

# **“Nuclear South Asia: A Guide to India, Pakistan, and the Bomb”**

## **Video Transcripts**

### **Chapter 6: Confidence-Building and Nuclear Risk-Reduction Measures**

#### **6.1: “Confidence-Building Measures (CBMs) and Nuclear Risk-Reduction Measures (NRRMs)”**

Michael Krepon: 00:07 Confidence-building measures are steps that a country can take to reassure another country. Nuclear risk-reduction measures are like confidence-building measures, but they are more particularly focused on nuclear programs. There are two ways for countries to try to build confidence. One way is by small steps, and you build on small steps to take big steps. So you start with lists of nuclear facilities – you exchange them every January, and then you give notice of military exercises before they're going to happen if they meet certain thresholds, and then you have an agreement so that your ships don't collide at sea. You build and build and build, and then you have a basis for significant achievement. The other approach is to take really big steps. Forget about the small stuff. Start with some major symbolic act to clarify leadership intention, to improve relations, and just go for it. These are the two approaches.

Toby Dalton: 01:30 So the basic difference between an incremental approach to CBMs and a more symbolic approach to CBMs is essentially in the path that you try in which to build confidence. Incremental steps are probably easier to build political space for and to get the bureaucracies to support, and yet they tend to be easier to break or to not implement faithfully. So their ability to build sufficient confidence, to change the nature of a security relationship, I think, is in some question. We see that in the kinds of CBMs that have been negotiated between India and Pakistan to date. They're less risky, don't really call into question the security strategies of either side, or present disadvantages to one side or the other, and thus haven't really made a significant difference in changing the nature of the potential for conflict there. A more symbolic approach to CBMs involves a much greater degree of political and security risk. Instead of building security in increments, you're seeking to establish a new baseline. And we see that kind of political risk-taking relatively more rarely in world history. It requires a leader, a national leader who has the political support to do so, but is also willing to take political, and indeed, personal security

risk, to make an agreement, to offer assurances or make concessions of the kind that can bring in a new paradigm of the relationship.

Mushahid Hussain Syed: 03:14

Basically, the purpose is avoidance of war, avoidance of tension, avoidance of mistrust, and strengthening of a semblance of peace, security, and stability. When both sides ratify the agreement and say on record that we will not attack each other's nuclear installations, it shows that they are not willing to escalate tensions beyond a certain point. And when they exchange lists, it gives them confidence that we can do business with each other and talk to each other rather than talking at each other. And it builds the confidence and creates a conducive environment for a larger, perhaps more comprehensive, peace process, which we hope and expect would usher in a new era of peace and progress between India and Pakistan. And we are waiting for that.

Swaran Singh: 04:11

CBMs and NRRMs (nuclear risk-reduction measures), of course, are very clearly important elements including atmospherics, which facilitate addressing other challenges of war and peace between nations. Clearly it was in the European context, but in the larger context of East-West Cold War relationship, that these ideas of confidence-building measures, or confidence and security-building measures, and then of course, nuclear risk-reduction measures, they were involved.

## **6.2: “Cold War and Post-Cold War CBMs”**

- Michael Krepon: 00:06 Confidence-building measures were really important between the United States and the Soviet Union in establishing codes of conduct. So, when naval ships are operating in close proximity, rather than scraping each other's hulls, there was a code of conduct about proper behavior. The same thing for air forces when operating in close proximity. The same thing for ground forces. Other kinds of confidence-building measures involved information exchanges. If I'm going to hold a military exercise, I'm going to tell you about it in advance, and depending on the kind of exercise it is, I'm going to allow you to observe it. So these things really helped to keep the Cold War from becoming hot.
- Amy Woolf: 01:02 There were several events, other conflicts, during the Cold War where U.S. and Soviet forces could have come into conflict and didn't. There were, according to many academics and analysts, several instances where both sides assumed, or received data or information indicating, that the other was preparing for war and by happenstance decided that the information was probably false, and therefore they decided not to escalate and go to war. So many, many analysts within the non-governmental community would argue that the absence of a nuclear war between the United States and Soviet Union was due to luck, that none of these events went hot. But if one follows the history of the Cold War and looks out over time, one notices that these events seem to become less and less frequent as the two sides communicated, shared information, participated in arms control negotiations, as the Cold War became less fraught. So one could also argue that the absence of nuclear use during the Cold War was due to the development of communications, transparency, and cooperation between two countries who had high suspicions and low reasons to cooperate, but over time, developed a relationship that allowed them to resolve misunderstandings and conflicts without war.
- Steven Pifer: 02:30 There were a variety of measures between the United States and the Soviet Union. The first was that going back to the late 1960s, just the fact that you had American and Soviet diplomats and military officers talking to one another. So they'd begin to develop a mutual understanding of concepts such as strategic stability, and then later on, as you had arms control become more formalized, you saw arrangements such as the Ballistic

