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ABSTRACT

The Indian military’s modernization drive is a credible threat to the deterrence stability of South Asia. Both states are sharing the most dangerous porous border in the world because of many unresolved issues which may trigger a limited or total war in the region. The possibility of nuclear exchange could not be ruled out because of the uncertain nature of the relationship between both states. This study aims to focus on three main areas: first to analyze Indian threat perceptions, internal and external security vulnerabilities and possible factors to drive military’s modernization plans, its strength, and capabilities. Secondly, to highlight the implications of force multipliers inducted in the Indian military for Pakistan’s security and deterrence stability in South Asia. The last part would discuss possible counter-measures for Pakistan to overcome this imminent threat. The Indian defense budget for the fiscal year 2016-17 have crossed the US$ 52.2 billion mark, and it is expected to increase in the near future to keep up the pace of modernization and overcome the operational gaps in its overall military machine. It has allocated huge funds for the development of its Army, Air Force, Navy, Network Centric Warfare and Electronic Warfare capabilities. The induction of Spy satellite Risaat-II and UAVs from Israel would keep 24/7 check on the strategic sites, LoC and deployment of Pakistani troops close to the border. India has inked deals with the European firms to induct the latest Aircraft for air superiority. Indian naval capabilities may undermine Pakistan’s long-term maritime interests in the Indian Ocean. The Indian military modernization reveals that it is on course to achieve regional hegemony and to operationalize its aggressive doctrines against Pakistan. Pakistan cannot afford conventional arms race with India, which compels Pakistan to increase its reliance
on tactical nukes and improve the quality and quantity of its nuclear weapons to achieve credible
deterrence against aggressive maneuvers of India in south Asia.
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INTRODUCTION

Presence of nukes, disrupted regional debates and a drawn out history of arms shaking and traditional military development among India and Pakistan in South Asia’s security community has brought them closer to a “nuclear flash point in the form of Kashmir”¹ in contemporary times, and “offers [stability-instability paradox]² as a possible outcome of the whole saga as both the terms project the sensitivity and volatility of the situation.”³ Now, with consistent doctrinal transformation and massive military hardware purchases to revolutionize Indian military has significantly brought the regional stability at risk.⁴ With persistent offensive approach, India is developing its hybrid warfare capability, sub-conventional warfare and surgical strike against alleged targets in Pakistan under Kautilya’s philosophy of undeclared war or “devious warfare”⁵ to avoid any escalation turning into major conventional military combat. This stark reality leaves only option for Pakistan to rely on ‘tactical nuclear weapon’ under “full spectrum deterrence”⁶. This aggressive behavior of India and reciprocating defensive posture of Pakistan endanger the delicate nature of prevailing deterrence in the South Asian region. This murky picture requires more in-depth and accentuating analysis and makes it more significant with an urgent need to address it.

A drastic transformation in Indian strategic outlook with massive military modernization drive is a manifestation of its aspirations to alter the power equation in the region. Development of nuclear weapon for establishing the strategic parity to avoid any military adventure seems failed to prevent India change its offensive behavior. Furthermore, with hybrid warfare strategy, “surgical strike” capability and ongoing conventional military buildup have endangered the existing deterrence in the region. Indian enhancement of its defense budget and massive acquisition of latest arms to revolutionize its military has adversely affected the delicate security situation regarding Pakistan in the region.\(^7\) Given the account of conventional asymmetries, prolonged animosity due to unsettled territorial disputes, this bolstering strategic transformation in Indian Strategy has created security predicaments for Pakistan. A continuous Line of Control (LoC) violation, disputes over water resources and diplomatic offences to isolate Pakistan further add to Indian aspirations to establish its conventional superiority in the region.

Indian heavy investment in buying satellites, Airborne Early Warning Systems (AWACS) 'eyes in the sky' from Israel\(^9\), Rafael Jets from France\(^10\), signals intelligence, nuclear submarines, latest high range artillery guns and reconnaissance assets to cultivate conventional asymmetry may invite conventional as well as non-conventional arms race.\(^11\)

---


This fast-paced modernization drive is indicative of offensive Indian behavior that has cultivated strategic disparity and undermines the regional deterrence. Pakistan is a vital player for effective strategic stability in the region that is under attack through discriminatory approach of the United States towards Pakistan imposing military embargos on it while arms letting flow to India.

Given the account of enhancement in military prowess, Indian military can get tempted to flex its muscles in any low-intensity conflict that can endanger regional stability through escalating to nuclear combat. Basking in military mighty is simply offensive in nature to provoke smaller states especially Pakistan in the region and eventually initiating an arms race that may jeopardize already volatile strategic balance. A whopping 64% increase in defense budget from 2001-13 further substantiate the argument of Indian ambitious designs.\(^\text{12}\)

India justifies the recent rapid expansion and transformation of its military is a response to emanating threats from China and Pakistan. But the defense posture, troop’s deployment and arms buildup display its Pakistan-centric approach. This has deteriorated the status quo and compelled the Pakistan to develop battlefield nukes.

This recent fast-paced military modernization drive is a response to perceived threats within and outside the region by the Indian political and military elite. This has further augmented Indian military to flex its muscles in low-intensity regional conflict.

**Literature Review**

The lack of access to original Indian archives and officials for an in-depth analysis of the subject under study is another limitation. Indian military modernization has taken place in different phases since its independence. After 9/11, it has rapidly transformed its strategic outlook and

enhanced military growth with operationalization of proactive military doctrine *Cold Start* and acquisition of advanced military hardware. This broadened canvas of inquiry has dominantly limited the study to only this era for better scope of inquiry and strictly towing to subject.

**Books**

This book, *The End of Strategic Stability? Nuclear Weapons and the Challenge of Regional Rivalries*,\(^{13}\) Despite rich historical, cultural and political linkages, the region has embarrassingly poor mutual understanding and hence integration. This source is an important and valuable contribution as it attempts to bring under one volume a holistic explanation of the discourse of nuclear security in South Asian region; opportunities and challenges in the present geopolitical and geo-economic environment; to include rise of religious fundamentalism, strategic alliances / emerging partnerships between countries of the region and extra regional powers.\(^{14}\)

*India and Nuclear Asia: Forces, Doctrine, and Dangers* is written by Yogesh Joshi and Frank O'Donnell. Authors argue that emerging trends in all three states are elevating risks of regional inadvertent and accidental escalation. These include the forthcoming launch of naval nuclear forces within an environment of contested maritime boundaries; the growing employment of dual-use delivery vehicles; and the emerging preferences of all three states to employ missiles early in a conflict. These dangers are amplified by the near-absence of substantive nuclear dialogue between these states, and the growing ambiguity of regional strategic intentions.\(^ {15}\)

---


Strategic Stability in the Second Nuclear Age is written by Gregory D. Koblentz. He reiterates that south Asia represent serious challenges to the regional stability and global security because of the changing strategic dynamics between both nuclear states. The author argues that presence of nuclear weapons along with consistent rivalries on the LoC, military buildup, terrorism & extremism, insurgencies and aggressive postures would create further instability and turmoil in the region.16

Research Articles

“Indian Military Modernization and Conventional Deterrence in South Asia” is written by Walter Ladwig and published in the Journal of Strategic Studies.17 “Nuclear Learning: The Next decade in South Asia” is edited by Feroz Hassan Khan, Ryan Jacobs and Emily Burky.18 “Strategic Stability of South Asia: The Role of USA” is written by late Professor Dr. Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema.19

Research Questions

1. What are the key drivers to accelerate the process of doctrinal transformation in strategic orientation of Indian Military and trigger a rapid drive to modernize its military?

---

2. How shall India find military hardware imperative to operationalize its strategic plans and its quest to establish conventional disparity in the south Asian region?

**Hypothesis**
Rapid military growth through provocative modernization drive, offensive doctrinal transformation and massive arms procurements has undermined the regional deterrence stability of South Asia.

**Theoretical Framework**
The study opts a poly-heuristic approach to understand multiple competing prisms of analysis for the better understanding of the subject matter. This study identifies India's growing military modernization as an independent variable. This military modernization is all possible due to strategic partnerships with Russia, United States and Israel for the acquisition and operationalization of its defense doctrines.

It predominantly depends upon John Mearsheimer’s *conventional deterrence* theory with Limited Warfare’s ‘strategic interaction’ theories to understand ongoing Indian modernization drive postulating possible scenarios as well. This study further brings into consideration Chanakaya Kautilya’s ‘preparedness for war’ and ‘undeclared war’ approaches to understand Indian hybrid warfare strategies and building military muscles. It also underscores three ‘force model’ that helps in making understanding of Indian acquisition of power and its defense partnerships.

**Research Methodology**
For the data collection and analysis, it qualifies with descriptive and exploratory approaches along primary and secondary sources. This research has focused discussion with eminent
scholars, retired military professionals and research scholars working in different think tanks on issues linked to south Asian security and strategic stability. This practice has helped immensely to gather data, critically evaluate established narratives on Indo-Pakistan sides, and develop an understanding of key concepts on the subject.

The study also gathers data from documented speeches, published doctrines, available commentaries and interviews of notable policy makers, military professionals for the clarity on the subject and accentuating the appropriate recommendations for future scenario.

**Scope of the Study**

Indian military modernization has taken place in various phases under different strategic perceptions and decisions of its policy-makers. Given the account of Indian transition in its military doctrines, this study shall encompass historical evolution and development of Indian postures and capabilities to knit it in ongoing strategic transformation to portray a balanced, present picture. That's why this study is an era-bound prologue and shall focus predominantly on the post-nuclearization developments. Following are the outlined scope of this study under research:

1) This study accentuates the theoretical underpinnings for the shift in Indian strategic thinking from Nehruvian approach to opt more offensive approach under Modi.
2) This study underscores the key drivers for Indian military modernization and rapid transformation in its military postures. It shall further find its operational capabilities to achieve its defined goals.
3) The study seeks the response from Pakistan to maintain regional deterrence through reinvigorating its conventional and non-conventional capabilities against massive growth in Indian military’s operational capabilities.
4) In Pakistan, there is no significant study to comprehend this subject under study and leaves a huge knowledge gap to be filled. There is a need to critically analyze the ongoing Indian drive of its military modernization, set the parameters of the study to
restrict the discourse being towed, evaluate succinctly the impact on strategic parity in the region, and find the results systematically.

**Division of Study**

This study aims at building a theoretical understanding of Indian military’s strategic outlook, modernization drive and its search for operational capabilities to turn it into a major power in the region. It brings into account historical evolution in Indian Military’s strategic thinking, facing threats to its national security and evolving environment in its surroundings. It further exfoliates Indian plans to augment its conventional military mighty, extension in strategic outreach through massive buildup and developing constabulary force capacity to establish conventional superiority over Pakistan also as a balancing act against China. Indian military modernization drive is also resultant of its political desires to seek major power status in the region.

This study has been divided mainly in following parts:

**Theoretical Framework**

The portion of the study creates a fundamental for the possible understanding of the discourse and takes multiple prisms to make the study more rigorous, appropriate and scientific. To identify the drivers of Indian modernization and rapid transformation in its strategic outlook requires succinct theoretical explanations. This part of the study revolves around conventional deterrence, offensive realism and ‘strategic interaction’ theories to understand the changing Indian defense postures and overwhelmingly investment in arms procurements. Its further sheds light on how conventional asymmetries and quest for altering to shift the strategic balance cultivates security dilemma and causes arms race in the region.

This part of the study also considers Indian ‘limited war’ approach under nuclear umbrella through ‘shallow maneuvers’ and ‘surgical strikes. It further elaborates ‘Strategic
Interaction’ theories to explain Indian hybrid warfare strategy to avoid any direct confrontation, fearing escalation of war to a major contest. This part deliberates Chankya’s philosophies of ‘undeclared war’ and ‘preparedness for war’ to influence and incorporate it into Indian strategic thought as well.

This chapter also discusses ‘three force models’ to identify Indian military potentiality and desired objectives.

**Indian Defense Doctrinal Transformation**

This part of the study outlines the time-series of transitions in Indian strategic thinking and doctrinal transformation. It considers, Indian policy maker’s perceptions about state security, external environment and nature of threats to its nation. It encompasses from Nehruvian understanding of military threat to holistically different Modi’s vision of strategic interests of India. It further elaborates the shift in military thinking, nuclear muscle flexing, missile programs and defense allocations that shaped the modern Indian strategic outlook.

This part focuses on transformation in Indian military postures: from ‘deep thrusts’ into Pakistan to ‘shallow maneuvers’, ‘proactive Cold Start Doctrine’ to indirect approach ‘hybrid warfare’. This part discusses the shift from ‘total war’ to ‘strategic indirect interaction’ to avoid possible escalation and establishing conventional military superiority in South Asia.

**Military Modernization Drive and Operational Capabilities**

This part of the study is of prime focus. It has two parts: the first one explains Indian drive for revolutionizing its military, traces drivers and variables for this robust and rapid military overhaul and second part discusses operationalization of Indian strategic thinking. This further
declassifies the plans for acquisition of latest weaponry, military hardware and intelligence apparatus along with upgrading the existing stockpiles. It further explains India’s ‘make India’ venture to accelerate local industry to lessen the defense dependencies. Its other part discusses internalization of these proposed war-games and operationalization to seek the desired objectives. It further sheds light how this acquisition and operational capability of these latest hardware to affect the existing conventional asymmetry between India and Pakistan.

**Strategic Partnerships with Russia, the US and Israel**

This part observes Indian history of strategic partnership for the execution of its outlined strategic plans with militarily powerful and advanced in sophisticated weaponry states like Russia, the US and Israel.

This part of the study investigates Indian strategic partnerships how contributed in arming its muscles, building conventional power and helping modernize its military. It further digs out Indian defense requirements to operationalize its proactive military strategy *Cold Start Doctrine*. It also sheds light how French Rafael, Israeli AWACS, Russian S-400 and Nuclear deal with US help India in its desire of establishing conventional superiority in the region. These partnerships changed the strategic outlook of Indian Military and augmented its prowess to enlarge its military outreach and political influence.

**Recommendations**

It underscores the possible effect on promoting regional arms race, enforcing Pakistan to reciprocate to reinvigorate its capability to maintain conventional parity for tactical deterrence in the region. This study aims at seeking possible responses from Pakistan to ward off any Indian
attempt to sabotage the existing strategic stability and outlines a few possible scenarios as well.

So far, no major study is available on this subject; this study shall contribute in knowledge.
CHAPTER 1
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

“The end of the Cold War has dramatically altered the "seamless web" of deterrence and decoupled nuclear and conventional forces ... As a result, the post-cold war period is one in which stability and the deterrence of war are likely to be measured by the capabilities of conventional forces.”

Gary L. Guertner

From ‘total war’ to ‘limited war’ through strategic advantages in conventional asymmetries in a nuclear-supported environment, is a hallmark of Indian strategic transformation. With massive arms procurement, expanding defense budget and enhancement in conventional capabilities are the markers of Indian strategic response to its regional states.

The transformation in its military from heavy and slow-moving forces to lighter, agile, and swift formations along with induction of cutting-edge high-technology, Network centric and electronic warfare approach is a manifestation of its quest to revolutionize its overall war fighting capabilities to operationalize its aggressive strategic thinking in south Asia.

Modernization is a strategic trap (perpetual process) that keeps the rival states engaged in building arms, improving and overhauling the organizational structures with constant fear of war.


22 Wezeman et al.
This process of modernization inducts changes in organizational patterns, quality training, efficient communication and logistic supports. This requires massive fiscal economy to support its operationalization and maintain its military posture especially conventional asymmetry to deny any strategic gain.

This requires an in-depth theoretical analysis of this modernization and doctrinal shifts to impact the military strategy in a conventional deterrence setting. It further demands to develop bases for the prospect of any conventional war if transformational drive enhances conventional asymmetry. How can a military be different for the security of a state in deterrence setting?

Technology has revolutionized the military sphere and broadened the scope of its employment to seek desired ends through changing character and conduct of contemporary warfare. It requires further underpinning the impact of technological advancements in shaping the strategic thinking and postulating defense postures of India.

It is further not to enlarge the scale and magnitude of the conflict with ‘unlimited military objectives’ that may trigger its escalation. India and Pakistan, both may not afford it. The Indian military modernization contemplates a strategy of limited aims vis-à-vis its nuclear adversary that does weaken the deterrence. The idea behind investment in conventional apparatus that with greater advantage of conventional superiority in air fire power, maritime maneuvering and advanced technological gadgets, limited objectives can be achieved without letting it escalate.

Modernization in conventional military sphere is also byproduct of non-conventional balance that exceeds the fear of retaliation, cost of military adventure and escalation. Building conventional military muscles evolved as supportive to strategic nuclear stability approach. It is
cold war approach between the rival super powers and extending this to their respective allies with focus on ‘limiting the escalation’ and ‘punishing the adversary’.

This part of the study shall encompass Offensive Realism, conventional deterrence theory and ‘strategic interaction’ of military strategy theories.

‘If you want peace, make ready for war’.23

*Latin axiom*

The induction of strategic weapons has evolved a nuclear strategy that broadened the scope and horizon of strategic maneuvering.

**Offensive Realism**

John J. Mearsheimer, a structural realist who like Kenneth Waltz believes that the power is the key factor behind functioning of the modern state-system, and this is the point where “structural realism”24 deviates from the classical realism which considers power as an end. Mearsheimer, like Waltz believes that the roots in the structure of international politics and that he explains through his “bedrock assumptions”25.

The first assumption is that, great powers are the main actors in world politics, and they operate under an anarchic system which means there exists no “government over governments”26, which can arbitrate or punish the aggressors.

---


26 Mearsheimer.
The second assumption is that all the great powers inherently possess certain offensive military capabilities which vary from state to state, and thus each state possesses the capability to inflict damage on the other states.

The third assumption is that the states can never be certain about the other states’ intentions, specifically in terms of uncertainty about whether the latter state would attack the former or not because intentions can never be judged with certainty. It is not to say that a state necessarily must have hostile intentions or cannot have benign intentions, but it is very difficult to judge whether the intention will remain the same or not because intentions can change quickly as Mearsheimer himself says that “State’s intention can be benign on one day and hostile the next”\(^\text{27}\).

The fourth assumption is that the survival is the primary goal of great powers. Specifically, states seek to maintain territorial integrity and autonomy of their domestic political order. States can pursue other goals too like welfare and human rights, but they take back seat to survival as survival of the state is the most crucial for achieving other goals, summed up perfectly in a point well made by Soviet Union leader.\(^\text{28}\).

The fifth assumption is that great powers are rational actors and tend to think strategically and rationally about their survival. This doesn’t completely remove the chances of a miscalculation by the states, since they operate with imperfect information that’s why are more prone to making mistakes. Mearsheimer agrees that any of the above assumptions alone doesn’t convey that states should compete for the power.

---

\(^\text{27}\) Mearsheimer, 31.

\(^\text{28}\) Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. 
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Kenneth Waltz argued almost the similar thing with certain assumptions that were somewhat alike the assumptions given by the Mearsheimer, in fact Mearsheimer’s theory is the continuation of Waltz’s structural realism unless it separates at later stage on the question of amount of power that a state needs to survive or which can be deemed necessary for the survival of a state. He argues that it is not human nature which defines the behavior of a state as classical realist like Hobbes, Machiavelli and Morgenthau claimed, rather the anarchic system and distribution of capabilities are powerful constraints that compel states to behave in a specific manner. In such conditions according to Waltz, states should accumulate and increase their share of the world power either to defend themselves or maintain balance of power. The most vital question in structural realism arises here, “how much power is enough?”, this is where offensive and defensive realism part their ways.

According Waltz, although international system offers states many opportunities to maximize its relative power as compared to the other states it will be considered as an aggressor and it’s likely that system will balance against and punish the aggressor where other powers would eventually make the alliances and take charge on to the aggressor state.

However, this assumption leads him to believe in another fact that, it’s not possible for all the states to maximize their relative power at the same time as it might well end up making the state system a relentless rather tragic security competition arena which keeps the system anarchic when every great power is thriving to maximize their relative power to ensure their survival through hegemony.

So, what causes this sharp division between the two school of thoughts? The answer lies within the chronological dispensation of the idea of ‘power’ and ‘fear’ analyzed in “symmetric
The fear is an essential psychological trait that is found in *homo sapiens* and is as old as they themselves are. The first fear that *homo sapiens* feared was that of death and to escape this fear they started to accumulate power, but it was not restricted to fear alone as suggested by Ahrensdorf. Based upon this assumption, defensive realists claim that, one can never differentiate between why a great power is maximizing its relative power; whether it’s out of fear or out of greed purely.

Niebuhr further classifies the acquisition of power into “will-to-power and will-to-survive”, and he declares ‘will-to-power’ as a mean towards the end ‘will-to-survive’. But defensive realists argue that “who will determine that a state is acquiring power just to overcome its fears and not to disturb the balance of power?”, and according to them if a state tries to maximize its relative power it will undermine its security instead of enhancing it because it will eventually create strong resentments in other states against the former. Therefore, defensive realists argue that a state must restrain itself just to maximize its share of world power or attain an appropriate amount of power to avoid unnecessary counterproductive effects.

So, this maximization of relative power by the revisionist state is not only counterproductive at system level as suggested by non-offensive school of thought but it also creates problem within a security community or between two rival or neighboring states. Butterfield and Herz agree with the idea of Niebuhr that; the answer to why individuals/states

---

29 Two events are defined to be simultaneous if an observer measures them as occurring at the same time. They are not necessarily simultaneous to all observers—simultaneity is not absolute.


tend to attain power lies in the form of fear from each other, but Butterfield and Herz further recognized a similar rather unfortunate outcome of this dynamic.\[32\]

Security Dilemma; security of one is insecurity of other, was one of the keys explaining feature of structural realism theory as Kenneth Waltz relied upon it while presenting his theory. Although Waltz wasn’t the first person to talk about the adverse effects of fear between states as a driving factor behind their decision, either to maintain or restore balance of power, it was Thucydides who wrote about what made Spartans to attack Athens and why?

Both offensive and defensive schools have different stance upon security dilemma. As mentioned above, Waltz relied upon the idea rather considered it one of the key driving mechanisms behind his theory of structural realism. According to him security dilemma can be reduced between the states through cooperation and thus the risk of initiating a zero-sum game can be reduced to a certain level.\[33\] Snyder pointed out this wrong accommodation of security dilemma by Mearsheimer in his theory.\[34\]

Waltz further believed that this phenomenon of security dilemma can possibly take place between only two states within a security community, while Mearsheimer doesn’t talk about the interaction between two states specifically, rather he talks about states interacting in a system through relative measures\[35\]. He proposes that, since polarity dynamics differ from region to


region as well as from regional to global, therefore the states should thrive to achieve hegemony in their respective regions which eventually can enable them to influence the dynamics of other regions as well like the influence of US on other regions.

Mearsheimer argues that it’s virtually impossible for a state to be global hegemon, therefore one must focus upon maximizing its relative power within its region preparing for the worst because he believes “the best defense is a good offense”\textsuperscript{36}. Mearsheimer further argues that great powers should always look for maximizing their relative power whenever they find a chance irrespective of the other’s intentions because intentions are not measurable with certainty. An argument supported by many classical and offensive realists and as stated by Zakaria\textsuperscript{37}, suggests that it’s not the matter of intentions in international system rather it’s the matter of relative capabilities.\textsuperscript{38} Therefore, he emphasizes mainly upon states going towards the hegemony (regional) whenever they can; fearing about the worst intentions of other states.

Now, let’s apply these dynamics on South Asia and try to unfold how India and Pakistan are interacting either within South Asian security community (from offensive realism’s perspective) or with each other (from defensive realism’s perspective; security dilemma). Recent trends in South Asian dynamics point out towards Indian ambitions of becoming a regional (global) hegemon while adopting to Mearsheimer’s suggestion to maximize relative power to the greatest extent. Pursuit of this hegemonic ambition by the India is not only costly for themselves but it also raised the bar for Pakistan as well, to survive. As suggested by Waltz, an attempt of

\textsuperscript{36} Mearsheimer, \textit{The Tragedy of Great Power Politics}, 35.


\textsuperscript{38} Mearsheimer, \textit{The Tragedy of Great Power Politics}, 45.
gaining relative power will eventually disturb the balance of power and it will not only be counterproductive, but it will also leave survival-driven states with no choice other than playing the game with aggressor’s rules. India has always taken the first step towards attaining relative power or as Waltz suggests towards disturbing the balance of power leaving Pakistan behind with virtually no choice other than following the India’s suit to fill the gap.

Everything started from the “Indira Doctrine”; an implicit security and foreign policy that the Prime Minister Indira Gandhi pursued in seeking regional hegemonic status for India. It was a bold rather ambitious move of Indira Gandhi to seek regional hegemony,\textsuperscript{39} It was kind of an Indian Monroe Doctrine where India’s hegemonic ambitions/interests were ensured by denying foreign powers a place in the regional matters of South Asia where they can possibly be able to interfere.

So where does this ambition or claim of India originate from and why? The answer can be compartmentalized into many aspects, the first and foremost is the perception in the minds of leaders and writers. It is a popular idea in the minds of Indian leadership and academia that India lies at the heart of South Asia covering more than 70% of territory, and borders almost with all six neighboring countries except Afghanistan which makes India ipso facto a hegemon in the South Asia. This perception made Indian leaders believe that India can play a role of benign hegemon, which substantially was not a right thought because of the hostile environment of the region and existence of nuclear state specifically Pakistan which will never accept Indian supremacy in the regional matters.

The second reason behind this specific mind-set is the very source of derivation of Indian strategic thinking from an ancient military, economic and statecraft account “Arthashastra” written by an Indian Philosopher Chanakaya Kautilya who was adviser to the Chandragupta Maurya. Indian scholarship is widely impressed by the Kautilya’s work and claim it to be the source of derivation of Indian foreign policy as well as military strategy. Summed up by Karnad that “there exists a deep routed tradition of politico-strategic realism in India that goes back to Kautilya as he refined the traditional thinking in a scholarly fashion”\(^40\). Similarly, former Indian foreign secretory Shyam Saran strongly recommends reading Kautilya to “help broaden our vision on the issues of strategy.”\(^41\) Nehru’s policy of non-alignment and making peace with the stronger China after the defeat in 1962 are the clear reflection of Kautilya’s two principles ‘observing neutrality’ and ‘making peace with the stronger enemy’. Inclusion of Kautilyan principles into the foreign as well as military policy of India made India an over-ambitious state and thus ipso facto an aggressor as well.

