

POLITICAL REFLECTION



MAGAZINE

January • February • March • 2021

ISSN: 2042-888X

Vol. VII No. 1 • Issue 26

**An Overview of Turkish Foreign
Policy as 2020 Ends**
by Dr Emrah Atar

**US Sanctions on Turkey's Defense
Industry Might Backfire,
Here is Why!**
by Dr Ali Bakir

**Interview with
Professor Scott Lucas**
by Dr Ali Onur Özçelik

**The Supremacy of EU Law over
German Law:
EU Law vs National Law**
by Dr Sharifullah Dorani

**The Fall of the Berlin Wall, the
Collapse of the USSR and the End
of Cold War**
**A Chain of Surprises 'Too Big' to
Be Predicted**
by Dr Marco Marsili

**Civil Society:
An Alternative Model**
by Dr Prasanta Kumar Sahu

**Public Diplomacy in Post
Pandemic World Challenges and
Perspectives**
by Rohith Sai Stambamkadi

**Setback for India:
The China-Pak Economic Corridor**
by Daniyal Talat

**China and
Turkey:
Escaping
the Trap of
the “Uyghur
Issue”**
*by Hrvoje
Čiković*

International Think-tank www.cesran.org
Consultancy
Research Institute

CESRAN International is headquartered in the UK
CESRAN International is a member of the United Nations Academic Impact (UNAI)

CESRAN International is a think-tank specialising on international relations in general, and global peace, conflict and development related issues and challenges.

The main business objective/function is that we provide expertise at an international level to a wide range of policy making actors such as national governments and international organisations. CESRAN with its provisions of academic and semi-academic publications, journals and a fully-functioning website has already become a focal point of expertise on strategic research and analysis with regards to global security and peace. The Centre is particularly unique in being able to bring together wide variety of expertise from different countries and academic disciplines.

The main activities that CESRAN undertakes are providing consultancy services and advice to public and private enterprises, organising international conferences and publishing academic material.

Some of CESRAN's current publications are:

- The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development (biannual, peer reviewed)
www.therestjournal.com
- Journal of Conflict Transformation and Security (biannual, peer reviewed)
- Political Reflection Magazine (quarterly) www.politicalreflectionmagazine.com
- CESRAN Paper Series
- CESRAN Policy Brief
- Turkey Focus Policy Brief

CESRAN International also organises an annual international conference since 2014, called **International Conference on Eurasian Politics and Society (IEPAS)**
www.eurasianpoliticsandsociety.org

- **Ranked among the top 150 International think tanks**



Political Reflection Magazine

Established in 2010

Chairman: *Dr Ozgur Tufekci*

Executive Editor: *Dr Rahman Dag*

South Asian Studies | Editor: *Dr Sharifullah Durrani*

American Foreign Policy | Editor: *Dr Mark Meirowitz*

Applied Economics | Editor: *Dr Hakan Uslu*

Middle Eastern Studies | Editor: *Dr Rahman Dag*

Interview Editor: *Ebru Birinci*

Interview Editor: *Emrah Atar*

Assistant Editor: *Ceren Hakyemez*

Assistant Editor: *Ruhullah Afshar*

Submissions:

To submit articles or opinion, please email:

Rahman.dag@cesran.org

or

editors@cesran.org

Note:

The ideal **PR** article length is from **1000** to **2000** words.

©2021

By

the Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis.

All rights reserved. Political Reflection and its logo are trademarks of the Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis, which bears no responsibility for the editorial content; the views expressed in the articles are those of the authors. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

VOL. 7 - NO. 1

JANUARY
FEBRUARY
MARCH
2021

POLITICAL REFLECTION

e-ISSN: 2042-888X

“ADVANCING DIVERSITY”

Contents

- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| | 05 - 12 | World News
<i>by Ebru Birinci</i> |
| An Overview of Turkish Foreign Policy as 2020 Ends
<i>by Dr Emrah Atar</i> | 14 - 17 | |
| | 19 - 21 | China and Turkey: Escaping the Trap of the “Uyghur Issue”
<i>by Hrvoje Ćiković</i> |
| US Sanctions on Turkey's Defense Industry Might Backfire, Here is Why!
<i>by Dr Ali Bakir</i> | 23 - 26 | |
| | 28 - 43 | Interview with Professor Scott Lucas
<i>by Dr Ali Onur Özçelik</i> |
| The Supremacy of EU Law over German Law: EU Law vs National Law
<i>by Dr Sharifullah Dorani</i> | 44 - 55 | |
| | 57 - 64 | The Fall of the Berlin Wall, the Collapse of the USSR and the End of Cold War
A Chain of Surprises 'Too Big' to Be Predicted
<i>by Dr Marco Marsili</i> |
| Civil Society: An Alternative Model
<i>by Dr Prasanta Kumar Sahu</i> | 66 - 68 | |
| | 71 - 75 | Public Diplomacy in Post Pandemic World
Challenges and Perspectives
<i>by Rohith Sai Stambamkadi</i> |
| Setback for India: The China-Pak Economic Corridor
<i>by Daniyal Talat</i> | 77 - 79 | |

Setback for India: The China-Pak Economic Corridor

Daniyal Talat*

Daniyal.talat2013@gmail.com

India is a major regional player in South Asia and playing a double role as a close United States ally to counter Chinese influence in the region. China and India have great monetary relations as the exchange between the two nations is assessed at \$70 billion. The approach of Indian think tank towards the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor is not monolithic. Talking during Raisina Dialogue 2020 in January, Indian Naval Chief Admiral Karambir Singh asserted that the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor encroaches on India's sovereignty. This was a redundancy of India's remain against CPEC, which is the flagship project of Chinese President Xi Jinping's goal-oriented Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). The Indian government additionally opposes CPEC because it considers Sino-Pakistani collaboration a threat. Be that as it may, the Indian opposition to CPEC on these two focuses do not hold ground.