Missile Launch Notification Agreement, so the sides would notify each other before launching intercontinental ballistic missiles or submarine-launched ballistic missiles. That was a plus, and then agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union, and then later between the United States and Russia, also brought in a range of other measures. So, for example, in the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty that was concluded in 2010, you have a data exchange agreement which requires a massive data exchange every six months between Washington and Moscow. You have notifications; on February 5, the fifth treaty year was completed, and more than 10,000 notifications had been extended or exchanged between the two sides. And then you also have inspections that allow the sides to go and promote greater transparency.

Deborah Schneider: 03:45

The Nuclear Risk Reduction Center, run by the U.S. Department of State, was founded in 1987 as a result of discussions between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. The two leaders wanted to reduce the risk that a miscommunication would lead to unintended nuclear war, and they agreed to found a nuclear risk reduction center in Washington, paired with one in Moscow, and the two would exchange information on a regular basis. In the late 1980s, of course, the primary discussions were about nuclear risk. When the Soviet Union broke up in the 1990s, a number of other treaties came online in arms control issues, also with verification and notification responsibilities, and the NERC, as we call it, took over the responsibility of exchanging those notifications as well.

Siegfried Hecker: 04:41

So my own experience has been particularly with the Soviets and then the Russians. In the Soviet Union to Russia transition, what I found most important is to have the scientists work together to do, what I call, "reducing the ambiguities" about the other side's nuclear program. That's what scientists are able to do. They speak a common language. They can look at those problems jointly. We did that during, what we call, the Joint Verification Experiment in 1988, where the Soviet scientists came on the U.S. Nevada nuclear test site. The U.S. scientists went to the Semipalatinsk Soviet test site, and we did verification measures of each other's nuclear tests. That built the relationship, which eventually then served us incredibly well during the Russia times after the end of the Cold War, and it led to what we call "lab-to-lab cooperation" to deal with all of the

issues associated with the breakup of the Soviet Union. So it was just simply crucial.

Michael Krepon: 05:47

The notion of a hotline, which has become symbolic of crisis behavior – you pick up the phone. The notion of a hotline came from the Cuban Missile Crisis because there were no hotlines, there was no direct communication, between Washington and Moscow. Certainly, there wasn't any satellite to bounce a signal off of and get direct communication. Communication came through commercial messenger services, and it took time. It took 6-8 hours to get a message to the other side, and then it had to be translated. The notion of picking up the phone to an adversary in a crisis this severe was hard to adopt because what if somebody is inferencing the wrong thing from your voice? If somebody can't see you when you're trying to communicate a message, it's hard, and there can be misunderstandings from that. So what the United States did was to ask, eventually, the Soviet ambassador, who had a very good command of English, a man named Dobrynin, to come and talk to the president's brother or someone else. And in that way, there was some kind of acceptable understanding of the communication that was to be conveyed. But can you imagine, in the midst of the Cuban Missile Crisis, waiting for a bicycle messenger from Western Union to convey the other side's message? This led to the hotline, and it's been an extremely useful device ever since, and it has been improved a number of times ever since. So it's not just voice. There's also ways to do facial expressions and imagery, but it's absolutely essential.

Linton Brooks: 08:20

The most important was the whole series of arms controls. The arms control agreements did several things. First, they capped and then reversed the arms race. Both of us felt a need to be at least equal, and so that meant we kept ratcheting up the level of arms. What arms control let us do was be equal at first the level we were at, and then ultimately at much lower levels. So that was the first big thing. Second was a set of incident-avoidance measures. It started with the '72 agreement on reducing incidents at sea. I was, in those days, a navy officer, and there were near collisions because of aggressive action primarily, but not exclusively I think, on the Soviet side. Incidents at sea provided a mechanism to avoid those. It also provided an opportunity for higher-level periodic discussion between senior military officers, and I think that brought benefits that we've never been able to fully quantify.