India’s acculturation of Kautilya’s six principles “War, Marching, Alliance, observing neutrality, making peace with one and waging war against the other, and peace”\(^42\) into the indigenous foreign policy made it more dubious at the same time aggressive as well. According to Kautilya war can be divided into two, the first being the open warfare where both the armies know about the build ups and capabilities of their adversary prior and they fight the battle with certain pre-existing rules like common people will not be harmed etc., and the second division of


warfare can be the devious one where a state should resort to carry covert operations against the other state if the direct attack on adversary is not possible due to the threat of counter-response, these operations include threatening the internal security of adversary through different methods for example fuelling the insurgencies and funding the rebels and providing them with political and physical sanctuaries. Kautilya argues that a King (state as a latest alternative to the Monarchy and Kingship) must attain more and more power as he describes power as a mean towards happiness and the more powerful you are the more certain you can be about your happiness. Nehru absorbed this idea of accumulating more and more power for the greater happiness of the masses and later Indira Gandhi molded it further into preparing India to take charge of the South Asia as a hegemon. Both of above-mentioned people designed and shaped the Indian strategic culture in a way that it put Pakistan’s survival in danger none the less, irrespective of which type of warfare India prefers to choose, open (direct war) or devious (indirect, hybrid war).

This Indian ambition of becoming a regional hegemon contributed towards massive military build ups to maximize its relative power in the region which indeed was counterproductive as it gave rise to the security dilemma in Pakistan, to overcome Indian threat Pakistan has always responded in the same currency. India has often claimed that, it has no ambitions of being a hegemon rather it is a status quo power which is not a worthy claim.\textsuperscript{43} This helps us to understand why the initial claim of India is not worthy to be believed that it is a Status quo power who is just preparing against the Pakistan. This argument of India is not a valid one because had India been carrying out massive military modernization to counter Pakistan’s

threat, it didn’t have to go towards attaining nuclear weapon since it already had conventional superiori-ty over Pakistan which was nearly impossible for Pakistan to challenge in near or for that matter in far future. India had comparatively more man power along with greater and more sophisticated fire-power at its disposal that Pakistan didn’t possess. That’s why many defensive analysts claim that, the India’s decision to go nuclear was a strategic blunder (if it was only meant for Pakistan), which deprived India of even the conventional superiority which it enjoyed earlier over the Pakistani conventional capabilities as now Pakistan has countered the Indian conventional as well as non-conventional superiority with its non-conventional/strategic capabilities and restored balance of power in the region. Wars or clashes between two nuclear states are very rare now, Kargil 1999 was an exception in nuclear Indo-Pak history but both sides successfully restrained Kargil conflict to a limited conflict to avoid a possible nuclear war. The Kargil conflict is also termed by many as a sectoral operation which was only confined to the LoC and could not escalate into International border.

Since full scale conventional wars are not possible between India and Pakistan, therefore limited tactical conflicts can be generated and thus carried out in targeted territories with specific goals and to do so India should first enhance its specific conventional capabilities (offensive and more mobile) and bring about some reforms into its military strategy. 44 This doctrine was also the result of a failed attempt to mobilize a very large military during Operation Parakram in 2001, where sluggish Indian military gave enough time to a relatively more mobile Pakistani military to take positions and move its strike formations at border areas even before the Indians could take positions and were ready to launch an offensive. Thus, Operation Parakram was a failed adventure on Indian military’s account where they found out that Indian military was not

mobile enough and was not capable of carrying out quick operations especially under nuclear threshold neither without allowing the conflict to escalate into a nuclear conflict nor concluding the limited operation before Pakistani military’s realization about the existence of such operation. Therefore, to accomplish this task of enhancing mobility of the Indian Armed Forces along with tactical improvements in operational field, a specialized and heavily mechanized force with improved mobility along with a more sophisticated ideology was created. This force consists of highly mobile and deployable battle groups (integrated battle groups) from all types of forces (land, air and sea), which are capable of inflicting damage with improved accuracy, lethality before giving any chance to the Pakistani forces to respond or counter-mobilize.

The Cold Start Doctrine posed serious threats to the sovereignty of Pakistan. As Waltz suggested that vacuum never remains unfilled for a long time as there exists a potential candidate somewhere within the system who comes forward to fill this vacuum. Moreover, *Cold Start doctrine* is naturally destabilizing ideology for the region as it presupposes that Indian forces will cross the International borders from where they will carry out punitive actions against Pakistani military forces thus left Pakistan with no other choice than to respond to it with serious intentions and urgency. This is exactly what happened; Pakistan responded the Indian initiative in a more articulated manner. 45

As mentioned clearly in the above statement, it was the matter of compulsion not the matter of choice. Pakistan simply reciprocated the Indian aggression to restore the balance in the region. The instrument that was brought around to operationalize the *credible minimum deterrence* policy was the test of multi-tube short range low yield of 60km, on April 19, 2011. This was indeed a very innovative rather genius response of Pakistan to the Indian Cold Start

Doctrine/aggression, bringing the strategic weapon into the field as a tactical weapon for the first time with smaller radius and range but with similar impact, “the Hatf thus beating the Indian superior conventional superiority with Pakistan’s tactical nuclear weapon”\(^{46}\). But again, this was not the matter of choice rather India pushed Pakistan to retain what Pakistan calls the *credible minimum deterrence*, since Pakistan is a survival-driven state therefore it is the matter of *do-or-die* for Pakistan as it cannot compete with Indian conventional might especially in the event of India operationalizing the CSD and initiating a strike over Pakistani land, Pakistan will respond through its tactical weapon NASR which will be launched on its own soil to inflict Pakistan will restrain itself from using long-range nuclear warheads against India due to the pressure of International community as well as threat of counter-response because if war breaks out between two nuclear powers eventually no one will be left in the position to claim victory after the war, thus suggesting that weapon NASR since it has been designed for the purpose specifically for countering the Indian aggression.

Pakistan responded to the Cold Start doctrine on both levels, conventional (*New Concept of War Fighting* NCWF) as well as nuclear (NASR). Pakistan also revolutionized its strategy (conventional) to respond to India’s future endeavors against Pakistan, Pakistan Army conducted Azm-i-Nau exercises between 2009 to 2013 along with PAF, the biggest military exercises since 1989. After these exercises Pakistan adopted the NCWF, according to which Pakistan army was made capable of mobilizing even faster than the Indian forces and thus have the chance to fire the first shot even before the Indian forces. Inclusion of Pakistan Air Force into the exercises and synergizing the High Mark exercises with Azm-i-Nau only provided the better results in

operations conducted by the land forces along with air force with more precision and better results thus leaving Indian Cold Start doctrine with very little to none scope of succeeding on Pakistani soil or even in any incident of aggression.

India’s massive military build-up is seriously disturbing the regional balance and making South Asia an arena of arms race. India’s increasing defense budget and conventional sophistication is directly threatening Pakistan and forcing it to counter India’s actions which it otherwise didn’t intend to do so due to deteriorating economic conditions of country recently hit by terrorism. India is spending billions of dollars every year to purchase arms making it the biggest importer of conventional arms in the World. Although previously Pakistan military has been using locally manufactured arms manufactured by state owned ordnance factories to avoid the budget deficit but import of latest generation more sophisticated weapons by the Indian forces left Pakistan with virtually no choice other than competing India hence acquiring modern equipment from the developed states which severely affects many other departments due to lack of funds.

But India’s ambitions seem nowhere to be stopping as India is continuously increasing its arms purchases on one hand ultimately disturbing the balance of region and provoking an arms race on other hand. There exists strong resentment in Pakistan against three recent and ongoing arms deals of India which according to Pakistan are disturbing the status quo and might prove to be disastrous in future, the first deal is the Indo-Russian deal for purchase of S-400 missile defense system, the second deal is the famous rather controversial Indo-French deal for Rafale fighter jets and the third deal was to develop nuclear submarine INS Arihant a three-billion-dollar submarine which gave India an assured second strike capability. These deals are multi-billion dollar deals which would enhance India’s offensive as well as defensive capabilities while
leaving its relatively weaker adversaries either at the disposal of India (as India wants) or in a constant phase of preparing against the threat to their survival. Because of India’s quest to become hegemon while disguising its ambition as “preparing for the worst”, security dilemma arises more and more in Pakistan as it feels insecure thus destabilizing the power equation between India-Pakistan and starting and unwelcomed and unnecessary arms race between the two nuclear powers with existence of significant hostile history and a critical territorial issue (Kashmir) between them.

Pakistan was forced by the structural dynamics to compete and respond to India, which Pakistan has managed to do so up until now after becoming nuclear power state in 1998. Pakistan has assured India of severe retaliation at every level in case of any offensive measure if taken against Pakistan, and track record suggest that Pakistan has successfully manipulated its resources against the mighty India despite the wider power gap between the two.

Rethink its policy towards Pakistan and change the methods of engagement thus adopting the other method of war which Kautilya suggested when the enemy is powerful enough to respond and inflict damage, the devious warfare. Since Pakistan has established credible nuclear deterrence it would be very unwise decisions on India’s behalf to engage Pakistan in any kind of conventional conflict irrespective of its nature, therefore India has shifted its energies towards destabilizing Pakistan internally as well as externally by launching an indirect warfare “hybrid warfare”. It is neither a kind of war where adversaries face each other at any level nor ground nor an immediate defeat of adversary is required. It is rather a war of ideas which includes generations in it and has impact on generations to come. Considering the India’s superiority in the fields of Information Technology, Media and narrative building on global level one can
easily assume why Pakistan is facing a bad reputation globally despite the fact it is Pakistan that has suffered the most from the terrorism.

India has diverted its energies not only towards building a grand narrative against Pakistan, but it also didn’t refrain itself from interfering in Pakistan’s internal matters by funding and supporting the terrorist and separatist movements in Pakistan. India’s funding and support to Tehreek-i-Taliban Pakistan- (TTP) Pakistan and Baloch Liberation Army- (BLA) is not a new thing rather it has taken a new shape with the changed actors (people and organizations) but with constant hostile intentions of India behind all this. At many instances in history, the Indian spies in Pakistan have been arrested while living undercover and carrying the covert operations. Arrest of a serving Indian Navy officer and RAW agent, Kulbhushan Jadhav in 2016 is the testimony of Pakistan’s claims that India is instigating sectarian, ethnic, insurgent and separatist conflicts in Pakistan and strengthening the terrorists by providing them financial, technical support along with training as well. Kulbhushan Jadhav’s statement in which he admitted that he was in Baluchistan to carry out operations as attributed to him by the RAW that are directly related to further destabilization of Baluchistan ultimately leading to more destabilization of Pakistan. Pakistan’s fear of Indian involvement to sabotage the project as at various forums Pakistan has described its concerns over the security of CPEC and the Indian mala fide intentions. It is expected that Indian strategic thinking will remain aggressive in the foreseeable future.
CHAPTER 2
AN EVOLUTION OF THE INDIAN MILITARY DOCTRINES

2.1 Introduction:
India has evolved different perceptions of strategic environment and challenges to its national security over the years. It has drifted gradually from Nehru’s approach to view national security as political matter and to manage threats politically rather than militarily. India has practiced this approach a long not to formulate ambitious military objectives and rearmament of its military. India rather always kept economy as its foremost priority and allocating its resources for development than defense. Today, under Modi regime, India is far more different in its strategic outlook, power pursuits and policy objectives than the previous governments. Diversifying its resources more to reinvigorate its military muscles to expand its political influence for strategic purposes. This hawkish approach has caused instability in the region and alarmed the bells for any possible Indian adventure as well.

To cope with its perceived internal and external strategic vulnerabilities, India is engineering modernization of its military and transformation in its strategic approaches as well. India has the foremost perennial problem is troubled history of relations with Pakistan especially lingering unsettled Kashmir issue. This has brought both the states to engage in missile and conventional arms race, building nuclear capacity and fight many wars since independence. In the recent history, Kargil- 1999. This has compelled the Indian civil and military elites to rethink and allocate more on defense budgets that has reached to 63.9 billion-dollar to be the fifth largest spender on military expenditures.47

Michael Kugelman cites another reason for this massive overhaul is being the Indian arsenal ‘inadequate and obsolete’ though India has denied any currency to this vehemently. Also, Mumbai attacks has crystalized the Indian maritime security and argument of dire need to modernize and equip with advanced technical apparatus. To ward off any Mumbai like surprise attack in future, India decides to focus more on Maritime Strategy. India seeks drastic transformation in its strategic outlook and aims to modernize its military.

A military strategy is typically employed against an adversary which conceptualizes the threat or use of force to advance a state’s distinct goals including military forces, territory and resources. Strategist thinking focuses on employing part or combination of land, air and naval forces. In response to stress a fragile system undergoes catastrophic loss of control, a robust system is largely unaffected, and an anti-fragility system becomes strengthened. Resilience deals with the ability of the system to recover from the damage. Offensive doctrines are more focused on disarming an adversary by destroying its armed forces and a deterrent strategy maintains a denial posture with reference to specific goals and raise the aggressor’s cost calculus in terms of initiation of war. The exercise of force is also meant to accomplish other societal objectives i.e. socio-economic systemic changes that are other than the defined goals or objectives as Clausewitz noted that the goal of war is ultimately political in nature. The nature, manner and time of application of force depends on the perceived effects in the intended system and avoiding generic conditions which make it counter-productive. This is reflective of the

---


system’s memory regarding strategic choices and the system’s capabilities which can be directed towards those designs. Democracies seek wars that are quick, easy to win and lead to low casualties as democratic leaders are more sensitive to domestic political instability. Although maneuver strategies are more successful but are only used 12% of the time. Structural factors like material resources i.e. steel production or level of industrial development constitute central variable for realist analysis of military industrial deterrence breakdown and its application.

On the other hand, an attrition strategy focuses on locating, attacking and destroying the center of the opponent’s forces to annihilate the enemy’s resistance (Napoleonic Wars). However, the punishment strategy focuses on breaking the resolve of the enemy’s forces either through civilian bombing campaign or destruction of industry to coerce the adversary in to submission (Allied Bombing of Japan, Germany, North Vietnam). Another prospect of the punishment strategy is the guerilla warfare employed to weaken the adversary in its territory (Viet Cong in Vietnam).^51

Strategic Doctrine translates power in to policy by being cognizant of the state’s security compulsions in the internal and external security environments and defining the strategic orientation of the state. The ‘realist defensive structural framework’ suggests that variables such as relative power, proximity and intention encourage a state to seek the right and appropriate amount of power. However, the offensive framework suggests that the anarchic environment encourages states to maximize power to the feasible limit. A state’s grand strategy is byproduct of defense-offense calculations, political objectives of the state and geographic, technological,

economic and political constraints as well as opportunities. The military doctrine framework translates the strategic understanding into tactical, operational and theatrical logic.

2.2 Nehru Doctrine
Following Independence (1947), NAM provided India with a platform that comprised of likely-disposed states and theoretically provided security through neutrality. Nehru maintained a neutral and non-committal attitude to International developments that was reflected in limited military-to-military contacts.

India in the post-colonial phase, focused on building an indigenous military industrial complex to free it from international entanglements and its primary focus was on economic advancement. Although, India became a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations as a result of economic and military pressures that accentuated through pressures from the British government. Nehru (1948) also viewed a military alignment with US but was convinced otherwise.\(^{52}\) The Kashmir War (1948) with Pakistan forced India to turn to UK, US and France for purchase of defense equipment to arm its military through Sterling reserves although it remained opposed to western military alliances.\(^{53}\) The first international involvement by India in the International arena was in the Korean War (1950) when it sent a medical unit under the UN flag and played role in UN diplomacy and its later posture remained one of supporting anti-western initiatives in UN and opposing those that intervened in South Asia.\(^{54}\)

The regional challenges that emerged in the 1960’s and 1970’s as manifestation in the form of (1962) war with China and (1965 & 1971) war with Pakistan. The Chinese attack (1962)

\(^{52}\) Zachariah Benjamin, *Nehru* (Routledge, 2004), 162–63.

\(^{53}\) Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *SIPRI Yearbook 2018*.

forced India to accept the U.S. offer of military assistance and exposed the weakness of its reliance on NAM. Subsequently, a five-year defense plan (1964) was launched that doubled the defense spending and focused on expansion and modernization of the military through foreign weapon procurements. The plan took count of resources available and the foreign assistance that could be expected from foreign countries besides proposing a defense production base that would reduce the country’s reliance on external procurement and expand DRDO. It recognized the need to synergize defense and development and a planning cell (1965) was established to facilitate medium and long-term defense planning. The first plan concluded in 1969 and exposed the limitations in attaining self-sufficiency in weapons and equipment as by-product of inadequacy of foreign exchange reserves and led to pursuit of steady long-term defense programs.\footnote{General V P Malik and Brigadier Gurmeet Kanwal, ‘Defense Planning in India’, \textit{Observer Research Foundation}, 2005.} From 1954 to 1962 India spent on an average 560 million dollars on defense and from 1962-63 the defense spending increased to 750 million dollars. The target was set to increase troops from 0.5 million to 0.8 million and air force squadrons to 45.\footnote{Maharaj K. Chopra, ‘Indian Defense at the Crossroads’, \textit{Military Review} 44 (1964).}

2.3 Indira Doctrine
Prime Minister Indira Gandhi (1966-1977) in response to regional events and strategic pressures significantly changed the defense outlook of India. The regional events that compelled strategic shift in the 70’s included the creation of Bangladesh which according to Indira, established India’s regional hegemony and superpower status in the South-Asian region. However, it not only prompted China to help Pakistan develop domestic defense industry, but Pakistan also intensified its efforts for regional cooperation. The 1973 oil embargo had repercussions for both Pakistan and India and the weapons acquisition in Middle East was upsetting Indian military superiority in the subcontinent achieved after 1971.
At the global level, the visit of Richard Nixon to Beijing (1972) altered the wider context of Indian security which perceived the past policy of U.S-Pakistan cooperation against communism being replaced by U.S-China military cooperation against Soviet Union. Also, China had acquired nuclear capability in 1964 and India was dependent on soviet deterrent capability. The ‘Peace, Cooperation and Friendship’ treaty with the Soviet Union (1971) established framework for Soviet military support and established them as India’s primary suppliers of defense equipment.

Secondly, British decision to withdraw from the east of Suez led to super-power naval rivalry in the Indian Ocean. The Pakistani position welcomed the setting up of a U.S. naval base at Diego Garcia and an American naval and airbase on Arabian Sea between Karachi and Iranian border as a possible counterweight against Indian nuclear blackmail. Contrastingly, India called for a ‘zone of peace’ and Pakistan called for a ‘nuclear-free’ zone.\(^{57}\) India perceived the unresolved geo-political problems of the area and the revised budgetary defense allocations from 1979-1980 remained around 4% of GNP or 27% of central government budget.\(^{58}\)

### 2.4 Sunderji Doctrine
Ravi Rikhye examines the induction of 97 systems between Pakistan and India (1947-88) and the number of Pakistani firsts goes down to six. During the 1970’s the lack of hard currency was hindering weapons procurement by India and Indian refusal to endorse Moscow’s plan for an Asiatic collective security scheme led USSR to constrict supply of weapons and spares. Similarly, the Indian Industry failed to provide indigenous systems for the forces and all these


\(^{58}\) Thomas, ‘Indian Defense Policy’. 
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developments affected doctrinal developments. However, military thought continued to develop and an expert committee consisting of K. Sundarji (1975) was tasked to develop a 20-year perspective plan for the army.\(^5\) Indira Gandhi (1980) carried out the recommendations with limited changes which involved prevention of war with smallest possible investment and maximization of India’s research and development capacity to reduce dependence on imports. The doctrine viewed Pakistan and China as threats and suggested achieving a force advantage by addition of two corps (six divisions), 31 tank regiments and two mechanized infantry divisions over Pakistan Army.

1980-87 was a period of intense military buildup as the army acquired T-72 tanks, Bofors 155mm Howitzers, Infantry Combat Vehicles, Modern Air Fleets, 12 Sub Marines. These developments were result of improving Indian foreign exchange reserves and Moscow’s concerns of reduction in its influence as it was engaged in Afghan war (1979-1988). It predominantly focused on South Asia and aimed to prevent external powers from exploiting the internal crisis of other South Asian states. India threatened retaliation to state that invited outside intervention and did intervene in Maldives (1988) and sent peacekeeping troops to Sri Lanka (1987-90).\(^6\)

Subsequently, India rewrote its military doctrine largely under efforts of General Sunderji, to use India’s mechanized strength for deep thrusts in to enemy territory to seize territory and fight on grounds of their choice. The major doctrinal shift came when General Sunderji became chief-of-staff and planned Operation Brass-tacks (1986) the largest military exercise in Indian history. It


\(^6\) Gupta.
was aimed at multi-corps formations including Reorganized Army Plains Infantry Divisions (RAPIDS) a division with one mechanized brigade, Reorganized Army Mountains Infantry Divisions (RAMIDS) and an Air Assault Division. The AAD was to be air mobile and can move to battlefields scores of miles away in a single day.

The 1987 Sunderji’s perspective plan- Army 2000 was to build the Army up to 45 divisions including 4 tank divisions. The structure aimed at quick mobilization for offensive or defensive purposes to impose Indian will. However, India’s external debt by 1991 had soared to $70 billion and the idea had to be shelved. Yet as part of India’s efforts to produce high technology weapons, an Integrated Guided Missile Development Program (IGDMP) was launched to develop ballistic missiles.  

### 2.5 Cold Start Doctrine- 2004:

Pakistan demonstrated its nuclear capabilities (1998) and the subsequent concentration of conventional power in Kargil (1999). A limited war could be the result of border dispute or Pakistan’s support to Kashmir struggle could lead to escalation towards a conventional war. Indian failure to rapidly mobilize troops against Pakistan (2001-2002) following the Indian Parliament attacks prompted and refined PAS explains operational dynamics of Integrated Battle Groups (IBGs), theater force reserves and defensive balance forces that can be quickly mobilized. CSD was aimed to dissuade Pakistan from its alleged support to the freedom movement in the IHK. CSD is likely to operationalize 8 IBGs within 72-96 hours which will be equipped with offensive elements, latest MBTs, mechanized infantry, potent air defense, for robust command, control and synergy. The military objectives will be to destroy Pakistan’s
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Army Reserve Divisions (North & South). India Corps I, II and XXI will be divided in to eight IBGs.

According to Indian strategist thinkers, forward deployed divisions can be mobilized faster and deployments close to the border reduce logistics requirements. Further, the loss of territory will counteract the regime survival argument for use of nuclear weapons and multiple divisions in different regions will decapitate the decision-making process. Similarly, many integrated groups will present monitoring and intelligence challenges and pose smaller targets to nuclear weapons. Another challenge would be to perceive India’s limited objectives that could include slicing Pakistan’s territory or holding it for negotiations. CSD is aimed at dividing the cohesive strength of Pakistan and creating confusion.

CSD is based on five pillars: One, preparedness to fight a two-front war at western and north-eastern border. Second, is the strategic consideration of both military (conventional, sub-conventional and nuclear) and non-military factors in to outlining objectives. Third, is the capacity to take war in to enemy’s territory while protecting India’s interests in the region and the littoral states surrounding the Indian Ocean. Fourth, is developing interconnectedness between the three branches of the Indian Army. Fifth, is the feasible degree of technological advancement required to pursue a limited-objective war. CSD aims at setting objectives well below the nuclear threshold level. However, the limited objectives under CSD may not be perceived as such by Pakistan which has a Sub-conventional offensive posture and has responded by posing a low-nuclear threshold to use of NWs against India itself and seek application of counter-value and retaliatory nuclear measures.
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62. ‘Indian Army Ready for War against China, Pakistan’ (Geo TV, 30 December 2009).
The Network Centric Warfare Capabilities based on a shock and awe tactic (rapid dominance) seeks to exploit the situational awareness during a time of crisis and decapitate the Observation, Orientation, Decision and Action (OODA) loop of the decision makers. NCW also allows for integration of military/battlefield strategy in a result-oriented framework with real time reorientation of goals in an empowered self-synchronized manner which takes input from intelligence gathering, reconnaissance aircraft and satellite monitoring. However, the conversion of defense corps in to strike corps presents a challenge of a counter strike by Pakistan as well as the reliance of Pakistan on nuclear deterrence to deter Indian designs.

2.6 Indian Air Force Doctrine- 2012: Sub- Conventional Ops
The Indian Army must maintain a high degree of preparedness in varied terrains and capability to operate in complete spectrum of conflict. The Indian Airforce Doctrine Outlines a framework for military readiness as per the Airforce Strategic Environment Assessment which include the emergence of a more multipolar world with deviations in US alliances and the development of more lethal weapon systems that pose threats to air capabilities.63

The outcome of the Kargil conflict laid the foundations for an air force upgrade and in modern times has shifted from a tactical focus to a more robust dominant strike force perspective. IAF proposes increasing SU-30 MKI to a significantly higher 272 aircrafts.64 IAF has over 800 combat aircraft with offensive and defensive potential to undertake the whole spectrum of air operations. The Sukhoi Su-30 MKIs are multi-role, MIG-29s are air superiority fighters 65 is a primarily used multi-role fighter.66 India has also acquired C-17 Globemaster IIIs for strategic or

heavy lift transport roles. The AN 32 medium transport aircraft was upgraded and Mi-8 was replaced by Mi-17.\textsuperscript{67} Mi-26 performs heavy lift transport role and Mi-35 is performs the attacking role in helicopter operations.\textsuperscript{68} India has also acquired sophisticated surveillance and reconnaissance technologies including unmanned aerial combat vehicles including Harpy.

The Kargil conflict established the efficacy of air power and subsequently and the review committee laid the foundations for a 15-year Defense upgrade that was worth $30 billion. The total cost of advancements and investments was to be to a volume of over $100 billion over the next three decades.\textsuperscript{69} This was to induct modern new generations of combat aircrafts, add technologies critical to mission success to evaluate mission progress, helmet-mounted cueing systems for better in-field guidance, integrated defense electronics posed at counter-measures to aid in prompt counter-response and multiple function performing information distribution systems to cater to information needs.

India has made huge investments in defense and space industry including 50 laboratories and 39 ordinance factories under the DRDO. The Light Combat Aircraft (LCA) is being built indigenously to replace Mig-21s and acquisition of SU-57s 12 of which will be operational by 2019 and purchased by India after development. Indian Airforce requires 200 of the single-seat fighters Light Combat Aircraft, Tejas Mark 1 and 20 twin-seat trainers. Similarly, the Indian Navy requires 40 of the same single-seat fighter jets. The jet is under production to fulfill the Indian Air Force demand and the naval version is being tested. Indian Airforce Squadron Flying Daggers was the first operational unit that was formed of two Tejas Jets in July 2016.

