

IMPLICATIONS AND CHALLENGES OF IMPLEMENTING NUCLEAR SECURITY STRATEGIES BY MAJOR POWERS IN SOUTH ASIA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Roshan Ara^{1*}, Farhan Khalid², Abdul Rehman³, Ambreen Aman⁴, Rizwan Ali⁵

¹PhD Scholar, Department of Political Science, Government College Women University, Sialkot

^{2&3}Lecturer Department of Political Science, Government Murray Graduate College, Sialkot

⁴Assistant Professor in Political Science, Govt Shahbaz Sharif Associate College (w), Sialkot

⁵Associate Lecturer Department of Political Science & International Relations University of Gujrat

*¹roshanara63@yahoo.com, ²farhankhalid5669@gmail.com, ³polscience56@gmail.com,

⁴ambreenaman2012@yahoo.com, ⁵rizwan.ali@uog.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *

Received: June 05, 2024

Revised: July 15, 2024

Accepted: July 30, 2024

Published: August 05, 2024

ABSTRACT

The qualitative study reveals the region of South Asia has become an insecure part of the world politics and game theatre for the big powers like, United States, China, Russia, British and France due to its internal fears and external threats of the proliferation of the nuclear armaments in South Asia. It examines how big powers are actively shaping the region's security landscape through diplomatic, economic, and military strategies. The divergent and miscalculated American policies towards South Asia increase the hostile environment in the region. The research work provides insights into how the major powers' interactions impact South Asia's security environment and the implications for regional and global stability? What are the Core power dynamics at play in nuclear South Asia and the potential consequences for the region and the world politics? The studies explores implication, challenges, application, and operational strategies of the leading international players and the contemporary scenario of global politics particularly after the terrorist incidents of 9/11. The conflict and diversity among the major powers of different regions invited nuclear proliferation, conventional weaponry race, deterrence and future warfare.

Keywords: Approaches, Big powers, Implications, Nuclear security, South Asia

INTRODUCTION

The region of South Asia has become the most attractive matter of concern due to its geographical strategic location and significance for great powers especially after the event of 9/11. The nations acquire nuclear weaponry power due to certain domestic issues and external threats from one another. The United States and former Soviet Union increase their atomic capability right after the Second World War which led cold war rivalry along with conventional and nuclear deterrence among the two major powers of the world in the second half of the 20th century. United Kingdom, France and china acquired nuclear weaponry power status to fulfil their own security concerns in the regional and global politics.

Pakistan and India got atomic ability because of the conventional conflict, antagonism and the presence of different unsolved conflicts in south Asia. The nuclear proliferation and weaponry race continued in the South Asian region by the end of 20th century. The nuclear and conventional proliferation of the weapon continued as an effective and vital factor in background of global and regional incidence that is Kashmir issue, rise of extremist organization like Taliban and Al-Qaida, the terrorist incidents of 9/11 attack and the international war on terrorism. The Washington administration increased its interest and intervention in the regional politics of South Asia in the post 9/11 environment. The threat perception continues to be existed as a vital and

expected intervening viable in the South Asian region despite both the countries adopted certain positive measures to eliminate antagonism, traditional rivalry and aggressive policy towards one another during the recent years. The regional security paradigm of South Asia is linked with political, economic, social factors adhered to military rivalry.

The Security and Strategic Studies Approach

The strategic studies relates to the aspects and dimensions of military, defence and national security used by the former of Soviet Union and United States during the cold war era. Strategic studies refers to initiation and prevention of warfare, how to begin a conventional, short range or open war and how to launch military operation in the most efficient manners to acquire the determined and targeted objectives (Farrel, 2010). The security studies conception has evolved through the notion of the war tactics, war preventing measures, military operations, weaponry race, peaceful strategies war and coercive tactics of war phenomena adopted by the states in international relations. The security strategies have been recognized and expended during 1990's which changed the conception of traditional security and transformed into modern strategic studies. According to the realists school of thought global system is anarchistic due to the existence of definite conflict among the states. The present international system possesses variant and critical actor's related to security and strategic studies i.e. military threats, conventional weapons, nuclear deterrence, economic and power rivalry.

