

globalpoint

CSS - CURRENT AFFAIRS

JUNE - 2016



COMPILED NEWS, ARTICLES, EDITORIALS FOR THE MONTH OF JUNE 2016

7/11/2016
THE CSS POINT
COMPILER: SHAHBAZ SHAKEEL

WWW.THECSSPOINT.COM | WWW.CSSMENTOR.COM | WWW.CSSBOOKS.NET

DOWNLOAD

CSS Notes, Books, MCQs, Magazines



WWW.CSSMENTOR.COM

- **Download CSS Notes**
- **Download CSS Books**
- **Download CSS Magazines**
- **Download CSS MCQs**
- **Download CSS Past Papers**

*CSSMENTOR.COM, Pakistan's The
Best Online FREE Web source for All
CSS Aspirants.*

Email: info@cssmentor.com

Contents

PAKISTAN

Will Chabahar Port Reap Greater Benefits Than Gwadar Port? Taha Kehar	5
Why Pakistan Went Nuclear Malik Muhammad Ashraf	7
Issues of over-development Noman Ahmed	10
The Case of the Mysterious Drone Shaukat Qadir.....	13
Sovereignty and Our Neighbours Yousaf Nizami	16
What Is The Real Threat To Democracy In Pakistan Dr Niaz Murtaza	19
Re-Setting Relations With Afghanistan Talat Masood	21
Pakistan's Isolation Editorial	24
Climate Change and Pakistan Editorial	25
Zarb-e-Azb: Clear Policies Needed For Final Victory Imdad Hussain	26
Civil-Military Interaction And Foreign Policy Dr Hasan Askari Rizvi.....	28
Islamic State Unable to Make Inroads in Pakistan.....	31
Solution of Water Issues: Options and Possibilities Zafar Mahmood.....	34
Pak Foreign Policy is Reactive Not Active: Khar	39
Brexit and Pakistan Khurram Husain.....	41

ECONOMY

Survey of the Economy 2015-16 Editorial.....	44
'Reform Delays To Dampen Pakistan's Growth Prospects' Amin Ahmed.....	46
An Overview of 2016-17 Budget Gen Mirza Aslam Beg.....	48
Budget: Governmental Incompetence Siraj Ul Haq	50
A Baffling Economy Farhan Bokhari.....	53

EDUCATION

Education: Engine Of Development Shaukat M Zafar.....	56
Education: Not a Priority for Pakistan government Editorial.....	58

WORLD

The Pivot to Asia and the SCO Mehr Ispahani.....	60
Nuclear-Free World — A Distant Dream Talat Masood.....	63
Kashmir And Normalisation Process Dr Muhammad Khan.....	66

'India is Widening Spectrum of Conflict'	68
America and Muslim World Politics Shahid Javed Burki	69
The Dream Of Durable Peace – OpEd Nasurullah Brohi	71
What You Need to Know About the Nuclear Suppliers Group	73
Can Hillary Clinton beat Donald Trump? Marwan Bishara	76
A Whole New World Ahmed Bilal	79
Why Does It Look Like The U.S. Is Rescuing ISIS? Rep. Ron Paul	81
Britain Leaves the EU Editorial	82

Pakistan

Will Chabahar Port Reap Greater Benefits Than Gwadar Port? | Taha Kehar

A whiff of competition is in the air.

It is swirling through every nook and cranny and drawing battle lines in its wake. The buzzword on the tip of everyone's tongue is Chabahar Port, the distant and impoverished cousin of Gwadar Port. The frightening mix of antagonism and optimism has paved the way for increased polarisation. At this stage, our vision of both projects and their intentions have been blinkered.

Sceptics believe the long-awaited trilateral agreement among Iran, Afghanistan and India to develop Chabahar Port poses a threat to efforts to boost the untapped potential of Gwadar Port. On the other extreme, a series of attempts are being made to rope Pakistan into the agreement.

As expected, the response to the matter has been exceedingly diplomatic instead of confrontational. A large number of Pakistani officials have also gone on record to discredit rumours that Chabahar will undermine the scope and influence of Gwadar Port.

As separate narratives emerge over which project will reap greater benefits and what the weakest link is, the initial goal of these initiative is in danger of being undermined. The tug-of-war and a gruelling battle of nerves between the various stakeholders has made us forget that these projects serve as attempts to fuel change, not shift the axis of the world order.

Chabahar and Gwadar will unlock the doors and windows for positive change. If the assurances of Iranian Ambassador Mehdi Honardoost's are anything to go by, the pact signed between Iran, Afghanistan and India will not seek to rival Gwadar Port or undermine the fundamental aims of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC). On the contrary, it will seek to capitalise on their comparative advantage and reap benefits from each other.

The ambassador has revived debates surrounding the Iran-Pakistan gas pipeline to persuade Pakistan to enter the agreement. The project has remained a sticking point for

a long time as Pakistan has frequently succumbed to pressure and failed to begin work on the initiative. If Pakistan adopts a favourable approach to the Chabahar agreement, it will set into motion plans that have remained in the pipeline for a long time.

In a similar vein, it will help the country address the growing insecurities faced by former defence secretaries that the trilateral pact will isolate Pakistan in the region and pose a security threat.

At this critical juncture, it wouldn't be fair to discredit the initiative because it is believed to have cropped up as a means of undermining CPEC. It is immaterial that one project is a veiled attempt to thwart the other. If both initiative are allowed to operate parallel to one another, they will eventually forge the path to progress and become the game changers that they are expected to be.

Why should it matter if one project is a veiled attempt to thwart the other? If both initiative are allowed to operate parallel to one another, they will eventually forge the path to progress and become the game-changers that they are expected to be.

If we focus on the neutral spaces of justice instead of trying to understand the matter in terms of shifting world orders, the fundamental purpose of such initiatives will become clearer. In a region plagued by uncertainty, development can help undo the toxic past and ensure that it does not repeat itself.

Why should we lose out on this opportunity because of a string of conspiracy theories? Although it seems naive to completely erase the impact of history in such matters, we can isolate this factor and needlessly draw insights from it. After all, what good would it do to cling to the past if it keeps holding us back?

Source:<http://blogs.tribune.com.pk/story/34897/will-chabahar-port-reap-greater-benefits-than-gwadar-port/>

Why Pakistan Went Nuclear | Malik Muhammad Ashraf

The dawn of 28th May, 1998 saw Pakistan emerging as a seventh nuclear power of the world when in response to the Indian nuclear explosions on 11th May, 1998, it also exploded five nuclear devices followed by another detonation two days later. Since then 28th May is celebrated as 'Yaum-e-Takbeer' (exaltation of God's name) and rightly so as it was the second most important day in the history of Pakistan, after Independence day.

When India, which had fought three wars with Pakistan over Kashmir and played an active role in its dismemberment, conducted the nuclear test in 1974, the latter had perforce to take the option of going nuclear, in view of the new security threat. It was by all means a defensive response to the aggressive designs of the enemy.

Regrettably, the USA instead of appreciating the security concerns of its ally, did everything within its power, including sanctions, to pressurise Pakistan to abandon its nuclear programme. But the Pakistani leadership refused to succumb to the threats and pressure exerted by US and continued with its efforts to attain nuclear parity with India. By the early eighties as revealed by Dr. Qadeer Khan, it had acquired the nuclear capability but refrained from conducting the nuclear test. When India took the plunge to show its nuclear prowess on 11th May and the Indian home minister L.K. Advani, following the nuclear tests urged Pakistan to realise the change in the geo-strategic situation in the region and refrain from intensifying the separatist movement in the Indian-controlled Kashmir, Pakistan was left with no choice but to respond to the Indian challenge with a befitting response.

Our supposed friend USA again tried the combination of threats and offer of huge financial assistance to stop Pakistan from responding to the Indian indiscretion and aggressive action. But it must be admitted that Nawaz Sharif who was the Prime Minister of Pakistan at that time, brushed aside the pressure and the lucrative offer for financial assistance from the US and as a leader of the self-respecting nation, made the right choice in the supreme national interest and did the nation proud by conducting the nuclear tests. The USA again imposed sanctions against Pakistan. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in his address to the nation after the nuclear tests said, "We never wanted to participate in this race for nuclear weapons. The enemy in its extreme arrogance forgot the rules of communication and is openly threatening us. We have proved to the world that we will not accept what is dictated to us." This adequately explained the rationale for Pakistan to go nuclear in exercise of its right to safeguard its security in the face of a grave threat.

In 1994 when India tested its medium range Pirthvi missile it was taken as a clear indication and warning that the Indian nuclear and missile technology could be used against Pakistan. Those apprehensions were duly corroborated when in 1997 India started deploying missile along Pakistan's border. This created a very tense situation and both the countries deployed troops along the border which created a real chance for an armed conflict between the two countries.

Pakistan rightly believes that nuclear deterrence is a factor of stability in South Asia. However it is pursuing a policy of minimum nuclear deterrent. Weakness invites aggression and the best way to keep the would-be aggressor at bay is to acquire the defence capability which would force it to think many a times before committing any aggression. Pakistan does not harbour aggressive designs against any of its neighbours and has no hegemonic designs in the region. Development of nuclear weapons by Pakistan is purported to ensure territorial integrity, political harmony and peace. Though Pakistan is not a signatory to NPT and other nuclear regimes but it has worked with the global community to promote nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Needless to emphasise that South Asia needs stability which necessitates a serious dialogue to achieve nuclear restraint, conventional balance and conflict resolution. The present government has gone the extra mile to get the dialogue going inspired by the vision to build an ambience of amity with neighbours and ensuring regional connectivity for shared economic prosperity, especially with India. But unfortunately India has not given a positive response to Pakistani peace overtures. It remains a hostile neighbour with hegemonic designs and least interested in the conflict resolution.

Encouraged and supported by USA and its western allies, India is feverishly engaged in expanding its nuclear arsenal and conventional weapons. Its 'cold start' doctrine, civil nuclear deal between US and India, NSG waiver to India and the recent development of interceptor missile and submarine based K4 ballistic missile by her have disturbed the nuclear and conventional weapons balance between the two neighbours. Pakistan therefore justifiably feels concerned over these developments which might have very serious ramifications as far as peace in the region is concerned. Pakistan has already announced to upgrade its defence after this latest development.

Pakistan's missile programme designed to produce short range missiles capable of carrying small nuclear warheads was started in response to the 'cold start' doctrine as a defensive measure to forestall the possibility of even a limited war between the two countries. As is evident Pakistan has only been reacting to neutralise the Indian threat.

There is strong lobby in Pakistan which keeps advocating Pakistan restraining itself from nuclear race with India. Conceptually speaking there is much substance in their argument. Nuclear arms race between Pakistan and India is indeed harmful for the teeming millions on both sides of the border and peace and security in the region. There could not be a better proposition than this if its sinks into the minds of the Indian leadership. Pakistan wants to resolve the core issue of Kashmir with India through dialogue and live like good neighbours with her. But as they say it takes two to tango. Mere wish by Pakistan to normalise relations with India and resolving all disputes through dialogue is not going to bring peace. The choice for Pakistan under the prevailing circumstances is either to accept Indian hegemony and compromise its security or keep pursuing its doctrine of minimum deterrence. Unfortunately the choice for the self-respecting nation like Pakistan has to be to give priority to the second option. Pakistan cannot afford to show slackness on its security till such time the other side and its supporters who cry from every convenient roof top to see South Asia as a stable region, instead of indulging in rhetoric show sincerity of purpose by adopting concrete measures to promote peace in the region and refrain from discriminatory treatment against Pakistan viz-a-viz India as well as help in the resolution of the Kashmir issue which is the cause of conflict between the two countries.

Source:<http://nation.com.pk/columns/03-Jun-2016/why-pakistan-went-nuclear>

Issues of over-development | Noman Ahmed

URBANISATION in Pakistan has been moving at a swift pace, albeit in a rudderless fashion. The Planning Commission estimates that half of our population shall be living in cities by 2030. Among other impacts, the approach and conduct of land governance shall drastically change for the worse, clear evidence of which is visible even today.

When Pakistan came into being in 1947, 17pc of our population lived in cities. The land, infrastructure and routine affairs of urban centres were managed according to the systems and institutions inherited from the British Raj. Municipal corporations and committees oversaw the routines of urban management and kept records of new developments as per regular procedures. Urban boundaries were well articulated and land categories of peri-urban, agricultural, forest and other typologies of land well documented.

For addressing urban problems of extraordinary significance, urban improvement trusts were set up. Following tradition, the Karachi Improvement Trust (KIT) was founded in 1951 to deal with issues of housing and settlement of incoming refugees and newcomers to the city. The government transformed KIT to the Karachi Development Authority (KDA) in 1957 to deal with expanded issues of urban planning, development and procurement of vital infrastructure. Mechanisms were devised to prevent speculation or land hoarding by prospective monopolists. The same approach was followed in Lahore, Hyderabad, Islamabad and other large cities in the country.

Pakistan's cities are fast turning into supermarkets of real estate products for the rich and powerful.

Planning controls, regulatory capacity and resolve to safeguard urban and peri-urban land assets have weakened since the late 1970s. At the macroeconomic level, the Bhutto government nationalised enterprises and production houses, leaving fewer options for businessmen to invest in. The rapid rise in remittances from overseas Pakistanis created an instant demand for investment in lucrative but secure ventures. Since manufacturing, industries, commercial and trading enterprises were viewed as high-risk options, a natural shift occurred towards land and housing initiatives. Large swathes of land, which were allocated for non-urban uses, were gradually taken over by urban land uses.

Plot development schemes were promoted by different government agencies, military authorities and private developers. Over the last three decades the status of land has changed from being a collective benefit asset to a saleable commodity, under the control and ownership of rich and powerful investors — a trend which has intensified. In this process of laissez-faire land transactions, public regulatory controls, checks and balances have been muted and rendered completely ineffective.

During the 1970-90s period, urban development authorities routinely prepared urban plans for projecting land uses by extrapolating from the existing urban situation. These plans were neither notified nor given potent legal cover. Chief ministers usually retained controls to decide on land distribution, adjustments in uses, jurisdictional considerations and even welfare functions. A legally validated plan would be a hurdle in the exercise of such discretionary powers. Therefore, urban planning assignments were reduced to being merely of academic value, and the government failed to implement vital recommendations.

For example, successive urban plans for Karachi recommended preserving the land use of the eastern and northern peripheries as green agricultural territories — wisely — to maintain environmental balance, food production, and for the consolidation of value-added agricultural livelihoods for the rural population. In total violation of this urban planning prescription, the administration has allowed mega-scale real-estate schemes to be developed by private and military agencies along the Super Highway. After dubiously expropriating farmlands and pastures, these leapfrog ventures have redefined the urban limits of Karachi to its farthest territorial end.

While Lahore's planners have categorically insisted on controlling urban sprawl to safeguard invaluable farmland along the southern edges, the same has been swiftly converted into housing schemes for upper income groups, overseas investors and other socioeconomic classes of power and privilege.

Unplanned densification of inner city locations and central city residential areas is another anomaly. In 2002, the City District Government of Karachi (now defunct) promulgated the commercialisation of roads policy to allow changes of densities and land use for a few important streets and roads. Under this ill-conceived initiative, more and more streets are allowed to experience high-density, high-rise development alongside residential plots.

The provisions for upgrading infrastructure, feasibility of urban services along the corridor, parking facilities for visitors, and possibilities of sporadic densification of other streets were not considered. Sharea Faisal, Shahrah-i-Pakistan, Tariq Road, Khalid Bin Waleed Road, Shaheed-i-Millat Road, Shahrah-i-Quaideen and Khayaban-i-Iqbal display a stockpile of new, and under-construction, tall buildings. Once these buildings are occupied, there shall be severe impacts on traffic flow, pedestrian movement and urban services.

A few days ago, the mad rush of consumers to a just opened department store caused a total traffic jam along Rashid Minhas Road. Likewise in Lahore, Main Boulevard in Gulberg and many other arteries show high-scale densification. In these strident physical transformations, heritage sites are not spared. Commercial developments taking place in southern parts of Karachi have caused damage to public heritage sites such as the Jehangir Kothari Parade and Shri Ratneshwar Mahadev Temple. Statutes — such as Sindh High Density Board Act — provide sweeping powers for the executive to fiddle with land use and density, almost at will.

