

Sino-Pakistan Maneuvering to Balance the Power in South Asia

Rizwan Naseer

Comsats Institute of Information Technology (CIIT), Islamabad.

Musarat Amin

Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi.

Why does China Fortify Pakistan's Defense?

With the advent of nuclear weapons escalation between India and Pakistan is less likely. Kargilcrisis (1999) is the testament that nuclear deterrence in South Asia got credibility. The most dominating factor in this entire phenomenon is the balance of power in South Asia. Balance of power between or among states is hard to achieve and equally challenging is to maintain it. If balance of power between states gets upset then they are more likely to engage into serious conflict. Balance of Power in South Asian region continued until Indo-US civil nuclear deal in 2005. Indo-US nuclear deal seriously damaged existing balance of power which would restart tensions between nuclear armed rivals.

Final approval of Indo-US nuclear deal was given by US congress on October 1, 2008. Indo-US nuclear deal proved a watershed as it lifted three-decade long US sanctions on nuclear technology transfer to India. Where some of the proponents of the deal lauded that it would expand US assistance to India's civilian nuclear energy program, on the other hand critics in United States criticized that this deal has reversed US' half century long efforts on Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). Additionally, this act of United States may prove counterproductive in preventing Iran and North Korea going nuclear and would trigger arms race in South Asia. This notion stood correct and North Korea has conducted three nuclear tests since 2006 (http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/21/world/asia/north-korea-threatens-to-conduct-nuclear-test.html?_r=0). Which has further heightened tensions between US and North Korea.

Science and technology fellow at the Council of Foreign Relations [Charles D. Ferguson](#) says that if we look at three countries (India, Pakistan & Israel) outside the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), this is a unique deal.

(<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/09/04/AR2008090401614.html>)

Indo-US civil nuclear deal surely gave India nuclear supremacy in terms of nuclear technology and *de jure* recognition to Indian nuclear program, though India is not a signatory of Nuclear nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) because NPT objectifies three goals which include disarmament, nonproliferation and peaceful use of nuclear energy (<http://www.state.gov/t/isn/npt/index.htm>). Though India has been successful in maintaining its reputé as non-proliferator but it is not adhering to disarmament and peaceful use of nuclear energy. Indian is virulently involved in Arms race and converting nuclear energy from civil purpose to military purpose.

After Indo-US civil nuclear deal, other nations of Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) stepped up to cut similar deal with India for trading nuclear technology and energy. Subsequent civil nuclear deals with other great powers placed India in strategically higher ranks than Pakistan which ultimately could upset the balance of power in the region. Otherwise before materialization of Indo-US nuclear deal member states of NSG were reluctant to reach nuclear agreements with India.

Pakistan has been US ally through cold war, post-cold war to war against terrorism. Being “*Non-NATO ally*” and a frontline state in American led war against terrorism former has been expecting similar nuclear deal from the latter. Pakistan’s demand for similar deal was quite legitimate. But Pakistan’s hopes to get similar offer got drenched when Washington categorically rejected any civil nuclear deal with Pakistan. Experts are of the view that rejecting similar deal to Pakistan reflects U.S favoritism for India which would raise tensions between the nuclear armed rivals and lead US-Pakistan relations to an uncertain and delirious situation. Jayshree Bajoria says that Pakistanis are concerned that Indo-US civil nuclear deal would feed Uranium to Indian nuclear weapon program and debilitate the existing deterrence. Some foreign policy experts expressed their concern that Indo-US nuclear deal would motivate Pakistan to clinch similar deal with China (<http://www.cfr.org/india/us-india-nuclear-deal/p9663>). The simple formula for maintenance of peace and stability between Pakistan and India is the balance of power. Historically, Pakistan’s strategic moves showed that Pakistan is ardent to keep hard balancing strategy with India. Ultimately when US turned down Pakistan’s demands of equal treatment then the latter counted on its all-weather-friend China for catching up Indian nuclear superiority.

China being the rising power and an immediate neighbor has got vested interests in South Asia. China earnestly desires preservation of peace and stability in the region which is conducive for China’s peaceful rise and beneficial for regional prosperity. Balance of power between India and Pakistan could ensure relative peace in the region as was witnessed after reaching strategic parity in 1998. Indo-US civil nuclear deal is set to upset regional balance of power which poses a direct threat to regional peace and stability and may impede China’s peaceful rise. Indo-US nuclear deal opened up door for other nuclear suppliers to trade nuclear technology and components with India without any limitations. To reconstitute regional balance of power caused by Indo-US civil nuclear deal, China assisted Pakistan with similar instrumentation.

