



**Not everybody can get their hands on the President's Daily Brief.
Now, there's something for the rest of us.**

Situation Report, FP's new daily national security newsletter. Be the first to sign up. [CLICK HERE](#)

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2012

FOLLOW [f](#) [RSS](#) [t](#)

FP National Security

Race to the End

Pakistan's terrible, horrible, no-good, very bad idea to develop battlefield nukes.

BY TOM HUNDLEY | SEPTEMBER 5, 2012



ISLAMABAD — One of the more tenacious conspiracy theories that have taken root in the hothouse of Pakistan's capital is that Osama bin Laden was not killed in the May 2, 2011, Navy SEAL raid on his compound in Abbottabad -- that, in fact, he had already been dead for years, killed in the caves of Tora Bora.

According to this theory, the CIA had been keeping bin Laden's corpse on ice, literally, ready to be resurrected at a moment when his "death" could better serve U.S. interests. That moment came when the SEALs decided to conduct a dry run of their long-planned operation to snatch Pakistan's nuclear weapons. Bin Laden's thawing corpse was brought along as cover in case the exercise blew up -- and as a devious bit of political theater to besmirch Pakistan's reputation if all went well.

What keep conspiracy theories like this alive are bits and pieces of half-baked evidence that could be construed to support a deeply held belief. In this case, it is the belief -- accepted across the board in Pakistan, from the top brass of its military down to the dusty gaggle of taxi drivers who awaited me each morning outside my Islamabad hotel -- that the United States has a not-so-secret plan to snatch Pakistan's nuclear arsenal.

The United States, which is duly concerned that Pakistan's nukes could fall into the wrong hands, almost certainly does have a plan to neutralize those weapons in the event of a coup or total state collapse. When the question was put to Condoleezza Rice during her 2005 confirmation hearings to become secretary of state, she replied, "We have noted this problem, and we are prepared to try to deal with it."

"Try" is the key word. Military experts -- American, Pakistani, and Indian -- agree that grabbing or disarming all of Pakistan's nukes at this stage would be something close to mission impossible. As one senior Pakistani general told me, "We look at the stories in the U.S. media about taking away our nuclear weapons and this definitely concerns us, so countermeasures have been developed accordingly." Such steps have included building more warheads and

spreading them out over a larger number of heavily guarded locations. This, of course, also makes the logistics of securing them against theft by homegrown terrorists that much more complicated.

Fears of that terrifying possibility were heightened in August, when a group of militants assaulted a Pakistani base that some believe houses nuclear weapons components. Nine militants and one soldier were killed in a two-hour firefight at the Kamra air force base. The local media immediately floated the theory that this, too, was part of the American plot to steal Pakistan's nukes. But more disturbing than any conspiracy theory is the reality that this was the fourth attack in five years on the Kamra base, just 20 miles from the capital. At least five other sensitive military installations have also come under attack by militants since 2007.

Yet, though the danger of a loose Pakistani nuke certainly deserves scrupulous attention, it may not be the severest nuclear threat emanating from South Asia, as I came to realize after interviewing more than a dozen experts in Pakistan, India, and the United States this summer. Since the 9/11 attacks, preventing the world's most dangerous weapons from falling into the hands of the world's most dangerous actors -- whether al Qaeda terrorists or Iranian mullahs -- has understandably been America's stated priority. Yet the gravest danger -- not only for the region, but for the United States itself -- may be the South Asian incarnation of a Cold War phenomenon: a nuclear arms race.

Pakistan, with an estimated 90 to 120 warheads, is now believed to be churning out more plutonium than any other country on the planet -- thanks to two Chinese-built reactors that are now online, a third that is undergoing trials, and a fourth that is scheduled to become operational by 2016. It has already passed India in total number of warheads and is on course to overtake Britain as the world's No. 5 nuclear power. Pakistan could end up in third place, behind Russia and the United States, within a decade.

This April, Pakistan tested a short-range ballistic missile, the Hatf IX, a so-called "shoot and scoot" battlefield nuclear weapon aimed at deterring an invasion by India's conventional forces. This development carries two disturbing implications. First, Pakistan now has the know-how to build nuclear warheads compact enough to fit on the tip of a small missile or inside a suitcase (handy for terrorists). Second, Pakistan has adopted a war-fighting doctrine that does not preclude nuking its own territory in the event of an Indian incursion -- a dubious first in the annals of deterrence theory.

India, meanwhile, has just tested its first long-range ballistic missile, the Agni-V, with a range of 3,100 miles. In April, the Indian Navy added a new Russian-made nuclear-powered submarine to its fleet and is now building its own nuclear subs. One has already been launched and will enter service next year, and India is determined to add submarine-launched ballistic missiles to its arsenal. This puts India on the verge of joining the elite nuclear "triad" club -- states with the ability to survive a first strike by an adversary and deliver a retaliatory strike by land, sea, or air.

India has also said that it has successfully tested an anti-ballistic missile shield that could be deployed "in a short time" to protect New Delhi and Mumbai. The downside of this defensive measure -- putting aside the question of effectiveness -- is that it invites an adversary to build many more warheads in the hope that a few will be able to slip through the shield.

India claims that it is not really engaged in an arms race -- or that, if it is, its opponent is not Pakistan, but China, a nuclear-armed superpower and economic rival with which it shares a disputed border. The Agni-V was dubbed the "China-killer" in some overheated Indian headlines. China's nuclear ambitions are geared toward deterring the United States and Russia, but it obligingly stirs the pot in South Asia by providing Pakistan with plutonium reactors -- in flagrant violation of its obligations as a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group.

Meanwhile, through a 2008 deal negotiated by George W. Bush's administration, the United States has given India access to nuclear fuel on the international market. In the past, India had been barred from such trade because the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty does not consider its nuclear weapons program legitimate, and its limited supplies of domestic uranium forced it to choose between powering its reactors and building more nuclear weapons. "Power production was the priority; now they can have both," explained Toby Dalton, deputy director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

With both sides armed to the teeth, it is easy to exaggerate the fears and much harder to pinpoint where the real dangers lie. For the United States, the nightmare scenario is that some of Pakistan's warheads or its fissile material falls into the hands of the Taliban or al Qaeda -- or, worse, that the whole country falls into the hands of the Taliban. For example, Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, a former CIA officer now at Harvard University's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, **has warned of** the "lethal proximity between terrorists, extremists, and nuclear weapons insiders" in Pakistan. This is a reality, but on the whole, Pakistan's nuclear arsenal appears to be reasonably secure against internal threats, according to those who know the country best.

To outsiders, Pakistan appears to be permanently teetering on the brink of collapse. The fact that large swaths of the country are literally beyond the control of the central government is not reassuring. But a weak state does not mean a weak society, and powerful internal dynamics based largely on kinship and tribe make it highly unlikely that Pakistan would ever fall under the control of an outfit like the Taliban. During the country's intermittent bouts of democracy, its civilian leaders have been consistently incompetent and corrupt, but even in the worst of times, the military has maintained a high standard of professionalism. And there is nothing that matters more to the Pakistani military than keeping the nuclear arsenal -- its crown jewels -- out of the hands of India, the United States, and homegrown extremists.

