A5 Journal of Defense Industry
www.a5dergi.com
Volume: 1 Issue: 1 Year: 2026
ISSN: 3108-8201

Comparative Assessment of Defence Industrial Capabilities Of Pakistan and India: Indigenous Production, Technological Innovation, and Strategic Autonomy in South Asia

Syed Rizwan Haider Bukhari[1]

1. Islamia College University Peshawar Pakistan

Research Article

10.71350/a5journal.2

Received: 27.12.2025
Accepted: 07.02.2026
Published: 05.03.2026

Abstract

This paper plays a comparative analysis of the defense industrial capabilities of Pakistan and India, in terms of how each country seeks to go in the direction of indigenous production, technological advancement and strategic independence in the changing security environment in the South Asian region. The study examines the evolution of the military spheres and history of the two nations, the institutional nature of the development, and the political and economic factors impacting decision-making. Through the analysis of the most prominent sectors- aerospace, armored systems, naval platforms and emerging technologies the study notes disparities in industrial maturity, culture of research and state industry co-operation. It also evaluates the contribution of global alliances, transfer of technology, and export aspirations to the long-term strategic objectives of individual countries. In the end, this comparative evaluation will help to better understand what the strong and weak aspects of the development of Pakistan and India toward increased self-reliance in the creation of military forces are, as well as what the future directions of this process is, and how these decisions impact on the stability and power balance in South Asia.

Keywords: *India, Pakistan, China, USA, Russia, South Asia*

Introduction:

Pakistan and India defense industries have grown under the strains of historical competition, changing security needs and the larger goal of seeking strategic independence in a complicated regional context. Being the two nuclear-armed nations located in one of the most sensitive geopolitical regions in the world, both nations know that strategic choices of the country are constrained by dependence on foreign suppliers over the long run. This realization has continued to motivate them to enhance the indigenous defense production, invest in research and development, and develop technological capacity that minimizes external weaknesses (uz Zaman, 2025).

Pakistan and India have taken different developmental paths in their defense industrial base although their motivation was the same. With the larger economy and broad institutional networks, India has had an ambitious agenda of diversifying its production, deepening its technological base, and combining the domestic industry with international supply chains. Relative to relatively modest economic resources and more pressing security issues, Pakistan has adopted an active and adaptive strategy that has focused on selective modernization, joint partnerships and incremental innovation in key areas of the military.

Such divergent paths are not only important to the national defense planning they also play a role in the overall strategic balance in South Asia. The industrial capability of the defense determines the capability of a state to continue with military activities, negotiate international relations, and to stand independently during periods of crisis. Therefore, the development of the defense sectors in Pakistan and India provides valuable data on their strategic orientations in the long term and the regional consequences of their desire to become self-reliant (Bukhari, 2024).

This paper compares the capabilities of the defense industry in Pakistan and India with special consideration to domestic production, technology development, and pursuit of strategic independence. By the exploration of institutional structures, output results, technological development, and constancy of limitations, the study will help in illuminating each nation on the relative strengths and weaknesses of their respective defense industrial ecosystems. In this way, it can be used to promote a better comprehension of the changing military-industrial situation in South Asia and its importance to the stability of the region and strategic rivalry (Bhutia, 2024)..

Literature Review:

Scholars and policy analysts consider defence industrial capability as an aspect that is multi-dimensional and it depends on the history, institutions, market size, state policy and international relations. Early accounts form the background of the historical origins: Organised production of defence in Pakistan occurred through Pakistani Ordnance Factories (POF) in the 1950s and through state enterprises through which India developed a defence base with Heavy Industries Taxila Pakistan Aeronautical Complex (PAC) as it increased in size, and through which India has employed a broader state-led industrial sector encompassing DRDO, HAL and ordnance factories, until more recent liberalising reforms. According to these historical accounts, the current response to the pressing security plans and the historical vulnerabilities in the supply were the decisions on the industrial structure in both countries (Naseer et al., 2023).

There is an existing trend of the literature that compares the self-reliance strategy of the two countries. The attempts of the Indian government to introduce reforms since the 2010s through the Make in India program and changes in the procurement policy are largely seen as attempts to accelerate the scale of Indian production, a greater role of private sector and foreign joint ventures; according to official statistics as well as alternative and recent studies the value of defence production is rapidly increasing and the contracting practice is unprecedented in the early 2020s. Such policy instruments - forms of procurement, production-quantity-based incentives, production-quantity-based offsets - and their effectiveness in stimulating the capacity and technology adoption of the Indian industrial base are discussed in this literature - are said to be generating a rapid advance in the value of Indian defence production and volumes of contract activity in record time - and this literature claims bigger and broader benefits than before would be being brought about by the Indian industrial base by the existing policy tools.

By contrast, the off-the-record information of Pakistan plies a more focused, limited strategy: limited resources have been dedicated to using official mediums (e.g., tank, small weapons, some of aerospace patches and repacks) and has become beholden to incredibly short-term export connections, in particular to China, to deliver systems of complexities and technology. As the analysts explain, though Pakistan is striving to modernize the capabilities in a small way, the combination of the state production, the licensed production and selective imports has kept the nation in a state of preparedness of operations. Several institutional studies document the efforts of the defence corporations of Pakistan to locate export opportunities and diversify his business to sustain R&D (Hussain, 2025).

Technology and innovation are given more attention. The current thinking in the scholarship and policy commentaries in the case of India is that the mixture of a large home market, the emergent personal R&D, and the global collaboration (with the United States and Europe) is shifting India off to the licensed production to the local design in the areas such as missiles, naval systems, and the subsystems of combat aircraft. The literature, however, also presents potential institutional barriers against endangering dominance: fractured supply chains, slow commercialization of defence research and development, and inadequate subsystem and microelectronics capability, which restricts full technological autonomy(Choudhury, 2018).

