



# The Concept of Deterrence in Arab and Muslim Thought - Pakistan

---

## Working Paper

Name of Author: Oded Brosh<sup>1</sup>

Project Leader: Shmuel Bar

June 2012

## Executive Summary

---

The issue of deterrence in the Pakistani context involves two separate, but to a degree overlapping, fields of investigation: the first is the nuclear deterrence posture of the Pakistani state, as it has evolved over the past few decades, and whatever may be intrinsically Islamic about it; the second involves the perceptions regarding the utility of the gaining of control and of the possession of Pakistan's nuclear assets, as may be held by Islamic or extremist Islamist groups – i.e. by the establishment Muslim parties, or, tangentially, by radical or extremist, or "Jihadi" Islamist organizations. The latter have so far been marginal to the issue, and currently remain remote to it; but they have indicated significant interest and debate regarding the implications of such an outcome, and they do potentially signal dire consequence should they acquire control of one, a few, some, many, or all of Pakistan's nuclear assets.

The Pakistani state nuclear deterrence posture started out, and openly remains, as declaredly one of minimum deterrence. The concept of minimum deterrence is grounded in well-known, well-established and well-documented principles, drawing on the cases of the United Kingdom, France, and also last but not least India. In Pakistan's case – and differing from India – the early NATO principle of declared first-use of nuclear weapons in case of an overwhelming conventional onslaught that cannot be defeated conventionally, is a complementary added feature of Pakistan's nuclear posture. The principle of minimum deterrence, since the UK's entry into the nuclear club in 1952 under the title of an independent deterrent and minimum deterrence, is well suited to a state that does not have the resources, or nuclear wherewithal, to establish first strike or survivable assured destruction second strike capabilities against its adversary of reference. In the case of Pakistan this has meant India, much as Britain and France could not

establish these against the Soviet Union, and India can not establish them vis a vis the PRC. In spite of lacking such assured destruction second strike assets, minimum deterrence still establishes the essential level of retaliatory capability sufficient to dissuade the potential adversary from considering striking first or creating an intolerable threat level, if the punishment expected, while not constituting assured destruction nevertheless more than nullifies any rational gain ventured.

Additionally, Pakistan's motives have included the element of Islamic prestige, as it remains the only Islamic nuclear weapons power to date (until Iran goes nuclear openly). As such, fierce nationalistic, perhaps fired by religious, emotions regarding India, and particularly its nuclearization, have clearly driven Pakistani actions, and serve to reinforce the credibility of deterrence threats so that use may be expected at thresholds not far removed from posturing to do so. While the official line rarely makes outright reference to the Islamic dimension of the nuclear posture, public implication of its importance is often highlighted in Pakistan in academia, media or public opinion discussions of the significance of Pakistan's nuclear standing and capabilities.

It is suggested here that Pakistan's official minimum deterrence posture is undergoing transformation to a significantly more potent capability. Over the past decade, it appears possible, or in fact of deed probable, that Pakistan's capabilities, as either already acquired or evolving into the future, reflect a significant shift away from minimum deterrence towards great-power-like, or superpower-like, nuclear postures. The constant expansion of Pakistan's weapons grade plutonium and HEU production capabilities, and the reported ongoing increase in the number of nuclear warheads, would confirm this, together with the ongoing intensive development, testing, production and deployment of an entire spectrum of missiles – including ever-better strategic range ballistic missiles (SRBMs, MRBMs, IRBMs?), cruise missiles, and short-range theater relevant missiles or rockets (including MRLs), all nuclear warhead capable. The emphasis on missile delivery capabilities also indicates a relative displacement of Pakistan's air-delivery capability, which could be vulnerable to an Indian first strike and then, in case of a Pakistani second strike effort – to India's air defenses, thus its relative deterrent value as a threat may be degrading. The missile effort is also unmistakably driven by the desire to keep up with India's unrelenting missile development.

Pakistan's C3 structure is said by some observers to be far more effective than India's, which is believed to be cumbersome and weighed down by the need for civilian oversight and authorization procedures, while that of Pakistan is held to be more compact, and subject to the military authorities' control and thus discipline; however, it may be prudent to consider that this view could be skewed and misleading in its depiction of Indian inefficiency that might actually not be relevant in this case. This way or that, it can be established that Pakistan is a formidable nuclear weapons power, continuously striving to "close the gap" with India, or perhaps now or soon of equal or greater standing compared to its nominally more formidable rival India. Thus Pakistan is in the process of establishing deterrence across the entire spectrum, from first strike to survivable assured destruction second strike, and theater or tactical nuclear strike capabilities, including against limited conventional war such as the reputed Indian "Cold Start" strategy, backed up by deterrence against Indian retaliation and escalation beyond theater use.

Alongside the Pakistani state's formidable nuclear weapons progression, posture and possible operational doctrine, stands the dual specter of either establishment Muslim parties or organizations, for one scenario, or of a radical or extremist Islamist group, or coalition of groups, for a second, more remote, scenario, gaining possession of a single, several, many or all of Pakistan's nuclear weapons – or of materials and the know-how or capabilities to make or assemble them. Clearly there is a high level of awareness among these groups of the significance of Pakistan being a nuclear weapons power, albeit the specifics, the

intellectual clarification of the implications and consequences, and the desired utility of the circumstances – are in a long-term and ongoing process of formation. To the point, how Pakistani nuclear weapons – whether one, a few, many or all of them – might be perceived by extremist, or "Jihadi", groups, to be exercised in terms of their utility to the Islamic *umma*, is worthy of note and exploration.

Regarding this aspect, there are some significant methodological constraints, because the extremist groups are many, very dispersed in their orientation and specific agendas, remote geographically, and secretive. What the leadership of any given group is thinking about nuclear weapons postures and utilities – is necessarily subject to some extrapolation from their views regarding their agenda in general. All of them have very clear notions about their respective agendas: regarding the Pakistani state; Western infiltration, intrusion, influence, and exploitation in the Islamic *umma*; India as an implacable, hated, enemy; United States interests and manipulations in the Islamic geographical domain; capitalism, oil, traditional or conservative Arab regimes that have "sold out their soul" to America; Israel; the same-time omnipotence and impotence of Western liberal society and its deterministically inevitable collapse in the face of a more resolute adversary; establishment of *Dar-ul-Islam*, the Caliphate, cleaned of the *kuffar* (infidels); and so on.

