

Vacillation between Soft and Hard Balancing: China-Pakistan versus Indo-US Strategies

Dr Muhammad Zubair Iqbal* and Dr Musarat Amin**

Abstract

State systems have undergone some drastic changes for the last few decades largely because of the information revolution and the concept of Westphalia state sovereignty (1648) and state-centric paradigm is withering away. Additionally, globalization has changed the landscape of international politics in which new non-state actors are emerging more powerful where they could easily threaten state sovereignty and security¹. State is vying for its identity in a globalized world and advanced democracies are getting borderless (European Community) One factor that has remained persistent and perpetual, despite ongoing regionalism and surge towards globalization, is the national interest.² As long as the national interest continues to be a supreme priority for states, realist paradigm would remain the dominating theory in international relations. For the accomplishment of national interest, states tend to remain engaged in balancing strategies either by acquiring Weapons of Mass Destructions (WMDs) or conventional military build-ups. Within this context, this paper attempts to see China-Pakistan strategic partnership vis-à-vis Indo-US strategic cooperation. It also aims to explore whether both the interactions are providing a balancing influence in the region. This paper also divulges multiple strategies of 'Hard Balancing' between India and Pakistan which seems to maintain stability in the region.

Key Words: State Sovereignty, State Identity, China-Pakistan Strategic Partnership, Indo-US Strategic Cooperation, Balance of Power.

*The author is Associate Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Bahria University ,Islamabad.

**The author is Assistant Professor , Department of Defence and Diplomatic Studies, Fatima Jinnah University ,Rawalpindi.

¹S. D. Krasner ,“Sharing Sovereignty: New Institutions for Collapsed and Failing States,” *International Security*,29(2) (2004): 85.

²David Jablonsky,“National Power,”*Parameters* 27, no. 1 (1997): 34-54.

Introduction

In international politics, states carve out balancing strategies because of two simple reasons:³ First, they want to prevent the rise of a hegemon, second, they want to prevent the rise of an inimical state to a predominant position where it could pose any significant threat to its security and survival. States follow either soft balancing or hard balancing to accomplish this very objective.⁴ Considering the intricate dynamics of South Asian politics, where both India and Pakistan are proactively engaged in hard balancing strategies to advance their respective national interest, risk of armed clash is always imminent. India enjoys superiority over Pakistan in conventional military strength, which is supplemented by its strategic partnership with the US. Continuous huge sales of modern and sophisticated American weapons to India invigorate Indian military power, which may adversely affect the already fragile regional balance of power. Consequently, this imbalance in military prowess of both the countries may lead both nuclear rivals to brinkmanship.

In this backdrop, Pakistan-China relations appear to follow the path of balancing strategy against Indo-US strategic partnership. As Afridi and Bajoria argue “Beijing clearly sought to build up Pakistan to keep India off balance.”⁵ Despite the fact that the US lashed sanctions on Pakistan, because of the latter’s nuclear pathway, China has continued its military support to Pakistan which is an example of their sustained strategic ties. Sino-Pakistan joint collaboration now includes; joint military exercises, personnel training, intelligence cooperation and joint counter-terrorism efforts. Pakistan has also made headway in nukes development — with the help of Chinese counterparts — and in hi-tech procurements from the latter like short-range and medium-range ballistic missiles.⁶ In April, 2015, three weeks before the Chinese President Xi Jinping’s visit to Pakistan, Prime Minister of Pakistan Nawaz Sharif

³R Gilpin and J. M. Gilpin, *The Political Economy of International Relations*, vol. 8 (Princeton: Princeton University Press):5.

⁴R. A. Pape, “Soft Balancing against the United States,” *International Security*, 30(1) (2005): 7.

⁵J. Afridi, and J. Bajoria, ” “China-Pakistan Relations,” *Council on Foreign Relations* (2010), 6.

⁶Ibid.

approved a deal of purchasing eight submarines from China worth US \$ 5 billion.⁷ With this deal, it is expected that “Pakistan Navy will gain a competitive advantage in their underwater fighting capability.”⁸

China not only supplied weaponry to Pakistan, it has also contributed to enable Pakistan to develop conventional arms indigenously. Al-Khalid tank, JF-17 Thunder fighter Jets and the development of Hatf, Shaheen and Ghauri long range ballistic missiles, are few examples of Sino-Pakistan joint production. They seem to help maintain balance of power and preserve peace and stability in the region. Another milestone in non-conventional security is China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), which is expected to extend Sino-Pakistan strategic influence beyond South Asia to Middle East and Central Asia.

