

**Where Do We Go Now: A Study on the Response of the United States, India, and China?
To Pakistan's Extremist Government**

Matthew Ryan Wissman

INTL 504

INTRODUCTION

I now think al-Qaeda can be marching on Islamabad in two to four years.

-Benazir Bhutto 2007

This quote was uttered a few days before she was assassinated by the Pakistani Taliban and at the current time appears to be more accurate than she could have imagined. The following is an analysis of what will the responses of the major powers in the region would be if Pakistan were to become a state run by religious extremists. The state is now run by a Taliban like group and all of the issues that arose in Afghanistan prior to the United States invasion of 2001 are surfacing again resulting in a nuclear armed state run by extremists and the creation of the "Islamic Bomb". These countries are the United States, India, and China. These countries all have a stake in the future of Pakistan, its nuclear arsenal, and the sense of security which they feel inside of their own borders. The issues these countries must face come from all fronts including: nuclear proliferation, economic aid, a continued aggressive response to the Kashmir crisis, and the prospect of armed uprising by extremists in their own countries. This is the importance of Pakistan and why the issue must be studied and a forecast must be developed to gauge the appropriate response when and if the day comes that Pakistan becomes the new center of Islamic extremism in South East Asia.

The question that will be examined in this study relates to the responses of China, the United States, and India should Pakistan become a country run by Islamic extremists. Having Pakistan run by Islamic extremists poses a mortal threat to the rest of the world and by studying what may happen in the future we will be better able to put together a feasible response if this were to occur. The reason that this is such an important topic and must be examined is due to several reasons. The first and most significant is that Pakistan has an estimate 60-80 nuclear weapons scattered throughout the country. This poses a significant problem to the United States and India should extremists gain control of the weapons and attempt to use them in a first-strike against India or deploy them inside the United States as is Osama bin Laden's stated goal. The second issue is the continued military and economic cooperation that China has given Pakistan in recent years. This includes helping to design the nuclear program, as well as, helping to design and procure materials for their missile delivery systems. A third issue that arises should Pakistan fall to the control of Muslim extremists is that they were once a key ally of the United States in the Global War on Terror. Should they become a country run by extremists the U.S. will have to determine what type of measured response they will have to a country that has received billions of dollars in both military and economic aid since 2001? All of these issues show the importance of why this topic must be examined. Dealing with a nuclear state run by extremists poses significant dangers to the countries involved where one wrong step or perceived misdeed can lead to a nuclear exchange by any of these countries. In examining the history of the United States, India, and China in relation to Pakistan we find that there is a level of anger, fear, mistrust, and general disinterest when it comes to their economic and military. While Pakistan posed a threat to all of the countries involved in the past having it run by Islamic extremists poses the most significant threat at the present. By taking a qualitative look at what has occurred

in the past between the three major players and Pakistan we will be better able to formulate appropriate scenarios when predicting what will be the responses should Pakistan be run by Islamic extremists.

LITERATURE REVIEW

By examining current literature on the topic of Pakistan and its relationships with the United States, China, and India we will be able to piece together a picture of not only what has happened in the past but what may happen in the future should Pakistan's government come under the control of Islamic extremists.

The first step in doing this is by understanding the terrorist and extremist groups that are currently in place in Pakistan. An article entitled "Pakistan's New Generation of Terrorists" by Jayshree Bajoria helps with this problem. The article begins by pointing out that this new group is more violent and less political than the organizations that preceded it and those elements of the leadership of al Qaeda and Afghan Taliban have taken the tribal areas near Afghanistan and turned them into training grounds and safe havens for Pakistani militant groups. Once this is established the most important part of the article breaks down the Pakistani militants into five subcategories including: sectarian, Anti-Indian, Afghan Taliban, al Qaeda and their affiliates, and the Pakistani Taliban (Bajoria 2009). For the purposes of this study we will be using the Pakistani Taliban lead by Hakimullah Mehsud as the organization that has taken over control of the government. Bajoria then discusses the support network that has been created between the Pakistani Taliban, the Afghan Taliban, and the Punjabi Taliban; which consists of members of banned militant groups of Punjabi descent. The Pakistani Taliban has grown in size since their

formation in response to the Pakistani militaries' incursions into the tribal regions of northwest Pakistan in 2002. Current estimates put their numbers at around 30,000 to 35,000 members.

Bajoria concludes the article by discussing how the Pakistani Taliban are recruiting younger and younger people to carry out suicide attacks against the Pakistani government and the by attacking their forces they may in fact be straining the relationship with the Afghan Taliban who provides their training. The reason for this is because of the close knit relationship the Afghans have with the army and Pakistan's intelligence agency the ISI. This article points out the challenges that Pakistan is facing and also gives us the basis for the enemy which will be guiding an extremist Pakistan throughout the study.

Michael Petrou describes how these radical groups may come to power in the near future in his article "Worth the Trouble?" The article's goal is to point out the strength required by former Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf when dealing with extremism in his own borders and points out how a civilian leader would have great difficulty in dealing with the group's intent on toppling the government. Petrou implied that without a strongman like Musharraf "al Qaeda would grow in strength and, in the most apocalyptic of scenarios, Islamists might take control of a nuclear-armed state" (Petrou 2007, 34). The article goes on to state that at the time there were no civilian leaders who would be able to gain the trust of the military and continue to counterterror operations. This is important because of the fact that Asif Ali Zardari is now the civilian president of Pakistan and is roundly criticized for being corrupt and America's puppet. Petrou continues to point out the close relationship between the I.S.I. and the Afghan Taliban and the fact that many are reluctant to sever these ties because of the perception that Hamid Karzai is an ally of India. The article discusses the amount of control that the Pakistani Taliban has over the mountainous Tribal Areas that border Afghanistan and how their influence is spreading. A

large part of this is due to Maulana Fazlullah who is tied to the Pakistani Taliban and seeks to impose strict Sharia law throughout Pakistan. The final portion of the article discusses how Pakistani citizens view the war on terror and how our continued support will wind up polarizing the Pakistanis and states that “sooner or later that will rebound to the benefit of Islamic extremists” (Petrou 2007, 38).

In addition to understanding the enemy that will guide our study we need to lay a firm groundwork when dealing with Pakistan’s nuclear weapons capability. By understanding exactly what types of weaponry, how much of that weaponry and the security measures that are in place we will be able to better decide the best scenario for the study. Paul Kerr and Mary Beth Nikitin’s 2010 study entitled “Pakistan’s Nuclear Weapons: Proliferation and Security Issues” provides excellent insight into the nuclear capabilities of Pakistan. The study begins by providing the location of the main enrichment facility at Kahuta while stating that they may also have other enrichment sites. These sites produce the highly-enriched uranium (HEU) that is needed for nuclear weapons. According to Kerr and Nikitin Pakistan has anywhere between 60-90 nuclear weapons with warheads that have a solid core of 15-20 kilograms of HEU. Pakistan also is approaching the point of being able to use a plutonium core in its weaponry. With help from the Chinese and some European nations they have been operating the 40-50 megawatt Khusab plutonium production reactor and are also producing 2 more heavy water reactors. Combined with the increase in reprocessing facilities including the Pakistan Institute of Science and Technology and a possible site at Chasma it is clear to most analysts that they are beginning to increase their nuclear weapons capabilities. The delivery methods for their nuclear weapons include modified American-made F-16A/B, as well as, their ballistic missiles. These include the Hatf-III with a range of 400km, the Hatf-IV with a range of 450km, Hatf-V with a range of

1300km, and the soon to be deployed Hatf-VI with a range of 2000km (Kerr and Nikitin 2010, 7).. Pakistan's command and control over its nuclear weapons is tightly compartmentalized to prevent instances of rogue officers using the weapons without authorization. It is broken down into a 3 tiered structure that includes the National Command Authority (NCA), the Strategic Plans Division (SPD), and the Strategic Forces Commands. According to Kerr and Nikitin final launch authority requires a consensus by the NCA with the Chairperson casting the final vote. Finally, the current government of Pakistan subscribes to a policy of minimum credible nuclear deterrence which is done to offset India's superiority in terms of conventional weaponry. This coupled with a pledge of no-first-use against non-nuclear-weapon states and a possible first use against a nuclear-armed aggressor paints a dreary picture should the countries weapons fall into the hands of Islamic extremists.