"Pakistan struggled to acquire these weapons against the wishes of the world. Our nuclear capability comes as a result of great sacrifice. It is our most precious and powerful weapon -- for our defense, our security, and our political prestige," Talat Masood, a retired Pakistani lieutenant general, told me. "We keep them safe."

Pakistan's nuclear security is in the responsibility of the Strategic Plans Division, which appears to function pretty much as a separate branch of the military. It has its own training facility and an elaborate set of controls and screening procedures to keep track of all warheads and fissile material and to monitor any blips in the behavior patterns of its personnel. The 15 or so sites where weapons are stored are the mostly heavily guarded in the country. Even if some group managed to steal or commandeer a weapon, it is highly unlikely the group would be able to use it. The greater danger is the theft of fissile material, which could be used to make a crude bomb. "With 70 to 80 kilos of highly enriched uranium, it would be fairly easy to make one in the basement of a building in the city of your choice," said Pervez Hoodbhoy, a distinguished nuclear physicist at Islamabad's Quaid-i-Azam University. At the moment, Pakistan has a stockpile of about 2.75 tons -- or some 30 bombs' worth -- of highly enriched uranium. It does not tell Americans where it is stored.

"All nuclear countries are conscious of the risks, nuclear weapons states especially so," said Gen. Ehsan ul-Haq, who speaks with the been-there-done-that authority of a man who has served as both chairman of Pakistan's Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee and head of the ISI, its controversial spy agency. "Of course there are concerns. Some are genuine, but much of what you read in the U.S. media is irrational and reflective of paranoia. Rising radicalism in Pakistan? Yes, this is true, and the military is very conscious of this."

Perhaps the most credible endorsement of Pakistan's nuclear security regime comes from its most steadfast enemy. The consensus among India's top generals and defense experts is that Pakistan's nukes are pretty secure. "No one can be 100 percent secure, but I think they are more than 99 percent secure," said Shashindra Tyagi, a former chief of staff of the Indian Air Force. "They keep a very close watch on personnel. All of the steps that could be taken have been taken. This business of the Taliban taking over -- it can't be ruled out, but I think it's unlikely. The Pakistani military understands the threats they face better than anyone, and they are smart enough to take care it."

Yogesh Joshi, an analyst at the Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses in New Delhi, agrees: "Different states have different perceptions of risk. The U.S. has contingency plans [to secure Pakistan's nukes] because its nightmare scenario is that Pakistan's weapons fall into terrorist hands. The view from India over the years is that Pakistan, probably more than any other nuclear weapons state, has taken measures to secure its weapons. At the political level here, there's a lot of confidence that Pakistan's nuclear weapons are secure."

The greater concern -- not only for India and Pakistan, but for the United States and everyone else -- may be the direct competition between the two South Asian states. True, in terms of numbers and destructive capacity, the arms buildup in South Asia does not come close to what was going on during the Cold War, when the United States and the Soviet Union built enough bombs to destroy the planet many times over. India and Pakistan have enough to destroy it only once, perhaps twice.

But in many ways, the arms race in South Asia is more dangerous. The United States and the Soviet Union were rival superpowers jockeying for influence and advantage on the global stage, but these were also two countries that had never gone to war with each other, that had a vast physical and psychological separation between them, that generally steered clear of direct provocations, and that eventually had mechanisms in place (like the famous hotline between Moscow and Washington) to make sure little misunderstandings didn't grow into monstrous miscalculations.

By contrast, the India-Pakistan rivalry comes with all the venom and vindictiveness of a messy divorce, which, of course, it is. The two countries have officially fought three wars against each other since their breakup in 1947 and have had numerous skirmishes and close calls since then. They have a festering territorial dispute in Kashmir. The 1999 Kargil conflict, waged a year after both countries went overtly nuclear, may have come closer to the nuclear brink than even the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. At the height of the showdown, there was credible intelligence that both sides were readying their nuclear arsenals for deployment.

Pakistan lost all three of these wars. Its very large army is still only half the size of India's, whose military budget is more than seven times larger than Pakistan's. Pakistan's generals are well aware that in any all-out conventional confrontation with India, they're toast. The guiding ideology of Pakistan's Army -- from the generals on down to their drivers -- is that India represents a permanent existential threat. This is why Pakistan clings to its nukes and attempts to maintain at least the illusion of what its generals call "bilateral balance."

This conventional asymmetry increases the danger of the nuclear arms race -- it feeds India's hubris and Pakistan's sense of failure. Here are two countries headed in opposite directions. India's \$1.7 trillion economy is eight times the size of Pakistan's and has grown at an enviable 8.2 percent annually over the last three years, compared to just 3.3 percent for Pakistan. India is in the forefront of the digital revolution, and while the country's leaders were embarrassed by this summer's massive two-day blackout, Pakistan's broken-down infrastructure struggles to provide citizens with more than a few hours of electricity each day. India, the world's largest democracy, is on the cusp of becoming a global power; Pakistan, with its on-and-off military dictatorships (off at the moment), ranks 13th on **Foreign Policy's** most recent **Failed States Index**.

More significant than these statistics is the mindset behind them. India is brimming with confidence. Pakistan is hobbled by fear, paranoia, and a deep sense of inferiority. India's major cities, New Delhi and Mumbai, are modernizing global metropolises. Checking into the Marriott in Pakistan's capital is like

checking into a maximum-security prison -- high walls topped with razor wire, armed guards in watchtowers. Islamabad today looks and feels like a city under siege where there could be a coup at any moment. Soldiers and checkpoints are everywhere. It felt this way the first time I visited, in 1985.

This economic and cultural lopsidedness is strikingly reflected in the countries' nuclear competition.

In perhaps no other major power is the military quite so submissive to civilian authority as it is in India. "The civilian side lords it over the military in a manner that often borders on humiliation -- and there is no pushback from the military," said Ashley Tellis, an India expert with the Carnegie Endowment. The reasons for this are rooted in India's long struggle for independence against a colonial master that filled the ranks of its police and army with natives. "The military was seen as a force that served a colonial occupier," said Tellis. With the Indian officer corps' fondness for whiskey, mustaches, and other Britishisms, "the nationalist leadership looked at them as aliens" and took extreme measures to make sure there would be no coups.

From a nuclear standpoint, the result of this dynamic is a command-and-control system that is firmly in the hands of the civilian political leadership, a clearly stated "no first use" policy, and a view that nukes are political weapons -- a way to project global power and prestige -- not viable war-fighting tools.