\textsuperscript{68} “Mil Mi-25 / Mi-35 (Hind) Akbar”, Bharat Rakshak
The Indian Airpower Doctrine (APD) was developed in 1995 which placed emphasis on offensive capabilities with limited sources, strategic or deterrent air defense, acquisition of force multipliers and competencies of space power on equal footing with air, land and sea. The main task of the Indian Airforce is to ensure sovereignty of Indian airspace, launch aerial warfare operations during the conflict and defend India’s security. India requires aircraft to deliver nuclear weapons which will allow it to complete the nuclear triad and ensure a credible second-strike capability. UAV’s will be central to operative intelligence gathering within Pakistan or China in the Tactical Battle Area (TBA) and apply it in an offensive manner as India inducts armed UAVs to strengthen aerial force multipliers.\(^7^0\)

In a hypothetical scenario of conflict, several factors will point to the requirements for a robust Indian Air force. Basing the assumption on the 1:1 parity of the combat personnel the Indian Air force will need to field a force like the Pakistan Air force. The PAF can also be expected to have six Flight Refueling AF Equipment and Force Structure Requirements Aircraft (FRA).\(^7^1\) Therefore, to fight a one or more front war Indian Air force would critically require a minimum of 63 fighter squadrons of modern generation and 4\(^{th}\) generation aircrafts by 2032.\(^7^2\) NDA government, in April 2015, announced the deal to buy 36 Rafael fighter jets off the shelf at a price of 7.87 billion euros.

### 2.7 The Indian Maritime Strategy- 2015- Sea Dominance

Indian Navy despite being an antiquated force was envisioned to be an existential deterrent to Pakistan which attacked the Naval base at Dwarka (1965). India planned a sea-denial campaign

---


(1971) but was offset by U.S. decision. The role of the navy was to maintain control of sea in conflict with small powers and deploying effective deterrent against extra-regional powers. This implied denying access to India’s regional competitors and complete control in the contiguous zones

*Whoever controls the Indian Ocean will dominate Asia; the destiny of the world will be decided on its waters.*

*Alfred Thayer Mahan, The Influence of Sea Power upon History 1660–17831*

2.8 India’s security policy:73

India maintains its assertion to build its military capabilities to achieve its own ‘manifest destiny’ to control Indian Ocean.74 James Holmes and Toshi Yoshihara have developed this framework to understand the Indian security policy by examining references to Monroe Doctrine. Their inferences develop three force models to measure Indian maritime and air capabilities.75 They cite references from 2004 and 2007 to make this comparative analysis. Holmes and Yoshihara have borrowed American naval concepts to assess Indian naval capabilities: free-rider, constable and strongman. These models are three different stages of strategic cooperation and building military muscles.

2.8.1 Free-Rider Model

This model requires naval capability to neutralize low-level maritime threats i.e, any sort of illegal trafficking, sea-based terrorist activities, and piracy. It is lesser aggressive in posture,
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74 Holmes and Yoshihara, 337–39.

75 Holmes and Yoshihara, 340–41.
more focuses on safe trade transit and sea lanes. This model doesn’t diversify resources for expensive military apparatus. It seeks presence of powerful maritime power to guarantee the smooth sailing, maritime security in the region. It is an approach to avoid exhausting resources in mere muscle buildup as those can be utilized more in economic resources, multiplying trade and maintaining good image as well.

India, in this model seeks United States as dominant maritime force to play as guarantor and help in its economic endeavors to support domestic economy. Furthermore, United States works as balancing act against China, given the account of its assertive policies and comparative military prowess in the region.

2.8.2 Constable Model
This is next phase where a state seeks political restraint not to allow maritime access to any state forcefully. It requires dominant maritime security, better equipped and capable of such denial. This model requires sufficient capacity not letting any conflict provoked prematurely.

2.8.3 Strongman Model
This model requires a state capable of denying any external threat’s maritime access. For this, a state has to build capacity, latest military hardware, advanced technologies to respond any sort of maritime threat.

Indian Ministry of Defense [MoD] chalks out maritime strategic objectives in its Annual report 2014-15. It deliberates on maritime sovereignty of the state and full use-of-sea. It further elaborates that prime objective of Indian Navy is to deter any maritime threat and dissuade acts against its national interests. This report doesn’t rule out the probability of any conventional naval contest either but also very low in nature.
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Therefore, given the less likelihood of maritime conflict, India doesn’t find any persuasive reasons to procure expensive military hardware and modernize its maritime force. The statistics display massive Indian defense purchases that aim at building its power image, helping in extending leverage and political influence in the region. They also conclude that Indian military modernization drive is reciprocal to its continuous growing economy so it can allocate more budgets to expand its strategic clout in the region.

After analyzing all these three maritime models, India looks aspirant to be a resourceful constabulary force in the region. To establish its power, India requires carriers to induct in Navy. Holmes and Yoshihara find that “carriers have the capacity to execute traditional and nontraditional maritime roles such as air-to-air combat, air-ground attack, sea denial, anti-submarine, anti-surface warfare, mine and countermine anti-piracy and noncombatant evacuation operations (NEOs).” Given the account of its drive to modernize its navy, India requires three carriers in its East and West Coast fleets, with a third in a refit and training cycle.

2.9 India’s extended-neighborhood
Indian Ministry of External affairs uses the term ‘extended neighborhood’ in its Annual report 2006. David Scott outlines four geo-economic variables to measure Indian approach of
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extended neighborhood: trade, energy, security and military concerns.\textsuperscript{83} India aims to project both hard and soft power to gain and maintain effective economic, security, political and cultural advantages, Southeast Asia and into the South Pacific.\textsuperscript{84}

Scott maintains that India seeks its influence in extra-regional territories to support its domestic economic growth; its military capabilities for safe transit to ward off any piracy and establishing own preeminence.\textsuperscript{85} Minister of Defense A.K. Antony, states “India must develop stronger military capabilities to protect increasing economic interests overseas.”\textsuperscript{86}

This argument of Scott doesn’t validate Indian overwhelmingly investment in defense procurement for its maritime strategy. It further stands incorrect when India cuts new deals for nuclear submarines and expanding maritime advanced apparatus. For an aspiring major power, it is imperative to build its capability to ensure smooth sailing of its economic transit and security. This position cannot be achieved in absence of robust, effective maritime force.

Indian Ministry of Defense Annual report 2014-15 focuses on a variety of conventional and irregular security challenges that India confronts.\textsuperscript{87} This report further takes into consideration the probability of full—scale conventional war with Pakistan as low that further dispels the argument of Scott. It also undermines any compelling reason for maritime modernization drive.

\textsuperscript{82} Scott, ‘India’s “Extended Neighborhood” Concept’.
\textsuperscript{83} Scott, 113.
\textsuperscript{84} Scott, 107–8.
\textsuperscript{85} Scott, ‘India’s “Extended Neighborhood” Concept’.
\textsuperscript{86} Jane Sentinel Security Assessment, External Affairs (Jane, 2015), 1.
Therefore, accelerating Indian military modernization activities trigger the disruption in strategic setting of South Asia and endangering its stability.

This is one dimension that mostly infer on India’s long practiced policy of Non-alignment and focusing more on economic interests. But a careful and vigilant time-series analysis of Indian security policy determines how India has undergone through drastic strategic outlook and security capabilities. Congress, despite the party of Nehru, slightly drifts towards military muscles after 1962 indo-China War that remains continuously growing along maintaining the posture of neutrality and passive.\footnote{Sumit Ganguly and Manjeet S. Pardesi, ‘Explaining Sixty Years of India’s Foreign Policy’, \textit{India Review} 8, no. 1 (10 February 2009): 4–19.} Under the steer-ship of Indira Gandhi, India stresses ‘strategic autonomy via non-alignment, cautiousness towards high defense spending and attention to domestic economics.

The 2015 strategy reflects an intrepid flotilla with a maritime viewpoint of India’s security requirements.\footnote{Ben Wan Beng Ho, ‘The Aircraft Carrier in Indian Naval Doctrine: Assessing the Likely Usefulness of the Flattop in an Indo-Pakistani War Scenario’, \textit{Naval War College Review} 71, no. 1 (2018): 71–92.} However, India’s AC can carry a limited number of fighter jets known as the ‘small deck carrier quandary’ which will make offense-defense considerations difficult in view of anti-access/ area-denial complex.

After the 26/11 attacks India designed a strategy to reinvigorate maritime security and focus on the navy as the nodal authority for redressal of coastal and off-shore security concerns. The new strategy was refocused to take in to consideration the threats emanating from and at sea that were of concern to India’s vital strategic and territorial interests. Indian Doctrine published in 2007 was focused on military and was titled as the Indian Maritime Military Strategy. However, the 2015 doctrinal shift exhibits a refocus on security with the new doctrine being titled Indian
Maritime Security Strategy. IMSS-2015 encompasses a larger area of influence by expanding its horizons.\textsuperscript{90} IMSS’s statement for the intent of the Indian state to structure the maritime environment through engagements with related actors in the maritime region of primary and secondary concern. The formal ‘recognition’ of the additional choke-points highlights the embayed landscape of the region and contains allusion.

This clarifies India’s role thereby in which the latter would imply taking up role as a regional policeman and subsequently lead to the over-stretching and tying up of India’s maritime forces in unnecessary regional commitments and balances. IMSS-2015 appears to operate on the assumption of comprehensive security whereby the Indian Navy must acquire the attendant capability to operate on the full spectrum of conflict including conventional military threats along with a sufficiently able deterrent capability. The 2015 concept of naval security operates across a far wider range of escalation.\textsuperscript{91}

India had adamantly remained focused on the Indian Ocean and the factors that were impacting its security along its specific maritime boundaries. The impact of changes beyond this region posed several gaps in the existing security framework of India as there was no definitive indication of the Indian Navy being aware of these geo-strategic changes and more importantly if India was willing to expand its primary area of maritime interest and influence. The regional navies did not have a clear insight in to the Indian maritime perceptions all the while as US, Japan and Australia could perceive an enhanced role of India in the evolving security


architecture. IMSS-2015 exhibits the recognition by India of the complex and wider area of its concerns and a commitment to security in the enhanced area of interest.92

The third critical development is the definition of steps required to achieve that end. The document outlines the environment conducive for the execution of that role. The regional diktat which required India to play an enhanced regional and maritime role and the step taken to define India’s commitment is a positive approach in reorienting regional expectations. The ‘objective’ that the Indian Navy appears to have set out for itself again symbolizes the focus on the precursory need for a conducive or favorable environment.

The strategy reflects a consistent theme of Indianization which warrants a sufficiently advanced domestic capability in terms of technical and industrial expertise that would allow India to indigenously produce such technology and be more self-sufficient in its planning and acquisition of naval systems. The traditional norm of development would be to acquire foreign technical expertise by the procurement and purchase of such technologies from foreign suppliers or licensing the manufacture from other providers. However, Indianization appears focused that would cultivate, harness and further an indigenous capability to produce such technology in the future. Focus on indigenous industry provides greater autonomy and freedom of action through increased and on-demand availability of technical expertise which broods reliability.93

The indigenous refocus indicates a refocus in India’s thinking as a maritime power. Navies to be able to do so require greater interaction and contact to generate commonalities for such a collective security response as has been exhibited by Us navy through the commonalities


induced by NATO membership. However, the difference in technologies will reduce communication and the requirements will become more complex. The increasing US modernization of its Navy will change the technological profile of the US Pacific fleet and provide difficulties in establishing a useful naval partnership with Indianized technology.  

2.10 The Joint Indian Army Doctrine- (2017)

The Joint Indian Army Doctrine (2017) lists the following National Interests and Security Objectives India’s National Interests are derived from the need to protect and preserve its core values:  

a. To preserve the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of India.

b. To preserve the democratic, secular and federal character of the Indian Republic.

c. To safeguard India’s existing and emerging strategic, political, economic and military goals in consonance with the National Aim.

India’s National Security Objectives are:

a. Maintain a credible deterrent capability to safeguard National Interests.

b. Ensure defense of national territory, air space, maritime zones including our trade routes and cyber space.

These interests and objectives are relevant in a larger strategic perspective which entails the following:


a. India’s aspirations for a greater role in the New World Order do not allow it to remain detached from global developments and it has to harness all aspects of national power and influence the world through its geography.

b. Effective deterrent capabilities to protect strategic interests in regions along Northern, Western and Eastern borders and sensitivities across LOC and LAC.

c. Addressing concerns of instability and radicalism in the immediate and extended neighborhood which arises from geo-political rebalancing, assertiveness by emerging powers and regional instabilities.

d. The centrality of land borders and Indian Ocean Region to India’s growth and security as land and sea routes are vital for trade. Cooperative security and strategic partnerships in this regard are also crucial.

The Joint Armed forces doctrine (2017) focuses on the following aspects:

a. Jointness- a high-level of cross domain synergy for optimized capability to engage in Joint-War fighting. Joint Military Objectives and resource allocation for cross-domain requirements while keeping in mind the uniqueness and special attributes of each service.

b. Other elements of integration are Joint Strategic Military Education, integrated logistics structure, integrated human resource development structure, integrated procurement, integrated perspective planning and emerging ‘triad’ to the traditional mediums of Land, Sea and Air, wherein future wars are likely to be fought, viz. in the domains of Space, Cyber and Special Operations.

The military is viewed as the upholder of Comprehensive National Development due to the reason that a military and security compromise will impact progress. The increased investment in military tasks it to maintain infallibility and for that purpose needs a robust military doctrine. The
military also has the responsibility to aid the civil administration as and when needed. The doctrine envisions an operational environment which is focused on “synchronization” of rather than ‘integration’ between the various instruments of military power. The doctrine tasks the establishment of synergy between the three wings of the Armed forces which is based on the notion that the application of joint force yields better results than the cumulative effect of the three wings applied individually. Synchronization refers to accumulation of force which will result in a bottom up approach compared to integration which would signify a top down approach. In this manner a bottom up approach will be better connected to ground realities, task demands, and cost analysis of the objectives involved.

A doctrine is aimed at prioritizing activities rather than platforms or services involved in the execution. As the notion of the strength of defense suggests that any chain is as strong as the weakest link in it and in the modern warfare such a weak link in air power target system will be the pilots as they are the hardest to replace in real time. A Special Force tasked with the goal of neutralizing the adversary’s pilots will render its air power futility.

Various arms of the defense forces have individual doctrines which are cognizant of the nature of operations and their respective mediums of operation. The behavior and outlooks of the personnel vary according to the operational mediums and the capacity of their roles varying from combat, combat support to support service. The perspectives and attitudes are acquired as the individual grows within the service.

The area under exercise of power also referred to as geographical range also depends on the nature of the force where aircraft can provide air support to the land and water forces by providing air cover and neutralizing targets in real time and space. However, if the flexibility of the air force is exchanged for a larger fleet under a single commander, this will reduce the
efficiency of the Air Force by impacting its real time threat assessment and target acquisition. A multi-role aircraft can perform combat operations as well as ensure air space denial to enemy aircraft. The multiplicity of roles in the Air force warrants flexibility for bogies and similarly the perception related to nature of theatres varies in Army and Air force calculations. A military doctrine therefore needs to be operationally optimized to use integrated force across military forces and mediums.

The Indian Military Doctrine deals with synergy of the armed forces with integration within individual forces. The various arms of military are individually operated and follow a top-down approach of integration.

Execution of operations along the Army, Navy and Air Force requires an integrative military authority for coordination of functions and the consequent change in structure will aid the prioritization of objectives and utilization of available resources in a timely, efficient and cost-effective manner. An integrative synergy would be cognizant of the challenges posed by geography, aid impactful utilization of Air force and aid collective application of military power. The central authority will be able to allocate such assets on a need basis in each region as dictated by operational space and mission time. The common assets will only be deployed on a need-based basis for their efficient utilization as force multipliers. The task of Training, Administration and Support including as a function to aid civil government will be performed by the existing military organizations.96

Military Divisions be placed in such operational settings that resemble their operational preparedness and need. Peace time will be utilized for Training, Maintenance and Administration of the units and place the Units will be placed within Military Regions with special focus on the

possible need to neutralize an impending threat. The Military Authority in individual regions for these divisions will be supplemented by senior support staff from the three services to enhance interconnectedness.

The Central Military Authority (CMA) will be represented by the senior most military officer and he will be tasked with the goal of effectively applying military power and integration of the forces through the Regional Military Authorities (RMAs). The RMAs will comprise of specialized Integrated Task Forces which will be uniquely designed for specific purposes and the size of such forces will depend on the task at hand and the demand of the situation. However, operational command will be handed over to the CMA with operations being its domain. The existing Commands will be made congruent to military regions in terms of operational, threat based, and defense need understandings.

The commander of Air Forces will have command over aerial assets even belonging to other organizations. Exceptions will be made to the operational domain of CAF in case of air power integral to an Army thrust, Naval task forces and assistance to the CMA in pursuit of its original functions. Similar integration mechanisms will be worked out at lower level Military Regions and subsequently at the Integrated Task Force levels within the Region. 97

2.11 Doval Doctrine
A.S Dulat, a former special director of the IB and chief of Research and Analyses Wing (RAW) characterized Doval as “the hawkish Ajit Doval”. The difference between the current NSA and his predecessors is that none of his predecessors had the field experience which Doval possesses, moreover his predecessors focused more on diplomatic tackling rather than strategic and operational with no field experience whatsoever. He has led many covert operations in foreign

countries in the past; and by foreign country it is referred towards Pakistan where he spent seven years as a spy. Moreover, he doesn’t hesitate to roll up his sleeves and get into the action. Doval’s working style suits his boss PM Narendra Modi’s, who is also hawkish and is out to prove that he is better than all his predecessors. PM Narendra Modi and Doval’s synergy has resulted in many changes into the core doctrine of India which makes it even more hawkish towards its neighbors China and Pakistan.

In Doval Doctrine, he has proposed to completely change the long existing grand consensus within the India, a consensus which was majorly non-confrontational and non-aligned in nature; the Gandhi-Nehru consensus, and bring about the changes at strategic as well as the tactical level. He proposed to defy the cost-benefit into India’s favor and reiterated to raise the cost for the adversary instead of raising benefits for India. According to him India should not let its adversaries to prepare against it while they themselves enjoy peace, rather India should work to create distractions in adversary states and exploit their vulnerabilities (social, economic, ethnic, religious or political), so they are never in a position to come over their vulnerabilities before doing anything against India. He is a man who is more in favor of action than dealing situations through diplomacy and dialogue. After his appointment as NSA, the operational conduct of intelligence agencies and Border Security Forces of India (BSF) has completely changed where the number of covert activities of India in Pakistan has seen a significant rise and also bilateral border confrontations have intensified more than they were in the past and massive and uncalled for retaliatory responses by the BSF has taken Pakistani forces by surprise. 
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He follows the aggressive and hawkish policy to tackle the adversary; he believes that it’s the time to raise the cost of action for the adversary. He presented a doctrine of defensive-offensive, according to which India should take offensive measures to conduct operations (covert or overt) against an adversary (mainly Pakistan) while taking preemptive-defensive measures in mind. This defensive-offensive doctrine is extremely dangerous in nature for the region because it presupposes the fact that India has to work in order to weaken its enemy even before the enemy can takes any action against India. The question here is that, how would India be able to judge accurately whether the adversary is going to take any action against India in the future or not? since intentions are no standard for judging one’s future actions since intentions have benign characteristics with an element of suddenness and a tendency of being interpreted in the wrong manner.

Doval rejects the diplomacy and negotiations as primary modus operandi of solving bilateral clashes between India and Pakistan rather he believes that India should take strict actions against Pakistan to remain superior in the region because negotiations would not prove the point of India being the superior state in the region. He suggested there should be no dialogue with Pakistan and change should be adopted in India’s cost-benefit calculus. He proposed a dimensional change in foreign policy of India towards Pakistan. In February 2014, while giving a speech in Shastra University he answered a question “how to tackle Pakistan?” in this manner, “India should let go its defensive posture and adopt defensive-offensive mode since Pakistan’s vulnerabilities are way more than the vulnerabilities of India as Pakistan is vulnerable in many ways; economically, politically, religiously, and ethnically therefore, India should work upon to exploit those vulnerabilities through defensive-offensive measures ergo putting Pakistan in a situation where it is not affordable for Pakistan to harm Indian interest and security.”
shifts gear from defensive to defensive-offensive, Pakistan would know the cost of conflict has been raised as he warns. This statement about Baluchistan is the heart of Doval Doctrine and helps in understanding the crux of the doctrine.99

He reiterates the point all the time that India should change the methods of its conduct to use power against its adversaries especially Pakistan. At one place, he states that India has to create deterrence against attacks on its soil, not exercising the power is just similar to not having it at all. On the question of morality, he is pretty clear that state does not work on the principles of individualistic code of moralities rather state is a rational actor which only pursues its interests and those interests should never be over-shadowed by the need to remain moral thus while pursuing India’s interests we should not bother how we are pursuing them and at what cost whether moralistic or immoral doesn’t matter. Pakistan condemns this kind of mindset and rejects such doctrine which endangers the regional balance of power and moreover which includes immoral conduct of warfare. There’s no doubt, Doval Doctrine has taken Indian strategic posture by a storm and it seems India is following his instructions. India has opted to conduct covert and overt operations as suggested by the Doval.100

India has been carrying covert operations on Pakistani soil for decades and there had been a visible increase in number of instances after the nuclearization of India and Pakistan. Since Pakistan is also a nuclear weapon state therefore India knows a slight misadventure can quickly turn into a nuclear Armageddon therefore India keeps itself refrained from carrying out any

99 Pratyush Ranjan, “Who is India's NSA Ajit Doval and What is the 'Doval Doctrine'?,” NEWS NATION, September 27, 2016.

conventional operations. Thus, opting out a non-conventional method of warfare or as suggested by the Kautilya “the devious warfare” and favored by the Doval Doctrine. Currently India is indulged into carrying out operations in Baluchistan in a similar fashion as India did in case of East Pakistan; fueling the separatist movement in 1971. It is claimed by an Indian newspaper that, “at least eight covert operations have been carried out by the Technical Service Division (TSD) in foreign countries and it is not hard to guess which foreign country would that be and moreover, it is allegedly claimed by the TSD.

According to an Indian newspaper *The Hindu*, “officials have confirmed that both Pakistani occupied Kashmir PoK and Baluchistan will be target more and more when India faces allegations by Pakistan over Jammu and Kashmir”. This shows the true face of India who is responsible for all the terrorist and separatist activities inside Pakistan and harbors enemies of Pakistan with its money and covert support. Also, this reiterates the point that Doval Doctrine is real and is functional in the true spirit of letters. India is in constant struggle of weakening Pakistan both internally as well as externally. Balaach Pardili’s presence in India and a press conference in New Delhi is a proof of Pakistan’s claims. Also, the arrest of an active Indian Navy officer Kulbhushan Jadev who was spying in Pakistan in 2016 proves the claims of Pakistan that India is fueling insurgencies and terrorist activities in Pakistan through its spies and intelligence agencies.

These actions of India are to cut Pakistan with double edged sword, internally such activities achieve the target of Doval Doctrine which was to cash out Pakistan’s vulnerabilities to make it a weaker state as compared to India so it is never be able to harm Indian interests, and secondly
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making Pakistan’s posture look bad and insecure globally while pursuing another objective of isolating Pakistan globally.

India is also active on overt front as well, an overt operation is defined as “An operation conducted openly, without concealment”. The border clashes have been intensified more than ever and Indian border security forces are not hesitating to use heavy artillery on Pakistani bordering villages resulting tremendous loss of lives and property. Moreover, Indian security forces are given a green signal by the NSA Ajit Doval to use barbaric force against innocent Kashmiri people to crash freedom movements and send a signal to the Pakistan as a warning. The brutal use of pellet gun on unarmed Kashmiri people have resulted in severe damages to their bodies, these actions of India have also been condemned by the World also.

2.12 Surgical Strike
“A surgical strike is a military attack (airborne and artillery), which is intended to damage only a legitimate military target, with no or minimal collateral damage to surrounding infrastructure, and property of other sorts like vehicles, buildings or places for general public utility.” 103 As the definition suggests, a surgical strike is a limited operation involving limited number of troops against pre-decided targets while in collaboration with intelligence agencies and air force for the success of mission. Direct confrontation is avoided or is intended to be avoided when carrying a surgical strike while troops move deep inside the territory of adversary to hit the target (not civilians) and fall back to their initial positions without being traced or contacted with by the enemy troops.

Surgical strike is relatively a sophisticated operation which requires sophisticated strategic maneuvering along with well-trained and well-equipped military forces specifically trained for the purpose. Surgical strike requires advanced equipment and expertise in articulation of information about the target. It is considered that an efficient surgical strike is the one which includes the land forces as well as air force to conduct the airborne operations and to drop the troops down in the target area and carry air strikes if required as suggested by Hasan Askari. Intelligence agencies play the pivotal role in success of surgical strikes, because access to the credible information about the target, its position and its capability to respond is the first step towards planning a surgical strike. Moreover, a careful and constant analysis of target’s movement and maneuvering is required to ensure the success of the strike. It is important to note here that common forces or border security forces are not capable enough of carrying surgical strikes because surgical strikes require specific training along with the special equipment and technical support. Currently very few military forces in the world can carry such operations with certainty of success.

Recently, Pakistan in September 2016 in the aftermath of Uri attack. According to Indian government, Indian military forces have conducted a surgical strike on the night of 29th September 2016. India claims that it had targeted the several launch pads of terrorist organizations across the border into the Pakistani territory during the night and came back before the dawn to their initial positions. Indian media was fluxed with the news of surgical strike and it was being claimed that the Indian military has avenged the Uri attack by conducting a successful surgical strike and killing terrorists as well as Pakistani soldiers on the Pakistani soil too. Indian notion was rejected right away by Pakistani government and media wing of Pakistani armed forces ISPR rejected the existence of any such activity in Pakistani territory. It was merely a
cross border firing instance which is nothing new in case of India and Pakistan on LOC. Absence of proofs on the both sides to support their claims forced the strategic thinkers to go back and ponder upon the most important question “about the legitimacy of Indian claims” that comes to mind right after hearing about India conducting a surgical strike, “is India capable of carrying a surgical strike in the first place?”. And the answer to this question was more negative than positive even on the Indian side.

He further reiterates the point by arguing that India’s most advanced unmanned air vehicle (UAV) DRDO Rustom II is still undergoing necessary tests therefore India needs more sophistication in UAV technology for spying purposes and for the purpose of gathering information and monitoring the movement of target without which surgical strike is not possible to take place successfully or even to take place.