Pakistan has an incredible nuclear arsenal that is growing by the year. This poses the question how secure is it? Seymour Hersh analyzes this topic in his article "Defending the Arsenal". Hersh describes the principal American fear of mutiny in Pakistan by extremists currently in the military. President Obama has even gone so far as to say that he is "gravely concerned" regarding the government of Asif Ali Zardari, Pakistan's president. Hersh goes on to discuss high level understandings between the American military and General Ashfaq Parvez Kayani that specially trained American units would move into Pakistan and help secure the arsenal should the government be put in jeopardy. This also includes 400 million dollars for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund. Should this ever be undertaken and American boots wind up on the ground in Pakistan; Hersh believes Pakistani anger and distrust towards the United States will grow due to the fact that many see the nuclear arsenal as a symbol of national pride. Hersh continues to illuminate more Pakistani nuclear doctrine which calls for the warheads

and their triggers to be stored separately from their delivery devices. This is due to the desire to not begin a nuclear exchange with India unless it is absolutely necessary. The key part of this study comes from a former senior American intelligence officer that states “a team that has trained for years to remove or dismantle parts of the Pakistani arsenal has now been augmented by a unit of the Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC), the elite counterterrorism group” (Hersh 2009). The article concludes with several troubling interviews that bring into question the issues of American interference should Pakistan’s arsenal need to be guarded including a discussion with Lieutenant General Hamid Gul former director of the I.S.I. who states” What would happen if, in a crisis, you [America] tried to get—or did not get—our nuclear triggers? What happens then? You will have us as an enemy, with the Chinese and Russians behind us” (Hersh 2009). The importance of these statements show that should we attempt to secure the arsenal following the rise of an extremist state we will do more harm than good and it could lead to a significant attack.

Now that there is an understanding of how the extremists could have come to power, the nuclear arsenal that is up for grabs and possible American intervention to secure the weapons we need to investigate the relationship between India and Pakistan, which is undoubtedly the most fractious of the four nations. The first article that deals with the India/Pakistan relationship is entitled “Hostile Relations” and was authored by Shivshankar Menon former Indian Foreign Secretary. He begins by discussing the myths that are inherent on both sides regarding the other. He begins with the myths Pakistani’s have regarding India. These include: India wants to undo the 1947 partition and annex Pakistan; differences in size, power, and development make hostilities inevitable, and the issues in Jammu and Kashmir. Indian myths regarding the Pakistani’s include: Pakistan has an identity problem and only sees itself as Anti-Indian and the

Pakistani army needs hostility to justify its hold on power. All of these underlying myths lead to increased tensions between the two states that would only be exacerbated by a strict religious theocracy across the border. The article continues to discuss the minor wars and terrorist activity perpetrated in India by elements supported by the Pakistani government and how they have adverse effects on the relationships between the two countries. Menon describes how India, in the face of repeated attacks, has displayed incredible restraint and patience. Finally, Menon feels that segmentation and appeasement of terrorist organizations will ultimately lead to legitimization of the groups and will force ordinary people to have to obey them.

Another article that discusses the relationship between India and Pakistan is “India-Pakistan Rivalry in Afghanistan”. Here the authors discuss how the two countries have been in competition in Afghanistan since the beginning of the war against the Soviets. In it the authors describe the ongoing relationship between India and the Northern Alliance as a way to hedge against the Taliban gaining strength and aligning itself with the Pakistani’s in a struggle against India. India has worked to prevent a restoration of the Taliban in Afghanistan and to limit the Pakistani’s influence over any governmental regime that may come to power. This is important to this study because it shows that India will go to whatever lengths it deems necessary to be able to curtail Pakistan’s influence in Central Asia. The authors also point out the use of India’s intelligence service to bleed Pakistan as a sort of retribution for the covert wars that the Pakistani’s have undertaken against India for decades. Using this article to lay the groundwork for India’s continued pursuit of a non-radicalized regime in Afghanistan we are able to make the assumption that any gains they have made in Afghanistan would be wholeheartedly used against a Taliban-like regime in Pakistan.

The final article used to provide information on the India-Pakistan relationship is Praveen Swami's "Failed Threats and Flawed Fences: India's Military Responses to Pakistan's Proxy War". This article details the Indian response to the Pakistani backed wars fought in Punjab in 1981 and more recently in Jammu and Kashmir. The article describes the role of the ISI in enabling armed activities in the Punjab region to achieve a level of violence that had not been seen up to that point. The ISI was also tacitly connected to the 1981 hijacking of an Indian Airlines flight. Following these incidents India engaged in a training exercise named Operation BRASSTACKS to show the level of conventional warfare they were capable of conducting against the Pakistanis. It only served to provoke Pakistan into a near nuclear response because of a lack of communication. Swami goes on to discuss how the ISI has a substantial cross-border network that allows it to transport men, equipment, and even narcotics into the disputed regions to engage in a sub-conventional war. The article concludes that while both sides engage in a large amount of saber rattling whenever an attack is perpetrated they have always shied away from the use of nuclear weapons and returned to diplomatic communications.

China has always had a hand in Pakistan. Whether it be helping them to create their ballistic missile program, providing economic support, or helping to build their nuclear reactors the Chinese have been willing participants. However, they have always been wary of a nation run by extremists so close to their southern border. The article "Wary China Watches Taliban Resurgence" discusses how the Chinese are worried about the Taliban regaining power in Afghanistan and providing support to the Uighur's in the Xinjiang provinces. They have begun to contemplate a deal with the Taliban to restrain the movement's support in China. The article states that it is Chinese policy to deal with whichever regime is in power due to the fact that they put their own public safety and way of life ahead of world affairs. The Afghan Taliban has had

ties with Islamic extremist groups in Xinjiang for years. Xinjiang also shares the border with Pakistan. In the article the author states that the ethnic riot in Xinjiang in 2009 and the subsequent government crackdown has put the Beijing government in the position of oppressor of Muslims, which it does not want to be. The author states that the Chinese government is extremely fearful of Uighur militants establishing a safe haven in a Taliban controlled country and engaging in cross-border attacks. The fear of being portrayed as anti-Muslim led a Chinese spokesman to say: “We have made our position on the 5 July incident very clear on many occasions. It was a serious crime of violence carefully plotted and organized by the three evils aimed to separate China and undermine ethnic solidarity. We hope that the Islamic countries and our Muslim brothers could see the truth of the 5 July incident.” The fear in China is that if they were to attack a Taliban led government that Islamic animosity will be placed squarely on Beijing which is something they do not want. The author concludes that China will again work with any government to prevent being seen as anti-Muslim.

The next article was filed by the BBC and discusses an anti-terror drill conducted by China and Pakistan to promote military understanding in the region. Codenamed Operation Friendship the exercise was the third of its kind between the countries and was used to consolidate friendship between the countries. Wang Guosheng, commander of China’s Lanzhou Military Area Command said the drill was used to “promote military understanding and mutual trust.” This is important because of the mutual cooperation currently in place between the two countries.

The above articles paint a picture of the most likely actors that have the most to lose and to gain should Pakistan become a religious theocracy. Using this information we will be able to

produce a very detailed predictive analysis regarding the responses of China, India, and the United States to a Pakistan controlled by extremists.

ACTORS AND PERCEPTIONS

There are four major actors involved in this study: Pakistan, China, India, and the United States. Each of these countries has a large stake as to what will happen if Pakistan becomes a religious theocracy. By examining each of these countries perceptions and abilities we will be able to better establish the necessary elements for the scenarios we wish to predict. By understanding what each country has to gain and lose the study will be more likely to predict the most likely alternate future.

PAKISTAN

Pakistan is the most important player in this study because it is the country that will dictate how the other three actors respond to the actions that it undertakes. If it does in fact become a religious theocracy it will have the potential to become a safe haven for the world's terrorists, launch attacks against India to regain the disputed regions, provide support for the Uighur rebellion in China, and have the nuclear capability that many extremists can only dream of. Understanding Pakistan will help to provide better insight into the alternate futures later in the study.

ECONOMICS

According to the CIA World Fact book Pakistan has a GDP of 433.1 billion ranking it 28th in the world (CIA World Fact book 2010, 8). The majority of this is composed from the services sector. The largest trading partner that it has is China. Overall Pakistan is very unstable

when it comes to the economy. They offer little in exports and rely heavily on foreign aid at home from countries such as the United States. Pakistan has also received observer status in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SHO). This has allowed them to open up to a greater amount of trade with China and the other member nations. They have yet to receive full member status because of the ongoing tensions with India. Economically Pakistan is weaker than the other nations involved in the study, but should its issues ever be resolved concerning India they stand to benefit greatly from the SHO.