In theory, Pakistan's nuclear trigger is also in civilian hands. A body called the National Command Authority, headed by the prime minister, is supposed to be the ultimate decider of whether to initiate a nuclear attack. In reality, however, it is the military that controls the process from top to bottom. Pakistan has never formally stated its nuclear doctrine, preferring to keep the Indians guessing as to when and where it might use nukes. But now it appears to be contemplating the idea of actually using tactical nuclear weapons in a confrontation with India.

The problem with this delicate state of affairs is not simply the two countries' history of war, but Pakistan's tactic of hiding behind its nuclear shield while allowing terrorist groups to launch proxy attacks against India. The 2001 attack on India's Parliament building and the 2008 Mumbai attack are the most egregious examples. Both were carried out by Lashkar-e-Taiba militants based in Pakistan with well-established links to the ISI and were far more provocative than anything the Americans or Russians dished out to each other during the four decades of the Cold War. (More than 160 people were killed in the attack that held India's largest city hostage for 60 hours.) Terrorism is the classic underdog tactic, but Pakistan is certainly the world's first nuclear-armed underdog to successfully apply the tactic against a nuclear rival.

India has been struggling to respond. "For 15 years this country is bleeding from attack after attack, and there is nothing we can do," said Raja Mohan of the Observer Research Foundation, a New Delhi think tank. "The attacks correlate directly to Pakistan's acquisition of nuclear weapons. From the moment they got nukes, they saw it as an opportunity they could exploit. And India has no instruments to punish Pakistan or change its behavior."

There are encouraging signs that Pakistan may be rethinking this tactic, realizing that over the long run the Taliban and others of its ilk pose a far greater danger to Pakistan than to India. The relentless succession of suicide bombings and attacks on police and military bases and a costly war to wrest control of the Swat Valley from the Taliban seem to have finally convinced Pakistan's military that, in the words of one general, "the threat today is internal, and if it is not pushed back and neutralized, it will continue to expand its influence and we will have an Afghanistan situation inside our own country." But even if the ISI is sincere about ending its relationship with jihadi proxies, India's military planners are still searching for an appropriate weapon with which to punish Pakistan in the event of "another Mumbai."

The problem for India is that even though it holds a huge advantage in conventional forces, its mobilization process is ponderously slow. This shortcoming was humiliatingly exposed after the 2001 attack on the Parliament building, when it took the Indian Army about three weeks to deploy for a retaliatory strike -- enough time for the United States to step in and cool tempers on both sides. A potential nuclear crisis had been averted, but in 2004, India, still smarting from its inability to retaliate, announced a new war-fighting doctrine dubbed "Cold Start," which called for the capability to conduct a series of cross-border lightning strikes within 72 hours. The idea was not to hold territory or threaten the existence of the Pakistani state, but to use overwhelming firepower to deliver a punishing blow that would fall short of provoking a nuclear response.

Pakistan's reaction -- or overreaction -- was to double down on developing its short-range battlefield nuclear weapon, the Hatf IX. Any incursion from India would be met with a nuclear response even if it meant Pakistan had to nuke its own territory. "What one fears is that with the testing of these short-range nuclear missiles -- five in the last couple of months -- this seems to indicate a seriousness about using theater nuclear weapons," said Hoodbhoy, the physicist.

While strategists on both sides debate whether the Hatf IX, with a range of 60 kilometers and a mobile multibarrel launch system, would be enough to stop an advancing column of Indian tanks -- Hoodbhoy argues that "smaller, sub-kiloton-size weapons are not really effective militarily" -- they do agree that it would take more than one missile to do the job, instantly escalating the crisis beyond anyone's control.

The last nuclear weapon state to seriously consider the use of battlefield nuclear weapons was the United States during the first decades of the Cold War, when NATO was faced with the overwhelming superiority of Soviet conventional forces. But by the early 1970s, U.S. strategists no longer believed these weapons had any military utility, and by 1991 most had been withdrawn from European territory.

Pakistan, however, seems to have embraced this discarded strategy and is now, in effect, challenging India to a game of nuclear chicken -- which seems to have made India tread carefully. Tellingly, in 2008, when Lashkar terrorists attacked Mumbai, Cold Start was not implemented. These days, Indian officials seem to

be backing away from the idea. "There is no Cold Start doctrine. No such thing. It was an off-the-cuff remark from a former chief of staff. I have been defense minister of the country. I should know," veteran Indian politician Jaswant Singh assured me. In a [WikiLeaked classified document](#) dated Feb. 16, 2010, Tim Roemer, then U.S. ambassador to India, described Cold Start as "a mixture of myth and reality" that, if implemented, "would likely encounter very mixed results."

Pakistani military planners, however, continue to be obsessed with the idea of Cold Start. It comes up in every conversation about security, and it is the driving force behind the country's program to develop tactical battlefield nukes. For now, the focus is on missile delivery systems, but according to Maria Sultan, director of the South Asian Strategic Stability Institute, an Islamabad think tank, there is growing interest in using nukes in other ways -- such as to create an electromagnetic pulse that would fry the enemy's electronics. "In short, we will look for full-spectrum response options," she said.

The arms race could make a loose nuke more likely. After all, Pakistan's assurances that its nuclear arsenal is safe and secure rest heavily on the argument that its warheads and their delivery systems have been uncoupled and stored separately in heavily guarded facilities. It would be very difficult for a group of mutinous officers to assemble the necessary protocols for a launch and well nigh impossible for a band of terrorists to do so. But that calculus changes with the deployment of mobile battlefield weapons. The weapons themselves, no longer stored in heavily guarded bunkers, would be far more exposed.

Nevertheless, military analysts from both countries still say that a nuclear exchange triggered by miscalculation, miscommunication, or panic is far more likely than terrorists stealing a weapon -- and, significantly, that the odds of such an exchange increase with the deployment of battlefield nukes. As these ready-to-use weapons are maneuvered closer to enemy lines, the chain of command and control would be stretched and more authority necessarily delegated to field officers. And, if they have weapons designed to repel a conventional attack, there is obviously a reasonable chance they will use them for that purpose. "It lowers the threshold," said Hoodbhoy. "The idea that tactical nukes could be used against Indian tanks on Pakistan's territory creates the kind of atmosphere that greatly shortens the distance to apocalypse."

Both sides speak of the possibility of a limited nuclear war. But even those who speak in these terms seem to understand that this is fantasy -- that once started, a nuclear exchange would be almost impossible to limit or contain. "The only move that you have control over is your first move; you have no control over the *n*th move in a nuclear exchange," said Carnegie's Tellis. The first launch would create hysteria; communication lines would break down, and events would rapidly cascade out of control. Some of the world's most densely populated cities could find themselves under nuclear attack, and an estimated 20 million people could die almost immediately.