- Charles Glaser: 09:43 Okay, so many people don't think of the Cold War arms race as being simply completely dangerous and completely wasteful, and I think much of it was. If I had to point to one dimension of the race that was most dangerous, I would say it was that the United States and the Soviet Union invested far too much in trying to destroy each other's forces, which created incentives to preempt or launch an attack in a crisis. And so the improvement in this ability to attack the adversary's forces to accurate missiles in the U.S. side, in particular, the willingness or the determination to try and hunt for Soviet submarines, actually made that competition dangerous. On the other hand, it did have some stabilizing aspects. The United States deployed a diversity of forces, an air leg, a sea leg, and ground-based leg of the force, which made it hard to destroy. So that had kind of an important stabilizing dimension. The United States and the Soviet Union also agreed in the ABM Treaty not to build missile defenses, and that reduced competition and made this balance more steady as well.
- Amy Woolf: 10:48 Over the years, both arms control negotiations and treaty implementation led to frequent interactions and exchanges between U.S., Soviet, and now Russian officials. And in the process of communicating regularly and interacting regularly, the two sides managed to build trust and confidence and understanding between them, so that they had less resort to standard, talking-point reactions when things came up. So when there are crises or difficulties in the relationship, it is often the arms control relationships, the routine relationships in arms control developed over the years, that sustain and maintain, even when other relationships are bad.
- Linton Brooks: 11:29 Arms control agreements reflect the success of broad agreements. They reflect the belief on each side that they're better off with an agreement than they are without it. And they depend, therefore, on a political willingness to compromise, and they depend, in my view, on the belief that each side accepts, as an inescapable fact, the existence of the other. So that after the Cuban Missile Crisis and after the various events in Eastern Europe where it became clear, no, we weren't going to roll back the captive nations in the post-World War II rhetoric, then arms control became possible because both sides, at a macro level, did not seek to change the status quo. So the answer is you can't divorce arms control from overall relations, but you shouldn't think that you have to wait till overall relations are perfect to try arms control, because it may actually contribute at least a dialogue and possibly to actual improved relations.

### **6.3: “The Lahore Process”**

Teresita Schaffer: 00:04

India and Pakistan both tested nuclear weapons devices in 1998, and within less than a year after that, two things happened that showed the promise and the danger of that moment. The first of those was the Lahore Summit. Here, India and Pakistan had just tested nuclear devices. The Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, came from a hardline nationalist background, but he was kind of a smiley guy. He'd been foreign minister before. He actually, in that time, had tried to move forward with some kind of a dialogue process with Pakistan. The Prime Minister of Pakistan was Muhammad Nawaz Sharif, also from a nationalist background, but much more of a classic politician, and in a country where the army has always played an important role. And the two of them put together a summit meeting in Lahore, which is basically Nawaz Sharif's hometown, very close to the Indian border, that took a lot of people by surprise. What happened at the Lahore Summit? First of all, Atal Bihari Vajpayee came to Pakistan. It wasn't his first time there, but it certainly was the most dramatic. Secondly, he paid a visit to what's known as the Minaret of Pakistan, the Minar-e-Pakistan, the place where, in the days before the British left the subcontinent, the Pakistan movement had declared its intent to form a separate state. This was a huge gesture showing Indian acceptance of Pakistan as a separate Muslim state. And the third thing that happened was that they signed a series of documents, or they stood by as their officials signed them, which basically seemed to set forth a map for some kind of reconciliation between them. There were a series of confidence-building measures, consultations, hotlines, and so on. And there was also a couple of undertakings on areas that didn't directly touch on security. For example, they undertook to consult on their international trade policy, on which actually India and Pakistan have fairly similar interests, or did in those days. So both by their formal agreements and by the theater of the meeting, the Lahore Summit seemed to signal that India and Pakistan having put themselves in possession of the world's most destructive weapons, were trying to take a different path.

Michael Krepon: 03:04

The most important thing about Lahore was that it happened after India and Pakistan announced to the world that they had usable nuclear weapons. After these underground tests, there was a lot of concern, global concern, and Prime Ministers

Vajpayee and Nawaz Sharif took it upon themselves to alleviate international concerns and regional concerns. And Vajpayee, on fairly short notice, gets in a bus, travels over the bloodied territory of Punjab during Partition, and he crosses the border and goes to Lahore and sits down, amidst much confusion, with Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. Three things come out of this Lahore meeting: a declaration, a joint statement, and a memorandum of understanding. They basically say the same things. They commit at the highest level: "We are going to do our best to assure our people and the international community that the advent of these nuclear weapons are not going to create deep problems in the region. We're going to work really hard to implement bilateral confidence-building measures and nuclear risk-reduction measures."