POLITICS

The political situation in Pakistan is one that is extremely difficult for them to combat the continued growth of domestic terrorists. The president Asif Ali Zardari is considered corrupt by many and has little faith from the population. He is currently facing a corruption charge in the Pakistani Supreme Court that threatens his office. The major concern in the political spectrum is how this case will affect government stability. The repeated delay in prosecuting the money laundering case against Zardari has provoked frustration in the army and political opposition (Brulliard 2010). The corruption case has weakened an already weak government that was supposed to improve the lives of Pakistani's after the oppressive regime of General Pervez Musharraf. Under Musharraf the Pakistani people suffered an ever increasing loss of rights beginning with a crackdown on civil society, lawyers, journalists, and human rights activists (Petrou 2007, 7). The Musharraf government was undoubtedly a dictatorship that allowed extremism to flourish and now with a weakened civilian government there may be little chance at a larger crackdown on them.

NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS

The Pakistani's have been in a state of quasi war with India since the partition in 1947. There have been repeated attacks in the disputed zone of Kashmir which each remains central to each countries self-identity (Clad 2002, 13). According to Lewis Dunn as long as there is a continued conflict in the Kashmir region it will provide the trigger to a larger clash between India and Pakistan (Dunn 2002, 29). Pakistan uses their overt nuclear capabilities as a continued deterrent to Indian aggression which has proved successfully after Pakistani ISI supported attacks in Mumbai and India's Parliament. Pakistan is overly mismatched in a conventional war against India which leads to the ever increasing threat of nuclear war should the countries ever engage in a full scale conflict. Of larger concern to the current Pakistani regime is the increase of homegrown terrorists that threaten its stability. The most important of which is the Pakistani Taliban led by Hakimullah Mehsud. These groups thrive in the border states between Pakistan and Afghanistan and routinely conduct terror attacks in country. Attacks in the country doubled between 2007 and 2008 (Riedel 2009, 11). Many of the men involved in with the Pakistani Taliban have only recently begun to organize themselves around the Taliban Islamic theology and with 30000 members they are increasing their attacks against the foundation of Pakistan's security, the army (Bajoria 2010). Coupled with the ever present involvement of the army and ISI with terrorist organizations Pakistan faces a severe national security crisis in the near future.

THE UNITED STATES

The United States has several large factors facing it should Pakistan fall to religious extremists. The major one being that it relies heavily on them to prosecute its war against insurgents in Afghanistan. A recent example of this close relationship involved the closing of the Torkham crossing; which has long been used to shuttle NATO supplies to soldiers on the ground in Afghanistan. When the U.S. accidentally killed two Pakistani soldiers the pass was closed and

vital supplies were destroyed (Rising 2010). Having the Pakistanis on our side in the Global War on Terror has proven effective despite a continued refusal to crackdown harder on extremists in their own country. However, not having them on our side and possibly run by extremists would prove detrimental to not only the war effort but to our overall sense of security at home and abroad.

ECONOMICS

The United States is the chief importer of Pakistani goods; taking in 15.87% of all goods manufactured there (CIA Fact book 2010). This helps to support the economy of Pakistan and better our partnership with them. The U.S. also offers a tremendous amount of military assistance most recently a four hundred million dollar authorization for the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund in June 2009 (Hersh 2009). According to a Times of India article from February 2010 the total U.S. aid package since 2001 has been 18 billion dollars with 11.5 billion being for military assistance (The Times of India 2010). Furthermore the United States has pledged an additional 1.2 billion for fiscal year 2011. The continuing Global War on Terror will undoubtedly put the United States in a position to continue the economic aid to Pakistan. There is little incentive for the United States to cut economic ties with them at this moment however, that could change in the near future.

POLITICS

The role of the United States with regards to Pakistan and India has been to push nuclear nonproliferation by any means necessary. The U.S. has always regarded the nuclear capabilities of both nations as somewhat troubling, but within 2 weeks of 9/11 all sanctions that we had imposed were lifted to create allies in the Global War on Terror (Feinstein 2002, 5). Tacit

support of both countries since 9/11 has had the result of nurturing good working relationships with both countries at the same time for quite a while. Using these current relationships U.S. policy makers must begin to focus on ways to press nonproliferation as well as continued assistance in the Global War on Terror. The relationship between the United States and Pakistan when dealing with the disputed tribal regions and the governments supposed crackdown on the extremists within them has been hit or miss. While the Pakistanis have routinely launched attacks into these areas the majority have been against groups that directly attack Pakistan and not the groups that are fighting the war in Afghanistan. Despite billions in aid and support the U.S. has received only marginal effort from Pakistan in fighting the war. However, they remain a key ally and we must maintain good relationships with them as evidenced by their closing of the Torkam crossing.

NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS

The United States biggest concern lies in the realm of its own national security. Having a nuclear country that is run by extremists is seen as the nightmare scenario for the U.S. The confidence that the U.S. has in Pakistan and their ability to maintain control over their nuclear arsenal appears to be waning. President Obama said in 2009 that he was “gravely concerned” with the stability of President Asif Ali Zardari’s government and that “Their biggest threat right now comes internally.” He continued, “We have huge national-security interests in making sure that Pakistan is stable and that you don’t end up having a nuclear-armed militant state” (Hersh 2009, 29). Those words point out that our government is concerned over the security of the weapons inside Pakistan and their ability to fall into the hands of extremists. That is why the U.S. has been offering the economic and military support that it has. How to secure the nuclear arsenal in Pakistan has proven to be a hot button issue in Washington. Admiral Mike Mullen has

worked closely with his counterpart in Pakistan, General Kayani, to establish a procedure should a coup occur. Mullen did not however discuss the possibility of using U.S. Special Operations Forces to secure the weapons. Allowing extremists to take over the Pakistani nuclear arsenal would be a game changer for the way the United States operates in Afghanistan and the Middle East in general. Should their wind up being an “Islamic Bomb” the United States’ national security would be greatly threatened.

INDIA

ECONOMICS

India’s economic infrastructure is growing. It’s economy is expected to be the third largest within a few decades (Kronstadt 2007, 45). Beginning with its new status as an observer nation in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization India has begun to become a regional player in all things related to Central Asia. Trade relationships have increased between India and China from 200 million in the 1990’s to 20 billion in 2005 (Norling and Swanstrom 2007, 438). The increased Indian participation in the SCO has also led to greater ties to Pakistan and numerous high level talks regarding a pipeline involving Iranian fuel. The biggest issue for India in the economic realm is to develop trade partners for its increased need for energy. It has recently begun working with the Chinese to expand trade ties and in June 2006 reopened the trade route at Nathu La pass which had been shut since 1962 (Norling and Swanstrom 2007, 439). The relationship between India and the United States is also growing on the economic front; most importantly on the civilian nuclear front. The 2005 U.S.-India Joint Policy Statement opened India to American companies to sell reactors and operate nuclear power plants to assist India in their ever increasing need for energy (Kronstadt 2007, 29). India has grown into a regional

economic power with the only thing that is limiting it is the continued struggle in Kashmir. This has caused the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) to come to a standstill because of the issues posed by India and Pakistan. This is also the reason that India is not a full member of the SCO.

POLITICS

The government of India is one of the most stable and populous democracies in Central Asia. Relationships between the United States and India have grown immensely because they share a large amount of core values. These relations have been strengthened in recent years due to a lifting of restrictions on trade in high-technology goods, as well as, the civilian nuclear program; although this issue is seen as an American attempt to curtail India's nuclear arsenal. India's political relationship with Pakistan has also grown in the last few years. Even though the peace initiative has slowed in recent years it is still underway and marks a drastic step in the process of rebuilding decades of mistrust and anger. Although there are talks India is still concerned with Pakistan's perceived support of cross-border terror operations in the Kashmir region (Kronstadt 2007, 7). Despite this perception numerous high level talks have been completed between the two countries that help to open trade routes and provide for humanitarian aid (Kronstadt 2007, 7). While relations remain frosty between India and Pakistan their relationship with China has warmed increasingly. Since the Sino-Indian War of 1962 tensions were high. However, in recent years the inclusion of India as an observer state in the SCO has helped to increase high level talks (Norling and Swanstrom 2007, 436). Politically India is a stable government where that appears to be heading in the right direction and with increased support from the United States and China should be able to sustain its position as the leading democracy in Central Asia.

NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS

India's national security is what will drive their response to a Pakistan run by extremists. Since the partitioning in 1947 India and Pakistan have been at odds over many disputed regions including Kashmir. Although India maintains a superior conventional force compared to Pakistan the Pakistani's have used their nuclear arsenal as a deterrent in all of the minor skirmishes that have arisen (Kerr and Nikitin 2010, 2). India has routinely stated that it needs only a "credible minimum deterrent but has never defined what that is. India's other national security concern stems from the cross-border incursions from Pakistan of Islamic terrorists to perpetrate attacks in the country. The major perpetrators of these attacks are Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Mohammed both based in Pakistan. These attacks include the Mumbai attacks of 2008 and the attack on the Indian Parliament in 2001. India believes that these instances were made possible with the support of the Pakistani army and the ISI, which many believe to have been the case. Even though they have been attacked regularly India has shown incredible restraint with regards to retaliatory attacks against Pakistan. Former India Foreign Secretary Shivshankar Menon states that Indian and Pakistani relationships will remain strained until Pakistan decides to crack down on the extremists conducting these attacks (Menon, 2009 18). National security is the largest concern for India in much the same way as it is for the United States and China. If Pakistan becomes a religious theocracy the chance for a sustained peace effort between the countries could be placed in jeopardy or cancelled outright.

CHINA

ECONOMICS

China's economy in relationship to the other actors involved in this study is one of continued influence and potential growth. The creation of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization has allowed China to form partnerships with India and Pakistan that allows for increased trade and energy flow that has proven beneficial to all parties involved. It has been used to hedge against continued U.S. involvement in Central Asian economic affairs and has led to a feeling among those in the United States of an emerging anti-U.S. bloc (Norling and Swanstrom 2007, 429). China's need for increased energy has also led to deals to develop the Yadavaran oil field in Iran as well as to supply China and India with Iranian natural gas. With regards to Pakistan China has provided the majority of the funding for the construction of a port in Gwadar. This has provided the Chinese with a strategic foothold in the Persian Gulf (Kugelman 2009). Beijing has also invested heavily in Pakistan including dams, energy development, and infrastructure. China is concerned with its economic well beings and having a radicalized government in Islamabad could possibly undermine their economic security which could cause them to end an otherwise peaceful 60 year relationship with the Pakistani government.

POLITICS

Pakistan has not had a larger supporter of them on the world's stage then China. The two countries are connected through 60 years of cooperation on all aspects of the political stage including counter-terrorism, and military development. China helped Pakistan to build their nuclear program and has supplied them with delivery systems for nuclear weapons. According to Kugelman Chinese President Hu Jintao an 80% approval rating (Kugelman 2009). Even though China has been the biggest supporter of Pakistan over the years they are increasingly shying away from overt support. This is due to continued concerns over militancy in Western China

where many of the insurgents have received training in Pakistani camps (Feinstein 2002, 6). However, the Chinese have always taken a policy of placation with governments they feel may be able to help them avoid being seen as anti-Muslim and should Pakistan fall to extremists it may be in China's best interest to continue support of the country to hedge against increased extremism in China.

NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS

China's biggest fear is the increasing Uighur uprising in Xinjiang. The issue at hand is that the insurgents are increasingly getting trained in the autonomous regions of Pakistan. The Chinese are becoming increasingly concerned that if a Taliban like government were to establish itself in Pakistan then it would become a safe haven for Uighur insurgents. From these bases they would be able to launch attacks and receive training and financial support to continue the struggle in Xinjiang. To combat this the Chinese government and the other governments of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization have created the Regional Anti-Terror Center to share information regarding terrorist threats (Weitz 2010). China is also wary of being seen as anti-Muslim. Pang Zhiping, the director of the Central Asia Research Institute in Xinjiang said: "Why would you make yourself the target of global terrorist organizations?" (Weitz 2010). If Pakistan were to become a religious theocracy China would most likely work with the government to maintain its status as pro-Muslim and to maintain its economic foothold in that country.

Pakistan, China, India, and the United States all will be impacted by the creation of a radical Islamic government in Pakistan. The level of response to this situation will be dictated by how Pakistan decides to operate on the world's stage and how they interact with the other three actors involved. Allowing Pakistan to become a religious theocracy may be a foregone

conclusion, but there are options available to the other countries involved many of which are not favorable. By combining the literature review with the information and perspectives regarding each of the actors there is now enough information to conduct the predictive analysis that will provide for the alternate futures when Pakistan becomes a religious theocracy.

RESEARCH DESIGN

There are countless ways to conduct a predictive analysis study; for this study the author has chosen the Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP). The reason for this is because the LAMP method is best suited for prediction and analysis of the ever changing international political stage. The LAMP method draws from other types of predictive analysis to create a well-structured and thorough approach to prediction. The major reason to use the LAMP method is because of the potential number of possible alternate futures based on the interactions of sovereign nations, each with their own unique perspectives and political agendas (Lockwood & Lockwood 1993). The LAMP method takes into account the actors “free will” which allows the author to study each actor’s viewpoint and analyze the information in regards to that specific actor. The use of “free will” is what makes the LAMP method different from the other types of predictive analysis. By taking into account the each actors “free will” and their perceptions of events the author is able to compare the potential outcomes that are available to each actor. The LAMP method is designed to determine possible futures by having the analyst take into account the perceptions of every actor involved in the scenario instead of only focusing on only one of the major players.

LAMP is a twelve step program that focuses largely on relative probability rather than quantitative probability like other analytical methods. By correctly using the twelve steps the

analyst will be able to effectively determine the most likely future scenario and the indicators of it occurring. The following are the twelve steps to the Lockwood Analytical Method for

Prediction:

1. Determine the issue for which you are trying to predict the most likely future.
2. Specify the national “actors” involved.
3. Perform an in-depth study of how each national actor perceives the issue in question.
4. Specify all possible courses of action for each actor.
5. Determine the major scenarios within which you will compare the alternate futures.
6. Calculate the total number of permutations of possible “alternate futures” for each scenario.
7. Perform a “pairwise comparison” of all alternate futures to determine their relative probability.
8. Rank the alternate futures for each scenario from highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of “votes” received.
9. Assuming that each future occurs, analyze each alternate future in terms of its consequences for the issue in question.
10. State the potential of a given alternate future to “transpose” into another alternate future.
11. Determine the “focal events” that must occur in our present in order to bring about a given alternate future.
12. Develop indicators for the focal events (Lockwood & Lockwood 1993, 27-28).

Studying the possible responses of India, China, and the United States to Pakistan being run by Islamic extremists is an excellent way to test the LAMP. The reason for this is because of the strong interconnectedness of each actor to the other and also the long history and relationships that have developed over the last 63 years since the British partition. By stating that Pakistan has already fallen to extremists we are able to focus on their likely actions towards the rest of the world and how those actions will be perceived and reacted to by the other actors in the study. We can imagine that considering Pakistan is a strategic part of the Global War on Terror, a valued

trading and economic power with China, and a nuclear nation that any action undertaken by an extremist Pakistan will be met with responses from one if not all of the other nations.

While the LAMP model is effective in reducing the most likely future scenario it is still bound by the author that has created it. Taking into account all of the perceptions and actions of the given actors will often be done with a slight bias from the author. This bias is in no way intentional and by doing an exceptional amount of research the author has hoped to steer the study away from any such bias particularly because if not handled correctly the alternate futures presented in this study could prove to be catastrophic to the world at large. This is one of the most important issues facing the world for the next 10-15 years considering the substantial nuclear arsenal of Pakistan. Only by understanding the possible outcomes of the actions undertaken by the actors in this study will we be able to find a brighter tomorrow.

POTENTIAL COURSE OF ACTION FOR INTERESTED ACTORS

The actors involved in this study all have responses to Pakistan becoming a religious theocracy. The United States, India, and China are likely to take different steps in response to Pakistan's new extremist government's actions against any of the other actors or the world in general. By utilizing steps four through six of the LAMP we are able to determine the possible courses of action available and the major scenarios in which we will compare the alternate futures. There are an infinite number of possible actions available to each of the actors involved however, we must generalize the responses or it would be impossible to conduct a predictive study. In developing the potential responses of the United States, India, and China we must look at the potential economic impact on each country, the political problems that may arise, and the national security concerns of each country. By doing this we are able to theorize that the possible

courses of action available to each nation are: utilizing force against to affect regime change, use diplomatic efforts as a hedge against the spread of extremism, and use economic sanctions to weaken the government at home. There is also the possibility that the three nations could do nothing and allow Pakistan to engage in whatever action it feels; however it is not included in this study. Many of the actions proposed above would prove costly both at home in each country and around the world. However, by examining each of these possibilities we are able to remove any bias that may have made its way into the study and also to provide a most likely alternate future.