The challenge of loss of control over Pakistan's nuclear assets, emanates from four possible general scenarios: 1) established Muslim parties gaining control through a democratic or semi-democratic process; 2) a cataclysmic event which might propel extremist Islamist elements to the fore; 3) infiltration by extremist Islamic individuals or elements of the Pakistani security establishment, undermining of its integrity or its takeover, leading to the gaining of control of nuclear weapons from the inside, leading to theft of nuclear bombs or warheads, or in a worst case scenario unauthorized use; 4) outright theft of a single nuclear warhead, or of more than one nuclear warhead. An additional concern is the diversion of nuclear materials, for use either to make a nuclear weapon or lower level nuclear materials that could be used for a "dirty bomb".

Currently it is widely believed among reliable experts on the Pakistani scene, that the Pakistani military is in firm control, will not allow the materialization of the "implosion" of the Pakistani state scenario, and as such the dire contingencies regarding loss of control – including over nuclear assets – remains truly remote. Additionally, it is often asserted that the security level of Pakistani nuclear assets is very high, and that extremist elements cannot really gain control of them – that such a scenario is mostly a nightmarish fantasy propagated by Western academics and media worriers. However, concern is grudgingly heightened because extremist Islamic trends, and the gaining of influence within the military ranks by individuals identifying with them, are clearly on the rise – and this is a real disconcerting alarm bell. Moreover, such infiltration of the security services, the ISI, and the forces involved in the guardianship of Pakistan's nuclear assets, by individuals with variable degrees of inclination towards radical or extremist Jihadi groups – is also worrisome looking down the road. *In extremis*, the assertions about the military's strong hold remain valid for as long as they last – similar assertions have been made in past cases, such as Iran before the revolution, only to dissipate embarrassingly in hindsight. Another example worth watching is the way in which Islamic parties in Egypt have been gaining ground while driving for a fundamental, and perhaps eventually total revolutionary transformation of the political situation. The potential for loss of control over Pakistani nuclear assets, and their devolution to extremist Islamist elements within one of the four parameters described above – should be viewed as a low-probability-high-consequence scenario that cannot be ignored, and must be addressed.

## Preface

---

The issue of deterrence in the Pakistani context involves two separate, but to a degree overlapping, fields of investigation: the first is the nuclear deterrence posture of the Pakistani state, as it has evolved over the past few decades, and whatever may be intrinsically Islamic about it; the second involves the perception of the utility of the gaining of control and of the possession of Pakistan's nuclear assets, as may be held by Islamic or extremist Islamist groups – i.e. by the establishment Muslim parties, or, tangentially, by radical or extremist, or "Jihadi", Islamist organizations.<sup>1</sup> The latter have so far been marginal to the issue, and currently remain remote to it; but they have indicated significant interest and debate regarding the implications of such an outcome, and they do potentially signal dire consequences should they acquire control of one, a few, some, many, or all of Pakistan's nuclear assets.

Islamist groups harbor total revolutionary goals regarding everything – the Islamic social structure, the state political structures, and the international environment, i.e. direly anti-Western, anti-US, anti US- and Western- interests, anti-Western notions of liberalism, i.e. capitalism or democracy, anti-Christian, anti-Hindu, and anti-Jewish or Israeli.

The essential heretofore established and official posture of Pakistani state nuclear deterrence is that of minimum deterrence, which *per se* draws upon well-established and well-known principles. However, recent developments give cause to believe that minimum deterrence is undergoing transformation to something much more comprehensive, or is being in fact of deed abandoned. The activities of the past few years, in terms of the expansion of weapons grade fissile material production, increased number of warheads in the arsenal, and intensive attention paid to missile delivery systems for them – would lead to dramatic conclusions regarding the future of the Pakistani nuclear posture. Acquisition of the entire spectrum of first strike, survivable assured destruction second strike, and theater nuclear war-fighting as well as deterrence assets, thus the wherewithal to establish overall and multi-level escalation dominance – is hard to reconcile with the declared doctrine of minimum deterrence.

## Chapter One: Pakistan's Minimum Deterrence Doctrine – sources and practice (1987-2006?)

---

The principles of Pakistan's official policy of minimum deterrence draw, logically and inevitably, from four recognized sources:

1. the nuclear deterrence postures of the United Kingdom and France (and later India, to be addressed separately), who by default could acquire neither first strike nor assured destruction second strike capabilities vis a vis the defined adversary, i.e. the Soviet Union – as could do the United States – but retained the option of retaliation to the degree that nothing could justify a Soviet attack upon them;<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Some, or perhaps many, observers systematically call the extremist groups "Jihadi", and this is another way of highlighting the fact that their agendas are not only theological or ideological in the abstract, but contain messages actively encouraging strategic action, especially the use of violence, to realize their respective causes. To a degree the terms "Jihadi" and "extremist" might indeed be interchangeable, especially when focusing on their action programs. Other experts tend to differentiate between "radical", "extremist" or "Jihadi", for a multitude of reasons.

<sup>2</sup> Setting aside for the moment the French declaratory "*tous azimuts*" posturing.

2. or to use another term – sufficiency, i.e. enough clout to effectively deter both nuclear attack and territorial violation by the enemy, to make them cogently unthinkable and unrealistic;
3. early NATO principles of "first use" against an overwhelming conventional assault by the Warsaw Pact against Western Europe that could not be defeated using conventional forces alone, as a "tripwire" trigger – i.e. to signal that a conventional war in Europe is out of the realm of possibility;<sup>3</sup>
4. Pakistan's particular requirements for establishing deterrence vis a vis India, based on religious, nationalistic or even personal drivers of a perhaps eccentric nature.

Background factors influencing the evolution of Pakistani nuclear thinking play a crucial role in posture formation: the "two-state" partition solution of 1947/8, leaving Pakistani vulnerability to a perceived threat regarding a potential future Indian attempt to re-unify the nation at an opportune moment; the continuum of three wars (1948, 1965 and 1971) up to the point of nuclearization of the conflict, at which time it appeared to stabilize; the trauma of the truncation of Pakistan in 1971 through force of Indian arms; the nuclear ambitions of India in the 1950's and 1960's, mainly designed as a thrust towards attaining prestige and standing in the international arena, at a time when nuclear standing was the *lingua franca* of global recognition of great power status (to wit, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council – albeit the PRC joined later – being synonymous with the recognized NPT Nuclear Weapons States), and as an expression of cultural drivers to define nationhood and identity for a nation of India's substantial proportions or weight; the China-India war of 1962, which drove home the Chinese threat, thus adding a security dimension to Indian motives and therefore forming a three-way multilateral nuclear relationship – probably explaining later Chinese nuclear weapons assistance to Pakistan; China's 1964 entry into the nuclear club, driving still more India's nuclear activism, regarded by Pakistanis as a threat and a challenge that could not be left unaddressed; and the 1974 Indian PNE test, establishing India as a de-facto nuclear weapons capable power.