What's more, the resulting firestorms would put 5 million to 7 million metric tons of smoke into the upper atmosphere, according to a [new model](#) developed by climate scientists at Rutgers University and the University of Colorado. Within weeks, skies around the world would be permanently overcast, and the condition vividly described by Carl Sagan as "nuclear winter" would be upon us. The darkness would likely last about a decade. The Earth's temperature would drop, agriculture around the globe would collapse, and a billion or more humans who already live on the margins of subsistence could starve.

This is the real nuclear threat that is festering in South Asia. It is a threat to all countries, including the United States, not just India and Pakistan. Both sides acknowledge it, but neither seems able to slow their dangerous race to annihilation.

Save big when you [subscribe to FP](#).

RIZWAN TABASSUM/AFP/Getty Images



Tom Hundley is senior editor at the [Pulitzer Center on Crisis Reporting](#). This article for Foreign Policy is part of the Pulitzer Center's [Gateway project](#) on nuclear security.

58 COMMENTS

Powered by [livefyre](#)



Welcome to Foreign Policy's new commenting system! The good news is that it's now easier than ever to comment and share your insights with friends. Here's how it works: You can now sign in by creating a LiveFyre account (which will replace the ForeignPolicy.com accounts from now on), or using a Twitter or Facebook account, and carry on a conversation with your fellow commenters in the section below. You do not have to sign in using a social network if you choose to remain anonymous -- simply use a LiveFyre account to continue commenting. For more information, [click here](#).

SIGN IN WITH TWITTER FACEBOOK LIVEFYRE

+ Follow conversation

POST TO TWITTER  FACEBOOK 

POST COMMENT AS

Sort: Newest | Oldest



AhmadBilal

Why this is an ideological article...

Nuclear safety has absolutely nothing to do with it...

Belgian nuclear safety chief spells out fissure fears (Less than a month go)

(AFP) – Aug 16, 2012

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5jTmQ9SdhUoXg-fkdu1iiwy2NL5gg?docId=CNG.ff07ae66976d8bde3c71c64ad1a1a01.4a1>

"Troubling ineptitude" in security at nuclear bomb plant (A week ago)

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/08/31/us-usa-security-nuclear-idUSBRE87U0WA20120831>

Bolivians Express Doubt in Uranium Seizure (Just over a week ago)

<http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/news/2012/08/28/bolivian-police-seize-2-tons-uranium/>

Xcel shuts down 2 Minn. nuclear reactors (Due to leakage) (Less than a month ago)

<http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2012/08/14/news/xcel-shuts-down-minnesota-nuclear-plants/>

Nuclear plant break-in blamed on security (Happened Just over a week ago)

<http://www.sfgate.com/nation/article/Nuclear-plant-break-in-blamed-on-security-3832509.php>

Leak brings safety of Hanford nuclear site into question (Happened less than a month ago)

<http://phys.org/news/2012-08-leak-safety-hanford-nuclear-site.html>

Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB) (India) detects flaws at nuclear plants (This happened 3 days ago)

<http://www.business-standard.com/india/news/aerb-detects-flaws-at-nuclear-plants/485318/>

6 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



ani1994

Vigorous prayers should lead a person to enlightenment but unfortunately our neighbour seems to be heading the opposite direction, intent only on total destruction both internally & externally to achieve what? in the name of god, who never responds.

7 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



AhmadBilal

I think it's a mistake thinking that India can outlive a nuclear exchange with Pakistan... When India develops second strike capability through subs; that would be a different thing...

Analysts predicted that Pakistan would be able to develop hydrogen bombs within 5 years of the 1998 nuclear tests... It's not unreasonable to expect that that has happened... Pakistan nuclear capability is acknowledged by the west to be better than India...

Pakistan didn't test dumb bombs in 1998... It tested miniaturized warheads which could be placed on ballistic missiles... The actual challenge has always been miniaturization and not atomic bomb tests...

India at the time, tested dumb bombs... One of which was a hydrogen bomb...

Secondly 3 divisions (45,000 troops) of the Pakistan army are directly responsible for the safety of the nukes... The rest of the Pakistan army, a full 600,000 troops would be up like bees within a couple of hours of an attempt at the nukes...

Any attempt to de nuke Pakistan would be a clear casus belli in the eyes of the Pakistan army...

We are not the Iraqis or the rag tag Afghans...

7 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



anjan288

@ Ahmad Bilal,

India's nuclear retaliation will not be limited to Pakistan alone. All the Sunni muslim nations within India's reach, specially the historical allies of Pakistan would be vapourized in a matter of hours !

3 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



AhmadBilal

👉🔥 anjan288

lol...

Funny how you let ur closet bigotry show through... What about the 161 million Indian muslims who would turn rabid within a microsec of such an event?

Do you have a finger on the itty bitty indian nuke button?? Nope...

Secondly you discount China in all of this... Ask yourself, what would China do? Your generals will definitely be asking themselves the same thing...

3 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



JacobINDN

Pakistan has a lot of insecurities, and justifiably so. It is a much smaller and punier state. But so far India is concerned, they really do not need to worry anymore. I agree there was a one-nation lobby for some time after the partition, that is not the case anymore. Most of political leadership and common people in India do not want anything to do with Pakistani territory. This is a different generation, we are engaged in nation building and would like to be left with that. However, Pakistan needs to understand, that provocations would result in some kind of response. I fail to understand why after 65 years of independence, Pakistani ruling elite still needs animosity with India to prove their case? A nation building at home will surely be a more just and popular political agenda, ensuring not only the survival of the democratic government, but the nation state itself.

If you look 50-100 years in the future, our next generations could be living in a more secure, prosperous and friendly South Asia. Pakistan really needs to get its act together and focus on the right path for that to become a reality. Nukes should be the last on that priority list.

8 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



PatrickBrownrigg

@JacobINDN I do not see a good end for the Paki's if they continue to proliferate nukes. Even 50-100 yrs from now, if they make it that far. You must consider the inbred nature of their psyche. Compulsive, quick to anger and lack of self control will play in the end for them. Just as it did in ancient times.

7 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



AhmadBilal

👉🔥 PatrickBrownrigg 👉🔥 JacobINDN

As far as my reading of "ancient times" goes; I seem to remember muslim hordes running over the subcontinent; time after time...

7 HOURS AGO

Like Reply

ArishSahani

No one can win from arabs .Their master plan is working since 1400yrs. Convert poor , uneducated and criminals of any country to islam by their mullahs no



cost to them. Use these convert fools to destroy the nation they are born and use them to kill other who are non converts. 55 nations and one billions converts under their fold now. One book quran to guide them and now whole world will be destroyed just by one call by saudis. "Islam is in danger and Allah o Akbar" call and you will see all street flowing in blood . Are we going to let arabs do to us or we will wake up and see the converts are treated differently as they treat us in their land.Arabs will not let anyone in their country to convert but have open offer in all nations to convert their citizen to be antinational and love Islam and be loyal to islam. BUt will not these convert in their country to marry , work or die.