Pakistan’s relationship with Washington is about seven decades old and it also had many ups and downs over the course of history. Washington’s military aid to Pakistan was halted because of Indo-Pakistan war and later, whatever was supplied, was used in first and second Afghan wars⁹. Pakistan also emerged as a Non-NATO ally of the US in the wake of war against terrorism but that did not make much difference with the former, as it did not have any real privileges. Despite convergence of interest, Washington and Islamabad could not enjoy bonhomie because of deep-rooted mistrust.¹⁰ Pakistan needed a durable strategic partner to deal with Indian threat and, therefore, Beijing was a rational choice for Pakistan.

Theoretical Perspective

States adopt balancing strategy to prevent the rise of a “hegemon” and if this strategy works, it is called ‘balance of power’. As Kenneth

⁷“Beijing Eyes Bigger Arms Exports after Pakistan Deal,” *South China Morning Post*, April 26, 2015, <http://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy-defence/article/1776522/beijing-eyes-bigger-arms-exports-experts-say>

⁸Ibid.

⁹Bruce Riedel, “Pakistan and terror: The eye of the storm,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 618, no. 1 (2008): 35.

¹⁰Giacomo Chiozza, *Anti-Americanism and the American world order* (JHU Press, 2010).

Waltz has propounded that the basic purpose of balance of power is to stop an actor from reaching a predominant position where it could endanger interest of other states¹¹. States may follow two possible courses of action to reach balancing position i.e. ‘Hard Balancing’ and ‘Soft Balancing’. Hard balancing is often adopted by the states who are engaged in intense rivalry with other states.¹² Aggrandizement of military capability and making alliances with other friendly states to reach power parity is a modus operandi of ‘Hard Balancing.’ Traditional realists and neo-realists often prefer hard balancing among states.¹³ On the other hand, ‘Soft Balancing’ involves tacit tactics of formal alliances. This strategy is generally adopted between the states that develop entente to balance a rising power or threatening state. Soft Balancing usually involves limited military build-up, military exercises and collaboration at regional or international institutions. There are fair chances that Soft Balancing may turn into Hard Balancing if competition between dyads becomes intense or a powerful state undermines security of other states.¹⁴ Pakistan is engaged in both internal and external balancing strategies, though Hard Balancing against India is more noticeable than Soft Balancing.¹⁵ However, in case of Sino-Pakistan security partnership and Indo-US strategic alliance, both types of balancing is pursued by both sides. Pakistan seeks to balance Indian military might and India manoeuvres counter-balancing of China by making alliances and modernizing its military.

Despite reaching nuclear parity with India, Pakistan still lags behind in missile technology and conventional weapons. If missile technology is *sine qua non* for maintaining minimum credible nuclear deterrence, the conventional weapons are equally crucial for any country, particularly to

¹¹R. Jervis, “Cooperation under the Security Dilemma,” *World Politics* 30(02) (1978): 167.

¹²J. S. Levy R Thompson, *Causes of War* (John Wiley & Sons),10.

¹³F. Zakaria, “Realism and Domestic Politics: A Review Essay,” *International Security*, vol.17 (1), (1992): 177-198.

¹⁴P. M. Morgan, “American Grand Strategy and the US–ROK Alliance,” *Pacific Focus*, 24(1), (2009): 3.

¹⁵Chen Zhimin, “Soft Balancing and Reciprocal Engagement: International Structures and China’s Foreign Policy Choices,” in *China’s Reform and International Political Economy*, ed. David Zweig and Chen Zhimin (London: Routledge, 2007), 19.

combat non-state actors. There is an urgent need to modernize and update Pakistan's conventional warfare capability as country is fighting a war against terrorism and there are multiple challenges to the state.

Due to Pakistan's traditional dependence on American weaponry, the former could not excel in indigenous arms industry. Though Pakistan had established Pakistan Ordnance Factories (POF) in early 1950s,¹⁶ it has notable capacity to compete with the growing Indian military might. However, now Pakistan seems to have reached a sufficient level of indigenous arms where it has started producing JF-17 Thunder fighter jets, Mushak and Super Mushak aircrafts, Al Khalid and Al Zarrar tanks produced on various locations throughout Pakistan¹⁷.