Especially after the trauma of 1971, Pakistan embarked vigorously on the road which led it to becoming, and remaining so far, the only Islamic nuclear weapons state. This was highlighted by periods of Islamic ideological pre-eminence, including with the establishment of *sharia* rule by the Zia al-Huq term that began with the overthrow of secular civilian government in 1977. The Islamic dimension was accompanied by chords of reference to Pakistani extended deterrence to friendly Islamic countries, such as Saudi Arabia and other Gulf States. At the time, it was suggested that Saudi assistance, indeed bankrolling, of the Pakistani nuclear project, was extended as a substitute for the Libyan involvement extended to the Bhutto effort earlier on. Also of note is that a by-product of Pakistani nuclear capability is deterrence of other theoretical adversaries, such as the Soviet Union in its day, Russia, the United States, Israel, or of Iran when it goes nuclear – a Pakistani-Iranian nuclear rivalry could potentially be especially unstable, for several reasons, including theological-ideological rivalry and territorial contiguity.

---

<sup>3</sup> This held for as long as the Warsaw Pact was perceived to enjoy an overwhelming superiority in numbers that could not be successfully defended against by NATO, which was constrained to maintain a relatively limited deployment. In later years, perceptions were adjusted somewhat, and NATO's expansion, and technological and qualitative advantages were credited with allowing for at least a fighting chance to successfully fend off a Warsaw Pact invasion conventionally; however, NATO tactical nuclear weapons remained deployed and available for immediate use in Europe, and so remain to this day. The mirror image of this posture was the Soviet deployment of a formidable tactical nuclear capability, and the delegation of authorization to initiate the use of tactical nuclear weapons to field commanders, whether in Europe, the Far East, and, notably, in 1962 in Cuba – an explosive fact unknown until revealed only after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The delegation and authorization issue regarding initiation of the use of tactical nuclear weapons in the South Asian context – is worthy of exploration too, although currently it appears doubtful that field commanders in this case are so authorized.

Pakistan is assumed to have assembled its first nuclear weapons sometime between 1987 and 1990, thus becoming then a *de facto* nuclear weapons state. India's 1974 Pokharan test had already established that standing for India, with actual weaponization and possible deployment following by the end of that decade. Pakistan's tacit nuclear weapons standing as such was apparently first wielded during the "Brasstacks" crisis of 1987, when Pakistani nuclear signaling is reported to have occurred to deter an Indian conventional military assault, which Pakistan believed – rightly or wrongly, that's beside the point – was imminent.<sup>4</sup>

But it was only through the openly declared nuclear weapons tests in May 1998 that the way was opened for a public discussion of the two states' nuclear deterrence doctrines, or postures. The Indian "draft" nuclear doctrine, published in August 1999, established the principle of minimum deterrence for India, including the principle of "no first use", i.e. as a threat of retaliation against nuclear attack only.<sup>5</sup> Pakistan for its part, although not defined as an official policy or doctrine, but rather in the form of a collection of statements comprising a national concept of deterrence, elaborated upon similar principles of minimum deterrence, with one prominent difference, that of a refusal to commit to "no first use"; or rather, indeed promising first use in response to a conventional attack severely violating Pakistani territory, or threatening in such or other ways the survival of Pakistan as a viable independent state.<sup>6</sup> India officially adopted the draft nuclear doctrine of August 1999 in January 2003, adding to it the dimension that nuclear retaliation could be authorized in response to attack by chemical and biological weapons too (didn't have to be, but might be).<sup>7</sup>

Since 1998, in fact since 1974, developments are such that it appears that technological momentum, prestige drivers and also the implicit Chinese threat have been pushing India towards an extensive nuclear capability that might establish sufficiency for a minimum deterrent against the PRC, naturally without the ability to acquire either first strike or assured destruction second strike forces vis a vis China, which itself has been relentlessly expanding its nuclear strike capabilities – the only recognized NPT Nuclear Weapons State to be increasing its arsenal (the other four have all significantly reduced theirs). For India, some prestige ambitions driving its nuclear buildup since its inception have to a degree been realized, especially since legitimacy was granted to its peaceful nuclear programs in spite of being an NPT holdout, including

---

<sup>4</sup>Bhumitra Chakma, in "Pakistan's Nuclear Doctrine and Command and Control System: Dilemmas of Small Nuclear Forces in the Second Nuclear Age", *Security Challenges*, Volume 2 Number 2 (July 2006), p. 118-119, recalls the reported wielding by Pakistan of nuclear weapons as a deterrent signal in the "Brasstacks" crisis of 1987 and the 1990 Kashmir crisis; and fn.10 recounts the A.Q. Khan interview with Indian journalist Kuldip Nayar in early 1987, during which Khan allegedly claimed that Pakistan had already made the bomb.

<http://www.securitychallenges.org.au/ArticlePDFs/vol2no2Chakma.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> Embassy of India, Washington, D.C.: *Draft Report of National Security Advisory Board on Indian Nuclear Doctrine*, August 17, 1999, and

Arms Control Association: *India's Draft Nuclear Doctrine*

[www.armscontrol.org/print/514](http://www.armscontrol.org/print/514)

<sup>6</sup> Chakma, "Pakistan's Nuclear Doctrine", op.cit., p. 127, quotes Lt. Gen. Khalid Kidwai as stating that Islamabad would use nuclear weapons if:

- a. India attacks Pakistan and conquers a large part of its territory
- b. India destroys a large section of its land and air forces
- c. India proceeds to the economic strangulation of Pakistan
- d. India pushes Pakistan into political destabilization or creates large-scale internal subversion.

And "Pakistan's Nuclear Programme and Imports", in *Nuclear Black Markets: Pakistan, A.Q. Khan and the rise of proliferation networks – a net assessment; an IISS strategic dossier*. London: IISS, 2007, Ch. 1, p. 36 (pdf)

<http://www.iiss.org/publications/strategic-dossiers/nbm/nuclear-black-market-dossier-a-net-assesment/pakistans-nuclear-programme-and-imports-/#chapter>

<sup>7</sup> Originally published in January 2003 by the Indian High Commission in Ottawa, as

[www.hcottawa.ca/news/pr/pr-030120.html](http://www.hcottawa.ca/news/pr/pr-030120.html)

and quoted in Scott D. Sagan, *The Evolution of Indian and Pakistani Nuclear Doctrine*. Cambridge, MA: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, May 7, 2008

[http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/uploads/Sagan\\_MTA\\_Talk\\_050708.pdf](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/uploads/Sagan_MTA_Talk_050708.pdf)

the signing of nuclear supply agreements with the United States, France and Russia. President Obama's recent remark in New Delhi to the effect that India should become a permanent member of an expanded UN Security Council is indicative of the realization of such status having been acquired. So it would seem that just as India's nuclear expansion might well have occurred regardless of China's policy of relentlessly increasing its nuclear strike capabilities, similarly Pakistan's expansion might well have occurred regardless of India's, because of the multiplicity of cultural and prestige drivers that have been responsible for the regional nuclear arms race – quite apart from the security related ones, which carry their own weight.

