related challenges. While, declaring Pakistan as epicentre of extremism is worrisome, the US desire of strengthening Pakistan's capacity to fight out terrorism is not likely to go well with India as this may entail 'military assistance' as well.

In the context of US security, it is important to mention that the US homeland territory was last attacked in 1812 until the incident of 9/11 broke this sense of invincibility. US claims that Al-Qaeda network targeted the United States long before it targeted Al-Qaeda and that terrorist attacks are not the offshoot of Iraq or Palestinian issue.

## **Reverse the spread of Nuclear and Biological Weapons and Secure Nuclear Resources**

As per US NSS 2010, the possibilities of nuclear threat to US in a terrorist attack have increased since end of the cold war. The terrorists are resolute to make an access to the nuclear weapon as black markets are also involved in dealing nuclear

secrets and supplies. Above all the nuclear proliferation needs to be controlled as it could lead to a nuclear exchange. Therefore, it is in the US interest to see a reversal of nuclear spread. The US efforts in this direction are aligned at pursuing ratification of the CTBT and in seeking an end to the production of fissile materials. The NSS also mentions that US would make all possible efforts to desist Iran and North Korea from increasing / possessing nuclear weapons. If both countries disregard the world-wide obligations, then their isolation would be further increased.

The threat of chemical and biological weapons to the US especially from non-state actors seems to have grounds, if considered neutrally. There have been 52 threats or actual incidents involving use of chemical or biological ingredients between 1968 and 2006.<sup>4</sup> The one-ton bomb exploded at world trade centre by Ramsi Yousaf in 1993 is said to have also contained cyanide which got burnt in the explosion and did not evaporate to cause catastrophe.<sup>5</sup> In 2007, in Iraq, there have been 12 cases of use of chlorine gas against US forces in suicide attacks.<sup>6</sup> It is appropriate to indicate that alleged accidental proliferation of nuclear material such as uranium have taken place in India and Russia as well.<sup>7</sup> The US has serious concerns with the nuclear programmes of countries like Pakistan, Iran and North Korea whereas it has a fair degree of tolerance towards similar programmes of India and Israel.

### **Building Cooperation with other 21<sup>st</sup> Century Centres of Influence**

US NSS-2010 states that "the United States is part of a dynamic international environment, in which different nations are exerting greater influence, and advancing US interests would require expanding spheres of cooperation around the world". It highlights emergence of new power blocks and 'Centres of Influence'. In this regard the document emphasizes three countries and states that "US relations with China, India, and Russia will be critical to building broader cooperation on areas of mutual interest." It admits rise of Russia as a strong voice and enhanced global role for China and India.

### **Invest in the Capacity of Strong and Capable Partners**

The NSS discusses states, which have been unable to achieve internal security and could not provide for meeting fundamental needs of their citizens. Such states create and generate challenges at global level, because lack of such conditions nurture extremism that could directly threaten the security of American people. Therefore, such states must be assisted to strengthen their security in addressing such common challenges. The NSS then precisely highlights Iraq and Afghanistan where, there is a necessity to provide assistance in security, economic and governance related issues.

The NSS document has not touched upon the rise of a serious question asked from US, that who brought anarchy, instability and poverty in Iraq and Afghanistan. The wars in these countries have not resulted in bringing peace and prosperity. The extremism and terrorism in these regions has not reduced. Likewise, the size of ERF in Afghanistan is disproportionate to tackle Al Qaeda and a large number of countries still have serious reservations about invasion of Iraq.

## **Ensuring Strong Alliances**

The NSS-2010 describes 'Alliances' as 'Force Multipliers' and emphasizes that transnational harmonized action transmits more impact than discrete action. The document pledges to defend Allies and also to benefit from collective security. In this regard, good relations between US and foreign militaries are considered essential. The document stresses relation with NATO that is envisaged to "strengthen our (US) collective ability to promote security, deter vital threats and defend our people." In Asia, alliances with South Korea, Japan, Philippines, Australia, and Thailand have been underlined as critical for peace and stability in the region, whereas promotion of democracy in Eastern European countries with help of EU has also been stressed.

Even predominant powers like US require allies to further its strategic objectives. This is considered to be a genuine foreign policy objective pursued by all countries for security as well as economic considerations. Countries forming alliances would face challenges to strike a balance between its own and international alliances' interests. US interest of sponsoring democracy in Eastern Europe with EU is a healthy sign but Russian interests in Eastern Europe especially with countries like Ukraine, Georgia would need to be taken into consideration else friction and polarization in expend. The US alliance with Japan and Korea would likely see a challenge, if situation in South China Sea worsen.

## **Balanced and Viable Growth**

US was quick to respond to the economic crash of 2008, though economic recovery was predictably slow. It was not until 2013 that budget deficit fell below \$1 trillion as a slowly recovering economy and higher tax rates boosted receipts to a record level.<sup>8</sup> Understandably, there seems to be greater realization in US to address the debt issue.

The NSS-2010 states significance of economic prosperity for US. It lays stress on the necessity to prevent re-emergence of global slowdown. It emphasises on reforming the US monetary system and reassures citizens to save more and reduce the long-term budget deficit. The document recognizes the benefit of engagement with G-20 especially in the context of pursuing governance reform at the IMF and World Bank.

## **Relevance of US Security Concepts with South and West Asia**

Keeping in view the prevailing international environment, mentioning Afghanistan and Pakistan with reference to extremism and terrorism is understandable. Likewise, South and West Asia region is relevant to some of the US economic and security core concerns, which are as under:-

- US Rebalancing to Asia Pacific.
- Control Chinese economic and military influences and its supremacy in Asia Pacific and Indian Ocean.
- Containment of Russian influence on CARs.

- Growing militancy and radicalism in Afghanistan and Pakistan. (2<sup>nd</sup> ME)
- Nuclear ambitions of Iran and possible fall out for Israel and Middle East.
- Role of India as strategic partner.
- Energy security and diversification through Central Asian natural resources and safeguarding energy corridors.

### **Views about Important Players in US National Security Strategy – 2010 Afghanistan**

The document says, “In Afghanistan, we must deny Al-Qaeda a safe haven, deny Taliban the ability to overthrow the government, strengthen the capacity of Afghanistan’s security forces and government so that they can take lead responsibility for Afghanistan's future”.

Even a large section of US academician and intellectuals have shown reservation about success in Afghanistan, invasion of Iraq while the Afghan war was still going on, the withdrawal from Iraq and the durations of Afghan war. Some even argue that the US policy has further added to extremism and radicalization. Keeping in mind the US interests as highlighted above and the US stated policy objective, ‘To sustain world leadership role’ for as long as possible, the US policy in the region and particularly Afghanistan indicates some consistencies and associated interests.

### **Post US Drawdown and likely Situation**

- US would maintain military presence in Afghanistan after 2014, albeit with reduced strength.
- Drawdown without any eloquent dialogue with political factions’ would likely lead to a disorder in Afghanistan.
- Afghanistan’s war-ridden economy will be unable to sustain due to reduced international focus.
- An annual budget of USD 3.5 Bn is estimated for Afghan National Security forces.<sup>9</sup> In absence of such assistance, the development and sustenance of the force would pose serious challenge.
- Cross border movement of militants would likely increase between Afghanistan and Pakistan with its fall-outs for both countries.
- The drone strikes in Pakistan tribal belt are likely to continue; though its frequency is likely to decrease.

### **Russia**

The importance of Russia to US has been acknowledged in successive National Security Strategies. National Security Strategy-2006 says “by reason of geography and power, Russia has great influence not only in Europe but also in many other regions of vital interest to US”. National Security Strategy-2010 also recognizes

resurgence of Russia as a 'strong voice' and expresses desire to deepen cooperation in trade and investment. US seek greater cooperation from Russia in defying violent extremism, particularly in Afghanistan. It also seeks to ratify a landmark "New START Treaty" with Russia to limit deployed nuclear warheads. The NSS-2010 also comments on US support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Russia's neighbours. US and Russia have a common interest against religious terrorism and radicalism.

### **Russia – US interests**

US and Russia can affect each other's vital interests, therefore, both remain relevant to each other. US pursuance of 'Freedom', 'Human Rights' and 'New World Order' are sources of concern and worry for the Russians. Russians also consider that "Leadership is a part of the national DNA of Americans".<sup>10</sup> Russia considers that US and its allies undertake deliberate actions to isolate Russia from its potential allies, economic partners and desired influence in the region. These apprehensions saw its manifestation in Iraq, Libya, Syria and Iran.

### **Central Asia**

The NSS-2010, largely discuss Asia and mainly South-East Asia, but specific interests in Central Asia have not been listed in detail. It is however, assessed that US may likely have following interests in Central Asia:-

- Counterterrorism drive in Afghanistan.
- Development / diversification of energy resources and supply routes.
- Drug trafficking.
- Non- proliferation.

The interests of global and regional powers in energy rich Central Asia is likely putting the wheels of the old 'Great Game' of 19<sup>th</sup> century in motion, 'New' being addition' of 21<sup>st</sup> century. The new game has more performers and the effects of this game have world-wide implications. In this New Great Game, United States, Russia and possibly China are the key players; whereas, Turkey, India, Iran and Pakistan may have economic and strategic interests.

In support of the global war on terror, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan gave bases to US while Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and Tajikistan granted over-flight rights.<sup>11</sup> Many States facilitated transportation of US and NATO supplies to Afghanistan through 'Northern Distribution Network'. The Central Asian States also recognize that it is in their interest to seek broadening of pipelines towards Europe. This desire goes in line with US aspiration for an easy access to US firms in energy exploration, refining and marketing. US also desire to shrink Russian and Iranian energy domination in the oil market.

At the same time, Russia and China also appears to have forged a common cause to prevent US influence in this region. Thus CARs seem to return to an age of great powers clash of interests. Russia is looking to enhance its political and military influence in the region by building bases in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan.<sup>12</sup> China on the

other hand is chalking out its own plans for safeguarding energy and economic interests in Central Asia through bilateral agreements.

## **Iran**

The NSS-2010 does present unambiguous US stance that Iran had presented challenges and threats to the security of the region, reinforced terrorism, tracked illicit nuclear programme, endangered neighbours and undermined peace between Israel and Palestine. It states the desire to see a positive transformation in Iranian policy. It calls for presenting a choice to Iran to either accept international commitments on its nuclear programme or face isolation through 'Multiple Means'.

From the NSS document, the possible inference drawn would be that Iran is a strategically important country, yet it controverts US interests in many ways. Iran has links and influence over so many countries which have relevance to the US national security concerns; such as Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, Palestine and Lebanon. Besides, Iran is the only country that presents credible threat to the state of Israel, whose relevance to the US needs no amplification. Interestingly, Iran influence despite imposition of sanctions has relatively increased in the region.