Strategic thinkers have consensus on one point that although India has revolutionized its military capabilities and military doctrine over few years but it still lacks the basic minimum capability to carry out a surgical strike and that too against a sophisticated army like Pakistan’s. Most strategic thinkers have declared Pakistani notion on the issue more valid. Similar claims have been made by Sandeep Singh, who believes that surgical strikes have to take place deep inside the adversary country and what India is claiming to be a surgical strike is nothing but just another cross-border clash.

Experts have claimed that, first of all India lacks the basic capabilities to carry such surgical strike as claimed by India and secondly had India actually conducted the surgical strike it is impossible for the Indian forces to return back unharmed given the rough and difficult terrain of the area, steep slopes and of course in the existence the definite possible retaliation of greater magnitude by Pakistani forces. On other hand India seems determined over its claims and
propagating it more and more which according to some experts could be provocative and extremely dangerous for the region. According to Ajai Shukla claims of surgical strikes have other motives too, the political motives of the ruling party Bharatiya Janta Party (BJP). He states that BJP has used surgical strike as a tool for political objectives and Uttar Pradesh (UP) elections are clear indication. This helps to clarify the broader picture hidden behind the claims of surgical strike, the political consideration of the ruling party. BJP has always propagated anti-Pakistan and anti-Muslim slogans to win the popular support of greater Hindu population in India, and this claim of a surgical strike is just another link in anti-Pakistan chain.

Claimed the deaths of several terrorists and Pakistani military personnel. These claims have been rejected by Pakistan by saying that it was just another incident of cross-border firing initiated by the India in which Pakistan has lost 2 soldiers at two different locations. The only difference this time is that Indian government is publicly admitting that it has attacked Pakistani forces across the border. In a statement DG ISPR Lt. General Asim Bajwa reiterates the point by saying that India is trying to create “false illusions” just for the consumption of its citizens to hiding its failures.

If we look at Indian perspective it seems possible since all the doctrinal shift in Indian strategic playground suggests that India consider itself to be capable enough of carrying a limited operation under nuclear threshold. Cold-Start doctrine is another indicator of such Indian intentions but Pakistan’s preparations against Cold-Start doctrine and adoption of Credible minimum deterrence by Pakistan has left Indian claims of possibility of future surgical strikes just short of reality. Pakistan has created a more mobile and well-equipped and trained force to counter such future endeavors of Indian forces. Moreover, possession of low-yield, field of field short range tactical nuclear weapon by Pakistan has left Indian with no choice other than just
dreaming about the future adventures. Recently in the aftermaths of Pulwama attacks, Indian Chief of Army Staff General Bipin Rawat has once again indicated about another surgical strike in Pakistan, upon which global community is concerned that it might escalate to bigger problems between India and Pakistan and may eventually become a nuclear flashpoint.
CHAPTER 3
INDIAN MILITARY’S MODERNIZATION DRIVE AND
SOUTH ASIAN STRATEGIC STABILITY

3.1 Introduction
Since 9/11, India has witnessed a rapid economic and political rise that compelled it to seek military prowess through transforming its strategic outlook and modernizing military. Indian booming economy coupled with changing strategic dynamics in the region. This evolving relationship from ‘estranged democracies to engaged democracies’ helped India to foster its military muscles, reinvigorate defense capabilities and use military force as a ladder for political influence in its immediate neighborhood. This has further revolutionized its strategic thinking, military outlook and defense capabilities. From ‘deep thrusts’ to ‘shallow maneuvering’ through limited war under nuclear overhang, India has built offensive doctrine of Cold Start and acquiring relevant military hardware to operationalize it.

Indian military has undergone through a massive military overhaul, transformation in its strategic doctrines and operational capabilities. India has inked many significant arms deals to modernize its military, equipping with latest and advanced defense apparatus for sharing sensitive geospatial intelligence have multiplied Indian conventional military prowess and earned status for ‘major defense partner’ of United States. The Anti-Ballistic Missile investment with
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Israel\textsuperscript{107} and recent S-400\textsuperscript{108} with Russia clearly projects the ambitions of India, Indians offensive modernization drive that has alarmed the bells in Islamabad policy corridors as well. The checkmate with tactical nuclear weapons for the offensive cold start doctrine of India has shaken with this latest acquisition. Also, induction of AWACS systems\textsuperscript{109}, naval carriers, anti-ship missiles and INS Arihant are Indian efforts to revolutionize its military to offset the existing power equation and impose a conventional asymmetry. Indian quest for becoming a major power faces its security challenges within and outside of India.

On the one hand, United States inks nuclear deals with India\textsuperscript{110}, helps in revamping Indian military through latest equipment, supportive of Indian membership in Export Control Regime,\textsuperscript{111} extends Indian role in Afghanistan\textsuperscript{112} and on the other hand, denying Pakistan F-16\textsuperscript{113}. Pakistan, having a long history of hostility with India cannot afford any shift in existing strategic balance that may question her potential to safeguard her territorial integrity.


\textsuperscript{110} Rosen and Jackson, ‘The U.S. India Defense Relationship’.

\textsuperscript{111} Rakesh Sood, ‘India and Non-Proliferation Export Control Regimes’ (New Delhi: ORF Occassional Papers, 2018).


\textsuperscript{113} Franz-Stefan Gady, ‘US Won’t Subsidize Pakistan’s Purchase of F-16 Fighter Jets’, The Diplomat, 4 May 2016.
Indian growing military prowess and ambitious designs have alarmed many in the world. World seems to be endorsing Michael Krepon to justify Pakistan’s stance upon the possession a result of India’s blind followed path of increasing its conventional might to increase gap with Pakistan. Another possible explanation for Indian modernization can be its immense coastline\textsuperscript{114}, global trade and adversarial relationship in the region as well. In terms of fleet size, India is ranked fifth globally but due to sluggish nature it falls short of expectations and is strategically more vulnerable to China.\textsuperscript{115} Arun Prakash, former Indian Naval chief outlines drivers for intensification of modernization drive are: growing global sea-based economy, adversarial relationship with China and to ward off any adventure from Pakistan.\textsuperscript{116} India prioritizes its investment in maritime security mostly to deny Mumbai attacks like repetition. This modernity drive is manifold and on multiple fronts. It has somehow equally focused on Indian Ocean Region as well.

They mostly overlook Indian regional motives to enlarge its political influence and its efforts to expedite the modernization drive. There is also naivety in this analysis as how the increased military growth shall help India in its pursuits in immediate neighborhood. One also finds it objectionable in the given account of Indian internal and external security threats to pursue the global power status. It rather stays at home more with enhancing its military capabilities and to cause an arms race among the rival states especially Pakistan to follow the suit.


\textsuperscript{115} Kugelman, 13–14.

\textsuperscript{116} Kugelman, 14.
3.2 The Indian Military Modernization: Historical Background:
India has evolved different perceptions of strategic environment and challenges to its national security over the years. It has drifted gradually from Nehruvian approach to view national security as political matter and to manage threats politically rather than militarily. India practiced this approach a long not to formulate ambitious military objectives and rearmament of its military. India rather always kept economy as its foremost priority and allocating its resources for development than defense. Today, under Modi, India is far more different in its strategic outlook, power pursuits and policy objectives. India being the largest importer of arms globally, one can easily map out the intentions and ambitions of India which is none other than being unreasonably offensive while diversifying its resources more to reinvigorate its military muscles to expand its political influence for strategic purposes. This hawkish approach has caused instability in the region and alarmed the bells for any possible Indian adventure as well.

3.2.1 Threat Perceptions: Internal and External Security Challenges:
In international politics, military buildups are equated with threat perceptions, power transition, changing status quo or developing defensive or offensive capabilities in the wake of certain security challenges. There are always multiple factors and competing variables to shape a state’s national security strategy and essence for revamping and modernizing its military muscle. The Indian military modernization is characterized generally as the product of its perceived internal and external security vulnerabilities. India has longstanding territorial disputes with its immediate neighbors China and Pakistan that has led it to wars as well. With a constant threat from both sides, India requires a robust, advanced and well-equipped military with the latest defense apparatus and military technologies. Relatively proportional deployments of troops on borders with enhancing capacity of surveillance, combat readiness and continuous military
exercises on Pakistan border amply depicts the Indian offensive military modernization drive as Pakistan-centric more than China-focused.\textsuperscript{117}

India is facing severe internal security challenges because of the multiple insurgencies, which are left wing extremism (LWE), North East Conundrum and growing violence in (Indian-held) Jammu and Kashmir valley. India is a heterogeneous society with bulk of ethnic communities along a widened gulf in access to resources and living standards. Though India is prospering, and its growth rate immensely hiked upward yet an affluent majority lives to toil in the gloom of poverty. India has many homegrown insurgencies and rising violent Right wing who consistently kept its military engaged and devouring bulk of resources.\textsuperscript{118}

To cope with its perceived internal and external strategic vulnerabilities, India requires engineering modernization of its military and transformation in its strategic approaches as well. India has the foremost perennial problem is troubled history of relations with Pakistan especially lingering unsettled Kashmir issue, water disputes, Siachen, Sir Creek, and proxy wars. This has brought both the states to engage in missile and conventional arms race, building nuclear capacity and fight wars since independence. This has compelled the Indian civil and military elites to rethink and allocate more on defense budgets that has reached to 63.9 billion dollar to be the fifth largest spender on military expenditures.\textsuperscript{119}

Michael Kugelman cites another reason for this massive overhaul is being Indian arsenal ‘inadequate and obsolete’ though India has denied any currency to this vehemently.\textsuperscript{120} Also,
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Mumbai attacks has crystalized Indian maritime security and augment the argument of dire need to modernize and equip with advanced technical apparatus. To ward off any Mumbai like surprise attack in future, India decides to focus more on Maritime Strategy. India seeks drastic transformation in its strategic outlook and aims to modernize its military.

3.2.2 Factors that accelerated the Modernization Drive
It has cultivated an opportunity for US and India for their respective global and regional interests. This convergence of interests led the Indian economy to flourish and sufficiently enhance its military inventory purchase capacity as well. This modernization drive has many factors that accelerated the pace and help the Indian Military to equip with latest military hardware. Though, mostly it is believed as China-centric under United States’ Asiatic balancer to counterweight growing Chinese flux, but the critical examination of the Indian military doctrines, its troop deployments and conventional arms purchases amply evident of its ambitions in immediate neighborhood.

Also, series of events like attacks on Indian Parliament on December 13, 2001 followed by *Operation Parakram* that manifested the Indian military’s logistical constraints, defense hardware obsolesces and exposed badly its capacity to mount any quick, swift surprise attack or respond effectively under the nuclear umbrella. This was the major development that compelled the Indian decision makers to allocate more resources to overhaul its military machine and modernize it immediately. Later on, Mumbai Attacks- 2008 developed the Indian conscious to augment its military muscles more to neutralize any such militant activity in future. That requires synergy among all forces, more focused on conventional war-fighting with conventional superiority in the wake of nuclear weapon to seize the adversary not to take any irrational move.
Indian bolstering rise in its military is aimed at expanding its capability to “assert, defend, deter and assist’ military operations to enlarge its horizon of influence.  

3.3 Global Dynamics

_In the twenty-first century, the emergence of India as strong, stable, democratic and outwardly looking global player with global interests has the potential to enhance the effectiveness of the international system and the security and well-being of all, in a positive sum game_. (Jim Steinbreg).

U.S. finds India as a vital partner sharing similar strategic interests; rise of China, Islamist threats and non-proliferation issues. U.S. considers India with its booming economy and the largest democracy can be a significant pillar in U.S. Security Strategy in South Asia.  

International politics is all about convergence of interests and shared strategic objectives. India and U.S. have different strategic priorities but share similar interests in the region that transformed into a significant defense cooperation. It also brought Indian addition as a central pillar in Indo-Pacific Security strategy.  

3.3.1 Indian and American Defense Partnership: An Asiatic Balancer

U.S. presence in Afghanistan, nuclear India-Pakistan with constant risk of war and rising economic power China turned Asia as the center of gravity and global political competition. U.S
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and China share mutual hostility of geopolitical encirclement, cyber rattling, expanding military competitiveness and economic resources. Given the changing strategic environment in the region with Chinese economic rise brought the Cold war estranged democracies to engaged democracies. India rose to be a significant potential contender in the region. With its rising economy to support its military modernization drive and huge market appeal with the largest democracy, India fitted to be as ‘Asiatic balancer’. So, for the balancing act, India requires massive military modernization, self-sufficiency and readiness with reach-out capabilities. U.S. developed strategic partnership with India, assisted through military procurement, joint military exercises and civil nuclear cooperation. U.S. increased ‘size, sophistication and scope’\textsuperscript{124} of strategic cooperation with India through joint humanitarian and training operations, missile defense collaboration and weapons production\textsuperscript{125}. President Bush was not to observe ‘Congagement’\textsuperscript{126} policy of his predecessors rather to contain China through developing strategic cooperation with India and boosting its defense capacity and political clout.

U.S. and India share common allies for arms sales, defense collaborations and counterterrorism issues. For instance, India has defense collaborations with Israel\textsuperscript{127}, arms procurements from France and United Kingdom.\textsuperscript{128} Japan, another strategic ally of U.S. in the region shares common


\textsuperscript{125} Ladwig III, ‘Delhi’s Pacific Ambition’, 102.
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perception about China and has developed security ties with India. Indo-Japan relationship includes military exercise, energy security and defense industrial cooperation.\textsuperscript{129} Tokyo supports India’s “Look East policy”, signed a civil nuclear agreement in 2016 and joined in regional security initiatives with India and U.S.\textsuperscript{130} Rising Chinese economic and military power is one key driver to accelerate capacity, and harness political influence in the region.

3.4 Regional Dynamics
China and Pakistan are the significant factors to shape Indian military modernization drive and transformation in its strategic thinking.

3.4.1 China Factor:

“\textit{Today or tomorrow, China will likely turn against India. New Delhi must be ready for when the time comes.}” (T. V. Paul).\textsuperscript{131}

China as a significant threat with its rising economic might and efforts to fortify Pakistan through military and economic aid against India.\textsuperscript{132} India and China have territorial disputes and fought a war in 1962 as well that ended with humiliating defeat for India. Prior to this discord, Sino-India relations were of friendly neighbors with “Hindi-Cheeni, Bhai-Bhai”. Convergence of Indo-US priorities to contain Chinese growing economy and expanding influence in Indo-Pacific
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Ocean has helped India to seek US defense cooperation to augment its capacity, build asymmetrical.

China is building multiple infrastructure projects, ports in different countries like Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh in a manner to channelize her economy. China also is building a naval base in Burma. India sees such moves as strategic play that further demands to invest and uplift muscles to build reach out to counter Chinese growing influence and countering piracy in the region. In 2009, an Indian defense official responds to Chinese maritime plans “Chinese navy is being developed at quite a rapid pace, no wonder what Chinese ambitions in Indian Ocean are.” According to him countering China’s modernization plans should be on the priority list of India’s Maritime policy along with safeguard of energy security, protection of sea lanes and eradication of Islamic extremism.

3.4.2 Indian Ocean
China is searching for sea-based requirements. This has coupled Indian security concerns with economic as well. Now it is believed also, with latest inventory and military muscles on its ranks, India does have enough defense capability to guard herself against China.

3.4.3 Territorial Disputes
India and China have border disputes, Tibetan Plateau water resources and Chinese presence in Jammu Kashmir with warm ties with Pakistan help rising tensions between the two Asian
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behemoths. A recent Doklam episode is evident of this deeper animosity and manifestation of strategic prowess on either side.

### 3.4.4 Pakistan Factor

Issues between India and Pakistan are very complicated. Whether it is Kashmir, Siachen, Sir Creek, water or terrorism, both countries have been failed to overcome these issues. Both the states have conventional asymmetries that deepen the sense of insecurity for Pakistan and naturally compel it to reciprocate in rational and responsive manner to dodge Indian military mighty. Pakistan and India have many lingering issues that range from territorial disputes to water resources, terrorism to Siachen, Sir Creek, continued cross border shelling on Line of Control (LoC) that has caused mistrust, enmity on either side. So far, nuclear arsenal has played a role of deterrent between two warring rivals, but it has brought back possibility of ‘limited war’ as well.

India seeks enhancement in response capability to any alleged terrorist attack linking it to Indian-held Kashmir based militant outfits with alleged support of Pakistani military. This massive growth in Indian military muscle is a manifestation of its aggressive designs in the region. Furthermore, this approach has staggering challenges to already delicate strategic environment of South Asia. Nuclear factor has played as deterrent to avoid any direct conventional combat between the two warring rivals.

India enjoys conventional superiority over its neighbors but later also possess adequate military potential to defend especially its nuclear weapon adds more strategic advantage. Despite
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all conventional advantages, India lacks to defeat Pakistan decisively\textsuperscript{137} and that may be an explanation to Indian modernization drive and immense acquisition of latest conventional inventory.

\textbf{3.4.4.1 Kashmir: Nuclear Flashpoint}

After six decades of Indian occupation, Kashmir is still burning. More than 100,000 people in Kashmir have lost their lives and thousands are missing or buried in mass graves in Indian held Kashmir. Kashmir issue has become very complicated now. Because of the strategic position of Kashmir, immense water resources, and political expediencies, India will never concede Kashmir. There are many insurgencies going on in India, if it admits independent stature of Kashmir then it is going to give legitimacy to other insurgencies inside India. Secondly conceding Kashmir would be a great setback for India. Rivers are considered as a lifeline for India and Pakistan. India would never want dependence on Kashmir or Pakistan. So, keeping in mind these strategic realities, Kashmir’s solution is not possible in the foreseeable future.

\textbf{3.4.4.2 Siachen Issue}

In 1984 India annexed Siachen glacier and a new conflict born between India and Pakistan. Both countries have lost almost 8,000 soldiers (five thousand India and three thousand Pakistan). India’s aggressive move in Siachen compelled Pakistan to reciprocate at Kargil which had resulted in casualties of hundreds of soldiers on both sides.\textsuperscript{138} The Siachen issue could be resolved through negotiations between both states but the Indian government’s stubborn attitude.


3.4.4.3 Indian Offensive Mindset
India’s coercive policies compelled Pakistan to become a security state. Today India is sitting in Afghanistan and using Afghan soil against Pakistan. Pakistan is facing two front war dilemmas because of Indian presence in Afghanistan. India has opened a second front against Pakistan from Afghanistan.

3.4.4.4 Afghan Chessboard: Fear of Two Front War Dilemma
Pakistan looks suspiciously towards opening of consulates at more than place by the India as their consulates are in Heart, Mizar-i-Sharif, Jalalabad and Kandahar. Pakistan accuses India of carrying out covert operations from these consulates against Pakistan, provoking the waves of separatism and insurgencies in Baluchistan while providing economic as well as physical sanctuaries to the extremists in their consulates and hosting the operatives from their own various intelligence agencies.

3.4.4.5 Hybrid Warfare in Pakistan
It is evident from an unprecedented increase in the violence in tribal areas and Baluchistan. It is a possibility that India is providing funding, training and other logistical support to BLA and TTP from their safe heavens in Afghanistan. India considers Pakistan army and ISI their main enemies, we have seen some high-profile attacks on Pakistan security forces, in which almost 5000 men were killed, and thousands are injured. How it is possible that a group of militants could plan and carry out such high-profile attacks without any external support. Attacks on Pakistan’s strategic installations indicate external support to these militants.

Taliban from Pakistan or Uzbek militants have nothing to do with our surveillance and reconnaissance aircraft. These strategic assets are meant to counter India; they are wholly focused against India. Indian ingress is increasing day by day in Afghanistan and problems for Pakistan are also greater than ever. Pakistan faced hundreds of cross border raids from
Afghanistan. It is difficult for militants to carry out such raids without any support and logistics. India has opened a second front against Pakistan and carrying out its malicious activities from there.

3.4.4.6 Terrorism and Extremism: Proxy War
Pakistan and India’s relations will remain bleak in the foreseeable future. Both countries must realize this fact that policy of confrontation and competition would give them nothing but misery and chaos. It is vital for both countries to closely work together for the betterment of their people.

The border between India and Pakistan is the most vulnerable and volatile in the whole world, because of the nuclear flash point. Both countries are in a state of war since their independence in 1947. The defense budget of India has seen drastic rise for the purchasing of new arms in order to eliminate the existing functional deficiencies in its overall military capabilities and operationalization of its aggressive doctrines against Pakistan. 1998 proved to be an important year for arch-rivals as it marked, attainment of Nuclear weapon by the both adversaries eliminated the concept of absolute war between them completely. The Indian military’s mobilization in 2001-02 after a terrorist attack on its parliament proved to be ineffective because of the slow mobilization and loss of the element of surprise.

In 2012 the Indian Air force introduced its vision in which they emphasized more on sub-conventional warfare options. It also shows that now India is moving away from fighting a total war and wants to engage Pakistan in a limited conflict. The Indian Navy’s maritime strategy-2015 also put more focus on irregular threats to Indian national security and they are giving priority to irregular challenges over traditional threats.
All these doctrines and strategies by the Indian military suggests that they are looking room for a limited, short and intense conflict with Pakistan, but to operationalize such an ambitious doctrines Indian military would have to revamp its overall war fighting capabilities. In future India would add latest Main Battle Tanks- (MBTs), reconnaissance aircraft, advanced artillery, weapon locating radars and battle field surveillance radars, night vision capabilities not only in aircraft, helicopters, tanks but also in its infantry soldiers. With all these capabilities the Indian military would be able to operationalize its aggressive doctrines against Pakistan. To overcome its deficiencies Indian government under BJP launched a make in India campaign. In which Indian government would carry out contracts with other countries to manufacture military hardware in India, share technology and expertise. In this way India’s own defense industry would face uplift and overcome its paucities in its overall military capabilities. Indian ambition of seeking massive conventional buildup and enhancing conventional capabilities to a point where it can possibly disturb the existing order in its favor will not only threaten Pakistan’s survival further, but it will also turn the whole region into an arena of uncertainty and may lead it towards an arms race.

3.5 Modernizing Army
Strategic stability of region at take due to over ambitious attitude of India towards growth and modernization of its conventional military muscle by acquiring more sophisticated and lethal technology which suit and supports the offensive doctrinal shift in India’s strategic thinking. The galloping doctrinal transformation coupled with provocative military modernization aimed at seeking major power status in the region has cultivated strategic disparity compelling regional arch rival Pakistan to reciprocate with possible countermeasure which may undermine regional deterrence stability.
India has the fourth largest military with hi-tech boasting inventory. It has already inducted Sukhoi 30 and T-90, nuclear submarines in its military.\textsuperscript{139} India has adequate defense capabilities with conventional superiority over its arch rival Pakistan.\textsuperscript{140} So, it approves further that Indian military modernization in absence of any visible strategic vulnerability, is evident of its offensive designs that shall cause a security dilemma and trigger arms race in the region.

With US presence in Afghanistan and rising Chinese economic hegemony, cultivated an opportunity for United States and India both for their respective global and regional interests. This convergence of interests led Indian economy to flourish and sufficiently enhance its military inventory purchase capacity as well. This modernization drive has many factors that accelerated the pace and help Indian Military to equip with latest military hardware. Though, mostly it is believed as China-centric under United States’ Asiatic balancer to counterweight growing Chinese flux, but the critical examination of the Indian military doctrines, its troop deployments and conventional arms purchases amply evident of its ambitions in immediate neighborhood.

Also, series of events followed Operation Parakram that manifested Indian military’s logistical constraints, defense hardware obsolesces and exposed badly its capacity to mount any surprise attack or respond effectively to any immediate threat. This was the major development that compelled Indian decision makers to allocate more resources to overhaul its military war machine and modernize it immediately. Later on, tragic Mumbai Attack 2008 developed Indian conscious to augment its muscles more to neutralize any such militant activity in future. That requires, synergy among all forces, more focused on conventional superiority in the wake of nuclear weapon to seize the adversary not to take any irrational move.

\textsuperscript{140} Tellis and Wills, \textit{Strategic Asia 2005-06}. 
Indian bolstering rise in its military is aimed at expanding its military operations to enlarge its horizon of political influence.\textsuperscript{141} India has restructured its armed forces, turning into small but swift integrated battlefield groups (IBGs) and enhanced latest weapons induction for its regional political and defense pursuits.

\textbf{3.5.1 Objectives of Indian Military Modernization}

Indian military modernization drive objectives range from developing its ‘assert’ capability to seek favorable strategic outcomes beyond its borders along building ‘defend’ capacity sufficiently to guard its territorial integrity, respond effectively any offensive strike from a hostile state or non-state actor’s threats at home. Any state, in absence of credible ‘deterrence’ capability cannot develop a sound sense of ‘security’. So, India has focused ‘deter’ ability along extending its ‘military assistance’ to peacekeeping missions, humanitarian aid etc. for enlargement of its political clout in international politics. A careful surgical examination of Indian Military’s modernization shall help us in understanding its ‘assert, defend and deter’ capabilities.

\textbf{3.5.1.1 Assert Military Prowess}

These have exposed not only ineffectiveness of its military, denying element of surprise attack also allowed Pakistan to seek political solutions and mobilize its military to borders.\textsuperscript{142} India has developed its offensive doctrine Cold Start, with small integrated battle groups, equipped with latest inventory and linked in a synergy for a swift and effective retaliation in the wake of any attack on its soil. It is manifestation of ‘limited war’ to ward off ‘nuclear threshold’ and seize ‘sizeable territory’ for better strategic bargains. Indian has equipped its land, air forces and also
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aiming at ‘blue water navy’ status to achieve ‘outreach’ in Indian Ocean. Along, with three battle-carriers, India has developed its ‘assertive’ capacity beyond its borders. Induction of S-400, nuclear submarines, Raphael and LORROS have developed Indian conventional superiority over its nuclear rival Pakistan. Furthermore, with development and implementation of Hybrid Warfare capabilities, India has sought another way to ‘asset’ its political influence.

3.5.1.2 Defense Capability
India has significantly attributed resources to build its defense capabilities and equip its armed forces with latest military hardware and innovative technologies. To build its defense capabilities against any possible attack from a hostile neighbor like Pakistan or china, or even from non-state actors, India has acquired defense equipment from US, Israel and Russia.\(^{143}\) It has enlarged its security apparatus, turned it into more robust and effective with persistent military modernization and doctrinal transformation. India has invested immensely in its Anti-ballistic Missile Program to ward off any missile attack on its soil. Sea lines of communications remains open and smooth transactions. India attaches significant importance to its economy, safety of transit routes and effective measures to threats from piracy, non-state actors or forced blockades by Pakistan or even China.