Urbanisation will continue to rise — and thus the intention to turn cities and hinterlands into supermarkets of real-estate products. Some steps are vital to stem the rot. A provincial spatial plan must be prepared for each province to identify existing urban footprints, cite locations suitable for expansion of urban development, and pinpoint territories where urban development must be forbidden.

All land uses, according to scientifically validated criteria, must be addressed for its present and future projections. Local governments must be instituted and empowered to manage urban lands and territories according to these plans. Investment options in other sectors must be devised in order to ease pressure on urban development. Necessary targeting must be done to absorb the urban poor in specially designed housing schemes.

It must be remembered that land is a finite asset. If we lose those categories of land which are vital to support our food production and environmental equilibrium, we threaten our very existence.

The writer is chairman, Department of Architecture & Planning, NED University, Karachi.

Published in Dawn, June 6th, 2016

Source:<http://www.dawn.com/news/1263022/issues-of-overdevelopment>

The Case of the Mysterious Drone | Shaukat Qadir

With the Taliban acknowledging that Mullah Mansoor — their last Emir Mullah Omar's successor — died due to a drone attack close to Noshki, Maulvi Haibatullah, reputedly a non-combatant, has been hurriedly nominated by the Shura as his successor. When Mullah Omar's death finally became public, there was considerable infighting among those competing to succeed him. Omar's brother and son were among the competitors. Mansoor, however, had the reputation of being the least intractable and more amenable to talks.

With the Afghan Taliban splintering even while Omar's death was not public, speedy action was necessary and, with the support of like-minded well-wishers, Mansoor was nominated by the then Shura.

Over time, Mansoor overcame those who continued to oppose him and, slowing the splintering, began reuniting the various groups of the Taliban. However, in order to do this, he was forced to take a harder line on peace talks. This was partially due to the inroads made by the hardest of hardliners, the IslamicState, in Afghanistan.

Consequently, Washington and Kabul began expressing their impatience to Islamabad. Despite numerous efforts to explain the reasons for Mansoor's conduct and seeking more time, Washington decided to sign his death warrant.

Since the demise of the Soviet Union, the CIA appears to have lost any remaining vestige of human intelligence. Although unmatched in its technological ability, which provides it with an unparalleled and multi-faceted electronic intelligence, it has virtually no human intelligence of its own resource. For human intelligence or Humint, it has become dependent on cooperation of intelligence services of friendly countries, or on purchasing Humint from the market. For the latter, it frequently takes recourse to outsourcing to private security companies; the largest beneficiary of this outsourcing is the infamous company known as Blackwater or, more recently, XE.

The first drone strike by the US in Pakistan was in 2004 but drone operations actually picked up pace from 2008. The total number of drone strikes in Pakistan is estimated to be well over 400. Until May 21, when Mansoor was executed, not one had been in Balochistan. It is understood that whatever agreement that exists between the US and Pakistan since the Musharraf era, included the understanding that Balochistan would not be hit. This was a red line, but one that the US decided to cross. Its official version is that it was aware that Mansoor's family was dwelling in Iran. Since it apparently lacked

Humint support from the ISI in this venture, the US picked up the “electronic signature” of a “possibility”, when it left Kandahar and confirmed it to be Mansoor, when he reached the (known) location of his family.

Then the US stayed with the target till it crossed the Iran-Pakistan border and at an unpopulated spot, which was at a location where it might not be spotted quickly (in fact, some hours elapsed between the strike and its discovery), the target was “taken out”.

From my modest understanding of US electronic surveillance capabilities, this is not merely a plausible, but a very likely, accurate acknowledgement of what happened. Furthermore, after the army chief’s hard words to the US ambassador, I discount the possibility of duplicity in our government’s claim that it was unaware. When John Kerry claimed that the prime minister and the army chief “knew”, I take it that they were informed after the hit or while it was taking place. If this be so, two questions come to mind. First, why was it necessary for the hit to be executed in Balochistan? After all, it could have been equally effective in Iran or Afghanistan.

The only possible explanation that occurs to me is that the US had some points to make: a) that there were no longer any red lines for US drone strikes and, by extension b) that the security situation of Balochistan is no longer a US priority.

An amazing thing happened when this attack occurred. While everything and everybody in the vehicle was burnt beyond recognition, a new passport with a CNIC of the passport holder, Wali Muhammed by name but the photograph on it was that of Mansoor, fell a few yards away, intact and un-singed. The second question arises, therefore, how did that happen? A far-fetched possibility is that Mansoor was playing with it when the vehicle was hit and, in an unconscious gesture flung the passport out of the window of the (air-conditioned?) vehicle. I must admit, I broach that possibility with utmost scepticism. If this is not a real possibility, then the only alternative is that it was left there to be found. If it was left for that purpose, the only object of this that I can think of is to again malign Pakistan and its armed forces before the court of international and domestic opinion.

If Mansoor had a Pakistani CNIC, passport and a place of residence here, it puts Pakistan in a very awkward position before the entire world, but before Afghanistan most of all. When I was researching for my book on OBL’s assassination, I concluded that we were being subjected to a malicious propaganda campaign to malign the army in general and the duo of Generals Kayani and Pasha, in particular. I get the feeling that

a similar thing may be afoot right now and that this may be the beginning of a propaganda campaign targeting our armed forces.

Moreover, I held the view that since last year, the US had ceased its hybrid war targeting Balochistan and I had hoped that our amity would last. I believe this attack puts paid to my last hopes from the US — the “enemy-who-allies-us-when-he-wants-to”.

Published in The Express Tribune, June 5th, 2016.

Source:<http://tribune.com.pk/story/1116360/case-mysterious-drone/>

Sovereignty and Our Neighbours | Yousaf Nizami

It took almost a week for the Interior Ministry to confirm that it was in fact Mullah Mansur, the recently elected Taliban chief, who was killed in a US drone strike in Baluchistan. The US was first to release reports of his 'unconfirmed' death that were soon confirmed by president Obama. Then the Taliban themselves announced their leader's demise. However, our over sensitive and exceedingly paranoid security czar, Chaudhry Nisar took his time, and understandably so.

The fact that Mullah Mansour was killed on Pakistani soil by the US, the same soil he had frequented using a Pakistani passport that was issued twice in Quetta would be hard to digest for the thickest skinned interior minister. At a domestic level it shows the incompetence of our security and intelligence apparatus. It also highlights the presence of corrupt Taliban sympathisers in NADRA who facilitated Mansour in getting a Pakistani Passport and CNIC, under a false name, twice, to travel within Pakistan and to other countries from Pakistan.

From an international perspective, it is embarrassing to say the least. The incident vindicates the US in terms of their persistence that we harbour, breed and protect selected terrorist groups and their leaders. Action against the Haqqani Network has been, and still is a serious bone of contention with the US. India maintains the same view about our support of radical ultra-right groups that have been attached to attacks in India.

Mansour's killing could not have come at a worse time. In the past month our foreign relations with the US and our neighbours have taken a nosedive. Prior to this incident, a bill was passed in the House of Representatives that put conditions on the release of USD 450 million for the purchase of F-16 jets to Pakistan. The conditions include action against Haqqani Network, release of Shakil Afridi who was instrumental in confirming Osama Bin Laden's identity that resulted in the operation in Abbottabad, active coordination with Afghanistan to restrict militant movement and to ensure that US funds are not used to persecute minorities.

Similar conditions have been placed on Pakistan in the past, mostly on the insistence and strength of Republicans who push bills in the House of Representatives that go to the Senate to be finally signed or vetoed by the President. President Obama has usually pushed for military aid to Pakistan. Only last year he proposed that the civilian and military aid to Pakistan be increased six-fold to \$ 1 Billion. But that was last year. Obama is almost out of the White House and the recent pressure to block aid coupled with the Mansour incident makes it particularly tough for him to veto this bill.

What makes this change in the US's attitude towards Pakistan more evident is the stance Obama took after the incident, saying, rather warning that they will go after leaders of terror groups whenever and wherever they find them in the future. So, all the discourse that follows after such incidents about sovereignty and drone attacks, all the regret that is felt by the foreign office and Interior Ministry, the condemnations and all the hue and cry is futile. The US has and will in future carry out such attacks as long as we provide safe havens to such groups and their leaders. It's not just a perception it's a matter of fact.

It is funny that these cries of sovereignty being violated get amplified only when there is a drone attack or a team of 'US Navy Seals' flies into Abbottabad but the presence of rogue/extremist elements that freely cross over/live and operate in Pakistan is overlooked. This selective anger is quite ironic given that it is ignoring these very elements in the first place that forces the US to violate our so called sovereignty.

The nuclear race has also gained pace in the last few months. India has developed two new technologies this year. The first one is 'Second strike capability', i.e. submarine nuclear ships that can reply with a strike if a country sets off a nuke first. Secondly, they have successfully tested anti-ballistic missiles which, in theory, are capable of intercepting incoming nukes. Naturally we are quite bothered with the pace at which India is developing its nuclear arsenal. Historically, we have kept up with the race as well.

But to what end? These new technologies are expensive, really expensive. It begs the question that in a country that is surviving mostly on debt, where most of the resources are diverted towards high visibility infrastructure projects and defence; can we really afford such expensive 'deterrence'? That too, at the expense of education and health, sectors that get the smallest piece of the pie in every budget in any case and are the first casualty when cuts need to be made. The latest budget is no exception either.

The divergence over foreign policy also presents a predicament. The civilian side opts for a relatively accommodative approach; the real policy makers however are reactionary and confrontational in nature and practice. A case in point is the recent announcement of development of a deep sea port on the Iran coast, the Chabahar port, a joint project between India and Iran to serve as a link to Afghanistan, bypassing Pakistan. While the foreign office believes that the new port can be complimentary to Gwadar, which is just 72 Km away, two former defence secretaries (retired Army Generals) feel that it is a security threat.

And it is not that we are deliberately being sidelined from the project either. Iran has invited not only Pakistan but other regional nations to join the \$500 million project. Even China, our favourite best friend, is in favour of any possible association. In an interaction with Asian newspaper editors, China's Prime Minister, Li Keqiang said that the new project is not a threat to Gwadar or CPEC, instead an opportunity that all regional countries can and should take benefit from.

Similar disconnect can be seen when it comes to Afghanistan. While the approach should be to reduce the trust deficit between the two countries, we keep provoking them through confrontation. The border closing at Torkham was another unfortunate incident. While it is imperative to monitor and control militant elements crossing over into Pakistan, it is equally important that business and trading conducted through the boarder by around 15,000 people who use the crossing daily is not completely stopped. It seems that the blame game of who protects which terrorists more to carry out attacks on their soil is never ending. A US drone kills a Taliban leader on our soil, "told you so" says Afghanistan. In return, we catch six of their spies and parade them on TV, claiming their handlers are generals of the Afghan Army. The killing of Mullah Mansour is being claimed as a serious blow to the QCG (Quadrilateral Coordination Group). But had Mullah Mansour really been willing to come to the talking table at all since the QCG was formed?

The reality is that there is disconnect between the civil-military foreign policy. The problem is not as simple as making a full time foreign minister. That will not change much. It is quite apparent as to who dictates foreign policy in Pakistan. The minister will only be the messenger. The only way forward is adopting a modern, accommodative and current form of diplomacy. We still resort to registering our strong condemnation of 'acts against the state' and 'threats to security' at the highest world forums. But is anyone really listening?

Source: <http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2016/06/04/comment/sovereignty-and-our-neighbours/>

What Is The Real Threat To Democracy In Pakistan | Dr Niaz Murtaza

ISLAM and democracy are forever in danger in Pakistan. The danger to Islam is overblown by clerics, it being ensconced safely in millions of highly devoted hearts. Clerics may really be the main threat to it. The danger to democracy is real given past breaks.

The Panama leaks suddenly threatened a democracy which was looking secure, though not delivering much. Critics say the real threat to it is from poorly performing politicians and poorly managing leaders (their acronyms aptly being PPP and PML). But PPPs and PMLs endanger its quality, not existence. Critics say poor quality threatens existence by forcing 'national guardians' to act to prevent doom. But the army has struck not when politicians caused doom but when its twin (personal and institutional) interests were threatened. If imminent doom is their basis, (counter) coups should always occur during army rule since Pakistan came closest to doom during all army rules, not under elected rule.

The three long guardian rules (counting the Ayub-Yahya show as one) ended leaving Pakistan worse off than when they had intervened to save it from 'doom'. Key local and global indexes say governance has improved since Musharraf, the last guardian. Pakistani history can roughly be divided into seven decade-long eras: the three martial laws, Bhutto era, 1990s, 1950s and post-2008. This is the first time where the economy and security are still improving eight years into the decade. Even the worst democracy is clearly better than the best autocracy.

Coup options have reduced but resistance to them has grown. Is democracy's existence unsafe again or is it consolidated enough to survive? Democracy gets consolidated when key actors warily accept it as the worst option except all others. Key-most are actors strong enough to end it directly, those in Pakistan being only the military and militants. The first beat the second so badly that its views are now irrelevant. But how disposed now is the mighty victor towards puny democracy? What lies in its bosom is difficult to discern for its stern, placid face reveals little. But snoopers say something is cooking in Pindi and odours reaching Islamabad raise fears there that democracy's goose is being slow-cooked to perfection by GHQ chefs.

Ignoring gossip, I will use social science tools to analyse trends. I will focus on not the patriotic but irrelevant query of whether we are facing doom which justifies saviour action by 'guardian' generals, but relevant realpolitik queries regarding threats to twin army interests, its intervention options and likely resistance. Over time, coup options

have reduced but resistance to them has grown, thus consolidating democracy, followed by the security establishment's attempts to regain control.

The 1958 coup was at will, with no national, institutional or personal threat, since local and global distaste for coups was low. By the 1970s, global and local (due to the '71 tragedy) aversion to them had grown. Thus, the military silently endured years of Bhutto's attacks on its twin interests. The anger finally exploded into a coup. Zia invented 58-2(b), an easier option to tame civilians which reduced consolidation and was used to dismiss four prime ministers who did not threaten core interests but were not pliant enough on civilian issues. Nawaz Sharif defanged 58-2(b) and then targeted both core army interests, incurring a coup, which reinstated 58-2(b). But it was revoked in 2008.

This brings us to now. The twice-bitten PML poses neither core threat. It is not intruding on army core turf, only not ceding more civilian issues. The army chief is not being fired. But the guardians are reportedly still upset about everything: India, US, F-16s, CPEC. Given the aversion to coups and absence of core threats, an open coup is unlikely.

Post-58-2(b), the guardians have three other tools to tame PPPs and PMLs unwilling to cede endless turf: law, guile and agitation. Each has issues. NAB and the courts may not comply and can only remove guilty individuals, not the system. Getting mass PML desertions through a 1990-type ISI act seems infeasible. An Imran-led agitation on Panama can cause chaos without ensuring regime change or favourable election results later or a pliable regime even if PTI is aided to win. Panama justifies legal action against the guilty but not street agitation to enforce mob justice.

So, while guardians may have gripes despite wide powers, their options on core and non-core irritants are more limited and complex now, reflecting democratic consolidation. The bottom line is clear. Coups will occur only as a last resort when core interests are threatened and other options fail. When core interests are safe, other options will be used to encroach upon civilian matters.

So, reason suggests democracy will survive (but not thrive yet). But hearts have reasons which reason cannot fathom. Do our generals harbour such reasons?

The writer is a political economist.

murtazaniaz@yahoo.com

Published in Dawn, June 7th, 2016

Re-Setting Relations With Afghanistan | Talat Masood

Much of Pakistan's problems are rooted in the reality that it is not clear what sort of a state it wants to be. Every state institution has its own concept of what a state should be and tries to mould the country in accordance with its thinking. Taking advantage of the weakness of the democratic leadership, major institutions are virtually operating as independent entities rather than as a cohesive whole. This has allowed foreign powers to exploit the situation to their advantage and internally encouraged non-democratic and vested interests to expand their influence. Nothing could be a more classic demonstration of this intrinsic weakness than the government's response to the recent drone attack on Mullah Mansoor in Balochistan. Instead of Pakistan's interior Minister or adviser on foreign affairs, it was President Obama and the Afghan government that first broke the news. Pakistan took five days to follow suit, not because it did not know what had happened but clearly was so confused and embarrassed over how to respond to a situation in which its opaque Afghan policies were laid bare. The full-throated protests by the civil and military leaderships appeared hollow in the face of our confused and contradictory policies.