Iran played important role in assisting US by providing intelligence to fight the Taliban and is also likely to help in post draw down political situation if so desired by the later. Incidentally, by removing the Taliban from power in Afghanistan and installing a Shiite government in Iraq, the US has increased the relative power of Iran in the region. Iran also enjoys good relations with Russia and remains interested to supply gas to Western Europe.<sup>13</sup>

In US view, Iran is following double game in Afghanistan. The Americans believe that on one hand it facilitating US government in the Afghan development program on the other it is believed to be in contact with forces fighting against US. Iran seeks to enhance influence in Persian speaking non-Pashtuns and is against the indefinite presence of US in Afghanistan. It had provided materiel support to selected groups of Taliban and other militants in Afghanistan.<sup>14</sup> Iran also opened Taliban office in Zahidan in 2012 allegedly to facilitate Iranian role in political reconciliation in Afghanistan.<sup>15</sup>

The US had kept broad international economic pressure on Iran against its nuclear programme. US acknowledge Iran's right to peaceful use of nuclear energy, although it is difficult to exactly interpret this statement. US sanctions have indeed harmed Iran economically and the election of a relatively moderate President Hassan Rouhani, perhaps reflect public desire for an amicable solution to the nuclear issue. It is difficult to predict the outcome of ongoing negotiations between Iran and US led European countries.

## **China**

The NSS-2010 desires deep and effective relations with rising Centres of Influence. In this regard NSS specifically mentions China, Russia, India and calls for a comprehensive relationship with these countries particularly China. US has often expressed desire to see China taking more responsible role towards global issues such as economic recession, nuclear proliferation and climate change. Concurrently

it also expresses caution over rising Chinese military potential and at making necessary adjustments in order to guard her interests. The document calls for lessening in tensions between China and Taiwan. US concern over China human rights violations remain a challenge between the two countries.

Chinese new security concept inclines on the five principles; equality, respect for each other's sovereignty, non-interference, non-aggression and peaceful co-existence. At present China opposes intervention in other states without the UN backing. Both countries have main differences over Taiwan, Tibet, Syria, Asia Pacific and Central Asia. China's sensitivities include Taiwan, relations with Tibet, territorial issues with Japan in the East China Sea and settlement of South China Sea maritime claims/ boundaries. Chinese policy makers in 2010 declared South China Sea as, "core interest". US is a strong proponent of protection of global commons particular freedom of Navigation (FoN) at high seas and south China sea. China is seriously concerned over US policy of 'rebalancing to Asia-Pacific' and takes it as part of overall containment efforts by the US. The American presence in Central Asia is considered by China as an infringement on Chinese sphere of influence. China is amongst the largest consumers of energy in the world and according to an estimate, its oil imports would increase by more than 500% by 2030 at an estimated 11 billion barrels a day.<sup>16</sup> Given China's growing interests in Central Asian hydrocarbon reserves, China would be uneasy with an arrangement where United States would be in dominant position to interfere with Chinese energy supplies. Both countries also have differences over Korean issues. China, while trying to convince North Korea to control challenging acts, opposes the US military presence in the Korean Peninsula, as China considers this as an attempt to deter China. In June 2011, Russia-China issued a joint statement that said, "The two countries pledged support for each other on a wide range of issues, including Russia's security challenges from the United States and Europe as well as US pressure on China in the Asia-Pacific regions".<sup>17</sup>

## **India**

As stated earlier, India is being considered as 'Key Centre' of influence. The document states that, "The United States and India are building a strategic partnership. We seek a broad-based relationship in which India contributes to global counter-terrorism efforts, non-proliferation and helps promote poverty-reduction, education, health and sustainable agriculture. US would seek to work with India to promote stability in South Asia and elsewhere in the world".

India is viewed as a growing economic-military power with shared strategic interests. US does not view India only as a major player in stability of South Asia but also relevant to US for containment of China and an important player in the 'Rebalance to Asia'. The rebalance is a military strategy cum politico-economic engagement in Asia which China believes is about preventing her from gaining dominance in Asia. US backs the Indian desire for the permanent UNSC seat when President Obama in 2010 said, "I look forward to a reformed UN Security Council that includes India as a permanent member".<sup>18</sup> The rising strategic connection can also be sensed in increasing number of Joint exercises between the two countries. The Indo-US nuclear deal has added a new dimension to this relationship. The warmth in relations has also touched the Chinese sensitivities whereby China believe that India alongside Japan and Australia would be used to contain China.

## **Pakistan**

It seems that the US NSS -2010 sees Pakistan and Afghanistan through one prism and makes no distinction between them on terrorism; rather calling both to be epicentre of terrorism. US believes that Al-Qaeda network in Afghanistan and Pakistan remains a credible threat to US interests and therefore, it must be dismantled and defeated. The NSS further spells out that US will “foster a relationship with Pakistan founded upon mutual interests and mutual respect”. It also says that, US will provide considerable support and cooperation in wide-ranging areas.

The main concerns between two countries are:-

- Many Pakistanis believe that prior to 9/11; the situation in FATA and KPK was relatively manageable. It was US, which is said to have coerced Pakistan to support and join WOT that resulted in instability inside Pakistan.
- US look at Pakistan from the lenses of only Afghanistan and terrorism. US has never been a reliable partner, especially in times of crises and violates Pakistan sovereignty through drone strikes giving rise to Anti US sentiments and mistrust.
- US deal India and Pakistan differently. It exerts pressure on Pakistan on issues of concern to India. It is felt that US exert little or no pressure on India on issues of concern to Pakistan.
- Despite so many sacrifices both in men and materials by Pakistan, the US still demands “ Do More” and believes that Pakistan is not sincere in fight against Al-Qaeda and Taliban.
- US also remain apprehensive about the security of nuclear capability falling into non-state actors’ hands.
- Although US has never openly opposed Pakistan growing strategic relations with China, however, given the rise of ‘near peer competitor’ it would understandably be apprehensive about Pak- China relations.

Pakistan must be cognizant of the role of external forces that may use extremist forces to attack the vulnerabilities or strengths of Pakistan to achieve their objectives, which could be:-

- To exploit the situation in Baluchistan.
- Discredit and degrade Pakistan armed forces
- To dilute Islamic and ideological character of the nation and spread hopelessness and desperations especially through effective and powerful media campaigns.

Unlike India and Israel, Pakistan’s nuclear programme has remained a source of concern for US and its allies from multiple perspectives. In recent times, there has been a shift in concerns from proliferation to safety and security. The overall common concerns include the following:-



- A radical regime may take power in Pakistan and thereby control over nuclear weapons.<sup>19</sup>
- While nuclear weapons are currently under firm command and control; technology could be sold off by insiders.<sup>20</sup>
- The terrorists could attack and seize noteworthy nuclear components dangerous to international security.

Pakistan, after Dr Qadeer episode, has managed to satisfy the world at large on the proliferation of nuclear assets. A strong organizational set up and a number of important initiatives such as strengthened export control laws, improved personnel and material security and international nuclear security cooperation programs have improved the security situation in recent years. Lt. Gen (Retd) Khalid Kidwai said that there were 800 incidents a year internationally involving the illegal transportation of illicit radioactive materials. “None of them are in Pakistan”.<sup>21</sup> While a military threat to Pakistan’s nuclear assets stands low, Pakistan must remain cognizant that any significant political instability or anarchy, that could be purposefully orchestrated, could give chance to US to approach UN Security council with concerns for Pakistan’s nuclear assets. Hence these assets must be jealously guarded at all times against all security scenarios.

## **Conclusions**

In light of the stated US National Security Strategy 2010 and its perceived geo-political objectives in this region, following conclusions are made:-

- The prevailing situation is likely to take longer than expected if US does not review its interventionist policy and craft its foreign policy objectives in light of universally accepted principles of justice and equality.
- The countries which have stakes in the Central Asian energy reservoirs should evolve an amicable, political and legal framework to benefit equally from these resources taking into account the various sensitivities of different stake holders, but more importantly the host countries.
- All genuine concerns of US regarding nuclear security and proliferation needs to be amicably addressed. US handling of Pakistan and India on nuclear issues need balancing and fairness.
- Pakistan may make following decisions in national interest:-
  - Eliminate all kind of terrorists’ movements from within or outside its borders.
  - Improve writ of government in FATA/ Balochistan. Religious exploitation and intolerance must be addressed on priority.
  - NACTA should be immediately implemented and NSP be framed with clear policy guidelines and objectives for a national

response. Short term strategy should aim at eliminating terrorist and in medium term FATA should be brought in mainstream Pakistan.

- Pakistan should strengthen its laws and legal system for speedy disposal of terrorism related cases.

South and Central Asian region seems to be most relevant to core security and economic concerns of United States. Like other dominant powers of the past US is pursuing grand strategic objectives in South and South-west Asia aimed at strong economy, security and global dominance. The plausible US objectives are defeat of terrorism, control of energy resources and routes, sustenance of global leadership role and prevention of nuclear proliferation. Keeping these objectives in mind the US is likely to maintain its military presence in the region particularly Afghanistan at least in short to medium term.

The post-9/11 world has opened a new era of challenges to Pakistan. The major escalation in challenges was witnessed after Abbotabad incident and Salala attack. Pakistan also faces dilemma of keeping economic-military disparity with India to minimum level for maintaining security balance in the region. Pakistan's economy is linked to internal security situation which has been marred by terrorism and extremism. A nuclear state with some elements having extreme religious tendencies would find it difficult to gain global acceptability particularly from West/US. Pakistan, being a developing country specifically needs to focus on its national security that would depend upon political stability, economic viability and internal defence.

