



---

**RESEARCH PAPER**

**Emerging Security Challenges in South Asia: Impacts on Pakistan**

Muhammad Saleem Akhter<sup>1</sup> Bilal Aslam<sup>2</sup> Iqra Jathol<sup>3</sup>

1. Lecturer, HED, Govt. Postgraduate College Sheikhpura, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Department of Politics & IR, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Centre for South Asia Studies University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

---

<b>PAPER INFO</b>	<b>ABSTRACT</b>
<b>Received:</b> February 13, 2017	The study highlights the current security situation in South Asia, particularly in Pakistan. Pakistan is facing different internal and external dynamics for the current threats. The region of South Asia has strong and weak features. Pakistan and India are two major players in this region and peace and security challenges depend on the relationship between the two countries. Pakistan lives in an environment with internal and external challenges. There are currently several critical issues, including political, socio-economic, energy crises, security, drone strikes, suicide bombings, and various other challenges. South Asian countries are facing grave security concerns due to increasing extremism, terrorism and intolerance. Terrorism, bigotry and suicide bombings are a major threat and an obstacle to the region's progress and prosperity. Even the mosques and <i>imambargah</i> , as well as the targeted murder of religious leaders from both sects, are not certain. Terrorism has seriously threatened the peace, security and stability of this region and the rest of the international community. The question is what can be done to improve the regional security situation and how, under these circumstances, can mutual trust be built between the two main players in South Asia?
<b>Accepted:</b> June 24, 2017	
<b>Online:</b> June 30, 2017	
<b>Keywords:</b> South Asia, Security, Challenges, Terrorism, Sectarianism, Extremism, Instability	
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>  saleemakhterph d@gmail.com	

---

**Introduction**

History of South Asia begins with the civilization of the Indus Valley, which lasted until 2350 BC. In fact, this is one of the oldest civilizations in the world. South Asia consists of eight countries: Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and the Maldives. South Asia has a distinctive character because of its geographical location. This separates it from the other regions of the world. India and Pakistan are most prominent and rivalry states of

this region. Both of the states came into being in August, 1947. Both of them have never remained on good relations due to various issues, disputes and mainly security challenges. (Burki, 2004)

“South Asian countries inherited a weak, backward and traditional financial infrastructure from their colonial masters or the indigenous authoritarian rulers. Except Sri Lanka and India where some kind of infrastructural development had taken place during the colonial rule, the other countries lacked even the basic economic infrastructure. All the South Asian countries began with the process of modernization and development in the fifties. There have been numerous problems and challenges which have affected the South Asian economies”.

Pakistan on the other hand has been facing the challenges of democracy and stability more than 75 years of its existence. Pakistan also began with democratic system of governance but could not sustain it.

Today South Asia, despite being independent for the last century, is a poorest and most backward region in the world. The main purpose of the country is to adequately protect and protect the country of origin. No country feels relaxed when surrounded by threats of all kinds. To strengthen the security environment, countries use various strategies and are supported by foreigners in the form of mutual alliances. Join the bilateral alliance. Maintain your abilities Encourage foreigners to come to this area and act as balancers. Isolate the enemy. Promoting and reconciling regional alliances, even at very high costs. “Security in the Third World countries (that includes Pakistan as well) is state centered in character in terms of both its territory and institutions and to the security of those who profess to represent the state territorially and institutionally” (Corsi, 2004).

It is clear that there are multiple dimensions of conflicts in the south Asian region. Many of these conflicts have serious implications for security in the region. It may also be added here that these are strong between different dimensions of conflicts. Here an attempt has been made to explore various dimensions of conflicts and their security implications in South Asia. The comprehensive approach to security believed that if human beings are secured, society is secured and if society is secured, state is also secured. Since it is human beings which need to be secured, all areas of its activities such as social, political, economic environmental, etc form of components of the comprehensive security approach.

It is in the context of the comprehensive approach to security that domestic conflicts become a major challenge to security. Actually domestic conflicts emanating due to various reasons that security come up. It is also implies that of the domestic conflicts are resolved amicably; the challenges of security are resolved to a large extent.

The War on Terror was the most critical shock of the 21st century, and Pakistan suffered the most. Pakistan's role in this war has led to a "multidimensional" restriction on the country's external security. Pakistan was the biggest victim of the entire war. The situation in Pakistan against other entities in Afghanistan has also been battered. (Goraya, 2013).