MAJOR SCENARIOS

Pakistan is the catalyst for all actions that will be undertaken by the other three nations involved in this study. The reason for this is that should they decide that they will not participate in any of the three scenarios provided below then there is no need to differentiate from the status quo of the relationship that currently exists between the actors. However, should Pakistan attempt any of the actions below then there must be a reaction from the three other actors. Utilizing LAMP the analyst will develop the scenarios which will dictate Pakistan's behavior and then by utilizing the actor's perceptions will develop the alternate futures. The three major scenarios that will affect Pakistan are: it becomes a safe haven for terrorist groups from which they launch worldwide attacks, it attempts to regain control of the disputed zones, and it begins to threaten its neighbors with its nuclear arsenal. Each of these scenarios is likely to produce a different reaction from the other three actors involved and in order to perform the LAMP the analyst now must perform step six and calculate the total number of permutations of the alternate futures.

PERMUTATIONS OF BEHAVIOR

To determine how many “alternate futures” are possible for the actors involved in the study the LAMP uses the equations $X^Y=Z$. In the equation X equals the number of actions available to each actor, Y equals the number of national actors involved and Z equals the total number of alternate futures to be compared (Lockwood & Lockwood 1993, 38). In this study there are four courses of action for each of the three actors; this includes the option of doing nothing and also Pakistan’s options which are covered in the scenarios. Taking this into account this analysis becomes $3^3=27$, which means there are 27 possible “alternate futures” that need to be examined in regards to the United States, India, and China as they relate to each of the three scenarios dictated by Pakistan. The next step is to create tables for each of the scenarios that include all of the possible 27 “alternate futures”, which will allow the analyst to conduct the “pairwise comparison” dictated by the LAMP. To develop the tables the analyst must take each scenario individually and use each of the actor’s options. The alternate futures scenarios will be shortened with the abbreviations below:

Utilizing Force to Affect Regime Change: UF

Using Diplomatic Methods to Hedge against the Spread of Extremism: UD

Use Economic Sanctions to Weaken the Government at Home: ES

The three scenarios will also use abbreviations:

Scenario 1: Terrorist Safe Haven: TS

Scenario 2: Regain Control of Disputed Zones: DZ

Scenario 3: Nuclear Threats Against its Neighbors: NT

Table 1-Alternate Future Permutations

Possible Future #	United States	India	China
1	UF	UF	UF
2	UF	UF	UD
3	UF	UD	UF
4	UD	UF	UF
5	UF	UD	UD
6	UD	UF	UD
7	UD	UD	UF
8	UD	UD	UD
9	UF	UF	ES
10	UF	ES	UF
11	ES	UF	UF
12	UF	ES	ES
13	ES	UF	ES
14	ES	ES	UF
15	ES	ES	ES
16	UD	UD	ES
17	UD	ES	UD
18	ES	UD	UD
19	ES	ES	UD
20	UD	ES	ES
21	ES	UD	ES
22	UF	ES	UD
23	UF	UD	ES
24	UD	ES	UF
25	UD	UF	ES
26	ES	UD	UF
27	ES	UF	UD

PAIRWISE COMPARISONS FOR EACH SCENARIO

Now that the analyst has completed the Alternate Futures Table (Table 1) they are now able to conduct the pairwise comparison utilizing each alternate future within each of the scenarios presented above. You will begin by comparing the first two alternate futures relative to the scenario in question. By doing this you will develop a theory as to which one is more likely. This is done by utilizing the understanding of each actor’s viewpoints, biases, and perceptions that were developed earlier. After you complete the comparison of the first two futures you compare the first and the third and so on. This continues until all of the futures have been compared to

each other and voted on. The formula for the number of pairwise comparisons is expressed as follows:

$$X = (n-1) + (n-2) \dots + (n-n)$$

Where n equals the total number of alternate futures to be analyzed, and X equals the total number of pairwise comparisons that must be performed (Lockwood & Lockwood 1993, 40-41). By substituting the number of alternate futures (27) for n the equation looks like:

$$X = (27-1) + (27-2) \dots + (27-27)$$

Once the calculations are complete the total number of pairwise comparisons is 351 for each of the three scenarios. After the number of comparisons that need to be made are established the analyst will use the same alternate futures table created above but will add another column labeled votes to establish the most likely response to each scenario. The following tables help to establish the most likely alternate futures for each of the three scenarios relating to Pakistan.

Table 2

Alternate Future

Scenario 1: Terrorist Safe haven

Possible Future #	United States	India	China	Votes
1	UF	UF	UF	15
2	UF	UF	UD	26
3	UF	UD	UF	3
4	UD	UF	UF	6
5	UF	UD	UD	18
6	UD	UF	UD	24
7	UD	UD	UF	4
8	UD	UD	UD	16
9	UF	UF	ES	25
10	UF	ES	UF	3
11	ES	UF	UF	7
12	UF	ES	ES	14
13	ES	UF	ES	21
14	ES	ES	UF	1
15	ES	ES	ES	10
16	UD	UD	ES	12
17	UD	ES	UD	13
18	ES	UD	UD	16
19	ES	ES	UD	13
20	UD	ES	ES	9
21	ES	UD	ES	10
22	UF	ES	UD	19
23	UF	UD	ES	16
24	UD	ES	UF	4
25	UD	UF	ES	21
26	ES	UD	UF	3
27	ES	UF	UD	22

351

Table 3

Alternate Future

Scenario 2: Regain Disputed Zones with India

Possible Future #	United States	India	China	Votes
1	UF	UF	UF	3
2	UF	UF	UD	11
3	UF	UD	UF	2
4	UD	UF	UF	10
5	UF	UD	UD	3
6	UD	UF	UD	22
7	UD	UD	UF	7
8	UD	UD	UD	18
9	UF	UF	ES	12
10	UF	ES	UF	2
11	ES	UF	UF	12
12	UF	ES	ES	4
13	ES	UF	ES	25
14	ES	ES	UF	7
15	ES	ES	ES	16
16	UD	UD	ES	19
17	UD	ES	UD	19
18	ES	UD	UD	22
19	ES	ES	UD	21
20	UD	ES	ES	15
21	ES	UD	ES	19
22	UF	ES	UD	4
23	UF	UD	ES	7
24	UD	ES	UF	9
25	UD	UF	ES	24
26	ES	UD	UF	12
27	ES	UF	UD	26

351

Table 4

Alternate Future

Scenario 3: Threaten neighbors with nuclear arsenal

Possible Future #	United States	India	China	Votes
1	UF	UF	UF	9
2	UF	UF	UD	17
3	UF	UD	UF	4
4	UD	UF	UF	11
5	UF	UD	UD	9
6	UD	UF	UD	26
7	UD	UD	UF	7
8	UD	UD	UD	23
9	UF	UF	ES	13
10	UF	ES	UF	0
11	ES	UF	UF	9
12	UF	ES	ES	5
13	ES	UF	ES	21
14	ES	ES	UF	1
15	ES	ES	ES	12
16	UD	UD	ES	19
17	UD	ES	UD	19
18	ES	UD	UD	22
19	ES	ES	UD	18
20	UD	ES	ES	15
21	ES	UD	ES	18
22	UF	ES	UD	8
23	UF	UD	ES	10
24	UD	ES	UF	3
25	UD	UF	ES	21
26	ES	UD	UF	7
27	ES	UF	UD	24

351

Table 5

Reordered Alternate Futures

Scenario 1: Become a Terrorist Safe haven

Possible Future #	United States	India	China	Votes
2	UF	UF	UD	26
9	UF	UF	ES	25
6	UD	UF	UD	24
27	ES	UF	UD	22
25	UD	UF	ES	21
13	ES	UF	ES	21
22	UF	ES	UD	19
5	UF	UD	UD	18
8	UD	UD	UD	16
18	ES	UD	UD	16
23	UF	UD	ES	16
1	UF	UF	UF	15
12	UF	ES	ES	14
17	UD	ES	UD	13
19	ES	ES	UD	13
16	UD	UD	ES	12
15	ES	ES	ES	10
21	ES	UD	ES	10
20	UD	ES	ES	9
11	ES	UF	UF	7
4	UD	UF	UF	6
24	UD	ES	UF	4
7	UD	UD	UF	4
26	ES	UD	UF	3
3	UF	UD	UF	3
10	UF	ES	UF	3
14	ES	ES	UF	1