The security establishment, for long, has cooperated with the drone programme. We were initially told that drones were being used with Pakistan's approval. During General (ret'd) Musharraf's rule, we had a base in Quetta, which was used by the Americans to operate drones and target both Pakistani and Afghan militants. Later, when we realised the folly of compromising our sovereignty so openly, the CIA shifted the drone complex to Afghanistan but continued to strike Pakistani targets. Our Foreign Office and more so the establishment did protest against such strikes, but this was more a formality. In fact, there was within the security community some who saw clear benefits of drone strikes in our fight against terrorism. I will not be surprised if there are those among the establishment, who still find the use of drones valuable, provided they are fired with our consent at TTP leaders hiding in Fata or in Afghanistan. Irrespective of any tactical benefits, drone strikes are a gross compromise of our sovereignty and if we are to accept them, a clear policy needs to be publicly enunciated. It would be advisable if the Committee on National Security or the Defence Committee of the Cabinet holds a special session on the subject of drone strikes and makes its position implicit, defining clearly the follow-up in case of another violation.

Simultaneously, we must address the other enigma that weakens our position in the eyes of the international community — the freedom of movement and the safe sanctuary that Mullah Mansoor and other Taliban shura members enjoyed and still continue to enjoy in Pakistan. However much we may want to convince the world that

we were not aware of the Taliban chief's comings and goings, we lack credibility. It is not that we underrate the intelligence agencies of foreign countries, as they know a lot of what is happening in Pakistan. It is also not that we are not aware of the Afghan government's sensitivities either. But we still hope to develop strong ties with it and simultaneously use the special relationship with the Taliban and the Haqqanis, hoping to further leverage it. This diplomatic manoeuvre has not worked in the past and is unlikely to succeed in the future. Nothing would suit India more than the continuation of this contradiction for it helps in drawing Afghanistan closer to it and deepening Afghan hostility toward us. The same dynamic is replicated in our relations with the US. The adverse consequences of supporting the Afghan Taliban in our internal fight against the TTP and other militant groups, especially at the ideological level is never a subject of our national discussion. In brief, the support of the Taliban has come at a huge cost to Pakistan and no one seems to have done a serious analysis of this, apart from the illusory belief that they will act as a bulwark against India's growing influence in Afghanistan. This is not to suggest that we take sides and invite Taliban hostility. We need to genuinely implement the policy that our political and military leaderships have defined in simplistic terms — "Afghan led and Afghan owned" — but regrettably, this has never truly been accepted for its fidelity by the Afghans or the Americans. It is also doubtful if the Afghan government is presently in a position to negotiate a deal on its own with the Taliban without international support. Pakistan finds itself in a difficult situation, with the Taliban on the offensive and not amenable to negotiations and the Afghan government not trusting us. In this situation, the best option would be to ease out the Taliban leadership from Pakistan and let events take their course in Afghanistan. Simultaneously, we must strengthen border management to prevent any adverse fallout. Pakistan's focus mostly has been to develop close relations with Pakhtuns. This is natural due to the presence on both sides of the border of a large Pakhtun population. We should broaden our base and give equal priority to ties with the Tajiks and Uzbeks. More importantly, we should support the government in Kabul to regain its lost trust. Deep distrust within the Afghan people about Pakistan has to be addressed through bold confidence-building measures. More frequent visits of the prime minister and the army chief to Afghanistan and reciprocal visits to Pakistan should help in regaining confidence and trust. This should be accompanied by exploring avenues for enhancing trade and commerce.

Afghanistan, too, must stop supporting the TTP and militant groups opposed to Pakistan. Its intelligence and security agencies should not view Pakistan through the Indian lens. Pakistan and the US need to engage more frequently and seriously to discuss Afghanistan to reduce misgivings and refrain from making accusations. Ensuring Pakistan's national interest will require an appreciation of the prospects

offered by developing a mutually trusting relationship with Afghanistan by expanding economic, political and cultural links, and using these as a springboard for regional cooperation.

Published in The Express Tribune, June 8th, 2016.

Source:<http://tribune.com.pk/story/1118158/re-setting-relations-afghanistan/>

Pakistan's Isolation | Editorial

Need to explain policies

Surely even Pakistan's most committed lobbyists – if there were any – would find it difficult to sensibly explain the latest resurrection of the Difa e Pakistan Council. It does seem – when saner minds do not intervene and explain – that the Council has been mobilised, by someone, for specific foreign policy optics. Why, otherwise, would Maulana Sami and Hafiz Saeed gather it in Islamabad, with everybody watching, and swing fists at India and America? Since this strange episode came just when Pakistan began feeling the pinch of increased regional isolation, it's not just a bad strategic move if it is indeed part of some detailed institutionalised planning, but also surely to make things worse for Islamabad.

For one thing, DPC's, especially JuD's, latest accusations and threats put not just the government but also the military in a difficult position. Accusing the US and India of working together against Pakistan's interests is older than the Council, but threatening nuclear drone strikes on behalf of the Pakistani military is quite another. That this should happen just when our relations with both Washington and Delhi are at an uncomfortable low only adds to suspicions about motives. It would not help, of course, if there is no official reply – both civilian and military – to these developments.

Zarb-e-Azb was supposed to be more than an armed operation against terrorists. It was not even supposed to be restricted to the TTP. It was meant to signify a shift in mindset and, subsequently, in policy-making. Regressive forces that hurt Pakistan's image, increase foreign isolation, and bring practically nothing in return were not going to be allowed in the mainstream any longer. At least that is what the progressive part of Pakistan took the operation to be. Once more there is a need for the government and the establishment to explain its policy direction.

Source:<http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2016/06/07/comment/pakistans-isolation/>

Climate Change and Pakistan | Editorial

A serious issue often ignored by most governments, climate change has the potential to greatly endanger the lives of millions of people in Pakistan. The present government, it seems, has finally realised the dangers of this global catastrophe as it has announced an amount of two billion rupees to be earmarked for Prime Minister's Green Pakistan Programme (GPP). Under this five-year programme, a total of 105 million trees are to be planted across the country. While it does remain to be seen as to what extent these funds are effectively utilised to make Pakistan greener, the earmarking of funds is a positive development as it would at the very least steer some attention towards climate change and hopefully result in some substantive improvements.

Pakistan is a country that is extremely vulnerable to climate change. Rise in global temperatures and the resulting irregular weather patterns could wreak havoc on the majority of the population. The recent waves of destructive floods bear testament to the fact that the poor in Pakistan have the most to lose as a result of climate change. Moreover, global warming can grossly damage the agricultural base of the country, which, in turn, would endanger food provision and security for the masses. Even heat waves that affect both cities and villages have shown their destructive potential as scores of people died due to the unforgiving heat last year. All this shows the gravity of climate change and the need to effectively counter it.

The most peculiar aspect of climate change is that it does not recognise the artificially constructed boundaries of nation states. Carbon emissions of one country will not stop to adversely affect that country alone. In light of this, it is often argued, mostly by the developing nations, that since most of the carbon emissions are by developed countries, it is their responsibility to decrease them. This argument is buttressed by further contending that since the developed world progressed without any regard to issues of carbon emissions then the developing world should also be allowed to do so. However, all this negates the fact that climate change would be harmful to developing countries more than the developed world because of the former's reliance on agriculture and its far more numerous underprivileged population. Hence, climate change should not be looked with the myopia that it is often looked with in Pakistan. While it is true that there are other pressing issues that need the country's resources, nevertheless they must not be used as pretence to relegate the issue of global warming to the fringes of the development agenda. And in order to give global warming and climate the priority it deserves, awareness regarding its adverse affects on the country must be constantly raised.

Source:<http://dailytimes.com.pk/editorial/09-Jun-16/climate-change-and-pakistan>

Zarb-e-Azb: Clear Policies Needed For Final Victory | Imdad Hussain

Although Operation Zarb-e Azb and other actions against terrorists from Khyber to Karachi have delivered much, their complete success and total elimination of terrorism remain a dream, which require clarity in our internal and external policies. The country's policies in this regard, however, remain shrouded in confusion. Contradictory statements by Pakistani officials over the US drone attack and the killing of Afghan Taliban leader Mullah Mansoor indicated chaos within the policymaking circles. The handing over of the Angoor Adda border crossing to Afghanistan and then the controversy over this action was another manifestation of this institutional muddle.

The government states that Islamabad wants friendly ties with all neighbours, including India, but the poor state of relations with that country as well as with Iran, Afghanistan and Bangladesh is a reflection of our contradictions. Pakistan has so far failed to effectively deal with the India factor in diplomatic terms — Pak-Afghan ties are marred by the India factor as are our ties with Bangladesh. With the India factor barring Pakistan from establishing stronger friendly relations with its neighbours and intelligent diplomacy being absent in tackling the situation, our interests in the region have been damaged. This has led to mistrust in our relations with regional countries as well as with the US. Gaps among regional countries has given space to terrorism to flourish.

We need to understand that an effective foreign policy is not just a set of wishes; it needs to be fully thought out and implemented through a clear course of action. The role that effective diplomacy can play in modern geopolitics cannot be understated. In contrast, Pakistan lacks diplomatic effectiveness in important areas, such as the issue of the Coalition Support Fund, and the controversy over the F-16s with the US. Our domestic policies are also in disarray. A lack of interest and delay over Fata reforms, the poor implementation of the National Action Plan and the delays in rehabilitation of IDPs have been debated in the media for long. Several months back, the situation prompted the ISPR to issue a statement urging that increased attention be paid towards protecting the gains of Operation Zarb-e-Azb. At the same time, we see unnecessary delays in making Nacta a functional institution. This situation provides evidence of the lack of focus in implementing our internal policies effectively so that serious national crises can be tackled. We still haven't seen any concrete steps being taken towards addressing corruption and instituting good governance, which are important if we are to tackle the root causes of terrorism. Pakistan cannot afford such confusion while facing complex challenges. On the one hand, RAW agents confessing to sabotage activities in Pakistan are being arrested, while on the other, al Qaeda, TTP

and their numerous factions, foreign militants, as well as groups with sectarian motives, still pose a grave danger to our security.

Despite all these complexities, the armed forces have been able to control the violence in Fata, Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa and Sindh. Since March, a decline in incidents of terrorism was noted in Balochistan although fatalities have increased a little bit. Similarly, while the March suicide attack in Lahore caused an upsurge in fatalities in Punjab, the number of terror and violence affected districts reduced from 24 to 19 in the province. Since June 2014, when Operation Zarb-e-Azb was launched, a steady decline in terrorism and fatalities due to violence has been observed. Observers maintain that incidents of terrorism have shrunk by 65 per cent in the last two years. This year, fatalities due to violence dropped by 36.8 per cent as compared to the first quarter of the last year. Suicide attacks do not occur as a matter of routine anymore, militants do not occupy any territory, and though we still witness isolated incidents of terrorism, the situation is certainly not as bad as before.

In order to preserve this momentum, a revamp of our policies is essential. Approval of policies by both houses of parliament, backed by input from relevant ministries and institutions, is crucial. Every policy that has popular backing will succeed. A nation is the aggregate of its citizens, and interests of the citizens are termed as the national interest. Policies need to be drafted keeping in mind the interest of the ordinary citizen — in the sense that the security of life, property, economic well-being and social protection remain the foremost interests.

Published in The Express Tribune, June 9th, 2016.

Source:<http://tribune.com.pk/story/1119135/zarb-e-azb-clear-policies-needed-final-victory/>

Civil-Military Interaction And Foreign Policy | Dr Hasan Askari Rizvi

Pakistan represents a civil-military hybrid where an elected civilian government rules but it cannot command the political system to the exclusion of the top military brass, which exercises clout over policymaking from the sidelines. Such a situation is more likely to arise in countries that have shaped as security states mainly due to external security pressures and internal political and societal incoherence, rampant extremism and an incessant use of violence by competing politico-religious interests. Governance involves balancing the imperative of participatory democracy and good governance with the pressures of national security.

A troubled political system like ours cannot be effectively managed singlehandedly by either the civilian or the military elite alone. They need to work in harmony, pursuing cooperation where they need to work together and, at the same time, respecting each other's institutional autonomy. The shared policymaking areas include internal and external security affairs and the interaction between the demands of national security on internal political and economic matters as well as the financial implications of security. Each side also has its own exclusive domain. The civilian government manages exclusively political issues and day-to-day governance affairs and provides basic services to the common people. The military's exclusive domain includes internal and organisational service matters, disbursement of the defence budget, and professional affairs.

There are areas of military activity whose boundaries are not yet fully determined. One of these is the periodic civilian demands on the military to undertake tasks outside of its professional domain. The 'Aid to Civil' is an established role of the military. However, if it is called out too frequently for civilian tasks, it makes the civilian government vulnerable to criticism that it is unable to perform its primary tasks. A good example of civilian-military cooperation is the handling of terrorism. The military deals with terrorists and criminal elements that challenge the writ of the state. However, the civilian aspects of extremism and terrorism are the responsibility of the civilian government. The elimination of terrorist hideouts and training centres is important but this cannot be achieved if the civilian dimension of terrorism is not addressed. Counterterrorism and counter-insurgency efforts must have full political ownership of the civilian government, the political elite and society.

On June 7, a meeting was called between the military top brass and top civilian officials to discuss the current security and foreign policy challenges. The army chief and his principal staff officers sought more activism from the civilian government to address the

challenges. We then saw the Foreign Office showing activism by giving a briefing to some diplomats in Islamabad on Pakistan's policy on a number of issues. The adviser on foreign affairs addressed a press conference on Pakistan's relations with the US and Afghanistan, and our membership bid for the Nuclear Suppliers Group. Several other officials and ministers gave a special briefing on Pakistan's economy to some foreign diplomats and the Pakistani media on June 9. The key issue is why the civilian leadership did not embark on active diplomacy on its own? Why was it slow in responding to diplomatic and economic challenges until the establishment pushed it? Pakistan's current foreign policy crisis and a slow response to the changing regional and global situation represent a multifaceted dilemma. The three dimensions of the crisis include: a lack of a comprehensive vision of what Pakistan should achieve in the next five to 10 years and through what strategies rather than complaining about the whole world undermining Pakistan; a leadership crisis in the sense that too many people are poking their noses in foreign policy, resulting in incoherence and inaction; and personal preferences of the rulers that may not necessarily advance our long-term interests.

Pakistan needs smart diplomacy to deal with India, Iran and Afghanistan as well as to cope with the current trouble in its relations with the US. Smart diplomacy seeks to find alternative ways to deal with a situation when one option does not offer a credible opportunity. You do not wait for the situation to change on its own; you invoke different diplomatic options to create space for yourself. If India has a secured trade route to Afghanistan and Central Asia through Iran, Pakistan should not view this as a threat. Instead it should quickly take practical step to obtain gas and electricity from Iran. If this economic connection is built, Iran will have greater interest in cultivating Pakistan because this economic relationship will not require the use of a land route of a third country.

Pakistan has shown greater interest in obtaining LNG/gas from Qatar and it is hoping that gas will also be available from Turkmenistan through the TAPI project. Similarly, Pakistan is very keen to get electricity through the CASA-1000 project from Central Asia. However, given the law and order situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan's troubled relations with that country, TAPI and CASA-1000 may not materialise in the near future. Pakistan wants to wait for these projects rather than seek gas and electricity from Iran. Our future demand for gas and electricity is going to be so high that we will be in a position to consume gas and electricity from all these sources. However, our rulers are pushing their personal preferences rather than adopting a realistic approach to address the energy problem.

There are many other examples from Pakistan's foreign and security policies, which show poverty of vision and leadership in exploring new options. Had China not been so supportive, Pakistan would have faced even more diplomatic embarrassment at the global level. Pakistan's civilian leadership and the establishment have now adopted a more forthright position in their interaction with the US delegation that visited Pakistan on June 10. Pakistan has asked for reciprocity in relations rather than the US presenting a demand list for dealing with terrorism. Hopefully, the vitality demonstrated in our foreign and security disposition after the meeting between the military top brass and the civilian leadership will improve the prospects of initiating smart diplomacy and new options for coping with our current economic, military and diplomatic pressures.