## Chapter Two: Is Minimum Deterrence Still in Effect?

---

Currently, Pakistan is intensively expediting and expanding its capability to produce weapons grade fissile materials, including through the launching of relatively large plutonium producing heavy water reactors, in addition to its long-established HEU production. Plutonium is alleged by outside observers to be intended to ease the miniaturization of warheads for missiles. Pakistan is also intensively expanding its missile capabilities, including development, testing and deployment of an ever more impressive array of strategic ballistic missiles (SRBMs and MRBMs), cruise missiles and tactical short-range missiles and rocket systems (including MRLs), all nuclear-warhead capable,<sup>8</sup> possibly now also including as a response to India's alleged "Cold Start" strategy, so as to deter an Indian conventional attack too.<sup>9</sup> If in the past the nuclear arsenals of both states were relatively small, to the extent that neither could acquire either first strike or survivable assured destruction second strike capabilities, and thus there was an inherent logic to the assumption of the minimum deterrence strategy, it must be said that things are undergoing fundamental transformation. The sheer weight of numbers, together with the ever growing number and flexibility of delivery systems, is making the notion of minimum deterrence appear increasingly to be a condition of the past.<sup>10</sup>

The impression is that Pakistan has been acting since 2006/7 in a mode that indicates that it no longer adheres to minimum deterrence. In that case, it is probable that in 2003/4 a change in nuclear thinking occurred towards acquiring first strike and assured destruction second strike capabilities against India, and also theater nuclear weapons capabilities against a conventional Indian assault, so that the spectrum of threats be covered, including deterrence against Indian escalation and retaliation in response to the use of

---

<sup>8</sup> Pakistan's nuclear and delivery capabilities are detailed in Paul K. Kerr and Mary Beth Nikitin, *Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons: Proliferation and Security Issues*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, November 30, 2011  
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34248.pdf>

and Hans. M. Kristensen and Robert S. Norris, "Pakistan's nuclear forces, 2011", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 67(91-99), July/August 2011  
<http://bos.sagepub.com/content/67/4/91.full>

<sup>9</sup> Rodney W. Jones, "Pakistan's answer to Cold Start?", *The Friday Times*, Vol. XXXIII No. 13, May 13-19, 2011  
<http://www.thefridaytimes.com/13052011/page7.shtml>

and Zachary S. Davis, Conference Report - *A Decade of Nuclear Learning: Ten Years After the South Asian Nuclear Tests*, The Center for Contemporary Conflict, Naval Postgraduate School, with support of the National Nuclear Security Administration, Honolulu, HI, February 12-13, 2009  
[http://www.nps.edu/Academics/SIGS/ccc/conferences/recent/NuclearLearningMar09\\_rpt.html](http://www.nps.edu/Academics/SIGS/ccc/conferences/recent/NuclearLearningMar09_rpt.html)

<sup>10</sup> Some of this is suggested in Reshmi Kazi, *Pakistan's Nuclear Doctrine and Strategy*, Report of a Seminar held at the IPCS Conference Room on 16 August 2007

[http://www.ipcs.org/article\\_details.php?articleNo=2361](http://www.ipcs.org/article_details.php?articleNo=2361)

The comments made at the seminar should in this case not be discounted just because they are made by Indian observers, because here they do actually explain rather well what appears to be happening in the Pakistani nuclear program, and the logic behind the expansion and shift from vulnerability to an extensive arsenal which addresses the different levels of deterrence and even nuclear first use, including against India's Cold Start strategy, as well as first strike and survivable assured destruction second strike issues.

theater nuclear weapons, thus reinforcing deterrence to dissuade India from launching such an assault in the first place. The emphasis on the missile program, including the development, testing and deployment of nuclear capable strategic ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, tactical missiles and MRL's, would indicate a displacement to a degree of the air deliverable capability, due to its possible vulnerability to an Indian first strike, and to its weakness as a credible survivable second strike force because of India's air defense capabilities. Some observers believe that Pakistan's command and control structure is far more effective than India's, which is believed to be cumbersome and inefficient in comparison, due to the greater adherence to principles of civilian oversight, control and authorization, and the involvement of civilian individuals and institutions in these;<sup>11</sup> but it is suggested here that this could be a misleading illusion, and alleged Indian inefficiency not relevant in this case.

Another fundamental element inherent in the Indian-Pakistani security relationship, in both the greater perspective and in the specifics of force buildups, deployments and doctrines – is the discrepancy regarding the way each side views the relationship. India's is said to be a fundamentally optimistic outlook, believing that, given a more or less healthy world economy, opportunities can be exploited for the betterment of the national destiny. The economic boom of recent years, the massive expansion of the previously almost non-existent middle class, with the growth potential that this signals, and India's almost automatic military dominance against external threats (less vis a vis the PRC, which is a separate, but not currently acute, adversary) – all bear witness to this *weltanschauung*. India's aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines, and space capabilities – virtually none of which Pakistan possesses – bear witness to India's goals, standing and horizons, and poignantly to the sharp discrepancies between the two states. To the point, Indian strategic thinking holds, or strongly implies, that stability is guaranteed by the fact that India will always maintain a significant escalation dominance edge over Pakistan, thus deterring Pakistan from any major escalation, and from any risky behavior that could upset the stability, or deterrence stability, thus established.

Contrarily, the Pakistani *weltanschauung* is the almost complete negative, and involves fundamental repudiation of the Indian perspectives. To begin with, Pakistan does not enjoy the optimism that India enjoys for an economic, social, and political democratic expansion. Neither is it, or is it going to be, invited to hold a permanent seat on an expanded United Nations Security Council, as is India. Economically, demographically, socially, and politically, Pakistan has no real prospects for a positive surge – some observers cruelly label Pakistan a "failed state", although this may be carrying things a bit far. Moreover, to the point, Pakistani strategic belief fundamentally and thoroughly rejects the Indian notion that stability is ensured by a permanent Indian edge and escalation dominance. Thus Pakistan is in a constant, decades-long, quest to close the gap with India, thus to abolish the latter's inherent and permanent escalation dominance, and to overcome, and supersede, it. The current Pakistani effort to increase its nuclear weapons arsenal, in both numbers and delivery capabilities, is clearly evidence of this. In the Pakistani *weltanschauung* so long as India enjoys such an escalation dominance and strategic edge, stability can only be established on India's terms – repugnant as they are to Pakistan. Thus, the inherent condition dictates an infinite arms race between the two, whereby India is trying to keep up with the PRC and to maintain an unequivocal escalation dominance edge over Pakistan, so as to establish and ensure deterrence stability as India defines it; and Pakistan is unwavering in its constant determination to close the gap with India, and to establish deterrence stability by superimposing its own version of escalation dominance over India, hence the dual thrust of its current nuclear weapons expansion program and its outright rejection of any notion of

---

<sup>11</sup> Zachary S. Davis, op. cit., Conference Report - *A Decade of Nuclear Learning*.