Scholars are interested to adaptive innovation- licensed production, reverse engineered and selective co-development in the defence industrial organizations to counter resource constraints to Pakistan. Subsystems integration, sales of small arms, additions of older platforms have made, albeit with some gains, recent articles report some bottlenecks, with limited access to the high-end micro-electronics, limited participation of the private sector, and reliance on a small number of foreign suppliers of state-of-the-art subsystems. Comparative work mentions that the innovation trajectory or Pakistan is not established as a result of the market depth but rather on the basis of decision of security needs and alliance(Shan et al., 2025).

Strategic autonomy is a conceptual frame that is replicated in the literature. Analysts do not view autonomy as either or both, but as a set of capabilities- depth of production, variety of supplier and the political space within which it can operate without being coerced by outside pressures. More contemporary comparative analysis has suggested that India is attempting to gain greater geopolitical autonomy by using economic coercion and diversified alliances, whereas the calculations of autonomy that Pakistan is making are very insecure as to depend upon the immediate security competition between India and as being excessively dependent on a fewer number of strategic partners (and one in particular). These differences guide the acquisition decisions, export strategies and the degree to which each state is ready to provide foreign dependence on essential capabilities(Kiran, 2024).

Most of the debate has been empirically supported by a series of policy-oriented research and databases, SIPRI, RAND, IISS and national ministry publications, which have asked trade and procurement statistics, contract announcements and production statistics. These sources will enable drawing comparisons across countries but, at the same time, they will point to the limitations of the methods: not all production is licensed, it is not observed in subcontractors, and not all innovation after a firm. Scholars are constantly requiring case research at the company level, map supply, and longitudinal data to compute technological scale and real independence(Delgado et al., 2025).

Finally, a dataset that is beginning to be measured in the recent literature is the impact of the existing technologies, including drones, AI, electronic warfare, and cyber tools on the balance in defence industry. The first signs of change are as follows: firstly, such technologies offer new companies and new startups (especially in software and systems integration) an easier gateway; secondly, they reveal their vulnerabilities (microelectronics, secure supply chains) that the two countries will need to strengthen in order to escape this form of dependency. It is an emerging literature area and scholars observe that there ought to be comparative empirical studies of how India and Pakistan are integrating such technologies into their doctrine and procurement and industrial policy.

Theoretical/ Conceptual Framework:

- **Industrial Complex Security Perspective.** An effective theoretical framework on the defence industrial evolution in Pakistan and India can be formulated through the incorporation of the concepts of multiple complementary frameworks. Security-industrial complex point of view is used to clarify how the threat perceptions with national character, the power struggles of the region, and the geopolitical pressures influence the decisions states take in defence manufacturing. In South Asia, where the India-Pakistan conflict is historical and enduring, this method explains why the two nations still value self-reliance in military capabilities, have sizeable state-owned defence industries, and ever-growing home procurement units despite their seasonally crippling economies. Their different approaches to industrialization, purchasing policies, and financial spending, on the other hand, are reflecting not only the necessities of operations but also the game of strategy, which forces every state not to lose behind its competitor.
- **Strategic Autonomy Framework.** The strategic autonomy framework is a narrower analytical perspective within this general security environment. It conceptualises operational, technological and political dimensions of autonomy as a spectrum as opposed to defining autonomy as a fixed or absolute condition. This assists in determining the extent to which indigenous industrial capacity is converted into a practical strategic flexibility. Diversification of Indian defence suppliers and the strengthening of a domestic industrial base demonstrates the efforts at making the country less vulnerable to external pressure, whereas the dependence of Pakistan on a smaller group of partners exemplifies yet another way toward gaining independence and achieving an autonomy by building specific alliances and electrical advances. In this way, the framework enables subtle comparison of the effects of industrial capabilities on the freedom of action of each state in deciding on defence.
- **National Innovation Systems (NIS) Approach.** The National Innovation Systems (NIS) strategy can be very necessary in order to know why each nation has developed at different paces. This school of thought considers defence capacity as the aggregate output of a countries wider system of innovation (or as a whole) based on R&D investment, university-industry partnership, business sector participation and the quality of the technology-transfer infrastructure. Since, Pakistan and India are very different in these respects, NIS assists to comprehend the difference between their industrial course. The fact that India is increasingly successful in aerospace, naval platforms and even missile systems is an indication that the relatively strong but still developing ecosystem of innovations is expanding. Pakistan, on the other hand, has developed by being more focalized in terms of innovation that is mainly backed by strategic alliances, joint ventures, and/or collaborative development deals, especially with China and Turkey.
- **Creative Manipulation of Dependency Theory.** Though neither of the two states can be well explained by classical dependency models, there are aspects of Dependency Theory that can be chosen to make good explanatory power. In both nations, there are still structural constraints that are imposed by foreign dependence- be it in the form of technology-transfer bottlenecks, licensing dependence, or susceptibility to export controls and sanctions. The reliance of Pakistan on few suppliers poses certain barriers to its industrial development and strategic freedom, as the historical reliance of India on Russian systems still affects its procurement and modernization selection. Outlining these limitations, dependency-oriented analysis elucidates the influence of the external actors on internal industrial development.
- **Balance of Power Context.** Collectively, these views are placed in the larger balance of power, and this is the main focus of defence industrial progress in south Asia. The eternal strategic competition that exists between India and Pakistan forces both these states to invest in domestic military production not just as an economic venture or an industrial venture but as a strategic need. Industrialization of defence, thus, is an instrument of balancing, intimidating rivals and avoiding tactical impunity. The combination of these theoretical frameworks presents the complex interaction of security imperatives, industrial policies, innovation system, and external dependencies which inform the defence industries of both states and their strategic autonomy.