The Changing Landscape of Strategic Studies: An Evolution of Approaches

The eminent realist scholar Quincy Wright has examined the conception of security and war prevention in his famous book 'Studies of the War' in 1942. Whereas many classical strategists are of the view that war is an instrument of state craft. Wright believed that collective security, diplomacy, self-determination of a state and settlement are the protectors of the global harmony (Baldwin, 1995). Germany was defeated in the Second World War due to its Fascist agenda and the allies countries like China, Russia, France, UK and USA established a new world order to bring peace and stability. These states encouraged the foundation of different non-state actors like United Nations, World Bank and International Monetary Fund for making of cordial

and cooperative environment in the world. These institutions performed an essential part in the improvement and management of regional and global crises along with the conflict resolution, activities the military and non-military devices of the state. The state defence, security dilemma, civil liberties and democratic process became an important factor of the contemporary global politics. The ideological diversity increased division between the capitalist and communist ideologies which led the conflict and diversity trends to be flourished in the post-cold war situation. The strategic analysts debated that the atomic armaments and conventional weaponry race among Russia and United States led conflict and the situation of warfare during the cold war arena which laid subsequent impact and implications on the regional politics. The analysts of international relations have also argued that strategic studies unsuccessful to estimate the ending of cold war. The security and safety needs have been expended there is need to deal non-military threats a greater challenge to the existence of state and international peace. A plenty nuclear weapons, terrorism, climate change, human security and security problems are the fundamentals of modern day security challenges and dynamics (Booth, 2005).

Dynamical Security measures in the Context of Global Politics

The phenomenon of security studies remain to be revised and revisited in the current and global politics particularly for the state having arch rivalry and antagonistic neighbourhood (Barry, 1991). The military thread had been emerged as the basic focus of different states in the cold war era in the perspective of state's security concepts. The analysts of international relations and strategic studied observed that the usage of force by different countries is the principle response in the context of state security prospect even in the contemporary world politics. So this has been known that threat with orientation to safety measures of the states (Javed, 2012). The strategic security studies carry to many theoretic approaches i.e. the Realism and the critical thinking. The strategic studies a phenomenon has been evolved from realist school of thought and the critical thinking approach developed under an evolutionary process in terms of the security measurements. The strategic studies and critical thinking approaches are attributed with strategic planning, propaganda, threat, war and the nuclear

conflict. At the other side the realist school of thoughts is another significant and dominant approach in the field of strategic studies. According to the realist strategic study scheme states are obligatory bound to protect their people in the case of racial genocides, violation of human rights, poverty and hunger, food shortage and energy crises and the horrible consequences of the climatic change.

Strategic Cooperation and Conflicts in the Context of Nuclear Arms

The United States was used two nuclear bombs on the Hiroshima and Nagasaki to counter the Japan this was the first atomic war for survival and existence and it was ended in 1945 (Carroll, 2007). However, after WW II the (USSR) Union of Soviet Socialist Republics speeded up their fissile expansion programs, because they are fearful that the United States and their Allies will attack on them (Holloway, 1995). These states were working for the attainment nuclear arms and nuclear power for their survival and security purposes, and it was started the Cold War. Mostly realists consider that states must fight for their own perseverance, they believe on this theory that the whole world is in an anarchy state (Mearsheimer, 2006). The United States, Germany, United Kingdom (UK), USSR and the Japan they all had atomic weapons program at numerous phases of development for the period of the World War II. For develop and make an atomic bomb firstly would have the capability to win the war, and survive for own. It would be a positive action with atomic weapons to secure a country, such as many other countries are less likely to be violent to a nuclear equipped country. This highlights the welfares of propagation, and supports the theory of survival. Though, other states may feel threatened that a downside to one state having atomic weapons is that by this and keenly strive for atomic weaponries themselves (Burr & Richelson, 2006).

Nuclear preservation of global and regional powers during Cold War

In the time of cold war states wants to gain atomic power. They want to make a nuclear bomb for their security and survival. Particularly France and UK wants to gain nuclear power because of their fears that the US give assurance to NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) members states can be reliable upon. The other clash relays to “great power” status such as the object for both of the countries France