The military and economic aid coming from the US is considered to have been used largely in the fight against terrorists and militants.¹⁸ The US kept Pakistan highly dependent on its arms and even imposed arms embargoes. While, China, being faithful ally and friendly neighbour, always supported Pakistan to strengthen its security against internal and external threats. According to Akram Zaki, "In ideological terms, China wants peace and stability in South Asia, but that is only possible if the imbalance created by the US extraordinary support to India is to some extent corrected."¹⁹ For Zaki, China's strategic philosophy was to make Pakistan self-sufficient in the production of defence equipment. On the other hand, it is argued "China has realized that the stability of Pakistan is in supreme national interest of China. If Pakistan goes unstable it may certainly undermine Chinese stakes in South Asia. India enjoys greater support from Russia and the Western countries while Pakistan has strong support of China".²⁰

Countering India's Conventional Military Superiority

In response to growing modernization of Indian military machinery, Pakistan is also making an effort to update its military to match the

¹⁶<http://www.pof.gov.pk/>

¹⁷<http://www.dawn.com/news/1151174>.

¹⁸S. G. Jones, "Pakistan's Dangerous Game," *Survival*, 49(1), 17

¹⁹M. A. Zaki, "The Evolution in Global Power Balance and Pak-China Relations." *Policy Perspectives*, 11(2).

²⁰China Helps Pakistan, see, <http://www.onlinenews.com.pk/details.php?id=180002>

Indian might. Compared to conventional weapons, Pakistan has put a great deal of effort into the nuclear and missile technology which can offer some credible deterrence against potential threats. China stands as Pakistan's principal arms supplier,²¹ though Pakistan's purchases are pocket-sized in comparison to what India has bought, therefore, the former cannot match the latter's conventional weaponry. It might be called as "imbalance" in conventional forces as India enjoys superiority in conventional weaponry. India views itself as a rising regional player, which appears to look around for potential partners and enemies, and considers a potent military power as a crucial factor in this process. Conversely, Pakistan is vying to catch up with India to deter any threat from it. This complex triangular relationship may be defined as 'elusive' in strategic terms between New Delhi and Islamabad. Pakistan cannot match India's military power in terms of 'man-for-man' or 'gun-for-gun' but Pakistan's huge investment in technological weapons and modernization of its armed forces is to present effective challenge to enemy.²²

India's conventional military superiority over Pakistan largely owes to its hike in defence expenditure over the past three decades. Its defence expenditure stands six to seven times more than that of Pakistan²³. Between 1990 and 2003 Indian ability to combat offensively has outpaced Pakistan remarkably with 3:1 high performance aircraft numerical advantage. Other technological advancements in warfare technology like, wide-area communications and reconnaissance are much better than Pakistan's. Asymmetry of economic resources and limited choices to acquire modern technology has slackened conventional modernization of Pakistan's armed forces. This imbalance in conventional weaponry raises strong concerns about the outbreak of another conventional war between the two countries or it may lead to Brinkmanship. Keeping Indian aggressive policies in mind, there is a possibility of Indian pre-emptive air campaign against Pakistan if

²¹T. V. Paul, "Chinese-Pakistani nuclear/missile ties and balance of power politics," *The Nonproliferation Review* 10(2): 21-29.

²²Jonathan Marcus, "India-Pakistan Military Balance," http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/1735912.stm.

²³Malcolm Knight, Norman Loayza, and Delano Villanueva, "The Peace Dividend: Military Spending Cuts and Economic Growth," *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* No. (1577).