3.5.1.3 Effective Deterrence
The third aspect of Indian military modernization drive is to build its credible ‘deterrence’ capability to keep adversaries away from taking any offensive measure against it. A country like India requires more in presence of hostile countries like Pakistan and China, nuclear capable and history of prolonged animosity on territorial disputes. India has deployed its integrated battlefield groups (IBGs) under Cold Start doctrine for any swift, coordinated offensive measure
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to deter Pakistan to mount any attack alongside the border as well as not letting it escalate to ‘nuclear threshold’. Pakistan has brought ‘tactical nukes’ into play to checkmate Indian offensive moves.144 Through massive arms procurements and induction in its war machine, India is striving for strategic disparity at conventional level along developing hybrid warfare capabilities to deter Pakistan.

India has enormously investing in its missile and nuclear program under ‘credible minimum deterrence’ policy. India has vouched for ‘no first use’ but to build capability for the second strike as well.145 Though India has acquired ‘second strike capability’ at sea that has enabled its military posture stronger in uplifting its credible deterrence.

3.6 Indian Military Capabilities:
Induction of new doctrines into the strategic calculus of Indian military in 2004 was a step towards revolutionizing the battle fighting tactics of Indian military. Previously Indian military emphasized on three strike corps deployed in central India away from international border. Indian military’s operational preparedness was exposed in 2001-02 when India decided to deploy their 800,000 troops in the aftermath of parliament attack. Indian military took more than 27 days to bring their military to the border, whereas Pakistan deployed their forces within no time much before than the Indians. This operational weakness in Indian military denied them the element of surprise. To overcome these loopholes Indian military decided to form a Jaipur headquartered South-Western Command in 2005.

144 Jaspal, ‘NASR (Hatf IX) Counteracts India’s Cold Start Doctrine’.

Second important development in 2005 was the deployment of “Pivot Corps” in Exercise Vajra Shakti-2005. The concept of Pivot Corps was later briefed by the Indian commanding officer. It would have defensive and offensive punch, which means the main purpose of this force would be to hold the enemy incursion but if required they could also carry out offensive against enemy forces.

Indian military is comprised of approximately 1,350,000 personnel serving into various capacities.\(^{146}\) Indian army constitutes the major part of armed forces of India and is constituted upon approximately 1,151,000 serving men, second in strength is the IAF with approximately 127,500 serving men and third is the Indian Navy with approximately 58,350 serving people. India aims to become a global power to maintain strategic stability with arch rivals China and Pakistan.\(^{147}\)

---


3.7 The Refurbishment of Army

The Indian government has also launched ambitious programs to refurbish its army and bring them at par with modern forces of the world. To incorporate modern technology in its infantry divisions the Indian government is working on two projects. The T-90 would enhance the offensive operational capabilities of India military and would prove to be decisively-crucial in the event of any future conflict with Pakistan.

The Indian army has also inducted modern artillery guns to revamp its firepower against Pakistan at LoC and international border. The US made M777A2 LW155 ultra-light howitzer artillery was

---

added under a deal worth $737 million.\textsuperscript{149} Under the contract the US firm in collaboration with Mahindra Defense Systems would manufacture 120 howitzers and remaining artillery guns would be transferred by America in three years.\textsuperscript{150} This gun has range of 30km,\textsuperscript{151} which may increase the outreach and firepower of the Indian Artillery against Pakistan. India is also manufacturing indigenous artillery guns. The Dhanush 155mm/ 45 Caliber Artillery System has been developed by the Indian defense industries.\textsuperscript{152}

### 3.8 The Transformation Process in IAF

Strength is close to 33 but to operationalize its aggressive doctrines it must have more than 42 squadrons to control air space and maintain hegemony in the region.\textsuperscript{153} India would take another 15 years to get 42 squadrons.\textsuperscript{154} The IAF has plans to add over 400 aircraft in future to replace aging fleet.\textsuperscript{155}

This aircraft has a range of about 3,000 km but could be enhanced to 8,000km with refueling.\textsuperscript{156} The IAF is also in negotiations with their Russian counterparts to upgrade Sukhoi-30 aircraft with fifth generation attributes.\textsuperscript{157} The induction and up-gradation of Russian aircraft would augment IAF’s ability to strike deep inside Pakistan and improve its outreach. The Indian government is also in deal with the French counterparts for the purchase of 36 Rafale aircraft worth $8.7 billion. India would get these aircraft in next six years. The Rafael aircraft is also
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considered to be the air superiority aircraft. It can carry nuclear or non-nuclear warheads at a range of about 1,850km.\textsuperscript{158} The purchase and upgradation of aircraft would uplift IAF and challenging the conventional balance vis-à-vis Pakistan and putting the regional security at risk.

### 3.9 The Indian Naval Modernization: Hegemony at seas

"Whoever controls the Indian Ocean will dominate Asia; the destiny of the world will be decided on its waters". (Alfred Thayer Mahan)

#### 3.9.1 India’s security policy

India maintains its assertion to build its military capabilities to achieve its own ‘manifest destiny’ to control Indian Ocean.\textsuperscript{159} James Holmes and Toshi Yoshihara have developed this framework to understand the Indian security policy by examining references to Monroe Doctrine. Their inferences develop three force models to measure Indian maritime and air capabilities.\textsuperscript{160} They cite references from 2004 also 2007 to make this comparative analysis. Holmes and Yoshihara have borrowed American naval concepts to assess Indian naval capabilities: free-rider, constable and strongman. These models are three different stages of strategic cooperation and building military muscles.
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The first model (free-rider model) is operationalized to overcome low-level maritime threats by acquiring necessary naval capabilities, threats like piracy, water-based terrorist activities and illegal trafficking etc. Overall this model is less aggressive in nature and is only expected to ensure the safety of transit routes. This model doesn’t diversify resources for expensive military apparatus. It seeks presence of powerful maritime power to guarantee the smooth sailing. This model pursues target achieving more and more savings by avoiding the huge expenditures and diverting those surpluses to further enhance the trade and economic growth by investing that surplus money into respective fields. This model requires India to look upon the US as the supreme maritime force and guarantor and helper of India in achieving its economic endeavors. Moreover, US is considered as a balancer to the Chinese threat emanating from the immediate neighborhood of India, due its influential policies and more sophisticated armed forces comparatively.

The second model (constable model) is more rigid in its nature, as it is suggested by the name also. According to this model a state must protect its maritime boundary through applying political restraints on other states and not allowing them to either enter or intervene in it. This of course requires prior state to be capable enough and in possession of better equipped naval force to deny the access of its maritime boundary to other states forcefully. Also, this model requires the first state to be capable enough of not letting the conditions slip out of hand and escalate towards an armed conflict prematurely.

The third model (strongman model) expects a state to be capable and strong enough of halting and responding back to any external element threatening its maritime sovereignty. To achieve this purpose a state must prepare itself to respond in case of any possible aggression and violation of its maritime borders by enhancing the capabilities of its armed forces especially its
navy through arming it with latest hardware and technology. Maritime strategic objectives have been chalked out by the Indian Ministry of Defense in its Annual report 2014-15. It deliberates on maritime sovereignty of the state and full use-of-sea.\textsuperscript{161} This doctrine further reiterates the point that defense of Indian maritime borders and maintenance of maritime security is the prime objective of Indian navy to preserve Indian interests in the oceans. According to this report the chances of limited conventional naval conflict cannot be ignored completely as there exist a possibility but a minor one. Ergo, given the circumstances and keeping the minor chances of any future conflict in mind, Indian policymakers have conclude that Indian navy doesn’t require a large-scale expensive modernization process to undergo rather sufficing action should be taken to maintain credible naval deterrence. According to the statistical data available, India seems to be spending massively in defense deals for smoothening of its power-image, in order to increase its influence regionally as well as globally. It has also been pointed out that rapid economic growth of India allows it to spend massively to purchase arms and expand its military growth at a lightning speed to increase strategic influence in the region.\textsuperscript{162}

Careful analysis of above models points out towards Indian ambitions of being an aspirant to become the in charge of regions waters. But in order to fulfill this ambition, India needs to introduce new technologies to existing navy along with aircraft carriers to achieve its objectives. According to Holmes and Yoshihara “carriers have the capacity to execute traditional and nontraditional maritime roles such as air-to-air combat, air-ground attack, sea denial, anti-submarine, anti-surface warfare, mine and countermine anti-piracy and noncombatant evacuation
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operations (NEOs).”

Given the account of its drive to modernize its navy, India requires three carriers in its East and West Coast fleets, with a third in a refit and training cycle.

### 3.9.2 India’s extended-neighborhood

Indian Ministry of External affairs uses the term ‘extended neighborhood’ in its Annual report 2006. David Scott outlines four geo-economic variables to measure Indian approach of extended neighborhood: trade, energy, security and military concerns. India aims to project both hard and soft power to gain and maintain effective economic, security, political and cultural advantages, Southeast Asia and into the South Pacific. Scott maintains that India seeks its influence in extra-regional territories to support its domestic economic growth; its military capabilities for safe transit to ward off any piracy and establishing own preeminence. Minister of Defense A.K. Antony, states “India must develop stronger military capabilities to protect increasing economic interests overseas.”

This argument of Scott doesn’t validate Indian overwhelmingly investment in defense procurement for its maritime strategy. It further stands incorrect when India cuts new deals for nuclear submarines and expanding maritime advanced apparatus. For an aspiring major power, it
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is imperative to build its capability to ensure smooth sailing of its economic transit and security. This position cannot be achieved in absence of robust, effective maritime force. Indian Ministry of Defense Annual report 2014-15 focuses on a variety of conventional and irregular security challenges that India confronts. This report further takes into consideration the probability of full—scale conventional war with Pakistan as low that further dispels the argument of Scott. It also undermines any compelling reason for maritime modernization drive. Therefore, accelerating Indian military modernization activities trigger the disruption in strategic setting of South Asia and endangering its stability.

This is one dimension that mostly infer on India’s long practiced policy of Non-alignment and focusing more on economic interests. But a careful and vigilant time-series analysis of Indian security policy determines how India has undergone through drastic strategic outlook and security capabilities. Congress, despite the party of Nehru, slightly drifts towards military muscles after 1962 Indo-China War that remains continuously growing along maintaining the posture of neutrality and passive. Under the steer-ship of Indira Gandhi, India stresses ‘strategic autonomy via non-alignment, cautiousness towards high defense spending and attention to domestic economics.

Recently the incumbent government in India has allotted $8 billion to refurbish its Navy. Currently the Indian Navy possesses about 171 naval vessels, 250 aircraft and 16 submarines to

---
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guard its maritime interests. The Indian navy has planned to get 3-aircraft carriers by 2022.\textsuperscript{174} India has also acquired nuclear submarine from Russia and in coming years it has planned to get five more such submarines. It would boost India’s maritime outreach and firepower against Pakistan.\textsuperscript{175} Highly sophisticated conventional Scorpion submarines worth $3.5 billion.\textsuperscript{176} Additionally, P8-I have also been handed over to the Indian Nave by the Indian government in order to improve its operational capabilities, acquired from the US for $2.1billion.\textsuperscript{177} The P8-I can cruise at a speed of about 907 km per hour to carry out operations at 1,200 nautical miles.\textsuperscript{178} This would enhance the operational ability of Indian Navy and will further improve its sphere of surveillance as compared to Pakistan thus endangering the maritime interests of arch-rival Pakistan in the Indian Ocean.

\textbf{3.10 The Advancement in Transportation and Logistics in the Indian Military}

The transportation and logistics play vital role in country’s war fighting capabilities. To operationalize its aggressive military doctrines India must acquire quick, swift and long-range transportation and logistics capabilities. This is the reason that India carried out deals with the US to acquire modern transport aircraft to replace aging Russian logistics aircraft. India purchased advanced C-130J Hercules transport aircraft from American defense companies.\textsuperscript{179}
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India acquired five such aircraft and six more will be inducted soon.\textsuperscript{180} The C-130 Hercules operate in harsh weather conditions.\textsuperscript{181} The C-130 has the ability to carry more than 20 thousand kg of logistics at speed of 410mph at 22,000 feet with a maximum range of about 1,956 miles.\textsuperscript{182} The acquisition of these logistics transportation helps India for operationalizing its doctrines against Pakistan. Another important induction in this regard was the C-17 Globemaster-III, both states carried out.\textsuperscript{183} Deal was worth $4.1 billion for ten C-17 Globemaster aircraft.\textsuperscript{184} Inclusion of this specific aircraft would enhance Indian military’s logistic capabilities ergo would help in bridging out the operational deficiencies that Indian faces due to vast territory, difficult terrain and sluggish armed forces. Indian Government is also willing to purchase 15 Chinook helicopters for its military costing $833 million, these are the heavy lifter helicopters. These are highly advanced transport and logistics helicopters and could be used for many purposes. It could be utilized for rescue operations, Special Forces missions, quick transportation of weapon, equipment and men during conflict.\textsuperscript{185} All these attributes are essential for intense limited conflicts which India desires under her military doctrines.
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3.11 The Electronic and Network Centric Warfare capabilities in the Indian Military

The LORROS can track its targets in day and night which enables the Indian army to keep 24/7 check on the border.\textsuperscript{186} The LORROS would help India to overcome its operational weaknesses in recon and observation field. Another major step in the acquisition of network centric warfare capabilities was taken in 2005 during Vajra Shakti\textsuperscript{187} from aircraft, drones, surveillance aircraft and radars to help the field commander to take swift action. After 2005 the Indian military practiced the NCW capabilities in almost every military exercise to incorporate modern weapon system. Achieve these capabilities Indian DRDO has introduced Battlefield Surveillance Radars- (BFSR) to detect enemy movement at a short range. The BFSR has the capability to spot, track, and categorize objects like sneaking men, a group, combat vehicles, and helicopters.\textsuperscript{188} These electronic warfare capabilities are prerequisite for the operationalization of CSD, surgical strikes or pro-active military operations.

Another major development towards NCW and EW capabilities is the acquisition of Weapon Locating Radar- (WLR), which is crucial to identify the range, position and then destroy the enemy artillery, mortar and short-range missile sites. India successfully deployed four such radars close to the LoC to detect Pakistan’s artillery position. Due to which India claims that Pakistan reduced artillery fire. This WLR has range of about 50km to mechanically spot precise


location of the adversary’s mortar, shells, and short-range rocket sites.\textsuperscript{189} The Indian military has deployed these systems which helped them detect and target Pakistan’s artillery positions.

Previously the Indian military was dependent on other countries but 2017, India introduced locally built AeW&CS. This surveillance aircraft has the capacity to detect aerial threats.\textsuperscript{190} Such capabilities would put Pakistan’s security at risk. In this regard the Indian military is equipped with Israeli made UAVs to keep constant check on Pakistan’s deployment and alleged infiltrators from Pakistan side of Kashmir.\textsuperscript{191}

The Indian military in this regard acquired ten highly advanced Israeli made Heron-TP UAVs under a deal of about $400 million. The Heron TP is a long-range UAV with endurance time up to 45 hours.\textsuperscript{192} Indian military has also acquired radar destroyer harpy missiles from Israel. These missiles target radars of the enemy and cripple enemy’s detection capabilities.\textsuperscript{193} It has a potent range of about 500km and could be launched from multiple launch pads.\textsuperscript{194} Such inductions in the Indian military are serious threat for the security of Pakistan. The Indian military have also acquired the Harpoon Missile from Israel which is also considered as a lethal weapon against enemy command and control centers, missile sites and strategic assets. The Harpoon missile has range of about 1,000km,\textsuperscript{195} and has the ability to carry weapon of 15kg\textsuperscript{196}, which makes it a
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lethal weapon against enemy. The Indian military have also made huge strides in the field of spy satellite. In collaboration with Israel, the Indian military launched RISAT-II Spy satellite to keep constant check on Pakistan’s military installations, strategic sites, deployment and movement of troops close to the border.

3.12 Indian Military’s Hybrid Warfare Strategy
Prem Mahadevan, an Indian author who in his book *The Politics of Counterterrorism in India* suggests secret operations. Unfortunately, it does not seem to be acquaintance with the devious activities of his government against Pakistan and other regional countries. It seems that he is trying to present the naïve picture of India, but reality is not the same. According to him, carrying out operations inside Pakistan and targeting Pakistan itself while carrying out counter-terrorism missions in India and implementing domestic security reforms, is the only viable way to eradicate the terrorism in India. He further advises his government that Pakistan should be deterred with the credible devious capabilities and that capability should always be kept in control with an amount of calibration.

Author suggests that India should play on front foot at the diplomatic pitch as well, India’s policy should always be offensive towards Pakistan and India should work hard not in full control its own territory and is unable to stop the spread of terrorism. According to the author, peace talks should be organized and attended for the sake of international community and reputation of India globally while running all the covert operations in the background. It turns out, most of the advices given by the author are already adopted by the Indian government and it is important to know that Indian government is practicing them effectively like secret operations
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against Pakistan to spread instability and provoke insurgency and terrorism, diplomatic propaganda, failing state which is unable to ensure its survival and a state with rogue military which calling the shots at domestic as well as global level for the Pakistan. Upon the careful analysis, it turns out that the existence of Pakistan has never been accepted by the India therefore carrying out the malicious activities against Pakistan from the day one.

In 1968, R&AW was created whose basic task was to carry out spying missions in Pakistan, spread false that they were given the task of keeping Pakistan busy internally and create the internal distractions to keep ISI busy therefore it does not get a chance to come out of their internal problems and do any harms to the Indian interests likewise. According to him, R&AW has successfully achieved its target of keeping its adversary states entangled with the internal problems by either sponsoring the terrorism in those states or insurgent movements thus leaving them no time to conduct any harm to the Indian interests. More recently, an Indian Spy Surjeet Singh who spent thirty years in Pakistani jail confessed on his return.

India has friendly relation with Pakistan’s neighboring country Afghanistan where India is using their territory to initiate secret and offensive operations in Pakistani tribal areas as well as in Baluchistan. Baluch rebels and militants from Swat and FATA regions are provided safe heavens, funding and training by the Indian intelligence agencies along with the collaboration of Afghan government and its allies. This clarifies the reason behind regeneration of terrorism in Pakistan from the Afghan soil even after the successful counter-terrorism operations armed forces of Pakistan. Militants in Baluchistan and tribal areas of Pakistan are equipped with latest weapons and techniques by the Indian intelligence agencies to undermine the efforts of armed forces of Pakistan against terrorism. According to Janes Information Group, “in years to come many important personalities would be targeted inside the Pakistan including religious, military
personalities, journalists, lawyers, judges and bureaucrats by the four specially orchestrated agencies specifically created by the R&AW and Mossad of Israel. Moreover, acts of terrorism would be carried out to spread the fear among masses, these acts would include blasts at public places like hotels, cinemas, bridges, trains and stations, but more importantly the bombings would target the mosques to encourage the wave of sectarian conflict.” Although it is an old report, domestic conditions even today. Important personalities like military personals, religious clerics have targeted in a similar fashion as was suggested by the report to provoke uncertain conditions into the country. Significant increase in violent activities and terrorist activities has also been noticed like bombings at public places and mosques etc. Few people in Pakistan believe that these covert activities of India in Pakistan started after the 9/11, this is not the truth as India started to carry out malicious activities against Pakistan right after the separation and the example can be forced occupation of the princely states who wanted to align with Pakistan.

Among all the immoral and evil acts of Indian intelligence agencies, one was the most vicious and condemnable, the involvement of Indian Intelligence agencies to separate East and West Pakistan in 1971. Author, claimed that, “it was Indira Gandhi who supported Bengali speaking people against Pakistan to attain their support and create what we now know as the Bangladesh.

According to B. Raman, “A special division was established with the name of PSYWAR by the R&AW in the war of 1971, the primary task of this division was to do propaganda against Pakistani army and project it on the global level as a brutal force to but sympathy for Bengalis thus reclaiming the required legitimacy for their actions”. Even as of today, India’s information division is still indulged into similar kind of immoral game against Pakistan. India pays heavily to create lobbies in the foreign countries like US, UK and other European countries in order to highlight the Baluchistan issue and in support of the separatist movements. But Indian success is
impossible this time, as due to excellent recovery of Pakistani armed forces in fight against terrorism, armed forces have successfully regained public affection and now the whole Pakistani nation is standing at the back to enhance regional influence, Indian government along with its allies has been indulged into amoral activities against Pakistan and other rival states. Tamil insurgent movement in Sri Lanka was also supported by R&AW. Tamil Tigers were trained and funded by the R&AW and Mossad. “War is a moral contest, they are won in temples long before they are ever fought” says a Chinese strategist and philosopher Sun Tzu.197 With the advent of nuclear technology in the post-world wars context, the warfare tactics and techniques have changed a lot. Conventional weapons are being invented till now but that are just to trumpet the warfare capabilities and deterrence. In fact, the war now is not fought in the battle fields where we can classify the protagonists as victors or losers. Now the war is fought on different vanguards. It wouldn’t be wrong to say that every aspect and every field of life is in a state of constant war that has its manifestation on broader spectrum. The mode of warfare techniques in modern times are not just contained to conventional means but it is blend of both conventional and non-conventional tactics and strategies; it is also called hybrid warfare or fifth generation warfare. The perception management and the thought process of the individual camp of the adversary is used as a tool of exploitation to achieve the political objectives and aims.

The target may not know where it is being attacked from and the weapons are at times abstractive or cognitive and the enemy is always in denial of those attacks. At times, the actor is being attacked but it is not aware of the attack and when the consequences manifest themselves and before any steps can be taken, the damage is already done.
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In hybrid warfare the adversary makes use of its own capabilities which are already present on one hand and the manufactured capabilities on the other hand. The manufactured capabilities are dependent on the vulnerabilities of the opponent. The governmental or the non-governmental sector, the realistic or the psychological, wherever the vacuum exists, it marks its vulnerability and it invites the adversary to have a triumphed position.

Lessons from the Russian Experiences in Crimea

A study of Crimean annexation with Russia based on studied evidence can be considered for capabilities of Russia that also led to threat perception by the West. Russia used both conventional as well as non-conventional modes of warfare to annex Crimea which are the components of Hybrid warfare. The factors of deniability and ambiguity were also there but based on the evidence available, hybrid warfare can be observed in the very case. Soft power usage has also been observed in Crimean case as the activities of little green men in the non-conventional fronts provide a manifestation. The regime changes and the use of proxy wars is another element of the hybrid warfare.

To give a description, it is discussed vulnerability adversary is the weapon of the hybrid warfare tactics of the actor. One of these vulnerabilities also includes terrorism. The conflicting factions in the society of the state can be used against the very state via exploitation. As discussed before, information warfare is also an important subset of hybrid warfare and is used as an empowered tool against the adversary. In the case study of Russian annexation with Crimea, documentation of use of information warfare tactics has provision.198 The deductions that follow the case study of Russia’s annexation with Crimea lead us to believe that hybrid warfare is no myth but a

verified conduct of warfare that has been developing fortuitously and with the changing era in the field of inventions, it is also undergoing through transformation. Hybrid warfare weakens the adversary in a very secretive and unidentifiable manner and results in victory of the actor at the boiling point in achieving its political objectives.

3.12.1 Strategic Interaction
Strategic Interaction theory explains the asymmetric conflict and explains the tactics a weaker party uses win conflict. Offensive and defensive strategies is made by the strong actor and the weak actor respectively. The strong actor uses the barbarism in order to change the will of the adversary and to eliminate its capacity via coercion and pain infliction. While the weak actor uses guerrilla warfare strategies which Kautilya has termed as concealed war. In Guerrilla Warfare Strategies- (GWS). As US losing war in Afghanistan despite of being a strong actor but Taliban are using GWS and targeting their will to fight. Then, there is the concept of indirect offense vs. direct defense where the indirect offensive strategy is used to target the defender’s will to resist. Economic sanctions and strategic bombing. Domestic factors of an adversary state can also be targeted in this case that further exploits the situation for the defender. The strategic interaction theory provides some implications for Pakistan which confronts a hegemonic adversary i.e. India. How a weak power can win the war implies some strategies given by the strategic interaction theory which are relevant in case of India and Pakistan.

3.12.2 Kautilya’s Undeclared Warfare Strategy
Chanakaya Kautilya, a famous military strategist and advisor to Chandragupta Maurya, wrote in Arthashastra, must have all elements of power whether they are economic, social or military. In the modern times, this strategy has evolved with a new name and still is in use. Kautilya’s views provide a theoretical framework to study the hybrid warfare cases in the modern world.
India and Pakistan both being nuclear weapons do not directly confront each other by conventional means rather non-conventional means including asymmetrical and irregular warfare that is usually covert is used to achieve the political objectives. Pakistan to achieve its political gains and several records available proves, India’s covert involvement in Pakistan on different fronts. Being a big country, India wants to be a hegemon of South Asia and in order to achieve this objective, it is fighting against its adversary on all fronts and how India is doing this is discussed in the arguments that follow.

To understand what hybrid warfare and on what fronts it is fought, we firstly need to address those fronts on which the protagonists are interacting in what manner. In the changing world order and increased interdependence as a result of globalization, it is not possible for a state to survive alone. For survival, a state needs to interact with its neighbors and other nations of the world. So, there is strategic interaction that may be societal, economic, diplomatic, political, informational, infrastructural, and environmental as well as on different heads. And war is possible on all of these fronts. Modern war is fought via policies. In the strategic interaction, there is an element of interdependence of decisions among the states in the international system. Strategic interaction is not independent of the expectations and the behaviors of the adversary in the context of warfare. In strategic interaction, the structure of information and the choices available does matter as it defines the tactics and the policies of the country.

This interaction can be explained through the example of India and Pakistan’s strategic interaction and how this structure of strategic interaction serves as an instrument of hybrid warfare. The critical vulnerability is what the adversary should know in order to attack within the spectrum of a framework. Pakistan is facing the ethnic conflict issue in home and India knows this fact. So, India will best use its capabilities to exploit the situation and there will be a
crippling of the society which Pakistan cannot blame on in India because element of deniability is the beauty of hybrid warfare technique. So, strategic interaction is basically interdependence and interaction on different fronts where the action of one protagonist is conditioned by the other and in the context of warfare, strategic interaction highlights the critical vulnerabilities of the adversary where the victory of one party lies. Within the framework of strategic interaction how a weaker party wins the war is also an important question. Weaker parties cannot confront their adversary because of their weaker conventional might so these asymmetrical wars are fought by non-conventional means including guerilla warfare strategies and proxies which formulate the elements of hybrid warfare tactics. But the actor should pin point the vulnerabilities of the adversary, then exploit them and use the enemy’s resources against its own. As we discussed earlier that there is interdependence of actors in different fields in the age of globalization and this interdependence exposes the actors to each other to some extent. Within this exposure, different tools and gadgets are identified to use as political weapons to fight the war which is covert, lethal, without any laws and involves the elements of deniability, ambiguity and secrecy.