Published in The Express Tribune, June 13th, 2016.

Source:<http://tribune.com.pk/story/1121394/civil-military-interaction-foreign-policy/>

Islamic State Unable to Make Inroads in Pakistan

ISLAMABAD: As investigators probe connections between the Orlando killer and the Islamic State group, analysts say the militants are struggling to gain a foothold in one country repeatedly linked to their high-profile attacks: Pakistan.

White House hopeful Donald Trump mentioned Pakistan in a speech this week in New Hampshire as he doubled down on anti-immigration threats in the wake of the bloody rampage in Orlando.

Trump cited an attack in California last November, when a Pakistani woman and her US-born husband were praised by IS as “soldiers” of the caliphate after killing 14 people.

Other murky links between Pakistan and IS attacks have also emerged.

In rare admission, Pakistan recognises growing presence of Islamic State
Two people were killed in France on Monday by a man claiming allegiance to IS — and known to French intelligence for his role in a Pakistan-linked ‘jihadist’ group.

In April, Austrian prosecutors said they are investigating a Pakistani held in connection with last November’s deadly assault on Paris, also claimed by IS.

Washington earlier this year designated an IS affiliate — the “Khorsan Province” — as a Afghanistan- and Pakistan-based terrorist organisation.

But Islamabad officially denies IS has a formal presence in the country.

Analysts say that while the group’s ultra-violent ideology has seen some success as a recruitment tool, IS is still scrabbling for purchase in Pakistan largely due to competition from well established extremist groups already there.

“My sense is that it has had limited success mainly because it has to compete for recruits with indigenous jihadi organisations,” said Marvin G. Weinbaum, director of the Pakistan Center at the Middle East Institute in Washington DC.

“I don’t see it as having the potential to make large-scale territorial gains and existentially threatening Pakistan as a nation,” said Aymenn Jawad Al-Tamimi, a research fellow at the US-based Middle East Forum.

The Islamic State — implications for Pakistan

“I am also somewhat sceptical of the potential to supplant al Qaeda and the Taliban,” he wrote in an email to AFP.

Attacks claimed by IS in Pakistan are rare, the most significant being a 2015 gun assault on a bus in Karachi that killed 44 people.

However Pakistani officials told AFP that hundreds of suspects have been rounded up as authorities try to break an domestic IS recruitment network.

“Educated, motivated and unemployed youth are an IS recruitment base in Pakistan. We have busted several recruitment cells here,” a senior security official told AFP on condition of anonymity.

“Their focus is on the middle-class youth, many affluent and able to run operations of the IS state,” said Muhammad Amir Rana, a security analyst.

That means not only foot soldiers, but people who can “run cyber operations, hospitals, and administrative operations”, he said, estimating that some 700 young Pakistanis have already left to join IS.

Islamic organisations and security sources say at least two dozen people suspected of IS connections have been detained in the port megacity of Karachi.

Authorities also found evidence of IS recruitment efforts in Pakistan’s wealthiest province Punjab, and made arrests in 2014.

Last year authorities traced a mother-of-four who went missing from the provincial capital Lahore with her children over fears she had left the country to join IS.

Her family says she is now in an IS-controlled area of Syria along with another Pakistani family.

Authorities have also arrested multiple people accused of IS sympathies with links to the religious political party, Markazi Jamiat Ahle-Hadith Pakistan (MJAP).

Diplomat slams NYT article blaming Pakistan for Islamic State

A senior party member told AFP that his son had become radicalised and is now missing.

“Some people say he has gone to Damascus, others say to Afghanistan or Turkey,” Talib-ur-Rehman Zaidi said.

In Pakistan's northwestern tribal belt that borders Afghanistan, analysts say IS are targeting militants already operating there.

"My impression ... is that IS mainly attracts and tries to recruit disillusioned members of the Taliban movements as well as the likes of Lashkar-e-Taiba," analyst Al-Tamimi said.

However they are not succeeding, says analyst Rana, because of sectarian differences between the militants.

Islamic State smuggling timber into Pakistan, say Afghan officials

The jostling of Pakistan's array of other extremist groups means IS will not become a threat to Islamabad "any time soon", said Weinbaum.

But the group's seeming inability to establish itself on Pakistani soil may not deter "lone wolf" attacks, as US investigators believe happened in Orlando.

"Individuals just associate themselves with them (IS)," president of MJAP Sajid Mir told AFP, as he denied any links between his party and the militants.

"We have no connection — what IS is doing, that is not jihad but barbarism."

Source:<http://tribune.com.pk/story/1123263/islamic-state-unable-make-inroads-pakistan/>

Solution of Water Issues: Options and Possibilities | Zafar Mahmood

In the 25 articles written so far, an attempt was made to cover the important issues pertaining to water management for the current and future generations.

It was also mentioned that based on global experiences water issues are best resolved by politicians.

In a country like Pakistan, handling of such emotive and intricate problems is even more difficult because in our federation, water is a provincial subject and ideally we need to have a uniform policy for all provinces.

The justification for the need of uniformity is based on peculiar position of surface water availability in Pakistan.

We have only one large river basin which is the main source of water in all federating units.

Up till now, we have not made any progress in such policy formulation because of our failure to agree on Kalabagh Dam (KBD) Project.

There is an urgent need to develop a consensus on KBD for it may enable us to hammer out an agreement on more important water issues.

With this aim, an honest effort was made to remove misperceptions which have come to surround this project over the last 25 years.

It is sincerely hoped that with positive help from the media, information about the real facts would pave the way for better understanding.

Therefore, alongwith an agreement on KBD we may make an effort to resolve the real problems.

It is in this regard that a set of suggestions are given in this article:

The water issues should be dealt with by a Committee of Chief Ministers under the constitutional forum of Council of Common Interests (CCI), where several challenges may be entrusted to that Committee for finding a solution.

After a careful study of the impact of climate change on Pakistan, develop a long term adaptation plan to cater for the effects on water flows in Indus Basin. Price of water should be fixed, with incremental increases over a period of time to ultimately bring it at par with its optimum value.

An action plan for the treatment of effluent generated by industry, agriculture and municipal use must be implemented.

Population growth and its adverse impact on availability and quality of water should be measured for taking remedial measures.

The Committee may hire the services of experts to provide them with relevant information and brief them about international practices for water management and design an enforcement mechanism through a legal framework.

Regarding resolution of KBD issue, the problem revolves around public perception in certain regions rather than economic and technical facts of the project.

If that was not the case, how and why can we explain the difference in acceptance of Diamer Basha Dam (DBD) and rejection of Kalabagh Dam.

Both are located on river Indus, DBD 320 km upstream of Tarbela Dam and KBD 200 km downstream of Tarbela Dam.

Both will store water.

DBD has 6.

4 Million Acres Feet (MAF) live storage and KBD 6.

1 MAF live storage.

Similarly both will generate electricity, DBD 4500 MW and KBD 3600 MW.

None of the two dams would have any off-taking canals because in both cases such outlets have been declared technically un-feasible. (A comparison of the two projects is available on WAPDA website www.wapda.gov.pk).

Water is distributed among provinces in accordance with the Water Apportionment Accord (WAA) 1991 and both these dams would have no role in the distribution of water.

The distribution of water from Indus takes place from the barrages known as Jinnah, Chashma, Taunsa, Panjnad, Guddu, Sukkur and Kotri. Then what is the difference between the two which forms the basis of decision to approve DBD and oppose KBD.

The one explanation on record is that after constructing an expensive dam for storage, there would be a natural tendency to fill it up even when water may be in short supply. This would reduce downstream flow.

This is a valid apprehension but this could be equally applicable to any storage facility; be that at point A or at point B on the same river.

If the decision to store water at KBD can be detrimental to the interest of lower riparian, then how a decision to store water at DBD cannot have the similar effect.

So, if this is not the real explanation and there is no significant difference between the two Dams, what is the problem which has not been stated but is at the centre of Sindh's reluctance to accept KBD?

The real problem lies in decision making framework in IRSA which controls the operation of reservoirs.

Decision making in IRSA is through a majority vote and Sindh wants certain safeguards. And as a lower riparian, it is perfectly legitimate for Sindh to ask for appropriate measures to protect its interests.

When President Musharraf wanted to develop consensus on Kalabagh Dam, he constituted a Technical Committee on Water Resources in November, 2003 with eight members, two from each province and the 9th member Mr.

A.
N.
G.

Abbasi as the Chairman. When its report was finalized on August 25, 2005, there was difference of opinion on some issues between the Chairman and seven members of the Committee and consensus could not be reached.

Mr.

A.

N.

G.

Abbasi, a competent engineer who had held Ministerial position in Sindh and was Chairman TCWR, included views of the seven members of the committee alongwith his own comments.

In Sindh, the comments of Mr.

A.

N.

G.

Abbasi are believed to accurately reflect Sindh's point of view.

It is recommended that the Chief Ministers' Committee proposed to be constituted by the CCI may include the following in its TORs: The comments of Mr.

A.

N.

G.

Abbasi as contained in the final report of TCWR. Mr. Idris Rajput another respected engineer from Sindh who served as Secretary Irrigation & Power Department, Government of Sindh and regularly contributes in Sindhi newspapers on water issues was made Chairman of a Committee constituted by PILDAT in 2011.

His recommendations as contained in PILDAT's "Background Paper on Inter-Provincial Water Issues in Pakistan" may also be included.

The remaining TORs may include the issue relating to water requirement for irrigation of Sailaba area and regulated flows downstream of Kotri barrage. Sustaining of life and maintaining ecological balance in Indus Delta;

The KP Government may be offered to engage international Panel of Experts to assess the possibility of flooding as well as the water logging of lands in Peshawar valley due to construction of KBD.

To counter the threat of flooding to Nowshera, the most effective intervention is possible through building Mohmand Dam.

Therefore, the decision to build KBD must be coupled with proper allocation of funds for building Mohmand Dam.

The leadership in Punjab displayed magnanimity when Ghazi Barotha Hydro-Power Project (GBHP) was under approval in ECNEC.

Punjab was pleased to fore-go its right of Net Hydel Profits for developing a consensus on GBHP.

The Government of Punjab could show similar magnanimity in case of KBD with a difference.

Net Hydel Profits from KBD be administered separately by CCI and its proceeds may be used for, economic benefit of people who are displaced by storage of water in KBD.

The suggestions in this article, which is last of the series are in my personal capacity and given with the best of intention.
May Allah help and guide us !

The writer is Chairman WAPDA.

chairman@wapda.gov.pk

Source:<http://nation.com.pk/columns/25-Jun-2016/solution-of-water-issues-options-and-possibilities>

Pak Foreign Policy is Reactive Not Active: Khar

ISLAMABAD: Former foreign minister Hina Rabbani Khar on Sunday said that Pakistan's current foreign policy was reactive and not active as Pakistan was not taking its own line or direction but was only reacting to the circumstances arising in the region or world at large.

"In 60 years, we have taught our children that our national identity is to hate someone, and we are doing it with those who are physically the nearest. Hostile with India and now hostile with Afghanistan," she said.

She said that Pakistan could not 'conquer Kashmir through war' and progress on the issue could only be made in an environment of mutual trust with India.

"I believe that Pakistan cannot conquer Kashmir through war and if we cannot do that, the option we are left with is dialogue, and dialogue can only proceed with a partner with which we have normal relations and a certain level of mutual trust," the former minister said in an interview with Geo News programme 'Jirga' hosted by Salim Saafi.

She claimed that the PPP government, despite being a coalition government, had tried its best to normalise ties with India through relaxation of visa rules and by normalising trade ties. "The issues between the two countries cannot be resolved in a hostile environment," she said.

Khar, who remained Pakistan's foreign minister from 2011 to 2013, maintained that the Kashmir issue could be resolved, "if we continue to talk on the issue, then we will reach somewhere".

Answering a question regarding the military influence on Pakistan's foreign policy, the former foreign minister said that it was a diplomat's job to carry forward the military's perspective on issues where 'the military is a relevant stakeholder.'

She said some people believed that the issue could only be resolved, "if there is a BJP government in India and a military government in Pakistan". She observed that Musharraf gave India adequate relaxation on the Kashmir issue during his tenure.

She said the US tilt towards India was driven by economy, market and because of a wish to contain the rising power of China. "Now let us ask ourselves, is US moving towards India because India is a nuclear state, or because it is a military power, no, it is

people power and their democratic traditions, if we want to compete, let's compete on these grounds," she said.

She termed Pakistan's entry into Afghan Jihad a 'mistake' and maintained that Pakistan's dependence on US was more in "our minds than on the ground". She termed it Zia's mistake for helping the US in the 80s, and added Musharraf had no option when it came to helping the US in 2001.

Criticising the approach and the performance of ministry of foreign affairs, she asked if the foreign office had turned into a political office. "The foreign office is busy nowadays in apprising the nation about some country's leader sending flowers to the prime minister or inquiring after his health," said Khar. Summing up her answer, she maintained that the basic objective of Pakistan's foreign policy should be to serve the people of the country and not the pursuit of power.

Source:<http://www.thenews.com.pk/print/131256-Pak-foreign-policy-is-reactive-not-active-Khar>

Brexit and Pakistan | Khurram Husain

There is more than one way to look at Brexit from Pakistan. The less interesting one is to search for ways in which the fallout can have an immediate impact on Pakistan's economy. Sartaj Aziz may be right in ruling out any immediate impact, but it is worth bearing in mind that the event has consequences far beyond the immediate.

To me there are two principal insights to draw as a Pakistani. But before we can get to that, it is important to be clear about how we understand the event in the first place.

What just happened in Britain? There are three two large narratives that I can identify.

It would be a colossal mistake to believe that Pakistan will be immune to the large-scale changes that have just been activated in Britain.

One says that there is a rising tide of xenophobia engulfing the democracies of the advanced industrial West, brought on by deindustrialisation, immigration and wages growing at a slower pace than corporate profits. The resentments borne by growing inequities are driving growing numbers of people to vote for disruptive outcomes in their elections, whether nationalist or populist or some combination of the two.

The other narrative says that with the advance of globalisation, states have become increasingly tuned to the dictates of capital and transnational regimes — whether global (like the WTO) or regional (like the EU). This has made them less and less responsive to the voice of their own electorate, and since in advanced industrial democracies the electorate is accustomed to receiving high levels of social services and social protection from their governments, there is a growing chasm between what people expect from their governments and what their governments can do for them.

In countries where there are political parties that can reliably become the carriers of their electorate's grievances, these parties are capturing the imagination of a growing number of voters. Syriza in Greece and Podemos in Spain are two examples, and more recently the Five Star Movement in Italy has scored large victories against the incumbent centre-left Democratic Party. In France and Germany, the far-right wing is gearing to fill the political vacuum.

And in those countries where none of the mainstream parties can credibly become the carriers of the electorate's grievances, we are seeing a leadership crisis as they struggle to adapt to the demands from below while keeping their commitments to big capital and transnational regimes. The US and the UK are prime examples, where the electorate is throwing up increasingly disruptive outcomes that seek to push the self-destruct button rather than continue with business as usual.

In the UK the line has actually been crossed with the referendum, while in the US they have come close to that line, as exemplified by the recent refusal of the Tea Party faction of the Republican party to raise the borrowing limit for the government in 2013, forcing a government shutdown and almost precipitating a near catastrophic sovereign default by the world's largest economic entity and sovereign borrower — the US federal government.

The kinds of changes that globalisation has wrought are the subject of much writing these days. For now, it's enough to acknowledge that Pakistan has been swept by this wave of change too. We are not key members of any transnational regime as such, whether global or regional, but the state in our country is tied into global regimes through multilateral organisations like the IMF and the World Bank, on whose doorstep we have been permanent fixtures since 1988.