Methodology

The paper assumes a qualitative, comparative research approach to analyse the defence industrial capacity of Pakistan and India, with particular attention paid to indigenous production, technological advancement and strategic independence. Considering that defence-related information can be sensitive and confidential in many cases, the qualitative and document-based method enables achieving a deeper context-rich insight into the structures, policies, and outcomes, which shape the defence industries of both states.

- **Research Design: Comparative Case Study Approach.** The case research design used in this study is qualitative comparative case study research as it involves analyzing defence industrial capability of both Pakistan and India. A comparative analysis is especially suitable due to similarities in the overall geopolitical and threat environment that both states play in, but the level of contrast between the states is extreme in terms of industrial capacities, institutional structures, technological ecosystems and resources. Through a review of these differences and similarities, the research aims to identify the structural, political, and strategic pillars behind the evolution of defence industry within each nation of a country. Instead of assessing the promotion of defence production and innovation by only using the numerical indicators, this design enables one to take a deeper look into the role played by strategic motivation, chosen policy, and institutional forces in forming defence production and innovation. By doing this the research delves into this situational complexity that would have eluded those simple quantitative comparisons.
- **Data Collection Methods.** The analysis of documents is the main form of data collection that is deployed in the study. This covers a wide range of publicly available and authoritative documents which include government publications, defence policy frameworks, ministerial reports, official acquisition procedures of Ministries of Defence of Pakistan and India. Besides, the work utilizes the resources of foreign research organizations, such as SIPRI, IISS, RAND, and U.S. Congressional Research Service, as well as scholarly sources on defence economics, security studies, and innovation systems all of which underwent peer-reviewing. The data is also supplemented by reports in the defence industry, production statistics, and confirmed news archives, which provide more current data about the direction of procurement, modernization work, and technological progress. Embracing various categories of independent sources, the study is valid triangulated and prevents sharp biases characteristic of state-centric or politically distorted explanations.
- **Secondary Data Integration.** As long as there is quantitative data available in the public domain, secondary data are incorporated into the qualitative discourse to consolidate the background knowledge. These will contain information about the arms transfers, importation and exportation trends and the volume of production, research and development expenditure and the technology purchases or licensing deals. This information is not assessed as a separate matter but rather evaluated in the context of the wide-ranging political, institutional and geopolitical arrangements that inform the defence industrial strategy of individual countries. This methodology preserves the primacy of the qualitative analysis and still enjoys the benefits related to the abundance of the numerical indicators.
- **Data Analysis Strategy**. The analysis strategy used in the study is the thematic analysis. Through examination of collected documents, recurrent ideas, trends, and thematic groups are determined in regard to the indigenous production capacity, technological proficiency, national innovation systems, international collaboration, dependence relations, and institutional organization. Such an interpretive procedure enables deriving analytically based insights into how each of the countries defence industry operates and develops. Once the first thematic analysis is carried out on each of the cases this is followed by an organized cross-case comparison which brings out the areas where there is a convergence and divergence between Pakistan and India. Such a comparative prism explains why the decision made in each country has its long-term effects on strategic independence and explains how each state pursues its defence and security goals in different ways.

- **Validity and Reliability**. As a measure of ensuring that the research is academically rigorous, the study uses a number of instruments to make the findings credible and reliable. The source material is also based on various independent and authoritative sources, which makes the verification of the key information only at minimum possible. Quality articles in peer-reviewed journals, governmental material and internationally known databases are given preference over unverified commentary or speculative reporting, as it is typical in defence journalism. Whenever claims on production or procurement are received, they are verified by international recognized sources like SIPRI wherever practicable. The research is also open in terms of restrictions in the availability of data, particularly in cases where such data might be not complete, classified, or politicized. The proposed approach is an objective and equitable approach to the evidence at hand.
- **Limitations of the Study.** The paper recognizes some of the inherent limitations linked to research in defence industry. Only limited access to sensitive or classified information is allowed, especially on matters relating to superior technology, launching projects and also internal decision making. Information published by state agencies can be biased, partial or encased in political accounts. Moreover, defence innovation procedures, in particular involving the R&D pipelines, are not always publicly visible, and thus cannot be evaluated fully. Nevertheless, the methodology of triangulation and document-based approach allows conducting a sufficiently strong and meaningful analysis of the defence industrial development in both countries.
- **Ethical Considerations.** Every piece of information employed in this work comes out of publicly accessible and legal materials. At no point in the study is any classified, unauthorized or sensitive content used. The analysis is analytically neutral and is neutral on whether or not any military posture or policy should be introduced. The principle of ethical integrity is followed by revealing accurate data, no misinterpretation, and disadvantaging national security scopes. The final objective is intellectual investigation, rather than political evaluation.