Sino-Pakistan deep strategic cooperation caused huge unrest in Washington and New Delhi alike. Under the terms of agreement between China and Pakistan, former would construct two nuclear reactors in Pakistan. United States and India opposed such a civil nuclear deal instantaneously (<http://nation.com.pk/Politics/21-Jun-2010/China-angers-US-with-plan-to-build-nuclear-reactors-in-Pakistan>). One thing is very clear that Pakistan would not be able to secure nuclear trade with NSG members but the India-Pakistan asymmetry would not widen largely.

China-Pakistan agreement to restore balance in South Asia is seen with suspicion by Washington and New Delhi alike. Internationally, media and think-tanks termed it a direct contravention of international guidelines because the non-signatory of NPT cannot trade nuclear technology and components freely with other nuclear states. But on the other side Indo-US civil nuclear deal did not face such an intense criticism from legal experts and international regimes. India is also a non-signatory of NPT but signed a historic Indo-US civil nuclear deal by getting exemption from Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG).

The purpose of NSG establishment was to empower NPT regime and to strictly oversee nuclear commerce but NPT could not stop India from testing nuclear weapons. India has not signed NPT yet based on that Indian membership of NSG is very hard to achieve but United States is vying to get Indian membership of NSG. After President Obama's visit to India in Nov,2010,President Barack Obama reiterated US support for India in NSG and other multilateral export control regimes. After issuance of India-specific waiver by NSG in 2008 other nuclear supplier group members including US, UK, France, Canada, Argentina, Kazakhstan, Russia, Namibia, South Korea and Mongolia have signed nuclear cooperation agreements with India. But after meeting at Vienna in March,2013 China, Japan, Netherland, Switzerland and Ireland also opposed Indian inclusion into NSG.(Painter:2013)

The Sino-Pakistan agreement is under severe criticism from all corners whereas the cooperation between China and Pakistan dates back to 1986 when Beijing and Islamabad reached a "*Comprehensive Nuclear Cooperation Agreement*". According to that pact China was supposed to build four nuclear plants in Pakistan by 2011.

Based on that historic agreement China and Pakistan are deliberating materialization of that nuclear deal. According to that deal China would sell three nuclear power plants to Pakistan worth \$13 billion. *Wall Street Journal* has already reported that China would build two nuclear plants in Karachi of worth \$ 9 billion. United States has objected burgeoning of China-Pakistan nuclear commerce because Pakistan is non-signatory of NPT and no nuclear commerce can be carried out between Pakistan and members of NSG. According to *Wall street Journal* this act of China may create a diplomatic tussle between China and United States. The NSG is a body of states which deals with nuclear trade and regulates exports of nuclear material (dual use) under the legal domain of NPT. On this very issue China clearly maintains that its nuclear commerce started before its

NSG member. (<http://thediplomat.com/2014/01/pakistan-china-discuss-3-plant-nuclear-energy-deal/>).

Pakistan Foreign Office had rebuffed Indo-US concerns over the deal that the deal is an axis against India. The spokesperson clarified that, “Pakistan-China cooperation has been continued for years. Our nuclear cooperation is under the supervision of ‘International Atomic Energy Agency’ safeguards. Therefore the concerns, if any, are misplaced”. It is mention worthy that Sino-Pakistan agreement dates back to September 15, 1986 when the ‘Comprehensive Nuclear Agreement’ was reached between Pakistan and China in the presence of Chinese Premier and Chairman of Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission (PAEC) Dr. Munir Khan. The Agreement was reached between Pakistan’s Foreign Minister Sahibzada Yaqub Khan and his Chinese counterpart in Beijing. In that nuclear agreement it was decided that China would construct four nuclear power plants in Pakistan (Chashma 1, 2, 3 & 4) (<http://www.opinion-maker.org/2010/07/sino-pak-nuclear-deal/#>) China successfully constructed Chashma 1 and 2 but the construction of Chashma 3 and 4 fell into abeyance because of unspecified reasons. Now the US and other NSG members urging China to obtain approval from NSG and IAEA otherwise it would endanger ideals of nuclear non-proliferation Regime. China’s Foreign Ministry spokesperson Mr. Qin Gang clarified that “the nuclear cooperation between the two countries was for peaceful purposes and totally consistent with its international obligations and safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency”. Indeed, Sino-Pakistan agreement does not require approval by NSG and IAEA because when China and Pakistan signed it the former was not member of NSG (Nuclear Supplier Group). Additionally China had completed all formalities and legalities to become the member of NPT, therefore, technically China is not under any obligation to get approval from NSG and IAEA. Anyhow China is pretty much determined to advocate its case that the agreement with Pakistan was signed before joining nuclear club in 2004, therefore, the case does not fall in the ambit of NPT and NSG. Voicing India’s concern over the issue the Indian Minister of State for Science and Technology, Prithviraj Chavan said that India had serious concerns about transfer of technology to Pakistan in an improper way. Some of the experts raised the questions on China’s silence over finalization of Indo-US nuclear deal and its exemption from Nuclear Supplier Group. China had fair chance to block-off this deal with diplomatic strength at the forum of NSG but let it pass. Stephen P. Cohen (a senior fellow at Brookings institute) remarked about China’s non opposing tactics over passage of Indo-US civil nuclear deal in NSG, he said that China misestimated the exact number of countries who were to block-off NSG waiver for India. The member countries in NSG were fairly small even the combined population of those member countries was barely the size of New Delhi populace. Then why those countries would stake their relations with India for nothing. (<http://www.livemint.com/2008/10/12224959/In-the-US-even-those-against.html>).