Of the many categories that occupy hybrid warfare, some important ones are: Conventional, Cyber, Political, Environmental, Informational and Infrastructural. Hybrid warfare has polarized opinions and there is no consensus on a fixed definition of this fifth generation warfare.\(^{199}\) Within the above given categories, different elements are bred that might include terrorism, staged riots, false information etc. and these elements can lead to the staging of a conflict within a society causing a damage on broader spectrum of state’s interests and political objectives.

As we mentioned earlier, the capabilities are dependent on the vulnerabilities of the opponent. The weak sectors of Pakistan are more prone to the attacks of India. Apart from the conventional

warfare and tactics, India has been using non-conventional methods against neighbors. As we talked earlier that decisions following the strategic interaction are interdependent. So, this strategic interaction revealed to India that Pakistan is more concerned about its security and to weaken this the basis of the security structure needs to be attacked. This structure has several variables including development and economy. Weak economy of Pakistan is a critical vulnerability which can be translated into the capability of Indian warfare tactics. Strategic interaction is not independent of the expectations and behaviors of the adversary. So, India is involved in Hybrid warfare against Pakistan and this notion is not in denial. Several precedents and evidences are available which clearly show that India is involved in the exploitation of different sectors where it finds the vacuum. Kulbhushan Jadhav’s case and Indian National Security Advisor Ajit Doval’s doctrine against Pakistan support this argument.

Firstly, we talk about this strategic interaction in terms of economy, how Pakistan’s economic conditions are vulnerable in context of CPEC and regional system. CPEC is a billion-dollar investment of China in Pakistan in the sectors of energy and infrastructure. CPEC is of international importance as China is an emerging global and regional power and the international powers are competing in the region for strategic interests. Pakistan being a regional partner of China is vulnerable to the proxy wars and the cyber and the political warfare employed by India and allies especially US. Such statements show how uneasy US is with CPEC. The involvement of RAW in Baluchistan and the capture of Kulbhushan Jadhav provides an evidence of such concerns. Better economy is development and development secure security.

Poor economic conditions of a state make it more vulnerable and less secure and in case of Pakistan which has huge enemy on Eastern Front and on Western front, it has neighbor with the
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threatening situation of terrorism. CPEC is an economic opportunity for Pakistan and exploiting it is an act hybrid warfare tactics do consider. Terrorism and Informational attacks like anti-business speculations to undermine Pakistan’s domestic stability are some methods that make Beijing and Islamabad unreliable for each other in their businesses. Moreover, terrorism sponsored by India in Pakistan casts a bad image of the state making it unattractive for business and tourism directly affecting the already dwindling economic situation.

Secondly, environmental factor is another non-traditional threat where again Pakistan is vulnerable and gives enemy a chance to further exploit the situation. India has control over the water flow from the Himalayan Karakorum range that flows in the Indus valley. After the Uri attack, PM Modi made a statement “blood and water cannot flow together”.201 A new wave of conflict was generated regarding the Indus water treaty in the aftermath of Uri attacks. Moreover, discussion on the building of Kishenganga Dam is also on its way by the Indian policymakers. This dam will ultimately reduce the water flow and affect the ecosystems of Neelum and Jhelum having implications for Pakistan’s water security.202 Pakistan is already a water starved country and much part of its power projects and agriculture industry is dependent on water which is ultimately related to industries and the economy of the state. This nontraditional threat can make Pakistan a crippled economy which thwarts the form of government and the state institutions in turn making it a failed state.

Thirdly, Ethnic and the sectarian conflicts as the critical vulnerability within a country strengthen the hybrid warfare capabilities of the adversary. Pakistan today has crisis of fundamentalism and

ethnic conflicts. These conflicts and the fundamentalism have its roots deeply attached with the grievances of the unsatisfied group. The grievances may be materialistic or cognitive and cognition can be molded in order to intensify the conflict that may weaken the state. Baluchistan separatist movement is getting stronger and the Baloch people have hatred sentiments against the state and the establishment. Poverty and lack of education further exacerbate the situation. So, we should not undermine this subset of the Indian Hybrid Warfare Capabilities when we are already having evidences of presence of India in Baluchistan as well as Afghanistan from where they are operating in our backward areas like FATA.

Fourthly, cyber security paradigm is also of fundamental importance with the advancement of technology. The method of warfare has changed, and the cyber security breaches pose big challenges and have effect on the Foreign policy of states and the bilateral ties. Here, the element of deniability provides an edge to the officials because it is easy to put blame of breaching the cyber security on the private citizens of which the state may not accept the responsibility.

Apart from these domains, terrorism breeding in Pakistan is also a critical vulnerability. Indian sponsored terrorism in Afghanistan and operating in Pakistan are also a serious threat to the state’s security and stability. Narco-terrorism in this category cannot be ignored. The battle in the cognitive and moral domains is also intense and the public will of the society of a state if exploitable presents a serious threat. A recent report says that millions of illegal Indian DTHs are operating in Pakistan which means that this threat is already on its way.

The role of IGOs, NGOs, MNCs and other non-state actors should also not be undermined and if these non-state actors leave a vacuum, they can bring a state on its knees by internally eroding the society culturally. All the capabilities under the rubric of Hybrid Warfare are difficult to cover at a time because they are always evolving and keep on manifesting themselves. The
conventional mightiness of India is an apparent threat but what is covert is the Hybrid warfare capability which is dependent on the vulnerability of different sectors of Pakistan.

Security analysts of India claim that their hybrid warfare capabilities are succeeding them in Kashmir because a greater number of Kashmiris are now participating in the administrative structure of Indian state and this success comes from the critical vulnerability that serves as the tactical capability of India. If Pakistan doesn’t keep a check and balance on all its vulnerabilities, it will be on losing side in this dangerous type of warfare, further creates a threatening situation for Pakistan. Using Afghanistan’s land, India is waging proxy war in Pakistan. The case of Kulbhushan Jadhav and the attacks on the Pakistan-Afghanistan consulates points out that RAW is involved in carrying out such activities in Pakistan. The very recent attack on the Chinese consulate also makes us think that India’s agencies are active in Pakistan. The mastermind of the attack on Chinese Consulate has claimed its allegiance with the enemy country. Apart from these proxies, the economic and the environmental fronts are very much exposed to the enemy where it is actively exploiting.

“in the enlightenment of the Hindutva doctrine of the current ruling party BJP lead by Hawkish Narendra Modi, one can never eliminate the possibility that Indian policy of dealing with Pakistan is not influenced by the Kautilyan principles if not completely run by them keeping Indian hegemonic ambitions in mind. Long-standing unresolved Kashmir issue, Indian ambitions of being a regional hegemon, growing economic and military muscle and moreover the presence of a hawkish leader, when we look at all these elements through a kaleidoscopic lens, Pakistan’s claims of situation getting worse and worse seem true.”²⁰³

In hybrid warfare, at times several ambiguous tools in different mediums are used in a synchronized manner and that may be called as horizontal intensity and at times the medium is changed and the intensity of one of the tools is kept high and it is the vertical intensity. This switching between the vertical and the horizontal intensities keeps the position of actor in a gray zone. It is not black not white but in gray. The position of the attack and the target is not defined. The attacker might be aware of the target most of the times but not always and so is the understanding of the opposing actor. Attack might be on any department of the state so each department of the state must be aware. It is said that nature of war never changes but the methods to conduct a war change. So, Hybrid warfare is an example of this change of conduct in context of the mod technology and the modern wave of terrorism that itself has changed the methods of war within hybrid warfare.

The most dangerous form of warfare because it is hard to locate the targeted sector as well as the direction of incoming unleashed weapon. What Pakistan needs in the contemporary times in order to overcome the expected threats is to fill the vacuums, it has generated in its own home apart from competing in conventional grounds. A strong hold on domestic grounds weakens the hybrid warfare capabilities of adversary.

Recently, Indian strategy of devious (undeclared) warfare has been profoundly functional against Pakistan. This notion of undeclared warfare is referred to as “hybrid warfare” in this study. Iranian and Afghani soil has been used by India overwhelmingly to erupt and provoke. Former
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leader of TTP, Latif Mehsud has exposed India by confessing about its involvement into the covert activities against Pakistan, the Pakistani authorities later on. He further exposed India by stating that Indian R&AW uses different people and organizations to create unrest in Pakistan.\textsuperscript{206} Later, Ehsan Ullah Ehsan’s arrest and confession further presents a clearer image of devious activities of India, according to him most of the organization in Afghanistan are funded and trained by India to create turbulence in Pakistan on wide scale.\textsuperscript{207} Pakistan’s security has been seriously challenged by all the turbulent activities carried out by the Indian intelligence agencies. Kautilya in \textit{Arthashastra} put great importance. He also reiterates the point by having said that even the businessmen and traders should also be used as spies. Recent and practical use of this advice can be seen in the case of Kulbhushan Jadev who represented himself as a businessman in Iran to conduct covert activities in Pakistan (Gopal, 2017). Although India still does not admit Pakistan’s stance on this matter and provides an alternative explanation.

Pakistan’s allegations have been denied by the India. According to the Indian government, Kulbhushan Jadev is the ‘son of soil’\textsuperscript{208} but he had long been retired from the service and furthermore his presence in Iran was only business orientated, according to the Indian government he mysteriously vanished from the Iran thus blaming Pakistan for kidnapping him.\textsuperscript{209} But there exist many hiccups in the Indian side of story like why was he carrying a fake

\begin{footnotes}
\item[206] ‘When Terror Speaks! Taliban Leader Confesses’ (Youtube, 29 January 2016), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jp10uaAZbWU.
\end{footnotes}
passport issued by the Indian government itself? Why only he was chosen to be kidnapped by the Pakistani forces out of approximately 4000 Indians living in Iran, what different he was doing that made him so special for the Pakistani agencies and therefore a favorite candidate for the abduction out of all those Indians living in Iran? Jadev’s case has been turning into a mysterious quagmire recently due to a pile of questions that Indian government is unable to answer.210 That’s how the tussle between the intelligence agencies of the rival states is handled traditionally, if a spy is captured the best thing is to denounce any affiliation with him at organizational level.

Pakistan claims that Kulbhushan Jadev is a high-ranking official who was serving in the intelligence agency. He was present in the Pakistan to achieve several high-end goals which included provocation of insurgency and terrorism in Baluchistan which can harm Pakistan’s interests in both ways, firstly it will endanger the territorial intactness and secondly it will help India to achieve its goal of sabotaging the megaproject. His major targets were the Gwadar Port city and the metropolitan city of Pakistan, Karachi. Additionally, Indian support to the terrorist organizations operating from the Afghan soil against Pakistan is also condemnable, Indian support to those organizations in terms of funds, technical support and provision of crucial intelligence is not something which is hidden from anyone now, rather India supports militants in Afghanistan openly against Pakistan.211

Due these actions of India, tensions not likely to be reduced rather tensions might see a new high in the future. All this might force Pakistan to respond in the same currency by funding the organizations in Indian held Kashmir-IHK against the India, also Afghanistan might also extend

in the IHK in the future just to create turbulence for India. Unless the bilateral issues between the India and Pakistan are not negotiated and brought on the table for viable solution, covert activities by both are not likely to stop. India has been substantially successful against Pakistan with its strategy of devious warfare as suggested by Kautilya.

As suggested by the Kautilya in *Arthashastra*, a state’s diplomacy must have to be offensive in order to undermine its enemy. Kautilya strongly believed that the diplomacy is also an act of war and it should be taken seriously, diplomacy should be used as a step by step journey towards weakening the adversary while keeping an eye upon the ultimate objective. India has adopted this advice and performed well as Kautilya would have expected, Indian propaganda machine keeps blaming Pakistan for the terrorist attacks in IHK without any substantial proof. Another offensive diplomatic objective of India to isolate Pakistan regionally was met with success when Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Bhutan were agreed to join India in boycotting. Indian leaders on various occasions have vowed to isolate Pakistan regionally as well as globally.

This kind of hostility is not only damaging for he both arch-rivals. Without a stable Pakistan, South Asia would never be able to expand its geo-economic interests as a region to other regions. Indian strategy of devious warfare enabled India to achieve three crucial goals against Pakistan, firstly Pakistan suffered unacceptable damage to the economy due to recent wave of terrorism, secondly, becoming a pincer state which was being challenged on both fronts on eastern border India was challenging Pakistan’s sovereignty while on western Afghani border Indian sponsored terrorists were keeping Pakistani forces engaged making it two-front war, and thirdly Pakistan lost more military and civilian people in Indian sponsored wave of terrorism than in all the wars combined with India since 1947. Despite all the efforts made by India, Pakistan has been able to tackle terrorism in the FATA region effectively. Pakistan has achieved substantial success
against Al-Qaeda and its affiliated groups along with TTP majorly. All the terrorists have been eliminated from the Pakistani soil and pushed back to the Afghan soil where they enjoy the facilities of Indian backing. Law and enforcement agencies of Pakistan also succeeded in restoring peace in Karachi and Baluchistan by conducting operations with prior intelligence that has restored not only the credibility of Pakistani forces in tacking the terrorism but also have provided the favorable conditions for the megaprojects like CPEC. Insurgents and rebels from Baluchistan have also been included into the national sphere by the government of Pakistan after addressing their reservations and meeting their demands and acquisition of modern technology for the purpose with pre-supposition of entering Pakistan and damaging its integrity not only creates security dilemma for Pakistan but might also plunge the whole region into chaos.

3.13 Conclusion: Critical Assessment of the Indian Military Modernization

“If you know yourself and your enemy, you will never perish in a hundred battles.” Sun Tzu. It is necessary for Pakistan to critically analyze its enemy’s capabilities that would help it to analyze. Indian ambitions are to achieve the target of making its armed forces strongest in the region in the decade to come. Its gigantic economic muscle can bear the burden of this modernization drive and can afford to allocate funds even for such an adventurous cause. Indian GDP had achieved the wondrous mark of $1.53 trillion dollars in 2010 and has been expanding at the rate of 8.5 for the year 2010-2011. Indian ambitions of modernizing its giant sluggish war-machine could be achieved easily with such a promising and flourishing economy at its credit in few years or even before the estimated time.

According to different estimates, India will be spending around $48 billion in 2017 for the purchase of jets and aircrafts, helicopters and transport and trainer aircraft. It is expected by the BAE, Europe’s largest defense contractor that in the next decade India is going to be their
biggest market after US. BAE had already inked the deal worth of $803 million with Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd. According to which they would deliver India 57 Hawk jet trainers. IAF is planning to acquire around 230 choppers in near future. These developments are expected to give new life to the aging defense industry of India and provide necessary boost for the enhancement of Indian military and a step towards the achievement of its dream of advancement and modernization in the next decade. It is necessary for the policy makers in Pakistan to improve indigenous defense industry and cooperate with friendly countries to maintain conventional balance at par with India.
CHAPTER 4
THE INDIAN STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

4.1 Introduction
The Indian military’s insistence over the aggressive doctrines, proactive military Ops or CSD have the ingredients of a limited conflict which may later escalate into prowess, expanding its operational capability and assisting in developing indigenous production. Also, India has evolved defense cooperation with Israel to mount conventional asymmetry for strategic superiority in the region through AWACS, UAVs, radar systems and hybrid warfare capabilities.

4.2 Doctrinal Transformation:
The Indian military had an aggressive outlook vis-à-vis Pakistan since 1947. Both countries developed their military strategies against each other and always tried to get an upper hand. India being a major power had the resources and political will to destabilize was to cut Pakistan into two and weaken it to a level, so it can never support or raise the Kashmir issue at any forum. To achieve this goal India carried out massive military exercises with a code name Brass-tacks in 1986-87 near the border with Pakistan. The plan was to carry out major thrusts into Pakistani territory and slice Pakistan into two along the Indus River.\textsuperscript{212} Another war was tried to impose upon Pakistan in the name of Operation Brass-tacks, which by any mean was not a military exercise rather a planned offensive buildup. Lt. General (R) P.N. Hoon says, “initially everything was planned to drag Pakistan into fourth war, but the more shocking thing about this plan was

that, it was kept secret even from the Prime Minister of country, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. But because of the reciprocal Zarb-I-Momin military exercises by Pakistan, cricket diplomacy by General Zia Ul Haq. After overt nuclearization in 1998, the idea of a major conventional war in south Asia lost its essence. Later, the idea of fighting a limited war under the nuclear threshold was presented by the ex-Indian Army Chief, General (R) V. P. Malik in 2000. Since, then the Indian military is convinced that they are going to fight an intense, limited conflict under the nuclear umbrella. General (R) V.P Malik was of the view that a limited war between India and Pakistan may occur because of two issues, first over a border a dispute, where a severe clash may start a war between both states. Secondly, Pakistan’s alleged support to Kashmir based insurgent would allow India, to wage a conventional war against Pakistan. He was of the view that conventional war between two nuclear belligerents is fought under the ‘nuclear overhang’ and regarded as sub-conventional or limited war. The sub-conventional war must be limited in time, space and politico-military objectives. These types of operations are carried out under careful consideration to control the escalation ladder during the conflict. The sub-conventional operations would also require agile force, air superiority, greater firepower, quick mobilization.

---
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Figure 2: Cold Start Doctrine

Concept coined by Gen. V. P. Malik in 2000 and since then the Indian military has practiced this concept in several wargames.\textsuperscript{218} The Indian strategic community believes categorically rejected this idea and believe in peaceful co-existence. The next part of the study would analyze the concept of CSD and response from Pakistan.

\textsuperscript{218} Brigadier (R) Feroz Hassan Khan-Interview, (Research Professor at the Department of National Security Affairs, Naval Post Graduate School, USA), in an interview with the Author in Islamabad on October 16, 2017.
4.3 The Evolution of Cold Start Doctrine:
According to ex-Indian Army Chief, General (R) Deepak Kapoor, “A limited war under the nuclear threshold can still be fought in South Asia and it’s still a reality in the region.”\textsuperscript{219} The incumbent Indian COAS has declared that India would again cross the LoC and attack Pakistan.\textsuperscript{220} He also echoed that Cold Start Doctrine does exist because the future conflicts between India and Pakistan would be short and intense.\textsuperscript{221} The Indian military has practiced offensive maneuvers and joint operations in several wargames. The Indian government is in strategic partnership with Russia to induct upgraded version T-90S MBTs, advance SU-30 aircraft, gunship helicopters, logistics aircraft, nuclear submarine and highly sophisticated air defense systems in last few years to revamp overall war fighting capabilities. All these capabilities are necessary to operationalize CSD against Pakistan.


\textsuperscript{221} Sandeep Unnithan, “We Will Cross Again”, \textit{India Today}, 4 January 2017.
Civil-military leadership has jointly reiterated in the recent past that they will not hesitate from any aggrieve moves against Pakistan. It is obvious nuclear overhang to target Pakistan military outposts or Kashmir based insurgent groups close to the LoC. Pakistan has already declared that any such attack by the Indian military would face quid pro quo response Pakistan military in modern technology and force multipliers.

The Indian military however lacks offensive firepower and required capabilities to execute CSD against Pakistan. To overcome their operational deficiencies. Among all the strategic partners, Russia is considered as the most reliable strategic partner of India. The next part of the study

Figure 3: Elements of Cold Start Doctrine
would analyze the Indo-Russian defense collaboration and its impact on the execution of CSD type of offensive operations.

4.4 India and Russia Strategic Alliance - Operationalization of CSD:
India and Russia strategic alliance is peculiar its sense and scope. Though it covers wide range of aspects but, only those elements be discussed which may help the Indian army to operationalize CSD against Pakistan.

4.4.1 The T-90 Main Battle Tanks- Quick Thrusts
India and Russia in deal to induct 1,640 T-90 MBTs by 2020. These tanks are equipped with modern technologies which include thermal imaging/night vision capabilities, greater fire power and anti-tank missile. The T-90 possess an effective range of about 550km and can travel at a top speed of 60kmh in plain or dessert areas. The T-90 MBT is crucial for the execution of CSD because it would be used for quick thrusts inside Pakistan territory. Greater maneuverability and lethal firepower of this tank would be a great challenge for Pakistan in wake of any aggressive moves on the border. However, Pakistan’s own MBTs and anti-tank capabilities are impeccable, which may impede the advance of the T-90s. Any misadventure by the Indian Army would be dealt accordingly.
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4.4.2 The SU-30 MKI Aircraft: Air Dominance/Close Air support.
The execution of CSD is impossible without any close air support. Currently, the IAF is considered as the fourth largest in the world with an estimated strength of 170,000 personnel. The IAF possess thirty-three squadrons whereas for air dominance in south Asia it must have 42 operational squadrons. However the procurement process sluggish because of the inter services chafing and bureaucratic hurdle. The procurement of these highly sophisticated aircraft would help India to get rid of paucities in its air force, improve synchronization with land forces and add lethal fire power in case of any conflict. SU-30 aircraft is a big plus for the IAF. The SU-30 MKI is considered as an air superiority aircraft. India possess two hundred SU-30 aircraft, whereas, fifty-three more will be inducted in near future. The SU-30 MKI is equipped with advance features, greater firepower and it can carry BraMos cruise missile. This aircraft has a potent range of about 3,000 km with this range it covers virtually whole Pakistan. India and Russia are also negotiating to upgrade the Sukhoi-30 aircraft from fourth generation to fifth generation aircraft. The SU-30 would augment the IAF’s ability to take out targets behind the enemy. It would give confidence to the Indian armed forces on land to operationalize the Cold Start or proactive military operations against Pakistan. However, adequate response from Pakistan has neutralized the IAF edge in the skies. But has also added LY-80 air defense system
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which is considered as “deadly accurate” and can shoot down Rafale or SU-30 MKI aircraft.\footnote{228}{Lt General (R) Zahid Latif Mirza-Interview, (Former Commander of Pakistan army Air Defense Corps) in an interview with the author on April 26, 2018.}
The Indian army’s insistence with the CSD will bring instability and turmoil in south Asia

### 4.4.3 The S-400 Air Defense System: Shield from Incoming Aerial Threats

The strategic significance of potent air defense system cannot be ignored. It provides shield from incoming cruise or ballistic missiles, aircraft, and UAVs etc. Such a capability is considered as a game changer in south Asia because Pakistani policy makers think that their missiles or aircraft may not hit India, because the S-400 is considered as a terror for enemy’s aircraft, 16 defense projects with India on October 15, 2016. The most important part of the deal was the S-400 air defense system.\footnote{229}{Kallol Bhattacherjee and Suhasini Haidar, ‘India to Buy S-400 Missiles from Russia’, \textit{The Hindu}, 16 October 2016, sec. National, https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/India-to-buy-S-400-missiles-from-Russia/article16072929.ece.}

\[\text{India would buy this system for $5 billion. The S-400 has the potential to simultaneously engage 36 targets.}\footnote{230}{PTI, ‘India to Buy Gamechanger S-400 Air Defense System from Russia’, \textit{The Economic Times, India Times}, 14 July 2018.}

\[\text{India would induct five S-400 systems, three would be deployed against Pakistan and the rest would be against China. Each battalion of S-400 would be equipped with eight launchers, command and control center, radar and 16 missiles. After the induction of this air defense system, India would feel that it is impenetrable, it would feel confident. The offense-defense balance would tilt in the favor of offender, this is where the danger comes from. It creates instability because it gives a false sense of invincibility which is not. India cannot protect itself from the ballistic missiles of Pakistan. Pakistan can do so many things to India easily. India’s vulnerabilities are much greater than Pakistan, it must cover the whole land mass which is quite impossible. India cannot cover all cities and strategic installations from the reach of Pakistani ballistic or cruise missiles. The S-400 or other BMD systems in place would give India a kind of over confidence to go for misadventure.}\]
4.4.4 Nuclear Submarines: Second Strike Capability
The incumbent government in India has allocated $8 billion to refurbish its Navy.\(^{231}\) Currently, the Indian Navy possess about 171 naval vessels, 250 aircraft and 16 submarines is planning to induct three aircraft carriers by 2022.\(^{232}\) India has also acquired nuclear submarine from Russia and in coming years it has planned to get five more such submarines. It would boost India’s maritime outreach and firepower against Pakistan.\(^{233}\) The Indian nuclear submarines are coming up to add the nuclear triad, to achieve second strike capability. The credible second-strike give a confidence launch CSD or proactive type of operations to deter Pakistan’s nuclear response.

4.5 Indo-US Strategic Partnership
“The world faces four major problems — terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the movement of the center of gravity from the Atlantic region to Asia and the impact of a globalized economy on the world order. The US and India have compatible, indeed overlapping, vital national interests in all four areas.”\(^{234}\)

*(Henry Kissinger)*

Recent civil nuclear deal\(^{235}\), expanding economic clout and arms deals have witnessed convergence of interests and shared priorities in the region\(^{236}\). To improve efficacy cooperative mechanism and assistance in enhancing anti-submarine warfare capability are the latest markers

\(^{232}\) Bajpaee, ‘Naval Buildup Reflects India’s “Ambition to Project Power”’.


to define Indo-U.S growing defense cooperation. It further has brought into consideration the synergizing ISR assets and enlarging the maritime domain awareness mechanisms.\(^{237}\) India as an ‘Asiatic balancer’\(^{238}\) in the region. US consider South Asia with its significant economic potential as pivot to South East Asia to contain China, reaffirm its strategic superiority also developing a powerful alliance with India. On the other hand, Indian vibrant economic market gels with strategic ambitions of its political elite to seek the major power status in the region that requires strategic autonomy. With growth in its economy, India has multiplied its arms acquisitions, military modernization and operational capabilities to seek assertive role in regional politics. The transformation in strategic doctrines of India, expanding role in Afghanistan, global market access and lobbying for the ‘permanent seat’ at Security Council\(^{239}\) along member of Nuclear Suppliers Group are further evident of changing Indian postures, political influence and establishing its strategic superiority in the region. The operationalization of offensive military doctrines like Cold Start\(^{240}\), inducting latest military hardware and initiating hybrid warfare against Pakistan\(^{241}\) are Indian strategic maneuvering towards seeking conventional superiority under nuclear overhang in the region.