Over the past decade and a half, policymaking in Pakistan has been more responsive to the requirements laid down by these multilateral bodies, and the larger apparatus of donor agencies, than it has been to its own citizens. Evidence of this can be seen in the massive amount of government attention given to matters such as reforms in customs tariffs and taxes rather than social protection and reform of education and health service delivery. Our economic policy is animated almost entirely by the search for reserves and revenues, to keep the economy afloat and maintain our debt-servicing capacity, more than anything else.

One development that has the potential to rectify this is the 18th Amendment and the NFC award. With large-scale devolution of power and resources to the provinces, a door has been opened to possibly freeing up governance from the shackles of its creditors and benefactors. But thus far the provinces have not stepped up to the plate. They have preferred to pour the additional resources of the NFC award into large and visible infrastructure projects instead of working towards any serious reform of education and health service delivery.

Even though our citizenry has been similarly conditioned by the changes that have swept across the economy, there is one key difference: there is no burgeoning groundswell of disaffection that is throwing up disruptive outcomes in successive elections. Despite the best efforts of the PTI to be a driver of disruptive change, it has not managed to establish a link with the disaffected voter in the way that the new parties in the advanced industrial democracies have done.

One reason could be that citizens in Pakistan have different expectations from their government. They do not expect social protection or service delivery as much as access to power when needed for the settlement of disputes, or government jobs; objectives for which they have developed enduring alternative routes. Despite deep-rooted changes in our economy, and the structure of opportunities it presents to the population, coupled with dismal outcomes in social protection and service delivery, the population has not turned its ire towards the state in the way the electorate in advanced industrial democracies has done. It seems despair does not fuel revolutions the way disappointment does.

But it would be a colossal mistake to believe that Pakistan will be immune to the large-scale changes that have just been activated in Britain. Historically, our economy has been deeply vulnerable to convulsions taking place in the global economy. Last year, a near run on Chinese capital markets sparked a massive stampede out of other stock markets too.

In the year to come, the convulsions that are gathering steam will be far larger than the Asian financial crisis of 1997 or perhaps even the global financial crisis of 2008, both of which pushed our economy into crisis. There may be no immediate impact, but complacency at the top and despair below is no way to run things.

Source: <http://www.dawn.com/news/1268077>

Economy

Survey of the Economy 2015-16 | Editorial

The Economic Survey 2015-16 was unveiled yesterday, giving another chance to Finance Minister Ishaq Dar to convey, what he thinks, are achievements of the government and play the blame game for all targets that were missed this fiscal year. Mr Dar said the government would have met its ambitious GDP growth target of 5.1 per cent had the cotton crop not seen a decline in production. GDP growth clocked in at 4.7 per cent, a figure over which analysts have already raised doubts. However, Mr Dar is right in saying that the decline in cotton production, which was 28 per cent in the ongoing fiscal year, shaved off precious percentage points in GDP growth, an area that needs to be prioritised — especially at a time when commodity prices remain depressed.

The finance minister remained tactful in his presentation of the survey, and gave a reminder as to why he is in office, deflecting questions at will and continuing to provide explanations that avoided controversy and further queries. For instance, to a question on how the government was facing issues in holding the census — pending since 1998 — Mr Dar was shrewd enough to avoid using the word 'delay'. He instead said the country has been involved in a war on terror that took precedence, but that in no way meant the census could not be held. Mr Dar avoided giving a timeframe for the census, but said that it would be held soon. It left participants at the press conference wondering as to what the answer was — a perfect way to answer a question without really answering it.

There is no doubt that the poor performance of the agriculture sector was the bitter pill that the economy had to swallow during the fiscal year. Farmers continue to suffer as depressed commodity prices and floods shave off their produce. The Rs341 billion Kisan package, announced in September last year, has clearly not achieved much. It was announced before the local government polls and had more of a political flavour to it than an economy-related one. Maybe that is where the failure has occurred. Traditional methods of farming have pegged the agriculture sector further back, and the government's continued ignorance of this aspect is embarrassing.

Analysts have continued to pinpoint falling exports, but concerns regarding this have fallen on deaf ears. Mr Dar, however, was quick to say that the quantity exported had gone up, but the return on exports had gone down due to depressed prices — another

example of how he deflected criticism on to something beyond his control. However, at the same time, he chose to ignore the criticisms of exporters, who complained of the continued power crisis hurting them as well as the FBR's tendency to hold back refunds. These contributory factors to falling exports were conveniently not mentioned by the finance minister although he was quick to point out the incentives given to export-oriented sectors. Mr Dar boasted of increased revenue collection, but neglected to mention that the number of income tax filers actually went down, meaning that the tax net had in fact become smaller. How is it then that tax collection still went up? It did because tax rates on those already inside the tax net went up significantly.

While the government can be given some credit for the improving security situation that will hold the economy in good stead in the long-term, and for reducing tax exemptions, to say 'a job well done' on the performance it gave in the fiscal year that has just passed would be taking it too far, especially when we know that falling oil prices meant it had a lot going for it. Subsidies were massively reduced and these savings could have been used for development projects. But these remained restricted largely to one province. Last year's economic targets were ambitious and were backed not by a growth-led model, but a debt-ridden one that relied on heavier taxation. This is not how an economy is spurred into action. The government's economic policy should be focusing on inclusive growth. So far, that has not been the case.

Published in The Express Tribune, June 3rd, 2016.

Source:<http://tribune.com.pk/story/1115242/survey-economy-2015-16/>

'Reform Delays To Dampen Pakistan's Growth Prospects' | Amin Ahmed

ISLAMABAD: Reform delays in Pakistan, such as entrenched political obstacles to privatisation, would compromise future productivity and dampen growth prospects, and may also increase fiscal pressures as budget projections take into account proceeds from strategic disinvestments, the World Bank has said in a report.

If the planned divestment from the state-owned enterprises (SOEs) materialises in Pakistan, it would contribute to further fiscal consolidation, according to the latest update of the 'Global Economic Prospects' report published on Tuesday.

The bank said that chronic energy deficiencies in Pakistan have weakened foreign direct investment, but a pick-up was expected with the start of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) programme. Nonetheless, domestic investment in the country remains weak.

On the positive side, the report said Pakistan would benefit from expected improvement in power supply and security situation. Investments under the CPEC would provide a boost to demand in the short run, and over time alleviate transportation bottlenecks and energy shortages, it said.

Addressing energy bottlenecks in South Asia remains critical for sustaining the region's long-term growth. In Pakistan, which has an annual energy deficit of about 5,000 megawatts, power shortages may have shaved about four percentage points off GDP growth per year.

Ongoing monetary accommodation would support an expansion of credit for domestic borrowers and Pakistan was expected to continue on its path of fiscal consolidation, the report said.

The report said GDP growth picked up to 4.2 per cent in 2015-16 — its highest pace in seven years. This pick-up was supported by several positive factors: an improving security situation, lower oil prices, higher remittances, an acceleration in credit growth and rising public investment.

Pakistan's Extended Fund Facility arrangements with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) remains on track, and the fiscal deficit fell to 5.3pc of GDP in 2015 from 8.4pc in 2013 as revenues improved and recurrent expenditures were curtailed, the report said.

The report painted a positive outlook for South Asian economies, stating that growth in South Asia was expected to remain robust at 7.1pc in 2016, picking up to 7.3pc in 2018.

“Growth in South Asia has been remarkably strong, and with it, a steep decline in poverty rates over the past two decades. However, some of the tailwinds that have supported South Asia’s recent strong performance due to significantly lower oil prices are likely to fade over the medium term,” it added.

External risks include weaker-than-expected global trade and an unexpected tightening of global financing conditions. South Asian economies will not be immune to such developments, even though the region is less integrated with global markets than other developing regions.

Heightened volatility in financial markets could lead to a reversal of capital flows and debt rollover difficulties. Countries in the region with weaker buffers and exposure to international capital markets are likely to be the most adversely affected.

Although the region’s systemic banks do not rely heavily on wholesale funding, vulnerabilities in bankbalance sheets may lead to financial stress and weigh on lending. Some corporate borrowers, particularly state-owned enterprises, are facing sizable losses, which could eventually turn into non-performing bank loans and contingent government liabilities in India and Pakistan.

Published in Dawn, June 9th, 2016

Source:<http://www.dawn.com/news/1263570/reform-delays-to-dampen-pakistans-growth-prospects>

An Overview of 2016-17 Budget | Gen Mirza Aslam Beg

Three years back the government decided to “beg and borrow”, to correct the economy and save the country from going into default. They did succeed in achieving the primary objective but this simple answer to the complex issue has created myriad problems as one can judge from the comments of our eminent analysts:

“Aid reliant Pakistan has purse strings controlled by IMF/USA. Foreign aid does not reduce poverty; it offers little in terms of policy design and as monetary policy runs out of bite, it will take a fresh crisis to force new thinking to emerge; this budget is politics by the means repeated year after year; it is business as usual; it has failed to adopt an egalitarian approach that deplores extremes of wealth and poverty, thus unbalancing the social order; budget is an instrument of social change through education and health, but it promises little for the over 2 million jobless youth and debt free economy; budget is simply a revenue and expenditure narrative, promoting not growth but fiscal consolidation; no reforms, no tax structuring; it is a budget by the elite, and for the elite, of the political order supporting oligarchic order; they “claim high growth trajectory” but there is negative growth in agriculture, which contributes 6% to GDP; drop in export and investment, and all targets missed. However it is a good budget for the poor parliamentarians whose present Rs. 80,000 a month pay and perks go upto Rs. 470,000 a month. Congratulations.”

The strategy for social change, driven by foreign debt, dole and aid, places serious strains on our economy while the stress is on fiscal consolidation, than growth. The budget thus reminds me of Ghalib, who said: “ Qarz ki petay thae mae aur kehtey thae kae haan, Rang lae gi humari faqa masti aik din”. The implosion effect of our faqa masti will show its colour. Let us examine.

The volume of the budget is Rs. 4400 bn, out of which we pay, Rs. 1800 bn, as debt servicing, which is 41% of the budget, leaving only Rs. 2600 bn to “mastermind the budget plan”, between the rich and the poor. Those living under the poverty line are 30% and above this line are 40%; 25% are the lower and upper middle classes and the remaining 5% are the privileged class. For poverty alleviation, allocation is 2.6%; education 1.8% and health 0.27% — a total of 3.4% is the very generous allocation for the 80% under privileged Pakistanis. Agriculture gets Rs. 700 bn which is 15.9% of the budget and likely to fall in the hands of the big landlords, holding “bainami khatas”, leaving very little for the genuine land holders.

Defence gets Rs. 860 bn, which is 19.55% of the budget and 2.62% of the GDP which

stands at Rs. 32,700 bn. Our defence budget at 2.62% of GDP is much lower than, 4.70% of the Indian defence budget. The rule of the thumb is that, the defence budget must remain within 2% to 2.5% of the GDP. Our defence budget is well within these limits, maintaining more than 650,000 foot soldiers at a minimal annual cost of Rs. 0.8 mn per soldier; India is Rs. 1.7 mn; Saudi Arabia Rs. 2.7 mn; Turkey Rs. 3.0 mn and USA Rs. 42.5 mn. Yet Pakistani armed forces are one of the best in the world, paying the debt to the nation with their blood, raising the level of performance to heights, acclaimed world wide. Thus our armed forces, through their demonstrated capability are maintaining a level of deterrence, by means of a “knowledge based defence policy of development and strategy to fight out-numbered.” This phenomenon I have explained in my article, “China Pakistan Strategic Pivot”, published a few weeks earlier.

This year budget has come hard on our nuclear programme by cutting down the allocation to Rs 27 bn from Rs. 54 bn of the year 2014, while India has allocated Rs. 1000 bn (one trillion) for its nuclear programme development. Whereas the Full Spectrum Nuclear Deterrence Regime, that Pakistan has achieved by means of a unique nuclear science and technology technique development by Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan and his team of experts. It is a success story of dedication and sacrifices, supported by strong political will. My recently published article, titled “Full Spectrum Nuclear Deterrence”, explains this phenomenon.

Our defence forces achievements and the nuclear deterrence capability developments are the two success stories demanding similar approach from our economic planners to create a knowledge-based economy, “before our monetary policy runs out of bite, it will take a fresh crisis to force new thinking to emerge.”

— The writer is ex-Chief of Army Staff, Pakistan.

Source:<http://pakobserver.net/2016/06/11/an-overview-of-2016-17-budget/>

Budget: Governmental Incompetence | Siraj Ul Haq

The present government has presented its fourth budget of Rs 43.95 trillion. This budget has a deficit of Rs 1276 billion. There was a hope that the government will present a budget for the welfare of people with respect to recent national circumstances. That the problems of the common man will be addressed in it. The government would give a clear line of action to solve the financial issues of people and try to give them basic human rights. But all this wishful thinking came to an end after the budget speech. This budget can be regarded as traditional and administrative. But if we call it a welfare budget, it will be simply an injustice. All the facts and figures behind this budget are imaginary. They do not have any relation with reality. The estimations of income and expenditures are incorrect because the government has failed in calculating the real number of total population. It will not be wrong to say that the distance between the budget and people is like the distance between the air conditioned hall of the Senate and the heat of Multan. It is quite shameful that there is only one doctor for 1308 persons and 1 bed for 1613 persons. Every fifth person does not have access to medical facilities. The budget for education, health, environment and human development projects should be increased. But the government has entangled itself in the labyrinth of taxation to fulfil the expenditures of administration. The allocation of 2.2% for education is surprising. Where literacy rate is 57% and 43% are uneducated; such a little amount can only destroy the department. We are far behind from Bangladesh, Bhutan and Sri Lanka in education. It means that we shall not be among the educated nations in the next fifty years.

The resources have not been divided fairly according to the constitution. The government has also been unsuccessful in giving the shares of NFC award to the provinces. It has increased a sense of inferiority and hatred against the federation in provinces. What is the budget? To take loan from the IMF and World Bank, and then pay interest on loans? And then take another loan to pay the interest. 42% of our budget is allocated to pay interest on loans only. It is extremely shameful. To pay the interest on loans 1360 billion rupees have been allocated. For this, new taxes of 1148 billion rupees have been imposed. 90 types of withholding taxes have been imposed on the common man in this budget that has been dictated by World Bank and IMF. The prices of essential commodities shall rise unimaginably. People are already living from hand to mouth. It has become difficult for them to pay utility bills. The increase in the salaries of government servants is very low. How can low-paid workers face the challenge of high prices with only a 10% increment in their salaries? The minimum salary of a labourer should be 20000 rupees in view of high inflation. But the government has fixed is at only 14000 rupees. And still there are no signs of

implementation. I shall accept Ishaq Dar as an economist when he will make the budget of a family in Rs14000.

Here, the standard for measuring the poverty is ridiculous. The daily income is 2 dollars per capita. All the figures of income and expenditures presented in the budget are false. So, no improvement can be expected in the economy. It is as if we tell the host about the arrival of the guests but do not tell them the number of guests. Agriculture is the backbone of our economy and 64% of our total population is associated with it. The government has announced to revolutionise the agricultural structure several times but could not achieve the targets of previous year. In fact, the policies of the government are unable to satisfy the farmers. The government is giving an impression that it has given a big relief to farmers only after lowering the prices of fertilizers. But there is a complete silence about the prices of seeds, pesticides and other agricultural things in the budget. Government has announced an agricultural package for farmers. According to a survey of World Bank, 5% landlords have occupied 64% of agricultural land. Landlords shall take the advantage of this package. 342 billion rupees will be taken by landlords. 20 million youths are jobless in the country. But the government hasn't paid any attention, nor does it have any planning for them. FATA and the tribal areas always have been deprived of the Government's attention. That's why they have a sense of hatred and lack of confidence against the government. The budget of only 100 billion rupees for FATA is insufficient.

Unfortunately, such kinds of people have been ruling the country since independence, that have confidence in Jewish businessmen and money lenders but do not trust Allah Almighty. They fix the prices of our commodities. Utility bills are decided according to their dictation. Prices of oil and gas are fixed in accordance to their wishes. Now, the situation is that we have become a victim of Jewish conspiracies. There is only one solution to this problem that we should leave the economy based on interest and adopt the Islamic economy. The economy based on interest can't give a relief to the people. How can an economy based on loans flourish?