## Endnotes

---

- <sup>1</sup> <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2002/nss.pdf>
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid
- <sup>3</sup> Samuel R Burger, “Obama’s National Security Strategy”, quoted in *The Washington Post: A little George Bush, lots of Bill Clinton* (30 May 2010)
- <sup>4</sup> Michael D Intriligator and John P Sullivan, *Countering Terrorism and WMD* (Routledge USA, 2006), Page 30.
- <sup>5</sup> Nadine Gurr and Benjamin Cole, *The New Face of Terrorism*, (London, IB Tauris, 2000), pgs 5, 25.
- <sup>6</sup> [www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17254507](http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17254507); [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/6385033.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/6385033.stm)
- <sup>7</sup> ‘Uranium smugglers caught in India’, [news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/English/world/south\\_asia/newsid\\_1512000/1512077.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/English/world/south_asia/newsid_1512000/1512077.stm)
- <sup>8</sup> Jeffrey Sparshott, “Deficit Dips in New Fiscal Year” in *Wall Street Journal*, (12<sup>th</sup> Dec, 2013), Accessed at <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB1000142405270230447704579252343430166778>.
- <sup>9</sup> Barnett R Rubin and Ahmad Rashid, “From Great Game to Grand Bargain” in *Foreign Affairs Magazine*, (ed. Nov-Dec, 2008), Page 34.
- <sup>10</sup> Dimitry Ryurikov, “A Way Forward for the U.S. and Russia” in *The National Interest*, (15<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2013), Accessed at <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/way-forward-the-us-russia-9410?page=1> on 21, Dec, 2013.
- <sup>11</sup> “Global Terrorism: Genesis, Implications, Remedial and Counter Measures”, A collection of papers presented at International Seminar by Institute of Regional Studies, (Published by Aziz-ulhaq, 2006), page-172.
- <sup>12</sup> Stephen Blank, “AWOL: U.S. Policy in Central Asia” in *The Central Asia-Caucasus Analyst* (Bi-weekly), (30<sup>th</sup> Oct, 2013), Accessed at <http://www.cacianalyst.org/publications/analytical-articles/item/12848-awol-us-policy-in-central-asia.html> on 23 Dec, 13.
- <sup>13</sup> ‘US Interests in Central Asia’, testimony by Ariel Cohen before the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific – US House of Representatives, (March 17, 1999), Accessed at <http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/Arielcohen.cfm>
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid
- <sup>15</sup> Maria Abi-Habib, “Tehran Builds on Outreach to Taliban” in *Wall Street Journal*, (August 1, 2012).
- <sup>16</sup> Evelyn Goh and Sheldon W. Simon, “China, the United States, and Southeast Asia”, (Routledge, 2007), pg. 224.
- <sup>17</sup> David Lai, “The United States and China in Power Transition” in *Strategic Studies Institute Book*, US Army War College, (December 2011), Page (xv).
- <sup>18</sup> “Obama supports India on UN Security Council”, AP, *The Independent*, (08 Nov, 2010), Accessed at <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/obama-supports-india-on-un-security-council-2128544.html> on 19 Jan, 2014.
- <sup>19</sup> “Al Baradei to Al Hayat” in *Dar Al Hayat*, (English Edition online, January 10, 2008), [<http://english.daralhayat.com/Spec/01-2008/Article-20080110-639032eb-coa8-10ed-01ae-81ab2ea588db/story.htm>].
- <sup>20</sup> Comments by David Albright in “Pakistan in Crisis: Interview with Benazir Bhutto,” CNN, (November 5, 2007).
- <sup>21</sup> Los Angeles Times, January 27, 2008.

# PAKISTAN – RUSSIA RELATIONS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

**Lieutenant Colonel Rehan Aqil Khan**

## **Abstract**

*Pakistan and Russia have an interesting history of diplomatic relations. Rather than having a bilateral outlook, the relations have been shaped under the influence of Pakistan – US ties and regional situation in South Asia. The paper is based on a review of historical data and various developments in the recent past which are becoming the enablers for rapprochement between the two countries. Having explored the driving factors, mutual interests, convergences, constraints and opportunities, an effort has been made to identify the areas of cooperation. It is evident that that the evolving environment presents opportunities to both countries for chalking out a new chapter in their relations. While Russia is taking new initiatives in the region and beyond as evident by the prevalent crisis in Ukraine and new alliances are being sought by Pakistan within the region particularly in post 2014 environment in Afghanistan. Any efforts to improve Pakistan – Russia mutual relations, would demand both the countries to strike a delicate balance in their relations with other major Global and regional players respectively.*

## **Introduction**

For decades, despite being geographically closer, Russia and Pakistan have had indifferent relationship owing to the “East-West confrontation.” Pakistan’s increasing military and economic assistance by United States and differences (ideological / territorial) with India who forged close ties with USSR were the main hurdles in Pak-Russia ties. Pakistan’s inclination towards United States after signing of SEATO and CENTO was one of the consequences which propelled Russia to establish strategic relations with India. Thereafter, although, relations between two countries saw periods of enhanced mutual cooperation as evident from Russia’s setting up of only Steel Mill in Pakistan, but Russia’s overt support to India during 1971 Indo – Pak war reinforced Pakistan’s mistrust towards USSR. Furthermore, Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 compelled Pakistan support Afghan Jihad with US backing and funding resulting in strained relations two countries.

Russia is re-asserting itself at the global stage and has started to play its role as a counter weight to politico-economic policies of the West. Pakistan is also looking for new avenues of opportunities. For the mutual benefit of both countries, it is vital to improve their relations. This is possible if both countries develop a relationship based on mutually beneficial cooperation. Pakistan and Russia will have to strike a delicate balance with their symbiotic allies i.e. US and India respectively. Thus, there is a need to carry out a study to take stock of the ongoing relations in order to assist in ascertaining the future course of action for forging closer ties between the two countries. To carry out a study of the different phases of Pakistan-Russia relations with special focus on the dynamics of the current development affecting the political, economic and military relations between the two countries with a view to recommending way forward that may facilitate in improving bilateral relationship.

## **Pakistan -Russia Relations 1947 – 1960**

This phase of Pakistan-Russia relations was shadowed by indifference, which subsequently turned into adversarial relations:-

**Soviet Perception of Indo-Pak Independence.** Pakistan emerged on the world map in 1947 at the onset of cold war. Moscow was not very forthcoming to the idea of the partition, as Soviet Union under hardliner Joseph Stalin did not welcome the partition of British India and it did not approve of the act.<sup>1</sup> He eyed the sub-continent independence struggle with unease and suspicion.<sup>2</sup> Pakistan was also inclined towards the west for the reason of language, religion and leadership bias towards west.

### **USSR Ties with India and Pakistan**

**Ties with India:** Despite initial prejudiced view of Stalin towards India and Pakistan, Indo-Soviet relations molded around precepts of defense, economic and commerce. This was aided primarily by an unsuccessful sojourn of the Indian leadership to Washington in 1949. In 1951, a contract was signed to supply India with 100,000 tons of Soviet wheat in exchange for Indian exports of traditional commodities.<sup>3</sup>

**Ties with Pakistan:** Pakistan established diplomatic relations with Russia on 1<sup>st</sup> May, 1948 through the agreement concluded in New York. Shortly USSR and Pakistani embassies started functioning.<sup>4</sup> Despite Soviet invitation, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Liaquat Ali Khan opted to visit USA over USSR, firstly due to its dire need for economic support and secondly to stabilize the military imbalance. Particularly after signing of SEATO and CENTO in 1954 and 1955, Kremlin did not perceive Pakistan's inclination towards United States well.<sup>5</sup> These relations further deteriorated when a U2 American reconnaissance aircraft flying from a Badaber Base (Peshawar) on a spy mission for the US was shot down by the USSR.<sup>6</sup>

### **Pak – USSR Relations 1960-71**

This period was marked by ephemeral economic collaboration, with oscillating trust. The Indo-China War of 1962 became a water shed event for South Asia. India gained pre-eminence with the west, where it was given material support. A rebalancing was thus necessitated by Pakistan to redefine its relations with other regional actors.

A significant development in 1965 was the visit of Pakistani Leadership to Moscow. A visit that took 18 years to come and it paved the way for multiple agreements on commerce, and culture.

When Indo-Pakistan war of 1965 broke out, the Soviets supported India. Yet, following termination of hostilities<sup>7</sup> hosting of Tashkent Conference in January 1966 by Soviet Union was a land mark in the history of Soviet policy, towards Indo-Pak and more so for Pakistan.<sup>8</sup> Post Tashkent agreement, Soviet efforts to further relations with Pakistan took impetus. USSR provided US \$176 million while overall trade reached a level of US \$ 326 million, as against US \$ 3.7 million ten years

earlier.<sup>9</sup> In 1971, Soviet Union signed a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation<sup>10</sup> with India and extended diplomatic and military support to both India and Mukti Bahni.

In addition to support rendered on diplomatic front, Soviet Union physically influenced Indo-Pak war of 1971 by sending warships comprising destroyers, cruisers and nuclear submarines equipped with nuclear tipped missiles from its far eastern port of Vladivostok to Indian Ocean on 13<sup>th</sup> December.<sup>11</sup>

### **Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan and Disintegration of USSR (1978 – 1990)**

Soviet incursion into Afghanistan in December 1979 set in motion, major destabilization in the region. It affected all; Central Asia, South Asia, China and US.<sup>12</sup>

Consequent to USSR's military incursion of Afghanistan, relations between USSR and Pakistan touched the lowest. Influenced with the perceived idea of USSR expansion to gain access to warm waters, Pakistan got deeply involved in the war to look after its own security interests.<sup>13</sup>

### **Pakistan - Russia Relations 1990 – 2000**

In the wake of communist collapse, Russian-Pakistan relations improved gradually. Some of the significant events include:-

In 1989, Soviet ambassador to Pakistan offered help in installation of a nuclear power plant in Pakistan; however, after US intervention the plan was put into cold storage.<sup>14</sup>

Russian leadership of the time did make efforts to further the relations. Their efforts bore fruit, when Pakistan's Federal Minister on Economy visited Russia in November 1992. In December 1992, Russia reciprocated. Both sides deliberated, a draft agreement for cooperation in the political, economic, commercial, scientific, technical and cultural fields.<sup>15</sup>

Taking the process of improvement further, in December 1994, Russian President Boris Yeltsin invited Pakistan's Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto to Russia<sup>16</sup> but no headway could be made as Pakistan recognized Taliban government in Afghanistan.

The next important land mark was visit by Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif to Moscow in April 1999 after nearly 25 years. Russia termed it as a new juncture in the relations of two countries, wherein creation of a commission for inter-governmental trade and economics was signed.<sup>17</sup>

In February 1999, Russia welcomed Lahore Declaration between Pak and India but strongly criticized Pak for Kargil episode of 1999.

On 19 April 2001, as a result of state visit of Russian Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Alexander Losyukov to Pakistan, both countries agreed to collaborate in economic development and to work towards peace and prosperity in the region.<sup>18</sup> Same year Russia launched Pakistan's second satellite Badr-B, from Baikonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan.