On the other hand China's standpoint differs over not opposing Indo-US civil nuclear deal. China didn't impede Indo-US civil nuclear deal because in NSG, unanimity is required for the passage of any nuclear related agreement even if a single member rejects the deal, it stands cancel. It was not a big deal for China to block-off Indo-US civil nuclear deal at NSG forum. China being the member of NSG could declare Indo-US civil nuclear deal as null and void on the grounds of India's non signatory status of NPT but China did not oppose Indo-US civil nuclear deal and let the US set a precedent of violating NPT regime. Now when America has materialized Indo-US nuclear deal and is opposing Sino-Pakistan similar cooperation, is a staunch paradox in U.S stated ideals and its deeds. If the matter of Sino-Pakistan is taken to NSG forum then China would be expecting the similar treatment from Washington to show reciprocity because Washington distorted the rules of NPT and CTBT to materialize Indo-US civil nuclear deal. There is another reason that U.S would not block-off Sino-Pakistan agreement because on the issue of Iran and North Korea's nuclear program, United States needs China's help to impose tough sanctions (<http://csis.org/blog/china-and-pakistan-move-forward-nuclear-deal>).

Dis. /Similarities between Indo-US and Sino-Pakistan Nuclear Deals

India is non-signatory of Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) despite that United States signed a civil nuclear agreement with India which is a obvious violation of NPT regime. United States did not persuade India to sign NPT because of the fear that India might back out of the proposed Indo-US civil nuclear deal any time. If Washington could have shown considerable strictness than chances of finalizing Indo-US nuclear deal were quite bleak. There was an intense opposition within India over the deal even the Indian government led by Congress party survived the vote of confidence in the parliament.

Pakistan, similar to India is a non-signatory of NPT but the Sino-Pakistan agreement did not violate clauses of NPT because the deal was inked back in 1986 when China was neither member of NPT nor NSG. Despite the fact Ashley J. Tellis differentiates between Indo-US nuclear deal and Sino-Pakistan agreement on the following bases.

- China seems to dismiss its obligations to Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) whose membership China got in 2004 and claims that the deal was signed in 1980s.
- United States respected international Non-proliferation by requesting an exemption from NSG while China seeks to short circuit Nuclear Supplier Group (http://carnegieendowment.org/files/china_pak_nuke1.pdf).

Ashley J. Tellis differentiates both the nuclear agreements on the basis of agreeability not on the bases of legalities. The first and foremost commonality between India and Pakistan is that both the countries possess nuclear weapons but neither is signatory of Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. So legally Nuclear