"no first use". Thus, Pakistani perceptions imply that stability, including nuclear deterrence stability, must be ensured by Pakistan enjoying escalation dominance – not India, which cannot be trusted.

The emotional charge inherent in Pakistan's posture, including, or especially, its first use doctrine, reinforces the credibility of its threats. This includes the combined effect of religion and nationalism, i.e. fierce anti-Hinduism and anti-Indian sentiment derived of both indoctrination and perceived grievances. For example, A.Q. Khan's fierce despising of anything Indian or Hindu is well-documented, and could be traced to his youth experiences as a refugee from his birth province of Indian Punjab; he has also made virulent comments about America, the Jews and Israel, and all of these sentiments could well be an expression by a national hero of a widely held consensus. Thus, fierce hatred, mixed with a degree of paranoia and fear of extinction, serves to boost the credibility of deterrence. So its not just capabilities, but resolve too, derived of a multiplicity of drivers of rational, cultural – perhaps including religious identity, emotional or psychological qualities.<sup>12</sup>

## Chapter Three:

### The Threat of Loss of Control over Pakistan's Nuclear Assets to Islamic Mainstream and / or Extremist Islamist (/ "Jihadi") Elements

---

As regards the Pakistani nuclear arsenal and the problem of its takeover, in part or in whole, by Islamic or Islamist organizations, the problem is in four respects:<sup>13</sup>

1. the possibility, currently widely viewed as unlikely, that established Muslim parties, like the JI or JUI, could gain control of the deployed nuclear arsenal through a democratic or semi-democratic process, by aligning a coalition with other parties, including civilian secular ones and / or extremist Islamist factions, thus displacing military control of the country – the example of Egypt's political evolution could serve as a precedent for such a process, with mainline Islamic parties leading the way to prevail and oversee a further Islamization, with more radical parties buttressing or goading them towards policies that may be even more disconcerting to Western perceptions; or through the "implosion of the Pakistani state" scenario;
2. a cataclysmic event that might propel extremist Islamist elements to the fore, be they today minute or marginal as they may; the Afghan and Iranian examples show how extremist revolutionaries can carry the day, even if their mass constituencies are nuanced in flavor – extremists are the ones willing to use the most brutal means to gain ascendancy;<sup>14</sup>
3. an intrusion by extremist Islamic elements into the Pakistani security establishment, its systematic takeover, or systemic undermining of its integrity, leading to the gaining of unauthorized control of

---

<sup>12</sup> One recent exploration of the complexities and many aspects of maintaining nuclear stability between India and Pakistan is Sumit Ganguly and S. Paul Kapur, *India, Pakistan, and the Bomb: Debating Nuclear Stability in South Asia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010. Ganguly reaches generally optimistic conclusions, while Kapur is pessimistic, and concerned.

<sup>13</sup> Some of these are touched upon in Shaun Gregory, *The Security of Nuclear Weapons in Pakistan*. Bradford, UK: Pakistan Security Research Unit, University of Bradford, UK, Brief Number 22, 18<sup>th</sup> November 2007;

[http://spaces.brad.ac.uk:8080/download/attachments/748/Brief\\_22finalised.pdf](http://spaces.brad.ac.uk:8080/download/attachments/748/Brief_22finalised.pdf)

and Ian Bremmer & Maria Kuusisto, *Pakistan's Nuclear Command and Control: Perception Matters*. London: South Asian Strategic Stability Institute, SASSI Research Report 15, May 2008.

<http://www.sassu.org.uk/html/Pakistan%20Nuclear%20Command%20and%20Control%20Final.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> Arguably, the Jacobins, Bolsheviks and Nazis are more historical examples of how initially eccentric minute marginal groups may expand to capture the middle ground, and then gain domination by eliminating more moderate elements by sheer brutality.

nuclear weapons, pilfering of nuclear bombs or warheads, or in a worst case scenario unauthorized use against a variety of likely targets. Many informed observers highlight the fact that individuals with intense Islamic identities, and sympathy with radical Islamic groups, are already increasingly evident within the Pakistani military, its officer corps, and also in the more sensitive security organizations, such as the ISI; it is not known what their proportion may be in the forces forming the guardianship of Pakistan's nuclear weapons and other nuclear assets, but they may be on the increase there too;

4. outright theft of a single nuclear warhead, or of more than one nuclear warhead, perhaps with inside assistance, and use thereof, by extremist elements or terrorist organizations (if used against India, this could precipitate a regional nuclear war).

According to one report, at least one testimony reflects the fact that a radical Islamic organization in Pakistan (*Hezbat Tahrir*, or *Hizb ut-Tahrir* – HT) wanted to take control of the state specifically so as to be in possession of its nuclear arsenal – this is current to 1999, and it can only be assumed that the subject has developed since.<sup>15</sup> Tayyib Muqeem, reported to be the *Hizb ut-Tahrir* leader in Lahore, is quoted as saying in 2009 that the group was prepared to bring the Islamic caliphate to power by "waging war".<sup>16</sup> The jihadist media outlet Omar, which functions under the aegis of the Pakistani Taliban, published a video clip by the top Taliban commander in Mohmand, one of Pakistan's restive tribal agencies, Sheikh Omar Khaled Al-Khurasani, titled "The History of the Taliban in Pakistan". In it, Al-Khurasani reviews motives and milestones in the establishment of the Taliban in Pakistan. He then warns the Pakistani regime against retaliating against the Taliban or his Agency, calls for the implementation of shari'a [Islamic law], and asserts the Taliban's aim of controlling Pakistan's nuclear weapons and establishing a worldwide caliphate.<sup>17</sup>

Numerous references exist to the effect that the radical Islamist organizations view the nuclear arsenal (of Pakistan) as an asset of the *umma* to be used as may be fit – whether for deterrence, defense, or potentially any other use that will be viewed as legitimate vis a vis the threat of the *kuffar* (the infidel), including with regard to the Western usurpation of the *umma*, the Islamic domain and its peoples, be they wherever they may (including the Middle East, the Islamic heartland). The possession of nuclear weapons is presented first and above all as a necessary requirement for Muslims to have the same weapons as those available to those who will ill towards Muslims, or could serve to kill Muslims.