## **The Recent Transformation**

At present, the relations between Pakistan and Russia are improving. Both countries are in the process of developing a working relationship based on common interests. Moreover, both are vying for greater bilateral cooperation in the backdrop of convergence on vital regional and international issues.<sup>19</sup>

## **Major Breakthroughs**

Recent events which highlight various measures undertaken by both the countries to improve the relations are:-

### **Formulation of Joint Working Group**

President Musharraf visited Russian Federation in 2002 which led to institutionalization of relations. Various Joint working Groups were established which covered subjects such as Counter-Terrorism and Strategic Stability along with an Inter-governmental Joint Commission. Five sessions of these Joint Working Groups have been held with the last one organized in Islamabad on 28 January, 2014.<sup>20</sup>

### **Visit of Russian Prime Minister**

Mutual relations between both the countries were further boosted after Russian Prime Minister; Mikhail Fradkov's visited Pakistan in 2007 which was first visit of a Russian Prime Minister in 38 years. During the visit, he held in-depth discussions with President Pervez Musharraf and Prime Minister; with emphasis on advancing economic cooperation.<sup>21</sup>

### **Thaw in Diplomatic/Defence Ties**

Various events which signify improved Pak–Russia relations include:-

General Ashfaq Pervaiz Kayani, former Chief of Army Staff of Pakistan, visited Russia in 2012. Postponement of an earlier planned visit to Inter-Governmental Commission on Military-Technical Cooperation in India by the Defence Minister of Russia, signifies the importance Russia gave to General Kiyani's visit. This visit revitalized the defence cooperation between Russia and Pakistan.

Russia also formally presented to give technical as well as financial help for construction of Iran-Pakistan gas pipeline.

Russian Foreign Minister, Sergey Lavrov visited Pakistan in October 2012 where he expressed Russia's support to Pakistan's stance on drone attacks.<sup>22</sup>

Russia also condemned the coalition attacks on the Salala Post. A public statement was issued in support of Pakistan's stance on the issue.

## First Strategic Dialogue

Pakistan - Russia first strategic dialogue was held on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2013. The dialogue laid the foundation of framework and parameters for improving the ties between both countries. Both countries agreed for maintaining and increasing diplomatic ties at all levels and enhancing coordination for forging a consensus on regional and international issues, increasing trade and investment and cooperation in the field of energy and power generation.<sup>23</sup>

## Economic Convergence

Trade between Russia and Pakistan has been increasing continuously. Mutual trade volume in 1980 was US \$ 95 million only and increased to US \$ 231 million in 2010/11.<sup>24</sup> Details of bilateral trade are as under:-

Year	Exports (Million)	Imports (Million)	Total	Balance
2005-06	52.42	459.20	511.62	406.78
2006-07	83.39	275.86	359.25	-192.47
2007-08	98.62	101.12	199.74	-2.5
2008-09	114.87	376.91	491.78	-262.04
2009-10	139.989	42.83	182.81	+97.16
2010-11	206.58	25.22	231.18	+181.36

*(Pakistani exports to Russia include cotton yarn & woven fabrics, rice, edible fruits & nuts, leather & leather manufactured goods and sports goods)*

In 2010, both countries setup, a Russian – Pakistan Inter-Governmental Commission on Trade and Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation for collaboration in science, technology and education.<sup>25</sup>

In 2011, Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gillani met Mr. Vladimir Putin during 10<sup>th</sup> Heads of Government meeting of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization<sup>26</sup> and deliberated on the matters of mutual interest.

Russia at present is also in the process of financing a major energy project, CASA-1000, which would transmit power generated in Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan to Pakistan.<sup>27</sup>

## Analysis – Future Prospects of Pak-Russia Relations

### Constraints & Opportunities to the Development of Pak Russia Relations

#### Constraints

Although emerging geo-political environment favour enhanced ties between Pakistan-Russia, yet it is necessary to ascertain salient aspects / divergences which needs consideration in further fostering the bilateral relations in order to arrive at pertinent conclusions:-



## India

Kashmir along with other unresolved disputes, still continue to blemish prospects of improvement in Pakistan-India ties. They also envy each's relations with strategic powers of the world.

### Changing Political Landscape

Despite development of strategic ties between India and US, the steadfast friendship between India and Russia is robust. Their geopolitical ties were further strengthened when in 2011 they elevated their friendship to the level of "Special and Privileged Strategic Partnership".<sup>28</sup>

Pre 9/11, Russia and India were both particularly anxious about Taliban regime in Afghanistan and had set up a working group between their foreign ministries to discuss Afghanistan.<sup>29</sup>

Russia is supportive of Indian efforts to become a permanent member of United Nation Security Council (UNSC), and a member of SCO. To quote President Putin's remarks made during his visit to India in 2010, "India is our candidate number one in terms of enlarging the geographical representation of the Security Council".<sup>30</sup>

**Trade and Economic Cooperation.** Trade between India and Russia is on the rise. By 2013, the trade between both the countries had reached US \$ 11.133 billion. Russian exports to India counted to US \$ 6.1 billion in 2011 along with imports of US \$ 2.8 billion from India to Russia.<sup>31</sup> The two-way investment between the two countries stands at approximately US \$ 7.8 billion. Both countries aim to boost mutual trade and achieving a target of US \$ 20 billion by 2015.

**Defence Ties.** India's substantial purchases of Russian military equipment, include 1000 Main Battle Tanks T-90, two nuclear powered submarines, retrofitted Admiral Gorshkov aircraft carrier renamed as INS Vikramaditya, up-gradation of fighters and helicopters, 6 x transport aircraft; being modified to fit Israeli Phalcon radars. Apart from this, there have been agreements signed for joint production of BRAHMOS cruise missile, a 5<sup>th</sup> generation fighter programme, Sukhoi Su-30MKI programme, and Ilyushin/HAL Tactical Transport Aircraft which would need modernization, upgrading and replacement.<sup>32</sup>

**Energy Sector.** Both countries have been cooperating in energy sector. It encompasses joint exploration of oil and gas, provision of 2 x nuclear power plants of 1000 MW each at Kudankulam. Moreover, partnership in outer space for peaceful purposes, which can also be used for development of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

## US

In the recent past, US-India relations, have gradually transformed into a strategic one. The US strategic partnership with India, and the Indo – US Nuclear Agreement are relevant in this regard.

Keeping in view, Pakistan's relevance in Afghanistan end state and US interest in securing Pakistan's support in seeking Afghan solution, US may not want Pakistan's close relations with Russia. Russian President's support for Pakistan's SCO membership is viewed with suspicion in the US.<sup>33</sup>

In addition, as the war in Afghanistan has entered the critical phase, it is in the interest of US to keep Pakistan away from Russian influence which is likely to offset US influence on Pakistan.<sup>34</sup>

## **Opportunities**

Pakistan and Russia may like to explore and capitalize upon host of existing opportunities to their benefit:-

## **Geo- Strategic**

US is trying to increase its influence in Russia's neighbourhood. Same is being witnessed during on-going conflict between Russia and Ukraine. The occupation of Crimea by Russia has created a complex situation for US which has forced it to rethink about the situation in Europe.

Proposed energy corridor including Pakistan, Afghanistan and CARs can be better implemented with backing of Russia.

China can facilitate improvement in Pak-Russia relations as it wields close bilateral relations with both the countries.

## **Economy and Trade**

Russia is one of the fastest growing economy in the G8. Averaging 7% annually, since 2003. Russia wishes to play large political and economic role in the world and particularly in Asia. Pakistan is likely to remain relevant for the Russians in the times to come because of geo-strategic location.

Pakistan exports to Russia account for only 0.06% of Russia's total imports while Russian export to Pakistan is only 0.99% of Pakistan total imports.<sup>35</sup> There is great potential for Pakistan textiles sector to increase their exports (US \$ 47 Million)<sup>36</sup> to Russia which is the third largest Textiles importing country in the world. A bilateral free trade agreement is required to give more ingress to Pakistan's textile sector in the Russian markets.<sup>37</sup>

**Energy Sector.** To bolster growth of Pakistani industry, Russia has expressed great interest in providing assistance. Memorandums of Understanding following the visit of a high-powered delegation to Islamabad in 2012/13 for investment in various Pakistani projects<sup>38</sup>:-

Funding and technical expertise to develop trans-regional rail links with Iran and other countries in Central Asia.

Implementation of CASA – 1000 project. This will allow electricity diffusion from Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan to Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Technical and financial assistance to Pakistan to develop Thar Coal Project which is an immensely viable project.<sup>39</sup>

**Defence Ties.** Defence relations amongst the two countries have been limited except for a helicopter deal in 1969 during President Yahya's regime.<sup>40</sup> A comprehensive boost is expected in this cooperation following Pakistan Army Chief and Pakistan Air Chief's, visits to Moscow and Russian Military Chief Col-Gen Alexander Postnikov's visit to Pakistan last year.<sup>41</sup> Though from the outset a high level defence and military cooperation between two countries will be a far objective, Russian interest of defence sales to support its economy, provides opportunity for expanding defence ties by Pakistan.

### **Convergences in Afghanistan**

Russia is of the opinion that there is no solution to Afghan imbroglio till the time Pakistan is not involved in a constructive manner by all the parties.<sup>42</sup>

Both nations oppose the Indian stance<sup>43</sup> on US permanent military bases in Afghanistan. Role of Pakistan in period of post-US drawdown, in Russian perspective is through maintaining a broader regional imperative. Giving space to each other to cater for their respective interests thus reflective of viability of their relationship.

**Counter Terrorism.** Terrorism has been an area of concern for both countries. Russia has been particularly concerned about inflow of terrorists from Afghan border into Russia and CARs with alleged foot prints coming from Tribal areas of Pakistan (Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan etc). In post US drawdown by end 2014, both countries need to develop mutual trust and cooperation not only in the field of intelligence sharing but also can help each other benefitting from exchange of Counter terrorism expertise.

**SCO Membership.** Stronger ties with Russia may help Pakistan in gaining membership of SCO. Lessening in distrust is evident through the Russian support received by Pakistan as an observer in SCO. Russian President's, public endorsement through his statement is significant, in which he said "Pakistan is a very important partner in South Asia and the Muslim world for Russia".<sup>44</sup>

**Commonality of Views.** Both countries have convergence on views on several issues of critical importance being confronted by the modern world<sup>45</sup> such as:-

- The concept of multilateralism.
- Accepting the authority of UN in all international disputes.
- No to unilateralism and all such efforts to affect changes in the International system by application of force unilaterally without approval of UNSC.
- Counter terrorism.
- Taking measures which bring about meaningful nuclear non-proliferation.

## **Recommendations**

Keeping in view the detailed analysis of various hurdles in forging strong Pak-Russia ties and opportunities, concrete measures based on a multi prong approach should be chosen to develop and then sustain these. Some of the suggested steps in this regard are as under:-

### **Political and Diplomatic Front**

**Diversification of Foreign Policy.** Pakistan should diversify its foreign policy by making efforts for building trust to usher a new era of bilateral improved relations with Russia.

**Strategic Consensus with Russia.** While evolving a strategic consensus with Russia on the issues of counter-terrorism, evolving East- West energy corridors and nuclear non-proliferation, Pakistan can work for an effective role in Post 2014 Afghanistan policy and peace and stability in South Asia.