and UK in quest of nuclear power. For a good control of their own security and survival, the France and UK expand with their own atomic weapon program because of fears that was relating to NATO. The requirement for the atomic weapon programs of UK had been interrogated on much state of affairs. This shows that the survival and security of a state through means of atomic weaponries is not all the time indispensable, but it does not essentially eliminate the need of propagation. This can be seen from time to time as the theory of state survival being used such as a reason or a terror battle to acquire the supports of public for atomic expansion (Pifer, 2011). China was started an atomic weapons survival race, with the involving of India and Pakistan in Southern and Eastern Asia. China was started developing atomic weapons in the face of the Taiwan Straits Crisis and the Korean War, in 1954. For the US this was perceived as a off-putting and later the USSR, in the atomic armaments world a lot China is elapsed, and that nuclear-powered program of China eventually directed to the India and then in order, Pakistan emerging their own atomic caches. In this case the survival theory is sustained through “No First Use Policy” of China, through which they have assured to only usage their nuclear resource in retribution to nuclear violence from the other states. Though, trustworthiness of China such as to even if they will adhere to their Policy of “No First Use” has been interrogated, employing their survivals and defensive goals in query (Ullman, 1971). India engaged in with the atomic expansion, with its programs that was started in 1967, and the first nuclear test was in 1974, after first nuclear tests of China in 1964. There are numerous fights for why India required nuclear-powered weaponries, mostly concentrated on the theory of state survival. For instance the 1962 border war of Himalaya among China and India was the utmost significant reason in pronouncement for makes an atomic cache of India. This could be realized to stress the need of India for nuclear weaponries as a conclusion based on the survival of a state. Moreover, Pakistan was started working to gaining an atomic competency on account of India’s atomic program in 1972, and in particular, the war of Indo-Pakistan in 1971 that was cost Pakistan lots of region. These strains commanded the Pakistan to the expansion of nuclear in fear of their survival of state in the situation of more conflict with India. It can be claimed that Pakistan, India and China all had exact justifiable grounds for obtaining atomic power,

because of previous conflicts and on-going security concerns. The theory of state survival is debatably the main motivation that countries had wanted nuclear powers and atomic arsenals. The explosion of nuclear-powered weapons has sequentially directed many other countries to pursue atomic armaments for their own survival of state. In previous antiquity in the time of Cold War nuclear proliferation race was expanded and states wanted to seek nuclear weapon for their state security (Rizvi, 2002).

Strategic Deterrence: The United States and USSR in the Context of Warfare

Atomic weapons are well-thought-out as political appliances instead of military weaponries. The mutual deterrence theory works over balance of terror. The capability of all side to devastate other’s cities remains the central and indispensable component in the balance of terror. In the time of Cold War the balance of terror has prohibited the two great authorities United States and USSR for going to warfare. Usually the Cold War is represented such as the bipolar balance of power constructed on atomic weaponries and frequently denoted such as the balance of terror among US and USSR. Atomic weaponries have converted a political armament, and

atomic armament states turn up this strength as deterrence unbiased (Huth, 1999). With the existence of atomic weaponries, nuclear power states were escape of the fighting for war. “In a system where every state must provide for its own sanctuary, most realists hold that a balance of power is the most efficient mechanism for maintaining order (Ball, 1986).” Atomic weaponries are planned and installed definitely to frighten an opponent. A harmless, secure and safe atomic armament structure is very essential for an actual nuclear deterrence.

The Interaction of Global Security Culture and U.S. Nuclear Security Dynamics

The United States developed its nuclear security culture founded on the concept of the contentment of the communist threats from 1945-91. After the cold war period it was attributed to settle a global balance of power process. Afterward the accomplishment of deterrence was another major objective of the US nuclear security strategy of the Washington administration. Different other nuclear weaponry states recognized by non-proliferation treaty followed the principle of nuclear security strategy for the creation of deterrence, balance of power and the protection of national interests.

Table 1. Evolutionary development of NPT Nuclear Power States:

Nuclear Weapon States	First Test Date	Measures
United States	16 July 1945	Strategic importance, contentment of communism, promotion of capitalism, end of cold war diplomacy, supporting the Western Europe Democracy and maintenance of global balance of power.
Russia	29 August 1949	Combating the US Monopoly of nuclear weaponry power and the expansion of communism in the Eastern Europe.
UK	October 3, 1952	National security, state sovereignty, maintenance of world order, North verses South strategy and imperialism.
France	December 3, 1960	National security, defense of state sovereignty, maintenance of world order, North verses south strategy and imperialism.
China	October 16, 1964	Maintenances of strategic importance, breaking the nuclear monopoly of super powers i.e. Russia and the United states

India	May 18, 1974	Yes
Pakistan	May 28, 1998	Yes
North Korea	October 9, 2006	Yes?
Still process Nuclear Weapons		
Israel	November 2, 1966	No
South Africa	September 22, 1979	No
Belarus	N/A	No
Kazakhstan	N/A	No
Ukraine	N/A	No

SOURCE: C. Dale Walton ‘The Second Nuclear Age: Nuclear Weapons in the Twenty-First Century’ John Baylis, James J. Writz, and Colin Gray (Eds.), *Strategy in the Contemporary World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010, P.209.