Supplier Group (NSG) countries cannot trade nuclear related technology with other countries who have not signed NPT. On the basis of this legal perspective Indo-US nuclear deal whether debated publicly, was in direct contravention of NPT regime. United States did not push India to sign NPT rather adopted the way of NSG waiver exclusively for India. US overlooked Indian track record on nuclear testing as a violation of nuclear non-proliferation regime. Indian detonation of nuclear devices in 1998 was open defiance of international regime for proliferation. India did not face immense pressures for continuation of developing Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and their testing without signing NPT and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). India rejected NPT in 1960s and later CTBT in 1996 and conducted nuclear tests in 1998 which incited Pakistan to follow suit. India rejected to sign CTBT on the basis that the treaty was not conceived a step towards Universal disarmament (http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/publications/case_studies/19/index.html). United States president Bush lauded India over NPT issue but it should be clear upon everyone that India misused Canadian and US nuclear assistance in 1974 by conducting nuclear tests which was given to India in the name of peaceful purpose. That is the reason India remained out of international nuclear mainstream and most of international assistance was cut off to India because of 1974 nuclear tests. Despite all these improper acts it claims to have excellent track record compared to Pakistan (<http://pakobserver.net/detailnews.asp?id=57684>). Tellis' second objection is that China seems to dismiss its obligation to Nuclear Supplier Group whose membership China got in 2004 but Sino-Pakistan cooperation dates back to 1986 when China was neither member of NPT nor NSG. Germany being a member of NSG has declared Sino-Pakistan Agreement as not subject to NSG ratification. Germany issued the statement during annual meeting of NSG members in Nordwijk, Netherland. Germany expressed complete satisfaction over Sino-Pakistan nuclear deal and adopted a stance as China's export of two nuclear reactors to Pakistan is covered by existing policies and understandings of NSG and there is no need to discuss this matter in annual meeting at Netherland. U.S assistant Secretary for South Asia and Central Asia Robert Blake had told reporters in Beijing that "We expect China to abide by the commitments that it made when it joined the Nuclear Suppliers Group in 2004, and in particular we think the construction of new nuclear reactors such as the Chasma 3 and 4 would be inconsistent with those commitments." But Germany declared that "China can export nuclear goods for construction of nuclear power plants such as Chashma 3 and 4 in Pakistan without violating NSG guidelines." (<http://armscontrolnow.org/2011/06/21/germany-opposes-united-states-on-china-pakistan-nuclear-deal>). Ashley J. Tellis' third objection is that United States respected international Non-proliferation by requesting an exemption from NSG while China seeks to short-circuit NSG. But if technically seen then United States has undermined Non-proliferation by signing Indo-US nuclear deal. India was not a member of NPT which meant nuclear deal could not

be signed with non-signatory of NPT but United States concluded that deal even by amending domestic law “Hyde Act”.

On moral grounds United States has little ground to oppose Sino-Pakistan cooperation because of Indo-US civil nuclear deal .The conception that Sino-Pakistan nuclear deal poses nuclear threat to India is absolutely a faulty idea. Infact, Pakistan is undergoing acute energy shortage and it wants to tap nuclear energy to meet its rising energy demands (<http://www.vifindia.org/China-Pak-Nuclear-Axis-Against-India>).Dr. Kerry Brown(a Senior Fellow, with the Asia Program at London’s Royal Institute of International Affairs) (RIIA), explains America’s expected response to Sino-Pakistan cooperation, he is sure that President Obama will ‘turn a blind eye’ to the PRC-Pakistan deal for sake of amassing Beijing’s support on Iranian and North Korea’s nuclear program. China is significant player and U.S’ priorities are denuclearization of Korean peninsula and revaluation of RMB. He extended his argument by saying as for as Sino-Pakistan cooperation is concerned ‘Americans can live with it’(<http://analysis.nuclearenergyinsider.com/new-build/china-pakistan-nuclear-deal-causes-stir>).

Rationale behind Sino-Pakistan Strategic Cooperation

Unlike Indo-US civil nuclear deal, Pakistan’s Agreement differs in several respects. Indo-US civil nuclear deal upsets the *quasi balance* of power between India and Pakistan but Sino-Pakistan strategic cooperation vies to counter-balance Indo-US strategic alliance as the balance of power is conducive for peace and stability of the South Asian region. History has witnessed that whenever the balance of power got upset war broke out or the shadows of war loomed large. This Sino-Pakistan strategic cooperation would ward off dangers of nuclear war by retaking strategic parity between nuclear armed rivals.

Realist’s argument is that “Power is checked most effectively by counterbalancing strategy.” Even major powers do not feel secure from other major or rising powers; they feel threat to their security. The basic axiom of *balance-of-power theory* is that great powers will develop and mobilize sufficient military means to constrain the most powerful among them. Though the theory has been formulated in many ways over the centuries, the key proffer of almost all versions of the theory is “States tend to balance against threats of hegemony over the system.” Therefore, the theory posits that once a state assumes more power relative to others then other actors engage in counter-balancing to avert any possible future threat (Naseer,Amin,2011:10).