Cognizant of significance of rail-road transport corridor from Tajikistan to Pakistan, through the Wakhan sector and its linking up with Karakoram highway, Pakistan and Russia should work to expedite and materialize the option at priority.

**Defence Ties.** Diversification of critical dependencies of Pakistan is essential through developing defense ties with Russia. Following is suggested in this regard:-

#### **Phase -1 (Short term)**

- ✓ To understand bilateral necessities and compulsions, both countries to boost exchange of military delegations.
- ✓ Form Joint Commission on Defence Cooperation and hold annual meetings to identify areas pertaining to training, joint exercises, defence procurement and mutual cooperation.
- ✓ Exchange of Armed Forces students, covering wide ranging spheres of training.

#### **Phase -2 ( Medium Term)**

- ✓ Joint exercises.
- ✓ Acquisition of military hardware.
- ✓ Up-gradation of Heavy Mechanical Complex Taxila and Pakistan Machine Tool Factory Karachi thus enhancing its capacity.

### **Cooperation in Counter Terrorism**

Both countries should share each other's experiences of counter terrorism through initiatives like seminars, sharing of literature and joint training in specialized counter terrorism fields.

In order to further refine anti-terrorism efforts both countries should consider establishment of joint intelligence sharing mechanism at appropriate level.

## **Trade and Economy**

Increase people to people connectivity. Create space for boosting and facilitate regular Private, Commercial and Trade Programs.

Establishment of commercial counselor appointment in Russia, to exchange valuable information, trade delegations of both the countries and coordinate trade exhibitions for enhancement of trade.

Pakistan should seek Russian assistance for the improvement of its railway focusing on development of exiting infrastructures including Railways bogies, tracks expansion and locomotives.<sup>46</sup> Connecting Gwadar to Russia and Central Asian States through rail link is the need of time.

**Energy Sector.** Russia has already shown interest in Thar coal power project, exploration of gas. Thus, Pakistan should try to draw Russian businesses to invest in Thar Coal project, gas exploration and gas /oil pipelines.

## **Education Ties**

**Establishment of Study Centers in Pakistan and Russia.** To encourage greater intellectual partnerships and enhance understanding of the country, establishment of a Russian Study Centre in Pakistan and a Pakistan Study Centre in Russia, must be done.

**Searching Education Avenues in Russia.** Russia has equally competitive environment for scientific education. Hence, while sending our students to western countries we should simultaneously develop cooperation with Russia in scientific education sector as Russia is geographically closer to Pakistan and the cost of education is relatively affordable.

## **Cultural Links**

**Media Linkages.** Both the countries have a strong state sponsored media. It may be possible to carry out an exchange of various program segments like News, cultural shows, dramas etc to increase awareness about each other's thinking and culture.

**People to People Contact.** There is no denying the fact that enhanced people to people contact in different fields like economics, politics and especially culture would help in transforming the relations between both the countries.

## **Conclusion**

Pakistan-Russian relations are the story of relations of missed opportunities and mistrust during various stages. The changing geo-strategic situation has provided an opportunity to work together at regional and international forums. The way forward is to have maintainable and long-term bilateral relationship where both countries have huge potential to enhance mutual cooperation. Need is for Pakistan to adopt a pragmatic and robust foreign policy which endeavors to not only develop closer relations with Russia but with all countries of the World.

## Endnotes

---

- 1 Adnan Ali Shah, "Pakistan-Soviet Union Relations". Institute of Strategic Studies, Islamabad, February 26, 2012.
- 2 Valeriy Kashin, "What Russia Thought of Ghandi and Nehru". Russia and India Report, May 3, 2012. [http://indrus.in/articles/2012/05/03what\\_stalin\\_thought\\_of\\_gandhi\\_and\\_nehru\\_15660.html](http://indrus.in/articles/2012/05/03what_stalin_thought_of_gandhi_and_nehru_15660.html) accessed on: 10<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- 3 Valeriy Kashin, "What Russia Thought of Ghandi and Nehru". Russia and India Report, May 3, 2012. [http://indrus.in/articles/2012/05/03/what\\_stalin\\_thought\\_of\\_gandhi\\_and\\_nehru\\_15660.html](http://indrus.in/articles/2012/05/03/what_stalin_thought_of_gandhi_and_nehru_15660.html) accessed on: 10<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- 4 Muhammad Nawaz Khan, "Positive turn in Pak- Russia Relations." IPRI Fact File, February 14, 2012. <http://www.thefrontierpost.com/?p=115476> accessed on : 25<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- 5 Bakhtiar Hakeem, "Pakistan-Russia: Down the Memory Lane,"Opinion Maker, May 9, 2012. <http://www.opinion-maker.org/2012/05/pakistan-russia-down-the-memory-lane/>accessed on : 25<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- 6 "Pakistan-Russia Relations – Challenges and Prospects", Foreign Policy Series FPS.R.1, Centre for Pakistan and Gulf Studies, December 2013.
- 7 <http://www.tigweb.org/action-tools/projects/download/23787/Pakistan-Russia-relations-in-the-post-cold-war-era.doc> accessed on: 14<sup>th</sup> May 2014.
- 8 "Pakistan-Russia Relations – Challenges and Prospects", Foreign Policy Series FPS.R.1, Centre for Pakistan and Gulf Studies, December 2013.
- 9 Bakhtiar Hakeem, "Pakistan-Russia: Down the Memory Lane,"Opinion Maker, May 9, 2012. <http://www.opinion-maker.org/2012/05/pakistan-russia-down-the-memory-lane/>accessed on : 25<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- 10 "1971 India Pakistan War: Role of Russia, China, America and Britain". The World Reporter.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Bakhtiar Hakeem, "Pakistan-Russia: Down the Memory Lane,"Opinion Maker, May 9, 2012. <http://www.opinion-maker.org/2012/05/pakistan-russia-down-the-memory-lane/>accessed on : 25<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- 13 Baqir Sajjad Syed, "Islamabad, Moscow set sights on new era of relations" Dawn, September 18, 2011.
- 14 Ardeshir Cowasjee, "A recap of Soviet-Pakistan relations". Dawn, March 13, 2011.
- 15 Bakhtiar Hakeem, "Pakistan-Russia: Down the Memory Lane,"Opinion Maker, May 9, 2012. <http://www.opinion-maker.org/2012/05/pakistan-russia-down-the-memory-lane/>accessed on : 25<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 "Islamabad, Moscow seek better ties". Dawn archives, April 21, 2001.
- 19 Dr Noor ul Haq, "Positive Turn in Pak-Russian Relations", IPRI Fact file, 2012.
- 20 <http://enews.epakistan.com/5th-meeting-of-pak-russia-on-counter-terror-held/> accessed on: 25<sup>th</sup> November 2013.
- 21 Nazir Hussain, "Pak-Russia Relations: Lost Opportunities and Future Options," Journal of Political Studies, Vol. 19, Issue - 1, 2012, 84.
- 22 <http://ipripak.org/pa/ipr6.pdf> accessed on : 17 December 2013.
- 23 <http://dawn.com/news/1039487/accord-to-diversify-ties-with-russia> accessed on : 17<sup>th</sup> January 2014.
- 24 "Russian – Pakistan relations", Consulate General of the Russian Federation in Karachi, December 5, 2012. <http://www.rusconsulkarachi.mid.ru/Russia-Pakistan.htm> accessed on 17 January 2014.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 "Pakistan, Russia to go for FTA, Currency Swap Agreement", Tribune Express, November 8, 2011.
- 27 [http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2012/eirv39n08-20120224/33-36\\_3908.pdf](http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2012/eirv39n08-20120224/33-36_3908.pdf)accessed on : 24<sup>th</sup> January 2014.
- 28 Richard Weitz, "The Maturing of Russia-India Defence Relations", Journal of Defence Studies, Vol. 6, no.3, (July 2012), 89. [http://www.idsa.in/6\\_3\\_2012\\_TheMaturingofRussiaIndiaDefenceRelations\\_RichardWeitz](http://www.idsa.in/6_3_2012_TheMaturingofRussiaIndiaDefenceRelations_RichardWeitz) accessed on: 24 January 2014.
- 29 [http://www.afghanistan\\_newscenter.com/news/2000/november/nov20og2000.html](http://www.afghanistan_newscenter.com/news/2000/november/nov20og2000.html) accessed on: 17 February 2014.

- 
- 30 Muhammad Hanif, "Pakistan – Russia Relations – Progress, Prospects and Constraints", IPRI Journal XIII, no 2 (Summer 2013), 82.
- 31 P.Sen, "Hard Goods and Soft Currencies: Note on Bilateral Payment Arrangements", Working Paper New Delhi: Planning Commission, No.2, 1999.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Ibid, 84.
- 34 Khalid Iqbal, "Russia– Pakistan–America", The Nation, October 8, 2012. <http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/columns/08-Oct-2012/russia-pakistan-america> accessed on: 25<sup>th</sup> January 2014.
- 35 <http://www.fpcci.com.pk/trade-with-countries/Russian%20Fed.pdf> accessed on: 10<sup>th</sup> January 2014.
- 36 Ibid.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Muhammad Nawaz Khan and Beenish Altaf, "Pakistan-Russia Rapprochement and Current Geo-Politics", IPRI Journal XIII, no. 1 (Winter 2013): 125.
- 39 Ramtanu Maitra, "Improved Pakistan-Russia Relations: A Necessity for Stability in Eurasia", Executive Intelligence Review, February 24, 2012. [http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2012/eirv39n08-20120224/33-36\\_3908.pdf](http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2012/eirv39n08-20120224/33-36_3908.pdf) accessed on: 12<sup>th</sup> December 2013.
- 40 Muhammad Nawaz Khan and Beenish Altaf, "Pakistan-Russia Rapprochement and Current Geo-Politics" IPRI Journal XIII, no. 1 (Winter 2013): 131.
- 41 Dr Saima Ashraf, "New Dimensions in Pak-Russia Relations," *World Times*, October 1, 2012. [http://www.jworldtimes.com/Article/102012NewDimensions\\_in\\_Pak\\_Russia\\_Relations](http://www.jworldtimes.com/Article/102012NewDimensions_in_Pak_Russia_Relations) accessed on: 10<sup>th</sup> December 2013.
- 42 Muhammad Nawaz Khan and Beenish Altaf, "Pakistan-Russia Rapprochement and Current Geo-Politics" IPRI Journal XIII, no. 1 (Winter 2013): 131.
- 43 India wants permanent US military bases in Afghanistan. India foresees a role in Afghanistan and US military bases would provide her a dedicated strength to continue as an American proxy.
- 44 Muhammad Nawaz Khan and Beenish Altaf, "Pakistan-Russia Rapprochement and Current Geo-Politics" IPRI Journal XIII, no. 1 (Winter 2013): 133.
- 45 Zahid Anwar, "Pakistan–Russia Relations In A Regional And Global Context", Central Asian Caucus Institute Analyst, June 30, 2014.
- 46 Three memorandums of understanding (MoUs), were signed with a visiting Russian delegation comprising heads of Russian companies in Islamabad on October 3, 2012. In one of the MoUs Moscow agreed to develop infrastructures in Pakistan Railways bogies, tracks expansion and locomotives and Russian company, Transmas holding will involve in rail sector projects. <http://www.pennenergy.Com/wirenews/powernews/2012/11/06/pakistan-russia-cooperation-in-development-of-infrastructure-and-logistics.html> accessed on: 10<sup>th</sup> January 2014.