351

Table 6

Reordered Alternate Futures

Scenario 2: Regain Disputed Zones with India

Possible Future #	United States	India	China	Votes
27	ES	UF	UD	26
13	ES	UF	ES	25
25	UD	UF	ES	24
6	UD	UF	UD	22
18	ES	UD	UD	22
19	ES	ES	UD	21
16	UD	UD	ES	19
17	UD	ES	UD	19
21	ES	UD	ES	19
8	UD	UD	UD	18
15	ES	ES	ES	16
20	UD	ES	ES	15
9	UF	UF	ES	12
11	ES	UF	UF	12
26	ES	UD	UF	12
2	UF	UF	UD	11
4	UD	UF	UF	10
24	UD	ES	UF	9
7	UD	UD	UF	7
14	ES	ES	UF	7
23	UF	UD	ES	7
12	UF	ES	ES	4
22	UF	ES	UD	4
1	UF	UF	UF	3
5	UF	UD	UD	3
3	UF	UD	UF	2
10	UF	ES	UF	2

351

Table 7

Reordered Alternate Futures

Scenario 3: Threaten Neighbors with Nuclear Arsenal

Possible Future #	United States	India	China	Votes
6	UD	UF	UD	26
27	ES	UF	UD	24
8	UD	UD	UD	23
18	ES	UD	UD	22
13	ES	UF	ES	21
25	UD	UF	ES	21
16	UD	UD	ES	19
17	UD	ES	UD	19
19	ES	ES	UD	18
21	ES	UD	ES	18
2	UF	UF	UD	17
20	UD	ES	ES	15
9	UF	UF	ES	13
15	ES	ES	ES	12
4	UD	UF	UF	11
23	UF	UD	ES	10
1	UF	UF	UF	9
5	UF	UD	UD	9
11	ES	UF	UF	9
22	UF	ES	UD	8
7	UD	UD	UF	7
26	ES	UD	UF	7
12	UF	ES	ES	5
3	UF	UD	UF	4
24	UD	ES	UF	3
14	ES	ES	UF	1
10	UF	ES	UF	0

351

By examining the reordered alternate futures table we are able to reach several conclusions about the manner in which the three actors will react to Pakistan and the actions they may undertake. All of this will be explored in greater detail in the section to follow.

ALTERNATE FUTURES ANALYSIS

SCENARIO 1- PAKISTAN BECOMES A TERRORIST SAFEHAVEN

This is one of the direst situations that could arrive in a future Pakistan. Allowing terrorist organizations to operate freely within their borders will give them free reign to engage in attacks throughout the world. Considering Pakistani ISI cooperation in the past the analyst can only assume the same will occur. This will provide for a greater amount of research, funding, and equipment for any jihadi organization to carry out attacks against the perceived enemies of Islam. This scenario does not cover nuclear weapons being given to jihadists that will be covered in scenario 3.

The leading results of the study all foresee India taking military action to prevent attacks on its soil while China takes no action and America takes an almost wait and see attitude. The three scenarios that received at least 24 votes are the ones that have been deemed most likely by the author.

Alternate Future #2:

The United States and India use military force to attempt to affect regime change and limit the amount of terrorist attacks that could take place while China seeks a more diplomatic resolution regarding the Uighurs in Xinjiang. This future received the highest possible number of votes at 26. It calls on the United States to use its military might to strike against the Pakistani government for harboring terrorists. The most likely result of this will be the use of cruise missiles and predator drones much in the same way as it was done prior to the invasion of Afghanistan. India will attempt to partner with the United States to try to build a coalition to invade Pakistan and take out the government that way but most likely will not be successful. This will force India to use its larger conventional forces to attack Pakistan when the government

supported anti-Indian terror groups begin attacks in India much like the 2008 Mumbai attacks. China, who currently holds the best diplomatic and historical relationship with Pakistan, will seek to maintain that connection. This coupled with their strong desire to be seen as pro-Muslim in the region will prevent them from taking up arms to assist the United States and India. They will use their diplomatic relationship to attempt to prevent the training of the Uighur rebels in their Xinjiang provinces and will continue to provide the Pakistani government with observer status in the SCO. This future allows the Chinese to save face with the Muslim world and the United States and India to be able to defend itself or take a first strike option both of which are reasonable considering the fact that Pakistan is an open supporter of jihad at this juncture.

Alternate Future # 9:

The United States and India use military force to attempt to affect regime change and limit the amount of terrorist attacks in the region while China uses economic sanctions to force the government to crack down on training of Uighur rebels.

This future received 25 of the possible votes making it the second most likely. It calls for the use of military action by the United States and India to attempt to destabilize the Pakistani regime. The United States will use a cruise missile strikes and predator drones to attempt to hunt down the leaders in Pakistan and may utilize U.S. Special Operations soldiers and the C.I.A. to attempt to destabilize the government. India meanwhile will use whatever force they deem necessary to secure themselves against attack. By doing so they will be able to use their substantial advantage in conventional weaponry and personnel to secure themselves against the Pakistani army. However, the continued aggressive actions by anti-Indian terror groups will force them to attempt to attack the leaders of the groups. China will use its economic partnership

as leverage against Pakistan to try to get them to crack down on the training camps in country. This will have the two fold advantage of allowing them to garner what the need to remain secure while also showing other Muslim nations that by stopping attacks on China they will support whatever regime is in power economically. This scenario much like the first allows China to avoid the bulk of the ire from jihadi groups while still remaining secure and forces India and the United States to use force to secure their countries safety.

Alternate Future # 6:

The United States and China engage in diplomatic talks with Pakistan to prevent the further spread of the camps while India uses force to protect their national security.

This scenario received 24 votes making it the third most likely. In this alternate future the United States has reopened diplomatic lines of communication with the extremist government in an attempt to prevent the further spread of the camps. This is much the same way they are engaging the Taliban in Afghanistan today. By engaging the Pakistani government via open diplomatic channels the United States will hope to avoid a full scale conflict like those immediately following 9/11. China will also actively participate in these talks due to the fact that they wish to avoid being seen as anti-Muslim by the jihadists and still need to protect their national security interests in Xinjiang. Meanwhile due to the cross border attacks by anti-Indian groups India is once again going to use force to be comfortable with their national security situation. Having the United States and China engage in diplomatic talks with the Pakistani government will have the benefit of keeping both countries as being perceived as anti-Muslim, which could benefit the United States in the long term. However, by having India engaged in a

one on one conflict with Pakistan it poses the more significant problem of the two countries escalating to nuclear conflict. This instance is dealt with in scenario three.

Of the three alternate futures presented above they all show that India is the country which is most likely to engage in armed conflict with Pakistan. They have been at a state of de facto conflict since the partition in 1947 and have had several small scale conflicts since then. If Pakistan is run by religious extremists the support given to the anti-Indian terror groups by elements of the government will undoubtedly increase which will cause the Indian's to react accordingly. Should this happen the United States is most likely to provide support via their Special Operations community and cruise missile and predator capacity while China remains on the sideline choosing instead to garner a political relationship with the government based on its longstanding support of the Pakistani people. Overall having Pakistan being run by extremists and acting as a staging ground and safe haven will be bad for the three major actors involved; however their reactions may be able to prevent a further outbreak of radicalism.

SCENARIO 2: PAKISTAN ATTEMPTS TO TAKE CONTROL OF THE DISPUTED ZONES WITH INDIA

This is the second most troubling of the three scenarios presented in this study. Pakistan in the past has shown little to no aversion to open conflict with India regarding the regions of Kashmir and Jammu and should they become a country run by extremists they will have a continued influx of willing fighters to join the jihad. India will be forced to defend itself and since the United States and China have no real reasons to get involved militarily will most likely take steps to hinder Pakistan in its fight. These are the most likely alternate futures for this scenario.

Alternate Future #27:

The United States imposes strict economic sanctions on what Pakistan is capable of importing, including military hardware,; while India engages in a military conflict to defend itself and its national security; and China uses its diplomatic power to attempt to convince the Pakistani's to come to the bargaining table.

This future was given 26 votes making it the most likely of the alternate futures. In this future the United States will use its economic might and cut of all aid, both military and humanitarian, to Pakistan in an attempt to put a stranglehold on the government. This will have the negative affect of galvanizing the people against the U.S. but will help India in its conflict. India will engage in a full scale conventional assault once the Pakistani's make an attempt on the disputed regions. This will prove disastrous for the Pakistani's and will likely result in their defeat given that they have lost the military aid that has proven so important from the United States. The Chinese will likely use their diplomatic sway with the Pakistani government to try to have them pull out of the conflict as well as hedge against it expanding should the Pakistani's set their sights on joining with the Uighur's to create an autonomous region in southern China. This alternate future is the one that is most beneficial for the United States as it only calls on them to deprive the Pakistani's of aid; however it does paint them in a very negative light in the Muslim world. India will be able to easily handle the conventional attacks of the Pakistani army but must be careful with regards to non-conventional attacks, such as state sponsored terrorism. China will be able to still be seen as pro-Muslim and possibly more so because they will also be able to challenge India with full admission to the SCO if they end the conflict peacefully.