- Lisa Curtis: 04:51 I think the greatest confidence-building measures on the nuclear front were made in 1999 between Nawaz Sharif, who, of course, again is Prime Minister in Pakistan, and former Prime Minister of India Vajpayee. They made commitments in the spring of 1999 about missiles, alerting each other to missile tests and other nuclear confidence-building measures that were extremely important, some of which are still in place. So I think that 1999 Lahore Declaration can serve as a good model of where the two sides should go in the future.
- Manpreet Sethi: 05:40 The Lahore dialogue came so soon after India and Pakistan had tested their nuclear weapons, and much was expected to come out of this because Prime Minister Vajpayee, when he visited Lahore and also paid a visit to Minar-e-Pakistan, which was seen as an acceptance of India of the existence of Pakistan, because they've always been sort of troubled by the thought that India does not take the existence of Pakistan as a sovereign entity. So when Prime Minister Vajpayee went there, and with Prime Minister Sharif, he was able to conclude the Lahore Memorandum of Understanding, it was a moment of high for the world and for India and Pakistan. But unfortunately, soon after he came back, Kargil happened, and as a result of that, everything just broke down.
- Rizwana Abbasi: 06:31 I think the Lahore process failed because of the Kargil event and Kargil War. I think in the wake of Kargil War, India believed that it had been betrayed by Pakistan, possibly, and they actually showed reluctance in building a peace process. From Pakistan's side, they made efforts, and of course I would say, again, that

the level of mistrust that was generated in the wake of the Kargil issue basically undermined the Lahore Declaration and that whole process. I think it was a very significant move, particularly in relation to nuclear weapons and, of course, in relation to the futuristic role of these weapons in stabilizing deterrence and securing peace between India and Pakistan. If you see, the agenda of that declaration is immensely significant. I think that by all means, India and Pakistan need to get on-board and take the agenda forward and address and actually institute the agreements that they actually discussed during the Lahore Declaration, if they really aspire and desire to maintain peace and stabilize deterrence for the betterment of the people of this region.

## **6.4: “Key CBMs and NRRMs in South Asia”**

- Michael Krepon: 00:05 At first, Cold War CBMs were viewed skeptically by India and Pakistan. After a couple of years, I think these governments came around to the idea that if properly adapted to local circumstances, some of these measures had utility in providing reassurance. For example: missile flight tests, prior notifications, testing missiles away from each other; military exercises, providing prior notification, depending on how big they were, and keeping them away from borders. These CBMs have helped India and Pakistan get through some tough times.
- Swaran Singh: 00:52 India and Pakistan were able to focus on these important elements even earlier from when they formally declared themselves as nuclear weapons states. So that's interesting. Indian and Pakistani prime ministers had already signed an agreement on non-attack on each other's nuclear installations, which is almost a decade before when they went out and said we had developed nuclear weapons. So it's interesting that South Asian countries like India and Pakistan did learn a great deal from experience of East and West bilateral relationship and what was developed in terms of CBMs and NRRMs in the European context of being applicable to India, and that has been really very useful because that has opened several possible channels of improving understanding, accessing each other in case of crisis. For example, we have a hotline between two DGMOs. We also occasionally have had a hotline between two foreign secretaries, and these are all institutional measures and mechanisms that help you create an environment in which there is no panicked reaction, there is no misinformation, there is no misconception about things that are happening on the ground.
- Naeem Salik: 02:05 And both sides are very conscious of the misperceptions which can be created by a missile test. Therefore, they have been very careful in informing the other side about any intended missile test. It happened in January 2002, once India tested Agni-IA, they informed Pakistan because they knew that although they were signaling their intent, still they wanted to be on the safer side and they informed Pakistan. Then Pakistan followed these, in the last week of May, there was a series of missile tests by Pakistan and all were notified to the Indian side, as per the agreement. Similarly, in October 2002, the test which Pakistan conducted, they [India] were also notified. And interestingly,

this was well before the formal agreement was signed in August 2005. There was just an understanding in 2002, but still it was followed, and after the formal agreement in August 2005, both sides have routinely informed the other of their tests. That's why the missile tests do not create any panic on either side, these are taken on as routine technical activities.

Toby Dalton: 03:22

So the two agreements, the Missile Test Pre-Notification and the Non-Attack on Nuclear Facilities Agreement, suggest two different types of CBMs in South Asia. One is more of a functional agreement and that's the missile test notification, where it is designed specifically to avoid misperception during a crisis that a missile might be going the wrong direction or might be a prelude to an attack, whereas the nuclear facility agreement is more symbolic. It's to show transparency and to build trust that those facilities wouldn't be attacked, which I think is unlikely. But it really doesn't have a specific function like the missile test agreement. I think you see those two agreements in the context of the strategic situation between India and Pakistan. Both are important as confidence-building measures, but the significance is quite different. The missile test agreement came about as part of the post-Lahore Summit confidence-building process and was really designed to deal with the new reality of India and Pakistan as states with nuclear weapons who needed to manage their crises in that context, whereas the nuclear agreement was from an earlier era in which that was more the threat, as the nuclear programs were still somewhat underground in both countries, and there were concerns about attacks on those facilities. I think now you see those in slightly different contexts than they had at the time. The missile test agreement is more relevant now, I think, for the spate of missile testing that we've seen both countries active in, whereas the nuclear agreement, I think has less relevance to the current situation, yet still as a symbol of the need to have transparency and build confidence in between both countries, is still important.