Results / Findings

- **Indigenous Capacity Production in Diversity and Scale also Varies Considerably.** The results show a significant difference in the magnitude, variety and maturity of native defence manufacturing between Pakistan and India. India has a far greater and more diversified industrial furniture, which is able to produce a wide variety of systems, such as small arms, artillery, armoured vehicles, naval destroyers, submarines, combat aircraft, missiles and an increasing portion of space-sort of military technologies. The changes that have occurred in the last 10 years, especially the ones that have promoted the participation of the private sector, have seen the growth of India in terms of manufacturing presence within its borders and the industrialization level. Conversely, the local production capabilities in Pakistan, competently developed in a number of its core areas, is narrower and more focused. Large state enterprises like Heavy Industries Taxila (HIT), Pakistan Ordnance Factories (POF), and Pakistan Aeronautical Complex (PAC) have also continued to advance their efforts in skilled in armored equipment, small arms, UAV pilots, aircraft co-production particularly via such programs as the JF-17. Nevertheless, Pakistan does not have a multi-level industrial network on sophisticated, advanced platforms like advanced fighter planes, submarines and long endurance maritime systems. On balance, the ecosystem of India has high levels of breadth, institutional diversity, but its Pakistani counterpart has more platform-based, narrow capacities backed by robust global affiliations.
- **Divergent Patterns of Technological Innovation Trajectories.** The paper concludes that India and Pakistan are two countries that are on significantly different paths in terms of technological innovation. India has achieved significant progress in native research and development, specifically in the development of missiles, electronic warfare, space-based military facilities, naval weaponry and advanced defence electronics. The rise of private defence startups, venture capital and investment in the business, as well as partnership with international defence businesses have led to the formation of a more vibrant and competitive innovation landscape. The innovation situation in Pakistan, which, more evidently, is influenced by the lack of resources and financial restrictions, has rather lean towards the model of technological adaptation, incremental improvements, and

specific technology transfer. It has made significant gains particularly in unmanned aerial systems, integration of avionics, guided munitions and joint aircraft development programs. Still, Pakistan still depends on foreign suppliers of such high-end components as high-tech sensors, propulsion, and subsystems. As India moves slowly away to licensed production, and India to indigenous design, the model of innovations in Pakistan is still pragmatic, partnership based, and oriented to low costs and necessity.

- **Foreign Partnerships have a Different Impact on Autonomy.** The other significant point is that both states are dependent on foreign relations that form a major basis of cooperating with foreign states, but the relation has varied effects on strategic independence. Defence modernization in Pakistan goes hand in hand with long-term alliance with China which has helped the nation to maintain and update its military equipment at the same time posing a sector of dependency especially on engines, electronics and sophisticated sensors. The partnerships in India are more diversified and include Russia, the United States, France, Israel and more significantly Japan and states in Europe. This diversification counterbalances the dependence on one supplier but also puts India in a maze of the geopolitical demands and the rivalry of their strategic interests. The general results indicate that the autonomy of Pakistan is developed on a basis of concentrated dependence on a single significant partner whereas the autonomy of India is influenced on a ground of multiplicity of international commitments.
- **Individual Sector Involvement as One of the Key Distinguishing Features.** It is also indicated that the force of involvement of the private sector as a differentiating force in the defence business in the two countries. The reforms in India have been actively involved in the involvement of the private companies in the manufacturing of defence, shipbuilding, aerospace, and defence electronics. It has raised the level of competitiveness, attracted foreign investment and boosted technological growth. The emergence of large-scale privacy and the presence of the traditional state-owned firms has led to the more pluralistic and innovation-friendly environment. In Pakistan, defence production is, however, still largely controlled by the state, with relatively few contributions of the private sector. The sector is not yet a large one to substantially change the industrial situation in the country although some of the smaller companies are starting to emerge, especially in the drones, electronics and niche subsystems. This imbalance reveals the fact that institutional structures and market size are fundamental to the technological path example of different countries.
- **Export Capabilities Remanence of Home Industrial Strength.** Another observation is related to export performance as a measure of industrial maturity. There has been impressive expansion in the defence exports of India especially in the areas of naval platforms, missiles, radars, and aerospace components. This vice-versa expansion indicates an increase of confidence in Indian defence products on the part of international audiences and enhances the geopolitical position of India. Another constant export market is also held by Pakistan namely in small arms, ammunition and some chosen aircraft components. Its exports, to African and Middle Eastern and some Asian states are also reliable yet limited due to the reduced scope of domestically manufactured systems. The findings indicate that the success of the defence export is highly associated with the intensity and richness of the domestic technological capability and that the broadening portfolio of India gives it a better export outlook.
- **Strategic Autonomy in Both States is Still Disproportionate.** The general observation is that both Pakistan and India have not yet reached the ultimate strategic independence, even though both have been moving in different directions. India has achieved significant strides towards technological and industrial independence by increased production in the country, local research and development, and diversified collaborations. Nevertheless, it still relies on imported engines, electronics, propulsion technologies and premium materials, which restrain complete autonomy. Pakistan, on their part, exhibits functionality independence in a few key areas and enjoys the presence of reliable supply chain due to the strategic partnerships, particularly, with China. However its limited technological foundation and the weak innovation infrastructure impairs its long-term planning and technological autonomy. Therefore, India displays a greater structural freedom, whereas

Pakistan is more functional in its autonomy because it is based on particular platforms and supported by particular alliances.

- **Overall Synthesis.** Overall, the results demonstrate that Pakistan and India have similar aims, such as increased self reliance, innovation capacity, and strategic independence, but aim at their targets by different ways dictated by economic capacity, institutional frameworks, innovation relationships and international relationships. India is building a large, diversified and R+D intensive defence industrial complex whereas Pakistan has a narrow-focused, partnership-based, and operationally proficient system. These distinctions are not just a difference in strategies about industrial policy but also national strategies of control of strategic independence within competing regional frameworks.

Discussion

The development of effective defence-industrial potentials long had been the goal of both Pakistan and India, both aspiring to become independent in a precarious region. Their paths though are of very divergent decisions - determined not alone by the domestic institutions, resources, doctrine, but also by the effect of an external power, which influences, empowers, or limits their ways. This paper follows these lines, and draws parallels, putting them into a broader regional and global context.