Rotating Pakistan to the front is a game where Pakistan is both an American friend and enemy. Since September 11, Pakistan has been the scene of a blind war. It is hard to judge who is against whom every day. (Umbreen, 2013).

Religious radicalization and its violent eruption have been developing along two levels in Pakistan: the internal level and the international level. Pakistan's political leaders have blocked society and left no mechanism for genuine political expression, and their main goals have little to do with strengthening the internal structures of civil society. On the contrary, it introduced regional systems of power and underestimated problematic ethnic groups. The separation of East Pakistan, tensions and wars with India, as well as the endless conflict and the great unresolved problem between India and Pakistan over Kashmir have contributed to the creation of an unstable regional framework. The war in Afghanistan also had a major impact on internal security, which was closely linked to the rise in Islamic militancy, drug and sand trafficking. (Corsi, 2004).

Pakistan and India had a series of talks, negotiations and conflict management agreements, but all failed. According to the history the agreements such as the "Tashkent Agreement" of 1965, the Simla accord of 1972, the Lahore Declaration of 1998 and the 2004 Agra Summit were important landmarks for the first time, but were eventually violated. This leads to more bitterness concerning two countries. The two states worried to resolution the skirmishes concluded other networks, such as Channel II negotiation, and held in-depth discussions with the assistance of emeritus representatives, earlier armed people, businesses and other public services, but also with additional pains, not majorly positive Results. Pakistan and India are the two of the most of the significant countries in the South Asia region, must deal with and resolve their conflicts. (Geneva, 2015).

The internal terrorism front, a major challenge in itself, India's external involvement and events in Afghanistan have complicated our task, exacerbated by years of neglect and neglect, and possibly commission. On the military side, the support of the media and parliamentarians has given the necessary support to Operation swat onwards, many remains to be done. (Hyder, 2009)

The region named, South Asia is frequently stated to as the "most dangerous place on Earth" and the region's requirements is to urgently overwhelmed the hostile heritage of the previous in demand to make a peaceful and safe environment ... Pakistan May 1998 directing on the nuclear aspects of the region's nearly bilateral confrontation, from India's nuclear tests. In fact, South

Asia's security is compromised by the interplay of several elements that function at three different levels: national, regional and global. (Maleeha, 2002)

### **Conceptual Framework of Security**

In this article, the issue of security has been discussed by focusing on countries in South Asia, many of which, at their inception, actually had the constitutions that were closer to or modeled on the principles of UDHR unlike the constitutions of many established Western democracies. With provisions of fundamental human rights in their constitutions, it becomes particularly important to examine how the countries in the region are dealing with the question of security. Following up on the human rights provisions, security has been taken by examining two main security paradigms: state and human security. The question really focused on is what kind of resources is being put in state security agenda vs. people security agenda. It is in the context of the comprehensive approach to security that domestic conflicts become a major challenge to security. Actually domestic conflicts emanating due to various reasons that security come up. It also implies that of the domestic conflicts are resolved amicably; the challenges of security are resolved to a large extent. Problem arises when states invest too many resources on militarization for national security at the cost of human deprivation and misery. Several historical evidences suggest that just spending bulk of resources on military or border protection while undermining welfare of people could not protect national security. Moreover, the conventional security framework mainly draws upon protection against external threats or interstate conflicts. The state itself has a major responsibility for the safety, furthermore; the state-owned is devoted to international human rights treaties and addresses these issues of human security. However, national security conflicts with human security if the administration protects its own security at the expense of people's safety. As a bottom-up approach, human security focuses on creating a national security structure that represents and protects the fundamental rights of citizens. It is the duty of the state to help people who are at serious risk of internal war, rebellion, oppression and the collapse of the state. These states argue that this is a national issue that is being investigated by domestic security experts.

### **Traditional and Non-Traditional Security**

There are several definitions of national security, the modern favorite version of John M. Collins, which explains the benefits of national security as follows: Traditional lifestyle. , The basic system, values and honors remain the same. (Collins,1973) National Security can be separated by two segments, internal as well as external: The internal deals with the domestic problems of citizens and external deals with the globally. Military and political decisions have traditionally been the most important elements in maintaining national security. Balanced combination can best serve a state's security objectives and protect them from internal and external threats. States may have more or less state security in the

form of an arrangement of political funds and purposes. Nearly totally "essentials of state responsibility provide to the promotion of state security, but conventional armed forces and nuclear weapons have been the most direct means since 1945.