Like other convert countries. Iran .Iraq and many others ,Pakistanis down the hill, a great culture of Sindu river and old knowledge is now in duct bin and Hate and kill have become a new slogan of these Hindu converts.

10 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



ASirohey

kindly read following details carefully and decide rationally who is risk Pakistan or so called superpower.

February 2003: Oak Ridge, Tennessee Y-12 facility. During the final testing of a new saltless uranium processing method, there was a small explosion followed by a fire. The explosion occurred in an unvented vessel containing unreacted calcium, water and depleted uranium. An exothermic reaction among these articles generated enough steam to burst the container. This small explosion breached its glovebox, allowing air to enter and ignite some loose uranium powder. Three employees were contaminated. BWXT Y-12 (now B&W Y-12), a partnership of Babcock & Wilcox and Bechtel, was fined \$82,500 for the acciden

1977 – coast of Kamchatka – Loss and recovery of a nuclear warheadThe Soviet submarine K-171 accidentally released a nuclear warhead. The warhead was recovered after a search involving dozens of ships and aircraft.[58]January 24, 1978 – Northwest Territories, Canada – Spill of nuclear fuelCosmos 954, a Soviet Radar Ocean Reconnaissance Satellite with an onboard nuclear reactor, failed to separate from its booster and broke up on reentry over Canada. The fuel was spread over a wide area and some radioactive pieces were recovered. The Soviet Union eventually paid the Canadian Government \$3 million CAD for expenses relating to the crash.May 22, 1978 – near Puget Sound, Washington, USA – Spill of irradiated waterA valve was mistakenly opened aboard the submarine USS Puffer releasing up to 500 US gallons (1,900 l; 420 imp gal) of radioactive water.

8 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



PatrickBrownrigg

@ASirohey After carefully reading your post I conclude, Paki's are the risk.

7 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



kbc

Pakistanis use nuclear weapons as deterrent when it comes to india. Moreover, Pakistanis face existential threat in case of a full blown out nuclear war. India on the other side might face a huge loss of life but Pakistanis won't exist anymore. If there is any attack on India using nuclear weapons, Indians will make sure that no Pakistani living in Pakistan will be left crying for the devastation.

The problem with Pakistani nuclear weapons and them falling into the hands of terrorists is solely with USA. If Al Qaeda/Taliban grabs Pakistani nuclear weapons then America will be the most likely victim. The second most likely victim could be Israel. When it comes to India, there are scores of muslims in india and no Islamist orgaonization would attack their fellow brethren. It is an American problem.

13 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



Brian1975

👉🔥 kbc There are many muslims in America as well and such organizations did not hesitate to massacre them on 9/11. Nor did they hesitate to massacre muslims in Mumbai.

Those terrorists are muslims only so long as being so serves their purposes.

9 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



cnand007

👉🔥 kbc

Wrong. If Al Qaeda / Taliban grabs Pakistani nuclear weapons then the first victim will be the city of Riyadh. What more do you need to control the ummah? Nuclear weapons and the holy cities of Mecca and Medina. Next Teheran. Kill all Shias. That is why Iran is after the nuclear bomb. Not for Israel, but to protect themselves from the Pakistani Sunni bomb.

8 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



kbc

👉🔥 cnand007 Pakistan and Iran have best of the relations in post 911 world. They converge on Baluchistan. Pakistan's nuclear weapons are against India but they are more of a deterrent against a more powerful conventional enemy.

If somehow Al Qaeda/Taliban gets its hands over nuclear weapons, Iran would be on radar too. But the nuclear weapons are for mass annihilation and Taliban won't be able to use them again and again. If Al Qaeda/Taliban has to use the nukes, it will use against the real enemies, the infidels. Americans are the number target.

In 2001, the Al Qaeda could have blasted the planes on some Nuclear facility of USA. They didn't do that. A decade later, Al Qaeda might not hesitate. Americans need to get Pakistani nukes for their own security.

8 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



ChuckMartin

Pakistanis here are squealing because FP exposed Pakistan's nuclear policy as an irresponsible one. No point blaming FP guys, blame your own establishment.

14 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



anjan288

The propaganda in the western press about China arming Pakistan against India is blatant lie. The reality is, the Anglo-Americans, for the past four decades, armed Pakistan against India in equal measure.

Another totally ridiculous western propaganda is of Pakistani nukes falling into the hand of the Islamic extremists. The truth is, many political leaders and the Pakistani Army leadership has always been Islamic extremists. The nukes are already in the hands of the Muslim extremists of Pakistan.

More over, Pakistan was, is and will continue to be the paid agent of the Anglo-Americans for the foreseeable future ... !

23 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



Clint1

[anjan288](#) true dat.

Back in the day when the big BAD Soviets were around WE HELPED A. Q. Khan and silenced our own CIA agents - no it's not a movie:

<http://www.pogo.org/investigations/government-oversight/rbarlow.html>

quote:

"Working as a Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) counter-proliferation intelligence officer in the 1980s, Richard Barlow learned that top U.S. officials were allowing Pakistan to manufacture and possess nuclear weapons, and that the A.Q. Khan nuclear network was violating U.S. laws. "

Reagan helped AQ Khan. Because it suited us back then.

I am shocked that Pakistan has nukes! Shocked! Did you know who made AQ and Taliban? Read "Ghost Wars" Do you know which country paid to have Uzbek language korans printed to radicalize uzbeks? You got it! Bingo!

Shooting our feet since 1776.

21 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



alanchristopher

Short range missiles with multiple smart warheads guided from consoles in the missile battery can take out columns of armor and battalions of artillery without the need for nuclear weapons. Other smart munitions from stealth aircraft or stealth drone jets can hit command and control nodes. Battlefield drones with antitank missiles can reduce armored columns, and drones with machine guns can fire on advancing infantry with greater accuracy than troops. China has the weapons systems; Pakistan is China's ally; so no war between India and Pakistan needs to go nuclear.

China is India's number one trade partner and has an agreement with India for that country to use China's currency in bilateral trade, allowing the renminbi to replace the US dollar as the world's reserve currency one country at a time. China does not want a war with India and does not want a war between India and Pakistan. China gains with peace, prosperity, and trade. Maintaining a balance between India and Pakistan can help China achieve this goal.

The US engages in this endless warmongering rhetoric to keep other rising powers, including India, from moving ahead of the US economically. The US is the

current declining hegemon and wants to retain its position at the expense of everyone else. The US decline has been caused by excessive US foreign interventions without a corresponding development of its economy that pays for its war machine and develops and pays for its military's technological tools. The US is beginning to recognize that it can no longer afford its interventions, so it resorts to propaganda to encourage others to fight the wars that the US can no longer afford.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



Sam the man

👉🔥 [alanchristopher](#) I'd love to believe your claims....but for China's aggressive moves at sea (island disputes with Japan and Phillipines, ridiculous claim to the yellow sea etc.) and also, China's support for rogue destabilizing regimes in Tehran, Damascus and Pyongyang (all of which undermine peaceful trade and prosperity) speak louder than your claims. China's moves to arm Pakistan is also a destabilizing move, attempting to distract or contain India as a hedge.