- **The Homeland Industrial Landscape: Separate Ways, Common Interests.** The defence sector in India has developed into one of the largest defence systems in the developing world. Its industrial infrastructure has been developed (on land, in air, sea, electronics, and munitions) by a mix of legacies of state enterprises, a sector that is progressively becoming privatized, and a conscious change of policy (towards self-reliance or atmanirbharta). Recent statistics given by the Indian government showed that defence production and exports were at historic high levels. Nevertheless, some of the elements, especially high-technology subsystems like sophisticated engines, microelectronics, and some special materials, are still dependent on foreign suppliers. This type of hybrid model domestic capability with selective imports is a strength formed by the large economy of India, wide variety of industries and growing cooperation between the private and the public sphere (Singh, 1993). The model of Pakistan, on the other hand, has been more confined and narrow. The small variety of systems focused on by state-owned companies include ordnance factories, aeronautical complexes and heavy-industries plants: small arms, armored vehicles, licensed manufacture and modernization, and co-produced platforms (such as aircraft developed or modernized in partnership with foreign industries). Smaller economy, limited resources, and security imperatives have forced Pakistan to focus on cost-effectiveness optimization instead of the broad-based independence. Its defence industry, which is narrower in focus, aims at delivering what is operationally critical to the available capabilities. So, in spite of the fact that the concept of self reliance is pursued by the two nations, that of India is more of breadth and magnitude; that of Pakistan is more of pragmatism and selectivity(Galbraith and Schendel, 1983).
- **Technology Innovation and Research: Momentum and Bottlenecks.** In India, the increase in R&D efforts, both within the publicly funded defence research institute, and within the emerging private-technology sectors, implies that the trend will be a move away to licensed manufacturing, to the native design and systems integration, especially in missiles, avionics, electronics, and possibly cyber and unmanned systems. The spread of dual-use technologies (civilian ↔ military) is a good opportunity to innovate and gain new capabilities quickly, as long as institutional structures are modified accordingly. However, there are still long-standing issues: supply chain disconnects in premium microelectronics, overdependence on external suppliers of critical components and bureaucracy. This restricts total technological independence. The existence of numerous Defence Public Sector Undertakings (DPSUs) and a network of old structures occasionally impairs responsiveness and innovation - despite the fact that the participation of private companies in the production of strategic platforms is low. It is being observed that even with the presence of a large industrial base, even the transition toward the design and production of the products that takes place within the private sector is uneven (Bianchi, 2008). Innovation in the case of Pakistan has been more of an adaptive approach:

licensed production, modernizations of old systems, reverse engineering, and co-development with external collaborators selectively. The model is a bit flexible and cheap. However, it is also the case that in the context of state-of-the-art technology, microelectronics, high speed aerodynamics, modern sensors, Pakistan is still a heavy reliant on external suppliers. Consequently, its technological advantages, significant in some areas, have failed to transform into a wide-based native high-tech foundation.

- **Strategic Independence and the External Powers.** The impact of external forces- regional and global must be taken into account to get an idea of the results of defence industry in Pakistan and India. The strategic fit, as well as the procurement, is formed by the alliances, supplier-buyer relationships, and strategic alignment, which identify the long-term autonomy, as well as the geopolitical leverage. This research paper seeks to address the question of how the growing aggressiveness of China in South China Sea (SCS) has affected the defense policy of Japan and the security situation in the Indo Pacific region in general. With the increasing territorial claims of China and the development of its military forces by constructing artificial islands, Japan has also modified its defense policies, improved its military and changed the way it considers regional security. This study aims to describe how Japan has reacted to these changes and the impact it has on security cooperation, especially in the U.S. Japan alliance, and in alternative institutions (Quad and ASEAN). The paper examines the changing Japanese defense stance and its role in restoring the stability in the region by utilizing case studies, interviews and other official documents. Finally, the study presents methodological suggestions on how Japan and other concerned nations can deal with the tensions in South China Sea so that long term peace and security in the region can be achieved (Bukhari et al., 2025). The contribution of China towards defence industrialization of Pakistan is notable. Chinese support has enabled Pakistan to deploy realistic platforms at affordable cost through joint projects, licensed production deals and through supplying important systems that have improved functional operational autonomy. This, however, makes structural dependencies, too - particularly advanced components. In the long term, these dependencies may affect the ability to be flexible in strategies, negotiating space in a foreign policy, and susceptibility to supplier politics (Tröster et al., n.d.). India on the other hand has sought the strategy of diversified suppliers and partners. Though traditionally dependent on a small number of suppliers, it has in the past twenty years expanded its relations, getting involved with Western powers, Israel, Russia and others in terms of technology, platforms and strategic alliance. This is to reduce the risk of supplier dependence, and it provides a range of premium technologies. The trade-off is still there: between production in the country and a few foreign imports to fill the gaps in capabilities (e.g., engines, electronics). The last few years have seen the global competition intensifying on new technologies, drones, cyber systems, electronic warfare, networked sensors, etc., making the situation more complex. The two countries are currently confronted with a two-fold problem, namely, the establishment of a localized ability to deal with contemporary threats, as well as the aspect of geopolitics and reliance on external factors. In the case of India, diversified relationships are a tactical benefit - but absorption capacity and national assimilation are critical. To Pakistan, the small supplier base creates a clarity in operations at the expense of flexibility(Binder & Binder, 2016).
- **Arms Dynamics, Strategic Implications and Regional Stability.** The increasing defence-industrial capacity of both states, despite their drifting apart, have notable consequences to the stability in the region. On the one hand, native production makes it more pliant, less dependable and hopefully less expensive and shorter lead-time of modernization. Conversely, it contributes to an active arms atmosphere, which eases the task of these arms races to maintain. Since each party sees benefit or hostile modernisation in the other, the political pressures to acquire or manufacture may increase, hastening the speed of militarization. The disparity in the capabilities (selective and broad-based, deep and constrained) may also have strategic uncertainties. The comparative level of India enables India to seek higher platform, even export - to expand influence, and establish strategic cooperation outside the region. The more focused model of Pakistan enables the cost-effective deterrence and survivability, but still has the loopholes to the high-tech areas. This split may become different strategic behaviours in the time of crisis India maybe with a wider projection of power, Pakistan