Sitakanta Mishra: 05:29

In 2007, both countries have come up again, signing another landmark CBM that stipulates, or directs, each country to intimate or provide communication if there is an accident related to nuclear weapons in either country. In fact, this is a very, very landmark agreement between the two that creates a kind of trust in between because taking into account the complexity of nuclear weapons, the technology itself, and the

proximity as well, this agreement prompts both countries to come sit down together if there is any inadvertent accident relating to nuclear weapons in either country.

Abhijit Iyer-Mitra: 06:12

So the main benefits of these nuclear CBMs between India and Pakistan are at some level, doesn't matter what the level of tension is, at least the Nuclear Non-Attack Agreement gets you on the table and gets an exchange of papers every year without fail. And both countries stick to it, so I think the fact that both countries are demonstrating the willingness, year after year, irrespective of tension to actually exchange that list of very sensitive facilities, is the benefit of the first agreement. The benefit of the second agreement – it's very hard to gauge because we haven't had a nuclear accident as yet, where the exchange of information actually happens, and that would be a much more sporadic exchange of information. So it would be very hard to gauge any real benefit from it. It doesn't actually contribute to step-by-step consistency and trust-building. The downside of both of these agreements, though, is the fact that they both stop at verification. There is no verification, there is no inspection. It's merely the exchange of paperwork. So if you have to get confidence-building to the next level, you have to have an element of each country visiting the other or even non-intrusive verification.

Manpreet Sethi: 07:50

Missile test pre-notification and the non-attack on nuclear facilities are a couple of CBMs between India and Pakistan that have held despite periods of tension that the two have gone through several times, which is very heartening to see that, you know, where both countries see a sense in preventing certain kinds of misunderstandings, the agreements have held. The concerns that exist on both sides on these aspects have been well covered by the two agreements that are there, and there are, you know, success stories in CBMs between India and Pakistan. Another thing I'd like to highlight is it's not very well understood that India and Pakistan do have a lot of CBMs, not just nuclear CBMs, but general CBMs which are also in place. Troop movements along the Line of Control and the international border, how close can military aircraft come to the border, overflight issues, all of that exist in the form of certain CBMs. It's just that the political mistrust in the relationship often takes the greater highlight, and therefore you tend to miss out that these are two nuclear-armed adversaries that have some of the best CBMs that exist amongst any adversaries.

Hopefully, as we go along into the future, more nuclear CBMs can be finalized, but for the time being, the political climate does not seem to be right to do any more than what we've come this far.

Hasan Askari Rizvi: 09:23

I think new CBMs are only possible if India and Pakistan talk to each other and agree to certain measures where the probability of misinformation or misunderstanding of signals in the nuclear domain is taken care of. Similarly, non-nuclear CBM – there's a lot of scope for that also.

Michael Krepon: 09:51

There are very, very limited agreements between India and Pakistan, having to do with the avoidance of dangerous military practices. There are agreements to give prior notifications of ballistic missile flight tests, but not cruise missile flight tests. There are agreements to give prior notification of military exercises that exceed certain thresholds and not to carry them out in ways that are threatening or very close to the border, but that's not enough. Unless there are commitments, real commitments, to avoid close encounters at sea or in the air or on the ground, then there could be trouble.

## **6.5: “Obstacles to CBMs in South Asia”**

- Michael Krepon: 00:05 In South Asia, the small step approach hasn't worked because the small steps are few and far between, and the small steps don't lead to big steps. That's the complaint. Small steps may be useful, but without conflict resolution, how useful are they? In South Asia, big steps haven't worked. There have been two major gestures by Indian prime ministers to turn the page with Pakistan. Prime Minister Vajpayee traveled over the Punjab, visited Lahore after the nuclear tests, said, “Let's do a memorandum of understanding, a very ambitious memorandum, and let's go for it.” Prime Minister Modi stopped in Lahore after visiting Afghanistan, bearing presence for Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif on his birthday and for the Prime Minister's family where there was a wedding celebration. Those are pretty significant symbolic gestures, but nothing came of them. The reason why small steps haven't led to big steps, the reason why big symbolic gestures haven't led to big steps, is because progress has been interrupted by acts of violence directed against India by anti-Indian groups that are based in Pakistan. This is the tragedy of South Asia.
- Toby Dalton: 02:02 The primary obstacles to additional confidence-building measures, I think, are two-fold. First is that the two governments, the two polities, have to believe and find political space for these agreements to be negotiated and to work, and so there's a political will question. And as you've seen nationalist governments come and go in both countries, these have kind of been out of phase, and it's really been relatively rare periods when the two governments had both the collective political will, but also the political space to negotiate these kinds of agreements. And then secondly, I think there's also a bureaucratic will aspect of this too, which is that the security bureaucracies on both sides have to be responsive to the political leadership, yet these are very complicated agreements to negotiate and to work out and to implement. So you have the bureaucracies onboard as well. I think what we've seen now in South Asia over the last period is either one side has the political will and the other doesn't, or neither side does, and the bureaucracies have not been willing to take the risks to negotiate additional agreements.
- Sadia Tasleem: 03:16 The more fundamental, I think, problem is a serious trust deficit between the two sides. Also, I think there is a lack of clarity on