### **Theoretical framework**

The securitization concept is the main theoretical tool for mapping regional differences. Objective safety theories use their own vision to more easily integrate local events with the general theories that motivate actors' behavior. Securitization theories recognize that security programs cover a range of issues in different regions: not just different actors, but also the relative importance of different sectors.

This prevents the prejudice of in what way publics "react". For example clarified previous, the entire securitization research system plays two different roles in the current research role. These roles are at the ends of the theory. On the other hand, he argues that security has meta-theoretical capabilities, and it is not possible to mechanically obtain objective elements from the resulting security dynamics. Therefore, security keeps us after impartial safety, counting sightlessness to local changes. (Buzan, & Weaver, 2003).

The additional purpose of securitization must be mobilized at crucial points. In most regions, one or more questions are asked in the through elegant of the securitization investigation. The spinning arguments exist scrutinized, and the players, politician and decision makers enter the phase wherever they would then must remained fewer noticeable due to the broad possibility of examination. Compared to the past, present and (in particular) the future, Researchers analyze some of these sets of important political decisions, thus allowing concepts that conflict with materialist generalizations. The concept of security has numerous consequences. So, it needs to be contextual. Barry Bazan said that "people do not share the same idea of security because of moral, ideological and regulatory differences". Therefore, security issues are always determined on the basis of other theoretical grounds. In the real world, security can only be seen as a derivative of power or a synonym for power. (Stone, 2009)

### **History of Regional Security**

The "Cold War decolonization's proceeded in a very uneven manner. In a few places, most notably South Asia during 1947-8, all of the main states in one region were decolonized nearly simultaneously, making the transition from imperial subordination to autonomous RSC in a single, swift move. Mostly, however, decolonization happen a few countries at a time stretched out over a decade or more, as in the Middle East, Africa, and Southeast Asia. This meant that there was a drawn-out transition period between widespread colonial control, and the arrival of conditions in which autonomous regional security dynamics could begin to operate. The new third world RSCs in South and Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Southern Africa were without exception based on interstate

rivalry, and many of them were born in war. Thus even while the Cold War was defining an intense bipolar security structure at the global level, much of the so-called third world was structuring itself into equally intense RSCs". The connection of two stages of security subtleties in South Asia, the central Asia, Afghanistan, and portions of Africa has resulted in certain of the greatest dramatic, unsafe, and poorly understood incidents of the Cold War. "The impact of the Cold War on the process of emerging regional security dynamics was pervasive, and the ending of the Cold War therefore marks the opening of a clear third stage, the post-Cold War period since 1990. The ending of the Cold War had three major impacts on the story of regional security. The main game of security is defined by their near neighbors. Key to our approach is keeping the security dynamics at the global level analytically distinct from those at the regional level. But a neat pattern of global and regional players does not simply spring into existence fully formed. The binding theme of the story is the emergence of durable RSCs against a background of great power domination. This happens very slowly, and only at the margins, for the first 450 years, and then dramatically and almost universally, in two clear stages since 1945".

### **Domestic Factors**

Even after more than half a century of independence, South Asian countries are still in a vicious cycle of poverty, needs, and lack of development. South Asian countries are at the bottom of the world in terms of social development and human development. Few people have access to clean water, and few have a permanent roof on their heads. Education is open only to the rich. Living under these conditions is uncomfortable, damp and short. (Dash, 2008)

Now, Pakistan is currently passing in a very difficult situation mainly due to domestic problems and instability. Community, ethnic and regional conflicts are common terrorist activities. Corruption and crime are increasing. Pakistan's domestic security is poor and its international reputation is low. In India, the situation is completely different, more stable at the national level, and more economically developed, so in the eyes of the United States, what is needed to stabilize South Asia is completely political, Economic and strategic. (Javaid, 2013). Since September 11, Pakistan has identified a threat to regional security, as the threat to South Asia (Indo-Pakistan) and Afghanistan to Central Asia is considered to be limited. The threat to Pakistan has changed rapidly. Traditional threats are targeting the state to asymmetrical threats across the eastern and western borders. This has changed the dynamics of security inside and outside of Pakistan. (Mazhar, & Goraya, 2014).

The main threats to the two countries are now internal rather than external. However, domestic violence can lead to old wounds being reopened. External developments, including events in Iran, Afghanistan and China, can still have a significant impact on the subcontinent. (Krepon, & Stolar, 2007).