Alternate Future # 13

The United States again imposes strict economic sanctions and is joined by the Chinese while India is again forced to defend itself and its national security.

This scenario is much like alternate future 27 except the Chinese have cut off diplomatic ties and have resorted to economic sanctions against Pakistan. This would be the most devastating for Pakistan due to the fact that it would cut off all aid from the United States and now China. The Pakistani's would likely be unable to maintain the conflict against India if the aid from the United States was pulled and China began to pull their aid, as well as, investments made in its infrastructure, energy grid, and military. China would also likely remove the observer status of Pakistan in the SCO, which would prevent it from having the forum to make strike economic agreements with other Central Asian nations. By removing these two sources of financing for the Pakistani government they would almost be crippled. Add to that a conflict with India and Pakistan's extremist government may fall victim to a population of broken, starving, war torn civilians looking for change. This future may result in an uprising in Pakistan. The other issue that may arise is that China may be seen as anti-Muslim which a notion they have continually attempted to dispel is.

Alternate Future # 25:

The United States engages in diplomatic actions, while India uses military force to secure the disputed regions and its national security and China imposes strict economic sanctions on Pakistan.

This was voted the third most likely future with 24 votes. In this future the United States has resorted to engaging the Pakistani government in an attempt to achieve a diplomatic solution to the conflict in the disputed regions. They will also engage in talks with the Indian government

to try to bring them into the peace process. India will still need to defend itself against the aggression in the disputed zones but will be helped by China's economic sanctions. The imposition of these sanctions will prevent the Pakistani's from utilizing China to borrow money to finance the conflict, or receive military aid from the Chinese. China may also strip Pakistan of its observer status in the SCO and prevent it from making future economic agreements with its members. This future poses several benefits for the United States. It allows them to stay out of direct military action and also appear pro-Muslim by helping to mediate the dispute.

All of these futures have pros and cons with regards to the scenario of Pakistan attempting to reclaim the dispute zones. However, the country that stands to lose the most in all of these futures is India being that it must defend itself and will see military action as utterly unavoidable.

SCENARIO 3: PAKISTAN THREATENS ITS NEIGHBORS WITH ITS NUCLEAR ARSENAL

This is the most terrifying scenario of the three. It supposes that the extremist government of Pakistan is willing to use its nuclear arsenal to terrorize its neighbors into doing what it wants. This presents a significant problem for the other three countries involved particularly India. India has always had a no first strike policy due in large part to its superiority with conventional forces. Should Pakistan begin to threaten them with nuclear weapons that policy may have to be reevaluated? The United States and China have a responsibility as signers of the NPT and as superpowers to prevent this sort of situation from occurring and will have to use all of their resources to stave off a full scale nuclear conflict.

Alternate Future # 6:

The United States and China engage in high level diplomatic talks while India takes military action to attempt to prevent the worsening of the crisis.

The United States and China will immediately begin diplomatic talks with Pakistan to ascertain the likelihood of nuclear attack against themselves and their populations abroad. Due to China's support over the decades and its strong pro-Muslim perception they will have to best options available to them to talk the extremist government from the proverbial ledge. The United States on the other hand will no doubt leave military options on the table but is unlikely to engage in them because any attempt to secure the nuclear arsenal by American Special Operations forces will only enrage the entire Pakistani population and galvanize them to their government's extremist views. India will most likely take the appropriate steps to avoid being attacked by surprise and will make known its abilities to retaliate. It will move into the disputed zones to give itself a tactical advantage while prepping for the assault into Pakistan. Should Pakistan actually launch a nuclear strike on one of its neighbors all manner of diplomacy from India will be out the window and a nuclear exchange is likely to follow.

Alternate Future # 27:

The United States imposes strict economic sanctions, while India engages in military action to prevent a worsening crisis, and China uses diplomatic means to attempt to secure and end to the crisis.

This scenario received 24 votes making it the second most likely. In it the United States again cuts off all humanitarian and military based aid to Pakistan in an attempt to force them to stand down from their threat of using nuclear weapons. India again moves into the dispute region to provide a buffer zone against a conventional attack by Pakistan and makes known its ability to

retaliate to a nuclear strike. China once again uses its diplomatic sway with Pakistan to attempt to secure a peaceful solution to the conflict. This once again puts them in a positive view with Muslims throughout the world. The economic sanctions imposed by the United States will likely cause the regime to focus on earning money in different ways which may include selling a nuclear weapon to another regime which could prove deadly for the United States. Overall this future is not that detrimental to the United States of China but puts India in an incredibly unenviable position.

Alternate Future # 8:

All three nations engage in diplomatic negotiations with Pakistan to prevent a worsening crisis.

In this alternate future Pakistan is brought to the negotiating table with all three nations. While none of them takes military action or economic sanctions of the table they prefer to end this crisis peacefully. By engaging in these talks all of the countries appear to support peace in the region, as well as, maintain a status quo of perceptions with none getting better and none getting worse. It is also important because it creates an open dialogue between the nations with nuclear weapons and does not marginalize Pakistan even though it is controlled by extremists. By engaging in these talks a hopeful peaceful solution could be undertaken which be the most beneficial to all parties involved.

By examining the nine most likely alternate futures involving Pakistan as an extremist state it is clear that the vast majority of the time India will engage in armed conflict. This is due to the decades of anger and mistrust between the two nations and a lack of open communication by their diplomats. China will rarely engage in armed conflict due to their desire to maintain the

perception they are pro-Muslim. They will generally attempt diplomatic means and cozy up to any regime that they deem capable of advancing their goals and security. The United States is caught between a rock and a hard place. By engaging in military action they will likely galvanize the population of Pakistan against them and create more difficulty in the long run. However, by engaging in diplomatic negotiations they must go against their long standing policy of not negotiating with extremists and the politicians involved may be called weak by the population at home. Overall these countries will face some very difficult decisions should Pakistan ever become a religious theocracy. The next step in the study will allow the analyst to examine the alternate futures that can transpose into one another taking the issue to another place entirely and finally the author will examine some of the trigger events for all three scenarios.

TRANSPOSITION OF ALTERNATE FUTURES

According to LAMP the transposition of alternate futures occurs because “every act of free will has the potential to change the future” (Lockwood & Lockwood 1993, 55). This means that any action undertaken by any actor in the scenarios has the ability to change the actions of any other actor in any alternate future. The following are the likely transposition of events. For all scenarios assume that any of these actions could result in all three countries taking military action against Pakistan.

SCENARIO 1: PAKISTAN BECOMES A TERRORIST SAFE HAVEN

In this scenario transposition can be found by analyzing the United States’ ability to effectively deal with the Pakistani government in a non-military manner. By examining alternate futures 6, 8, 16, 17, 20, 25 all of these have the potential to transpose into future 2. This is due to the fact that in each of these alternate futures the United States is engaged in diplomatic talks and

at any time may decide that military action is the more fitting course to take against Pakistan. This is all due to the responses of the Pakistani government.

SCENARIO 2: PAKISTAN ATTEMPTS TO REGAIN THE DISPUTED ZONES WITH INDIA

In this scenario transposition between the alternate futures is very unlikely due to the fact that India will be engaged in securing its national defense. Drawing the United States and China into conflict and away from diplomatic talks would require the use of weapons against either of those countries or one of Pakistan's neighbors. This scenario is entirely dependent on the reactions between Pakistan and India when Pakistan decides to begin the conflict.

SCENARIO 3: PAKISTAN THREATENS NEIGHBORS WITH NUCLEAR ARSENAL

All of the alternate futures available on this scenario have to ability to transpose into alternate future # 1. This is due to the fact that nuclear weapons are involved and should the Pakistani's threaten either of the three countries with nuclear attack military action is almost a given. By having alternate future #8 as the third best option it allows all three countries to have a diplomatic out while still maintaining the ability to prosecute a military campaign should they feel threatened.

Overall the alternate futures leave little room for transposition due in large part to the Chinese desire to avoid conflict with a Muslim nation and India's overwhelming need for national security. These two factors will influence a majority of their decisions when dealing with an extremist Pakistan.