Indo-US civil nuclear deal tilted regional balance of power in India’s favor which was quite alarming for Pakistan’s security. India had been practicing hegemony over Pakistan in pre nuclearization of South Asia era. Indiaalso succeeded in dismemberingPakistan(1971) which has psychologically very deep impact on the minds of Pakistani strategists. Since then Pakistan has been feeling real threat from India to its safety and survival.

Balance of power theory posits that states maneuver to exist as independent entity in anarchical global system and that is why pursue power. Without achieving sufficient power in an anarchical system, states may become subservient to other powerful states and may jeopardize their security and prosperity. Anarchy thus is a motivating factor for states that evokes them for maximizing power as security and physical survival are not achievable without power. As a result of power struggle, competition among states becomes a natural state of affairs in international politics. Small powers do not possess the capability to ensure their security by themselves. They could adopt tactics of internal balancing of building up weapons to counterbalance rising power's military threat (Paul, Writz, Fortman, 2004:4-5). Thus Pakistan is reaffirming its *entente cordiale* with China by enhancing deep strategic cooperation.

Firstly the aim of Sino-Pakistan nuclear deal is to counterbalance Indo-US nuclear deal and Agreement would also help Pakistan to overcome load-shedding caused by energy crisis. Pakistan is grappling with serious energy crisis in the country which has damaged economy badly. China has stepped up to salvage Pakistan from energy crisis and pledged to assist Pakistan in 19 small and medium energy projects to cope with deteriorating situation. These 19 projects include four power generation projects with capacity of 2,297 Megawatts. China would help Pakistan produce power from coal reserves while the capacity of coal power project is 405 Megawatts (MW). Other projects include development of infrastructure, mining and power production from Thar coal, four structures of small and medium dams to make the deficiency of water to generate power. Five projects of transmission lines and power distribution, one project of alternative energy and two projects of geological survey are also part of Sino-Pakistan cooperation to overcome rising energy crisis in Pakistan. China would provide technical assistance and financial help to complete the projects between three to five years. During the visit of Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao to Pakistan in December 2010, it was decided that China would assist in financing and development of conventional, renewable and civil nuclear energy projects, to be identified by Pakistan (<http://tribune.com.pk/story/220978/pakistan-to-seek-chinese-help-for-19-energy-projects/>). That commitment is still on as Pakistan's current Prime Minister Mian Nawaz Sharif is eager to enhance cooperation with China to overcome energy crisis in Pakistan.

During a visit to Beijing accompanied by delegation former Federal Minister for Water and Power Syed Naveed Qamar said that China is the only country that can help Pakistan to combat its present energy crisis. "If at all there is a country in the world that can help us in dealing with the miseries (of load shedding), it is China" (<http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2011/08/03/business/%E2%80%98china-only-country-to-help-pakistan-with-energy-crisis%E2%80%99/>).

China has planted nuclear power reactor at Chashma (central Punjab province) with 325-Megawatts capacity, whereas the installation of second reactor with same capacity is underway. Pakistan is planning to generate up to 8000

Megawatts of electricity by wielding nuclear energy (<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/10/16/world/main4527309.shtml>). The main objective of this agreement is to fulfill energy demands and salvage economy. Since 2002, Pakistan is in continuous war against militants which resulted in destruction of infrastructure, flee of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and the governments could not devise any better solution to meet the rising energy demands. Now Sino-Pakistan cooperation will efficiently enhance Pakistan's power generation capacity which is surely for peaceful purposes. Mr. Wang Shoofeng the Director General *Three Gorges Corporation* in an interview to Pakistani media delegation informed that Chinese experts are working in Pakistan to provide technical knowhow in power generation field. He added that free of cost operational changes to WAPDA (Water and Power Development Authority) are underway and within next 10 years they will be enabling Pakistan to successfully generate 10,000 megawatts of power (<http://timesofpakistan.pk/business/2011-07-11/chinese-firm-to-help-pakistan-generate-10000mw-power/38396/>).

Former Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh upon his arrival at Toronto to participate in G20 summit demanded clarification from Pakistan over the issue. Pakistan as a sovereign state, refused to give any clarification to India. The then Pakistan's Foreign Office Spokesperson Mr. Abdul Basit answered back by issuing the statement that, Sino-Pak security pact is for peaceful purposes and no country should have any objection. International community knows Pakistan is facing terrorism and energy crises. Agreement with China is crucial to the economic development of Pakistan. United States also had demanded the similar clarification from Pakistan and China but both the countries refused to give any clarification. China has also made it clear upon international community that China's export of technology to Pakistan is for peaceful purposes. Chinese Foreign Ministry repeatedly stated to media that "the civilian nuclear co-operation between China and Pakistan is in line with each side's international obligations. It is for peaceful purposes, and is under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency (Khan.Op.cit).