Osama Bin Laden's references to nuclear weapons, and other weapons of mass destruction, lead to the conclusion that they thus could be wielded, and even used, for a multitude of purposes – such as to revenge past injustices, retribution, deterrence, or, perhaps most significantly, in the service of an anti-status-quo agenda to achieve victory for the believers over the enemy. According to one report, in 1998, Osama bin Laden issued a statement entitled "The Nuclear Bomb of Islam," under the banner of the "International Islamic Front for Fighting the Jews and Crusaders," in which he stated that "it is the duty of Muslims to prepare as much force as possible to terrorize the enemies of God."<sup>18</sup> It is noteworthy, not to

---

<sup>15</sup> Maajid Nawaz, "Islamism and the nuclear bomb", *The Friday Times*, Vol. XXIII, No. 27, August 19-25, 2011  
<http://www.thefridaytimes.com/beta2/tft/article.php?issue=20110819&page=4>

<sup>16</sup> UPI report from Lahore, July 6, 2009  
[http://www.upi.com/Top\\_News/Special/2009/07/06/Hizb-ut-Tahrir-set-for-coup-in-Pakistan/UPI-29551246906267/](http://www.upi.com/Top_News/Special/2009/07/06/Hizb-ut-Tahrir-set-for-coup-in-Pakistan/UPI-29551246906267/)

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.ict.org.il/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=uKtn6FAOkh8%3d&tabid=344>

<sup>18</sup> The following is an excerpt on Al-Qaeda and Bin Laden's references to nuclear weapons, taken from Ben N. Venzke and Aimee Ibrahim, *al-Qaeda Tactic/Target Brief*, v.1.5, 14 June 2002. Alexandria, VA: Intel Center.  
<http://www.intelcenter.com/QaedaTacticTarget-v1-5.pdf>

- ABC News interview with Osama bin Laden in Dec. 1998 when asked about chemical weapons and efforts to obtain nuclear material: "In answer I would say that acquiring weapons for the defense of Muslims is a religious duty. To seek to possess the weapons that could counter those of the infidels is a religious duty. If I have indeed acquired these weapons, then this is an

say alarming, that Bin Laden is viewed by the Pakistani Jihadists as a pioneer in defining the Islamic right to weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, because of the relatively close connections of the Pakistani groups to those of the Bin Laden and Al Qaeda milieus. The involvement of two members of the Pakistani nuclear establishment with Bin Laden and Al Qaeda in 2000 and 2001 is often cited as an alarming indication of this connection, as is the evidence about Al Qaeda's efforts to acquire mass destruction weapons capabilities (nuclear, chemical, biological or radiological) exposed in Afghanistan. According to other reports, at least six Pakistani nuclear scientists met with Bin Laden and Ayman Zawahiri.<sup>19</sup> But, in truth, it is rather the theological and ideological grounding of the justification for the possession, and use, of nuclear weapons submitted by Bin Laden, and possibly others of similar persuasion or stature in Pakistan, which is the far more significant and disturbing aspect of these developments.<sup>20</sup> They reflect, project and potentially carry over to a scenario of loss of control to any coalition in which Sunni Jihadi elements may play a role down the road.

There is an evident multiplicity of extremist groups operating in Pakistan, and their specific thinking on the nuclear issue is not available. While these groups have wide-ranging specific agendas, they do all harbor essentially common fundamental beliefs when it comes to the roles that nuclear weapons – or weapons of mass destruction more generally – have to serve in the struggle of Islam against the West and its agents.<sup>21</sup>

Many or most of the groups or organizations are minuscule, or ad hoc alignments of several groups to address specific issues on which common ground is found. *Lashkar-e-Taiba* (LeT) is the most significant in many ways, most powerful, and most organized of these; it is recognized to have linkages to the Pakistani establishment, through its connections with ISI, either organizationally, or through the influence of individuals who support it and are established within the Pakistani security establishment organizations.<sup>22</sup>

---

obligation I carried out and I thank God for enabling us to do that. And if I seek to acquire these weapons I am carrying out a duty. It would be a sin for Muslims not to try to possess the weapons that would prevent the infidels from inflicting harm on Muslims. But how we could use these weapons if we possess them is up to us."

- al-Muhajiroun leader Sheikh Omar Bakri Mohammed has issued fatwa stating it was permissible to use nuclear weapons in a defensive jihad.

- Osama bin Laden in interview with the Pakistani daily *Dawn* published 10 Nov. 2001: "I wish to declare that if America used chemical or nuclear weapons against us then we may retort with chemical and nuclear weapons. We have the weapons as a deterrent."

- US soldiers in Afghanistan found discarded documents in the abandoned house of an alleged al-Qaeda operative. These documents included a 25-page document filled with information about nuclear weapons including a design for a nuclear weapon.

- According to an IAEA report: "In Oct. 2000, an official of Russia's Security Council confirmed that Russia had blocked a Taliban effort to recruit a former Soviet nuclear expert from a Central Asian state."

- In 1998, Mamdouh Mahmud Salim was arrested in Germany for reportedly attempting to obtain highly enriched uranium in the mid-1990s.

- **On or about 29 May 1998, Osama bin Laden issued a statement entitled "The Nuclear Bomb of Islam," under the banner of the "International Islamic Front for Fighting the Jews and Crusaders," in which he stated that "it is the duty of Muslims to prepare as much force as possible to terrorize the enemies of God."**

<sup>19</sup> Subodh Atal, "Extremist, Nuclear Pakistan: An Emerging Threat?" in *Policy Analysis*, (CATO Institute, Washington, D.C.) No. 472, March 5, 2003, p. 5 & fn. 46

<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa472.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> Another interesting report alleges that Jihadi internet forums have begun to examine the possibility of controlling Pakistan's nuclear weapons, urged to do so by a senior al-Qaeda ideologue, in Abdul Hameed Bakier, "Jihadis Discuss Plans to Seize Pakistan's Nuclear Arsenal", *Terrorism Monitor*, The Jamestown Foundation, May 26, 2009;

[http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no\\_cache=1&tx\\_ttnews%5Btt\\_news%5D=35031](http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=35031)

and quoted in *NTI Pakistan Profile* (Monterey, CA: Center for Nonproliferation Studies), updated February 2011

<http://www.nti.org/country-profiles/pakistan/nuclear/>

<sup>21</sup> A very useful list is *Terrorist and Extremist Groups of Pakistan*, South Asia Terrorism Portal, Institute for Conflict Management (New Delhi); the original list is dated 2001, but the details on the different groups (each opening by link) is regularly updated, currently to 2012 (for example for LeT and TTP, to name just two of them)