## **Regional Factors**

Pakistan's Regional efforts to control neighboring countries represent anxiety and the way to concerns. Asymmetries that distance both strategic objectives and military relations with India and South Asia's largest nation, the Neighbor, are sources of internal instability and a desire to rule and strengthen India. Of course, control attempts are unstable and very dangerous. (Maleeha, 2002).

The external factor has also been important in aggravating conflicts in the region thereby posing serious security challenges the external interference also plays role in aggravating domestic as well as regional conflicts. "The tension which started between Pakistan and India after their nuclear explosions conducted in May 1998 culminated in the Kargil crisis in May 1999. The Kargil standoff between Kashmiri Mujahedeen and Indian army brought Pakistan and India to the brink of war with a threatening nuclear dimension. This conflict is the part of Kashmir issue that has been recognized as the main driving force behind the nuclearization of South Asia. James Woolsey, head of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), termed the Kashmir issue as a flashpoint that had the probable prospects for future use of weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons". (Mahmood, 1999).

The rivalry between India and Pakistan is due to three long-term problems: border issues, especially Kashmir; common problems exacerbated by the growth of BJP; and military rivalry, reinforced by the increased capabilities of missiles and missiles on both sides. "Border skirmishes between the two armies continued over the Siachen glacier and in Kashmir, and insurgent groups in Kashmir continued to find both official and unofficial support in Pakistan, linking them across to its Afghan engagements. India's defence of its claim to Kashmir occupied over half a million of its troops, and its attempts to suppress local rebels blurred into numerous border incidents and cross-border exchanges of fire with Pakistan. Politically, the intense domestic rivalry during the 1990s between Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif fuelled competitive anti-Indian rhetoric over Kashmir, escalating the two states' mutual accusations of interference in each other's domestic affairs. Pakistan also made much political mileage out of the various Hindu-Muslim clashes within India. All of this contributed to a virtual breakdown of diplomatic relations between the two states lasting from 1994 to 1997. Despite India's diplomatic initiative under the more liberal Gujral doctrine the two fought a small border war in the Kargil area of Kashmir during the summer of 1999, and in the spring of 2002 were again in heavy military confrontation as India responded to a series of terrorist attacks which it blamed on Pakistan. Short of all-out war, there was no end in sight to the longstanding pattern of alternating hostility and dialogue between the two states on high politics issues, accompanied by a steadier ability to cooperate on issues such as the sharing of the Indus waters. Since the 1980s the general assumption was that both either possessed, or could very quickly possess, operational nuclear weapons.

Their nuclear tests in May 1998 confirmed these suspicions, with both claiming weapon nuclear capability". (Walker, 1998)

Financial factors are the main cause of unrest in most developing countries. Since the Border States are completely ignored in their overall development, the reason is closer to the border and, in general, to disturbed areas. Perhaps the time has come for neighboring countries, especially Pakistan and India, to focus more on their economic growth and keep cold, controversial political and territorial issues. (Raswan, 2014)

### **Global Factors**

The situation in South Asia described above has a significant impact on the global condition, counting safety in neighboring counties. The opposite is likewise accurate. The pursuit of the greatest power in the sphere, the United States, for an unbalanced approach in South Asia can undermine security and exacerbate regional tensions. For example, some people's proposal to balance India for China can be destabilizing and counterproductive for the region and even for the interests of the United States on a global scale. Instead of adopting an outdated balance of power approach, US interests will be better served through partnership with South Asia as a whole. (Lodhi, 2002)

"Many terrorist groups and organizations, influenced by or affiliated with Al-Qaeda, exist in different parts of the world. They are not only in the Muslim majority countries, but many cells also exist in non-Muslim western countries like the United Kingdom, France, and Spain etc. Many of their members have been studying in the Madrassas in Pakistan and have associations with extremist religious leaders. With the perceived notion of a defensive jihad of Muslim Ummah against the U.S. and allies, some members of these organizations are travelling to Pakistan and joining terrorist organizations with money and weapons". (Karzai, & Jones, 2006)

"South Asia is a part of "Asian Arc of Crisis" and as such, it is highly prone to conflict and insecurity. Since its independence from the British rule in 1947, it has witnessed four major inter-state conflicts between India and Pakistan; a number of armed skirmishes on border and several accessions of force mobilization and deployment between neighbors. At no time have the south Asian countries been free from internal turmoil and disruptions these countries have also experienced direct violence and military pressures from the extra regional great powers like US, USSR and China"