what exactly do both sides want and what could be the negotiating space that both sides could actually explore in order to achieve a workable solution to the problems that they are confronted with. With these kinds of dynamics, it becomes very hard to develop a convincing case on CBMs. I think there is this sense which largely prevails both in India and Pakistan that CBMs, even the ones that are existing, have not really been extremely useful. Not that they're not important, but it's assumed in some circles that they have outlived their utility, and it's thought that investing in CBMs may not really change a lot of stuff on ground.

Manpreet Sethi:

04:33

I would list at least two or three obstacles that have existed to India and Pakistan agreeing to additional CBMs. The first of these would be the lack of a common desire for strategic stability. We saw in the times of the Cold War that at the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, both sides had a common sense of risk perception, a threat to strategic stability that emerged, and that led to a slew of measures on a confidence-building. In the case of India and Pakistan, the risk perception is not taken equally right now. In fact, there are many in India and also amongst the Western strategic analysts who tend to believe that Pakistan sees a greater sense in keeping a bit of instability at the nuclear level because that tends to enhance the deterrence of Pakistan. If there was stability at the nuclear level, then Pakistan cannot use the nuclear weapons as a shield, in the manner in which it has been using it for fomenting acts of sub-conventional terrorism. So, it's the threat of escalation to the highest level, the irrationality which is projected, or the uncertainty which has maintained at that level, that actually goes to enhance the deterrence, as seen by Pakistan. Therefore, the first primary obstacle is lack of a common desire for strategic stability. Secondly, of course there's an asymmetry in decision-making authorities on both sides. So you've got a very vibrant democratic political system in India which has to engage with a largely military predominated system on the other side, and both of them then come to these decisions with a different sense of understanding of the issues, the baggage, the domestic power structure, and that then becomes an obstacle on how to get along on more CBMs. And lastly, political mistrust. Both the countries haven't been able to get over a sense of mistrust in each other's intentions, and that becomes then an obstacle to more CBMs.

- Rizwana Abbasi: 06:44 I think a major obstacle between India and Pakistan in instituting CBMs is the Kashmir issue, and of course Pakistan thinks that Kashmir is the major issue that needs to be on the topic of a comprehensive dialogue. In parallel to that, India thinks that terrorism basically is the major issue that needs to be taken on board and on the top of a discussion. So I think terrorism and the Kashmir issue and of course, after Kargil, we see these terrorist attacks, and of course, Pakistan and India blame games, and these two countries lead some political rhetoric and aggressive statements towards each other are basically creating for the mistrust and distance between the two countries. At the same time we would say that the two states' directions are quite distinct. One is trying to basically manage peace, and the other one is busy in taking its profile forward into global affairs. So there are actually so many complexities attached to this and one major complexity, I would say, would be terrorism and territorial disputes between the two countries.
- Gurmeet Kanwal: 08:02 Deep distrust on both sides. On the Indian side, we feel that we should be talking to a civilian administration in Pakistan, where it is the army that actually calls it the shots. But army-to-army, whatever CBMs have taken place so far, they've held; all agreements army-to-army have held, but as a nation we have to talk to the dispensation that is in power in Pakistan. So it is distrust, at the end of the day, that stops the two countries from getting into deeper and more meaningful confidence-building measures.
- Sitakanta Mishra: 08:42 Whatever may be the success and failure of all these CBMs in operation, there are definitely a lot of drawbacks. There are a lot of problems still that the CBMs are facing in terms of implementation because when the gun is on the border, you cannot have a peace. The guns should stop, and therefore the CBMs will take its own course. When both of the forces are fighting on the border, talking about CBMs and peace actually, are futile attempts. And therefore there should be a political will in both sides to carry forward the CBM process, and maybe we can add a few more CBMs in the future. So the political will on both sides is more important when we talk about CBMs to carry it forward. Second one is the implementation process. Do we really have all the mechanisms required for implementing those CBMs that we have already signed? The way I pointed out, the 2007 agreement to notify each other in case of a nuclear accident in either side is just a mere document. There

has been no improvement or mechanism established after signing that treaty. Therefore, implementation is more important when we talk about CBMs or the CBM process in South Asia. I think both countries need to do a lot more in terms of implementation of all these.