# US - INDIA STRATEGIC ALLIANCE AND PAKISTAN'S SECURITY CONCERNS

**Lieutenant Colonel Qaisar Suleman**

## **Abstract**

*The growing Indo US strategic ties are likely to be further augmented over the coming years with increasing reliance of US on India as a regional strategic watchdog accompanied by adverse effects on the regional stability in general and Pakistan's interests in particular. The potential spoilers in such a scenario include, but are not limited to, domestic Indian left wing resistance to closer ties with US, a more assertive China, Pakistan and Afghanistan situation, US relationship with Iran and a perception of weakening US influence. Accordingly, this research expects to explore the nature and driving factors for emerging strategic alliance between India and the US while examining the extent of this alliance and its implications for Pakistan in order to offer policy guidelines and options for Government of Pakistan. Moreover, as this study aims to present a wholesome picture of the entire issue; it will, thus, serve as an aid to those professionals who want to explore the future prospects of US-India relationship and challenges which may emerge.*

## **Introduction**

In line with 'New World Order' strategy of USA, India is being viewed by the strategist as a potential ally in the Asia Pacific Region. With enormous demographic bulge, with rising economy, increased nuclear and conventional forces levels, and the stable political system, in the view of Capitol Hill, could be a tool of stability in the region. "While India has been getting away with its nuclear program and worst kinds of abuses in the occupied state of Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan has had to bear the brunt of not only economic and military sanctions, but has been under tremendous pressure by the United States to control religious extremists and militant activities from its territory". Economic and nuclear collaboration along with 10 year defence cooperation for joint exercises and arms sale are few strands of strategic cooperation between two countries. This strategic partnership has actually disturbed the balance of power in South Asia. Where an economically and militarily weak Pakistan confronted by both internal and external challenges "is likely to face serious implications in the days to come".<sup>1</sup>

## **Historical Perspective of India – US Relations**

### **Pre Sino-Indian War of 1962**

"Economic relations between the two countries provided an interesting contrast to their political relations. American investment in India was substantial compared to that by other countries".<sup>2</sup> "A contentious aspect of economic relations was that with very few exceptions, the US declined to invest in or assist Indian heavy industry".<sup>3</sup> This could be "perceived as an attempt to prevent India from achieving self sufficiency in this



sector as well as to ensure a market for US products. For this, as well as the supply of military equipment, India turned to the Soviet Union".<sup>4</sup>

### **Post Indo – China War of 1962**

"In the aftermath of the 1962 India–China border conflict, India requested, and received, military assistance not only from the Soviet Union but also from the US and Britain. Although much has been made of this gesture by the later two countries, circumstances soon allowed the reduction of this commitment. There are two points worth mentioning in this context. Firstly, only a small amount of 'emergency' assistance was actually committed. There was no offer of long term military aid. Secondly, the US-UK offer was conditional to successful resolution of the Kashmir dispute in which India was expected to make substantial concessions".<sup>5</sup> Additionally the US military aid was to be used against China only. "Brought about with the help of Pakistan, the establishment of US-China relations resulted in what was a convergence of US–Pakistan–China interests, a move that could not but be perceived by India to be threatening. The crisis in East Pakistan (later Bangladesh) that led to a war in 1971 resulted in the first step towards what would emerge as an Indo-centric power structure in South Asia. India decided to defy the US and its 'tilt' towards Pakistan and signed the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation with the Soviet Union, thereby assuring India of material and diplomatic support in case of a war with Pakistan which, by then, seemed inevitable".<sup>6</sup>

### **Post Indo – Pakistan War of 1971**

The nuclear tests of 1974 demonstrated Indian potential and importance in the region that was realized by the US. India also realized the importance of its relation with china and started working towards rapprochement with USA. Despite sanctions after 1974 nuclear explosion, India continued getting nuclear fuel from USA. With the advent of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) in 1987, India also faced embargoes on missile related technology." In 1992–94 the United States allowed India to buy a cryogenic rocket engine from Russia but blocked the transfer of related technology. In 1986 the US agreed to supply a number of General Electric F–404 engines and avionics for India's Light Combat Aircraft (LCA) then under development (it still is). Later, the US also agreed to sell a Cray XMP–14 supercomputer, the first such sale to a country outside the western alliance.

### **Post Cold War Era**

"In the 1990s, especially after India's declared policy of economic liberalization, it came to be viewed as an attractive market for US business. Despite the lack of an overall policy framework, security cooperation also increased during this period. During the Gulf War, the Indian Government granted refueling rights to US military aircraft en route from the Pacific to the Middle East".<sup>7</sup> In 1996 and 1997, the Indian and US navies held joint exercises (the Malabar series) in the Indian Ocean.<sup>8</sup>

## **Impact of 9/11 Incident**

Bush administration enhanced cooperation post 9/11 by waiving off all nuclear related sanctions on India and Pakistan as well. These included those under the Glenn Amendment which bars licences for items on the US Munitions list and prohibits defence sales under Foreign Military Sales and Foreign Military Financing.<sup>9</sup>

## **2005 Strategic Agreements**

“We need to examine the 2005 strategic agreements signed in June and July. On June 28, the US and India signed a 10-year Defence Pact and on July 18, the two countries signed a Nuclear Agreement”.<sup>10</sup> Impact of strategic alliance between India and US on Pakistan is mainly due to missile defence system, questioning the nuclear deterrence of Pakistan in the region and undermining the south and East Asia stability. “This instability is further heightened by another component of the Indo-US defence agreement - that of activating the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) in this region with India becoming a partner. The PSI is part of the US notion of 'coalitions of the willing' which is seen by some to be under prevailing international law - in this case the Law of the Sea - by attributing to members of the coalition the right to stop traffic on the high seas and in international airspace on a mere hint of suspicion of transportation of WMD material or components”.<sup>11</sup> It also included Advance Weapons Technology Transfer along with joint R&D in military domain.

## **Indo – US Nuclear Agreement**

“Moving on to the Indo-US nuclear agreement, it clearly undermines the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) on a number of counts. First, it contravenes the commitment by nuclear weapon states not to transfer nuclear technology and materials to states not signatory to the NPT. The US has agreed to supply nuclear technology to India. All that India is required to do is to separate its civil nuclear facilities from its weapons' facilities and put the former under IAEA safeguards. Second, the NPT only recognises the five nuclear weapon states that tested before 1967”.<sup>12</sup> Yet the US deal was unofficial approval of India being a nuclear state.

## **Economic/Information Technology Cooperation**

“As part of a programme to accelerate economic modernization, India is seeking US assistance to develop its commercial satellite and space launch capabilities”.<sup>13</sup> While cooperating with India to improve economy, provide opportunities to US businesses but how much sensitive knowledge US is willing to share is not clear.

## **Present Status**

Indo – US strategic cooperation has progressed rapidly in short time, but India needs clarity in its perceived role that it would aspire to play and weather that is the role US also wants or consider adequate.

## **Major Facets of Cooperation between India and USA**

Indo – US partnership may change the power dynamics in Asia and act as rebalancing in Asia Pacific region. The US has high hopes for these relations in long term for their role in the region while asserting her influence in the world to maintain a feasible order. However it remains to be seen as to how much India is willing to cooperate and to what extent.

### **Economic Cooperation and Information Technology Sector**

The strategic partnership with India in the region also sees Indian ability to act as economic anchor in the Indian Ocean region to serve the economic interests of US. Indian economy is on its way to long term competition that has stimulated innovation, improved quality, technological progress and long term growth.

### **Nuclear Cooperation**

The nuclear tests of India and Pakistan have added a complex dimension to the regional security calculus; however US does not see India as part of the challenge or any security threat. “Much of the US nuclear agenda for South Asia in the following years involves efforts by India and Pakistan to intensify bilateral contacts and confidence building measures on many issues including Kashmir. The US perceives that failure to restore trust and move towards reconciliation could lead to escalation, even nuclear exchange in South Asia. The pace of the Indo-US dialogues to date suggests that their relationship has acquired a greater convergence on a number of economic, political and military concerns which will form the agenda of long term co-operation between the two countries, and may even surmount the hurdles created by the Indian nuclear and missile programme”.<sup>14</sup>

### **Indo – US Glide Path Agreement**

Indo – US Glide Path is a recent phenomenon. It envisages “strategic Indo – US cooperation in the field of nuclear, space dual use technologies and BMD programme”.<sup>15</sup> The agreement will be implemented in three phases as under:-

**Phase 1.** Removal of sanctions from Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO), will also allow sale of materials to the non nuclear portion of Indian nuclear programme.

**Phase 2.** In the context of expansion of the dialogue on nuclear safety, US would likely permit direct cooperation, production, marketing and operation of Indian and US commercial satellites.

**Phase 3.** Removal of unilateral control of hi – tech exports to all Indian end user, would generate discussions on further cooperation in missile defence.

## **Likely Irritants and Divergences in Indo – US Relations**

### **US Relations with Pakistan**

The US relations with Pakistan and its position on the Kashmir is another issue of concern to India. Historically, the USA has regarded Kashmir as a dispute between India and Pakistan, to be settled through peaceful means and negotiations.

### **Russo-Indian Strategic Relations**

The historic Russo-Indian strategic relationship that has been reaffirmed during President Putin's recent visit to India is likely to be a source of concern which it would like to offset as far as possible.

### **Indo – Iranian Relations**

The fast growing relations between Iran and India are expected to experience difficulties due to the Indo-Israeli and Indo-US nexus. The US presence in Afghanistan and accusations by USA against Iran about her nuclear programme are matters of concern for Iran. This would also have a knock-on effect on Indo-Iranian relations.

### **Indian Desire to Balance Relations between USA and China**

Given its historic cautious approach, India is unlikely to play as US proxy against China. It will try to balance its relations with both China as well as USA. The weight of bilateral trade between India and China, which has grown to the tune of US\$ 100 Billion, may serve as a pointer.