Where does Pakistan fit in? Well, as per their usual position, Pakistan fits in as the basket case kleptocracy taken advantage of by the powerful foreign "friend". Pakistan would benefit greatly from abandoning claims to Indian territory it will never be able to achieve, reducing its conventional armed forces spending levels by 50%, focusing its remaining armed forces on counter-insurgency operations in its eastern territories, and investing in infrastructure and education. Competing militarily with India for the benefit of China (when India has no intention of invading or occupying Pakistani territory) is a fools errand. As far as I am aware India has never voiced grandiose claims to reconquer Sindh or raise its flag over the ruin of Lahore. Pakistan's bloated military budget funds should be spent on education and infrastructure, to help raise its poop citizens out of poverty.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



alanchristopher

🔥 [Sam the man](#) The aggressive disputes at sea have come from citizens who are proud of China's rise after its "Century of Humiliation" from 1839 to 1949. Chinese civilian fishing boats surrounded a US navy intelligence vessel; a Chinese fishing boat captain rammed two Japanese patrol boats; and Chinese fishing vessels faced off a Philippines warship when a Chinese naval survey vessel appeared causing the Philippines to withdraw the warship and replace it with a Philippine survey vessel. The correct responses should be to report Chinese fishing boats to Chinese authorities because China's international agreements are part of China's legal system just as they are for the US and other countries. China is strict in enforcing its laws. All countries have claims in the region, ASEAN has a 2002 Conduct of Parties agreement, and China has 2011 bilateral agreements with all claimants to resolve all disputes peacefully. Despite noisy propaganda, no war in the disputed area has erupted.

The US has its own prejudices over Iran dating back to the illegal US coup in 1953 that removed the democratically elected government to replace it with the Shah whose secret police used US guns and bullets to kill 20,000 Iranian college students during the next 26 years. Then, the US helped Saddam Hussein kill 500,000 Iranians in the 1980's Iraq invasion of Iran. Given the differences in populations, Iran should have the right to kill 2,080,000 US citizens and retard US development for 60 years. Damascus and Pyongyang are products of the Soviet Union. China has used North Korea to prevent US and Chinese troops from facing each other across a border of nations that remain, technically, in a state of war, and this is one of the wisest moves of the Cold War. China and Russia have learned not to trust the US and NATO after Libya, and this is also wise because the US doesn't have a scorecard on the insurgents and the likely winners in Syria. The US should not create a new bin Laden or Saddam Hussein in Syria.

If China supplies non-nuclear arms that allow Pakistan to protect itself from India without nuclear weapons, that should prevent a nuclear war. You must consider Pakistan's views of the problems in addition to the views of India and the US. You must also remember that the British empire drew the borders of India to include half of the Pashtun tribes of Afghanistan, so today's Taliban are on both sides of the border, and the Federally Administered Tribal Areas or FATA have instability built into them courtesy of the British Empire. Colonialism has left this world with a lot of booby traps.

I agree that Pakistan should spend more of its money on infrastructure and education, but it does not compete militarily with India for the benefit of China. It has conflicts with its tribal areas and with India over Kashmir that should have gone to Pakistan given its muslim majority, so Pakistan has a legitimate reason for concern about India after India's invasion of Pakistan after the partition in the late 1940's. Hopefully, some of the weapons that I have designed and developed will help maintain the peace.

22 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



mailhitendra

👉🔥 [alanchristopher](#) 👉🔥 [Sam the man](#) Alan is a Pakistani hiding behind a European name.

18 HOURS AGO

Like Reply

Sam the man

Bomb Pakistan now!



1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



MrBeverlyhills

👉🔥 [Sam the man](#) Agreed. Nuke the lot of them. Nothing but trouble in that area of the world.

16 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



xet12

People give undue credit to nazis for being masters of propeganda . FP beats them hands down. Just look at this article, or hit job, whats new in it, except everything has been rehashed with more intensity. Just look at the headline, " horrible, terrible, bad". It is screaming for attention. Couldnt the author find any more negative words to cram in the title? FP, I mean in this day and age of 24 hrs access to information, who are you kidding. Publishing such garbage with screaming and slang filled headlines, doesnt make you much of a foreign policy mazine.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



JiveSucker

👉🔥 [xet12](#) The title is a direct reference to the children's book "Alexander and the Terrible,Horrible,No Good,Very Bad Day". Relax.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



ayushdas

👉🔥 [xet12](#) "in this day and age of 24 hrs access to information, who are you kidding"

LOL... sir - believe it or not - that is what the world thinks of you. Every single word is true and am glad people outside are finally 'understanding Pakistan like we do in India. BTW, when you say 'in this day and age of 24 hrs of access to info' - what exactly do you mean? Can you show me a single word (I repeat, a single word) in there that is 'incorrect' or 'inaccurate' or even 'biased'?

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



xet12

👉🔥 [ayushdas](#) problem with your logic is that Pakistanis can also claim to know you Indians better than anyone else. You two have a long history with each other.

So any san person knows that views of Indians and Pakistanis about each other are always colored by bias.

My point, if you has difficulty understanding it, was that there are much bigger foreign affairs issues than Pakistan. And FP is kidding no one by rehashing stuff with screaming headlines.

14 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



Sorentang

👉🔥 [xet12](#) Dude.. First: Relax, Second: You have no facts or quotes supporting your arguments. Not even a single constructive sentence..The article on the other hand...

24 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



xet12

👉🔥 [Sorentang](#) 👉🔥 [xet12](#) After reading the comments, I stand corrected.....its a India Pakistan thing.... nothing to do with anything substantive on foreign affairs.

14 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



00Yankee

If the ISI can rationalize waging war on the US by supporting Al Qaeda and the Taliban I'm not too confident they wouldn't give them a nuke and use the same plausible deniability strategy (even if its utterly stupid) as they have continually. And to be honest I'm not sure America or India would make that "first decision" to retaliate if one bomb went off. The history of Pakistan out of control while the US and India stare with their thumbs up their arse is really clear at this point. Ask any US soldiers on the eastern front what they are doing there. Not one would deny the Taliban and Al Qaeda enjoy safe havens. The fact is the US has not predicted anything correctly. We wait for the disaster and then react like a blind man.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



Clint1

👉🔥 [00Yankee](#) yup.

We *let* Pakistan become nuclear -- we even silenced our own agents who raised red flags -- the proliferators are us -- well, Reagan:

<http://www.pogo.org/investigations/government-oversight/rbarlow.html>

Working as a Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) counter-proliferation intelligence officer in the 1980s, Richard Barlow learned that top U.S. officials were allowing Pakistan to manufacture and possess nuclear weapons, and that the A.Q. Khan nuclear network was violating U.S. laws.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



00Yankee

You are right about what happened in the 80's...in the Cold War. But that was a totally different time. We gave Jihadists manpads back then too. SO what? Regardless of what we did to win the Cold War we have a new war now.