Pakistan's conventional and nuclear power is sufficiently incapable of deterring Indian conventional superiority. In such circumstances, nuclear stability seems flimsy. Since 1960s India's defence establishment has carved out a policy to deal with Pakistan and powerful China simultaneously by declaring two front war strategies.²⁴

India-US Defence Cooperation

Historically, India and the US did not enjoy bonhomie in their mutual relationship but a recent convergence of their interests has brought them together into Indo-US strategic partnership. Indo-US cooperation in areas of economy and defence experienced an upthrust in the last fifteen years or so after the end of Cold War. US President Bill Clinton's visit to India in March 2000 further cemented the strategic ties. Bush administration ameliorated the mutual relationship furthermore and changed America's former stance towards China, categorizing China as 'Strategic Competitor' rather than a 'Strategic Partner'.²⁵ US Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage visited India in May, 2001 to inform his counterparts about President Bush's Strategic framework that included missile defence programme and terrorism.²⁶ India-US strategic cooperation grew further by signing General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA) in January 2002, which was an impediment in defence cooperation. By signing GSOMIA India got greater access to dual use of technology which further expanded sale of US arms to India.²⁷

Building Indian Military Power

India clinched an arms deal with the US in April 2002 for acquiring Raytheon System AN/TPQ-37 (V) 3 Fire-finder artillery locating radar systems. Thereafter, a subsequent deal included GE F404-GE-F2J3

²⁴R. W. Jones, "Conventional Military Imbalance And Strategic Stability In South Asia," SASSU, Research Paper, no. 1 (March 2005) 4-9.

²⁵D. Shambaugh, "Sino-American Strategic Relations: From Partners To Competitors," *Survival*, 42(1): 97.
(Fort Leavenworth Kansas: Bibliobazar, 2012)

²⁷S. Ganguly, A. Scobell and B. Shoup, eds., *US-Indian Strategic Cooperation Into the 21st Century: More Than Words*. (London: Routledge, 2006),90.

engines and advanced avionics for India's indigenous LCA project²⁸. Furthermore, negotiations have been set in for the sale of P-3 Orion Naval reconnaissance planes to India. For updating and modernizing India's Special Forces, she bought military equipment in abundance. Indo-US strategic partnership is used as a tool to balance China and bring about global balance of power. Under Bush and then Obama Administration, both India and the US have been seeking "sustainable strategic partnership". Though India has evolved strategically cooperative relationship with China but is simultaneously careful about China's military modernization and its implications for regional security environs. The most important advancement in Indo-US strategic partnership came with "10-year Agreement" which further consolidated India-US defence ties. Under this agreement both the countries would extensively engage in joint production and cooperation on missile defence. This agreement would step up efforts to conduct joint military exercises and expand cooperation in peacekeeping operations to advance regional stability. This multifaceted cooperation includes "The 2006 Indo-US Framework for Maritime Security Cooperation" which underlines challenges of maritime threats, transnational offences, proliferation of nuclear weapons, environmental protection and natural calamities.²⁹

Impinging upon Indo-US strategic cooperation, President Obama defined it as a partnership of 21st century and a priority of the US Department of Defence.³⁰ The US declares India — a natural partner on the basis of shared interests and values to establish a stable and secure world. Moreover, the US is struggling hard to upgrade Indian defence capability and has emerged as reliable and transparent arms supplier to India, which is evident from the deep rooted security engagement. Since 2002, India has signed more than 20 Foreign Military Sales (FMS) cases for defence articles and services such as C-17 and C-130J aircraft, TPQ-37 radars, Self-Protection Suites (SPS) for VVIP aircraft, specialized

²⁸K. Alan Kronstadt, "India-US Relations," *Library Of Congress Washington Dc Congressional Research Service*, 2009, 61.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 61-65.

³⁰Barack Obama, *National Security Strategy of the United States*, DIANE Publishing, 2010.

tactical equipment, Harpoon missiles, Sensor-Fused Weapons, and carrier flight and test pilot school training.³¹

In a short span of time, Foreign Military Sales (FMS) programme has reached a total value of approximately [US]\$6billion which is likely to rise in future.³² C-130Js were delivered to India at the beginning of February, 2011 which have been successfully employed to provide critical humanitarian assistance. Additionally, US Air Force (USAF) imparted training to more than 100 Indian Air Force personnel. After concluding C-17 pact with US, India would establish second largest fleet of C-17 in the world. Indian navy also received updated technological weaponry to furnish its warfare skills. Indian navy has received an upswing by adding USS Trenton and INS Jalashwa which was transferred in 2007.