[http://www.satp.org/satporgetp/countries/pakistan/terroristoutfits/group\\_list.htm](http://www.satp.org/satporgetp/countries/pakistan/terroristoutfits/group_list.htm)

<sup>22</sup> A most thorough account of Lashkar-e-Taiba is Stephen Tankel's *Storming the World Stage: the Story of Lashkar-e-Taiba*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011. ***Tankel's account, although focused on LeT, explains most enlighteningly and exhaustively the origins, development, agenda and idiosyncrasies of each of the many other groups of interest, other than LeT, and of their***

The perceptions of the diverse groups regarding the utility of Pakistan's nuclear assets, should they ever acquire control of some or all of them, or even influence over their wielding or use – may also be seen as a by-product of their specific ideologies or *weltanschauung*, which is more readily identified than particular expressions of their leaderships in reference to nuclear weapons<sup>23</sup>. [Appendix 1 suggests in table form a contrast between state and anti-state groups' perceptions of the practical utility of nuclear possession, including the idea that nuclear war is not to be feared if it is willed]

Thus, it is clear that there are various shadings as to the potential consequences of different Islamic groups taking control of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal, weapons or assets. A firm takeover by the mainstream Islamic party, the JI, is one thing, and hopefully might lead to a relatively stable transfer of power and control over the nuclear assets, while deterrence stability might remain high on the agenda. Were more radical parties, such as JUI, to join in sharing power with the JI, this could potentially create a permanent threat to deterrence stability as regards Pakistan's nuclear assertiveness, or the level of volatility. Anything more extreme would create grave doubts concerning the security of Pakistan's nuclear weapons, and other nuclear assets, such as weapons grade fissile material production facilities and stocks, delivery systems or other assorted lower level nuclear materials that could be filched to make "dirty bombs".

At the moment, not only are the "Jihadi" groups marginal, but they are often in competition with each other; competition between them could be either, on the one hand, beneficial to stability, as no group is able to prevail over the others for control of the Pakistani state or of its nuclear assets; on the other hand, this rivalry could theoretically inspire a competition to prove which group is the most devoted to the ideas of Jihad, the Caliphate, and so on, and thus increase the danger of actual use of nuclear weapons against an "infidel" enemy – India, the US, its perceived agents or interests, and Israel, would probably top the list of those, in that order.

Each of the sectors representing control over Pakistan's nuclear assets is thus worthy of special attention, to prevent their respective devolution into either unauthorized or potentially destabilizing hands. The current situation is reported to be of some concern, even as security appears to be relatively high, at least until a critical mass of infiltration by Islamic or Islamist / "Jihadi" elements occurs – either through the recruitment of individuals with association or sympathy with them, or by deliberate organized initiative on the part of such groups. Thus the sectors of concern are:

1. the nuclear command structure;
2. the forces constituting the guardianship of Pakistan's nuclear weapons – the warheads, wherever they may be, and
3. those pertaining to their delivery systems, and the chain links between the two;

---

**Islamic school of thought (eg. Deobandi or Ahl-e Hadith).** It is from this common ground that a potential threat to the control of Pakistan's nuclear assets might be evolving.

A much abridged version is Stephen Tankel, *Lashkar-e-Taiba: Past Operations and Future Prospects*. Washington, DC: New America Foundation, April 2011.

[http://newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/Tankel\\_LeT\\_0.pdf](http://newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/Tankel_LeT_0.pdf)

<sup>23</sup>Another source on the multiplicity of Jihadi elements is Nicholas Howenstein, *The Jihadi Terrain in Pakistan: An Introduction to the Sunni Jihadi Groups in Pakistan and Kashmir*. Bradford, UK: Pakistan Security Research Unit, University of Bradford, UK, Research Report 1, 5<sup>th</sup> February 2008.

[http://humansecuritygateway.com/documents/PSRU\\_JihadiTerrain\\_Pakistan.pdf](http://humansecuritygateway.com/documents/PSRU_JihadiTerrain_Pakistan.pdf)

Also, Jayshree Bajoria, *Pakistan's New Generation of Terrorists*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, updated Dec. 9, 2011

<http://www.cfr.org/pakistan/pakistans-new-generation-terrorists/p15422>

4. the security forces responsible for screening and oversight of the above mentioned forces, including the ISI or other internal security organs;
5. the intelligence community, including the ISI, insofar as it is responsible for both assessing and directing the impact of operations that are likely to lead to escalation, whether against India or against other potentially targeted forces (such as US forces in the region; Pakistani army forces loyal to the military rulers);
6. the work force associated with the weaponization process;
7. the work force associated with weapons grade fissile material production;
8. the forces responsible for the transportation and guarding in transit of all of the above;
9. the forces responsible for the physical security of all of the above;
10. the work force with access to lower levels of nuclear materials which might be unnoticeably diverted to Jihadi elements for the assembly of a "dirty bomb" – one, more than one, or many of them;
11. the Pakistani military in general, in light of the contingency of its takeover by Islamic, Islamist, radical, extremist or Jihadi elements, and thus of control over the Pakistani state, inducing its transformation to something other than what it has been so far;
12. most generally, trends signifying intensification of signals that Islamic mainstream forces (the JI) are in collusion with more extreme groups in an attempt to unite to take over Pakistan's political institutions by democratic or semi-democratic means (in similar manner to what is observed to be occurring in Egypt), and to undermine the military's control – and signs of an impending "implosion of the Pakistani state" scenario, including regional centrifugal energies.

## Conclusion

---

The issue of nuclear deterrence is prominent on the Pakistani agenda, is extensively debated and discussed, perhaps the item at the top of the agenda in many ways for wide sectors of the Pakistani elite and its decision-making processes, and ongoing as such for decades. Pakistan remains the only Islamic nuclear weapons state, and as such an element of Islamic thought about deterrence issues may be salient. The more so as Islamic and Islamist elements gain ground in the Pakistani political environment, in the Pakistani military, in the intelligence and security services, and insofar as they may access the forces responsible for the command, control, deployment, safeguarding, guardianship, and operational activation (targeting, arming, launch) of Pakistan's nuclear assets – weapons, delivery systems, materials, or other nuclear weapons relevant facilities.

Significant resources have been allocated to nuclear and defense postures in a country with stressed resources, which some have labeled a "failed state"; for some of the time it was alleged that these resources were extended to Pakistan by Saudi Arabia in return for intangible and undefined guarantees, perhaps a form of extended deterrence. In the future too, Pakistani nuclear assets are said to potentially stand at Saudi Arabia's disposal, possibly by their deployment to Saudi Arabia, and including the specter, albeit low-probability, of transfer of such assets to Saudi control, under certain circumstances – if regional nuclear proliferation firebreaks are breached (as a result of acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iran).