The United States formulated its temporary theoretic nuclear-powered policy grounded on flexible response. The Washington administration brought an obvious change in its nuclear strategy when the cold war finish. The United States take on the relaxation of long standing nuclear posture as the first step of change under the policy to wait and see how international actions existed to be happened. The arms control agreements were formulated and exhaustively debated in international environment like Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT). The START agreements brought the American and Russian reduction during 1990s. Both the Russia and America decided to cut down their war heads between 3000 and 35000 weapons. The American strategic planning leaves certain impacts on international security. The strategic and security uncertainty is a continual phenomenon constructed on firm surroundings of assurance for the United States defence department. The major of US Strategic policies were the Amelioration of security issues in South Asia, Japan and Russia and along with the promotion and protection in the world politics (Cambone & Garrety, 1994).

The Russian Nuclear Security Measures

The Soviet Union former acquired nuclear status in 1949 in respect to contain the US nuclear domination in the world policymaking. It was aimed to discourage the concept of un-polar monopoly and to condemn developing a Hydrogen Bomb. The Soviet

nuclear policy aimed to evolve a strategic balance in the world politics right with the beginning of cold war rivalry. Soviet Union tested its nuclear delivery system the medium range bomber B-46 to counter the US bombers, air crafts in the beginning of 1950’s. Russia continued to develop its nuclear and missile technology during 1950-90 with creating the situation of nuclear deterrence. The non-proliferation treaty, strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, Strategic arms Limitation Treaty, Ballistic Missile Treaty; Bi-lateral Talks between the official and political leaders of both the super powers were occasionally convened as the tactic of deterrence. The Moscow administration continued to contain the American nuclear proliferation policy both in defensive and offensive perspective. Bi-lateral talks in the context of LTBT in 1963, NPT in 1968, SALT in 1972, START in 1982, INF in 1987 and START II in 1993, START III in 1907 were the major episodes of bi-lateral talks related to strategic and global balance of power. The Russian defensive policy also included internal security challenges along with the external security threats specially the expansion of American influence and NATO in the world politics. The Soviet administration conceded certain economic, political and strategic interests in the regional and global politics. Soviet strategists and policy makers graded themselves as the part of international community of military thinkers (Paret, 1994).

The Great British and French Nuclear Strategies

The Great Britain and France formulated their nuclear policies on the bases of influence and effect of the United States and Russia. Furthermore the British and French nuclear strategies considered the vision of identity and the question of deterrence in the regional and global politics. The regime change in France and United Kingdom brought certain changes in their nuclear policy perspective. The security forces of both countries were employed for the looking after and world order in different areas of the world. This might have supposed to increase the worldwide protection of France and Britain with the hope that nuclear and conventional forces can create great in remaking of European defence identity. The idea of European nuclear identity is a little more than a theoretical device chalked out by United Kingdom and France for disguised as a reason of state deterrence (Shwartz, 1991).

Nuclear Security Strategy of China

China was entered into the nuclear power club in 1964. The People republic of China launched its space satellite and demonstrated a rapid progress in nuclear weapons development in connection with global nuclear system. The chain's nuclear strategy was erected on the objective of future development and capability in the field of nuclear weaponry power as an important factor. The China government believed in 1963 that the super power have exploited and monopolized the global nuclear weapons. China believed in this context that in the world there are over and above 130 countries. Every country is small or big, nuclear or non-nuclear are the same. This is totally difficult for two or three states to flourish of its atomic weaponry at will, issue, order and commends, to lord it over the world as self-ordained nuclear over lords, even though the devastating majority of the states are exhausted to Kneel down and follow commands quietly, as if they were nuclear slaves. China sought to break the nuclear monopoly of super powers in the world politics while following the principles and objectives of developing nuclear weapons, nuclear proliferation, they breaking a nuclear monopoly through total disarmament. They Beijing purposed different countries not to use atomic arms until it is exposed to atomic aggression from any other country. The Chain's nuclear proliferation strategy was designed to counter the nuclear weapons of Russia and America. China was in the favour to have many countries in the atomic

power club and openly advocated the nuclear proliferation. Therefor China prohibited the Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT) that was planned to associate the domination of America and the Soviet Union. The Beijing government argued that United States conducted many nuclear tests and got and stock of atomic weaponry. Therefor a complete test ban will not be changing factor for United States. Therefor the control of atomic armaments of a communist country is necessary. The nuclear proliferation can leaved significant impact on other non-nuclear states in the world to improve their weaponry power.