In addition, educational exchange programmes of military staff has increased dramatically. India has over 50 defence laboratories and the network is further expanded by implementing a letter of agreement signed in 2011, which would further expand areas of joint research and acquisition of technology. Mutual cooperation also includes cooperation in power and energy, micro-aerial vehicles, energetic and human development sectors. If a comparison is drawn between Indo-US defence cooperation with other countries for the last five years, it is more robust and rigorous. The US government is committed to ramp up this defence cooperation with India by increasing people-to-people contacts, military-to-military ties and implementing shared agreements on security, counter-terrorism and arms productions.³³

The US and Indian navies participated in five-nation joint exercises held in September 2007 in the Bay of Bengal. Navies of India, United States, Australia, Singapore and Japan conducted these exercises and used 25 ships, more than 20,000 personnel, and 150 aircraft. The primary

³¹ “Report to the Congress on US-India Security Cooperation,” US Department of Defence, November 2011, 1-6, 2011.,
http://www.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/20111101_NDAA_Report_on_US_India_Security_Cooperation.pdf

³²<http://www.dsca.mil/programs/foreign-military-sales-fms>

³³ “Report to the Congress on US-India Security Cooperation,” Department of Defence, 5.

objective of those military exercises was to train against antisubmarine warfare. Other objectives involve counter-piracy and disaster response. However, these military exercises evoked strong criticism from Beijing believing that the multilateral venture was aimed at them.³⁴ The India-US military engagement has conducted 56 cooperative events in fiscal year 2011. India is conducting more military exercises with the US than any other country. All the above mentioned events and nature of joint ventures have led to Washington's expectations from India to play a significant role regionally and globally. As the former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stated "US is making a strategic bet on India's future — that India's greater role on the world stage will enhance peace and security". Defence Secretary Leon Panetta characterized India as a "linchpin" for "rebalancing" towards Asia Pacific as part of new defence strategy of the US.³⁵

Indian Air Force (IAF) has shown considerable superiority over Pakistan's Air Force but China's Air-power is a challenge for her. Indian military strategists are planning to increase Indian Air Force's expeditionary capability so that it can extend power from the Red Sea to Strait of Malacca. Indian Air force is also preparing to achieve a valor to combat Pakistan and China simultaneously but to accomplish this challenge they are trying to replace Old platforms such as Mig-21, Mig-23, and Mig-27.³⁶

India's huge purchase of weapons from the US during the last decade has a considerable impact on modernization of Indian military. India's arms purchases worth US \$4.8 billion include trainers, amphibious ships, maritime-patrol aircraft and ten C-17, transport aircraft. Another purchase of six C-130, costing another billion dollars. India's attention to modernize her Air force in comparison to other competitors led it to buy 126 new modern jet fighter worth US \$20 billion from France, which annoyed Whitehouse. In addition, India is about to buy huge cache of

³⁴S. Latif, Lombardo N, "U.S.-India Defence Trade, Opportunities for Deepening the Partnership," *CSIS Report*, (2012), http://csis.org/files/publication/120703_Latif_USIndiaDefense_Web.pdf
Toward Asia," Library Of Congress Washington Dc Congressional Research Service, 2012.

³⁶S. Latif, N.Lombardo "U.S.-India Defence Trade, Opportunities for Deepening the Partnership," 9.

arms which includes 22 AH-64D Apache Longbow attack helicopters, more than 1300 Hellfire missiles and advanced radar systems. This deal would provide India a battle-tested system which is effectively used by the US, United Kingdom and Israeli Forces.³⁷

India has developed missile defence to respond to any nuclear attack through ballistic missiles. She has developed long-range ballistic missiles, though at present, Indian missiles can reach Beijing. The following table shows India’s missiles developed with technical support from the US, Russia and other great powers.

Table No. 1

India’s Ballistic Missile Arsenal³⁸

Prithvi-1	Operational	150 km	Liquid
Prithvi-2	Operational	250 km	Liquid
Prithvi-3	Development	350 km	Solid
Dhanush	Testing	350 km	Liquid
Sagarika/K-15 (SLBM)	Testing	700 km	Solid
Agni-I	Operational	700 km	Solid
Agni-II	Operational	2,000 km	Solid
Agni-IV	Tested	4,000 km	Solid
Agni-V	Testing	5,000+ km	Solid
Agni-VI	Development	8,000-10,000 km	Solid
K-4	Testing	3,000 km	Solid
K-5 (SLBM)	Rumored	5,000 km	Solid
	Development		