Disturbed Balance of Power and Rising Regional Instability

In the aftermath of September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on United States, it vowed to combat the terrorists behind targeting United States. United States desperately needed Pakistan's support to invade Afghanistan. United States initiated a war against terrorism and without the proactive help of Pakistan seemed impossible for United States to hope for winning the war. United States had already crippled Pakistan by imposing sanctions against military regime led by Pervaiz Musharraf. United States used coercive diplomacy to take Pakistan on board and demonstrated a highly undiplomatic behavior with Pakistan. President (Ex) Musharraf wrote in his memoirs '*In the Line of Fire*' that the day after attacks on American soil the then Secretary Colin Powell gave an ultimatum on telephone that "you are either

with us or against us". The very next day Powell's then deputy, Richard Armitage telephoned Chief of Pakistan's intelligence service Inter-Services intelligence (ISI) and made a serious threat "In what has to be the most undiplomatic statement ever made, Armitage ... told the director general not only that we had to decide whether we were with America or with the terrorists, but that if we chose the terrorists, then we should be prepared to be bombed back to the Stone Age" (http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-09-25-pakistan-memoir_x.html). Pakistan in reward of the services rendered for fighting U.S war on terrorism earned the title of Non-NATO ally. Pakistan gave away five airbases in Pakistan to American troops (Gupta, 2007: 204-2015).

According to *New York Times*, State and Defense Department Official said once the status of Non-NATO ally to Pakistan is conferred, Pakistan could get diplomatic prestige, defense equipment military technology and training. Mr. Colin Powell stated "In some instances it is more symbolic than practical" (<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/03/19/world/us-will-celebrate-pakistan-as-a-major-non-nato-ally.html>). This statement of Colin Powell proved valid when United States despite Pakistan's numerous sacrifices in American led war against terrorism rewarded India with the title of "Strategic Partner". The quick fallout of Indo-US strategic partnership was Indo-US civil nuclear deal which was a bumper prize for India. This Indo-US civil nuclear deal ended India's thirty years long status of nuclear pariah status which was due to nuclear tests in 1974 and Indian refusal to sign NPT. Indo-US nuclear deal empowered India compared to Pakistan in couple of ways.

- India emerged as more powerful player in international politics politically and strategically as other great powers rushed to sign civil nuclear deal with India up till now almost all major states of NSG have signed civil nuclear deal with India and more are likely to sign in near future. Under the terms of the agreement India can trade-off nuclear technology and components with other nuclear dealers.
- India would have an easy access to nuclear technology for its defense and civilian use. There will be legal authorization to Indian exchange of nuclear related technology with other nations. Indian access to high technology would give India primacy over Pakistan's nuclear technology.
- Indian market would be more open for Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) from United States and its allies which would definitely give rise to already boosted economy.
- The most important benefit to India from civil nuclear deal is Indian recognition as *de facto* nuclear state and has conceded flexibility which means it wants to retain civil nuclear facilities and military nuclear facilities. United States has acknowledged India as regional power in South Asia (Subash, 2005).
- This strategic strength of India would give it a boost in obtaining permanent membership in United Nations Security Council (UNSC).

Crisis Sets in Pakistan

On the one side India has entered in the ranks of regional powers with better economic, political and strategic potential, whereas on the other side Pakistan is losing the pace to catch up with great powers because of serious internal and external security challenges. Pakistan endured huge loss of lives, capital and national prestige in fallout of war against terrorism. United States frustrated with unachieved targets in Afghanistan mounted pressure on Pakistan to do more in war against terrorism. Those militant who targeted US when saw Pakistan has come up as a frontline state, started attacking Pakistan's strategic sites. Suicide bombings became frequent in public processions and religious congregations. These suicide attacks also claimed the life of Pakistan's ex-Lady Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto in 2007. General Headquarters (GHQ) Rawalpindi, Pakistan army's headquarters came under terrorists' attack. All these incidents have pushed Pakistan on the brink of failure. Intelligence reports later revealed the Indian involvement in such attacks against Pakistan's strategic sites to destabilize Pakistan. According to Major General Athar Abbas Spokesperson of Inter-services Public Relations (ISPR) the terrorists' attack on GHQ is a series of Indian proxy war against Pakistan and its security Forces. India initiated proxy war after Pakistan's splendid victory against Indian sponsored Taliban based in Waziristan. Indian spy agency Research Analysis Wing (RAW) is responsible for sabotaging in Pakistan (<http://www.daily.pk/ghq-attack-india-strikes-again-12053/>).