The wars in the world shall be fought on water in the future. But in our budget, a little amount has been allocated to build dams and water resources. There is nothing for the poor people of Punjab, Sindh, KPK and Balochistan in this budget. People are coming to the cities for a better future. Because there is no facility in the villages. The future of cities is also dark. There is no clean water or favourable atmosphere. There is no road map for decreasing unemployment in the budget. 20 million children are not going to school. Those who are going to schools do not have any future. Highly qualified youths are jobless. We can say that our educational institutions are producing jobless people.

There will be an army of unemployed people in the future. It is necessary to create 18000 new jobs daily, so that every jobless person can get a job. But it is not in the priorities of the government. No amount has been allocated for this purpose in the budget.

Source:<http://nation.com.pk/columns/27-Jun-2016/budget-governmental-incompetence>

A Baffling Economy | Farhan Bokhari

WITHIN days of the new budget getting rolled out amid much fanfare, questions over key numbers have revived an uncomfortable truth — that Pakistan's economic trends continue to raise baffling questions.

The immediate challenge to the official team led by Finance Minister Ishaq Dar comes from the Karachi-based Social Policy and Development Centre (SPDC). In sharp contrast to official proclamations, a team of SPDC economists led by former minister Hafeez Pasha claimed a significantly lower economic growth rate, a higher incidence of poverty, a higher budget deficit and the risk of a higher future drawdown on official foreign reserves.

Though the claims and counter claims need to be closely scrutinised, Pakistan has been reminded of two equally powerful realities.

On the one hand, it's incumbent upon the government of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif to publicly and convincingly defend its numbers, given the widespread popular scepticism over successive governments having been far from truthful over key economic parameters.

This is especially vital as the present-day rulers face large performance gaps in areas like forcing affluent Pakistanis to pay their taxes, or choosing the right spending priorities for a country of 200 million. But keeping quiet in the face of compelling challenges will further undermine the weak official credibility.

The gap between the rulers and grass-roots realities has widened.

On the other hand, Pakistan's key institutions responsible for giving a much-needed reality check, over time have been forced to quit their independence. In Islamabad, figures compiled by the main statistics agency were once taken as the gospel truth. But years after the federal compiler of statistics began succumbing to orders from key officials to turn the numbers positively on matters like poverty, the official take on the economy remains in doubt. As Pakistan's successive rulers tightened controls to only seek a 'sub aghaa' (all is well) outcome, the gap between those in power and grass-root realities has widened.

Meanwhile, the debate on the sanctity of key parameters cannot be carried out in isolation from the consequences of a long delay in updating Pakistan's population-related figures. The last census was due to be held in 2008 but still remains on hold. Without an accurate population figure, economic policymaking will remain out of sync with Pakistan's realities.

The challenge at the centre of the numbers debate is also driven by the workings of the ruling structure, where short-term priorities have often taken precedence over long-term interests. Presenting the budget in a meaningful manner has essentially become no more than an accounting exercise, detached from the kind of medium- to long-term assessment which once drove economic policy.

It's therefore hardly surprising that the word 'human development', coined by the late Dr Mahbubul Haq, one of Pakistan's most illustrious economists, effectively seems to have been replaced by 'concrete-driven development' as the new catchphrase.

At a time when more than half of Pakistan's population seems to have lost out in the past year in view of one of the worst crises to ever afflict the agriculture sector, the push for more fancy roads, bus and train services continues unabated. In spite of budgetary allocations for social causes, notably education and healthcare, there is no evidence as yet of a planned massive push to reform the quality of such essential services.

A related and timely case in point is also the future of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor or CPEC, often dubbed as a game changer for future generations. Along with the game change must come compelling questions about not only the direct economic cost of the projects involved but also their impact on Pakistan's future budgetary allocations.

Too often in the past, successive governments have sought to hoodwink mainstream Pakistanis by substituting the word 'assistance' for what was no more than money in the shape of hard or soft loans that eventually had to be paid back with interest.

The challenge is to come clean on the price tag of \$46 billion often bandied about for CPEC. As planned spending of such a proportion has never been undertaken in Pakistan's history, it is important for policymakers to roll out detailed financial information about the projects involved. The debt that Pakistan will accumulate in the process must be publicly disclosed to the last cent, and the cost of servicing that debt must also be public knowledge.

In tandem with that information must be a convincing answer to questions over exactly how Pakistan, saddled with CPEC-related liabilities, intends to manage its repayments in future. On the face of it such a massively ambitious financial commitment must require a significant if not a major overhaul of Pakistan's eroding revenue tax collection system. Is someone in Islamabad finally going to explain exactly how the country plans to manage the CPEC-related financial liabilities without taking the country to the cleaners after an unprecedented spend, spend, spend spree?

The writer is an Islamabad-based journalist.

farhanbokhari@gmail.com

Published in Dawn, June 15th, 2016

Source: <http://www.dawn.com/news/1264836/a-baffling-economy>

Education

Education: Engine Of Development | Shaukat M Zafar

As narrated by Hazrat Abu Huraira (RA), The Holy Prophet (PBUH) said “The Hour (The Day of Judgment) will not be established until knowledge will be taken away, earthquakes will be very frequent, time will pass quickly, afflictions will appear, murders will increase and money will overflow against you”. (Hadith No.1 Vol.I) Education has always been the engine of human progress and development. A well known philosopher Aristotle some more than 2000 years ago had said “The roots of education are bitter, but the fruit is sweet” which still ring true today. In other words it may cost the nation some money and time of individuals to keep on learning, but the results always worth it. Economic and social development is inconceivable in a country that neglects the education of its people.

Pakistan is absolutely uncertain where our country is heading. Its destination is still unknown. Pakistan is the country which has no minister for education. In Pakistan, no educational qualification is required to be part of the Parliament. So called Public Representatives therefore do not know the importance of education at local level. They send their own children abroad to get education so they need not to worry about the education within the country. Ruling elite do not want common people to get educated and promoting illiteracy. They need the status quo to prolong their retention in the power but if the poor people are get educated, they cannot be befooled anymore then who will serve and vote for this extremely corrupt elite.

Unfortunately, PPP and PML-N so called ‘democratic’ governments at the federal and provincial levels have been guilty of dereliction of their basic duty of educating the children and the youth on whom the future of the country depends. Despite the devolution of power to provincial governments, the woes of public sector educational institutions have not improved at all rather it has worsened. Both the governments bear the entire responsibility for this shameful neglect of education. The simple criteria to determine the real priority of the government attached to any sector is to look at the resources allocated in the budget for that sector. Just take an example of the situation of education in Islamabad run under the Ministry of Capital Administration and Development (CAD). Last year the federal government irrelevantly allocated Rs one billion to the Education Ministry, having nothing to do with the

education of Islamabad, to introduce reforms in the Capital territory. The whole is now going to be lapsed but no reform has taken place in Islamabad, perhaps those reforms have been carried out in papers. The federal government also did not feel any need to enhance the development budgets of the Education Ministry and the HEC last year. Inadequate spending on education during so called 'democratic' regimes has left Pakistan lagging far behind even the African countries.

Allocating spending even less than 2 percent of GDP on education is shameful, no doubt which remained far above during military regimes. Lowest spending on education has caused huge disparities in the country where public sector educational institutions, the only affordable source of education for poor, have been totally ignored. In comparison, Pak economy spent a whopping Rs 1.596 trillion (5.846 % of GDP) on debt servicing during the last year, the debt siphoned off by the ruling elite and never used to better the life of common man, where more than half of population is living below the poverty line. We are a poor nation of this rich country. Private tutors or getting education in private schools, colleges, and universities is a distant dream for this nation. The poor people cannot afford to pay the fees private schools demand. There are a huge number of masked talents being destroyed in rural and poor urban areas which are required to be unveiled with proper opportunity.

The government should not shrink its responsibility through privatization. It should improve and strengthen the public sector schools instead of their loot sale like other privatized entities.

misappropriations in public sector educational institutions should be controlled. Once the teachers were ill paid but now the situation has altogether changed. Now they are getting good salaries many times more than their counterparts in private schools. The government is incurring huge funds in shape of salary and perks with almost zero contribution to the society. Low performing teachers should be made strictly accountable and their salaries should be tagged with their performance. Political corruption in the appointment of teachers and heads of educational institutions are one of the main reasons for inferior quality of education which may now come to an end.

— The writer is former banker based in Islamabad.

Source:<http://pakobserver.net/2016/06/04/education-engine-of-development/>

Education: Not a Priority for Pakistan government | Editorial

When the Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz (PML-N) government presented its latest budget in Punjab, it was hoped that the ruling party's experience of governance would lead to prioritisation of the important sectors, of areas that are essential for societal development on myriad levels. However, this was not the case and the PML-N led provincial government, keeping in line with its past policies, reduced the budget allocation for education in Punjab. According to an analysis by the Non Governmental Organisation, AlifAilaan, the allocation for education in the provincial budget was 26 percent in 2013-14, and it was decreased in subsequent budgets to the current 18.6 percent. Needless to say, this is cause for concern as the education sector is far from the developed level that it should be in the province. In fact, most of the development indicators point towards the abysmal state of education in Pakistan, and there has been an absence of any signs of improvement. In light of all this, it is indeed absurd that the Punjab government decided to decrease the allocation for education rather than increase it.

The PML-N is often blamed on focusing too much on cosmetic appearances by building grandiose road structures. The reduction in the budgetary allocation for education in Punjab reflects this perception, and gives it considerable credence. While it is true that roads and communications infrastructure is essential for economic development, prioritising it at the expense of education can have disastrous consequences. For one, in the absence of qualified human capital, economic development would not be able to take off and all of the investment in road infrastructure would get reduced to an illusory effect that is hiding beneath it an underdeveloped and poverty stricken country. More importantly, illiteracy breeds intolerance and extremism, and as Pakistan is fighting its war against extremism, focus on providing quality education to deprived areas is needed in order to shrink the space for extremists altogether. While it is true that intolerance is a general feature of Pakistani society, which is not just limited to deprived areas, even that cannot be tackled if reforms in the education sector are not brought about that inculcate critical thinking and accepting difference. The issue of education woes does not merely stop at budgetary allocation for education, but it is also important to formulate comprehensive policies over spending of the allocated funds. The analysis by Alif Ailaan pointed out that out of the Rs 32.8 billion for education last year, the Punjab government has only been able to spend Rs 14 billion. This shows that not only is the budget for education decreasing in Punjab, but also the funds allocated are not even being spent wholly. This reflects the vacuum in education policy making in Punjab. Hence, in the absence of meaningful reforms in the education sector that are laid out by a well-formed policy and

supported by adequate funds, the abysmal state of education in Pakistan will continue to persist. And in order to fix this, the Punjab government needs to realise the importance of giving education its due share in the provincial budget.

Source:<http://dailytimes.com.pk/editorial/29-Jun-16/education-not-a-priority-for-pakistan-government>

World

The Pivot to Asia and the SCO | Mehr Ispahani

The world is changing from a uni-polar system to a multi-polar one

The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) has been a game changing organisation which was established in 2001 in Shanghai. Some people and analysts feel that the purpose of SCO was to counterbalance NATO, by counterbalancing the activities of NATO in Central Asia and the US. The Beijing-based SCO currently has China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan as members. SCO is an emerging powerhouse imposing itself with gravitational pull. Within a decade, SCO seems to be progressing to generate focus and close follow up in various circles. The geo-strategic potential of SCO can hardly be ignored. It marks the largest regional organisation in terms of both land mass and population. The Sino-Russian relationship has steadily stabilised in the new century and has grown much closer, bound by their mutual distrust of the U.S. hegemony and their perceived need to promote a multi-polar world.

China in particular sees SCO as an important tool for this aim and has an interest in showing that it can build an international bloc independent of the West and organised on non-Western principles with new security concept and new model of regional cooperation. These days, respective concerns of Moscow and Beijing have tended to cover more and more. The Asia Pacific region is in world focus for its growing political importance and for its economic developments. The region has undergone fundamental changes in its regional organisation, security order and power structure. The focus has shifted from the Atlantic to the Asia Pacific since the end of the Cold War. A new web of power relations is emerging in Asia today inspired by China's rise and the perceived decline of the US. Countries of the region are looking for mutual ties of relationships in which Asian countries are the main drivers. This developing web has provided an impetus to the US strategy by leveraging relationships among likeminded countries to share the burden with the US of managing China's rise and preserving China power from expanding in the region. The current dynamics of the US – China – Japan triangle will continue to haunt the region.

Pakistan (while still a developing country) is a strong market in both energy and defence sector, and that, therefore, makes it one of the most vital markets for Russia. Although China's major security interests do not always coincide with that of Russia, Central Asia may be an exception as both countries are concerned with the stability in Afghanistan and are interested in handling regional security. In addition, energy security is an issue where China's economic interest and Russia's military interest converge within the SCO.

India and Pakistan have much to gain and little to lose from assuming full membership in the SCO. On the security side, both countries hope to pursue their interests in Afghanistan and Central Asia. SCO might be able to play a facilitating role in dealing with the Kashmir dispute with India. The expansion of the SCO will help China fulfil its economic aspirations in both Central and South Asia though Russia fears that the expansion of the SCO could vault China into the driver's seat in Central and South Asia. SCO is expanding its portfolio beyond border disputes and security cooperation to include a wide range of economic, political, and cultural issues. Adding India and Pakistan is an essential aspect of such an effort, For China, an expanded SCO advances both security and economic interests.

The addition of nuclear states India and Pakistan to the SCO will not only change the political map but will also influence the balance of power in the world system of political affairs. Current geopolitical realities tell us that a world is turning into a multi-polar system from a uni-polar one. Two blocs will be formed of regional alliances, Russia-China-Pakistan 'Axis', of course we are aware of Pakistan and China's all weather relationship but Russia (which has been a time tested friend of India) getting close to Pakistan has raised serious concerns in India. Russia and China are both members of significant international organisations, in which they can shape global affairs by coordinating actions and strategies. More important is that China's grand strategy basically aims to create alternatives to each single institution, organisation or structure of the so-called developed world in the long run, and Russia plays a central role too. China and Russia have settled their longstanding territorial disputes and have demarcated their common border. Thus, no territorial claims or border disputes would damage the bilateral relations. The China-Pakistan affiliation is well known and is the most formidable leg of the Russia-China-Pakistan triangle. China has always been a great support against its rival India in terms of military and economic assistance.

On the other hand, Asia-Pacific region is noticing the increasing convergence of economic and security interests of the United States, Japan and India, and their expanding trilateral cooperation. In many ways, the three countries are natural partners.

They are linked together because of high populations, they're three of the largest democracies, and they're also three of the largest economies. They are connected because of the Indo-Pacific strategic construct that makes explicit the geographical connections. India is actively modernising its military, and the United States has rapidly become its top defence supplier. United States, Japan and India are becoming increasingly central to their economic and security calculations. At the same time Japan and India look at the United States as a potential energy supplier as the shale gas revolution turns the US into a major gas exporter. US and Japan have been updating their alliance.

While expansion may hinder the organisation's ability to act decisively, it will give the SCO the opportunity to revolutionise itself into a more comprehensive institution capable of connecting and integrating abroad swath of Asia.

It is hoped that the SCO will become an important platform for the further alignment of states development strategies.

Source:<http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2016/06/01/comment/the-pivot-to-asia-and-the-sco/>

Nuclear-Free World — A Distant Dream | Talat Masood

President Barak Obama's visit to Hiroshima was clearly a momentous event. It brought back memories of one of the greatest tragedies that mankind suffered 71 years ago, not as a result of a natural but a man-made disaster. The occasion provided the world a moment to reflect on the dangers inherent to it as long as nuclear weapons exist. During this visit, President Obama made an impressive speech on the desirability of reducing the nuclear stockpile and the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, which was strong in rhetoric but short in substance. The US and Russia are still caught in the Cold War legacy. Extraordinary advancement in technology has resulted in increasing the lethal power of nuclear warheads a thousand-fold. Apart from a few modest gains under a deal that Russia and the US ratified in 2010 to limit weapons, there has been no real progress towards non-proliferation. President Obama, of course, deserves credit for successfully concluding the Iran nuclear deal that restricts Tehran from limiting its ability to produce enriched uranium. But the US's renewed efforts to modernise its nuclear weapons would surely lead to Russia following suit with the overall strategic picture remaining bleak. China, too, may find compelling circumstances to step up its efforts to modernise and expand its nuclear and missile forces. As long as reliance on nuclear weapons continues to be the cardinal principle of global adversaries, progress on disarmament will remain stagnant.