Source: <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/missiles>

The “Agni-V” missile which was tested in 2009, can reach deep into China and is said to be very crucial achievement for “Indian missiles

³⁷Bruce Riedel, “A Breakthrough in U.S.-Indian Relations?,” *The National Interest*, August 29, 2012, <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/breakthrough-us-indian-relations-7392> Asia,”5-9.

defence system”³⁹. Much of India’s nuclear strategy focuses on improving delivery vehicles. India is aiming to complete a “nuclear triad,” a system that would allow nuclear weapons to be delivered from air, land and sea. India’s nuclear powered submarine named “Arihant” was tested in 2009 but there are no formal reports of making it operational. Indian fighter jets are another substitute to launch nuclear weapons but it is not clear whether Jaguar IS/IB, Mirage 200-H and Sukhoi-30 MKI models are capable of carrying nuclear payloads. According to the security expert, Karnad, “the tests had impact on Pakistan as. New Delhi’s shorter-range ballistic missiles already cover Pakistani territory”.⁴⁰

Hard Balancing: Sino-Pakistan Defence Cooperation

In this age of nuclear weapons, conventional arms have lost their significance, however, they are still important to respond to intra-state or inter-state security threats. Military analysts speak of Military-Technical Revolution (MTR) that is gradually narrowing down difference between conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction. A number of new conventional weapons are of dual use. They can carry chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. Modern conventional weapons with more devastative capability and accuracy can annihilate on large scale.⁴¹

Historically, Pakistan has been dependent on weapons from the US and European countries but, after experiencing arms embargoes during wartimes with India, Pakistan realized it should achieve self-sufficiency or at least reduce dependence on unreliable partners. China proved a reliable partner for Pakistan and enabled the latter to produce weapons indigenously. Some of the productions are joint ventures between China and Pakistan in procurement of conventional arms.

³⁹Joshy M. Paul, “*Emerging Powers and Cooperative Security in Asia.*” S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Report No. 221, 2010.

⁴⁰M. Stancati, “India Fires a Message to China,” *Wall Street Journal* (April 20, 2012), <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303513404577352763499718738.html>

⁴¹A. J. Pierre, ed., *Cascade of arms: managing conventional weapons proliferation* (Brookings Institution Press, 1997), 2.

Al-Khalid Main Battle Tank

After realizing that internal balancing is more reliable than external balancing, Pakistan developed conventional military hardware indigenously. For example, AL-Khalid (the immortal) known as Main Battle Tank-2000 (MBT-2000) is Pakistani and Chinese version of a modern main battle tank which was developed during the 1990s by both the countries. The Al-Khalid was handed over to Pakistan army in 2001 and is part of Pakistan's main battle tank fleet. China deals with customers of MBT-2000 internationally. Many regional and international clients have shown their interest in their purchase. Ukraine is another partner in the production of Al-Khalid Tank.⁴² Its Ukrainian engine, 6TDF is almost the same engine used in T-80/84 Tanks. It is more sophisticated than other modern tanks with a maximum weight of 46 tons.

Pakistan defence production has risen to the level where it can export indigenously produced weapons and is likely to get double as Pakistan plans to earn surplus foreign exchange for national development. Pakistan is primarily focusing on main Battle Tanks, Al-Khalid and Al-Zarrar, APC Al-Saad, Al-Muhafiz security vehicles, the Baktar Shikan anti-Tank guided missiles, Super Mushshak, K-8 trainer aircraft, missile boats, small arms and wide range of artillery.⁴³ Bangladesh and Saudi Arabia also showed interest in Al-Khalid Tanks. Saudi government showed their interest to buy 150 Al-Khalid tanks costing \$600 million.⁴⁴ Currently, in the global market Al-Khalid Tank is considered among the most competent Tanks.⁴⁵ Al-Khalid is an equalizer to India's Main Battle Tanks Arjun and T-90.

⁴²Rodney W Jones, "Force Modernization Trends-India and Pakistan," (paper presented at the APCSS Conference on Conventional Arms APCSS Conference on Conventional Arms Rivalry in Asia Rivalry in Asia – Pacific Region Pacific Region, October 23 -25, 2001) : 23-25.

⁴³C. Lovelock, "*Services Marketing, 7/e.*" Pearson Education India (2011): 205

⁴⁴Al-Khalid MBT-2000 /Type 2000 Main Battle Tank,
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/pakistan/mbt-2000.htm>

⁴⁵Ibid.