focusing on the asymmetric/ deterrence responding(Banerjee, 2014). Defence-industry perspective Defence-industry perspective The challenge of expanding indigenous capability without bringing the destabilizing growth; balancing dependency with autonomy; integrating the contribution of the private innovation, the world supply-chains, and national control in a more strategic and sustainable way is highlighted by this dynamic.

- **The Restraints and the Necessity of Open Information**. Another issue that makes research on defence industries, particularly in South Asia, difficult is the transparency of data. Most of the publicly available information is based on official official statements of government, some reports by think-tanks, and some leaks by defense-journalists and other unofficial analysis. Numerous indicative metrics - R&D expenditures, networks of subcontractors, supply-chain reliance, in-country content ratios, in-house design capacities - are veiled or secret. This makes it difficult to do strict comparison. Moreover, when I tried to trace the information of the connection you have given (Google Scholar profile), I was restricted in accessing it (I could not authentically draw or refer to the works of that scholar). This highlights a more general challenge: scholarly and defense-policy literatures in this field are frequently non-academic, or are piecemeal.

The very limitations just discussed mean that the analysis above is based on a mixture of publicly available data, policy reporting, commentary by experts, and rational assumption, as opposed to an all-encompassing, validated dataset. Conclusions should therefore not be handled with haste.

Conclusion

The analysis of Pakistan and India in terms of the defence-industrial capabilities indicates two wide different models which are influenced by domestic limitations and foreign alliances. India follows the strategy of breadth and scale, combining state sector and the potential of the private sector, and supported by diversified international relations. Pakistan is a pragmatic, resource-aware model - concerned with selective capabilities, exploiting strategic alliances, and not over extending. The two models possess their strengths and weaknesses. The strength of India is its possible diversified modernization and export-based leverage; that of Pakistan is its cost-effective deterrence, their flexibility, and alignment with their allies. To have a stable region the answer will not be to stop the competition- it will be tough to do so- but to control it: be it transparency, no arms race, build trust, and enhance strategic stability despite modernization. However, in the long term, strategic independence will require not simply manufacturing capacity, but also innovation ecosystems, internal institutional change, open governance, and adaptability and absorption of more complex technologies. Even the most ambitious defence-industrial plans will be reduced to pieces without them.

Recommendations.

- **Decouple Capability-Building and Escalation Dynamics.** The creation of the distinction between credible national capabilities building and unwilling pressures on region escalation is one of the primary policy demands. It implies that states must modernize their platforms, technologies and operational doctrines however any new acquisition or deployment is to be accompanied by diplomacy, signalling and transparency measures in order to ensure that capability gains do not become automatic crisis instability incentives. History tells that an unsignalled modernization promotes the application of worst-case motives by the competitors. The studies carried out by SIPRI of the increasing rate of arms-transfer in the globe substantiate the risk that close purchases specifically clandestine purchases facilitate the strengthening of the disturbing impressions and rival cycles of arms acquisition that may be problematic to de-crypt. Where there is open communication, however, as modernization takes place, deterrence is strengthened without weakening crisis management.
- **Become an Institution of Transparency and Frequent Exchange of Information.** India and Pakistan are able to integrate stability through predictable transparency concerns when they integrate it into their defence behaviour. Announced military exercises, annual defence white papers, sharing of information with respect to key systems and checklists on explaining the movements along the unprotected borders have in the past assisted in the alleviation of misperceptions in South Asia. This should be expanded to unmanned aerial systems, navy operations and ISR missions along the borders which would further prevent crisis. This has been

shown by the performance of CBMs in the South Asian context where the incidence of minimal, habitually regularized information exchange reduces the probability of misinterpretation by transforming uncertainty into predictively manageable predictability.