If the US pursues the logic of responding to the Russian build-up for refining its nuclear arsenal, then on what moral or political basis can it argue that Pakistan not react to Indian qualitative nuclear advances? The enthusiasm that the four Cold War warriors, former secretary of state George Schultz, former secretary of defence Bill Perry, former secretary of state Henry Kissinger and Senator Sam Nun, generated when they joined each other to form the Nuclear Security Project "to galvanise global action to reduce urgent nuclear dangers and build support for reducing reliance on nuclear weapons, ultimately ending them" has since largely faded. This is despite the fact that several former senior politicians and statesmen around the world and across political divides endorsed the call and demanded a global dialogue on reducing reliance on nuclear weapons and making the world a safer place.

However, Perry continues to remain active in his efforts at disarmament and in a recent statement warned of the dangers inherent in the new nuclear arms race that the two nuclear superpowers are pursuing. In essence, these dangerous policies are a throwback to the Cold War days. The nuclear competition between the US and Russia is likely to be duplicated by other nuclear weapon states, making the world more dangerous. The magnitude of the build-up can be gauged by Pentagon's plans to spend

\$1 trillion on nuclear bomber missiles and submarines, and upgrading its nuclear warheads in the next decade. With such brazenly aggressive policies, the US is setting a bad example to other nuclear states to follow. If the US and Russia would have embarked seriously on further arms reduction, a synergy could have been developed whereby other nuclear nations would have followed their lead. The US justifies these developments as a response to Russia's aggressive posturing and its sabre-rattling. The action-reaction phenomenon, a replay of the Cold War-behaviour, would surely lead to heightening of tensions with global ramifications.

For the US, another destabilising element is Russia's modernisation of tactical nuclear arsenal. It is not that tactical weapons are new for Europe as they have been deployed by both America and Russia in the past, but in the present state of tension they are a major source of concern to the US and its Western allies. As sabre-rattling picks momentum and differences over Ukraine remain unresolved, it brings danger of nuclear war close to the European theatre. Surely, the use of tactical weapons in Europe would have disastrous consequences and invite a massive retaliatory response. Its utility is thus questionable and host countries should be wary of deploying these. Employment of low-yield tactical weapons will invite the same massive response as any other nuclear weapon. It will be a folly to expect that any country can get away once it crosses the nuclear threshold, however small it may be. For Pakistan and India, too, the deployment of tactical nuclear weapons invites similar dangers and prudence demands they revisit their policies on tactical and low-yield nuclear weapons. Ironically, Japan, the worst victim of nuclear weapons, opposed the resolution recently sponsored by the group of 60 countries for a nuclear-free world. Opposition by the US was expected for obvious reasons but Japan's opposition was apparently linked to the extended deterrence that it enjoys under the US umbrella.

It is unlikely that the next US president will pursue any different nuclear policies from that of his predecessor. If at all, he or she may take a tougher position. Off-the-cuff remarks of Republican nominee Donald Trump reflected a lack of understanding of strategic issues when he suggested Japan should develop its own deterrence capability instead of relying on the US. With a nomination ensured, hopefully he will receive saner advice and be better informed. Hillary Clinton's views on dealing with Russia and global nuclear issues are close to that of the establishment. With the change in US administration, pressure on Pakistan's nuclear programme is expected to increase, at least initially. But having been subjected to unfair discrimination on its nuclear policy since its very inception it will not be anything new. North Korea is likely to draw the maximum attention of the next US president as rightly pointed out by Siegfried Hecker, a keen observer of North Korea's nuclear programme. Already North Korea has

conducted four nuclear tests and the rate at which it is building its inventory, in a decade it could have about 25 nuclear bombs. All these developments indicate that the goal of a nuclear-free world is a distant dream despite President Obama's well-intentioned pronouncements.

Published in The Express Tribune, June 1st, 2016.

Source:<http://tribune.com.pk/story/1113679/nuclear-free-world-distant-dream/>

Kashmir And Normalisation Process | Dr Muhammad Khan

A US scholar, Stephen P. Cohen considers Indo-Pak distrust as the main cause of Kashmir dispute, remaining unresolved after even seven decades. According to him, “Extremely persistent conflicts seem to draw their energy from an inexhaustible supply of distrust.” In their bilateral relations, the element of trust deficit has caused deterioration to an extent where they take one-step forward and two steps backward. Since Kashmir dispute remained unresolved for decades now, it has added many more issues in the list of bilateral problems. The water problems and Siachen Glacier are the direct outcomes of Kashmir dispute. Besides, heavy and unremitting defence expenditures hampering socio-economic development.

It is always the Kashmir dispute, which blocked the normalization process between Pakistan and India. Indeed, Kashmir holds the key of peace between Pakistan and India and peace between these two neighbors would guarantee peace and stability of South Asia. It is worth mentioning that, except 1971, all wars and conflicts between India and Pakistan were over Kashmir. Despite involvement of major powers in the regional politics of South Asia both during and after the cold war, they have been ‘ineffective in trying to help address the Kashmir problem.’ Keeping the region hostage of Kashmir problem, is indeed a collective failure of major powers, UN and in fact, “biggest failure of international diplomacy.” The dispute though has become complicated over years, yet can be resolved. There is a requirement of farsightedness and statesmanship for resolution of this dispute.

Leaving aside the UN resolutions and aspects of international law, India started calling Kashmir as its ‘integral part’. Pakistan however maintained its stance that, Kashmir is a disputed territory and it has to be resolved as per UN resolution through a plebiscite. In a recent article, Indian scholar and former lawmaker, Mr Kuldir Nayar has rejected the Indian ascertain that, “Kashmir is an integral part of India”. He referred to Article 370 of Indian Constitution, which is only applicable to IJK and not to any integral Indian state(S). India cannot make laws for the Kashmir, unless Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly ask for. However, this all is on paper, practically, IJK is under the Indian rule ever since August 1953 and under Indian Army, ever since 1990. There is no say of Kashmiri leadership in IJK and Kashmir people there are in state of repression and oppression with massive human rights violations under discriminatory laws like Jammu & Kashmir Public Safety Act & Armed Forces Special Power Act.

Very recently, Indian Home Affair Ministry has introduced a draft bill called, Geospatial Information Regulation Bill -2016. The bill is still under debate. The bill aims at,

unilaterally depicting Jammu and Kashmir as Indian Territory and anyone depicting Kashmir as disputed region, shall be punished. Pakistani representative in UN, Dr Maliha Lodhi has strongly protested with UN over this draft Indian bill. Whereas, the UN resolutions have declared the Kashmir as disputed, pending final decision, how can India unilaterally take such a decision? In fact, this is continuation of 1953 Indian agenda, being implemented by Modi Govt.

Among many election promises of the BJP Government, doing away with the Article 370 of Indian Constitution (only linkage between India and IOK) and integration of Kashmir with Indian Union was the most significant promise. Failure to get majority seats in Indian Occupied Kashmir Legislative Assembly, Modi Government has taken three steps.

First, implemented massive demographic changes in Jammu province through RSS, the militant wing of BJP. Two, plans for rehabilitating the Pandits and other Hindus, through fortified colonies on strategic locations for causing ultimate demographic changes in Muslim majority Valley. Then, there is an allocation of huge land for Hindu Shrine at Amarnath. Besides, there are plans for the establishment of Sanik (soldiers) colonies for the retired Army and BSF officers and men. Three, the introduction of the Geospatial bill, the consolidation phase through a broad coverage.

These measures would enable India to completely change the demography of the Jammu and Kashmir state, further do away with Article 370 of Indian Constitution and finally integration of the disputed state into Indian Union. There has been hardly any protest against these Indian developments in IOK from Government of Pakistan or diplomatic circle. Surprisingly, the Kashmiri leadership has not been very forthcoming on these developments. This insensitivity on the part of Kashmiris and Pakistan has further encouraged the India to implement its long-standing agenda of absorbing the Kashmir into India. The question arises, what would be Pakistani response, once India demands AJK and GB after incorporation of Indian occupied Kashmir into Indian Union. After all, Kashmir was an entity and Indian claims have been over entire Jammu and Kashmir.

— The writer is International Relations analyst based in Islamabad.

Source:<http://pakobserver.net/2016/06/03/kashmir-and-normalisation-process/>

‘India is Widening Spectrum of Conflict’

ISLAMABAD: A think-tank specialising in defence and strategic stability affairs on Wednesday said that India was widening the spectrum of conflict and that Pakistan’s response was being constrained by poor governance.

While referring to Indian attempts to disturb Pakistan’s sub-conventional stability by sponsoring terrorism in the country, President of Strategic Vision Institute (SVI) Dr Zafar Iqbal Cheema said that India was expanding the spectrum of conflict in Pakistan.

Mr Cheema was talking at the conclusion of a three-day seminar on ‘National Security, Deterrence and Regional Stability in South Asia’ on Wednesday,

“Pakistan is militarily well equipped to maintain an adequate conventional and nuclear deterrence equilibrium vis-à-vis India. There are no major worries in military or nuclear realm as far as Pakistan’s preparedness is concerned for dealing with threats from India,” Dr Cheema said.

However, he expressed his fears that with fresh political and diplomatic challenges, weak governance would hinder adequate response.

“There is a consensus that the country is suffering from poor governance which does not enable us to deal with non-military challenges to national security,” he said.

He said that based on the proceedings of the seminar, SVI calls for urgent remedial measures. “India is trying to contain and squeeze Pakistan in terms of its foreign relations, economy and security,” Dr Cheema said.

A number of other defence experts, academicians, policy analysts and retired senior officials also spoke at the seminar.

Dr Zafar Nawaz Jaspal of Quaid-e-Azam University also expressed the concern that India was focused on encircling Pakistan. He said Modi’s recent visits to Saudi Arabia, Iran, Afghanistan and upcoming trips to Qatar and US indicate the Indian government’s policy direction and priorities.

Published in Dawn, June 2nd, 2016

Source:<http://www.dawn.com/news/1262186/india-is-widening-spectrum-of-conflict>

America and Muslim World Politics | Shahid Javed Burki

In what came to be called the “Obama Doctrine”, the American president wanted to keep his country out of the business of nation-building. This was to be the case in particular with the politically backward Muslim world. This doctrine was diametrically opposed to the policy preferences of President George W Bush, Obama’s immediate predecessor. Bush followed a two-step approach: military action to overthrow an existing political order dominated by a narrow and self-serving elite followed by the quick introduction of liberal political institutions. He believed that his military interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq would create an environment that would eventually lead to the establishment of liberal democratic institutions in these countries. This was a highly naive belief against which a number of American scholars had argued at length. To take just two examples: the works of Fareed Zakaria and Francis Fukuyama. In his book, *The Future of Freedom*, the former wrote as follows: “For people in the West, democracy means ‘liberal democracy’: a political system marked not only by free and fair elections but also by the rule of law, separation of powers, and protection of basic liberties of speech, assembly, religion, and property. But the bundle of freedoms — what might be termed ‘constitutional liberalism’ — has nothing intrinsically to do with democracy and the two have not always gone together, even in the West.” Fukuyama produced a two-volume work to indicate how democratic institutions have developed and how they can fail if not properly tended. The Bush belief that regime change by the use of force would make the Muslim world suddenly democratic was not supported by experience and academic thought. In fact, his Afghanistan and Iraq interventions created more chaos than political order.

It was also a fault to treat the Muslim world as a homogenous stretch of land defined by the prevalence of one religion. The American intervention in Iraq was to demonstrate that sectarian differences once released from the discipline imposed by an authoritarian regime produced political and social chaos that led to the rise of the Islamic State.

Also the influence of tribalism on the political cultures of many parts of the Muslim world went under-appreciated by the “interventionists” in the West — in the US and Britain in particular. These two countries were to partner in the adventures in Afghanistan and Iraq. It was surprising that the then British prime minister Tony Blair became a strong advocate of the Bush approach towards the Muslim world. As Christina Lamb suggests in her long study of her country’s involvement in Afghanistan, the US should draw some lessons from Britain’s failed attempts to bring Afghanistan under its control. Blair’s enthusiastic participation in Bush’s war ignored these lessons. “When Britons look back on the first and second Anglo-Afghan wars of the 19th century, they see

mostly graveyards. In 1963, the British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan declared, ‘Rule No. 1 in politics: Never invade Afghanistan,’” writes Lamb.

While staying out of the Muslim world’s politics will most probably survive as the policy preference for the US in the post-Obama period, Washington will need to keep a close watch on what happens in societies that populate these regions. Given Pakistan’s geographical position, it could influence the political, social, economic and political progress of Muslim societies.

In this context, we need to identify the circumstances that drew Pakistan close to the conservative societies of the Arabian Peninsula and then analyse how the religious movement identified by some as ‘radical Islam’ is likely to shape the evolution of the global system. Pakistan was drawn to the Arab monarchies — in particular to Saudi Arabia — for reasons that included the ‘Muslimisation’ of the country as a result of the 1947 exchange of population; the migration of millions of young men to the Arabian Peninsula after the oil boom of the mid-1970s and how and why they succumbed to the charm of a radical interpretation of religion; the strong predisposition towards orthodox Islam on the part of President Ziaul Haq; and the need for external finance to keep the economy from collapsing.

It is on this strong link between Pakistan and Saudi Arabia that I rest my case for a strong association between Pakistan and the US. Pakistan’s robust political development could serve as a model for Saudi Arabia and other politically backward Arab states. Pakistan is now the second largest Muslim country in the world. In the next few decades, it will become the largest Muslim nation and how it develops politically, socially and economically could profoundly influence the world. What is now needed is to help it become a test case and a model for the democratisation of Muslim politics.

Published in The Express Tribune, June 6th, 2016.

Source: <http://tribune.com.pk/story/1116846/america-muslim-world-politics/>

The Dream Of Durable Peace – OpEd | Nasurullah Brohi

The constant efforts for an enduring peace in Afghanistan essential for the long term and plausible peace for the people has always been a collective effort of the Afghan government and the international community. The chaos and the conflict in Afghanistan has tried to be overcome through a political process by engaging the Afghan Taliban and the government in a series of negotiations. Previously, the regional powers as well as the United States backed the peace talks with the Afghan Taliban. However, with the sudden revelation of Mullah Omar's death, the over-delayed peace process between the two parties once again have fuelled the persistent tension in the country and encouraged other militant groups to make their place.

Pakistan had mediated a few rounds of peace talks, but after the Mullah Omar's death the peace talks were halted.

Through a mediatory role Pakistan twice endeavored to engage the Afghan government and the Taliban in a process of peace talks. Further supported by China and the US, both parties were urged to reach at a consensus about a ceasefire and eventually engage in the confidence building measures (CBMs). However, the recent news of the killing of the Afghan Taliban's supreme leader has once again put the goal of bringing peace in Afghanistan on the stakes. Under the leadership of Mullah Mansoor, the peace talks between the two parties were obscure, but yet there was a ray of hope that could move forward. The demands of Mullah Mansoor for a complete withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan was considered as an obstruction point since the US and its allies could not agree to a complete withdrawal of the ISAF forces therefore, the drag-on policy was never allowed toward a successful peace process for Afghanistan.

Many pretend that the death of Mullah Mansoor may lead to temporary gains such as a division amongs different groups of the Taliban. However, the selection of Mullah Haibatullah and his declaration about following his predecessor's policies may seem difficult for bringing-up an option where the two sides find a face-saving option. Mullah Haibatullah was former chief justice and head of Ulema Council of Taliban, therefore, his word and fatwa is largely acknowledged — yet many still believe that his attitude unlike to Mullah Akhter Mansoor is amenable with the possibility to join the peace process to bring an end to the Afghan civil war.

The regional countries' role always holds a significant position while mediating the peace talks of Afghanistan. Since Pakistan has already played the mediator's role, therefore at the recent meeting of Afghan Ambassador Dr. Hazrat Omar Zakhilwal with

Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's aide Sartaj Aziz in Islamabad the main focus remained about the prospects of the Afghan peace process after the death of Taliban leader Mullah Akhtar Mansour and the assumption of leadership by Mullah Haibatullah.