6 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



AhmadBilal

→ [00Yankee](#)

First of all, Pakistan has its own manpads which are not based on the stinger series... And these are battle tested against indian migs in kargil... And the inventory is in the thousands...

If ISI was supporting the talibs; you'd be seeing US helis dropping like flies in Afghanistan... No more low altitude operations at all...

The ISI does not need nukes to get the job done...

6 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



Rene Milan

"the CIA had been keeping bin Laden's corpse on ice": prepare to see this being picked up and propagated by the american right wing. Different camps, same thinking.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



PatrickBrownrigg

@Rene Milan No, actually we are keeping Ghandi on ice for his return as the savior of, of, somebody over there ah dunno. But I do like the "keeping on ice" story. When is the movie coming out?

7 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



AbelSantaAna

Such double standard that Pakistanis get to have nukes, while Iran is vilified for trying to get one. If the West fears the so-called "Islamic Bomb," Pakistan definitely fits that bill. They have been the biggest nuke proliferators, haven't they? They deserve to be sanctioned just as Iran.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



jvillain

→ [AbelSantaAna](#)

Other than Israel no one actually thinks Iran is trying to build a bomb. But your point is right on target. Every one is missing the big picture because Bibi keeps the focus on Iran and the US does what ever Israel wants. . The truth is the sanctions should be on the 4 countries that refuse to sign the NPT. That ship has likely already sailed because the US blew it's wad on strong arming the world on Iran.

Short term American thinking probably see's a growing nuclear war potential as being good for arms sales so the US is probably cheering it on.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



rizkhan

→ [AbelSantaAna](#)

Worst proliferator is US who covertly helped Israel in making the nuclear weapon. Even now the US is looking the other way while Israel is building its arsenal. Selective implementation of the laws breads insecurity and injustice. Iran can agree to denuclearise if Israel gives up nuclear path.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



xet12

→ 🔥 AbelSantaAna

I think you wanted to say Israel, the only undeclared nuclear weapon state with full access advanced technology. If you pay attention then you notice then Pakistan like Iran is also in the dog house.

Only difference is that Pakistan was lucky since it was coldwar and US needed Pakistans help in Afghanistan to fight soviets. Otherwise Pakistan would get the same treatment as Iran.

14 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



xet12

A hit peace paid by Indian PR machine. Bottomline they cant digest Pakistani nukes so now trying to make them controversial, and hoping one day US might be stupid enough to launch an invasion of the country snatch these nukes.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



kakhangandapur

"For 15 years this country is bleeding from attack after attack, and there is nothing we can do," said Raja Mohan of the Observer Research Foundation, a New Delhi think tank. "The attacks correlate directly to Pakistan's acquisition of nuclear weapons. From the moment they got nukes, they saw it as an opportunity they could exploit. And India has no instruments to punish Pakistan or change its behavior."

TOM HUNDLEY: Please do not portray India as so innocent. India managed a ceasefire with Pakistan in 2002 and also made Pakistan to stop supporting Jihadi Groups in Kashmir. The moment it achieved it, India has started fueling the insurgencies in FATA and Balochistan and has made Pakistan bleed miserably. Mumbai-like-attacks are a daily phenomenon in Pakistan but India is cashing on a single incident it for the last four years and constantly portraying Pakistan as a state harboring Terrorism. Pakistan is being forced to increase its stockpile of nuclear arsenal by India;s hegemonic designs.

Secondly, it is out of question that any loose nuke would fall in somebody's hand. These have never been mated and will never be, till the time India does not force Pakistan to do it. This stage would only come if the decision to launch is finally made. So keep your fingers crossed and request your pay-master India (seems from the one-sided views expressed by you in your article) to not fiddle with Pakistan and stop fueling the insurgencies in Waziristan and Balochistan.

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



ayushdas

→ 🔥 kakhangandapur

- If India is involved in Balochistan, then

1. Why didn't your govt present a single proof (let alone 'credible' evidence) when the Indian foreign minister went there. That's exactly what our foreign minister, SM Krishna told a paki journo when asked about Balochistan
2. You have blamed india in the past too - where attacks that Taliban has taken credit for were also 'formally' blamed on India by your foreign minister. Same for countless other incidents. What do you have to say about that? Doesn't that PROVE that u Pakis are just liars...
3. Here is an interview of a Pak army man, who was a POW in the 71 war and has written a book about it. He has also served in Balochistan ironically (after he came back and was reinstated in the army). When your news anchor asks him about 'foreign involvement' - hoping he would say INDIA - he's what he says:

"Yes, there is definitely foreign involvement. Russians & Afgans are involved"

www.youtube.com/watch?v=XIXwnvaXKs4 [watch from 37.47]

LOL. Honest answers and truth from your own army officers.

There are articles which suggest India may have been involved in balochistan in the past for a brief period of time. But all those activities have been shut down since 1971 - over 40 years ago. And you still keep falsely accusing & blaming us.

Lastly, if Indian involvement is found in Balochistan - will it not make our case against 'terrorism from pakistan' weaker in the international stage? Will then people not say - you are also doing the same thing in Pak? So WHY in the world would India get involved in something that would be counter-productive and a fatal mistake for us?

So stop spreading lies about India. It does not matter much, as there is no limit to the propaganda you already spread about India (starting from how Indians supposedly look darker & shorter than pakis, to how india started those wars, to how you won wars, to treatment of muslims in india, to media-and-movie influence, to ruining you cricket industry, to killings in burma, to the dog dying in your backyard). So it hardly matters. You are paying the price for your lies with your economy and internal-terrorism... So I am not complaining. I believe God is on our side.



**marty martel**

One of the biggest lies that Pakistani establishment has perpetuated and US has continuously accepted is that 'Pakistan's nuclear weapons are in danger of falling into the hands of Islamic terrorists if Pakistani State collapses or is taken over by Islamic fundamentalists'.

This canard is blatantly absurd because Pakistani State was, is and always has been owned and operated by Islamic fundamentalists to begin with.

Pakistani Army and Intelligence are Islamic fundamentalists. Pakistan's so-called democratic government and civilian leadership is also just as much Islamic fundamenatlist.

It was Gen. Zia who ushered in 1976 a new era of Islamic fundamentalism, bigotry and blasphemy laws in Pakistan targeting minorities, together with nurturing radical, armed Islamic groups, bent on waging jihad across the world.

Gen. Zia planted the Islamist poison seed and the tree from that seed is now bearing the toxic fruit.

Now the malaise of Islamic radicalism runs deep across Pakistan's entire establishment - civilian and military as well as society.

Lawyers of all the people showered the suspected killer of a prominent Pakistani governor with rose petals when he arrived at court and an influential Muslim scholars group praised the assassination of the governor who was recommending to reform Pakistan's sharia laws.