- **Establish Partnerships on the New and Autonomous Technology.** Given the rate at which AI is being diffused into military service, autonomy, robotics and advanced sensing, India and Pakistan should cooperate with each other either bilaterally, or through multilateral organizations, to establish norms of emerging technologies which they can integrate into the procedures of the battlefield engagement, before these technologies take root into complete components of such engagement. This can be accomplished through participation via the UN Convention on Certain conventions weapons (CCW) and UNIDIR, etc., in ensuring the establishment of common standards on meaningful human control, legal scrutiny of autonomous systems, and safe deployment practices. The lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS) are also directed at international policy junctions that demonstrate the urgency of, and the potentiality of, negotiating limiting common standards against runaway automation and algorithmic errors as well as against accidental military action.
- **Separate the Suppliers with Non Perceived Arms Racing.** Long-term dependence on one supplier will not make either of the countries resilient and independent; nevertheless, the needs diversification process must be carried out without raising the opposing anxieties of possible technological surprises. The effect of diversification of suppliers of the significant subsystems such as engines, sensors, micro electronics and precision parts on stability is favorable because it reduces leverage on any particular external supplier. However, the diversification is to be supplemented with the purposeful openness and predictable purchasing behaviour. The data on arms-transfer released by SIPRI enables one to conclude that these sudden asymmetric transfers on one great-power sponsor are more likely to create an asymmetric perception of threats in the region, a resultant counter-procurement response, and an increase of crisis-sensitivity.
- **Improve Resilient and Redundant Command-and-Control Systems.** As automation and remotely controlled systems continue to proliferate, both countries should ensure that the two are placed under high levels of human oversight, redundant communication networks, and hardened command and control (C2) systems. The increased vulnerability of digital military systems to the cyberattacks, spoofing, electronic warfare, or a software crash suggests that technical protection is currently a strategic protection. Lack of robust control and monitoring systems, such as (but not restricted to) kill-switches, authentication systems, and decentralized control facilities can cause a few tactical failures that can result in strategic failures.
- **Enforce Export Control and Management of Dual-Use Technology.** Microelectronics and AI creation tools, drones, and high-tech sensors need to fall under effective export control due to their marginalizing proliferation threats of Dual use products. Where feasible, end-use monitoring agreements should be put in place in addition to national export regimes. Research carried out by SIPRI and carried out by the Small Arms Survey proves that even the flows of allegedly low-tech systems are often leaked by the non-state players into their hands, contributing to the instability of the situation on the local level and the risk of the spin into the unintended result.
- **Promote Cooperation, Research and Industrial Interdependence.** India and Pakistan should seek the finder-following collaboration in the study of non sensitive aspects of defence adjacencies (disaster response, humanitarian technologies, search-and-rescue operations, maritime safety and environment surveillance) where circumstances are agreeable to strategy. It is possible to develop the interdependence and mutual interests towards stability by means of the joint participation in the neutral forums or by the joint organization of technical workshops. In in-house constituencies, the co-operative technical projects take the form of bureaucracies, defence industries, research institutions, where moderation and predictable interaction is favored.

- **Deconflict Crisis-Deconfliction in Risky Areas.** There must be bilateral agreements on the air, maritime, cyber and space environments to prevent the accidental escalation. The operational deconfliction capabilities may include rules of drone flights in conflict zones, communication protocols that are to be adopted during incidents at sea, mutually agreed no-fly/no-sail zones in sensitive borders, and a well-developed procedure of dealing with unfortunate ISR intrusions. As experience in the world has shown, technical and operating conventions are more stabilizing than the overall political ones, as they directly regulate the relations of military contact.
- **Interest in Doctrines Oriented Towards Escalation Control.** Military doctrines should make it explicit to ensure that survivability, redundancy, dispersion and command integrity are placed high instead of operating under the guise of hair-trigger postures or first-use incentives. The escalation-control doctrine is centered upon pre-meditated decision-making, hierarchy of command, and political authority in nuclear forces and highly advanced conventional forces. Body language that science proves vulnerability in the presence of the enemy, this presupposes that one uses it or loses it, will undermine a state of stability where determined-based doctrines will enhance the deterrence without escalating the levels of crisis.
- **Set up Internal Capacity Pre Large Scale Procurement.** The strategic independence requires the national capability to integrate, maintain, develop and secure more advanced systems. Transfers of technology can be translated into long term domestic strength still not long term reliance by means of investments in university-seven industry associations, technical preparation, standard development, and systems-integration expertise. Installation of high-technology systems without the technical ecosystem to maintain them reveals weak links that weaken and not enhance autonomy.
- **Report Cyber and Information Risks.** The offensive vectors have now shifted into the domain of cyber operations, fake information, sensor spoofing and digital interference with early-warning structures or C2 structures. India and Pakistan should develop mutual communication channels to attribute cyber-incidents, respond to suspected intrusion, and define technical peculiarities. The mindset of the contracts should be aiming at verification, investigating and de-escalator response rather than punitive response to the crisis being addressed that will reduce the likelihood of misunderstandings.
- **Manage the Spillover Mid State Diplomacy.** The chain of weapons delivery and diplomatic indicators create great power suppliers with an enormous impact in the South Asian military politics. The United States, China, Russia and European allies must collaborate to enable the process of regional confidence-building conferences, discouraging disruptive transfers and to promote the transparency, which will keep sudden shifts in the military balances. Focal streams of weapons into one state can rapidly augment the danger appraisal in the area and that is the purpose why multilateral guardrails are essential SIPRI information implies.
- **Restrict and Abate the most unstable Weapons Categories.** The disproportionate risks of escalation are of disproportionate risk to the hypersonic systems, tactical nuclear weapons and autonomous lethal platforms which must be addressed as the categories of high priority to be restricted. Fighting field experiments could be enclosed through negotiating transparency agreements within the doctrine and deployment arena, researching on joint technical norms regarding system weapons autonomy, and the implementation of verifiable limits on the most disruptive forms of technologies.
- **Ensure recovery of Strong Civilian Control and Parliamentary Review.** Civilians could use their control in defence procurements and development of doctrine to enhance accountability and prevent political or reactionary arming acquisitions. Open parliamentary practices will turn procurement into a national priority agenda; an incentive to the informed popular debate and the creation of domestic constituencies of temperance and stability. The other effect of the oversight management is the emergence of long term planning and avoidance of wastage of resources.

- **Offer Technical Failure Crisis Simulations.** Political-military crisis simulations and tabletop exercises should also contain worst-case scenarios like sensor failures, autonomous system failures, false alarms, and communication outages, and cyberattacks. Exercised uncertainty decision-making reduces the possibilities of real technical anomalies becoming runaway. There are also procedural and systemic breaches revealed in these exercises and they do not manifest themselves in real crises.