While Syed Munawar Hasan Chief of Jamaat-i-Islami Pakistan (a political party), held America and Israel responsible for the attacks on GHQ. American private security firms including notorious '*Black water*' has been working in Pakistan since inception of war against terror. Employees working for "Black water" and other security firms in Pakistan are said to be involved in Sabotage acts in Pakistan. Not only in Pakistan these private security firms also worked in Afghanistan and were ultimately banned by Afghan government for the unlawful acts of violence (DAWN October 4, 2010). United States has not hesitated in violating Pakistan's sovereignty. United States started bombing in tribal areas of Pakistan on the pretexts of hunting and eliminating Al-Qaida hideouts in Pakistan. Drone strikes in Pakistani areas to destroy Al-Qaida hideouts proved counterproductive and resulted in heavy death toll of civilians. 'Amnesty International challenged legality of drone strikes in Pakistan. Mr. Sam Zarifi Director of Amnesty International Asia-Pacific stated "The US authorities must give a detailed explanation of how these strikes are lawful and what is being done to monitor civilian casualties and ensure proper accountability" (<http://www.thewestindiannews.com/2012/01/>).

India Announces "Two Front War Strategy"

The deteriorating situation in Pakistan as a consequence of multiple internal and external factors has boosted Indian confidence the latter feels more virile in

strategic and economic areas. Indian behavior once again adopted threatening tone towards other regional states. Indian military is currently refining its '*Two Front War*' strategy with a purpose of coping with Pakistan and China simultaneously. India has long been struggling to acquire such a capability. After reincarnating India's "Cold Start" doctrine to deal with Pakistan, New Delhi has begun planning to fight a "*two-front war*" against China and Pakistan in case of Sino-Pakistan alliance against India. General Deepak Kapoor (Indian Army Chief of Staff) elucidated that both the "fronts"—the northeastern one with China and northwestern with Pakistan—would receive equal attention. If any war breaks out between Pakistan and India and China supports Pakistan then India will use its new integrated battle groups to overcome both fronts simultaneously. The locus of "two front war" strategy is China and then Pakistan. Delhi is purchasing and deploying sophisticated command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance networks; supersonic cruise missiles; lightweight towed artillery pieces; and new fighter aircraft with supporting electronic warfare and refueling platforms. Indian defense shopping spree includes C-130J aircraft which she bought from the U.S. for rapid force deployment. Indian navy is planning to expand its submarine fleet, navy is also acquiring three aircraft carriers to deploy them against any threat from Pakistan and China. To deter Beijing effectively India plans to deploy fighters and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) at upgraded bases on the Andaman and Nicobar islands in the eastern Indian Ocean. America has a priority to check China's rapid expansionism and American allies exploit this situation by reacting to China's rising power. Ultimately, the U.S. is the only country with the power and resources to reassure its allies that they need not to trigger costly arms races with China (<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704240004575085023077072074.html>).

In addition to conventional weapons India has been developing long range missiles to bring Beijing and Shanghai under target. India test fired a long range Missile in April 19, 2012 which irked reaction from neighboring countries and India was expecting a tit-for-tat reaction. New York Times reported that Indian leader celebrated this successful test. Graeme P. Herd a security expert at Geneva Centre for Security Policy said that "all of this is perceived by China, like an act of containing China rather balancing it." By launching the Agni V, a ballistic missile capable of hitting Beijing and Shanghai, India has become part of nations who has such a unique capability like China itself, Britain, France, Russia, Israel and the United States.

In response to Indian aggressive posture and American overt efforts to upset balance of power in the region China has stepped up to show its commitment for preservation of peace and stability of the region. China and Pakistan have demonstrated massive war-game exercise in response to presence of NATO and US troops and U.S attack on Pakistani soil. A top Chinese official issued a warning that any threat to Pakistan would be taken as a direct threat to China.