9/11 was the watershed that changed the political dynamics and reoriented the south Asian strategic environment. Before this, Indian strategy of self-reliance and neutrality in the world


affairs had kept it away from United States rather its pro-socialist policy resulted in US evolving relationship with Pakistan. India and United States had divergent strategic priorities and overlapping goals that kept both the sides at distance. This had shaped future political cartography of South Asia and brought super powers in the region and later caused its nuclearization as well. India and Pakistan developed strategic dependence for arms supplies on Soviet Union and US respectively. But after the Soviet disintegration, the world emerged with New World Order and expanding US influence, values and access across the globe. For the Indo-U.S. defense cooperation, US arms sales to India saw a record increase in numbers along with conduct of joint military exercises due to renewal of “The New Framework Agreement-NFA” in 2015.

4.5.1 Rise towards Indo-US Strategic Partnership

India strove for non-alignment, maintaining neutrality in international politics that strained Indo-US relations in 1950’s. Later on, US provided intelligence and assistance to India in Indo-China 1962 War but that couldn’t be translated in any major breakthrough. During 80’s the continuous substantial armed and economic assistance to Pakistan against Soviet Union to fight a proxy war in Afghanistan also tilted India towards Soviet Russia. Furthermore, endangered the
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strategic stability and ruined US efforts against nuclear proliferation to enhance regional stability.\textsuperscript{248} Post 9/11, US and India came closer and evolved considerably stronger political, economic and more focused on strategic ties to enhance defense cooperation in Indo-US.

Both Indian and US’s, policymakers sought many avenues of mutual understanding to advance their mutual interests i.e., defense industrial collaboration, counter-terrorism cooperation, promoting non-proliferation of deadly technologies. These shared values and interests led the both sides to engage. He suspends many nuclear related sanctions on India but no such relief for Pakistan.\textsuperscript{249}

India has been recognized as a ‘linchpin’ of US policy in the Asia by various policymakers in the US\textsuperscript{250}, a partner who provides necessary security ‘to the greater Pacific from the Indian Ocean’.\textsuperscript{251} Indo-U.S. relationship encompasses many important interests i.e., vast socio-cultural ties symbolized by the large Indian diaspora in U.S., evolving a new economic interdependence being liberal, democratic economies, mutuality of strategic competition from rising China and nuclear-armed Pakistan, and finally, the enhancement in military cooperation.\textsuperscript{252}

President George W. Bush considered India as ‘an asset’ and planned a comprehensive political and economic relationship through bilateral assistance. He was the proponent of the idea to use foreign aid and bilateral assistance for India as a ladder to expand the circle of development,

\textsuperscript{248} Husain Haqqani, Magnificent Delusions: Pakistan, the United States, and an Epic History of Misunderstanding (New York: PublicAffairs, 2013), 12.


\textsuperscript{250} AFP, ‘India “linchpin” for US Strategy in Asia’.


openness and infrastructure building in such a democracy.\textsuperscript{253} This massive and expanding relationship was sought India.\textsuperscript{254}

Upon the visit of Manohar Parrikar, the Defense Minister of India to the Pentagon, Carter said: 

In August 2016, when Manohar Parrikar, Indian Defense Minister was visiting Pentagon, Carter said: “Indo-US relations would be the most important.”\textsuperscript{255}

The US House also adopted an amendment in this regard, proposed by Ami Bera, an Indian-American Congressman as part of the NDAA 2018. Ami Bera said, "Cooperation between the US and India enhances our own defense and our ability”.\textsuperscript{256} ‘Tri-series exercises’, naval exchanges and expanding counter-terrorism cooperation, two-plus-two dialogue are ample evidence of evolving a deeper security cooperation with more interdependent in strategic priorities.

U.S. and India both share many common strategic and economic interests, but their approach and priorities differ from each other. U.S. has more global approach in chalking out strategic orientation and expanding its muscles and political influence to contain rising Chinese economic clout and strategic assertiveness. Regional prism expands flanks, seize power to be assertive in its immediate neighborhood, developing operational capability to expand beyond its borders and


especially in Indian Ocean region (IOR). Developing military bases, making inroads through port leasing and politics of infrastructure building that are viewed as aggressive Chinese advances by New Delhi and Washington. This shall pose a strategic challenge to keep Indo-Pacific open, secure and more prosperous for India and United States.

India has its own security vulnerabilities in Pakistan. It has longstanding territorial disputes, water issues and terrorism problems with Pakistan. Both the sides have fought many wars, continuously are engaged in arms buildup and developed nuclear capability as well. Both the sides have permanent standing armies on their borders and arms rattling have become a usual thing in between. Pakistan is also an irritant in Indo-U.S. relations. Expanding Indian role in Afghanistan, signing nuclear deals and reiterating support for Indian membership for Export Control Regime gradually siding Pakistan to its immediate neighbor China. This changing relationship equation with security compulsions and regional dynamics are the contributing features of evolving.

Chinese military in this region is a challenge to U.S. dominance. India views Chinese assistance to Pakistan in missile development as an attempt to strengthen Pakistan’s position. Amassing military muscles and modernizing its military to achieve conventional superiority against Pakistan. India is seeking military hardware, latest technologies to offset Pakistan’s nuclear threshold and not letting the conflict escalated if provoked.

India views Indo-Chinese growing trade as a part of two-pronged strategy that shall lull India into complacency through economic interaction and encircling it through ‘string of the pearls’ policy to undermine its security. India also wary of expanding Pak-China ties that goes beyond
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political and economy. Following are main developments that took place between U.S. and India that helped the later to modernize its military and operationalize offensive strategic doctrines.

4.5.1.1 India and US Nuclear Alliance:
Dedicate domestic sources of fuel in making bombs and further an unrestrained nuclear weapons program.\(^{259}\) It is also viewed as a non-proliferation disaster.\(^{260}\) In 2009, India signed an additional protocol with IAEA allowing for separation of civilian and nuclear technology and placing 14 of 22 civilian nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.\(^{261}\) U.S. diplomatic efforts also encouraged the 48-member NSG, that came in to existence specifically as a result of Indian tests in 1974, to grant India a ‘clean waiver’ in 2008 allowing nuclear trade.\(^{262}\) This marks a significant change in U.S. policy regarding NPT.

4.5.1.2 Defense Framework Agreements:
The Defense Framework Agreement (2005)\(^{263}\) between U.S and India provided rationale and direction to the security relationship. The agreement includes many areas of shared interests between India and US including the preservation of stability and security of the region, controlling extremism/terrorism, mutually shared vision regarding the proliferation of WMDs,
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\(^{263}\) US Secretary of Defense and Indian Minister of Defense, ‘New Framework for the U.S.-India Defense Relationship’ (US Department of Defense, 28 June 2005). Subsequent 13 points are cited from the same document. However, their sequence in the document may be different.
data, material and technology related to the WMDs. Following strategies and measures to enhance defense cooperation, develop a favorable U.S opinion and improve Indian military readiness:

i) **Joint and combined exercises and exchanges.** These exercises are aimed at geo-strategic objectives and provide professional training and skill development. All three wings (Navy, Airforce, Army) have held joint exercises with aircraft carriers taking place in the Malabar (2005) exercises for the first time.\textsuperscript{265} 14\textsuperscript{th} Yudh Abhyas (Sep-2018) were conducted at Chaubatia (foothills of Himalayas) to simulate counter insurgency and counter terrorism environment in mountainous terrain.\textsuperscript{266} Additionally, $ 1.3 million were allocated for India as part of International Military Education and Training (IMET) in 2018.\textsuperscript{267}

ii) **assist in building worldwide capacity to conduct successful peacekeeping operations, with a focus on enabling other countries to field trained, capable forces for these operations.** The III course was held at Centre for United Nations Peacekeeping (CUNPK) in New Delhi in 2018.\textsuperscript{268} These measures help boost India’s softer image as it has contributed 180,000 troops and police in 49 of 69 missions.

iii) **Strengthen the capabilities of our militaries to promote security and defeat terrorism.** The military exercises have been discussed previously.

\textsuperscript{266} PTI, ‘India, United States to Carry out Joint Military Exercise on September 16’, The Economic Times, India Times, 11 September 2018.
\textsuperscript{268} Andrew Strike, *US-India Joint Training Further Strengthens Peacekeeping Missions in Africa* (US State Department, May 16, 2018).
iv) Expand interaction with other nations in ways that promote regional and global peace and stability;

v) The opportunities for the transfer of technology, fraternization in technological areas,

vi) Collaboration in missile defense must be increased.

vii) Frequent exchanges should be conducted.

viii) Incidences of sharing should be further increased and frequent.

4.5.1.3 Export Control Regime:
In context of the (vii) point U.S. and India share a commitment to prevent proliferation of nuclear and weapons of mass destruction. U.S has since 2010, iterated its support for India’s membership to the four export control regimes Wassenaar Arrangement, Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), Australia Group and the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR).

It focuses on promoting transparency and greater responsibility in transfers of conventional arms and dual-use goods and technologies, thus preventing destabilizing accumulations (I.1) and enhance cooperation against states that become a concern to the Participating states (I.3). 269 Membership to these export control regimes strengthens India’s bid to join NSG as it is trying to quickly integrate itself within these regimes by playing politics. Furthermore, the old non-proliferation order and actors appear to be reconciling to India’s integration to the global export control systems.270

4.5.1.4 Defense Technology and Trade Initiative- (DTTI):
In 2012, Tata Advanced Systems Limited (TASL) and Lockheed Martin established a joint venture to produce C-130J Super Hercules airframe components as envisioned in DTTI. The

50th empennage was delivered in September 2016. TASL also has a joint venture with Sikorsky, established in 2011, to co-produce S-92 helicopter cabins. In June 2016, TASL and Boeing announced a Hyderabad-based joint venture to manufacture components for Apache helicopters and collaborate on integrated systems development opportunities in India.

In 2015, DTTI intelligence-gathering and reconnaissance modules for C-130J Super Hercules aircraft, Mobile electric hybrid power sources and Chemical-Biological Warfare protection gear for soldiers (300 crore Indian Rs. go-ahead). In 2018, DTTI has put forward projects for the joint production of a helmet-mounted digital display and a biological tactical detection system and the Americans pitched two plans for fighter jets as part of ‘Make in India’ Policy.

4.5.1.5 2015- Framework for the Indo-U.S. Defense Relationship:
The 2005 Defense Framework Agreement was revised by the 2015 further emphasizes bilateral defense arrangements, military exercises, strengthening of maritime security and defense trade and close engagement on regional issues. The framework agreement is part of efforts by U.S. and its allies to step up defense industrial ties in Asia as a counterweight to China’s military growth and assertion.

In Sep 2018 U.S. signed Communications Compatibility and Security Agreement (COMCASA) that allows New Delhi to buy advanced communications systems for defense equipment

---

purchased from the U.S to share sensitive military information securely and quickly. This will boost interoperability.\textsuperscript{274}

India will get critical military encrypted defense technologies for ground-to-air communication and intelligence data including real time imagery following COMCASA. India can also upgrade the less secure systems on high-tech.\textsuperscript{275} This synergy reflects India as a co-equal in providing security in the region.\textsuperscript{276}

4.5.1.6 Weapons Cooperation and Procurement

In December 2016, the United States and India signed a deal worth approximately $732 million to provide the Indian Army with 145 M777 Howitzer guns.\textsuperscript{277} Deals finalized with the US included the purchase of 12 Thales-Raytheon Systems AN/TPQ-37 Fire finder artillery locating radar, 40 General Electric F 404-GE-F2J3 engines for the LCA, deep submersible rescue vessel systems and spares for Sea King helicopters.\textsuperscript{278} India has also procured the Amphibious transport Dock Vessel, the USS Trenton, under the Excess Defense Article program of the Department of Defense for $48 million.\textsuperscript{279} The ship will be the second largest vessel in the Indian navy, and will considerably enhance its amphibious capabilities.

\textsuperscript{275} ET Online, ‘Seven Reasons Why COMCASA Is so Important for India’, \textit{The Economic Times, India Times}, 7 September 2018.
India operates the second largest C-17 and P-8 fleets in the world. With the support of the U.S. Government, the U.S. defense industry provided India with proposals for F-16 Block 70 and F/A-18 Super Hornet fighter aircraft.\textsuperscript{280} India announced its designs to spend $1 billion to purchase a National Advanced Surface to Air Missile System-II (NASAMS-II) to protect the capital city of Delhi. The system is co-built by the U.S. firm Raytheon and will deal with cruise and aerial threats.\textsuperscript{281} India has also made an official request to purchase two ISTAR aircraft under a government-to-government deal which will cost $1 billion.

The reduction in number of licenses needed for U.S exports to India will mean that India can get easy access to the latest technology. U.S has given STA status to only 36 countries most of which are NATO members or key-NATO allies. This is reflective of the growing U.S-India security and economic relationship.\textsuperscript{282}

\textbf{4.5.1.7 India’s Economy}

To facilitate joint ventures with Foreign Companies India has raised its caps on foreign direct investment in domestic defense firms (from 26 percent to 49 percent ownership stakes which can also be increased to 100\% in cases where modern technology is involved.\textsuperscript{283} Similarly, high cost contracts ($300 million or higher) will invest 30\% back in the Indian aerospace or defense

\textsuperscript{280} DOD, ‘Joint Report to Congress: Enhancing Defense and Security Cooperation with India’.
\textsuperscript{283} “India – Defense ”, \textit{export.gov}, last modified October 10, 2018.
sector.\textsuperscript{284} India has a defense allocation of $46.11 billion for 2018 of which imports $11.873 billion have been set aside for imports.

\textbf{4.5.1.8 Assessment of India and US Alliance}

This only leaves Basic Exchange and Cooperation Agreement for Geo-Spatial Cooperation (BECA) to make India a full-fledged U.S ally. LEMOA allows US military transporters to refuel and station at Indian bases for military exercises and disaster management conditions. COMCASA has established ground for real-time communication and intelligence sharing with US through advanced encrypted systems. The likely conclusion of BECA will result in unconditional sharing of intelligence, battlefield formations, maps, nautical charts, aeronautical charts, commercial and other unclassified imagery (Article 2.1.1).\textsuperscript{285}

The mutual defense and technological framework are already in place for strategic measures, counter measures and innovations. However, the strategic and defense interoperability between U.S and India will make South Asia a concert of great-power rivalry as these developments will not only affect Pakistan but also generate insecurity in Russian and Chinese quarters with the Chinese viewing it as the U.S Asia Pivot Policy. Moreover, it will also indicate a likely shift in Indian policy of strategic autonomy. This also creates possibility of a Chinese-Russian coalition posing a challenge to U.S hegemony.


\textsuperscript{285} ‘Basic Exchange and Cooperation Agreement between the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency of the Department of Defense Abd The Korean Defense Intelligence Agency of the Ministry of National Defense, Concerning Geospatial Intelligence’ (US Department of Defense, November 2010). This is a geo-spatial intelligence agreement between South Korea and U.S that was agreed upon in 2010 and explains the concept, scope and limitations in detail.
These two-pronged efforts by India in the nuclear as well as conventional dimension will impact deterrence stability between the regional nuclear triad (China-India-Pakistan) and the conventional arms instability will have far reaching geo-strategic implications.

The ensuing strategic imbalance will affect regional peace and its effects will trickle down to Pakistan that cannot be ambivalent to strategic and military builds, alliances and Indian designs of hegemony in the neighborhood. However, it is imperative that Pakistan continues its quest for peace, although it will need to focus on maintaining an effective and credible nuclear as well as conventional deterrent and invest in economic development to sustain its defense capability.

4.6 Indo-Israel Strategic Partnership:
The International World Order is a value-system that is based on the pre-eminence of power and relies heavily on power maximization for defensive and offensive objectives. The national interests of states are thereby governed in a framework of threat perception, cost-benefit analysis and threat minimization or neutralization. The equation between great powers operates differently with the credible assurance of mutually assured destruction (MAD) affecting policy considerations between US and Russia. The medium and small powers operate another way whereby the former seeks to achieve strategic advantage through force multipliers that would allow for an effective offensive capability and the latter pursues the objective of maintaining denial capability.

4.6.1 Strategic Matrix:
Pakistan since its inception (1947) has been engaged in alleviation of insecurity emanating from India. However, Pakistan’s strategy has been clear; it has sought to maintain minimum credible nuclear deterrence to deter aggressive Indian designs and achieve a degree of parity with India in
the conventional arena with International support. India has a relatively oversized defense budget of $50 billion as compared to $10 billion by Pakistan.\footnote{286 Toby Dalton and Michael Krepon, A Normal Nuclear Pakistan (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2015).} The situation in south-Asia is one of a precarious nuclear balance that since 1998 has prevented which points the application of rational deterrence theory.\footnote{287 Sumit Ganguly and S. Paul Kapur, India, Pakistan, and the Bomb: Debating Nuclear Stability in South Asia (Columbia University Press, 2010), 24–28.} Pakistan has maintained a nuclear posture whereby it cannot avoid but to rely on a first use nuclear policy in case of Indian aggression along the International Boundary.\footnote{288 Zachary Keck, ‘Watch Out, India: Pakistan Is Ready to Use Nuclear Weapons’, The National Interest, 8 July 2015, https://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/watch-out-india-pakistan-ready-use-nuclear-weapons-13284.} However, India’s shift to a more robust policy of military preparedness also known as Cold Start Doctrine relies on mounting a rapid offensive in 72 - 96 hours to decapitate Pakistan and making it unable to mount a diplomatic front.\footnote{289 Sebastien Roblin, ‘Why a Nuclear War Between India and Pakistan Could Mean in Millions Dead’, The National Interest, 31 August 2017, https://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/why-nuclear-war-between-india-pakistan-could-mean-millions-22123.} Pakistan has responded by developing tactical nuclear weapons (TNWs) that are specifically designed as theater weapons to be deployed in a radius of 70 km (Hatf XI). These were to counter Indian designs of a surgical strike or its incursions deep within the Pakistani territory for limited objectives. TNWs offer Pakistan stability and an answer to aggressive limited warfare strategies by India. However, Indian designs of a surgical strike in Kashmir (2016) had limited credibility as India did not possess the means to carry out surgical strikes that includes armed drones, laser guided artillery and stealth aircraft for airborne assault.\footnote{290 Snow, ‘Is India Capable of a Surgical Strike in Pakistan Controlled Kashmir?’} However, it’s in the
process developing such asymmetrical warfare technologies and much of it is in the testing phase along with training of Special Forces.²⁹¹

India’s strategic choices were restricted by these limitations; however, for the materialization of its policy the Indo-Israel strategic relationship has special significance. Pakistan has maintained a policy of non-recognition towards Israel which has hindered Pakistan from exercising influence in circles in Tel Aviv.²⁹² Pakistan relies for weapons procurements on countries with which it does not have the same level of understanding as is the case between India and Israel.

4.6.2 Indo-Israel Convergence:
The Indo-Israel strategic partnership is based on a common ideology, threat perception and shared goals and objectives.

1- India and Israel both face insurgencies at home (Kashmir and Palestine) and this offers opportunity for tactical cooperation in counter-insurgency operations. Pakistan views Kashmir as an indigenous struggle and focuses on the human right abuses in Indian Occupied Kashmir.²⁹³

2- The notion of Islamic terrorism also offers common ground for cooperation between the two states and has isolated Pakistan in the post war on terror scenario as India has effectively utilized its lobby in Capitol Hill to raise international concerns about Pakistan’s efforts against terrorism. Similarly, following ISIS defeat in Middle East its return elsewhere is plausible in the form of Islamic State 2.0.²⁹⁴ This generates scope for a

broader counter-terrorism strategy that includes intelligence sharing, training and military hardware transfers.

3- Israel also faces a crisis of legitimacy among large populations in Middle East, Europe and United States. India served as focal point of Israel’s Entrée in to the society of Asian nations. Moreover, India offers a lucrative market for Israel’s startups.295

4- The regional interests of Israel in West Asia and India in South Asia converge as Pakistan’s support to Tel Aviv’s rivals in Middle East is one of the underlying factors that is likely to hinder entente between Pakistan and Israel. India has similar concerns against Pakistan and its nuclear posture. However, the possibility of a de-facto Arab understanding with Israel might allow Pakistan the possibility of revisiting its policy in the Middle East as Israel seeks cooperative terms with pragmatic Sunni Arab states. Israel maintains military superiority in the Middle East to deter state (Iran and Syria) and non-state actors including Hamas, Hezbollah and ISIS.296

5- The Indo-Israel strategic partnership is also viewed favorably in US because of its implications for US grand strategy in Middle East and South Asia where the two states serve as guardians of US interests.297 The US envisions a greater Indian role in Afghanistan which in policy terms is viewed as Pakistan’s backyard and has shared interests with Israel which views it as a possible re-grooming area for ISIS following US and NATO withdrawal in 2014.298 Jundullah and Abu Umar Maqbool from Pakistan


296 Eran.

297 Yiftah S. Shapir, ‘Israel’s Arms Sales to India’, Strategic Assessment, November 2009.

Taliban declared loyalty to al-Baghdadi as they pursued a broader agenda of uniting various factions to attack India and touch on an apocalyptic confrontation with US. US and Israel see eye to eye on most issues in the Middle East. India has also changed its International stance from a political-diplomatic discourse to one based on realpolitik which seeks maximization of power through military capabilities to play role as a major power. Furthermore, the Chinese militarization of Indian Ocean has led to a reassessment of alliances with India viewing the Middle East as part of it extended neighborhood and as critical to its national interests.

6- Israel also must contend with the possibility of a nuclear armed Iran and wants to be capable on its own of stopping Iran if it pursues any such designs similar to the Osirak Pre-emptive strikes in Iraq (1981). Pakistan views Indo-Israel cooperation to pose a similar threat to Pakistan’s nuclear assets and facilities as such policy options from Indian and Israeli circles have emerged in the post 9/11 phase.

4.6.3 Defense Cooperation
The convergence of interests between India and Israel has strengthened military, economic and diplomatic cooperation. Israel is the 7th largest weapon exporter in the world (2018) and almost


300 Yadlin, ‘Israel’s Strategic Environment’.

301 Oshrit Birvadker, ‘Changes in Indian Foreign Policy: The Case of Israel and the Palestinians’, Strategic Assessment 18, no. 4 (January 2016).


half (49%) of weapons exports went to India.\textsuperscript{305} Israeli missiles account for nearly one-third of all arms sales and electronic warfare systems including radars which contribute 17% of the exports.\textsuperscript{306}

4.6.3.1 Ballistic Missile Defense (BMS)

India and Israel also signed $2 billion deals for air defense missile systems including Medium Range Surface to Air Defense Missile (MRSAM) system that has strike range of 50 – 70 Km in the sky against aircrafts, drones and Airborne Warning and Control System (AWCAS).\textsuperscript{307} India also acquired green pine radar from Israel in 2001 which has ability to detect incoming missiles from 500 km range. It can intercept missiles 25km away and fire missiles in 5 seconds. This will provide strategic advantage to Indian infantry and Main Battle Tanks (MBTs) from incoming Pakistani cruise missiles.\textsuperscript{308} India has focused its strategy on development and procurement of ABM systems to counter Pakistan’s reliance on a nuclear policy.\textsuperscript{309}

4.6.3.2 Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and Satellites

It enhances Indian surveillance capabilities along with cooperation with Israel on TechSAR which was launched by Indian help. Israel Aerospace Industry (IAI) has completed upgrading Russian-made Mi-24 assault helicopters and India has purchased HAROP attack UAVs which target radars.\textsuperscript{310} In September 2009, the Indian Air Force (IAF) purchased ten Harpoons from IAI

\textsuperscript{310} Shapir, ‘Israel’s Arms Sales to India’.
under a $100m contract. Harpoon has a range of 1000 km and minimizes its radar signature through stealth. India also procured 10 medium-altitude, long-endurance (MALE) Heron TPs, valued at $400 million to boost its ‘weapons systems cadre’ consisting of UAVs and pilots. 312

4.7 Conventional Asymmetry and its Implications:
The development of BMDs along with enhanced operational and tactical capabilities is likely to enhance Indian confidence for a cross-border military exercise or surgical strikes if it acquires the capability to block a nuclear strike from the Pakistani side. Moreover, Indian reliance on UAV’s for surveillance, as an effective laser designator to pinpoint attacks by aircraft, critical information and intelligence for maneuvering indicate towards a limited war strategy that possibly includes cross-border strikes. The Indian military envisions a gap between limited and total war without crossing Pakistan’s nuclear redlines.

Conventional asymmetry plays into a state’s security dilemma which generates geo-strategic instability. The International community has limited focus on arms buildup and resulting insecurity. Pakistan tested a nuclear-tipped cruise missile from a submarine in the Indian Ocean. Secondly, Pakistan will need to upgrade its weapon systems by developing its indigenous industry and by support from International allies like China. Pakistan’s upgradation of Al-Khalid Tanks and development of JF-17 thunder will mitigate immediate threat from Indian forces.


The contemporary era of wars is defined as ‘hybrid warfare’ which relies on integration of a wide-spectrum of forces and means for achieving objectives.\textsuperscript{315} Pakistan will need to revamp its operational and tactical strategy to reduce troop deployment times, effectively counter Indian reconnaissance and have operational UAVs for real time intelligence gathering. In March 2018, Pakistan flight-tested the ‘indigenously developed’ Burraq, a MALE unmanned combat aerial vehicle (UCAV), hitting moving targets with the Barq laser-guided missile.\textsuperscript{316} However, Pakistan needs to work on integrating several divisions of these modern UAVs to fill the operational gaps. Fourthly, Pakistan needs ABM technology to counter the possibility of an Indian aerial strike, cruise missiles or any far-fetched misadventure. Pakistan in response deployed LOMADS LY-80 which is a Chinese low-altitude interceptor.\textsuperscript{317} Pakistan cannot afford the Russian designed S-400.

\textsuperscript{315} James K. Wither, ‘Making Sense of Hybrid Warfare’, \textit{Connections} 15, no. 2 (Spring 2016).
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CHAPTER 5
IMPLICATIONS FOR PAKISTAN AND POSSIBLE RESPONSES

5.1 Introduction
Although it’s a known fact that Pakistan has never accepted or adhered to the South Asian security community in any capacity as it naturally places India in a superior position as compared to Pakistan (as a bigger power) keeping India’s geographic and demographic implications in to the mind. Pakistan has always refused to accept the role that this security community has always inferred upon it, but it had never been able to deceive or shed off the responsibilities and compulsions that this system has forced upon Pakistan to take care off. India had not only adhered to South Asian community overwhelmingly, rather it is constant pursuit of a self-fulfilling prophecy where India dominates the South Asian community with every other state’s consent while either forgetting about reservations of Pakistan and it’s like minded states or deliberately outbidding them. This stubborn attitude of India has caused unrest in the region, and it hurts the Pakistan most keeping the existence of sour history, border clashes and most importantly Kashmir issue as a possible nuclear flash point. Therefore, Indian pursuit of hegemony and acquisition of more and more weapons to enhance its conventional and non-conventional might for its hegemonic ambitions, have started an arms race in the region especially after 9/11 thus dragging Pakistan in unwillingly.