Michael Krepon: 10:04

But most of the trouble between India and Pakistan comes from two places. It comes from Kashmir, and it comes from anti-India groups that are based in Pakistan. And if the two sides really want to avoid dangerous military practices, India has to do better in Kashmir, and the Kashmiris need to breathe more freely, and Pakistan has to stop these acts of terror against India that originate on Pakistani soil. We haven't seen evidence so far that India is willing to do what it needs to do in Kashmir on behalf of the Kashmiri people, and we haven't seen evidence that Pakistan's military and intelligence services are prepared to sit on the anti-India groups, whose actions can lead to another crisis.

## **6.6: “Suggestions for Future CBMs”**

- Sameer Lalwani: 00:05 Confidence-building measures can be set up and institutionalized to reduce the probability of crisis, conflict, or war through a number of mechanisms. One of those is to share information, and that would be through transparency measures. Another would be enhancing communication, both on a standing basis to talk about intentions, capabilities, and strategic concepts, but also to enhance communication during times of crisis. You could set up institutions to reduce the temporal pressures and increase the amount of time decision-makers have during a crisis. You could correct misperceptions, collaboratively manage risk, facilitate arms control and reductions, and finally you could perhaps even develop changes in state policies that actually drive the rivalry or conflict.
- Toby Dalton: 00:51 Future CBMs might fall into a couple of different categories. You could imagine additional functional CBMs, like extending the missile test notification to include, for example, cruise missiles, or be more specific on sea-based platforms, which could be an additional area. But I think the bigger prize is to enhance transparency of intentions and capabilities in ways that hasn't really happened to date. In the Lahore Declaration, there was the promise of a dialogue on nuclear doctrines which has not taken place as yet. If India and Pakistan could get to the point where they could talk more openly about nuclear doctrine, then that might open the way to additional kinds of agreements that would be more specifically focused on reducing risks of escalation during a crisis. I think, ideally, what you'd see take place in South Asia, if and when both countries can agree that arms limitation or arms control could become a way of managing their security competition as an eventual shift towards the kind of arms control agreements that came to characterize the U.S.-Soviet relationship during the Cold War, or even things like the mutual inspection regime on nuclear facilities that was negotiated between Argentina and Brazil that was designed to build confidence that neither side was going to build up an additional capability, or new capability, to develop nuclear weapons. It looks a little bit different in South Asia, but you could still imagine some sort of mutual inspection regime that would be designed, particularly in the context of an arms limitation agreement, to build confidence that neither side was going to break out in a way that would be disadvantageous to the other side.

Linton Brooks:	02:40	My personal view is that what South Asia would most benefit from is the analog of some of the doctrinal discussions we had. That there is a great potential for escalation in South Asia, and I think that in hindsight, we didn't do enough in the Cold War to reduce the chance of escalation. We're not doing enough now to reduce the chance of escalation in a confrontation with Russia or China, and I think that South Asia may want to try and learn from that.
Riaz Khan:	03:25	Pakistan and India should have an arrangement for bilateral summits, at least once in two years, once in three years, because bilateral summits are extremely important to somehow improve the environment. Now that two countries are nuclear-weapons states, it's all the more important that their top leaders meet each other and make sure that there is no situation which is allowed to get out of control and push the two countries to the brink of a conflict.
Gurmeet Kanwal:	04:18	You see, for example, hotlines between foreign secretaries. I went to a military man, it means nothing. Hotlines are between operations rooms, manned by duty officers, 24/7. What we need is nuclear risk-reduction centers onboard the sites that are in contact with each other all the time, 24/7, 12 months of the year. Also, what we need is effective CBMs, like doing away with short-range ballistic missiles, which are destabilizing, from both the arsenals of Pakistan, as well as India. But since Pakistan has gone in for the Hatf IX Nasr missile with a 60-kilometer range, it's going to be a difficult one to do, but otherwise Hatf I, II, and III, and Prithvi I and II should be taken out of the arsenal, as they are of greater danger to the launching detachment than to the adversary on the other end.
Robert Einhorn:	05:09	One thing that the United States and the Soviet Union did was to establish channels of communication. Famously, there's the Nuclear Risk Reduction Center that operates in Moscow and in Washington, but this kind of crisis communication or strategic communications mechanism could usefully be adopted in India and Pakistan. Establishing nuclear risk reduction centers in the capitals of both countries and giving these centers a mandate to communicate on a routine basis, but also in a crisis situation, would seriously reduce prospects for unintended nuclear conflict in South Asia.