Joint Production of JF-17 Thunder Fighter Jets

To update Pakistan Air Force, Pakistan requested the US to provide F-16 fighter jets during 1980s. Despite reservation about Pakistan nuclear programme, the US government initially agreed to sell 111 F-16 aircraft to her. This decision was made due to Pakistan's proactive role in combating Soviet troops in Afghanistan. However, due to criticism on Pakistan's nuclear programme by the Congress, military and economic aid was cut-off under 'Presslar Amendment' in 1985. In October 1990, all types of military deals with Pakistan were terminated and as a result, Pakistan could not acquire F-16. Presslar's Amendment debilitated Pakistan air force in comparison to India. It was Clinton Administration that ratified 'Brown Amendment' to ease some pressures on Pakistan caused by Presslar Amendment. According to Brown Amendment, Pakistan was allowed to be granted limited military assistance for the purposes of counter-terrorism, peacekeeping, anti-narcotics operations. Additionally, President Clinton agreed to repay Pakistan US \$463.7 million which were paid for F-16.⁴⁶ Despite being a close ally, the US never gave military aid to strengthen Pakistan's defence against Indian aggression. It was China that bolstered Pakistan's defence by initiating production of fighter jets JF-17 which was seen as a substitute for F-16 fighter jets. JF-17 Thunder was handed over to Pakistan air force on Pakistan's Day March 23, 2007 which replaced Aircraft A-F of No.26 Squadron.⁴⁷ The discriminating approach of the US toward Pakistan strengthened Sino-Pakistan military partnership.

Chinese Help in Missile Technology

Pakistan reached strategic parity with India in May 1998 and then started to develop nuclear capable missiles. An effective delivery system to launch that nuclear device is important for credible deterrence. India already had acquired sufficient military and technological assistance from Russia, Israel, European countries and the US to develop weapons indigenously and gave India superiority in developing and deploying

⁴⁶“F-16(Military),Global Security,”

<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/pakistan/f-16.htm>

⁴⁷Information was retrieved from official site of Pakistan Aeronautical Complex Kamra, <http://www.pac.org.pk/jf17.html>

nuclear capable missiles. Pakistan sought technical assistance from China which transferred M-11 missiles and other missile related components to Pakistan. The Medium Range ballistic Missiles (MRBMs) of Pakistan were developed with extensive Chinese support.⁴⁸ The following table shows Pakistan's Ballistic missile arsenal in comparison to India.

Table No. 2

Pakistan's Ballistic Missiles Arsenal⁴⁹

System	Status	Range	Propellant
Hatf-1	Operational	80-100 km	Solid
Hatf-2 (Abdali)	Tested/Development	190 km	Solid
Hatf-3 (Ghaznavi)	Operational	300 km	Solid
Shaheen-1 (Hatf-4)	Operational	750 km	Solid
Ghauri-1 (Hatf-5)	Operational	1,300 km	Liquid
Ghauri-2 (Hatf-5a)	Tested/Development	2,300 km	Liquid
Shaheen-2 (Hatf-6)	Tested/Development	2,500 km	Solid
Ghauri-3	Development	3,000 km	Liquid

Source: <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/missiles>

Note: The above table is edited for clarity.

The Sino-Pakistan joint effort is aimed at maintaining peace and stability in the region, which can only be ensured by a balance of power between India and Pakistan. The post-nuclear era is believed to have maintained peace and stability, which can continue if balance of power in the region is not disturbed by any major power.

⁴⁸L. Gohmert, United States of America Congressional Record: Proceedings and debates of the 111th Congress. *First Session, House of Representatives, 155*, H7939:17890, (2009).

⁴⁹Pakistan's Ballistic Missile Arsenal, Fact Sheets and briefs, Arms Control Association, <http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/agni>

Non-Traditional Security Cooperation: Gwadar Port Project

The non-traditional security challenges in the 21st century include, environmental concerns, terrorism, mass migration, imbalance between growth and development, epidemics and lethal diseases (HIV, Ebola etc), proliferation of WMD.⁵⁰ There is another comprehensive concept of security which is amalgamation of both conventional and non-conventional.⁵¹ China-Pakistan strategic partnership covers both the dimensions of security. Pakistan's non-traditional security relationship follows the same pattern like traditional security. China is supporting Pakistan to achieve sustainable level of both types of Security. China's huge investment in Pakistan's strategic areas like Gwadar Port, gives boost to Pakistan's development and economy.