Exploring Nuclear Security Practices in South Asian Nations

Because of the internal and external pressures of the proliferation of the nuclear weapons the region of south Asia has become an insecure part of the world. Since May 1998, Both India and Pakistan have acquired the status of the nuclear powers and have created a maximum deterrence to pursuit their national security by developing an organized missile delivery system the nuclearization seems as a fundamental part of the state survival for India and Pakistan because it provide security and regional steadiness in South Asia. The Indo-Pakistan nuclear capability and proliferation strategy relates to deterrence condition directly and indirectly. Although many international analysts have suggested and talked on Indo-Pakistan mutual and bilateral issues to be solved under the peaceful process i.e. bilateral talks, dialogue diplomacy, arbitration and the role of regional and global organizations but yet both India and Pakistan have fought almost four open wars since 1948 to present. In South Asia there are certain pre-requisites for a stable and understandable situation of deterrence. The prevention of war strategy, escaping of accidental nuclear war, second-strike competence and the countering nuclear terrorism are the important policy preferences of India and Pakistan being the nuclear countries of South Asia. The origin and evolutionary expansion of atomic arms was originated by the mid of 1950s in the region. After the invention and use of nuclear armaments in the world politics during after the World War II India and Pakistan started their formal and informal work on the development of the nuclear powers. Resultantly India uncovered its nuclear supremacy in South Asia by testing its underground explosion in

1974. The South Asian nuclear dilemma took birth from an anarchic international order which augmented armed race, balance of power phenomenon, alliance politics and the nuclear deterrence in the world politics. The nuclear tests of May 1998 exposed the Indo-Pakistan nuclear capability and propagation as an alarming dilemma for regional and global peace. The Indo-Pakistan nuclear proliferation process activates and development was followed by the nuclear tests of United States, United Kingdom, France, Russia and China. Pakistan projected its nuclear doctrine following the major principles of the preservation of countries sovereignty, to avoid external combination based on the strategic restrained regime and survivability and integrity of deterrence in South Asia. Although the fundamental work on nuclear weaponry development in South Asia was started by the beginning of cold war politics in the mid of 1950s when there were differences and misunderstandings generated between India and Pakistan in the framework of their security issues and threat discernment towards each another. Pakistan aimed to join the resistance agreements with United States to build up its safety against India (Frank, 1990).

Implications and challenges

The implementation of nuclear security strategies by major powers in South Asia presents a complex interplay of implications and challenges. A thorough analysis reveals that while these strategies are essential for maintaining regional stability and global security, they are fraught with difficulties due to various technical, political, and strategic factors. One of the main challenges is the different strategic priorities and motivations of major powers, such as the United States, China, and Russia. These differing agendas can have a significant impact on the security landscape of South Asia, potentially causing shifts in power dynamics, alliances, and broader geopolitical relations. Furthermore, the technical aspects of nuclear security, including the development and maintenance of nuclear weapons, can be highly complex and demanding. This can lead to challenges in implementing effective security measures and ensuring the safety and stability of nuclear weapons. In addition, the political dimension of nuclear security cannot be overlooked. The possession of nuclear weapons can be used as a bargaining tool in international relations and can also have significant domestic political implications. This can further

complicate the already delicate balance of power in the region. While nuclear security strategies are crucial for maintaining peace and security in South Asia, their implementation is not without challenges. It is essential for all major powers to carefully consider the potential implications of their strategies and work towards finding mutually beneficial solutions for the region.