Nevertheless, Pakistan considers the killing of Mullah Mansoor a major reason that scuttled the peace efforts particularly at the time when all the parties, along with China and the US, have further added to the complexities of the Afghan conflict and only undermines the peace process. The implications are already manifold and the killing of Mullah Akhter Mansoor badly affects the efforts of those seeking a possible political solution essential to ending the enduring turmoil in the war-torn country. All the regional countries and the US advocate a politically negotiated settlement as most viable option that could compel the two sides to move forward on the issue of Afghan peace and stability.

Source:<http://www.eurasiareview.com/06062016-the-dream-of-durable-peace-oped/>

What You Need to Know About the Nuclear Suppliers Group

The Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) is a 48-nation club committed to limiting nuclear arms proliferation by overseeing the export, re-transfer and protection of sensitive materials that could foster nuclear weapons development.

It was formed in 1974 following the India's nuclear test, which demonstrated that nuclear technology transferred for peaceful purposes could be used to build nuclear weapons.

Guidelines for the group were published in 1978 by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which were to be applied to nuclear transfers for peaceful purposes to help ensure that such transfers would not fall victim to a harmful nuclear fuel cycle or be used in nuclear explosive activities.

The aim of the NSG Guidelines is to ensure that nuclear trade for peaceful purposes does not pave way to the proliferation of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, and that international trade and cooperation in the nuclear field is not hindered unjustly in the process.

The NSG Guidelines facilitate the development of trade in this area by providing the means whereby obligations to facilitate peaceful nuclear cooperation can be implemented in a manner consistent with international nuclear non-proliferation norms.

In 1992, the NSG established guidelines for transfers of nuclear-related dual-use equipment, material and technology (items which have both nuclear and non-nuclear applications), which could make a significant contribution to unprotected nuclear fuel cycle or nuclear explosive activity.

Over the course of these years, the NSG has made numerous legislative reforms such as adopting a "catch-all" mechanism in the NSG guidelines, to provide a national legal basis to control the export of nuclear related items that are not on the control lists.

How does the NSG work?

When considering a new nation to be admitted into the group, the NSG has certain prerequisites countries have to meet.

The country should have the ability to supply items, including items in transit. The country should adhere to and act in accordance with the guidelines of the group.

The nation needs to also implement a legally based domestic export control system which gives authorisation to the commitment to act in accordance with the guidelines.

Adherence to one or more of the NPT (Non-Proliferation Treaty), the Treaties of Pelindaba, Rarotonga, Tlatelolco, Bangkok, Semipalatinsk or an equivalent international nuclear non-proliferation agreement, and full compliance with the obligations of such agreement(s).

They also have to pledge their support of international efforts towards non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of their delivery vehicles.

Upon admittance of a potential member, the NSG has to vote on it first.

All members have to vote in favour; only a consensus can allow the admission of another nation, if any member votes against inclusion of a new country, the motion will not go through.

Why it's important for countries involved

Pakistan applied for the membership of the Nuclear Suppliers Group on May 20, saying its inclusion would help further non-proliferation objectives.

Pakistan has formally asked the US administration and the Congress to support its application for joining the NSG after it submitted an official application in Vienna, expressing its desires to join the group on solid grounds of technical experience, capability and well-established commitment to nuclear safety.

However, both US administration and Congress look unwilling to lend their support for Pakistan's cause.

Pakistan urges that its inclusion in the 48-nation club is in the interest of nuclear trading countries, as it will further promote NSG non-proliferation objectives by the inclusion of a state with nuclear supply capabilities and its adherence to the NSG Guidelines.

Pakistan's request for membership of the group came after India's application for membership. If admitted, India would be part of the decision mechanism, and would have say in decisions of nuclear commerce and will eventually have the ability to sell equipment.

Pakistan argues that in the wake of India gaining easy access to fissile material and technology for its civilian nuclear programme, it would have that much more material for its military nuclear programme.

“Pakistan has the expertise, manpower, infrastructure and the ability to supply NSG controlled items, goods and services for a full range of nuclear applications for peaceful uses,” said Tasnim Aslam, head of the UN desk at the Foreign Office. India gaining NSG membership will eventually lead to a nuclear arms race.

If India gains membership it will be the only participating country that has not signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, a requirement for being part of the NSG.

Many countries that initially opposed its entry, such as Australia, have changed stance; Mexico and Switzerland are the latest to voice support.

Since 2010, the US administration has been actively supporting India’s efforts. It has repeatedly given exemptions to India and recently Obama officially endorsed India’s application to join the group.

Only one participating country stands in between India’s inclusion into the NSG—China. Until China accepts India’s entry, there is no hope of membership since the decision has to be a consensus among all active members.

China argues admission in the group should be norm based, and rules applied to give India membership should also apply to all new entrants.

Can Hillary Clinton beat Donald Trump? | Marwan Bishara

I rushed to finish Hillary Clinton's book, *Hard Choices*, this week, expecting her to clinch the Democratic Party nomination for president. She did, but I am evermore ambivalent about her and her chances of winning.

Many factors will prove decisive in the November elections, but Clinton continues to suffer from the same shortcomings that cost her the 2008 Democratic Party primaries.

This is particularly important because in the public mind, the contrast can't be starker between the same packaged Clinton and the unrestrained Republican nominee Donald Trump. She won the Democratic nomination by mastering the rules of the game; he won the Republican nomination by refusing to play by the traditional rules of the game.

But come November, Clinton could still lose the general elections even though she's running against a populist candidate with "no policy knowledge or workable proposals", who managed to alienate so many Latinos, Muslims and African Americans.

Photoshopped candidacy

Hard Choices is a tough read not because it's a long and exhaustive balance sheet of her tenure as secretary of state, but rather because it is as self-congratulatory as it is self-explanatory.

She boasts of how her diplomatic intervention prevented "explosive confrontation"; how the team Obama-Clinton was seen as a "diplomatic version of the TV thriller, *Starsky and Hutch*"; and how she succeeded in lobbying for General Electric to gain multibillion-dollar contracts in Algeria. But there's little or no serious admission of fault and failure and of lessons learned, and certainly no bold vision for America in the world.

READ MORE: [An introduction to Trumpology](#)

Since it was written with the intention of running again for president – clearly, not a "hard choice" – it's the kind of book that reveals less than it conceals; peddles instead of explaining. It confirms many of the doubts about Clinton's authenticity.

Like her book, Clinton's campaign also projects an image of a scripted and packaged candidacy that contrasts sharply with her Republican opponent.

Despite his ignorance, Donald Trump has been able to communicate freely, effectively and spontaneously with his base.

The contrast in their visions for America could not be any sharper, as this Washington Post graphic shows, but it mirrors America's own down-the-middle societal and political division.

What will tip the balance to either side is the contrast between their characters.

Likeability and trust

The Democratic Party primaries have exposed Clinton's failure to inspire or gain the trust of important segments of the voters, especially the young.

The Democratic Party primaries have exposed Clinton's failure to inspire or gain the trust of important segments of the voters, especially the young.

According to The New York Times: "Many in this newest generation of American voters say that they don't trust her, or that she represents a Washington disconnected from their struggles."

In order to overcome this deep-seated suspicion about her character, the Clinton-friendly newspaper recommends that Hillary release transcripts of her Wall Street speeches and acknowledge the State Department inspector's general claim: that using a private email server for official business was not allowed or encouraged, but she did it anyway, in a misguided effort to protect her privacy.

This might help Clinton regain some credibility among her detractors, Democrats and Independents. But it won't suffice to change her image.

Courage and inclusion

To win the elections, Clinton needs to show how Trump's politics of fear is cowardly and un-American: fear of Mexicans, Muslims, illegal immigrants; fear of declining America; and fear of a world that threatens, disrespects and takes advantage of America.

She says America is great and doesn't require a Trump to make it "great again". But to demonstrate that, she needs to embrace the better, more optimistic, aspects of the Obama legacy and incorporate many of the proposals advanced by Bernie Sanders, both domestically and internationally.

She needs to show how fairness, inclusion and diplomacy trump Trump's politics of hatred and exclusion, and why building bridges with the world is better than walling America in.

And she must show real empathy towards working people and struggling youth as they search for their rightful place in America's future, and revise her campaign platform accordingly.

Standing tall

If as the record shows, and bizarre as it may sound, Americans are more likely to elect a taller candidate, the 6ft 3in Trump will have an advantage as he towers over Clinton come pre-election handshakes and debates.

But the record also shows that in America being tall pales in comparison to standing tall. The question is: Will Clinton stand taller as she confronts her aggressive, misogynist rival?

Otherwise, the Democrats are bound to repeat their 2000 defeat, when Al Gore, Bill Clinton's vice president, lost to the macho Texan, George Bush. At the time, more than two million progressive and disillusioned voters went for the Green Party candidate, Ralph Nader.

In other words, Clinton must heed the voices of those who gave Sanders their support in Ohio and other battleground states if she's to avoid Gore's fate.

Marwan Bishara is the senior political analyst at Al Jazeera. Follow him on Facebook.

The views expressed in this article are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect Al Jazeera's editorial policy.

Source:<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2016/06/hillary-clinton-beat-donald-trump-160609075037015.html>

Russia-China-Pakistan Axis of Power

Once again Pakistan is reassessing its relations with America. Once again America has attacked the sovereignty of Pakistan.

Since our inception, the USA has been using Pakistan for its own interests and abandoning relations with us when they feel they do not need us. On the other hand, Pakistan is forced to put up with this manipulation and blackmail due to our need of monetary assistance, trade and to keep the USAID projects going smoothly in the country's health, energy and educational sectors.

The question is, how long will we allow ourselves to be used and manipulated by Americans? When will the slogan of Ayub's book "Friends Not Masters" be in practice to deal with the US?

America just refused to hand over F-16s to Pakistan on loan and also gave their consent to give membership of Nuclear Suppliers Group to India, but not Pakistan, to pressurise us to take noticeable steps against Haqqanis and to keep political instability intact with drone attacks in Pakistan. In response to that, China – an all weather friend – jumped in and vetoed the decision of America to provide NSG to India, condemned the incident of American drone strikes on Pakistani territory, the latest of which happened in May this year, and asked the world to respect Pakistan's sovereignty. China standing with Pakistan at the time of need is highly commendable.

Pakistan should reassess their foreign policy in creating alliances with countries. Pakistan needs to further strengthen its bilateral ties with China and Russia. Geographically, Russia and China are closer and the tripartite relations amongst the three countries will make them collectively stronger in front of any foreign power that tries to look at them with an evil eye.

China is already investing 46 billion dollars in Pakistan for the development of CPEC, which is going to be the real game changer for us and will have a domino effect on the overall market of Pakistan by encouraging other foreign private entities and governments to invest in the development of our country. In Sindh, Chinese language is being widely taught and Punjab government has also started up a program to send a group of students to China to live and learn Chinese language there. These efforts to

remove the language barrier, and the Pakistani students participating, will be directly involved in CPEC.

Due to the assurance of safety by the military (because of Zarb-e-Azb) and economic development in Pakistan, media perception of the country will change on a global level and tourism will automatically rise, unlike in Dubai, because of having a competitive edge of being already culturally and historically rich.

On the other hand, Pakistan's relations with Russia also require attention. CASA-1000 has just been signed and Russia is directly financing this mega-energy project of transmitting power generation from Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan to Pakistan. Moscow has also increased its military and technical cooperation with Islamabad recently. Talking about the cultural and literary activities, Russian government has honored Faiz with Lenin prize – a Soviet equivalent to Nobel Peace Prize, and called him “our poet” after his demise. Russian Culture center in Karachi, in 2010, staged Chekov's plays, whereas Pakistani and South Asian literature is also widely famous in Russia.

In Russian War Games 2015, Pakistan actively participated side-by-side China and other 5 countries. Pakistan can provide cotton and agricultural support to Russia and in return can be benefited with Russian ammunition and machinery. Once our relations with Russia improve, ties with Iran will also be improved and so our issues of oil and gas will be resolved. Following this format, more positive relationships with Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Kyrgyzstan will be built, leading to a strong regional coalition.

Why does Pakistan have to reach across the world to America, and in return, only be used by them? Pakistan needs to work on their relations with Russia as they are doing with China. This way our dependency on America will be lessened to almost none. Then America, if they want, can be our friends but should not be allowed to be our masters in any case whatsoever. Otherwise, the US will be doing whatever they feel is in their own interests and we would always be “strongly protesting and condemning” their attacks on the sovereignty of Pakistan.

Source:<http://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2016/06/14/comment/a-whole-new-world/>

Why Does It Look Like The U.S. Is Rescuing ISIS? | Rep. Ron Paul

The ongoing war in Syria may see some escalation soon. A report that 51 State Dept. employees (out of 13,000 foreign service officers) signed a memo urging President Obama to change his focus in Syria from fighting ISIS to fighting the secular Assad government has caused quite a stir. The fact that such a small number of individuals could make this a noteworthy story shows that propaganda continues to reign supreme. It makes no sense that U.S. can weaken ISIS by attacking the main opponent of ISIS (i.e., Assad).

We're constantly smothered in rhetoric about how America "must stop ISIS." Yet, ISIS has been on the ropes, and in trouble. The group has been on the run, and what does the U.S. want to do? They want to hurry up and bomb Assad, which they've been trying to do for five years now.

There's agitation in the Congress right now to give the authority to Obama to do something that he 'seems' to be reluctant to do. If we would have had an aggressive neocon as a president, Congress wouldn't have mattered. He would have went ahead with the bombings by now.

I think we're really playing with fire here. Is it really worth the risk to stir up a war with Russia? It makes no difference to Americans whether or not Assad remain in power in Syria. It has nothing to do with our freedoms or economy. Yet the rhetoric keeps building nonetheless.

An American in Orlando lost his mind and shot 50 people dead, and the response is to go across the world and attack Assad in Syria? Such illogic reminds me of the U.S. attacking Iraq after 9/11. It made no sense then (or now) and it accomplished nothing but the creation of chaos (and ironically) ISIS itself!

Are we witnessing opportunism once again?

If we want to be safer and enjoy more liberties, we much change our foreign policy. We have to mind our own business, have a strong national defense, and practice non-intervention abroad with other nations. That idea is much better than the nonsense coming from the State Department and the government at large.

The original source of this article is Ron Paul Institute

Source:<http://www.globalresearch.ca/why-does-it-look-like-the-u-s-is-rescuing-isis/5532480>

Britain Leaves the EU | Editorial

The referendum held in the UK on June 23 has produced what is reasonably described as a seismic result. There was a 73 per cent turnout and by dawn on June 24, there was a clear majority of votes to leave. Shortly before 5am, the decision taken in 1975 to join the European Union (EU) was reversed and the UK entered uncharted territory. A local result is going to have a global impact, and unravelling a 43-year relationship is going to take at least another two years according to the majority of pundits.

Nothing is going to happen immediately. Trade and the movement of people will continue uninterrupted, but the political and social fabric of the UK comes under a tension unlike anything experienced before. With the vote almost equally divided, a glance at the map reveals that it was England that chose to leave the EU, Scotland decided to stay as did Northern Ireland, and Wales came somewhere between the two but was far from united in the desire to leave and Prime Minister David Cameron swiftly fell on his sword. London wanted to stay, the heart of the political and financial establishment, and the UK is more disunited than at any other time in its recent history. It is too early to say in any detail what may be the consequences of this event, but the pound sterling dropped like a stone in the hours after the result, and by noon the GB pound was worth Rs144, down almost Rs10 in the space of 24 hours. Immigration — from everywhere — was the cornerstone of much of the acrimonious debate that surrounded the referendum. The UK has got progressively harder to enter for migrants, both voluntary and involuntary, a situation that is only going to get worse. Travel restrictions between the UK and EU countries are now likely, free movement no longer possible. Few political events of recent times will have the global impact that the success of the Brexit campaign is going to have on the rest of the world. The adage ‘Be careful what you wish for’ is rarely more apt.

Published in The Express Tribune, June 25th, 2016.

Source:<http://tribune.com.pk/story/1129639/britain-leaves-eu/>