In 2011, Pakistan's Ambassador to Beijing Masood Khan appreciated China's role in construction of 'Gwadar Deep Sea port'. "China has already helped Pakistan to construct Gwadar port. We want to expand this Project. We will welcome China's role in future development of this deep sea port." He highlighted significance of Gwadar port for China's economic and strategic interests as well. Ambassador stated that "When this network is fully operational from Gwadar to Khunjerab, Urumqi, Beijing and Shanghai, it will give alternative choices to China for its trade with the Middle East and Europe. This alternative route will be much shorter than the one passing through the Malacca Straits," Khan further said that Pakistan and China have common objective of bringing prosperity in South Asian region. He mentioned that Pakistan and China were extraordinarily cooperating in various sectors, including energy, telecommunications, agriculture and infrastructure.⁵²

This cooperation has alarmed and the Indian analysts perceived it as China's Maritime encirclement of India. According to the US Defence Department report, China's involvement in Gwadar Port is Part of its

⁵⁰Ralf Emmers, "Non-traditional security in the Asia-Pacific: The dynamics of securitization," Marshall Cavendish International (2004):1.

⁵¹Yunling Zhang, *China and Asian Regionalism* (Singapore: World Scientific, 2010), 2.

⁵²"Chinese investment sought for Gwadar port," *Express Tribune*, August 14, 2011, <http://tribune.com.pk/story/230829/chinese-investment-sought-for-gwadar-port/>

'*Strings of Pearl strategy*'⁵³. Indian External Affairs Minister Sushma Swaraj stated that Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi "very strongly" raised the issue regarding China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) during his recent visit to Beijing, and termed the project "unacceptable."⁵⁴ However, China does not see encirclement of India as a strategic goal but considers Gwadar Port a strategic asset for Pakistan.⁵⁵ Considering all these strategic designs, the US exerted pressures on Pakistan to oust China and assume control of this strategic spot.⁵⁶

China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) which has been finalized between Pakistan and China after Chinese President Xi's visit to Pakistan in April 2015. It is likely to bring US\$ 46 billion investment in Pakistan which is going to be a game changer in the region concerning Pakistan's political and economic stature in the region.

Both China and the US want to promote peace in South Asia. If the US starts dealing equally with New Delhi and Islamabad, it would build trust in Pakistan about Washington's seriousness of promoting peace in the region. China is also an important stake holder in South Asia and wants peace in the region. China's rise to the status of superpower is only possible if it does not engage in any armed conflict with India. Increased trade with New Delhi reflects Beijing's smart approach to dissolve regional tensions. India and Pakistan have become permanent members of Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) in July, 2015, which provides a diplomatic forum to resolve their disputes through mutual dialogue.⁵⁷ China and Russia are two United Nations Security Council permanent members and have great stakes in the region. They may also facilitate peace process between India and Pakistan. There are economic benefits to both the countries

⁵³"*China builds Up Strategic Sea Lanes*," *Washington Times*,
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2005/jan/17/20050117-115550-1929r/>

⁵⁴<http://tribune.com.pk/story/895611/china-pakistan-economic-corridor-unacceptable-modi-tells-china/>

⁵⁵Carrie Currier and Manoj Chatterjee, *China's Energy Relations With The Developing World* New York: The Continuum International (2011):159.

⁵⁶Ibid.159

⁵⁷<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-33439553>

through this forum, but India should stop her provocative role towards Pakistan.

Conclusion

India and Pakistan fought wars in 1965 and 1971 because of the imbalance of power between them. Balance of power between both the countries has brought them to negotiating table. War is no more an option after the nuclearization of South Asia. The Kargil crisis did not escalate into full-fledged war because of the existing “Balance of Terror.” It is a fact that Hard Balancing between the two countries has remained a dominating approach, but it has been more costly for India and Pakistan in terms of their defence spending. Therefore, Soft Balancing would maintain the balance of power and would not undermine economic growth, democratic institutions and prosperity of the region. Soft Balancing would also result in result-oriented negotiations between India and Pakistan.