Conclusion

Although face-to-face interaction has its benefits, working from home has also proven to be advantageous in certain aspects. It eliminates the need for stressful commutes and allows for more time to be spent on personal health and well-being. Therefore, it is important for companies to consider both options and find a balance that works best for their employees. It can include implementing flexible work schedules or utilizing technology for virtual team building and collaboration. Ultimately, prioritizing the well-being and productivity of employees will lead to a more successful and harmonious workplace. The United States and other western countries like Britain, France, Germany and Russia provided economy and military support against Indio-China war of October 1962 at the expense of Pakistan's security. The Indian underground nuclear explosions in 1974 led a qualitative deterrence and a major concern for Pakistan which led the Washington organization adopts nuclear reduction towards South Asia. Pakistan was laid open to face a severe disengagement and economic restrictions by the American administration as the result of its nuclear policy but then again India remained successful to achieve its nuclear desires. However the regional peace and security became the significant and priority agenda of American policy towards India and Pakistan. Thus in South Asia the foundation stone of nuclear race was led as India began its nuclear weaponry program by the end of 1962 Indo-China war which led New Delhi to blue up its underground nuclear device in 1974 and Pakistan had already took similar initiative after the end of its war with India in 1972. The historical antagonism, Kashmir as the disputed legacy, political and cultural enmity produced ignition and movement to grow up nuclear proliferation in the region. India and Pakistan both experienced their nuclear competence when in May 1998 New Delhi and Islamabad formally tested their nuclear capability and reached on the verge of a

probable nuclear encounter which made the region a predictable nuclear flash point. The nations acquire nuclear weaponry power due to certain domestic issues and external threats from one another. The United States and former Soviet Union increase their atomic capability right after the Second World War which led cold war rivalry along with conventional and nuclear deterrence among the two major powers of the world in the second half of the 20th century. United Kingdom, France and china acquired

REFERENCES

- Baldwin, David A. "Security Studies at the end of Cold war", World Politics, Vol. 48, 1995.
- Ball, Desmond. "The Development of the SIOP, 1960-1983." *Strategic Nuclear Targeting*, New York: 1986.
- Barnaby, Frank. *How Nuclear Weapons Spread Nuclear-Weapon Proliferation in the 1990s* (London; New York: Routledge, 1993).
- Barry, Buzan. "People, states and fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post-Cold War era." *Dorchester: Pearson-Longman*, 1991.
- Booth, Ken. ed. "*Critical security studies and world politics*". London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005.
- Burr, William. and Jeffrey T. Richelson. "Whether to "strangle the baby in the cradle": the United States and the Chinese nuclear program, 1960–64." *International Security* 25, no. 3 (2001).
- Cambone, S. & Garrity, P. "The Future of Nuclear Survival" Vol. 36, 1994.
- Carroll, James. "*House of war: The Pentagon and the disastrous rise of American power*". Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2007.
- Farrell, Theo. ed. *Security Studies: Critical Concepts in International Relations: International Security*. Routledge, 2010..
- Freedman, Lawrence. "Great Powers, Vital Interests and Nuclear Weapons." *Survival*, Vol. 36, no. 4 (1994).
- Holloway, David. "Entering the nuclear arms race: the soviet decision to build the atomic bomb, 1939-45." *Social Studies of Science* 11, no. 2 (1981).
- Holloway, David. "*Stalin and the bomb: the Soviet Union and atomic energy*", 1939-1956. Yale University Press, 1994.
- Holloway, David. *Nuclear weapons and the escalation of the Cold War, 1945–1962*, In *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, 2010.
- Huth, Paul K. "*Deterrence and International Conflict: Empirical Findings and Theoretical Debates.*" *Annual Review: Political Science* Vol.2, 1999.
- Jackson, Robert. and Georg Sørensen, *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Jaspal, Zafar Nawaz. 'nuclear risks reduction measures and restraint regime in South Asia' New Delhi: Manohar, 2004.
- Jaspal, Zafar Nawaz. "Ballistic Missile Defence: Implications for India-Pakistan Strategic Environment," *NDU Journal* 24, (2011).
- Javaid, Umbreen. *Peace Building in South Asia: Limitations and Prospects*. Lahore: Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Punjab, 2012.
- Lyon, Peter. "*Conflict between India and Pakistan: An Encyclopaedia.*" *Roots of Modern Conflict*, ABC-CLIO, 2008..
- Paret, Peter. "Makers of Modern Strategy from the Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age" USA: Calrandorn Press Oxford, 1994.
- Pifer, Steven. *NATO, nuclear weapons and arms control*. Brookings Institution, 2011.
- Richardson, Jaffrey T. "Spy on Bomb", New York: ww.norton, 2007, P. 367.
- Rizvi, Hassan Askari. "Pakistan's strategic culture." In *South Asia in 2020: Future Strategic Balances and Alliances*, by Chalmer R. Chalmer, 305-328. Carlisle PA: Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, 2002.
- Shwartz, David N. "NATO's Nuclear Dilemmas" New York: Washington DC, 1991.
- Zagare, Frank C., and D. Marc Kilgour. *Perfect deterrence*. Vol. 72. Cambridge University Press, 2000.