FOCAL EVENTS AND INDICATORS

The final LAMP steps are to develop the focal events that will bring about a given alternate future and the indicators of those events. By establishing these two items it gives the reader and the analyst a sort of checklist to determine if an alternate future that had been proposed in the study is actually occurring. To examine these types of things we must first understand that Pakistan needs to fall to religious extremists for any of these alternate futures to occur. By establishing that groundwork we are able to take the most likely alternate futures and break them down into possible indicators. The most likely alternate futures and their indicators are presented below.

Alternate Future # 27:

This future consistently garnered enough votes to place it in the top five in all three scenarios. Here the United States uses economic sanctions to try to get Pakistan to cooperate on a given instance. India uses its conventional military power to engage Pakistan; and China deals diplomatically with the extremist government.

FOCAL EVENTS:

1. Pakistan's current government is overrun by religious extremists
2. India vows to defend itself against the new regime.
3. China continues diplomatic cooperation with the new regime.
4. America cuts off both military and humanitarian aid to Pakistan.

INDICATORS:

1. Current government in Pakistan cannot get control of extremists in the border provinces.
2. The United States sees that they are paying elements of al Qaeda in the Pakistani military and immediately cut off aid.
3. India conducts more military exercises in the area near the disputed zones.
4. China continues maintaining contact with Pakistan and also makes attempts at diplomatic outreach to the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Alternate Future #6:

This future is essentially the same as future 27 however the United States has entered a period of diplomatic talks with the extremist regime in Pakistan.

FOCAL EVENTS:

1. The United States rethinks its stance against negotiating with terrorists and extremists.

INDICATORS:

1. The United States begins discussions with the Taliban in Afghanistan and is seen as pro-Muslim for the first time in a decade. This carries forward to an extremist controlled Pakistan that is more willing to negotiate with the United States.

Alternate Future #13:

This future calls for both the United States and China to engage Pakistan with economic sanctions. India will continue to defend itself against aggression and will use military force as it deems necessary.

FOCAL EVENTS:

1. Pakistan refuses to gain control of the extremists within their borders; prompting the United States and China to take action.

2. India is subjected to increasing terrorist attacks which are implicitly linked to the Pakistani government.

INDICATORS

1. The United States and China begin to scale back military aid eventually turning of the tap entirely.

2. India moves more troops to the disputed border regions and begins a general state of preparedness.

3. The civilian government of Pakistan refuses to cooperate with its current allies.

CONCLUSION

The question of what would happen if Pakistan was ever to be controlled by religious extremists is a difficult one to answer. However, by analyzing the actions of the United States, India, and China an analyst is able to approximate a response based in a historical perspective while also accounting for each countries free will. The potential for Pakistan to fall to religious extremists is great and many feel that it is more than likely to occur in the next few years.

Therefore it is important to understand what each countries options are. The groups that would be in charge of an extremist Pakistan would be most like the Taliban that ruled Afghanistan before 9/11. This is due in large part to the support and resources that have been provided by the current intelligence service and military in Pakistan. These groups have been able to thrive in the lawless tribal regions on the border with Afghanistan and pose a significant threat to Pakistan's weak civilian leader Asif Ali Zardari and will continue to pose a threat for the foreseeable future.

By taking the findings in this study and examining our options when Pakistan becomes a religious theocracy we will be able to alter our national security strategy to build stronger relationships with the Chinese and India. By helping with economic growth in the region we will be able to have a larger ability to impose diplomatic sanctions on an extremist government and by moving away from the policy of no negotiation we may be able to stave off nuclear war. Understanding the culture that is present in a country like Pakistan may be the most important thing that our policy makers can do at the present. By doing this they will be able to hopefully see why we have such a low standing on the worlds political stage and why most people in Pakistan feel that they are being controlled as puppets by the west. Only by understanding the culture that we will be facing should Pakistan fall to religious extremists will we be able to fully comprehend the difficult task which lies ahead.

To expand this study we must continue to monitor the situation and dig deeper into the reasons why the Chinese feel the way they do regarding their perceptions in the Muslim world. Also developing an understanding of Iran's role as a regional power and how they may be able to control a state such as Pakistan in this situation is also important. Overall developing a basic understanding of possible alternative futures is the best option that is presented at this point. In

conclusion, we must continue to monitor the situation and prepare for the worst that way should the futures outlined in this study ever occur we will be prepared.

REFERENCE LIST

1. America, India and Pakistan." *Strategic Comments* 11, no. 2 (March 2005): 1-2. *International Security & Counter Terrorism Reference Center*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 20, 2010).
2. Bajoria, Jayshree. 2010. Pakistan's New Generation of Terrorists. *Backgrounder*, (October). http://www.cfr.org/publication/15422/pakistans_new_generation_of_terrorists.html (accessed October 8, 2010).
3. Brulliard, Karin. 2010. Pakistan's Judiciary Threatens Government Stability. *Washington Post*, October 12.
4. *The World Fact book 2009*. Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 2009. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html>
5. "China, Pakistan begin anti-terror drill in northwest China." *BBC Monitoring Newsfile* 3 July 2010. <http://www.proquest.com/> (accessed October 6, 2010).
6. Feinstein, Lee, et al. 2002. "A New Equation U.S. Policy toward India and Pakistan after September 11." 1-48. *Carnegie Endowment Working Papers*, no. 27. <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/wp27.pdf> (accessed 20 Sep. 2010).

7. Ganguly, Sumit, and Nicholas Howenstein. 2009. "INDIA-PAKISTAN RIVALRY IN AFGHANISTAN." 127-140. *Journal of International Affairs*, 2009. *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 20, 2010).
8. Hersh, Seymour M. 2009. "DEFENDING THE ARSENAL." *New Yorker* 85, no. 37: 28-37. *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 20, 2010).
9. Kerr, Paul K., and Mary Beth Nikitin. 2010. "Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons: Proliferation and Security Issues: RL34248." *Congressional Research Service: Report 1-20. International Security & Counter Terrorism Reference Center*, EBSCOhost (October 1, 2010).
10. Kronstadt, K. Alan. 2007. "India-U.S. Relations: RL33529." *Congressional Research Service: Report 1-63. International Security & Counter Terrorism Reference Center*, EBSCOhost (accessed October 16, 2010).
11. Kugelman, Michael. 2009. "Can China Deliver in Pakistan?" *World Politics Review* 3. *International Security & Counter Terrorism Reference Center*, EBSCOhost (accessed October 16, 2010).
12. Lockwood, Jonathan, and Kathleen O'Brien Lockwood. 1993. *The Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction*. MBS.
13. Menon, S.. 2009. *Hostile Relations: India's Pakistan Dilemma*. *Harvard International Review* 31, no. 3, (October 1): 14-18. <http://www.proquest.com.ezproxy1.apus.edu/> (accessed September 15, 2010).

14. Norling, Nicklas, and Niklas Swanström. 2007. "The Shanghai Cooperation Organization, trade, and the roles of Iran, India and Pakistan." *Central Asian Survey* 26, no. 3: 429-444. *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed October 16, 2010).
15. Petrou, Michael. "WORTH THE TROUBLE?" *Maclean's* 120, no. 46 (November 26, 2007): 34-38. *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 20, 2010).
16. PTI. 2010. Pakistan Got \$18bn aid from US since 2001. *Times of India*, February 23.
17. Raghavan, V.R. 2004. "The Double-Edged Effect in South Asia." *Washington Quarterly* 27, no. 4: 147-155. *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 11, 2010).
18. Riedel, Bruce. 2009. "Armageddon in Islamabad." *National Interest* no. 102: 9-18. *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 11, 2010).
19. Rising, David. 2010. Pakistan Reopens Afghan border crossing NATO uses. *Washington Post*, October 10.
20. Swami, Praveen. 2004. "Failed Threats and Flawed Fences: India's Military Responses to Pakistan's Proxy War." *India Review* 3, no. 2: 147-170. *Academic Search Premier*, EBSCOhost (accessed September 11, 2010).
21. Wietz, Richard. 2010. Wary China Watches Taliban Resurgence. *Jane's Islamic Affairs Analyst* (January).
<http://search.janes.com.ezproxy1.apus.edu/Search/documentView.do?docId=/content1/janesdata/mags/jiaa/history/jiaa2010/jiaa5254.htm@current&pageSelected=allJanes&keyword=china and pakistan and>

extremists&backPath=http://search.janes.com.ezproxy1.apus.edu/Search&Prod_Name=JIAA&
(accessed September 20, 2010).