Pakistan is nominally not in a competitive league with India, in terms of its size, population, resources, its scientific, technological and industrial base, or relative wealth. Historically its nuclear development has lagged decades behind India's, and India's nuclear weapons deterrent posture is supposedly directed at a much more powerful adversary, i.e. the PRC. Still in many ways Pakistan is today viewed as almost an equal, or equal to, or even a more forceful nuclear weapons state, than India; Pakistan's C3 structure is alleged to be far more centralized and effective than India's due to the latter's need to ensure civilian control, a more lax demand when applied to Pakistan – although warning is in order here to the wise that this could well be a misleading illusion, and untrue.

While Indian strategic thinking regarding Pakistan envisages that stability, including nuclear deterrence stability, requires that India always maintain escalation dominance, and a clear edge, over Pakistan – Pakistani thinking inevitably rejects this concept. In Pakistani perceptions, any Indian advantage may signal instability, while stability can only be ensured by Pakistani equality or advantage, including its own escalation dominance capability. Thus Pakistan is inescapably immersed in a constant arms race to keep up with the superior Indian potential, which is fueled by India's quest for superpower-like standing of near-equivalence to the UN Security Council P5, and is anyway directed to establish a credible minimum deterrent pointed in the direction of the PRC, which in turn itself is relentlessly expanding and modernizing its nuclear strike capabilities (the only NPT Nuclear Weapons State not reducing the count of nuclear warheads). In this way, a hopeless race that cannot be won to close the gap is an induced and conceptually superimposed trap.

Given current observed activity in the nuclear field, it appears quite possible that Pakistan is developing great-power-like nuclear capabilities, including first strike, survivable assured destruction second strike, and theater and tactical nuclear warfare fighting capabilities, including deterrence of the adversary (India) from initiating escalating retaliatory strategic nuclear blows beyond theater use.

Accompanying these developments looms the threat, currently evaluated as remote – but subject to revision at any given moment down the road – of Islamic, or radical, or extremist ("Jihadi"), Islamist takeover of either the Pakistani state as a whole, or of elements within the military and security services impacting on the forces in charge of the nuclear arsenal, or of individual nuclear assets, such as one nuclear warhead or more. There is a marked trend of an ever increasing Islamic advance into the Pakistani military and security services, by individuals identifying with Islamist agendas or groups, and concern is on an unmistakably irreversible rise regarding their gaining access into the structures responsible for the guardianship of Pakistan's nuclear assets. Among both the establishment Muslim parties and the radicals or extremists, there is a keen awareness of the special standing of Pakistan as a formidable nuclear weapons power.

The intellectual elaboration regarding the utility of such power for the benefit of the Islamic *umma* is still evolving, but some alarming fundamental expressions are already evident. The theological and ideological foundations regarding such a utility are discernible in definitions provided by Osama Bin Laden, other al-Qaeda figures, and their similarly-thinking sympathizers among the great multiplicity of Pakistani groups. The sum total of this thinking is that nuclear weapons should, or must, be acquired, possessed, wielded, and – *in extremis* – possibly used, against the "enemies of God" and of the Islamic nation, wherever geographically this may be mandated. They may be invoked, or wielded, for deterrence – mainly but not exclusively – or retribution, or as a winning card to achieve victory as commanded or determined by the Almighty or his legitimate emissaries on Earth.

## Appendix: State versus the Anti-State - Divergent Perspectives on Nukes

The following is a table presenting a sharp contrasting of the different attitudes towards nuclear weapons and nuclear war when comparing the perspectives of states on the one hand, and anti-state forces, like the extremist Islamist (or "Jihadi") elements, on the other. It may well represent some valid, poignant and salient observations relevant to the attempt to understand the Islamist views pertaining to possession and use of nuclear weapons, worthy of consideration.<sup>24</sup>

| Statist Perspective  | Anti-state Actor's Perspective  |
|--|---|
| State security and survival is paramount. One of the main prerogatives of state actors is to ensure the maintenance and preservation of their territorial integrity.                   | Islam's spread and survival are of paramount importance. The state security or national survival is irrelevant because the very idea of separate nation-states is an anathema to anti-state actors.   |
| Nuclear weapons are meant to ensure territorial integrity and national independence.   | The nation-state is not indispensable. The destruction of the modern state system may well be a pre-requisite to the creation of Dar-ul-Islam.  |
| Nuclear weapons are to be acquired when the very survival of the nation-state is seen as at stake.   | "It is the religious duty of all Muslims to acquire nuclear, biological and chemical weapons to terrorize the enemies of God" —al-Qa'ida.   |
| Nuclear weapons are weapons of deterrence, not weapons of war.   | All weapons, including WMD, are useable weapons to achieve victory over non-believers and enemies of the faith.   |
| Nuclearization brings an end to mapmaking exercise and freezes the territorial status quo. Nuclear weapons may be of little use in wresting politico-military concessions from others. | Nuclearization paves the way for waging low-cost, low-intensity conflict without fear of retaliation and can help in settling territorial disputes on favorable terms via coercion, subversion and blackmail.   |
| The resolution of the Kashmir dispute will lead to peace, prosperity and stability in South Asia.  | The Kashmir dispute is not about territory; it's about religion and history and its separation from India will bolster the cause of Islamist forces in the region and eventually lead to the unraveling of the Indian state and pave the way for the creation of a pan-Islamic Caliphate. |
| Pakistan's nuclear weapons are India-specific only and are designed to act as a force equalizer to overcome conventional weaknesses vis-à-vis India.                                   | Pakistan's "Islamic bomb" should be used to defend the broader interests of the entire Muslim world.  |
| Nuclear weapons are the "crown jewels" and symbols of a strong state.  | Anti-state movements and actors such as al-Qaeda are not concerned with the status symbols of nuclear weapons; they need weak, failing and war-torn states to thrive and accomplish their objectives.   |
| A nuclear war must never be fought. The taboo on the non-use of nukes must not be broken.  | There is absolutely nothing to fear from a nuclear war.   |

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to my teacher, colleague and friend Yaakov Y.I. Vertzberger of the Hebrew University for his patient explanations and referrals to some of the items cited here.

<sup>24</sup> The table is copied here as it appears in Mohan Malik, "The Stability of Nuclear Deterrence in South Asia: The Clash between State and Anti-state Actors", in *Religious Radicalism and Security in South Asia*. Honolulu, Hawaii: Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, 2004 (APCSS), Ch. 13, p. 344  
<http://www.apcss.org/Publications/Edited%20Volumes/ReligiousRadicalism/PagesfromReligiousRadicalismAndSecurityinSouthAsia%20ch13.pdf>