Some reports say that United States is crowding troops on Pakistan's border. In response, China feelsthrated from US it also sent large numbers of Second Artillery PLA troops armed with sophisticated DF-21C and short-range DF-11A tactical missiles to China's northwestern plateau. There are couple of events that intensify tension like as war against Afghanistan deepens, possible military action against Iran get stronger, rift with China increases then Pakistan is the only place from where US can gain military advantage. This quick Chinese response is for conducting a joint Sino-Pakistan huge military exercise to counter-any possible incursion from US on Pakistan. This incident reflects China's "attitude towards the US threat to Pakistan."

References

- ASHLEY J. TELLIS, the China-Pakistan Nuclear Deal Separating Fact from Fiction, Policy Outlook (July16, 2010).Carnegie Endowment for International Peace http://carnegieendowment.org/files/china_pak_nuke1.pdf
- DINSHAW MISTRY, India's Nuclear testing: The Consequences for International Security (Case Study#19). http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/publications/case_studies/19/index.html
- MUHAMMAD JAMIL Op.cit
- OLIVER MEIER, Germany Opposes United States on China-Pakistan Nuclear Deal,(June21,2011) <http://armscontrolnow.org/2011/06/21/germany-opposes-united-states-on-china-pakistan-nuclear-deal/>
- KANWAL SIBAL, A China-Pakistan Nuclear Axis against India, Vivekananda International Foundation <http://www.vifindia.org/China-Pak-Nuclear-Axis-Against-India>
- NASSER RIZWAN, AMIN MUSARAT, Balance of Power, A Theoretical Explanation and Its Relevance in Contemporary Era[J], *Berkeley Journal of Social Sciences*,2011,Vol1,(10):10
- Paul, T. V., Wirtz, J. J., &Fortmann, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Balance of power: theory and practice in the 21st century*. Stanford University Press.
- Pakistan to seek Chinese help for 19 energy projects, The Tribune. (2011, July 31).
- China only country to help Pakistan with energy crisis, PAKISTAN TODAY(August3,2011)
- China Aiding Pakistan's Nuclear Ambitions, <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/10/16/world/main4527309.shtml>
- Chinese Firms to Help Pakistan generate 10,000 Megawatts power,<http://timesofpakistan.pk/business/2011-07-11/chinese-firm-to-help-pakistan-generate-10000mw-power/38396/>
- KHAN.Op.cit.
- Musharraf's Book says Pakistan faced US onslaught if it didn't Back Terror war, http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-09-25-pakistan-memoir_x.htm
- GUPTA UN, *International Nuclear Diplomacy and India*[M],New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers,2007:204-205
- Blumenthal, S. (2010). India prepares for a two front war. *Wall Street Journal Online*.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704240004575085023077072074.html>

PAUL JOSPEH WATSON, YI HAN, Chinese Government Official: US Threat to Pakistan is Threat to China (December 1, 2011)

<http://www.infowars.com/chinese-government-official-us-threat-to-pakistan-is-threat-to-china/>

Hun, C S. North Korea. (2014, November 20). Threatens to conduct Nuclear Tests. New York

Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/21/world/asia/north-korea-threatens-to-conduct-nuclear-test.html?_r=0

Ankit Panda Pakistan, China Discuss 3-Plant Nuclear Energy Deal (January 21, 2014),

<http://thediplomat.com/2014/01/pakistan-china-discuss-3-plant-nuclear-energy-deal/>

DAVID RHODE, ERIC SCHMITT, *New York Times* March 19, 2004

KAPILA SUBHASH, United States-India Summit [J], July, 2005, Reviewed, Paper no 1477, South Asia Analysis Group.

GHQ Attack India Strikes Again, Pakistan Daily, (October 11, 2009).

<http://www.daily.pk/ghq-attack-india-strikes-again-12053/>

DR. RAJA MUHAMMAD KHAN, The Legal Aspects of the Deal, (July 1, 2010)

<http://www.opinion-maker.org/2010/07/sino-pak-nuclear-deal/#>

Afghanistan Bans Blackwater and seven Other Firms, DAWN (October 4, 2010)

RIKKI STANCICH, China-Pakistan Nuclear Deal Causes Stir, (May 27, 2010), Nuclear Energy Insider

<http://analysis.nuclearenergyinsider.com/new-build/china-pakistan-nuclear-deal-causes-stir>

Biographical Note

Dr. Rizwan Naseer is an Assistant Professor at Department of Humanities, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology (CIIT) Islamabad, Pakistan.

Dr. Musarat Amin is Assistant Professor of Defence and Diplomatic Studies (DDS) at Fatima Jinnah Women University Rawalpindi, Pakistan.