There are two significant reasons that drive the Indian resistance to the US\$50 billion CPEC project. The main explanation is that the economic corridor goes through the Gilgit-Baltistan district in Pakistan, which was influenced by the province of Kashmir at the hour of Partition. Since Kashmir is a universally perceived contest among India and Pakistan, India makes a case for Gilgit-Baltistan. In view of this rationale, India contends that an economic corridor among Pakistan and China is going through an Indian-claimed territory and subsequently disregards India's sovereignty.

The case of Gilgit-Baltistan

* The author has Master degree in Defense & Strategic Studies from Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad. Currently, he works with the School of Inclusion as a Program Coordinator.

In July 2018, S Jaishankar, then foreign secretary of India, told Chinese officials in Beijing that "CPEC violates Indian sovereignty because it runs through Pakistan-occupied Kashmir." India fears that when the CPEC corridor successfully begins working through Gilgit-Baltistan, at that point, it will internationalize the Kashmir debate. New Delhi has verifiably restricted this chance, demanding that the question is a respective issue among India and Pakistan. This position depends on the contention that the whole Kashmir area, including Gilgit-Baltistan, is Indian territory. Subsequently, the way that the CPEC corridor goes through Gilgit-Baltistan naturally disregards the regional sway of India

Historically, after Partition, Kashmir state sent its senator to Gilgit to take control of the region, yet the Gilgit Scouts, a paramilitary power, did not acknowledge the authority of the Kashmiri Maharaja. Only a few days after

Kashmir's by forced accession to India, the Gilgit Scouts rebelled against the senator and solicited Pakistan to take control of the region.

So, in historical terms, the nature of the dispute over Gilgit-Baltistan is totally not the same as that with respect to the Jammu and Kashmir regions. Subsequently, India can't claim Gilgit-Baltistan as they claim Pakistani-administered Kashmir. India's case on Gilgit-Baltistan can be defended if Kashmir's accession to India is confirmed as legitimate by the United Nations.

In addition, regardless of the historical context regarding Gilgit-Baltistan, this region has been firmly controlled and managed by Pakistan throughout the previous 73 years. Pakistan has made it a semi-autonomous governmentally controlled area, which for all practical purposes/reasons is part of Pakistan. Truth be told, the previously existing Karakoram Highway, which interfaces Pakistan with China, goes through the similar region. Pakistan has refrained from including Pakistan-administered Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan as legitimate pieces of Pakistan to maintain UN resolutions on the dispute. Besides, last August, India altered the geographic game plan in Indian occupied Kashmir despite it being a contested region. By this rationale, how might it question any progression taken by Pakistan-administered Kashmir? Consequently, there is no just cause for the Indian case that CPEC disregards its "sway" in Gilgit-Baltistan.

CPEC as Counterbalance?

The second reason for India's opposition to CPEC is the fear that it is being used by China to counterbalance the economic growth of India. Pakistan's economy was battling in mid-2015 when Beijing consented to the CPEC arrangement with Islamabad. CPEC has so far helped the Pakistani economy by increasing energy production and paving the path for the additional outside venture. Therefore, it bodes well that India may see CPEC as an attempt by China to prop up Pakistan against India. This hypothesis is additionally bolstered by the way that India is responsive to the Bangladesh-China-India-Myanmar Economic Corridor under BRI yet opposes CPEC. Accordingly, India's opposition to CPEC can be seen in a Pakistan-centric angle and not an overall resistance to the more extensive Belt and Road Initiative. Neither Pakistan nor China has indicated any express aims to counter India using CPEC. Besides, Pakistan likewise has a sovereign option to settle on bargains and enter concurrences with different nations for its monetary advantages regardless of whether they are contradicted by India. Be that as it may, CPEC in no way, shape or form speaks to any demonstration of antagonism toward India.

Moreover, the Gwadar Port in southwestern Pakistan is the backbone of CPEC. Pakistan intends to make Gwadar a territorial business hub with the assistance of China. To counter the achievement of Gwadar Port, India put resources into Chabahar Port in Iran this is only 175 kilometres from Gwadar. India put \$100 million in Chabahar, and as per Chinese media, the main clear explanation was to counter the accomplishment of Gwadar Port.

The planning of the Indian arrangement with Iran further backs the case made by Chinese media. India began putting resources into Chabahar in 2016, only a year after the CPEC understandings were agreed upon. It would be too big a coincidence if India began putting resources into a port only 175 kilometres from Gwadar if it had no intention to counter CPEC.

Chabahar could have been an opposite contender of Gwadar; however, then the appointment of Donald Trump as President of the United States changed the circumstances. The Trump organization reimposed sanctions on Iran, and it turned out to be progressively hard for India to continue putting resources into Chabahar. Therefore, Gwadar Port's importance increased, and it even began serving Afghan transit trade, which would have been a customer of Chabahar Port if the US government had not forced sanctions.

The Chabahar scene uncovers that it was India that caused a key move to counter CPEC, yet it did not work. Similarly, as India has the option to settle on autonomous venture choices like that, including Chabahar, Pakistan can do likewise with CPEC. Be that as it may, the Chabahar speculation is where India made an endeavour regarded antagonistic by Pakistan and China against CPEC, yet so far it has not worked out.

PR