### **Indian role in US rebalancing in Asia**

“Secretary of Defence Leon Panetta underscored India's prominence in America's new defence strategy during his visit to India: “Defence cooperation with India is a linchpin in this strategy. India is one of the largest and most dynamic countries in the region and the world, with one of the most capable militaries”.<sup>16</sup> Without question, U.S.-India military engagement represents an important new dimension in the overall relationship. This was demonstrated during the combined maritime humanitarian and disaster relief operations conducted by the two countries at the time of the 2004 tsunami. Since then, and with the added impetus of the landmark 2005 New Framework for Def Coop, mil-to-mil ties have evolved to the point where, today, “India engages in more mil exs with the U.S than with any other country”—with more to come. “Vice Admiral Gerald Beaman, comd of the U.S. Third Fleet”, recently said that the exponentially growing “U.S.-India maritime exs will be vital to stability and security in the region's sea lanes.”

## **Future Conflict in Defining Spheres of Influence vis-à-vis Indian Strategic Culture**

Many in India argue and cast doubts if anyone has a clear idea what “strategic relationship” actually mean (especially since New Delhi seems to find no incompatibility in having “strategic relationship” with Beijing and Moscow as well). Moreover, the term “terrorism” largely remains imprecise without agreed upon definition and the US and Indian definitions overlap only partially. There are too many possibilities for the kind of disagreement, familiar from the past that can lead to difference albeit in manageable limits. Furthermore, this security superstructure would greatly be influenced by the attitude of the governments in the two countries.<sup>17</sup>

### **Future of Indo – US Relations**

#### **Likely Future Internal Political Situation in India and US and its Impact on Mutual Relations**

While the United States has been careful not to characterize its defense ties with India as aimed at balancing China, the converse is also relevant —that is, whether India views the United States as a balancer against China. India would ideally like to be the single dominant power in the IOR, yet it knows it may not, given the long-standing U.S. presence in the region. For India, it is strategically advantageous to have close security ties with Washington and work more closely rather than trading a solo path. Thus, the Indian desire to form a partnership with the United States to hedge against China must be balanced against its desire to maintain a working relationship with it.

### **Future of Relations vis-à-vis Indian Strategic Objectives**

India’s major strategic “priority has been and shall continue to be the socio economic development of its billion people”.<sup>18</sup> Its democratic system must address the domestic agenda first and fulfill its peoples’ immediate needs and aspirations. “The central goal in relations with other countries is to address potential adversarial relations through political and diplomatic efforts and to rely on cooperative engagement as the primary instrument of strategy”.<sup>19</sup> However, that does not mean that India will compromise on its national interests, political autonomy, or territorial integrity. Thus, the primary effort rests on “trying to shape the security environment toward cooperative peace rather than plan on the basis of inevitable armed conflict”.<sup>20</sup> “The belief that there exists a long-term strategic convergence between the two countries is widespread”.<sup>21</sup> US support for India’s position during the 1999 Kargil conflict, and the hugely publicised visit of President Clinton in 2000, dramatically increased the appeal of the United States, even within traditionally anti-American sections of Indian society.

### **The Policy Shift 2012**

The “US economy and security are inextricably linked to developments in the arc extending from the Western Pacific and East Asia into the Indian Ocean region and South Asia, creating a mix of evolving challenges and opportunities”<sup>22</sup> holds the

document. It also explicitly elevates India to be a long term strategic partner whom the US will support “to serve as a ‘regional anchor’ and provider of security in the broader Indian Ocean region”.<sup>23</sup> The underlying US strategy in this region remains the maintenance of balance of power.<sup>24</sup> However, the focus on India and the strain in relations between the US and Pakistan could well mean a closer and more dynamic strategic relationship between China and Pakistan.<sup>25</sup>

### **Preserving Dominance**

The US Marine Corps Vision and Strategy 2025 document concludes that the Indian Ocean and its adjacent waters will be a central theatre of global conflict and competition this century.<sup>26</sup> The US Quadrennial Defence Review 2010, draws round the Indian Ocean as providing important SLOCs that are integral for the “global commerce, international energy security, and regional stability”.<sup>27</sup> “The document also maintains that the US has an interest in keeping the Indian Ocean region stable and ensuring its open access to all”.<sup>28</sup>

### **Future Regional Scenario and Role of Indo-US Relations**

Ever since US military action in Iraq, the debate on unilateralism versus multi-lateralism has also intensified. There is increasing realization in the world, including in the United States, that there is no alternative to multi-lateralism to prevent conflicts or for conflict resolution. The indo – US militaries have potential for regional and global cooperation.

### **Analysis and Implications for Pakistan**

#### **US Interests in Pakistan and Possibility of Maintaining Good Relations with both India and Pakistan**

Washington’s engagement with Pakistan vis-à-vis India goes in India’s favor as American assistance to India will likely expand. India’s economic and technological base may see translating into military power. This will aggravate the problem of uneven growth in conventional and nuclear capabilities of India and Pakistan. Despite its constructive engagement with Beijing, the West has not overcome its traditional mistrust of China. Any future US efforts to strengthen India to balance the rising power of China will invariably have effects on Pakistan. Broadening relations might increase US influence in Delhi but it would also enhance Indian influence in Washington. The state relations are largely governed by the national interests. The current phase of US-Pakistan relations will endure as long as they shared common objectives and the US need for a supportive Pakistan during her fight against international terrorism. In case of decreasing level of the US interest in the region there could be a gradual shift in the policy with further inclination towards India. This may further harden Indian attitude towards Pakistan. The nature of US policies bearing on Indo-Pak relations, particularly Kashmir and any significant disregard by the USA of Pakistan’s legitimate defence requirements will be detrimental to Pakistan-USA relation. The current US Security Doctrine enunciated in the National Security Strategy Paper, has some serious

implications for Pakistan. While India is seen as a strategic partner and an upcoming global power, the US relationship with Pakistan is seen primarily in the context of Pakistan having joined the US-led war on terrorism: *'With Pakistan, our bilateral relations have been bolstered by Pakistan's choice to join the war on terror and move toward building a more open and tolerant society.'*<sup>29</sup> So the relationship with Pakistan is conditional – and traditionally has been coercive one on the part of the US. “The strategic relationship between the US and India may cause further misalignment in the strategic interests of Pakistan with US and possibly US-Indo interests vis-à-vis Pakistan – including on the issue of Kashmir”.<sup>30</sup>

## **Diplomatic Issues**

On the sidelines of the US led war against terrorism India has been waging a diplomatic war against Pakistan on the premise that Pakistan was not acceptable as a member of the international coalition for reason of promoting and sponsoring terrorism. The bomb blast at the Srinagar Assembly was linked to the 9/11 as was the attack on the Indian Parliament later. The buildup of armed forces along the border was a step in the same direction aimed at coercing Pakistan to regress from its Kashmir Policy, or at least to lower to a certain degree Pakistan’s perceived level of resistance.

## **Effects on China**

China’s ambition to be a world power impinges upon US global dominance and interests. The Chinese, aware of the US high commercial stake in an expanding Chinese market may be able to sustain the American pressures, by playing the China market card. China, other than Pakistan, is one of the two countries affected most by the Indo-US nexus and may want to associate more closely with Russia as well as Pakistan to counter American designs. The maritime co-operation between India and the USA has far reaching implications for China, given the new Indian base in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands and her intent of maintaining naval presence in the South China Sea. “Despite the priority accorded to fighting terrorism, the present US government is expected to continue with the policy of strategic containment of China that would be pursued side by side with economic engagement. The military presence of the USA in Afghanistan and Central Asia cannot but arouse concerns in Beijing about long-term US goals on its western periphery”.<sup>31</sup> Maintaining the right balance in its relationship with China and the USA, would be tight rope walk for Pakistan.

## **Kashmir Issue**

India would endeavor to utilize US support to pressurize Pakistan to regress on Kashmir issue. Pakistan is fighting VNSA’s throughout the country and its western border with Afghanistan that might affect the Kashmir cause. Acknowledging Kashmir requiring international attention, the USA seems hesitant to broker peace.

## **Negative Effects on Pakistani Interests in Afghanistan**

“Instead of an interest-driven policy, Indian presence in Afghanistan is to counterweight Pakistani influence in the region. India is increasingly being looked upon as a friend, while Pakistan’s image has suffered”.<sup>32</sup> India is making all-out efforts to foment sub-nationalism in Baluchistan. Within the parameters of her grand strategy India’s natural orientation seeks to employ contemporary Afghanistan as a stringboard for fomenting terrorist activity and instability in the FATA belt on Pak-Afghan Border. India is engaged in imparting “training to Afghan police, Afghan National Army, parliamentary training to Afghan officials, judicial training, helping to develop media, information and broadcasting. Undoubtedly, India is stoking the separatist fervors in our Tribal Region and in Baluchistan. If not curtailed, this increasing Indian influence can have serious implications for Pakistan”.<sup>33</sup>

## **Military Imbalance**

On the face of it, the US’ approach towards South Asia and China appears to be based on maintaining the balance of power but in reality it would go beyond the balance, thereby lending power advantage to the US. Defence agreement between the US and India is a start point, which may help the US to undermine or at least slow down china rise. However, in case of Pakistan, it would tilt the conventional military balance in favour of India. “Equally US-India nuclear agreement, once implemented, would enable India to make quantitative and qualitative improvement in its nuclear arsenal”.<sup>34</sup>

## **Nuclear Deterrence and Missile Shield**

The USA seems to have realized the complications of complete elimination of nuclear weapons in South Asia. The US expects to achieve non- proliferation of nuclear technology to other states and in the short term is to contain further development of such capabilities and, in the meantime, work “for a regional solution to the problem of nuclear proliferation in South Asia. This does not mean that US would not, given the opportunity, try to exercise greater influence over Pakistan's strategic assets”.<sup>35</sup>

## **Major Conclusions:-**

The development of a strategic India–US military relationship would also express India's rising continental Asian status as a great power with interests and capabilities across the continent instead of being seen as merely a regional leader”.

China and India’s long-term strategic interests do not converge; therefore, a rapprochement between them is unlikely. It, however, suits American interests if it can avert greater cooperation between China and India.

India will have to establish a delicate balance in its relations with Russia and the USA.



Pakistan has emerged relevant to the USA on three accounts. One, being a nuclear power the USA wants her to be a stable country; secondly, Pakistan provides easy access to the rich Central Asian Republics while third and most important its fight against terrorism.

Pakistan would come under US pressure on Kashmir issue due American long term interests in India.

An India with a growing powerful economy and the American support will be able to increase manifold its already massive military might.

Pakistan will have to relook its deterrence strategy against present Indian modernisation of defence arrangement in conventional and strategic domain.