"There are three elements of terrorism that the world is concerned about, Number one, the Al-Qaeda factor. Number two is what (the Indians) are calling cross-border terrorism and we are calling the freedom struggle in Kashmir. Number three is the sectarian (Sunni vs. Shia) extremism and sectarian terrorism

in Pakistan". (Musharraf, 2002)

At the global level, CSR in South Asia was negligible compared to the major theaters of the Cold War, but still infiltrated. According to the RSCT forecast, the conflict regime of CSR will involve external interference in accordance with its own internal departments in the event of competition between world powers. As a result, Pakistan tried very early to deal with the United States, and a little later with China. In the early 1950s, she successfully joined the American containment alliance network. Although relations with the United States were often disrupted due to nuclear proliferation problems, especially since the 1970s, Pakistan regained U.S. support as an ally against the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in the 1980s. These relations between the United States and Pakistan, in particular the supply of US arms to Pakistan and US naval operations in the Bay of Bengal during the war between India and Pakistan have contributed to US security in India. The Indo-Soviet Union began to form an alliance in the early 1960s, initially based on the supply of Soviet weapons and in 1971. The Sino-Japanese War of 1962 strengthened India's desire for the Soviet Union and strengthened Sino-Pakistani relations. Thus, local differences in South Asia have intensified thanks to the globally competitive link between the United States and the Soviet Union, China and the Soviet Union. (Buzan, & Weaver, 2003).

### **Connectivity between Domestic to Regional and Global Security**

Most significantly, a detailed local strategy not ever appeared. "The concrete link between prioritizing the domestic and downgrading the regional is the essentially relative quality of security. Security is about prioritizing issues on the political agenda and, especially where resources are limited, such prioritizing is a zero-sum game. It is possible to legitimize this reorientation towards domestic problems as being for the general (regional) good: Regional security cannot be divorced from domestic security. Basic stability and law and order must be provided within a country that wishes to provide the same in its neighborhood". (Cilliers, 1999) This could create a legitimate and central region if a country at the center of the unipolar section guarantees much better domestic security than regional or international security and has very incomplete capitals. The model of friendship and hostility is usually better understood when the analysis is initiated at the regional level and is applied to worldwide performers on the one hand and national factors on the other. The definite reproductions of fear and love are usually not imported from the system level, but are created within the region as a result of a combination of historical, political and material situations.

Most countries in the international system require regional levels for security analysis. For the world powers, the regional level is essential for modeling both the options and the consequences of designing their influences and rivalries on the rest of the system. The regional level is most important for the countries that compose it, but also for the world powers. Security functions at regional level are sustainable. In essence, they are autonomous, not in the sense that they are

fully autonomous, but they have security dynamics that would exist even if other actors did not violate them. The protagonist is more motivated by the dynamics of global security than by the dynamics of regional security, and during the Cold War, it was mainly the global concerns that his security restrictions imposed on his small neighbors. As the central actor focuses on the world, the security dynamics of the region are extremely disturbed and suppressed. However, since all other actors in the region have linked their concerns, a general map of global security would always show a clear regional formation of close ties, as compared to the lack of connections inside and outside the region for most units. This therefore can still be treated as an RSC. "Rather than expecting the security dynamics of the interregional level to be weak in relation to those of the global and regional levels, we expect them to be strong. This spillover might result from the actions of a single great power, as in the case of China or it might result from the dynamics of a great power RSC as might be imagined if China and Japan became serious rivals or friends in Asia. Either way, such intense spillover may well bind together what would otherwise be separate RSCs into super complexes with one or more great powers at their core. In such cases the security constellation becomes more elaborate than usual. Instead of there being just three main levels domestic, regional, and global to take into account, one may have to add a fourth, superregional, and level to replace the normally weak inter regional one".

It is clear that there are multiple dimensions of conflicts in the south Asian region. Many of these conflicts have serious implications for security in the region. It may also be added here that these are strong between different dimensions of conflicts. Here an attempt has been made to explore various dimensions of conflicts and their security implications in South Asia. The comprehensive approach to security believed that if human beings are secured, society is secured and if society is secured, state is also secured. Since it is human beings which need to be secured, all areas of its activities such as social, political, economic environmental, etc form of components of the comprehensive security approach. (upreti, &Upaydhya, 2012)

## **Conclusion**

The Pakistani-Indian security complex has led to its nuclear development and has brought new, terrifying challenges since the Pakistani nuclear tests in May 1998, particularly for Pakistan. The cashmere dispute is often described as a potential nuclear focus. Any incorrect calculation can lead to the use of nuclear energy by both parties. These risks can only be limited within the framework of cooperative security. Since the unresolved Kashmir problem is at the heart of Pakistan's hostility, the conflict resolution process between the two countries should include a roadmap or strategy for resolving the Kashmir problem.