These steps are significant because Arms Racing and Technology has the potential to generate the war. The rapid process of acquiring technology, the non-transparent process of modernization, and accelerated dissemination of technology provide several entry points to inadvertent warfare. False perception and worst-case inference might think of competitors that conducting routine testing is an aggressive action. First-strike weaknesses by systems that pose a threat to C2 nodes or survivable forces are what result in incentives to pre-emption. There will inevitably be increased accident risks of automation, algorithm mistakes, spring of spoofed sensors, and undesirable interactions as autonomy penetrates into operational systems. The diffusion of even low-tech systems to non-state actors may create an instability, and the cyberattack on early-warning systems may be understood as the initial stage in a more comprehensive conflict. Finally, the arms-combustion shocks contributed by the great powers can trigger the destabilization of regional balances immediately and cause the re-acquisition or manoeuvre retaliatives.

Preparatory Policymaking The Information of the Next Steps

Against this background of hazards, the policy-makers should encourage a longer-term regional consultancy on autonomous and unmanned systems, bargain a wider and a replenished stock of confidence-building practices, and establish any bilateral working groups committed to supply-chain security as well as human-control benchmarks. More transparency has to be sought by parliaments or national audit institutions concerning defence R&D and end-use certification and by invoking multilateral institutions such as UNIDIR, IISS, and SIPRI as a mere platform of technical support and help to verification.

Final Note

The modernization of the military is a rational statecraft phenomenon and so is the necessity to seek allies and technology to offset the drawbacks. To institutionalize structures that would have these rational behaviours and coexistence with stability is the main policy issue. The optimal path to an increase in national capacity that will not lead to an irreversible increase or war is caregiving balanced transparency, sustained regional communication, and successful technical defense, enshrined under multilateral standards. States cannot prevent the technological development, yet can establish the strategic consequences of it.

Reference

1. Banerjee, D. (2014). India–Pakistan strategic relationship: Its impact on regional transition. In B. Chakma (Ed.), South Asia in Transition (pp. 247–266). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137356642_12
2. Bianchi, P. (2008). International handbook on industrial policy. Edward Elgar Publishing. https://books.google.com/books?id=j1-uAryy-vwC
3. Bhutia, L. T. (2024). The Dragon and the Tiger: A review of Sino-Indian relations in the twenty-first century world order. In P. P. Basu & T. Arshed (Eds.), 75 Years of India's Foreign Policy (pp. 111–134). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-6054-1_6
4. Binder, C., & Binder, C. (2016). A capability perspective on indigenous autonomy. Oxford Development Studies, 44(3), 297–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2016.1167178
5. Bukhari, S. R. H. (2024). Assessing the strategic imperatives and future trajectory of Pakistan's defense industry development. Spry Contemporary Educational Practices, 3(1). https://journals.sprypublishers.com/index.php/CONTEMPORARY-EDUCATIONAL-PRACTIC/article/view/91

6. Bukhari, S. R. H., Mujaddid, G., & Ullah, R. (2025). The impact of China's assertiveness in the South China Sea on Japan's defense policy and regional security dynamics: Implications for stability and multilateral cooperation in the Indo-Pacific. Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 6(2), 1–9.

7. Choudhury, T. (2018). Trend and mind-set that India's central science and technology sector further needs. Journal of Technology Management for Growing Economies, 9, 23–69. https://doi.org/10.15415/jtmge.2018.91002

8. Delgado, F., Garrido, S., & Bezerra, B. S. (2025). Barriers to visibility in supply chains: Challenges and opportunities of artificial intelligence driven by Industry 4.0 technologies. Sustainability, 17(7), 2998.

9. Galbraith, C., & Schendel, D. (1983). An empirical analysis of strategy types. Strategic Management Journal, 4(2), 153–173. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250040206

10. Google Search. (n.d.). Reference for "Make in India" reforms and procurement policy changes accelerating indigenous production and private-sector participation. Retrieved November 29, 2025, from https://www.google.com/search?q=India%E2%80%99s+%E2%80%9CMake+in+India%E2%80%9D+reforms

11. Hussain, D. E. (2025). Russia–Pakistan relations in the contemporary context: Geo-economic opportunities and strategic constraints. Journal of World Affairs: Voice of the Global South, 1, 165–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/29769442251350920

12. Kiran, S. (2024). Strategic culture of India and Pakistan and its implications for strategic stability. NUST Journal of International Peace & Stability, 51–63.

13. Naseer, N., Khan, M. F., & Raza, A. (2023). A comparative view of India and Pakistan's defence capabilities: Historical evolution and future trends. Asian Journal of Comparative Politics, 8(1), 214–227. https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911221124384

14. Shan, S. A. F., Khan, S., Khan, S. N., Khan, S. B., & ul Islam, M. (2025). High-tech and innovative emerging industries and Pakistan's policies toward adaptation in light of China's strategies of reverse engineering. Journal of Public Policy, 4, 1.

15. Singh, M. (1993). New economic policy, poverty and self-reliance. In New Economic Policy: Reforms and Development (p. 16). Mittal Publications. https://books.google.com/books?id=_P4nqH7ssLkC

16. Tröster, B., Papatheophilou, S., & Küblböck, K. (n.d.). Strategic autonomy meets global dependency. Retrieved November 30, 2025, from https://www.oefse.at/fileadmin/content/Downloads/Publikationen/Briefingpaper/BP36-Strategic-Autonomy-meets-Global-Dependency.pdf

17. uz Zaman, S. (2025). India's limited war-fighting doctrines and the May 2025 provocation: Challenges to deterrence and stability in South Asia. Strategic Thought, 7(1), 55–80.