- Deborah Schneider: 06:04 If you were to look at standing up a nuclear risk reduction center in India and in Pakistan, or in other countries around the world, you need to understand what the particular culture and geopolitics are, where you would put those centers. You would need to look at what kinds of notifications you would be willing to exchange. You would need to look at routinizing that communication because that's where you can really build trust and increase predictability.
- Swaran Singh: 06:36 Especially in the case of traditional CBMs, we understand that they were primarily focused on interstate challenges and interstate threats from one nation to another. But increasingly, we all realized that the greater threat now to nations is emerging from non-state actors, which would not only include terrorism, but also all kinds of corporate spying, misinformation, all kinds of other possible threats; pandemics could happen. So they're going to be new CBMs, which are going to address some of these issue areas, and not just the threat of military attack from each other. So I think we need to develop and conceptualize all kinds of new CBMs, which basically allow us to share maximum information; for example, intelligence sharing could be possibly seen as future CBMs between India and Pakistan, India and China, and these kinds of new sharing of information and possibly sharing of how to deal with these new threats, which are shared by all three nations, should be the new areas of interest in developing CBMs and even NRRMs.
- Siegfried Hecker: 07:38 So if one looks at the dangers in South Asia and one looks at the possibility of, sort of, reducing the risks by getting the scientists together, you have to find something that's in common interest to those scientists that they can work on together. Certainly one of the most immediate and most important things would be nuclear energy. Both India and Pakistan have substantial interests in enhancing the amount of nuclear electricity that they produce. India has a particularly large nuclear energy R&D program. Pakistan's is smaller, but the ambitions of both countries are very large. And I think there are again, as one looks at safety of nuclear power reactors, as one it looks at the next generation of nuclear power reactors, how you feel them, how you run them safely, economically, that's an area that they would benefit by. They live in this close neighborhood, and so the issues of nuclear safety are particularly important. So in the area of nuclear regulations, for example, there could be lessons learned and ways that the two countries could cooperate very

effectively. A more sensitive area, of course, is in the area of nuclear security, but even there, what we've found as we started to work, first with the Soviets, and then with the Russians, you know, going back to the Cold War and then right after the Cold War period, that even in those arenas, if one talks about nuclear weapons safety, nuclear materials safety, security, there are ways that one can actually work together very productively. I think India and Pakistan would benefit substantially from at least having some exchange in the spirit of, perhaps, first just conferences, meetings, workshops, but then also perhaps eventually some sort of exercises that they could do together.

Rizwana Abbasi: 09:40

There are a lot of areas where India and Pakistan can really talk to each other and negotiate and actually initiate CBMs that can be deployed. For example, the most important part of this CBM would be declaring a bilateral moratorium on non-testing, and of course then eventually moving towards signing the CTBT. And the second one would be, I think, instituting arms control mechanisms and the restraint regime kind of mechanisms.

Ashley Tellis: 10:15

I think there are a range of things that India and Pakistan can do with respect to confidence-building, and these are less technical than political. The most important thing that the two sides can do is to reach an understanding on how force is to be employed in the management of India-Pakistan relations. If Pakistan can make conscious decisions with respect to controlling the terrorist groups that operate out of its soil, it would remove a huge precipitant of conflict in South Asia. If India can provide Pakistan with the reassurance that it will recognize Pakistani efforts at controlling these terrorists groups, Pakistan might be induced to pursue these measures with a little more commitment and focus.

Mushahid Hussain Syed: 11:14

Well, there can be a number of CBMs between India and Pakistan in the nuclear field, provided there's a conducive political and strategic environment, especially the resolution of the Kashmir issue and a lessening of the trust deficits between India and Pakistan. And we can start off by discussing nuclear issues across the table on the basis of equality and reciprocity, a cap on production of fissile material, and also ensuring that there is no nuclear arms race.

Linton Brooks: 11:46 I think in South Asia, first you need to avoid a regional arms race, both quantitative and qualitative. An arms control agreement that freezes some kind of equality could help there. I think we weren't very successful in making arms control an instrument of stability. I think it's sort of hard to see stabilizing measures in South Asia that are likely to actually be implementable, but anything one can do to encourage survivable forces and to discourage a strategy that depends on early use seems, to me, desirable.

Michael Krepon: 12:46 There are a lot of good ideas about new CBMs for the region. They come from people in the region and outside the region, but a process of CBMs can't be divorced from the state of India-Pakistan relations. Unless the government of India places a high priority on improving relations with Pakistan, and unless the military and intelligence services in Pakistan place a high priority on stopping the explosions that stop the process of CBMs, we're going to be stuck, and India and Pakistan will be stuck. It takes a high level of commitment to have a process of CBMs and nuclear risk reductions to succeed, and there's insufficient evidence of that.