Although South Asia has been independent for a century, it is now the poorest and most backward region in the world. It is high time that Indian and

Pakistani leaders seized this opportunity for peace with the sincerity and courage that has come to them after so long. Pakistan needs to change direction and policy to meet internal and external challenges. The conflict resolution of various problems between these countries is not only necessary for them, but for the entire region of South Asia. The two governments should take confidence-building measures through cross-border interactions between various social groups such as students, business people, diplomats and academics.

South Asian countries continue to have overwhelming confidence in traditional security rather than in people-centered security. Although the region has achieved sustained economic growth, it has not been able to improve the lives of a significant number of people and remains one of the most deprived regions in the world with major inequalities. South Asia is not really concerned with the lack of resources to promote human well-being, but rather with the inequality and preference of governments to channel the most resources that are considered important to the country. Make effective use of available human resources. As the threat to human security crosses geographic boundaries, governments in the region must work together to improve people's daily lives. However, regional cooperation such as SAARC cannot function effectively without the real political commitment of governments and lead to significant results.

**References**

- Burki, S. J. (2004). *Pakistan: Fifty years of Nationhood*. Lahore: Vanguard Publication.
- Buzan, B., & Weaver, O. (2003). *Regions and Powers, The Structure of International Security*. United States: Press of Cambridge.
- Buzan, Barry, Barry G. Buzan, Ole Waever, Ole W'ver, and Ole Waever Barry Buzan, (2003). *Regions and powers: the structure of international security*. Vol. 91. Cambridge University Press.
- Cilliers, J. (1999): *An Emerging South African Foreign Policy Identity?*, Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, Occasional Paper no. 39.
- Corsi, M. (2004). *International Conflict in Pakistan*. Retrieved from [http://www.jstor.org/stable/25817916?seq=1#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/25817916?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents):
- Dash, K. (2008). *Regionalism in South Asia: Negotiating cooperation, institutional structures*. Vol. 8. Routledge.
- Faruqui, Ahmad (2003). *Rethinking the National Security of Pakistan: The Price of Strategic Myopia*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing.
- Geneva Academy. (2015). *India: International Peace Treaties and Agreements*. RULAC.
- Goaraya, Naheed. (2013). *South Asia in Perspective*. Lahore: University of the Punjab.
- Hyder, T. O. (2009, March 16). <http://www.jstor.org>. Retrieved from [http://www.jstor.org/stable/41261361?seq=1#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41261361?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents):
- Javaid, U. (2013). *South Asia in Perspective*. Lahore: CSAS, University of the Punjab,.
- Karzai, H., & Jones, S. G. (2006, July 18). *How to Curb Rising Suicide Terrorism in Afghanistan*. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/0718/p09s01-coop.html>: <http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/0718/p09s01-coop.html>
- Krepon, M., & Stolar, A. (2007). *Outlook for Regional Security in South Asia*. Pakistan Institute of International Affairs , 73-82.
- Lodhi, M. (2002). Security Challenges in South Asia. *The Nonproliferation Review*, 8(2), 118-124
- Mahmood, T. (1999). Kargil Crisis and Deteriorating Security Situation in South Asia. *Pakistan Horizon* , 52 (4), 31-47.

- Mazhar, M. S., & Goraya, N. (2014). *Post-2014 Afghanistan: Reflections & Off-Shoots*. Lahore: University of the Punjab, Lahore.
- Musharraf, G. (2002, March 28). *General Musharraf's Interview*. (W. Post, Interviewer) Punjab, Lahore.
- Raswan, S (2014). *Cross Border Terrorism: with reference to International regime*, Vij Books, New Delhi, India.
- Stone, Marianne. (2009). *Security according to Buzan: A comprehensive security analysis*. Security discussion papers series, 11 (1).
- Upreti, B.C. & Upaydhyay, Shashi. (2012). *Emerging Challenges of Security in South Asia*. New Delhi: Kalinga Publications.
- Walker, William (1998): International Nuclear Relations After the Indian and Pakistani Test Explosions, *International Affairs* 74 (3): 505-28