The Pakistani parliament's joint session convened on 5/13/11 after Osama's killing and ended after adopting a unanimous resolution condemning the American raid on the Abbottabad compound in which al Qaeda chief Osama bin Laden was killed.

Pakistani parliamentarians were not appear to be bothered about Osama living in Abbottabad for the past five years and in other parts of the country since 9/11.

Osama bin Laden was a hero in Pakistan even prior to his death and remains one now as well.

Nobody forced Pakistani government to facilitate relocation of Osama bin Laden from Sudan to Afghanistan in 1996. Democratic government of Pakistan chose to do so of its own free will.

Nobody forced Pakistani Army and Intelligence to create what ex-CIA official Bruce Reidel called 'this jihadist Frankenstein' monster in 1990s. Pakistani Army and Intelligence chose to do so with the full financing provided by Pakistan's democratic governments at the time.

Previous US ambassador Anne Patterson to Pakistan, wrote in a secret review in 2009 that 'Pakistan's Army and ISI are covertly SPONSORING four militant groups - Haqqani's HQN, Mullah Omar's QST (Quetta Shura Taliban), Al Qaeda and LeT - and will not abandon them for any amount of US money', diplomatic cables released by WikiLeaks show.

Ambassador Patterson had NO reason to mislead her own State Department and U. S. government.

Another lie that Pakistan has perpetuated and US has continuously accepted is that Pakistan's nuclear proliferation was a one man show when it was Pakistani Army and civilian governments were even more complicit in that endeavor. It was Benazir Bhutto who had personally negotiated a deal with North Korea to swap Pakistan's enrichment technology for North Korea's Chinese ballistic missile technology.

Pakistani leadership - civilian as well as military - is wearing this garb of moderate Islamism to milk Western governments for ever higher doses of foreign aid and the Western governments have fallen head over heels to accept and propagate that canard.

**cnand007**

👉🔥 **marty martel** I completely agree.

Zia introduced his fundamentalist education in schools some 30 years ago. The new breed of Pakistani generals will now be from Zia's madrasas. And thats the danger. Drop a bomb or two on kafirs, get killed and enjoy virgins in heaven. Musharraf started Kargil war to teach Indians a lesson. What will stop a new C-in-C to teach another lesson to Indians with nuclear weapons?



00Yankee

You hit the nail on the head!

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



vodabs

👉🔥 **marty martel** GET LIFE.....

1 DAY AGO

Like Reply



ArishSahani

👉🔥 **marty martel** No one can win from arabs .Their master plan is working since 1400yrs. Convert poor , uneducated and criminals of any country to islam by their mullahs no cost to them. Use these convert fools to destroy the nation they are born and use them to kill other who are non converts. 55 nations and one billions converts under their fold now. One book quran to guide them and now whole world will be destroyed just by one call by saudis. "Islam is in danger and Allah o Akbar" call and you will see all street flowing in blood . Are we going to let arabs do to us or we will wake up and see the converts are treated differently as they treat us in their land.Arabs will not let anyone in their country to convert but have open offer in all nations to convert their citizen to be antinational and love ISlam and be loyal to islam. BUt will not these convert in their country to marry , work or die.

Pakistan is newly formed Islamic state in last 65 yrs are more loyal to islam and ready to do any thing to please its Arab masters .

Muslim menas loyal to islam and not to nation not even birthplace can be destroyed to please Masters.

Arabic slave trade is still on.

10 HOURS AGO

Like Reply



michael phelps

The UK could be branch for an activity shortfall, and it seems adopted banknote is the abandoned way to get them out of it. With no money to advance nuclear ability alone, it's now been affected to seek across investment. But some abhorrence accessible assurance will yield a aback bench to authoritative profits, as RT's Sara Firth explains

wishes

michael phelps

<http://NewOrleansInteriorDesign.net>

2 DAYS AGO

Like Reply



fuzair

If Mr. Hundley had actually been anywhere in Pakistan in 1985, he would know that the country then was nothing at all like what it is now. In 1985 my father and I went to greet Gen. Zia on Eid--don't ask why, offical obligation--and we walked in along with several hundred ordinary Pakistanis. Gen. Zia literally had a reverse greeting line to meet the masses and the crowd at the Presidency was immense and security purely pro forma. I cannot conceive of that happening now. Zardari takes a helicopter from the Presidency to the damn airport!

As for the rest of this article, I don't have time to point out all the cr ap the author has spouted. I'll confine myself to a few points.

If tactical/battlefield nukes and the rejection of no-first-use is good enough for the US and NATO in the 1970s and 1980s, why is it so bad for Pakistan? ONLY the conventionally stronger side goes in for no-first-use; which is precisely why the USSR pushed it back then.

ALL countries (including the US and India: remember the Contras, the mujahideen and the Tamil Tigers?) support 'terrorists'--aka freedom fighters--when it suits their interests. Why should Pakistan be different? Terrorism is only bad when you're the victim; its just fine when you're doing it to someone else. Ask the Sri Lankans what they think of the Indian support of the LTTE; or the Nicaraguans what they thought of US support for the Contras. Ronald Reagan called the Contras the moral equivalent of the US's Founding Fathers; incidentally, the British thought all of the Founding Fathers were rebels and terrorists who should have been hung. Reagan was right but for all the wrong reasons. Many of the "patriots" were smugglers who were going to be put out of business because the East India Company could sell tea cheaper than they could be shipping it diretly to the Colonies from India--the Boston Tea Party was so that the criminals could keep making money!

2 DAYS AGO

Like Reply

[Show 8 More](#)

[FOLLOW US ON TWITTER](#) | [VISIT US ON FACEBOOK](#) | [FOLLOW US ON RSS](#) | [SUBSCRIBE TO FOREIGN POLICY](#)

[ABOUT FP](#) | [MEET THE STAFF](#) | [FOREIGN EDITIONS](#) | [REPRINT PERMISSIONS](#) | [ADVERTISING](#) | [WRITERS' GUIDELINES](#) | [PRESS ROOM](#) | [WORK AT FP](#)

SERVICES: [SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES](#) | [ACADEMIC PROGRAM](#) | [FP ARCHIVE](#) | [REPRINT PERMISSIONS](#) | [FP REPORTS AND MERCHANDISE](#) | [SPECIAL REPORTS](#) | [BUY BACK ISSUES](#)

[PRIVACY POLICY](#) | [DISCLAIMER](#) | [CONTACT US](#)



11 DUPONT CIRCLE NW, SUITE 600 | WASHINGTON, DC 20036 | PHONE: 202-728-7300 | FAX: 202-728-7342
FOREIGN POLICY IS PUBLISHED BY THE FP GROUP, A DIVISION OF THE WASHINGTON POST COMPANY
ALL CONTENTS ©2012 THE FOREIGN POLICY GROUP, LLC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.