A considerable consistency has been noticed recently in terms of increase in military expenditure by the India. India is one of the largest arms buying nation and it buys from the Western and
Russian military equipment traders.\textsuperscript{318} Rapid military growth of India ignited by the lightening growth of its economy points out to an important aspect hidden behind this massive buildup: the regional and global ambitions of India.\textsuperscript{319} According to various analysts, the only viable explanation of huge military expenditure by the India is its ambitions to increase global influence. These analysts often miss two crucial points, firstly they neglect the Indian motives behind these massive military buildups and secondly, they don’t bring into consideration that the accumulation of capabilities might enable India to pursue those motives. Pakistan has always accused India of disturbing the regional stability in pursuit of fulfilling its hegemonic ambitions. This dubious stance of India had earned it the title of “Reluctant Hegemon”\textsuperscript{320}. Although India totally denies existence of such endeavors, but its rapid expansion and modernization of military muscle suggests otherwise, India’s increasing military spending is likely to see substantial enhancement.\textsuperscript{321}

It was indeed Indian hegemonic ambition that not only dragged South Asia into an arms race but nuclear arms race, unfortunately Pakistan had to follow Indian suit as a natural response to Indian nuclear experiments in 1998. Although nothing can secure a state from external threat better than a nuclear weapon, but India never considered stopping itself even after the acquisition of this deadly technology. Rather India’s increasing investment and acquisition/sophistication of modern technologies suggests that India has different preferences other than just preparing itself against Pakistan. Contemporary developments have shifted Indian military posture from
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defensive to an offensive one, being offensive is a clear indication of being a revisionist. India’s rapid Weaponization give rise to security dilemma for Pakistan eventually starting a relentless power struggle and arms race which makes South Asia nothing less than a quagmire, in which not only India itself is drowning but also dragging Pakistan with it as well. India’s drive towards security is a drive towards more insecurity for Pakistan. There can be several reasons behind India’s quest for expanding its conventional and non-conventional might (only in the sea to give India an assured second-strike capability), first being the obvious one which suggests that it is the Indian hegemonic ambitions that drive this quest in a specific direction. But there exists another explanation for this relentless pursuit of enhancing conventional capabilities, this must do directly with the counter-measures of Pakistan against India at both levels conventional as well as non-conventional which shattered Indian dreams of being a hegemon. At non-conventional level Pakistan also carried out the nuclear experiments in the same month and announced its nuclear status thus countering Indian non-conventional superiority and virtually leaving India without any supremacy over Pakistan whatsoever. But India being the first to cast the dice on nuclear board, unknowingly presented Pakistan with the opportunity to not only counter Indian non-conventional might but also the conventional might to because a nuclear weapon is a neutralizer of conventional might doesn’t matter how big or sophisticated it might be. At conventional level although Indian forces were far more superior than the Pakistani conventional forces, but this superiority was undermined by over-grown Indian forces in size which made it sluggish and less mobile against the relatively more mobile and swift Pakistani forces, Operation Parakram later proved the fact.

Now, a bigger and more insecure India was in trouble, especially failed Operation Parakram in 2001 in the aftermath of attacks on Indian Parliament was an eye-opening fact for
the Indian thinkers and strategists. Doubts have been raised over the practicality of Sunderji Doctrine due to the significant change into the employment concept of Indian Army after Operation Parakram of 2001.\textsuperscript{322} Indian forces were mobilized to carry out decisive strike against Pakistan during Operation Parakram.\textsuperscript{323} Indian strike corps were too sluggish to move to the border areas near Pakistan, Indian strike forces took nearly a month to reach and take positions at the border areas.\textsuperscript{324} While in response, Pakistani forces were pretty quick to respond. Pakistani forces mobilized swiftly to reach and take the defensive positions at the borders even before the Indian forces reached the assembly area. India lost an opportunity to swift victory due to sluggish movement of its giant military. Political will in India was eroded due to the international pressure and diplomatic.\textsuperscript{325}

Indian scholarship presented two possible explanations for this failed Indian expedition. The first was, the slow mobilization of sluggish armed forces and failure to take defensive positions or offensive positions within the given timeframe, to be able to carry out decisive strikes.\textsuperscript{326} Therefore there was a need for a revision or abandoning of old strategies of deployment and carrying out operations against the development of new strategies to execute speedy and effective punitive actions against Pakistan.\textsuperscript{327} Indian thinkers came up with Cold Start Doctrine (CSD), this ideology believes in swift yet shallow military offensive against the
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Pakistan by ceasing its territory for a limited time period and degrading its armed forces even before they get to prepare against the incoming forces.\textsuperscript{328} Cold Start doctrine works based upon three assumptions.\textsuperscript{329} The first is, although a credible nuclear deterrence is active in South Asia but there still exists some space for conventional warfare under the nuclear hangover.

“The Cold Start strategy promulgates early offensives by integrated battle groups (IBGs) culled out from the pivot corps stationed close to India’s international border with Pakistan. These forces would execute shallow offensives to gain footholds while the Pakistani forces are still mobilizing. The ground actions will be preceded by an air campaign to shape the battlefield.”\textsuperscript{330}

5.2 Implications for the Deterrence Stability of South Asia

Though, in recent times Pakistan is managing the conventional asymmetries effectively with its indigenous defense industry and Chinese assistance but in the long run it may become difficult for Pakistan to maintain conventional balance with economically bigger adversary.

5.2.1 Conventional Asymmetries between India and Pakistan in Future

The security dilemma would emerge in the region due to the Indian military becoming an impeccable force in the region by overcoming its operational deficiencies with the help of strategic partnerships with US, Israel, Russia and France, and it would affect Pakistan more than any other state in the region. Pakistan would have no other choice other than to counter Indian conventional superiority and any misadventure by its military with its non-conventional capabilities if the region is dragged to a point by India where the balance in region’s

\textsuperscript{329} Ladwig III, ‘A Cold Start for Hot Wars?’

conventional deterrence is disturbed due to Indian ambitions. Therefore, there exists a possibility in future where due to Indian strategic partnership with major powers the conventional deterrence of the South Asia is disturbed, and Pakistan would be forced to take counter measures by either relying less upon its nuclear weapons to counter Indian aggression or join hands with other major powers thus leading to an arms race in the region.

5.2.2 New Arms Race in South Asia
Any misadventure by other state like initiating a limited war or conducting a surgical strike is nearly impossible due to heightened risk and cost of the crises in the presence of conventional deterrence. The nuclear weapons tactical or strategic may not deter Indian surgical strike or limited operations below the threshold of Pakistani nuclear weapons. It has been made compulsory for the Pakistan to acquire certain necessary conventional capabilities to raise the cost of the limited conflict and force India to refrain from initiating any limited war against Pakistan. Although Pakistan still possesses credible enough conventional capabilities to deter India and force it to not go for any misadventure along the LoC of the International border. But there is possibility of alteration in this balance in the future and by tilting in favor of India it would give birth to serious security and defense challenges for the Pakistan. It would leave Pakistan with no other choice than to follow the Indian suit by jumping into costly business of building up conventional might which would require Pakistan to divert funds from other sectors of struggling economy into the defense sector which could seriously harm socio-economic fabric of the country. This compulsion by the India would eventually end up starting a conventional arms race in the South Asia turning it into a catastrophic region with virtually no inter-regional cooperation or whatsoever. South Asia would become a quagmire due to this ambitious pursuit of India and its after-shocks in terms of compulsion on the other states especially by the Pakistan.
with no act of choice. Regional security would be further undermined and put at risk due rise in
tensions between India and Pakistan at LoC or International border.

5.2.3 Possibilities of Limited War under the Nuclear Overhang

There exists a possibility that India and Pakistan might face each other into a limited war that
escalates into a total war which in the first place has been started due to increasing gap between
Indian and Pakistani conventional capabilities thus placing India in a superior position to do any
misadventure and disturbing the balance. Significant number of offensive weapons had been
included into Indian military’s arsenal to turn the Indian dream of operationalizing offensive,
pro-active strategies like (CSD and Surgical strike) in to action against Pakistan. One thing is for
sure, that both India and Pakistan enjoy strategic parity when it comes to nuclear deterrence in
the region. The Spector of total war between India and Pakistan had been shied away due to
presence of nuclear weapons but it doesn’t completely eradicate the possibility of a limited war
between them. India would be a definite beneficiary of conventional disequilibrium between the
both states, and balance of power would be shifted in the favor of India. Indian military’s
warfighting capabilities would be enhanced by the availability of the modern technology, force
multipliers and more improvised and lethal weapons as compared to Pakistani military. Indian
military would be able to trigger its pro-active military doctrine CSD and carry out a limited
operation/surgical strike in Pakistani territory in the event of any major terrorist attack on the
Indian soil or in IHK. This would really test Pakistan’s potentials due to uncertainty of the events
and their outcomes, Pakistan’s response in the same currency might increase hostilities and
trigger a limited war which may possibly escalate to the total/nuclear war. Nuclear war between
India and Pakistan would not only be devastating for the whole region but it would also have
damaging implications for the major powers of the world like US, Europe and Middle East and
their economies. Therefore, Indian decision makers are advised to observe restraint while making
unnecessarily offensive and pro-active policies and moreover to bring and solve the outstanding issues with Pakistan on the table for the continuation of regional peace. Because the other option of confronting each other would end up dragging the whole region into further destruction and instability and no party would be able to claim the victory. Both states should act with maturity and show some positive restraint and cooperate with each other like good neighbors since ‘friends can be changed, but neighbors can never be changed’.

5.2.4 The Induction of Tactical Nuclear Weapons in South Asia

Offensive capabilities of Indian military are regularly and aggressively tested in the military exercises that are conducted near the Pakistani border. Due to certain obvious reasons Pakistan is not able to compete India in this costly arms race initiated by the later. Pakistan has suffered a lot due to terrorism in the previous one and half decade after the 9/11, it has lost thousands of people both civilians and military personals along with billions of dollars’ worth of infrastructure moreover suffered unprecedented losses to its economy overall. Recently, Pakistan’s economy has just started to recover after a tedious destructive era. Therefore, Pakistan can never be able to continue an arms race with India with such struggling economy and Pakistan’s absence from the competition would definitively bring about economic disparity between the two rivals thus compelling Pakistan to turn towards the other option of countering Indian conventional aggression by relying upon its nuclear weapons. This is the only way to ensure that India doesn’t trigger its pro-active military doctrines and does not think about going for a misadventure on Pakistani soil. The operationalization or enforcement of tactical nuclear weapon in the region doesn’t come without risks as the Indian nuclear doctrine does not or incapable of differentiating between a tactical or strategic nuclear weapon, which might lead India to respond with a strategic nuclear weapon thus leading towards the mutual assured destruction due to a full fledge nuclear war. Regional and global peace and security is continuously at risk due these kinds of
developments in the South Asia. The fear and possibility of any possible nuclear war between the two arch rivals can be avoided and mitigated through acts of mutual restraints in the positive direction, abstain from taking aggressive measures against each other and increased cooperation in the areas of mutual interests to bring about prosperity and stability in the South Asia.

The Indian military’s massive modernization drive and strategic collaboration with Russia would create conventional disparity in south Asia and force Pakistan to look for countermeasures. Pakistan came up with responses on both level, Conventional level as well as non-conventional level. At conventional level Pakistan came up with New Concept of War Fighting- (NCWF) at the end of exercises Azm-i-Nau through which Pakistani military would be able to move even more swiftly than the incoming Indian forces which will allow Pakistani forces to not only secure defensive positions before Indian forces but also to fire the first shot. And at non-conventional level Pakistan responded with the invention of low yield field-to-field nuclear tactical weapon to be used on its soil in case of an armed aggression by the Indian forces.331

Charles Glaser explained the logic of attaining tactical nuclear weapon as “nuclear weapon has enabled the weaker states (as compared to their adversary) to shift the offense-Defense balance tremendously in the favor of Defense thus satisfying the Defense needs and requirements of the weaker state efficiently.”332 Currently Pakistan Defense capability is declared as credible enough by many authors, also according them Pakistan has accumulated larger and more sophisticated

---


nuclear stockpile as compared to India.\footnote{Shane Mason, \textit{Military Budgets in India and Pakistan: Trajectories, Priorities, and Risks} (Stimson Center, 2016).} Short-range missiles and cruise-missiles are latest additions by Pakistan in its nuclear arsenal along with already existing delivery means. The short-range missiles are more compatible with tactical nuclear weapon delivery system.\footnote{Mason.} Moreover, Pakistan has also accumulated and successfully experimented the ballistic missile from its Submarine.\footnote{Joshua Berlinger, ‘Pakistan Launches Cruise Missile from Submarine One Month after India Missile Test’, \textit{CNN}, 10 January 2017, https://www.cnn.com/2017/01/10/asia/pakistan-submarine-missile/index.html.} This provides Pakistan with second-strike capability and further strengthens its Defense. Altogether, Pakistan has developed and improvised further many categories within its nuclear capability to deter Indian ambitions of doing any misadventure thus leaving virtually no space for war between the both rivals.

\textbf{5.3 Conclusion}

The conundrum in South-Asia is complicated by the regional and international interest in the region. However, the international efforts at easing of tensions and conflict resolution have suffered setbacks as they do not address the root causes (Kashmir). The stability that has remained relevant is deterrent and crisis stability which focuses on acquiring incentives for using lowest level of military forces. Meanwhile, the region needs more of arms race stability through multilateral conventional arms control and by lowering incentives for further military buildup. However, unilateral action by Pakistani side in this regard is futile unless India reciprocates and the burden of history points to the opposite. Pakistan is at one of its low-cycles in which economy is severely over-burdened and Pakistan finds itself short on allies that could finance, supplement or support its military procurement demands. The strained relations with US and the
subsequent cuts in military reimbursements forces Pakistan to rely heavily on Chinese technology that can mitigate several of its challenges although not address them permanently. Pakistan needs to visit its policy in the Middle East where such enhanced cooperation between India and Israel has become contradictory to Pakistan’s interests in the region. There are reports of possible de-facto understanding between Israel, Saudi Arabia and U.A.E that will give Pakistan the room to at least neutralize the perceived hostility with Israel with Saudi Crown Prince MBS recognizing the fact of Israel’s existence.

Détente with Israel with behind the scenes diplomacy has become crucial to preserving Pakistan’s national interests. Pakistan can imitate the Chinese model of military contacts as promoting political relations with Israel. A secret détente as in the case of India which materialized in the 1960’s but did not come to the fore until the 1990’s is Pakistan’s best shot. It would allow both adversaries to get a feel of the public opinion and allow room to counter threat perceptions and somewhat counter Israel’s Indian tilt. Pakistan can easily maintain equidistance between rival Arab states and Israel without compromising on its core values and policies. An easing of tensions does not necessarily mean a radical change in the foreign policy but rather the establishment of a minimum working relationship.

An outright recognition and declaration of official acceptance is not the rational policy choice. Rather, as discussed earlier Pakistan should explore the relationship in military procurement and benefit from Israeli support in US economic aid and arms supplies. Similarly, Pakistan has much to offer Israel in Middle East. A long-term relationship building process needs to be pursued rationally with a clear-cut understanding of what Pakistan wants out of it and is willing to give.
CONCLUSION

Pakistan and India are the two South Asian states with nuclear powers that mark the region highlighted at the global level. Not just these nuclear powers are asymmetrical but also enemy states with a prolonged history of animosity and wars that keep disturbing the regional peace. India with its added advantage of booming economy and larger diaspora channelize her economy for defense capabilities and achieving ambitious agendas.

Furthermore, the presence of terrorist groups from the very region, ongoing War on Terrorism and issues of nuclear proliferation gives it a geostrategic significance. The strategic alliance of different technologically advanced states like US, Russia and Israel with India further originate an asymmetrical warfare between the two foe states thus naturally compelling Pakistan to match the Indian might and disturbing the regional peace. These alliances sponsor India’s advanced capabilities in terms of technological warfare to operationalize the hybrid warfare, Cold Start Doctrine and building capacity for surgical strikes to confront Pakistan.

The alliance that India is seeking for advancement in the military technologies and the transformation of its strategic approaches can be rationalized with the help of certain explanations that pin point the external and internal vulnerabilities of Indian state. The foremost perennial problem of India is the diddling issue of Kashmir and the troubled relations with Pakistan since the time of independence. This has brought both the states to engage in missile and conventional arms race, building nuclear capacity and fighting wars since inception. Indian military has certain limitations. A few events from recent history display this limitation and have played a significant role to intensify the “sense of urgency” to ward off any future attacks. These
events include: Kargil- 1999, Operation Parakram- 2001-02 and Mumbai attacks 2008. This situation has compelled the Indian civil and military elites to rethink and allocate more on defense budgets that has reached to 63.9 billion-dollar making India the fifth largest spender of military expenditures.

Moreover, Indian economy is the fastest growing economy in the world with the third largest armed forces. India explains that changing strategic environment in the region, perceived internal and external security threats by key decision makers are the drivers of India’s military overhaul. Indian quest for becoming a major power faces its security challenges within and outside of India and these challenges may pose serious threats to the economic situation.

Another possible explanation for Indian military modernization can be its immense coastline, global trade and adversarial relationship in the region as well. In terms of fleet size, India is ranked fifth globally but due to sluggish nature it falls short of expectations and is strategically more vulnerable to China. India prioritizes its investment in the Maritime courses because also the Mumbai attacks have crystallized the Indian maritime security and the argument of dire need to modernize and equip with advanced technical apparatus. To ward off any Mumbai like surprise attack in future, India decides to focus more on Maritime Strategy. India seeks drastic transformation in its strategic outlook and aims to modernize its military. This modernity drive of India is manifold and on multiple fronts with a focus developed on the Indian Ocean region as well. With a robust, advanced-equipped blue water navy, India eyes on the power status in the region. Arun Prakash, former Indian Naval chief outlines drivers for intensification of modernization drive, which are: growing global sea-based economy, adversarial relationship with China and to ward off any adventure from Pakistan.
There is also a general belief that Indian military modernization is aimed at developing global reach out to act as a balancer against rising China and expanding its regional influence. The modernization of military growth would also help India in its pursuits of immediate neighborhood in a strategic and economic manner. Michael Kugelman cites that another reason for this massive overhaul is because the Indian arsenal is ‘inadequate and obsolete’ though India has denied this vehemently.

The statistics say that India has consistently increased its military spending over the past few years. It has now become one of the biggest buyers of Western and Russian military equipment. India’s surge in military spending spurred by its economic growth is commonly perceived to be an indicator of its global and regional ambitions. Pakistan has often accused of India for disturbing the regional stability in pursuit of fulfilling its hegemonic ambitions, but India has always denied the existence of any such ambitions rather it just tried to ensure its internal as well as external security issues while preparing against the worst-case scenario. The dubious stance of India has earned it the title of “Reluctant Hegemon”, as described by Mitra, “the hiatus between India’s self-perception as a mighty power and its perception by neighboring states as a regional bully is a main cause of stalemate in South Asian security environment”. Although India totally denies existence of such endeavors, but its rapid expansion and modernization of military muscle suggests otherwise. India’s increasing military spending is likely to see substantial enhancement in its military capabilities and enable it to contemplate ambitious military options in the region which will eventually disturb the balance in the region and allow India to enjoy an advantageous position in South-Asian security community.

This growing Indian military prowess and the ambitious designs have alarmed many in the world. World seems to be endorsing Michael Krepon to justify Pakistan’s stance upon the
possession of low-yield nuclear warhead along with short-range delivery system as a result of India’s blind followed path of increasing its conventional might to increase gap with Pakistan.

The Indian hegemonic ambition has not only dragged South Asia into an arms race but a nuclear arms race, which, unfortunately, Pakistan had to follow as a natural response to Indian nuclear experiments in 1998. Although nothing can secure a state from external threat better than a nuclear weapon, but India never considered stopping itself even after the acquisition of this deadly technology. Rather India’s increasing investment and sophistication of modern technologies suggest that India has different preferences other than just preparing itself against Pakistan. Contemporary developments have shifted Indian military posture from defensive to an offensive one, being offensive is a clear indication of being a revisionist. India’s rapid Weaponization give rise to security dilemma for Pakistan eventually starting a relentless power struggle and arms race which makes South Asia nothing less than a quagmire, in which not only India itself is drowning but also dragging Pakistan with it as well. India’s drive towards security is a drive towards more insecurity for Pakistan.

Indian strategists believe that although probability of full-scale war between India and Pakistan has gone with the advent of nuclear weapon, but still there will always be scope of a limited war between the two as Syneder’s security/insecurity paradox is still relevant in South Asia. Successful adaptation of Cold Start doctrine as a primary offensive military doctrine is the testimony of existence of hegemonic ambitions of India. The Cold Start strategy promulgates early offensives by integrated battle groups (IBGs) culled out from the pivot corps stationed close to India’s international border with Pakistan.

This whole phenomenon of conventional asymmetry between India and Pakistan has been aided by the number of deals that India has signed with the technologically advanced states like US,
Russia and Israel. The balance of power as a result of these deals have been shifted in the court of India that sends the waves of instability in the region. Indian heavy investment in buying satellites, Airborne Early Warning Systems (AWACS) 'eyes in the sky' from Israel, Rafael Jets from France, signals intelligence, nuclear submarines, latest high range artillery guns and reconnaissance’s assets to cultivate conventional asymmetry may invite conventional as well non-conventional arms race. The Anti-Ballistic Missile investment with Israel and recent S-400 deal with Russia clearly projects the ambitions of India, Indians offensive modernization drive that has alarmed the bells in Islamabad policy corridors.

Russian assistance in the nuclear submarines provides India with a second-strike capability against Pakistan to fill the operationalization gaps for the Cold Start Doctrine. The Russian SU-30 MKI Air Craft, T-90 MBTs, and S-400 Air Defense system and the surveillance capabilities add much to the Indian capabilities against Pakistan. The conflict between the two nuclear states with Russian sponsorship to India will just propel the situation to the whole region threatening its security and stability. To avoid the spillover effect of instability, India needs to limit its strategies in order to keep the region out of conflict.

US and Russia are the two main strategic alliances of India that sponsor the asymmetric warfare thus making the region endangered. US interests in Afghanistan and Central Asian region pursued with the help of India pose security as well as economic threats to Pakistan. This whole game on the South Asian chessboard provides India with the opportunity to wage hybrid warfare on Pakistan thus isolating it in a diplomatic manner.

The strategic alliance of India and Israel and their shared interests also pose a serious threat to Pakistan from the security perspective. The cooperation between the two countries leads to conventional asymmetry worsening the situation between them and putting them into new era of
warfare. The strategic cooperation between India and Israel involves heavy investments in ABMs, air defense systems, and anti-ship capabilities. Israel’s Technological assistance to develop a medium range surface to air (MR-SAM) systems for India’s military, AWACS to respond to air borne attacks, UAVs, Barak Missiles for Indian Navy and other such assisting capabilities that are threatening for Pakistan’s security. The provision of strategically advanced communication tech to India by these strategic alliances gives an easy way to pursue hybrid warfare against Pakistan. This fifth-generation warfare fought with particularly applying high tech methods affects the adversary by exploiting its domestic situation that has direct impact on the foreign policies and agendas of the state and eventually turning it into a failed state. So, all this strategic cooperation has fundamental importance in creating an asymmetrical situation between the two war monger states already at a verge of intense confrontation and strikes a security dilemma for Pakistan which in turn is compelled to fill this widening conventional gap by developing strategic response capabilities. This widening gap in conventional capabilities strikes security dilemma for Pakistan and compels to reciprocate with minimum credible deterrence, filling operational gaps, developing tactical nuclear weapons and enhancing surveillance and robust response capabilities. Pakistan, having a long history of hostility with India cannot afford any shift in existing strategic balance that may question its potential to safeguard the territorial integrity. So, Pakistan, in order to balance out India, needs strategic diplomacies and endeavors at a full spectrum and instead of plunging into arms race, it needs to develop its own defense capabilities.

Pakistan is at one of its low-cycles in which economy is severely over-burdened and Pakistan finds itself short on allies that could finance, supplement or support its military procurement demands. The strained relations with US and the subsequent cuts in military reimbursements
forces Pakistan to rely heavily on Chinese technology that can mitigate several of its challenges although not address them permanently. Pakistan needs to visit its policy in the Middle East where such enhanced cooperation between India and Israel has become contradictory to Pakistan’s interests in the region. There are reports of possible de-facto understanding between Israel, Saudi Arabia and U.A.E that will give Pakistan the room to at least neutralize the perceived hostility with Israel with Saudi Crown Prince MBS recognizing the fact of Israel’s existence.

Détente with Israel with behind the scenes diplomacy has become crucial to preserving Pakistan’s national interests. Pakistan can imitate the Chinese model of military contacts as promoting political relations with Israel. A secret détente as in the case of India which materialized in the 1960’s but did not come to the fore until the 1990’s is Pakistan’s best shot. It would allow both adversaries to get a feel of the public opinion and allow room to counter threat perceptions and somewhat counter Israel’s Indian tilt. Pakistan can easily maintain equidistance between rival Arab states and Israel without compromising on its core values and policies. An easing of tensions does not necessarily mean a radical change in the foreign policy but rather the establishment of a minimum working relationship. In such a manner, Pakistan can balance the advanced militarized structure of India that it is developing with the help of deals signed with major global powers.

In short, these strategic alliances with India are sponsoring an asymmetrical warfare between India and Pakistan that thwarts the regional peace of South Asia that is already exposed to the threats of terrorism. The war like situation between two nuclear states might create a vacuum for the terrorist groups to prevail that is not a threat just for regional security but will affect the international community as well. The conundrum in South-Asia is complicated by the regional
and international interest in the region. However, the international efforts at easing of tensions and conflict resolution have suffered setbacks as they do not address the root causes (Kashmir). The stability that has remained relevant is deterrent and crisis stability which focuses on acquiring incentives for using lowest level of military forces. Meanwhile, the region needs more of arms race stability through multilateral conventional arms control and by lowering incentives for further military buildup. However, unilateral action by Pakistani side in this regard is futile unless India reciprocates and the burden of history points to the opposite.
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