US' endorsement to support India for permanent seat in UNSC has intrusive implications for Pakistan's interests on number of outstanding conflicts with India.

The Indo-US strategic partnership and their close ties are now a reality that Pakistan and the world are reconciled to. This, however, does not imply that it is a zero-sum game. Pakistan has its own importance due to its geostrategic position linking South with Central and West Asia, as a nuclear power and a state that can play a key role in the stability of Afghanistan.

## **Policy Options for Pakistan**

### **Foreign Policy**

“The foreign policy of a state cannot be static even as some of its underlying concerns and norms have an enduring value. The 9/11 attacks offered only a short term fillip to US - Pakistan relations in the form of lifting of sanctions and the influx of military and economic aid. A spate of events in the past two years and clash of disparate interests in Afghanistan have led Pakistan's Parliamentary Committee for National Security (PCNS) to table revised guidelines on terms of engagement with the United States. One may call such a step as too little too late”.<sup>36</sup> Some of the important facets of foreign policy which need focus are suggested:-

### **Proactive Foreign Policy**

Pakistan cannot afford a reactive foreign policy and rather should follow a proactive foreign policy to benefit from the changing international and regional environment.

### **Avoidance of India-Centric Policy**

With the scope for interaction with other countries expanding and various forms of emerging co-operation, our foreign policy should cease to be frenzied with the Indian threat. While security should remain a basic determinant, emphasis is accorded to

fostering economic development and co-operation with other countries, essentially the USA.

### **Need for Regional Alliances**

Whereas, maximization of internal strengths must remain the primary goal regardless of any other policy, an ‘Alliance Strategy’ will be more prudent choice for Pakistan. Under the prevailing environment a formal political and military alliance with China can effectively address our insecurity syndrome. There is a substantial scope for an economic alliance. ECO could be used as a basis for such an alliance, and expanded subsequently.

It is within the broad parameters of the emerging US strategic policy that Pakistan needs to frame its external policy options – be they within the bilateral context with India / USA or the regional context.

### **Iran Policy**

“For Iran, which is now moving towards a proactive security policy in the Gulf region, Pakistan’s co-operative military linkages with the Gulf countries and Saudi Arabia offer an in-built structural framework to build a co-operative strategic relationship”.<sup>37</sup>

### **Fresh Afghan Policy**

There is need to further strengthen our existing relations with US administration by making realistic adjustments in our interests with US and Afghanistan, so that any apprehension planted by the hostile forces may not result in US wrath against Pakistan. At the same time, we need to improve our bilateral relations with the new Afghan Government.

### **Middle East Policy**

Our relation with Middle East should be business oriented rather religion centric.

### **Emphasis on Economic Issues**

Pakistan must define its relation with USA by focusing on economic issues; alongside continue to pursue pragmatic wholesome policy with china, Russia and CARs.

### **Preservation of Strategic Assets**

“No outside power should have any access to any part of Pakistan’s nuclear facilities. While accepting the limits of the Pakistan-US relationship, we need to be alert of the threat to our nuclear capabilities. Without adopting confrontational approach with the USA we must define the limits of our cooperation and enunciate our own national strategic compulsions”.<sup>38</sup>

## **Kashmir Policy**

Continues support of Kashmiri people over long term and its intensity may vary as per environment. The emphasis should be solution based on wishes of Kashmiris. Exterior maneuver needs to be mounted to create favorable space in international community that will come handy at the time of addressing this issue.

## **UN Monitoring in IHK**

India has successfully linked the Kashmiri struggle to cross-border terrorism. We need to counter this effectively by distinguishing between terrorism and freedom struggles, something that the UN also recognize, and we must make diplomatic and political efforts aimed at making India accept deployment of more international observers on the LOC as well as in IHK.

## **Improving the Country's Image**

A consistent effort to separate GSAVE from freedom struggle in Kashmir needs to be pursued. To promote this aspect Pakistan has to be proactive in managing its own perception in the world through practical action on ground.

## **Vibrant Pak-American Community**

The Pakistani-American community of 0.7 million in USA should be sensitized to play a greater political role. The role of Pakistan Embassies abroad needs to be seriously re-examined and projects undertaken to enhance their capability to play a positive role in this sphere.

## **Conclusion**

The US would not ignore Pakistan under the current environment but it would prefer to promote India as tool of its aspiration in the south Asian region. Although India might not be willing to play the US surrogate, yet it would attract the US for its role in the region. With the USA now more concerned with access to economically viable markets, the emphasis is on extracting maximum mercantile advantages rather than any serious concern for resolving contentious issues in the region. The convergence of US and Indian interests and shared perceptions on various issues has resulted in regular high level consultations between the two governments, close cooperation in defence, space, nuclear and high technology, and a substantially enhanced Indo-US economic cooperation. "The development of a strategic India-US military relationship would also express India's rising continental Asian status as a great power with interests and capabilities across the continent instead of being seen as merely a regional leader".<sup>39</sup> In the changed international environments, Pakistan needs to develop strong bilateral relations with US so as to counter growing Indian influence on the minds of US Administration.

## Endnotes

---

- 1 <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdf/files/ksil210.pdf> (accessed on 9 Apr, 14)
- 2 <http://www.aph.gov.au/Library/pubs/RP/2001-02/02rp20.pdf>(accessed on 14 Mar, 14)
- 3 [http://aphnew.aph.gov.au/sitecore/content/Home/About\\_Parliament/Parliamentary\\_Departments/Parliamentary\\_Library/pubs/rp/rp0102/02RP20](http://aphnew.aph.gov.au/sitecore/content/Home/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp0102/02RP20) (accessed on 8 Apr, 14)
- 4 <http://www.aph.gov.au/Library/pubs/RP/2001-02/02rp20.pdf> (accessed on 14 Mar, 14)
- 5 <http://wopared.aph.gov.au/library/pubs/rp/2001-02/02RP20.htm> (accessed on 9 Apr, 14)
- 6 <http://www.aph.gov.au/Library/pubs/RP/2001-02/02rp20.pdf> (accessed on 2 Mar, 14)
- 7 <http://www.aph.gov.au/Library/pubs/RP/2001-02/02rp20.pdf> (accessed on 3 Mar, 14)
- 8 Far Eastern Economic Review, 30 March. p. 22. <http://www.feer.mag.net/> (accessed on 3 Nov, 2013).
- 9 Fact Sheet: Sanctions on India and Pakistan, *Washington File*, 28 September 2013. <http://www.washingtonfile.net/factsheet/> (accessed on 14 Dec, 2013)
- 10 [http://www.issi.org.pk/ss\\_Detail.php?dataId=354](http://www.issi.org.pk/ss_Detail.php?dataId=354) (accessed on 9 Apr, 14)
- 11 [http://www.issi.org.pk/ss\\_Detail.php?dataId=354](http://www.issi.org.pk/ss_Detail.php?dataId=354) (accessed on 27 Mar, 14)
- 12 [http://www.issi.org.pk/ss\\_Detail.php?dataId=354](http://www.issi.org.pk/ss_Detail.php?dataId=354) (accessed on 27 Mar, 14)
- 13 <http://ipri-pak.org/latestarticles/usindia.htm> (accessed on 3 Apr, 14)
- 14 [http://www.issi.org.pk/ss\\_Detail.php?dataId=58](http://www.issi.org.pk/ss_Detail.php?dataId=58) (accessed on 7 Apr, 14)
- 15 "India's new dynamics in foreign policy", University of Heidelberg, 2010. (accessed on 29 Mar, 14)
- 16 [http://csis.org/files/publication/121101\\_WadhvaniChair\\_USIndiaInsight.pdf](http://csis.org/files/publication/121101_WadhvaniChair_USIndiaInsight.pdf) (accessed on 17 Apr,14)
- 17 Thomas P. Thornton, *The US and India: Setting the Focus*, The News, March 14. [www.thenews.com/archives/March14](http://www.thenews.com/archives/March14), (accessed on 22 Jan, 2014).
- 18 [http://observerindia.com/cms/sites/orfonline/modules/analysis/AnalysisDetail.html?cmaid=7048&m\\_macmaid=7049](http://observerindia.com/cms/sites/orfonline/modules/analysis/AnalysisDetail.html?cmaid=7048&m_macmaid=7049) (accessed on 13 Apr,14)
- 19 Deepa Ollapally. "The Pragmatic Challenge to Indian Foreign Policy", *The Washington Quarterly*, 04/2011 (accessed on 3 May,14)
- 20 Ibid
- 21 Ibid
- 22 "Sustaining US Global Leadership Priorities for 21st Century Defence," January 2012, p.2.
- 23 Nizamani, "US Priorities for 21st Century."
- 24 Brahma Chellaney, "US Strategy in the Asia Pacific," *Al-Jazeera Centre for Studies*, February 15, 2014.
- 25 Daya Gamage, "US New Defense Strategy Focuses Asia: Nations Tied to China Need Re-thinking," *Asian Tribune*, January 7, 2012.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 See, "Quadrennial Defence Review Report," 2010, 60.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Shireen M. Mazari, "The new US Security Doctrine: Implications for the South Asian Region". <http://www.issi.org/indo-usssecuritydoctrinedoc.html> (accessed on 17 Jan, 2014).
- 30 [http://www.issi.org.pk/ss\\_Detail.php?dataId=241](http://www.issi.org.pk/ss_Detail.php?dataId=241) (accessed on 3 Mar,14)
- 31 <http://www.dawn.com/2002/01/05/op.htm> (accessed on 23 Apr,14)
- 32 <http://www.pakobserver.net/200808/28/Articles02.asp> (accessed on 5 Mar,14)
- 33 <http://www.pakobserver.net/200808/28/Articles02.asp> (accessed on 10 Mar,14)
- 34 <http://www.stimson.org/images/uploads/research-pdfs/AdilSultan.pdf> (accessed on 23 Apr,14)
- 35 <http://www.ne.jp/asahi/peace/unitednationsreform2007/kawaguchi.html> (accessed on 19 Mar,14)
- 36 <http://ipripak.org/journal/summer2012/art3.pdf> (Accessed on 10 Apr,14)
- 37 [http://www.issi.org.pk/journal/2001\\_files/no\\_1/article/9a.htm](http://www.issi.org.pk/journal/2001_files/no_1/article/9a.htm) (accessed on 13 Mar,14)
- 38 Ibid
- 39 [http://www.talonnews.com/news/2003/august/0812\\_us\\_india\\_defensep.shtml](http://www.talonnews.com/news/2003/august/0812_us_india_defensep.shtml) (accessed on 2 Apr,14)

## **PART – II**

### **National Security**

- **Pakistan's Energy Security Challenges**